

## OUGHT THE TONGUE TO BE CUT OUT? (Ar. *Plut.* 1110)

Cario's reply to Hermes in the finale of Aristophanes' *Plutus* remains one of the passages in Greek drama on which there is no agreement among commentators. I quote here the reading of the new Oxford edition by N. G. Wilson for reasons that will be clarified below, *Plut.* 1110:

ἢ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι τούτῳ γίγνεται.

The distribution of main variants γίγνεται / τέμνεται as attested by the tradition is as follows: γίγνεται RK, Us.l., Vγρ: τέμνεται cett., Κγρ, Su.<sup>1</sup> Wilson is not the only one to adopt the reading γίγνεται: among his predecessors were Holzinger, Bergk and Dindorf.<sup>2</sup> And yet most editions of the play adopt the reading τέμνεται. At first glance, this reading seems to be supported by the custom to cut the tongue of a sacrificed animal (Ar. *Pax* 1060; *Av.* 1705: Ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται) and to give it to the priest or other official, including, if he was present, the messenger.<sup>3</sup> This reading is the basis of two main interpretations of this passage, which were proposed by the scholiasts and which are preserved in Tzetzes' *Commentary on Aristophanes*.<sup>4</sup>

1. Cario may regret that such a delicacy as the tongue of a sacrificed animal is offered to the messenger of such bad news, cf. *Sch. Ar. Plut.* 1110:

οὐ ματαίως θύομεν αὐτῷ τὰς γλώσσας τοιαῦτα κηρύσσοντι.

But the reading γίγνεται could have exactly the same sense. Moreover, if τέμνεται was the original reading, it is unclear, as Wilson has pointed

<sup>1</sup> N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Aristophanis Fabulae II* (Oxford 2007).

<sup>2</sup> K. Holzinger, *Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos* (Wien – Leipzig 1940) 308.

<sup>3</sup> In Homeric times, the tongue was sacrificed separately (*Od.* 3. 341). For the practice which existed up to the time of Aristophanes, see: N. Dunbar (ed.), *Aristophanes Birds* (Oxford 1995) 510.

<sup>4</sup> L. Massa Positano, D. Holwerda, W. J. W. Koster (ed.), *I. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem: Fasc. I continens prolegomena et commentarium in Plutum* (Groningen 1960).

out, “why γίγνεται should have been added”.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary one can easily imagine how τέμνεται could have gotten into the text as a gloss.<sup>6</sup> So γίγνεται as *lectio difficilior* is surely preferable here. But is the meaning of the phrase achieved within the limits of this interpretation really satisfactory in the context of the scene?

According to Holzinger, it is Cario’s constant preoccupation with food that accounts for his statement: he finds it a pity that the delicacy is intended for Hermes.<sup>7</sup> There are however some obstacles to this approach. Firstly, Cario could not have been the intended recipient of the sacrificed tongue anyway; hence this phrase can have nothing to do with his weakness for food. But even more importantly, in last part of the play Cario, as Olson has observed, “undergoes a radical evolution, as his character as an insolent slave is decisively repudiated and changed”<sup>8</sup> In the scene with Hermes he is no more a slave always concerned with his belly but a priest of the new cult. Conversely, Hermes, Cario’s “social equal”, remains a typical slave concerned only with his belly. About one third of their dialogue (*Plut.* 1120–1138) is devoted to a discussion of food, without which Hermes is ready to betray the gods (*Plut.* 1147). Hermes’ slavishness underlines by contrast the dignity of Cario’s new condition.

Some other considerations make me doubt whether Cario’s phrase can imply the sacrificial tongue at all. As Hermes states, from the time Plutus acquired vision there have been no more sacrifices to the gods (*Plut.* 1113 ff.). So the ritual expression accompanying the act of sacrifice would make no sense in the context, and it is very unlikely that Cario is referring to it here. Furthermore, in the ‘gastronomic’ part of his dialog with Cario Hermes mentions his usual food, which he is now lacking (*Plut.* 1120–1122):

εῖχον <...> / πάντ' ἀγάθ' <...> οἰνοῦτταν, μέλι, /  
ἰσχάδας, ὅσ' εἰκός ἐστιν Ἐρμῆν ἐσθίειν.

Neither this list nor the description of other delicacies which follows (flat-cakes, legs of pork and hot innards, cf. *Plut.* 1126–1130) includes a tongue. Finally, Hermes implores Cario to give him a loaf of bread and

<sup>5</sup> N. G. Wilson, *Aristophanea: Studies on the Text of Aristophanes* (Oxford 2007) 212.

<sup>6</sup> Holzinger (n. 2); Wilson (n. 1). If the phrase was conceived as meaning “the tongue is for herald”, τέμνεται could have been added by an erudite who knew the expression ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται (Ar. *Pax* 1060, *Av.* 1705), which was probably used as a ritual phrase during sacrifices.

<sup>7</sup> Holzinger (n. 2) 308 f.

<sup>8</sup> D. Olson, “Cario and the New World of Aristophanes’ *Plutus*”, *TAPA* 119 (1989) 193–199, part. 197.

a piece of meat from the sacrifice, which is being cooked right at the time of the dialog (*Plut.* 1137 f.):

κρέας νεανικὸν  
ῶν θύεθ' ὑμεῖς ἔνδον.

This detail is very important to our purpose. Here, as in the preceding part of the dialogue, there is no mention of the tongue, even though Plutus' followers make a sacrifice in Chremylus' house. Moreover, Hermes is begging for a piece of sacrificial meat from Cario instead of being offered the portion of it (the tongue) that he desires most. But since he is outside the new cult he cannot partake in the sacrificial banquet. This is probably the meaning of Cario's reply to Hermes in *Plut.* 1138: 'Αλλ' οὐκ ἐκφορά. The meat from the sacrifice "is not to be taken out" of Chremylus' house which became the sacred precinct of Plutus.<sup>9</sup> So the only way for Hermes to escape starvation is to be admitted to Chremylus' house as a member of the cult. Thus the text of *Plutus*, as well as of other Aristophanes' comedies, does not support the supposition that the tongue was offered to Hermes. Even if it was, it is highly improbable that Cario could have had it in mind in the context of *Plut.* 1110.

2. The reading τέμνεται admits of another interpretation of the phrase, which involves the tongue not of the sacrificed animal, but that of Cario's addressee Hermes. According to Tzetzes' *Commentary*, this interpretation was already proposed by the scholiasts: *Sch. Ar. Plut.* 1110:

κοπείη ἡ γλῶσσα τοῦ δις ἡμῖν τοιαῦτα κηρύσσει.

Holzinger rejected this possibility on the grounds that it would equate the indicative τέμνεται to the imperative τεμνέσθω.<sup>10</sup> What constitutes the problem here, however, is not so much the need for an imperative, as one can conceive the present indicative τέμνεται as denoting a usual practice. In this case, the meaning would be "the tongue of the messenger of such a bad news is usually cut out". In fact, it is not the grammar but the notion of this bloodthirsty statement that prevents me from accepting this interpretation (see below). It was however reanimated in the recent edition of *Plutus* by A. Sommerstein who translates the verse as follows: 'this herald needs a tongue cutting out'.<sup>11</sup> In the commentary the editor clarifies his thought: in adapting phrases common in sacrifice (ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς

<sup>9</sup> For the phrase οὐκ ἐκφορά as a regular expression in sacrificial regulations see: A. Sommerstein (ed.), *Wealth, The Comedies of Aristophanes XI* (Warminster 2001) 211.

<sup>10</sup> Holzinger (n. 2) followed by Wilson (n. 5) 212.

<sup>11</sup> Sommerstein (n. 9) 209.

τέμνεται and ἡ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι)<sup>12</sup> Cario tells “Hermes that, for bringing so unfriendly a message, his tongue is [i. e. ought to be] cut out”.<sup>13</sup> I doubt whether by referring to the tongue of a sacrificed animal Cario could have hinted at the tongue of Hermes himself. In fact, Sommerstein invites us to see in the phrase a play on the ambiguity of the Dative τῷ κήρυκι (for the herald / of the herald) and to think that behind this common phrase, if it is indeed common (see nn. 3 and 12), Cario actually conceals the threat to punish Hermes by cutting out his tongue. But a play of the sort would have been possible only if the custom of cutting out the tongue had really existed in Athens of 5<sup>th</sup> BC as a penalty for a crime. We know that it was widely practiced in medieval Europe, particularly in Byzantium, which may have determined the Byzantine scholiasts’ interpretation accepted by both Tzetzes and modern scholars. However, I have found no evidence for the existence of such a punishment in archaic and classical Greek literature.<sup>14</sup> In the absence of such evidence, the whole case made by Sommerstein looks doubtful.

Thus my conclusion is that we should agree with Wilson in his preference for the reading γίγνεται in *Plut.* 1110. What I find less convincing is Holzinger’s interpretation of this reading as an indication of Cario’s weakness for food. There remains only one other possibility of understanding the text, namely to interpret γλῶττα not as an anatomical organ but as ‘language, speech’. In this case, γλῶττα may be conceived only as Hermes’ speech. What Cario means by this reference may be inferred from the content of Hermes’ speech itself. But to see it more clearly, we need to return to the beginning of the scene.

Hermes comes to Chremylus’ house at the moment when the kingdom of Plutus has already extended over its original limits (Chremylus’ house) and the gods of Olympus begin to suffer from starvation because nobody offers them sacrifices. At the beginning of the play, Chremylus promised to Plutus that when he could see again he would become mightier than

<sup>12</sup> In fact our evidence allows this suggestion only for the former, see above and n. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Sommerstein (n. 9) 209.

<sup>14</sup> The extirpation of the tongue in Ar. *Eq.* 378 is a particular case connected to the assimilation of Paphlagone to the pig (*Eq.* 375 ff.). Because the tongue is one of the chief seats of pimple-sickness (χαλαζῶν) among pigs (Arist. *HA*. 7 [8]. 21. 603 b 21–22, cf. R. A. Neil [ed.], *The Knights of Aristophanes* [Cambridge 1901, repr. Hildesheim 1966] 59 f. ad loc.), in treating Paphlagon like a pig for cooking (*Eq.* 375 ff.: ἐμβαλόντες αὐτὸν τῷ πάτταλον μαγειρικῶς / εἰς τὸ στόμα) Demosthenes firstly proposes to pull out its tongue in order to examine it on the subject of the disease. Two cases of “cutting out the tongue” adduced by Herodotus, the mutilation of Masistes’ wife by Amestris in Hdt. 9. 112. 5 and cutting out the tongues of Psammetichos’ wives so as to prepare the meal for their children in Hdt. 2. 2. 29, clearly reflect Eastern but not Hellenic realities.

Zeus (*Plut.* 124–126). Now, by the time of the Hermes scene, his prediction has come true and Zeus' reign is seriously threatened. Under these circumstances, the arrival of Hermes bringing threatening news from Zeus resembles the appearance of Hermes in the finale of the *Prometheus Desmotes* (further *PD*). The arrival of the divine herald (which happens in other plays of Aristophanes too)<sup>15</sup> is not the only thing that the two scenes have in common. The beginning of the Hermes scene in *Plutus* (*Plut.* 1097–1110) displays a whole cluster of reminiscences of *PD*, which pertain to structure and plot construction.

Compared to Hermes of *PD*, Hermes of *Plutus* is a comically downgraded figure (cf. Prometheus in the *Birds* as compared to Prometheus of the *PD*).<sup>16</sup> When he tried to speak in the harsh manner of Hermes of *PD*, he behaves like a spy (*Plut.* 1099: Σέ τοι λέγω; cf. *PD* 944–946: Σέ <...> λέγω).<sup>17</sup> At the same time, aware of the vulnerability of his position, he is ready to implore Cario (*Plut.* 1100: ὦ Καρίων, ἀνάμεινον). After he has been interrogated by Cario if it was he who was knocking so hard on the door (1100 f.), Hermes only gradually comes to his senses (*Plut.* 1102 ff.: Μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ἔμελλον <...> ἀλλ' ἐκκάλει...)<sup>18</sup> and finally announces Zeus' threat in the tone that once again reminds us of Hermes of *PD* (*Plut.* 1107: ὦ πόνηρε, cf. *PD* 944 σὲ τὸν σοφιστήν).<sup>19</sup> These fluctuations disappear and Hermes' tone becomes unequivocally ingratiating only after Cario firmly states that the gods will never again receive sacrifices (*Plut.* 1116 f.).

Zeus' message both in *Plutus* and in the *PD* contains a threat to the opposing party, which poses menace to his reign. In *Plutus*, Zeus threatens Plutus' followers (first of all Chremylus and his household) that after having hashed them all up in a bowl, he would throw them into the Barathron (*Plut.* 1108 f.):

εἰς ταῦτὸν ὑμᾶς συγκυκήσας τρύβλιον  
ἀπαξάπαντας εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἐμβαλεῖν.

<sup>15</sup> I'm not inclined to see the influence of Hermes' scene in *PD* on the arrival of Iris in the *Birds* (so Herington) nor in *Peace* where the divine messenger is once more Hermes because in these scenes there are no hints at or relations with the tragedy.

<sup>16</sup> Dunbar (n. 3) 693 f.

<sup>17</sup> This address was probably very harsh (cf. Russian “ребе говорю”). Interestingly we do not meet it again nowhere outside these places, not even in Aristophanes' plays.

<sup>18</sup> In this passage the conceding and apologizing intonation changes to the offensive in the limits of one and the same sentence. One can trace this change in the use of two conjunctions ἀλλά: the former is in sharp contrast to the latter.

<sup>19</sup> See my interpretation of the meaning of σοφιστής in *PD* as ‘schemer, deceiver’: V. Mousbahova, “The Meaning of the Terms σοφιστής and σόφισμα in the *Prometheus Bound*”, *Hyperboreus* 13 (2007) 31–50.

In Attic, the word βάραθρον denoted specifically the cleft outside Athens, which served as a place of punishment of criminals (they were thrown into it, cf. Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 20).<sup>20</sup> Here, in the context highly reminiscent of *PD*, it may hint at Tartarus where Prometheus was thrown in the final cataclysm of the tragedy (*PD* 1050 f.). The threat “to hash up in a bowl” (συγκυκάν), which in itself would be rather superfluous before throwing into Barathron, seems to allude to the finale of *PD*. In my view, it is preferable to see in συγκυκάν an echo of the cataclysmic commingling of elements, which preceded Prometheus’ disappearance in Tartarus (*PD* 994: κυκάτω πάντα καὶ ταρασσέτω, cf. 1081 ff.).

Thus, despite the obvious comic overtones, the threat announced by Hermes is no laughing matter and has the same meaning as do the words of Hermes in *PD* 952: Ζεὺς τοῖς τοιούτοις οὐχὶ μαλθακίζεται. Both in *Plutus* and in *PD*, Hermes’ speech is followed by an utterance of the opposite side. Prometheus clearly reacts to the insulting tone of the herald with irony (*PD* 953 f.):

σεμνόστομός γε καὶ φρονήματος πλέως  
οὐ μῦθος ἔστιν, ὡς θεῶν ὑπηρέτου.

The harshness of Hermes’ speech characterizes him as the gods’ lackey. In other words, one cannot expect the servant of Zeus to speak in a milder style. Cario’s reply to Hermes would sound similar, if we understood γλῶττα in *Plut.* 1110 as ‘speech, language’. Indeed, both Cario and Prometheus react to the threatening tone and content of Hermes’ speech: the speech is characteristic of this herald, i. e. this is exactly what one would expect this kind of herald to say. In this interpretation the definite article ἡ of γλῶττα acquires the notion of demonstrative pronoun just as the article οὐ of μῦθος in *PD* 954 (this speech).<sup>21</sup> It’s noteworthy that in *PD* there is another statement of the same meaning addressed by Hephaestus to Kratos in the prologue of the tragedy, *PD* 78:

όμοία μορφῇ γλῶσσά σου γηρύεται.

“The things that your tongue says” is another way of saying “your speech”, and so Hephaestus says: “Your speech is similar to your aspect”.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> See also Sommerstein (n. 9) 168 ad *Plut.* 431.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 438 f.: τῶν τοι ματαίων ἀνδράσιν φρονημάτων / ἡ γλῶσσ· ἀληθῆς γίγνεται κατήγορος, where the article ἡ of γλῶσσα has the meaning of reflexive pronoun (their own language).

<sup>22</sup> Kratos expresses Zeus’ will while Hephaestus moved by pity for kindred god cannot keep from brief utterances against Kratos’ (i. e. Zeus’) violence as if he spoke for the opposite side. That’s why we feel that the sentence cited above could have been said by Prometheus.

The terrible appearance of Kratos is predetermined by his activities as an executor of supreme will. He is no less a zealous servant of Zeus than Hermes. So Hephaestus indirectly states that the style of Kratos' speech, as that of Hermes', is dependent on his occupation, which is exactly what Prometheus says to Hermes with an open contempt.

Thus the proposed interpretation of Cario's sentence not only has two parallels in the text of *PD*<sup>23</sup> but also escapes the difficulties of both traditional approaches to the line: it supports the reading γίγνεται and perfectly conforms to Cario's new character in the last part of the play. If this interpretation is correct, we have sufficient grounds to suppose that the beginning of the Hermes scene in *Plutus* was modeled on the analogous scene in *PD*. The parallelism of the two passages in terms of plot and dramatic composition points in the same direction. Each scene opens the last part of the play where the correlation of forces of two opposite sides has been elucidated and the fate of Zeus is at stake. In the finale of *PD* Zeus temporarily prevails while in *Plutus* he is decisively defeated and the utopia vividly described by Cario (*Plut.* 802 ff.), which was first established only in Chremylus' house, spreads throughout the entire Athenian state (*Plut.* 1178 ff.).

The fact that the context of the Hermes scene in *Plutus* is highly reminiscent of the Hermes scene in *PD* does not seem surprising at all if we take into account the relationship of Plutus to tragic Prometheus, which Aristophanes made clear by another series of echoes of *PD* in the beginning of his play. Unfortunately, the influence of *PD* on *Plutus* is largely disregarded by modern readers of the play, with the exception of a few scholars who saw several allusions to *PD* in the scene of Plutus' anagnorisis (*Plut.* 78 ff.).<sup>24</sup> Below, I discuss only the most probable of them.

Plutus was punished by Zeus for his intention to distribute the wealth justly among the people (to go only to the honest, *Plut.* 87–91). So he suffered, like Prometheus, from his benevolent attitude to the human kind. At the beginning of the play, he is blind and consequently incapable of pursuing his goal. In this sense, he is, like Prometheus, bound (δεσμότης). His and Zeus' fates are as interdependent as Prometheus' and Zeus' are: when Plutus can see, Zeus will be deprived of his might. According to *PD*, Zeus will preserve his might only if he concedes to freeing Prometheus

<sup>23</sup> I didn't find any other instance of such an equation of speech style to the kind of one's activity in Greek literature up to the end of 5 BC.

<sup>24</sup> H. J. Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie* (München 1957) 176; C. J. Herington, "Birds and Prometheia", *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 237 n. 9. Plutus' similarity to the tragic Prometheus is noted by A. M. Bowie, *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge 1993) 281 f. Curiously enough, it is mentioned neither in Holzinger's nor in Sommerstein's commentary on the play.

from his bonds. Comparing these two cases we may notice that the conflict, which in *PD–PL* ends with a reconciliation of the sides,<sup>25</sup> in *Plutus* is pushed to its logical end, to the change of the divine reign.

In their dialog with Prometheus, which in a sense occupies the central position in the play,<sup>26</sup> the Oceanids say something that sounds subversive for a Greek tragedy, *PD* 509 f.:

(ώς ἐγώ)  
εὗελπίς εἰμι τῶνδέ σ' ἐκ δεσμῶν ἔτι  
λυθέντα μηδὲν μεῖνον ισχύσειν Διός.

After hearing Prometheus' monologue, in which he enumerates all his gifts to humankind, the Oceanids suppose that when Prometheus is released from his bonds he will become as mighty as Zeus. Prometheus' report ends with his famous statement in *PD* 506: *πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως*, which presents Prometheus as an absolute benefactor of humans. But is it possible that so mighty a hero is not able to liberate himself from his bonds? This contradiction is what causes trouble to the Oceanids. Hence the Oceanids' appeal to Prometheus not to take too much care about mankind but to think about his own release instead (*PD* 507 f.). The lines cited above, which complete this thought, suggest in fact that Prometheus can become mightier than Zeus, because to release oneself in the dramatic situation of *PD*, i. e. against the will of Zeus, means that Prometheus should rebel and put an end to Zeus' rule. Prometheus however knows the future and succumbs to the fate: he should suffer many thousands of years till his reconciliation with Zeus becomes possible. Only then will he be released. So Prometheus prefers the evolutionary process of being released by Zeus to the revolutionary decision to release himself against the will of Zeus. But the idea that somebody may become mightier

<sup>25</sup> According to our evidence the reconciliation of Zeus with Prometheus took place in *Prometheus Lyomenos* (*PL*) which obviously followed *PD*. About the uniquely close connection of these two plays West's statement is eloquent: "if ever two plays were composed together, these two were" (M. L. West, "The Prometheus Trilogy", *JHS* 99 [1979] 130). In my doctoral theses I've discussed it as the matter of plot- and dramatic structure and arrived at the conclusion that while normally even connected dramas are centered each around a separate conflict, *PD* and *PL* present one and the same conflict which culminates at the end of *PD* and has been gradually resolved in *PL* (V. Mousbahova, *Сравнительно-историческое изучение текста и проблемы авторства: на материале трагедии Прометей Прикованный* [Comparative Historical Study of a Text and Authorship Problem: the Prometheus Desmotes] [mss.] [St. Petersburg 2010] 16 f.).

<sup>26</sup> Prometheus has just finished his report about the past arranged in two monologues where Prometheus related his role in the events of Titanomachia and in salvation of humankind. After this dialogue there are Io scene and related to it Prometheus' prophecies about the future.

than the supreme god seems to have been adopted by Aristophanes and served him as a foundation to build upon it the utopia of *Plutus*.

In *Plutus*, Chremylus addresses the blind god with the words that have more or less the same meaning as *PD* 509 f., see 124–126:

οἵει γάρ εἶναι τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα  
καὶ τοὺς κεραυνοὺς ἀξίους τριωβόλου  
ἔὰν ἀναβλέψῃς σὺ κἀν μικρὸν χρόνον,

and 128 f.:

ἐγὼ γάρ ἀποδείξω σε τοῦ Διὸς πολὺ<sup>26</sup>  
μεῖζον δυνάμενον.

Plutus is astonished by the last statement (129: ἐμὲ σύ;), but does not raise any objection (compare Prometheus). On the contrary, his curious inquiry (136, 139, 143, and especially 186: ἐγὼ τοσαῦτα δυνατός εἰμι  
εῖς ὃν ποιεῖν;) sets in motion his dialogue with Chremylus and Cario. Its main purpose is to persuade Plutus that he is mightier than Zeus (cf. *Plut.* 128 f. above). One of the most important arguments adduced by Chremylus, *Plut.* 160:

τέχναι δὲ πᾶσαι διὰ σὲ καὶ σοφίσματα  
ἐν τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐσθ’ ηύρημένα,

sounds like a citation of Prometheus' formulaic line πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως (*PD* 506, see above).<sup>27</sup> It is the most evident verbal echo of *PD* in the comedy and it is all the more surprising that the last commentary to *Plutus* that mentioned it was that by Van Leeuwen.<sup>28</sup> It is not mentioned in a recent paper devoted to this particular dialogue, whose author – on the grounds of multiple use in it of the formulaic expression διὰ σέ in the address to Plutus – suggests that it parodies hymnic language.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> In the text of monologue which precedes this line we find also the words σοφίσματα (*PD* 459), ἐξηῦρον / ἐξευρεῖν (*PD* 460, 468, 469, 503).

<sup>28</sup> J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Plutus cum prolegomenis et commentariis* (Lugduni Batavorum 1904) 26 ad v. 160: “Immerito Prometheus in scena tragica iactare: “πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως et ἀριθμὸν ἔξοχον σοφισμάτων ἐξηῦρον αὐτοῖς” demonstratum eunt herus et famulus”. The relation of *Plutus* to *Prometheus* was, according to Van Leeuwen, rightly observed by Haupt (*ibid.*, Proleg. XVI 1): “Minus longe a scopo aberrans C. G. Haupt anno 1826 in *Quaestiones Aeschyleis* p. XVII contenderat “Plutum respectu Prometheus Aeschylei habito esse scriptum”. Quae nucleus certe sincerum habet observatio; vid. infra ad vs. 160 sq. et ad vs. 1108 sq.”

<sup>29</sup> E. Medda, “Aristophane e un inno a rovescio: la potenza di Pluto in *Plut.* 124–221”, *Philologus* 149 (2005) 12–27.

It may be correct, but this is not all. Only if we keep in mind *PD* 506 can we explain the totality of Plutus' benefits and understand its function within the play, which consists in demonstrating that he potentially possesses enough power to replace Zeus as a ruler.

Aristophanes thus turns the situation in *PD* upside down. He begins with the promise that Plutus, when he can see, will be mightier than Zeus, the idea that in *PD* was naturally deduced by the Oceanids from Prometheus' monologue. Then, in order to prove this thesis he adduces, in the manner of an exemplary sophistic exercise, the list of Plutus' benefits to mankind modeled on Prometheus' catalogue. With the help of this short comparative study, we can trace the mechanism of constructing the utopia in *Plutus*, which can shed light on the adaptation of the tragic myth of Prometheus in Aristophanes and, more generally, in Old comedy.

Viktoria Mousbahova  
Thessaloniki

Автор отказывается от традиционных интерпретаций Ar. *Plut.* 1110 (ἡ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι τούτῳ γίγνεται / τέμνεται), основанных на понимании γλῶττα как языка жертвенного животного (как в Ar. *Pax* 1060, Av. 1705: ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται). Предлагается толкование стиха, основанное на засвидетельствованном частью рукописей чтении γίγνεται. Гλῶττα при этом должно пониматься как “язык, речь”. В результате реплика Кариона (“Таков язык у этого посла”) оказывается близкой по смыслу к реакции Прометея на речь Гермеса в *PD* 95 sq.: в *Плутосе* подразумевается, а в *PD* прямо говорится о том, что содержание и характер речей Гермеса соответствует его должности “слуги” Зевса. Это сходство находит дальнейшее подтверждение в структурно-сюжетным параллелизме обеих сцен (Гермес прибывает в финале с ультиматумом от Зевса, власть которого находится под угрозой). Кроме того, в начале сцены с Гермесом в *Плутосе* обнаруживается ряд пародийных перекличек с финалом *PD*. Эти реминисценции хорошо согласуются с давно замеченными, но в последнее время выпавшими из поля зрения ученых чертами сходства между *PD* и *Плутосом* как в сюжете, так и в фигурах заглавных персонажей. Таким образом, можно считать, что важнейшим прототипом аристофановского Плутоса послужил образ Прометея, созданный в трагедии.