Ancient Interpolation in Aristophanes
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To be considered for inclusion in the category of ancient interpolations in Aristophanes a word, phrase or passage must satisfy two conditions: first, there must be grounds for thinking that Aristophanes did not write it, or at least not with the intention that it should stand where it now stands in the text; and secondly, there must be grounds for thinking that it was present in at least one copy of the text earlier than the dark age which separates late antiquity from the Photian renaissance. This second condition is satisfied by words which are observably present in an ancient fragment of the text or are discussed or implied by the scholia vetera. It is also satisfied prima facie by words which are present both in R (Ravennas 137.4a) and V (Marcianus 474: not available for Ach., Lys., Thesm., Eccl.) and also in all or most of the Paleologan manuscripts (none of which, however, contains Thesm.); the qualification “prima facie” is necessary, since early dissemination of an interpolation first made in the ninth or tenth century is always a possibility to be reckoned with.1 An interpolation which first appears in the Paleologan era could be ancient in origin, but the presumption must be the contrary, given the span of time available to interpolators since the Photian renaissance and the propensity of Paleologan scholars to interpolate for the purpose of restoring metrical correctness and lyric responsion.

I distinguish between five types of interpolation2, of which type I may

---

1 Cf. R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1964), chapter IV, on apparent conjectural emendations and transpositions in Aeschylean manuscripts which have not undergone Paleologan editing.

2 G. Jachmann, *NGG* Ph.-hist. Kl., Fachgr. 1, N.F. i (1936) 124 f. asserts that erroneous intrusion plays a negligible role in interpolation; he puts the insertion of marginalia
properly be described as "accidental": that is, the copyist's insertion (normally repetition) of words which he would at once have recognized as erroneous and would have deleted if his attention had been drawn to the bare fact of his having inserted them (often, indeed, a copyist perceives the error himself and deletes the insertion).

Two types are, equally certainly, "deliberate," in the sense that the interpolator knows very well that what he is putting into the text was not written by the author. One of them (type IV) is the modification of a text by inserting words to make it serve as a means to an end not identical with the author's end. In this type I include the passages interpolated in tragedy in order to adjust it to the needs and tastes of audiences after the author's lifetime; interpolations in any technical, philosophical or historical work whose users might attach greater importance to completeness of information or clarity of exposition than to homogeneity of style or the integrity of the literary form designed by the original author; interpolations in passages selected, for any reason, for inclusion in anthologies or for quotation in support of an argument; and modifications of texts treated in later centuries as models for imitation (here I am thinking especially of Demosthenes). We should not expect to find that interpolation of this type has played a part in the transmission of the text of Aristophanes. We lack evidence that any Aristophanic play was performed after its author's lifetime, and I shall be surprised if evidence to that effect ever presents itself; comedy, unlike tragedy, continued to evolve throughout the fourth century until it was transformed into something strikingly unlike Aristophanes. The close relationship between a play of Aristophanes and the circumstances of its original production ensured that he was read and studied by lovers of the past, but it combined with his obscenity, inconsequentiality and sometimes childlike fantasy to keep him off the stage. Aspects of his language were a model for Atticists, but his style and dramaturgy were not models imitated by writers in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. He had no claim to be considered a systematic purveyor of information or an expositor of rational argument, even though some of the things said or done in his plays were treated as factually true by historians and biographers who should have known better.

---

He was not regarded by anthologists as a good source of inspiring moral sentiments, though a stanza from *Frogs* (454 ff., "for on us alone shines the sun," etc.) was inscribed by a Dionysiac association at Rhodes which wished to proclaim the comfort to be drawn from initiation.\(^5\)

The other type (type V) of unquestionably deliberate interpolation is a species of forgery. The interpolator has something to say, and he wishes future readers to believe that what he says was in fact said by the original author. Thucydides iii 84 is a case in point: an addition to Thucydides' characterization of stasis, parodying Thucydidean language and covering afresh some of the ground already covered, but introducing the theme of economic greed as a motive for stasis.\(^6\) I would put in the same category the forged laws and decrees in Demosthenes' *De Corona* and some other speeches. This is the type of interpolation which offers the strongest resistance to the systematic application of a critical principle to which I attach importance, the principle that no passage in a Greek text should be classified as an interpolation unless one can offer a historically plausible explanation of how it came to be there. Textual criticism is, after all, a branch of history, in which aesthetic evaluation operates in the service of historical hypotheses. Words exist only in so far as they have been spoken or written by determinate persons at points in space and time, and there cannot be a question in textual criticism which is not a question about what somebody did, said, thought, intended or felt at a certain time and place. It is conceivable that any given interpolation was the work of someone so mad, eccentric, perverse or devious that the criteria of probability on which historical hypotheses necessarily rely are inapplicable. There is no reason to suppose that people of this kind were more numerous in antiquity than today, but there are degrees of idiosyncrasy which lie well this side of such extreme conditions and yet may resist interpretation because we have no direct acquaintance with the interpolator as an individual and cannot claim to understand as well as we might wish motivations characteristic of late Greek culture as a whole.

There remain two types of interpolation in regard to which the simple dichotomy of "accidental" and "deliberate" may be misleading or inadequate. One of these (type III) is deliberate in the sense that the interpolator goes beyond simple transcription, supplementing it by conjecture, but he does so in the belief that the text before him is defective and that he has some chance of restoring what the author wrote. An example of this type is *Wealth* 1170, where all the manuscripts have

\(^5\) G. Pugliese-Carratelli, *Dioniso* viii (1940/1) 118–123.

It is possible that μοι originated in a supralinear amplification of δοκης (medieval glossators, at any rate, were notoriously fond of inserting direct and indirect pronominal objects), but in the light of 1153 ff. μοι is not the appropriate amplification, and there is a high probability that it was interpolated by someone who believed that the second syllable of διακονικός is short. The same misapprehension is responsible for αύτω γε διακονεῖται in Parisinus Regius 2715 at Ach. 1017 (responding to 1046 φωνή τοιαῦτα λάσκων). We may compare Ach. 928, where the whole medieval tradition offers us

δώσει κέραμον, ἵνα μὴ καταγγέλλωροιμενος

as an iambic trimeter. Elmsley's conjecture φερόμενος, founded on his correct scansion of the second syllable of καταγγέλλω as long is vindicated by a fragment from the fifth century A.D., ΒΚΤ v 2. no. 231.

Type II of interpolation, which in the transmission of Aristophanes outweighs in importance (though not always in interest) the other four types put together, is the insertion of words which the copyist for one reason or another, and at varying levels of consciousness, believes to be part of the author's text. Such a belief entails mistaking a variant, gloss, paraphrase, stage-direction or comment for an element of the text accidentally omitted by the copyist of one's exemplar and subsequently replaced by him above or beside the text. Errors of this kind would not have occurred if ancient copyists had invariably observed the simple rule that rectification of omissions should be made above the line and comment, of whatsoever kind, in the margin; or, failing that, if they had invariably introduced words other than the words of the text itself with one or other of the formulae available to them (γρ(άφεται) for variants, ἀντί τοῦ for glosses, ὁτον or ὅσει ἔλεγε [e.g. CGF 83.1 (s. I a.C.)] for paraphrases, etc.); or again, if they had been both conscientious and consistent in employment of the critical signs invented by Hellenistic scholars. These condi-

7 Cf. Holzinger's commentary ad loc.

8 -τα- is guaranteed by 944 καταγείλῃ ποτ' in responson with ψοφεῖ λάλων τι. Porson deleted 928; anyone who yields easily to the temptation to delete lines (ignoring the warning of D. L. Page, Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy, Oxford, 1934, 149) will probably see here an example of Βιμπλεντερπολατίον (Jachmann, loc. cit. [n. 2] 123–144, 185–215) and turn 927 f. into one line, δός μοι φωτιστών, ἵνα μὴ καταγγέλλωροιμενος, since it is, after all, the Theban, not Dikaiopolis, who will φέρει the packaged informer.

tions, however, were not met. A clear and simple medieval example of the consequences is provided by V at Frogs 625:

\[ \mu \delta \delta \epsilon \mu o\nu \epsilon o\delta \omega s \cdot \alpha nev \tau i\mu \epsilon s \beta a s \alpha n i \epsilon \alpha p a g a y o n \]

\[ o\sigma t o w \ \delta \ R: \ \tau o\delta t o w \ \delta \ \ c e t t. \ \alpha nev \ \tau i\mu \epsilon s \ \ r e c t e \ o m. \ R \ c e t t. \ \Sigma \nu: \ \sigma o\nu v \ \alpha nev \ \tau i\mu \epsilon s. \ o u d o\nu \ \theta e l o w \ \ups e r \ a u t o u. \]

The text of V here combines one tradition in which \( o\sigma t o w \), "unconditionally," was explained in a scholion as \( \alpha nev \ \tau i\mu \epsilon s \), "without compensation," and another in which \( \alpha nev \ \tau i\mu \epsilon s \) was written above \( o\sigma t o w \) as a gloss and was then mistaken for the rectification of an omission.\(^{10}\)

In a papyrus of the fifth century A.D. (POxy 1371), which preserves parts of the opening scene of Clouds, the words \( \rho u t a r o s \) and \( \tau \lambda [\gamma] \theta o\nu \), standing at a good distance from the column opposite lines 44 and 45, are clearly glosses on \( \epsilon i\varphi o t i\nu o n \) (or \( \alpha k\alpha r i t o s \)) and \( \beta r\omicron\omicron o\nu \) respectively. But in a Theocritus papyrus of the same date (POxy 1618) the gloss \( \epsilon i\nu \ \alpha k a l\epsilon f r a s \) standing over \( \epsilon n \ \ k\nu i\delta a s i \) in 7.110, equally a gloss (cf. \( \Sigma K \ \ k\nu i\delta \ \epsilon r' \ \hat{\eta} \omicron \omicron o\nu \ \alpha k a l\epsilon f r a h \ \delta e \ \ups p \ \ \Lambda i t i k \omega n \)), could formally be taken for a rectification of an omission. This ambiguity is exemplified far earlier in the London papyrus of Bacchylides (PLond 733). At 15.55 \( \alpha i n a s \) \( e i n o m i a s c k e m p - n u n t a c e \theta e m o t o s \), the word \( \alpha k o l o u\theta o n \) is written over \( \kappa a p i n o n \); it is required by the sense, "attendant on ...," and supported by responson with 48, and is thus rectification (by the second corrector) of a copyist's omission. Yet at 3.47, \( \tau \rho a p o c c e [\nu] \delta [\epsilon x] \theta r a f i l a t h a n e v a g y l \ups y k i c t o n \), the word \( \nu n o n \), also written in the second corrector's hand over \( \alpha p i \), is intended as a clarification ("what was hateful before is now welcome") and cannot be part of Bacchylides' text, for twelvefold responson guarantees the sequence \( x - u x x x - o o o - \ldots \). The same absence of discrimination between the functions of superscript words is apparent in a papyrus (POxy 1617) of Aristophanes' Wealth. At 55

\[ \nu n o n \]

\[ i.e. \ \pi o t h o i m e t \ \hat{\alpha} n \ \tau o n \ \chi r h e m o n \ \hat{\eta} \omicron \omicron o n \ \sigma t i \ v o e i. \]

\( \hat{\eta} \omicron \omicron o n \) is superscript only because it was accidentally omitted,\(^{11}\) but at line 39

\[ \epsilon i n e v \]

\[ \iota \rho h e s e l a k e n \ e k \ t o w \ s t e m m a t o w n \]

\[ i.e. \ \tau i \ \delta h t a \ \Phi o i b o s \ \epsilon l a k e n \ e k \ t o w \ s t e m m a t o w n ; \]

\(^{10}\) At Frogs 437 R is the offender, V innocent. Cf. Leidensis Vossianus gr. Q4A at Aesch. Prom. 214 (Dawe, op. cit. [n. 1] 206).

\(^{11}\) Cf. CGF 92.34 (Eupolis), POxy 852 (Eur. Hypsipyle) fr. 20/21.7. Ibid. fr. 1 iv 2 the clause \( t o w \ \pi o \delta i s \ \epsilon k t a \), rectification of an omission, is formally identical with a supra-linear comment.
\( \epsilon ' \pi e ν \) is probably a gloss on \( \epsilon λακεν \), conceivably a variant, but certainly not the rectification of an omission. In the light of these examples, it is not surprising if editors hesitate over the interpretation—gloss or variant?—of Men. Dysk. 284 in POxy 2467

\[ \text{[εὐφορείας] [εὐπορείας]} \]

or Herodas 1.34 in PLitLond 96

\[ \text{[εὐδοψίαν]} \]

i.e. \( τ η ν \delta ' \delta ψιν \) with \( τ ο \delta ' (e) \lambda ος \) (Headlam) superscript.\(^{12}\)

Nor is it surprising that after more than a millennium of sporadic editorial and transcriptional negligence we find at Frogs 202\(^{13}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(in R) } oυ \mu ' _{1} & \text{ ϕλων̄ τίσεις } \epsilon χων, \ \alpha λλ ' \ αντιβάς \\
\text{(in V) } oυ \mu ' & \text{ ϕλων̄ τίσεις } \epsilon χων, \ \alpha λλ ' \ αντιβάς:
\end{align*}
\]

or at Frogs 275

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(in R) } & \delta ' H ρακλής \\
& \text{kai } \tau ους \ \epsilon πιόρκους \ oυς \ \epsilon λεγεν \ ημίν: \ oυ \δ ' \ oυ\\
\text{(in V) } & \text{kai } \tau ους \ \epsilon πιόρκους \ oυς \ \epsilon λεγεν \ ημίν: \ oυ \delta ' \ oυ \ \alpha ν \ \delta ' \ H ρακλής} \\
& \text{kai } \tau αυτά \ μέν \ δ η συμκρατεί} \text{ but the ambiguity of intention inherent in word and phrases written above or beside the line extends also to longer units. For example, in PLond 733 at Bacchylides 11.100 ff. the words } \tau ου \delta ' \ \epsilon κλι \ αριστοπάτρα \text{ actually constitute line 106, but were accidentally omitted and replaced by the corrector in the space at the top of the column. There is nothing formally to distinguish a rectification of this kind from a marginal comment from which the introductory formula or sign which would make its nature apparent has been dropped; and therefore, since if A resembles B, B resembles A, nothing to distinguish (formally speaking) a marginal comment minus its introductory formula from the rectification of an omission.\(^{14}\) Obviously, form is not all; error can usually be avoided by a copyist who attends to the sense of what he is writing, and in any case many texts are consistent in distinguishing}
\]

\(^{12}\) In POxy 2258 (ss. VI/VII p.C.) at Callim. H. 2.6 πυλάων is written over θυράων; the medieval text has πυλάων, the quotation by \( \Sigma χ \) Theocr. 11.12 θυράων.

\(^{13}\) For conversion of glosses into variants in the medieval text of Aeschylus cf. Dawe, \textit{op. cit.} (n. 1) 102 f.

\(^{14}\) The likelihood of misapprehension is fortuitously increased when (as has happened in PBodmer IV at Men. Dysk. 944–946) a marginal gloss or comment is misplaced.
between the functions of adscript and superscript, or entirely devoid of marginal comment; but consistency was a likely casualty in late antiquity, when the total amount of comment of all kinds imposed upon a text increased.\footnote{POxy 2258 (cf. n. 12 above) is a striking example of abundant marginal and supra-linear comment in combination.}

One of the most spectacular interpolations in the medieval transmission of Greek poetry occurs at Aeschylus, \textit{Persae} 253, where in some Palaeologan manuscripts the messenger's line

\[ \omega \mu o i, \; k a k o \nu \; \pi \rho \omega \tau o n \; \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \ell e w \; k a k a \]

is followed by Soph. \textit{Ant.} 277

\[ \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma e i \; \gamma \tilde{a} \rho \; \omicron \delta e i s \; \alpha \gamma \gamma e l o n \; k a k \tilde{o} \nu \; \epsilon \tau \omega n. \]

In the early medieval Medicean manuscript (Laurentianus 32.9) the Sophoclean line is written in the margin as an apt comment on the messenger's utterance, but without any indication of its source, and evidently later copyists took this to be the rectification of an omission.\footnote{Cf. Dawe, \textit{op. cit.} (n. i) 308.}

One can only be surprised that such misinterpretation was not commoner; at \textit{Prometheus} 378, for example, the Medicean adds in the margin a sententious distich which says much the same thing at greater length, and \textit{\Sigma} \textit{II.} xv 393 attributes this distich to Menander (fr. 782 Körte-Thierfelder), but in the Medicean there is no such attribution.\footnote{Cf. the absence of attribution when lines are cited in \textit{\Sigma Birds} 266, 1620, 1647.}

\textit{Birds} 190–193 is a passage of Aristophanes in which there is reason to believe that a verse has been interpolated because it was taken for the rectification of an omission. All the manuscripts have:

\[ \omicron \upsilon t o s, \; \omicron t a n \; \theta i \zeta \sigma w a n \; \alpha \nu \theta r a s o i \; \theta e i s, \]

\[ \omicron \mu \eta \; \phi o r o n \; \phi e \rho o s a \nu \; \omicron \mu i n \; o i \; \theta e o i \]

\[ \delta i a \; \tau \tilde{y} s \; \rho \omicron \ell e w s \; \tau \tilde{y} s \; \alpha \lambda l o t r i a s \; k a i \; \tau o \tilde{o} \; \chi \alpha o u s \]

\[ \tau \omicron \nu \; \mu \rho \iota \iota w o n \; \tau \omicron \mu \kappa i \tilde{s} a n \; o u \; \delta i a \rho \tilde{r} i \tilde{s} a t e. \]

192 (=1218) del. Beck

Peisetairos is addressing the Hoopoe: "So, when men sacrifice to the gods, if the gods don't bring you tribute through the city which is not theirs and through the void you will not let through the savour of the thighs." I have deliberately omitted punctuation in the English translation. If we punctuate after \( \kappa \alpha i \; \tau o \tilde{o} \; \chi \alpha o u s \), the sense is wrong, for the gods will have to bring tribute to the city of the birds, not \textit{through} it; in 1218, on the other hand, the sense is right, for Iris is flying \textit{to} mankind on earth (1230) \textit{through} the city of the birds (1173). If we punctuate after \( o i \; \theta e o i \), the layout of the sentence is defensible (cf. \textit{Ach.} 277 Γ. \( \epsilon \lambda \nu \; \mu e \theta \; \omicron \mu i \omega i \; \xi \mu \pi \tau i \zeta \zeta s, \)
ek krapalos ... rophaeis tyrbdlon) but the sense is again wrong, for allotrias will then characterize a city which belongs to the subject of the verb of the clause in which reference to the city is made. This could have been expressed by dia tis polewv tis ymteras, precisely as in 556 f., "and forbid the gods to go to and fro, with penis erect, through your territory (dia tis xwras tis ymteras)." I have little doubt that 192 is interpolated, and that the cause of the interpolation was a marginal forward reference to 1218 for the purpose of clarifying diafpheresete. It is not uncommon for scholia to quote one passage of a play while commenting on another passage of the same play (e.g., on Birds 11, 168, Frogs 153, 1262), and Wealth 280–282 exhibits the intrusion of such a quotation into the text of one branch of the medieval tradition:

fapasai d' oupiw tetelkas hmiv
ostou xarivn mu' o despoti's o sos keklke deuro
oi polla' moxbhasantes ktl.

281 recte om. RV

mu' sits ill between hmiv and the plurals of the following relative clause, even when allowance is made for the oscillation between first person singular and first person plural which is so common in Greek drama, and it seems that 281 originated as marginal quotation of 259 (where it is preceded by sou d' atopois isos me thein, prin tautoa kai fapasai mu') in order to amplify fapasai (an unnecessary amplification, as we see from Aristophanes' usage in 62, 65, 268).

The examples of type II interpolation so far considered might be called "pure," in so far as the incorporation of words from the margin entails no modification of them, but we have also to consider a sub-type (which we might call "IIa" or "II/III") in which conjectural modification plays a part. Consider, for example, what has happened in R at Clouds 906 f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δικ. αιβοι· touti kai di'</td>
<td>Δικ. αιβοι· touti kai di'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χωρει το κακον· δοτε μοι λεκανην·</td>
<td>χωρει το κακον· δοτε μοι λεκανην·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ως ναυτων· ὑπο της εκεινου ψιχρας·</td>
<td>δοτε μοι λεκανην· ως ναυτων· ὑπο της εκεινου ψιχρας·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η· ινα εμεσω· χολη γαρ· μοι· επιπλεει·</td>
<td>η· ινα εμεσω· χολη γαρ· μοι· επιπλεει·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δια τα αυτον· βηματα.</td>
<td>δια τα αυτον· βηματα:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δικ. τυφογερων· ει· καναρμοστας.</td>
<td>Αδ. τυφογερων· ει· καναρμοστας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 V. Coulon, Essai sur la méthode de la critique conjecturale appliquée au texte d'Aristophane (Paris, 1933) 180 f., denies this, translating, "votre cite qui leur (c.a.d. aux dieux) est etrangere."

19 As suggested by Dindorf and Lenting.

The scholion explains why Right, disgusted, calls for basin; in R the scholion has been treated as part of Right’s own utterance. This seems at first sight a simple case of the phenomenon to which Galen (CMG v 10.2.1 100.11 ff.) refers, the mistaken treatment of marginal comment ὡς αὐτοῦ τοῦ συγγραφέως. Perhaps one should not make too much of the fact that the interpolated scholion is ordered in lines resembling the layout of the anapaestic verses which precede and follow it, for a straight incorporation of a marginal scholion is likely to yield lines of roughly that size; but the coincidence of line-end and phrase-end contrasts strikingly with the layout of the scholion in V, and it should be remarked that the quotation of the passage in EtMagnum 337.1 (s.v. ἐμῶ) and Zonaras 711 runs δότε μοι λεκάνην ἵν' ἐξεμέσω, which looks rather like an incompetent attempt at anapaestic versification.21

A simpler example of modification occurs in RV at Clouds 922–924:

\[ \text{Tῆλεφος εἶναι Μυσῶς φάσκων δύστρόπος} \\
\vspace{1em}
\text{ἐκ πυριδίου} \\
\vspace{1em}
\text{δύστρόπος} \\
\text{γνώμας τρόγυων Πανδελετίους} \]

The text of RV here is a conflation of one tradition in which δύστρόπος was a gloss on Πανδελετίους and another in which that gloss had been mistaken for part of line 922 and deliberately altered to a nominative singular in order to fit the syntax of that line. It cannot be accommodated metrically, since the passage is anapaestic and δύστρόπος constitutes only half an anapaestic metron.

Something more complicated is implied by Clouds 1230 f. in R, where we find

\[ \text{νῦν δὲ διὰ τοῦτο ἐξαρνός εἶναι διανοεῖ} \]
\[ \text{Δ" καὶ μὴν ἀποδώσεις ὡ μέλε' ἄ πρώην περ ἐλαβες.} \]
\[ \text{ζήτ} \]
\[ \text{Στ' τί γὰρ ἂν ἀπολαύσαμι τοῦ μαθήματος;} \]

The Crediton asks, "And now, because of that, are you intending to deny (sc. the loan)?" and Strepsiades replies "Why, how else would I get any advantage from (sc. my son’s) instruction?" 22 The copyist left a space between the two lines, and the corrector (adding ζήτ(ει) to the right of the space) filled in an atrociously versified clarification which (as it stands) means, "Assuredly you will pay back, my friend, what you

21 Suda λ 232 has καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης δότε μοι λεκάνην. ἴδον, χωρεῖ τὸ κακὸν δότε μοι λεκάνην, ὡς ναυτίων κτλ., but with ψυχρολογίας instead of ψύχρας; cod. V of the Suda omits ἴδον... λεκάνην, and between τὸ κακὸν and δότε codd. GM have ὁ αὐτός.

22 The copyist omitted the siglum Δα. at 1230. R and V both omit ἄλλ' before ἄν in 1231.
received the other day.” Unless the copyist had known of this line, he
would not have left a space; clearly he meant the decision on its ex-
clusion or inclusion to be taken later by someone else, and if the cor-
rector’s decision had gone against inclusion, any future copyist using R
as his exemplar would have been confronted with a διάλειμμα of one line
between 1230 and 1231, but also, presumably, with καὶ μὴν κτλ. in the
margin, in which case he in his turn would have to take a decision. The
interpolated line is already glossed (superscript μω) and already corrupt
(ὁ μέλε’ for ὁ μέλ’, and, I think, καὶ μὴν ἀπο- for καὶ μὴ ’πο-, “... and are
you not going to pay back . . . ?”).23 The original versification could well
be ancient; πρότην, “some time before,” “formerly,” is attested in Pro-
copius (the notion that the creditor, whose patience is at last exhausted,
is claiming money left “the other day” would be a striking misunder-
standing of the situation), and the presence of περ shows that the versifier
rejected the option ὁ πρότην.

At Birds 1343–1345 all manuscripts have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>1343a</th>
<th>1343b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὀὐκ ἔστων ὀδέν τοῦ πέτεσθαι γλυκὺτερον.</td>
<td>ἔρω δ’ ἐγὼ τι τῶν ἐν ὀρνισσῶν νόμων.</td>
<td>ὀρνιθομανῶ γὰρ καὶ πέτομαι καὶ βούλομαι ὀικεῖν μεθ’ ὑμῶν κάτιποτε τῶν νόμων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1343b del. Dobree ἐγὼ τι] ἐγὼγένε 

The πατρολόιας has arrived in Cloud-cuckoo-land, full of enthusiasm.
“There’s really nothing more delightful than flying! And I have a
passion for the rules of bird society. For I am crazy about birds, and I
fly, and I want to live among you, and I have a desire for your rules.”
ΣV on 1343 says: “After this (sc. line) some have a gap (διάλειμμα) of one
line, and Ἀριστοφάνα (νοῦσ[?]) πλήρωμα οὔτως”; then 1343b is quoted. It looks
prima facie as if Aristophanes of Byzantion in the third century B.C. was
acquainted with a text in which one line-space was left between 1343a
and 1344 and either found in another text, or himself composed,24 1343b.
There is indeed no reason why a Hellenistic edition of Birds should not
have contained a vacant line. It appears from ΣV on Wasps 1272 that
texts of Wasps in the Roman period had a space of several lines after 1283,
in some cases partially occupied by unintelligible fragments of words;25

23 I do not know at what date the modern Greek μὴν = μὴ is first attested, but an
isolated μὲν = μὴ is recorded from the second century B.C. by E. Mayser, Grammatik
der der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, i 1 (ed. 2, revised by H. Schmoll, Berlin, 1970)
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25 Cf. J. W. White, The Verse of Greek Comedy (London, 1912) 410 ff., and D. Holwerda,
Mnemosyne IV xvii (1964) 261 ff.
and a commentary of the second century A.D. on Aristophanes' *Anagyrus* (POxy 2737, CGF i 56) remarks (10 ff.) that the second half of one verse is missing. The word πλήρωμα is not attested elsewhere in the meaning "conjectural supplement"—πλήρης and its cognates are used of writing without elision (Sext. Emp. *Math.* i 161, τὸ πλήρες and ἐκπλήρωσις), syntactical completion of an elliptical utterance (CFG i 63.63, Σ Pi. O. 7.10a, 11.13c, ὁ πλήρης λόγος and πληροῦν, P. 6.13d)—but there is no reason why it should not mean "supplement"; in the *Anagyrus* commentary (15) πε[πλήρωμ[έν]ο[ (Lobel, ed. pr.) or (ἐκ])πλήρωμ[ατ]ό[ (tent. Luppe) occurs in a sentence of which the sense must be something like "the meaning would be clear if the line were complete." Yet it is not easy to imagine that Aristophanes of Byzantion seriously manufactured, for insertion between 1343a and 1344, a line which creates a lame tautology with 1345, and a preferable hypothesis is as follows. In the fourth century B.C. there were texts of *Birds* which contained 1343a, 1344 and 1345, but there also came into existence texts from which 1344 was accidentally omitted; we should note that as the second of three successive lines beginning with the same letter it is the most vulnerable line in the context. A copyist, collating a text in which 1344 was present with one from which it was absent, deferred decision (like the copyist of R at *Clouds* 1230) on whether to include 1344, and instead left a blank. He thus generated one of the texts known to Aristophanes of Byzantion, whose πλήρωμα was not an invention, but 1344 itself, known to him from other texts. 1343b ἐρῶ...τῶν ἐν ὀρνισω νόμων is in origin a paraphrase of the word ὀρνισμανῶ in 1344, and our scholion is the result of compressing a comment which began with Aristophanes of Byzantion's observation and ended with a paraphrase. The profoundly misleading results of compression in scholia are well-known, not least from the R-scholia on Aristophanes, e.g., on *Wasps* 1326, which Σ*R* describes simply as "from Euripides' *Troades,*" whereas Σ*V*, while pointing out the similarity to *Tro. 308*, rules out on chronological grounds the possibility that *Troades* can be parodied in *Wasps.*

The strongest reason for thinking ἐρῶ κτλ. an explanation of ὀρνισμανῶ is Σ 1281, where ἐλακκονομάνων, "they were crazy about Sparta" is explained as τῆς τῶν Δακώνων ἡρων πολυτειάς: cf. also *Knights* 61, where σβυλλαξ, "he's sibyl-struck," is explained in the scholia as χρησιμῶν ἐρᾶ καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖ or simply χρησιμῶν ἐρᾶ. The paraphrase constitutes an iambic trimeter: by accident or by design? δ* is no problem, for at *Birds* 10 ἐντευθεὶν τὴν πατρίδι' ἄν ἐξεύροις σοὺ ποι; we find in Σ*RV* the paraphrase

δύναμις δ' ἂν ἐνεύθεν τὴν πατρίδα ἰδεῖν; τούτως τὰς Ἀθήνας. ἐν ὀρνηκείν ισ a little surprising, since the scholia on Birds nearly always prefer the neuter plural ὀρνηκεῖα, but there are exceptions (e.g. ΣRV E 800), and the familiarity of ἐν ὀρνηκείς in the sense, "in (sc. the play entitled) Birds" may have determined the phraseology. But ὀρνηκεῖα rather than ὀρνηκεῖς looks like versification and so does ἐγὼ τι or ἐγώγη, since I can find no example of a subject-pronoun inserted in a paraphrase when the text does not contain it, and if ἐγὼ τι (ΣRV) was the original version any doubts about deliberate versification should be removed. The versification must post-date the compression which led to the belief that the paraphrase was a πλήρωμα and the consequent decision to incorporate it in the text.

"Stage-directions" (παρεπιγραφαί) were especially likely to be incorporated into dramatic texts (Eur. Cy. 487 is the locus classicus), and Bentley interpreted Thesm. 1187b as an interpolation of this kind:

``
κλαυσθ., ἢν μὴ νῦνον μένης.
ἀνακύπτῃ καὶ παρακύπτῃ ἀπεψωλημένος.
eἰέν. καλῇ τὸ σκῆμα περὶ τὸ πόστιον.
``

The dancing-girl sat on the policeman’s lap to take her sandals off (1182 f.), and he took the opportunity to feel her breasts (1185). Now she is practising her dance again, and he admires her buttocks. As one might expect, his phallos responds vigorously, and he tells it threateningly to "stay inside." Since he is a Scythian, he could be wearing trousers, and would certainly be wearing them if they allowed of comic exploitation, as I think they did; I suggest that he pulls his trousers halfway down his thighs, giving room and air to the vertical object which he has been wearing concealed under his clothes since he came on stage, καλῇ τὸ σκῆμα being a joke against barbarian manners and taste. Since he inflects his verbs haphazardly, the verbs ἀνακύπτῃ (i.e. -τι) and παρακύπτη could as well be second person as third—a question addressed to his phallos, "Popping up, are you, and peeping out, with your foreskin back?", or information confided to the audience, "It’s popping up..." The difficulty, of course, is stylistic. A simple ἀνακύπτη; would suit the Scythian’s staccato style very well, but no one can feel quite easy about the continuation καὶ παρακύπτη, and the good Attic word ἀπεψωλημένος (cf. Ach.

27 τὰ ἐν ὀρνηκείς νόμιμα in 1337 may be influenced by 1343b.
28 J. van Leeuwen, Prolegomena ad Aristophanem (Leiden, 1908) 338 f., in deleting 1343b, supposes that Aristophanes wrote δὲ, not γάρ, in 1344; Coulon, οφ. cit. (n. 18) 176 f., while leaving γάρ intact, supposes that it caused some difficulty to ancient commentators and facilitated the interpolation of 1343b. But I would be surprised if an ancient commentator found any difficulty in understanding the kind of γάρ discussed by J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford, ed. 2, 1954) 60–62.
161, 592, *Lys. 1168*) is too good; we would have expected the stem ὑωλ to figure in a comically ungrammatical observation. So far as the content of the line goes, it would be hard to reject the possibility that it is a versified stage-direction; cf. Σ *Peace 879 f.*, “Touching her buttocks and admiring them and showing her private parts to the audience” and “A member of the audience takes Theoria by the hips and feels her, drawing a line round with his finger” (some ancient commentator on Aristophanes had a fondness for bringing “extras” on stage, cf. Σ *Frogs 297, 308*). Nor indeed is the language of scholia always euphemistic; Σ *Thesm. 1187* in fact describes the Scythian as speaking πρὸς τὸ πέος. I would, however, like to keep open the possibility that ἀνακύπτει is addressed by the Scythian to his phallos and the rest of the line an attempt to repair a breach occasioned by the omission of something which had become unintelligible. Cf. above on gaps of this kind; and the omission of *Frogs 1294 τὸ ξυγκλινέσ τ’ ἐπ’ Ἀιαντί by some ancient texts (according to Timachidas in Σ ad loc.) may have been due to the fact that it is so inconsequential an utterance as to be unintelligible to those who expect a little too much of parody.

A crude example of an artistically unexacting πλῆρωμα seems to be presented by *BKT* v no. 231 (s. V p.C.) at *Ach. 780*, where the Megarian’s daughters, obeying their father’s command to squeak like piglets, say κοτ often enough to make up a kind of iambic trimeter (the right-hand part of the line is preserved in the papyrus, but not the left-hand part), whereas in the medieval manuscripts (including the citation in the Suda) they say κοτ only twice, which should not surprise us in the case of noises and exclamations. Later in this same passage occurs what seemed at one time to be an open-and-shut case of interpolation, 801–804:

Text of RAΓ  
Text of *BKT* no. 231

| Δι. τρόγοις ἄν ἐρεβίνθουσ; Κο. κοτ κοτ κοτ. |  
| Δι. τί δαί; φιβάλεως ἰσχάδος; Κο. κοτ κοτ. | ]οίκοι 
| Δι. τί δαί ἵσικα τρόγοις ἄν αὐτὸς; Κο. κοτ κοτ. | ]κοῖκοι 
| Δι. ὠς οὔ πρὸς τὰς ἰσχάδας κεκράγατε. | ]

801 κοτ bis R 803 om. Suda: del. Bentley σῦκα Α

30 Moreover, ἀπεφωνημένος is applied elsewhere to persons, not to penises (Coulon, *op. cit.* [n. 18] 174).
31 Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica ii* (London, 1896) ad loc. emended θεσατῶν to οἰκετῶν; but I think that the commentator was influenced by 877 f., 887, 905 f.
32 J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaecnica* (Oxford, 1955) 104–107 emends ἀνακύπτει to ἀνασύρει “he pulls up her dress,” and envisages an actio quite different from what I have suggested.
33 But the identity of 1295 with 1293 may have caused accidental omission of 1294 f.
34 Apparently an eightfold κοτ, with the second syllable short (despite the evidence of 801 f.), and therefore ending a trimeter Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ Ϝ.
In 801 Dikaiopolis asks one of the girls (τρώγουσ ἄν codd., τρώγουσ' ἄν Blaydes) if she would eat chick-peas, and in 802 (there is no reason why the question should not be addressed to the same girl) dried figs. Given the accentuation σῦκα in RL and the idiom τί δαί σὺ; (e.g. Birds 136, Lys. 136, Frogs 1454; cf. Blaydes ad loc.), it looks as if Dikaiopolis is asking the second girl, “What about you? Would you eat (sc. dried figs)?”, τί δαί σὺ; τρώγουσ ἄν;—to which she replies (as in 801) with a triple κοῖ (so Elmsley). σῦκα is not a synonym of ἰχάδες, and though it appears as a Paleologan gloss on ἰχάδες (at Knights 755, Wealth 877, 1122) it is not a likely gloss in the scholia vetera, which in fact use the word ἰχάδες themselves (e.g. Σ Peace 634, Lys. 647; cf. reflexes of ἰχάδες in many modern Greek dialects). The humour of the passage lies in its sexual reference; ἐρέβωνως can mean “penis” (as it does in Frogs 545) and it is not hard to see why ἰχάδες too could have this meaning35 (σῦκον in Peace 1349 f. is applied to the external genitals of both sexes).36 Ancient commentators on Theocritus interpreted the “foxes . . . which pick Mikon’s grapes” and the “beetles which eat away the figs of Philodas” in Theocrit. 5.112–115 as an allusion to people who have homosexual intercourse with Mikon and Philodas respectively, and if this idiom existed in Aristophanes’ time Ach. 801–804 could be spoken and acted (by-play with the artificial phallos, and increasingly excited reactions from the girls) very effectively. Since 802 and 803 begin and end alike, it is exceedingly probable that there existed at any given period texts from which 803 had been accidentally omitted, and its absence from the Suda’s quotation of the passage does not, therefore, tell significantly against the authenticity of the line. But the inexplicable residue left by this hypothesis is the presence of the word αὐτός, and I cannot offer a plausible explanation of it as a corruption of something else.37 There is much to be said38 for keeping αὐτός, adjusting the word order as in Parisinus 2715, and interpreting 803 as a coarse joke, τί δαί σὺ; τρώγουσ αὐτός ἄν; addressed to the Megarian himself (more by-play with the comic phallos), suggesting that he is ready to prostitute himself to avoid starvation, and eliciting a falsetto κοῖ κοῖ. For the layout, verb + x + ἄν (abnormal,

35 Because of its resemblance to the glans covered by the foreskin.
36 Appropriate to the vulva, which is “sweet” to the penis as the fig is sweet to the mouth, and also perhaps because a sliced or bitten fig could remind one of a vulva with the labiae parted; and appropriate to the penis for the same reason as ἰχάδες.
37 Coulon, op. cit. (n. 18) 171 f. suggests that τρώγουσ ἄν originated as an explanation of the verbless object in 802 and so generated a bad verse; but would not the versifier have written αὐτή, given that there are two girls and 801 is addressed to only one of them? Or did he envisage what I (following Parker) have suggested?
38 So Douglass Parker in his translation (Ann Arbor, 1961).
as against verb + ἄν + x or x + ἄν + verb or x + verb + ἄν), cf. Wealth 135 f. καὶ ῶδίως παύσεις, εἶ βούλειτο, ταῦτ’ ἄν, Frogs 96 f. γόνυμον δὲ ποιητήν ἄν οὐχ εὑροις ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν.

One of the singular features of many putative interpolations in tragedy is that they do not clarify the contexts in which they occur but either restate some part of the context or make a point in conflict with it, so that the text containing the interpolation presents in series what would rationally be presented as alternatives in parallel. To say this is, of course, to risk a charge of begging the question, since the reason for suspecting a passage as interpolated may be precisely the fact of its tautology or inconcinnity. But it happens from time to time that having spontaneously conceived a suspicion of a passage because it simply does not seem to fit, to the best of our understanding of how the tragic poets set about their business, we subsequently find that the passage was indeed absent from some ancient texts. A well-known example occurs in the opening speech of Euripides’ Andromache, where 5 f., “enviable in former times, νόν δ’ εἶ τις ἄλλη δυστυχεστάτη γυνή” is followed in our manuscripts by (7) ἐμοὶ πέφυκεν ἢ γενήσεαι ποτε, which would make sense only if we had νόν δη τίς ἄλλη in 6 and took δυστυχεστάτη as comparative. According to the scholion, 6 was modified, and 7 added, by actors; and 7 is absent from POxy 449. Compare Eur. Hρ. 871 ff. (and Barrett ad loc.), Ph. 1075 and Su. 902–906 (the citation of 901–908 by Johannes Damascenus omits 902–906, thus freeing the passage from tautological conceits and bearing out the speaker’s announcement ἐπανω ἐν βραχεῖ θήσω μέγαν).

In Aristophanes one of the most remarkable examples of alternatives presented in series by our manuscripts is Frogs 1431α–1432.

οὐ χρῆ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν.  
μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα μὴ ἃν πόλει τρέφειν.  
쁠 δ’ ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν.

1431α om. Plu. Alc. 16.3  1431b om. VA

The scholia recognize only a text in which all three lines are present, and they discuss whether all are spoken by the ghost of Aeschylus or divided between speakers. The omission of 1431β by some manuscripts is unimportant, since when two successive lines end with the same word the accidental omission of the second line is a widespread phenomenon. I

hope I may be allowed to take it as certain that Aristophanes did not intend 1431a and 1431b to be uttered one after the other.\textsuperscript{41}

The second passage is \textit{Frogs} 1251–1261.

1251 Xo. τι ποτε πράγμα γενήσεται;
1252 φροντίζειν γάρ ἐγώ, ἐγώ
1253 τίν’ ἄρα μέμιψεν ἐπόσει
1254 ἀνδρὶ τῷ πολὺ πλείστα δὴ
cppovTit,€i.v
tive,
alternative,
e
8e
followed
father?
father?
problem
first
one
versions
wedding-song
conics
intellectual
read
natives
Euripides.

The former exhibits a completely normal pattern of glyconics and phercrateans, the latter an unusual pattern, one glyconic followed by three phercrateans, for which the only parallels are the wedding-song at the end of \textit{Peace} (1341 ff., 1346 ff., two telesilleans plus three reiziana, but two of the reiziana are the cry ‘Γμῆν, ‘Γμέναι’ ὁ’) and the end of the epode of Pindar's second paean (glyconic plus four reiziana, but here again three of the reiziana are a refrain ἵπε Παιάν, ἵπε Παιάν δὲ μῆποτε λεῖπτοι), to which one might add Aesch. \textit{Pers.} 554 ff. \textasciitilde{} 564 ff., (two lekythia plus two phercrateans).\textsuperscript{42} The second of the two alternative versions is also remarkable (whenever it was written, and in whatever circumstances) in giving Aeschylus the title τὸν Βακχείον ἄνακτα, which one would not expect to find given to anyone but Dionysus. Euripides’ first words, πάνυ γε μέλῃ θαυμαστά, seem to pick up the words of the first alternative, κάλλιστα μέλη, and are inappropriate to the second alternative, since at first hearing it seems to pick up the chorus’s emphatic θαυμάζω but in fact has quite a different point. This doublet presents a problem to which I shall return. Much simpler is \textit{Clouds} 652–654,

\begin{center}
Στ. κατὰ δάκτυλον; νη τὸν Δλ’, ἀλλ’ οἰδ’. Σω. εἰπῃ δή.
Στ. τίς ἀλλοι ἀντὶ τούτωι τοῦ δάκτυλου;
πρὸ τοῦ μέν, ἐπ’ ἐμοὺ παιδὸς ὄντος, οὐτοσί.
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{41} But perhaps not everyone will allow me (cf. Coulon, \textit{op. cit.} [n. 8], 175 f.) to treat it as self-evident, if both lines were written by Aristophanes, that he regarded 1431a as better than 1431b, or that if only one of them is his, that one is 1431a. The objection that Alcibiades’ father did not merit the high praise “lion” surprises me; how many of us, in reading λέωντος οἰκυμών, “lion cub,” have given even a passing thought to Alcibiades' father?

If there were room for an adversative conjunction in 654, I would not regard 653 and 654 as alternatives; but there is not.

How did conflation of alternatives arise? It is easy to imagine that a copyist of Euripidean tragedy, confronted with two exemplars, of which one contained a histrionic alternative to what stood in the other, either took the responsibility of conflating the two himself or wrote one version in the text of his copy and the other in the margin—in which case the conflation which we find in the medieval tradition was the work of a subsequent copyist. The operative forces were reluctance to discard anything which might possibly be authentic and negligence or inconsistency in the use of critical formulae and signs. The phenomenon of alternatives in series was certainly familiar to ancient critics. Aristophanes of Byzantion marked with sigma and antisigma the two lines Od. v 247 f. (Odysseus building his raft) because "he considered the content of both to be the same," τὸ αὐτὸ ζήτησεν ἀμφότερο. A similar point is made, though with a difference of technique, by ΣΑ II. viii 535 ff.: "Either these three lines, which are marked with antisigma, should stay in the text, or the following three lines, which are marked with dots (στιγματα'), for they express the same thing (εἰς γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶ διάνοιαν)." ΣΑ II. ii 192 also refers to the conjunction of antisigma against one line and dots against a nearby passage, but this time with reference to a possible disturbance of order. The only place in the scholia on Aristophanic comedy at which we encounter sigma and antisigma is Frogs 151-153.

ν Μορψίμου τής ῥήμαν ἡγεράσατο.
Δι. νη τούς θεούς ἐχρῆν γε πρὸς τούτοις κεί
tὴν πυρρίχην τῆς ἐμιθέ τήν Κινησιόν.

ΣΥ says: "Some do not write the line νη τούς θεούς, but leave it out and write the next line as νη πυρρίχην κτλ. For this reason Aristophanes (sc. of Byzantion) puts in the margin the antisigma and sigma." No one could claim that 152 and 153 say the same thing; it is rather that 152 + 153 constituted an alternative to a slightly modified 153. Nor is there anything in the language and style of 152 + 153 to justify a suspicion on internal grounds that anything has been conflated with anything else,

43 Cf. the practice of ancient editors of Homer, and the survival of the words γυλδοντι δε Μοῖσας in Pl. O.2. 27a despite Aristophanes of Byzantion's observation that they violated responson (Σ48c, 48f Drachmann).

44 The difficulty of interpreting antisigma consistently in CGF 61.21, 24. 85.323 f., 248.1, is instructive. Cf. n. 9 above. At II. ii 192 ΣΑ made things harder for any subsequent copyist by misplacing the scholion (to 188) and writing antisigma with a dot instead of plain antisigma; see Erbse ad loc.
as there is in Hom. H.Ap. 136–139, where some of those medieval manuscripts which contain all four lines have preserved some marginal anti-
sigmata.45

The uncertainties which could be produced by editorial ambiguity and inconsistency and by negligence in summarizing editorial judgments can be appreciated if we consider the implications of modern scholarly publication. In Act III of Mozart's Idomeneo there are four extant versions of the oracular utterance. Mozart himself refers to two of them explicitly, and a third implicitly, in writing (18 Jan. 1781), “The oracular utterance also is still much too long. I have abbreviated it. Varesco is not to know anything about that, for everything will be printed as he wrote it.” In the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe (ii 5.11 1972) two versions are given at the appropriate place in the score, clearly labelled “28a” and “28b,” and the remaining two, “28c” and “28d” in the appendix. What would the fate of that text be in a culture which could transmit it only by manual copying?

On the assumption that we cannot expect to find in Aristophanic comedy histrionic interpolations of the kind we find in tragedy, we have to consider the hypothesis that alternatives originate with the author himself.46 Galen once more (CMG v 10.1 43.23 ff.) is helpful, telling us how he sometimes composed two alternative versions of a passage, one in the column of text and the other in the margin, postponing decision between them; but the text, he says, was copied before he made up his mind, and the copyist incorporated the marginal alternative in the column. In the case of Aristophanes, the hypothesis that he himself composed both the alternative versions of a passage has received support from the statement of Dicaearchus that Frogs was performed a second time, from the certainty that the Clouds we possess is a partially revised version of the Clouds performed in 423, and from the fact that the comic poets, including Aristophanes, occasionally put on plays bearing the same titles as plays which they had put on previously. But although there is reason to believe (Galen CMG v 9.1 120.8 ff.) that the second Autolycus of Eupolis was a revised version of the first Autolycus, the available evidence does

45 Unless, perhaps, it seemed to Aristophanes of Byzantion (I think this is what Boudreaux, op. cit. [n. 24] 27 means) that it was stylistically wrong for Herakles to end with a joke against Morsimos instead of leaving jokes about the arts to Dionysos. On this principle F. Ritschl, Opuscula Philologica v (Leipzig, 1879) 272 f., followed by Coulon, op. cit. (n. 18) 138–140, arranged the lines in the order 152, 153, 151. Since, however, one joke (148) has already been included in Herakles' otherwise portentous list of sinners, I see no real objection to his ending with another (151), even if it is not quite of the same kind.

not suggest that Aristophanes' two plays which shared the title *Thesmophoriazusae* had much else in common, and I would suspect that the same could be said of *Peace* and *Wealth*. The commentators from whose work the scholia on *Wealth* are derived believed that they were commenting not, as they were, on the play of that name produced in 388, but on the homonymous play of 408; accordingly, confronted in *Wealth* 173 with an apparent reference to the Corinthian War, they favoured the speculation that the passage had been transferred from the later *Wealth* to the earlier. But clearly they were not in a position to compare the two plays, and their explanation is disturbingly facile—rather like the idea, popular in antiquity (cf. Σ ad loc.), that the apparently hazy reference to Aeschylus’s *Persae* in *Frogs* 1028 is actually a reference to another, lost *Persae* which described the battle of Plataea and contained the death of Xerxes and was performed at Syracuse. Moreover, the traditional association of conflated passages with known pairs of homonymous comedies has recently been dislocated by a papyrus 47 in which *Lysistrata* 187 is followed by 197, 199, 198 and then 188 (after which the fragment breaks off). The passage beginning with 197 (δρόσωμεν κτλ.) and that beginning with 188 (εἰς ἀσπίδας κτλ.) can both hitch comfortably on to 187 (τίν’ ὥρκον ὡρκώσεις ποθ’ ἡμᾶς,—δυνατὰ;) and since 197 also hitches on to 196 (μηλοσαφενόσαι κτλ.) the possibility has to be considered that 188–196 and 197 ff. were originally alternatives—a possibility first brought home to us by their being conflated in the papyrus in the order which (unlike that of the medieval text) makes no sense.

The issue of author's variants is apt to arouse emotion, and one can see why. If an editor, confronted by variants of which one is sense and the other nonsense, attributes the former to the author's mature reflection and the latter to that same author's hasty drafting, 48 he implies that the transmission of texts down to the sixth century A.D. was exempt from the processes of corruption which we can see at work, step by step, before our very eyes, in many manuscript traditions from the ninth century onwards. This implication is not consonant with the evidence. If the editor's rule of procedure is rooted in an emotional commitment to defending the integrity of transmitted readings at all costs, he is vulnerable to the further charge, as serious in historical studies as in ordinary life, that he cares more what the truth is than he cares that the truth, whatever it is,

47 PColon. inv. 3, edited by A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, ΖΦΕ i (1967) 117–120; I follow the essentials of their interpretation, but hesitate to refer to histrionic modification of an Aristophanic text.

should be found. Yet the contrary rule, that we should never consider attributing textual variation to the original author in default of positive external evidence that he revised his text, is no less open to criticism. Rules, after all, govern relations between adversaries, especially in games, where part of their purpose is to ensure that the game is not over too soon. In historical study we have no adversary and no occasion to be just or unjust, fair or unfair. Instead of rules, we have hypotheses which are consonant or dissonant with the available evidence and procedures which promote or impede the establishment of results.

Jachmann, a vigorous critic of thoughtless recourse to authors' variants as an interpretative procedure, cites spectacular examples of the through-going alteration of a text by people other than its author,49 and no doubt many more could be cited. Yet an infinity of such examples cannot annihilate the independent fact that authors do sometimes rewrite their own texts. To take a contemporary example, Dürenmatt's play Romulus der Grosse first appeared in print in 1958 in a form differing in many details from the version first performed in 1949, and the playwright revised it again for republication in 1964, altering not merely tenses and connecting particles but also the sequence and scale of the dialogue in certain scenes. Or, a slightly less recent example: the number and extent of the revisions to which Hardy subjected The Mayor of Casterbridge between April 1885, the moment at which he could fairly say that he had completed the novel, and its appearance in Macmillan's Wessex edition in 1912.

Ancient scholars were willing to assume that revision of this kind had occurred. On Ar. Frogs 1206 ff. Αἴγυπτος, ὂς ὁ πλεῖστος ἐσπαρται λόγος, κτλ. Σν says: "According to some, this is the opening of Archelaus. They are wrong, for no such speech of Euripides is now extant. For, says Aristarchus, it does not belong to Archelaus, unless (sc. the poet) himself altered it (μετέθηκεν) later and Aristophanes has given the original text".50 So too on Frogs 1400 βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεὺς δύο κύβῳ καὶ τέτταρα, ΣνRV says: "Aristarchus says that this is cited as anonymous (ἀδεσπότως), since Euripides represented men playing dice in Telephus and (sc. later) removed them. It may therefore be from that play."

I am not in a position to assert that Aristarchus was right or wrong on these matters, but experience suggests to me that many authors rewrite their works as long as they are given the opportunity to do so. The

49 Loc. cit. (n. 4), 368 f.
50 Page, op. cit. (n. 8) rejects as spurious Eur. fr. 228, given as the opening of Archelaus in [Plu.] Vit. X Or. 837c, on the grounds that Aristophanes must have got it right.
modern processes of printing and publishing, and in particular the cold reception given by publishers to the good ideas which come into one's mind while correcting page-proofs, reduce the opportunities. Before the invention of printing, they were far greater. The title of Emonds' book, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum*, has perhaps done harm by encouraging us to think of ancient authors as revising their works in discrete editions, when we should be thinking of indefinitely prolonged and extremely irregular processes of revision. I recall that the late Professor Douglas Young altered some lines in his Scots translation of *Frogs* during the dress rehearsal. The actor concerned noted the changes and got them right in the performance twenty-four hours later. Others made no such note. When the play was printed, it naturally had the revised lines; but before printing, revised and unrevised typescripts coexisted. If anyone says that I should not tell such a story without adding *si parua licet componere magnis*, so that he may at once cry *non licet*, I can only proclaim the contrary conviction that in the behavior of writers and artists there are structural constants behind the cultural variables.

I am inclined to treat *Frogs* 1252–1256 and 1257–1260 as author's variants, though without invoking the story of the repeat performance of the play as evidence; and if I have to say which of the two passages was replaced by the other, I will say that 1257–1260 was replaced by 1252–1256. On this hypothesis, Aristophanes will have ventured on the expression τὸν Βακχεῖον ἀνακτα and then repented of it; and I suspect that not only the form, but the associations of a divine title predisposed him to a refrain-like sequence of pherecrateans. Whether the first version ended at καὶ δεδοικ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, I doubt; it makes a surprisingly short stanza, compared with any other choral stanzas which mark the transition from one section to another in an Aristophanic scene; the idea that the chorus fears for Euripides needs some amplification, and it is possible that Euripides' opening words in 1261 cohered as well with what followed 1260 in that first version as they now seem to do with 1255 f. But in thus classifying *Frogs* 1257–1260 as a type II interpolation rather than as a type V I am chiefly influenced by inability to point to any passage in Aristophanes which can be assigned to type V on grounds which carry real conviction.

The strongest contender is undoubtedly the latter part of the messenger's speech in *Ach.* 1174–1189.

51 Cf. Radermacher's commentary *ad loc.*

52 Coulon, *op. cit.* (n. 18) 177 f. suggests that an unknown admirer of Aeschylus paraphrased 1252–1256, bringing out in *θαυμάζω* and *δεδοικα* the ingredients of *φροντίζω.*
1181, since it repeats 574 (but with καὶ for τίς), has long attracted suspicion (though the context does not provide a motive for marginal quotation, such as we find in the context of *Birds* 192 or *Wealth* 280); κομπολακίδου in 1182 harks back to an offensive joke made by Dikaiopolis against Lamachus in 589, and may therefore be thought inappropriate in the lips of this distraught and portentous messenger; if the text of 1182–1185 is sound, it seems that the feather δεινὸν ἐξηύδα μέλος; if the utterance (hardly a μέλος) is addressed to Lamachus (and to whom else could it be addressed?) it creates a relationship between a feather and its wearer to which an audience, ancient or modern, may find it hard to adjust, and the opening words of 1185 are hardly intelligible; and in 1186 we pass, apparently, to Lamachus himself, falling down again (≈ 1178–1180) and recovering in order to conduct activities which are hard to reconcile with each other. Blaydes condemned 1181–1188 as interpolated, Wilamowitz 1181–1187, and more recently Page concluded, after severely adverse judgments on the sense—as comedy—of successive items in 1181–1188, that there is no alternative “except to recognize wholesale interpolation by a very inferior writer,” “specially composed to fill a known gap” after loss of part of the original messenger’s speech.53 The authenticity of the passage has however been defended in detail.54 Without rehearsing these details (which are numerous and complicated) I want to raise afresh the essential question: in what circumstances and for what purposes will a Greek capable of writing respectable iambic trimeters (and of quoting from *Telephus* in line 1188) have interpolated in a play of Aristophanes a passage of obscure drivel uncharacteristic of messengers’ narratives in comedy? We are entitled to reply, “We cannot imagine, but that does

not matter,” only if we are satisfied that the kind and degree of nonsense which we find in *Ach.* 1181 ff. are beyond doubt distinguishable from other Aristophanic nonsense. I stress “beyond doubt,” because to reject any passage in any author on the grounds that it is the most x passage in that author’s work automatically promotes the second most x to first place, and away we go on a rampage of deletion. The impossibility of quantifying nonsense precisely and the consequent necessity of recourse to subjective judgment should not deter us from tackling the problem of *Ach.* 1181 ff.; the questions which most insistently demand an answer are commonly unquantifiable. It seems to me that Fraenkel55 was right to adduce the lyric parodies in *Frogs*, but wrong in referring to the parody of Euripidean monody (1331–1363), which is actually a coherent passage, rather than to the parodies of choral lyrics (1264–1277, 1284–1295 and 1309–1322), which are incoherent in syntax, sense and imagery. In that section of *Frogs* Aristophanes wrote colourful drivel as a means of characterizing the object of parody as colourful drivel, and the reasonable inference from this is that the messenger’s speech in *Ach.* parodies something specific. We need not be abashed if we are not in a position to identify the original and compare the parody with it.

The problem of a passage stylistically unlike anything else in the author’s work is raised by the wedding-song (1329–1359) at the end of *Peace*. I have omitted indications of speaker, as irrelevant to the particular problem which concerns me here.56 The song is divisible into eight sections, which I have marked A–H. *Σ* offers a metrical analysis, which we may ascribe (in keeping with the subscriptio) to Heliodorus,57 and that is where our troubles begin, for (a) in *Σ* 1329 the expected noun preceding μονοστροφικ(ν) is missing, (b) the description given in *Σ* 1329 is simply not true of the text we have, (c) the scholion which begins opposite line 1334 and ends opposite 1346 seems to belong to 1337, and (d) the scholion which is keyed by a sign to line 1346 seems to belong to 1351. Section A could be made to fit the analysis by repeating Τμημα Τμένων α; since this refrain is in fact repeated in 1335 f., 1344 f., 1349 f. and 1355 f., it is a reasonable presumption that Heliodorus’s text contained a line 1332b

57 Newiger, loc. cit. (n. 56) 248 points out that “Heliodorus” is sometimes a term of convenience for the metrical analyses preserved in the *scholia vetera* on Aristophanes; it is noteworthy that the analysis of telesileans and reiziana in *Σ* *Knights* 1111 is fundamentally different from what we have in *Σ* *Peace* 1329. Cf. Boudreaux, op. cit. (n. 24) 36.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace 1329–1359</th>
<th>POxy 1373</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> 1329 δεῦρ᾽ ὃ γῆναι εἰς ἄγρον</td>
<td>δεῦρω[ ]υναιεισγρον δεῦρωνυναιεισγρον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 χαῖτις μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ καλὴ</td>
<td>χαϊσαμετεμοιομαλη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331 καλῶς κατακείσει</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332 Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> 1333 ὁ τρισμάκαρ ὡς δικαί-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334 ὡς τἀγαθά νῦν ἤκεισ.</td>
<td>1329 διπλὴ καὶ εν ἐπεισθέει &lt; &gt; μονοστροφικ(η) περίοδων πεντα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335 Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td>1333 εἰπτ ἐν ἐπεισθέει τοῦ χορ(οῦ) τὸ Τσον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336 Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td>1334 ἐν τοίτους φέρονται κατὰ τινας παράγγελοι ἐνα ὁ χορος ἀνὰ μέρος αὐτὰ λέγη καὶ πάλιν τὰ ἐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρον τοῦ χοροῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> 1337 τι δράσομεν αὐτήν;</td>
<td>1337 ἐν τισι ὁδὲ φέρεται διὰ τὰ μέτρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338 τι δράσομεν αὐτήν;</td>
<td>1346 ἐντεθὲν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὁ φέρεται ἐν πεντάκολα ἀκολού-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339 τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν.</td>
<td>1339 ἐν τοῖς ὁδὲ φέρεται καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐστὶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340 τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν.</td>
<td>1359 ὧρ' ὁ κορωνισ τοῦ δράματος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> 1341 ἀλλ' ἄρα μενοι φέρω-</td>
<td>sub fin. 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ. ὠτως 'Ἡλιόδωρος' κεκώλιστα πρὸς τὰ 'Ἡλιόδωρον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342 μὲν οἱ προτεσαμένοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343 τον νυμφόν, ἀνδρές.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> 1346 οἰκήσετε γοῦν καλῶς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347 ὁ πράγματ' ἔχοντες ἀλ-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348 ὅσα συκολογοῦσετε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> 1351 τοῦ μὲν μέγα καὶ παχύ,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352 τῆς δ' ἱδο τὸ σύκον.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> 1353 φήσεις γ' ὃταν ἐσθῆς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354 οἷνον τε πῖν συν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356 'Υμὴν 'Τμέναι' ὅ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> 1357 ὁ χαϊρετε χαϊρετ' ἐν-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358 δρες καὶ ἐννέπποιθε μοι,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359 πλακούντας ἑδεσθε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1332 bis Vat. Pal. 67
1342 προ- Bentley: προσ- codd.
〈Τμῆν Τμένας〉, in which case his characterization of the stanzas of the song in general as “five ionic dimeters, two of them catalectic and three brachycatalectic” (what we would call “twotelesilleanstothreecatalexia”) applies at any rate to the first stanza. Section B will fit the analysis only if we posit a lost reizianum, 1334b, before the double refrain. Section C, consisting of a repeated question and repeated answer, all reiziana, will not fit, and ΣV here informs us that this section (or does it mean part of this section?) was absent from some texts “because of the metres.” If the words διὰ τὰ μέτρα are sound, the scholiast is ascribing the absence of those four verses to deliberate omission for the purpose of making the text conform to the metrical analysis;58 and even if his explanation is wrong, his presupposition throws an interesting light on editorial procedures in the Roman period. For what it is worth, there is some reason to think that the fifth century codex of which POxy 1373 (PPrinceton AM 9056) is a fragment contained 1337–1340, since the copyist repeated line 1329 (which was subsequently deleted by scoring through). Why did he do this? Clearly we cannot always expect to explain why transcribers repeat lines—whether we are speaking of our own daily experience or of ancient copyists—and we may be dealing here with a pure coincidence,59 but it is tempting to suggest that someone (a) wished to make section A conform to the metrical analysis, (b) lacked understanding of the distinction between “catalectic” and “brachycatalectic,” (c) instead of taking the obvious step and repeating the refrain, was influenced by the repetition in section C and wished to imitate it.60

That is, of course, highly speculative; it is less speculative, taking Σ 1337 as applying to section C and also as true, to say: there did exist texts from which section C was absent. When the late Maurice Platnauer was preparing his edition of Peace, I found it impossible to persuade him at least to print section C in his text and express his doubt of its authenticity in the apparatus criticus; it was the only occasion on which his characteristic patience and courtesy in discussion of disagreements failed him, and he simply could not take seriously the notion that Aristophanes wrote those four crude, childish lines. Now, the form of question and answer, with assonance and partial repetition, seems to be a constant in

58 That is to say, to the analysis in Σ 1329; but Newiger, loc. cit. (n. 56) 251 remarks that if (as seems probable) καὶ πᾶλιν κτλ. in 1334 refers to 1341 ff., it implies not a continuation of the same metrical form as precedes 1341 but a return to an earlier form (cf. Σ B Ach. 204; White, op. cit. [n. 25] 397).
59 This is implied by Newiger, loc. cit. (n. 56) 251.
60 This seems to have been the view of Grenfell and Hunt in their introduction to POxy 1373.
Greek wedding-songs, from Sappho (fr. 115 Lobel-Page), "To what, dear bridegroom, am I most to liken you? To a slender sapling I most liken you," to the modern Sarakatsani, 61 "Whose is the flag, fine and red? The bridegroom's is the flag, fine and red!" The tone of jocular obscenity in section C accords well with that of section F and with ancient practice at weddings; and it should be noted that sections C and F have a formal feature in common, in that each follows a pair of stanzas which end with the Hymen-refrain. I do not see why Aristophanes should not have decided to integrate his own sophisticated poetry in this wedding-song with ingredients taken directly from rustic usage, which serve as a thumping coda to sections A + B and D + E respectively. C and F (I would prefer to think of them together, as far as possible) may have been present in one of the author's versions of the song and absent from another; if so, ΣV 1337 is explained and the problems of the metrical analysis are in part resolved. But I must confess that I am still not quite happy about the repetition within section C, and I would not absolutely rule out the possibility that it has its origin in pure error. If Aristophanes wrote one question and one answer, beginning with the same letter and ending with the same ten letters, the chance that the answer would be accidentally omitted in transmission was very high. This could set in motion a process which can be set out diagrammatically:

For deletion of a line as incoherent cf. Frogs 1294 (p. 148); and for marginal addition of something already there, cf. R at Wealth 1128–1131, where 1129 f., accidentally omitted in the text, were written by the copyist in the margin and again (in the same hand, but a different ink) at the top of the page. It will be objected that the process indicated in the right-hand side of the diagram is not likely to have occurred unless transmitters of the text were familiar with repetition as a feature of actual wedding-songs. Perhaps indeed they were; so, then, was Aristophanes, and the repetition ceases to require explanation, whether sections C and F belong to a revised or to an unrevised version of the exodos of Peace. Whichever of the alternative hypotheses considered may be judged the more probable, Peace 1337–1340 has no better claim than Frogs 1257–1260 or Ach. 1181(2)–1187(8) to be classified as a type V interpolation in Aristophanes.

In this article I have tried to found discussion of difficult and disputed cases on what is simple, observable and undisputed elsewhere. Even if my hypotheses commend themselves as far as they go, they will require re-examination when the editing and indexing of the scholia vetera on Aristophanes has been completed and (in conjunction with the publication of more ancient fragments of commentaries) has increased our understanding of the ways in which ancient editors and commentators operated.62 It will be easier then also to distinguish between the methods, interests and predilections of different individual commentators, or at least different periods and traditions.63

University of St. Andrews

63 Boudreaux, op. cit. (n. 24) took some important steps in this direction. The commentators from whom the scolia vetera on Birds and Frogs were derived like to cite individual scholars by name (later commentators are more prominent in Birds, earlier in Frogs), while names are almost entirely suppressed in the scholia on Wealth and Clouds, and those on Wasps occupy an intermediate position (cf. W. G. Rutherford, A Chapter in the History of Annotation [London, 1905] 417–434). There are very full metrical analyses in the scholia on Ach., Knights and Peace, some on Clouds and Wasps, and none on the extant plays which would come later in any edition of the plays arranged not in alphabetic but in chronological order. These data alone give rise to interesting but inconclusive reflection.