

# 10

## Ancient Interpolation in Aristophanes

KENNETH J. DOVER

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 responson.

I distinguish between five types of interpolation<sup>2</sup>, of which type I may

This paper was read to the Hellenic and Roman Societies in Oxford on 28 July 1975. I am indebted to Mr P. J. Branscombe for the references to Mozart and Dürrenmatt and to Princeton University for a good photograph of POxy 1373.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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;<sup>4</sup> 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.

---

into the text (my type II) into this category, and distinguishes it from interpolation which is *bewusst*, by which he means my types IV-V. I shall argue that this bald distinction is unhelpful, and that even if it is adopted Jachmann's generalization is not true of Aristophanes.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart, 1973) 16 f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. Jachmann, *NGG Ph.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. i N.F. iv* (1941) on early interpolations in Plato.

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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> 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

<sup>5</sup> G. Pugliese-Carratelli, *Dioniso* viii (1940/1) 118-123.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. Fuks, *AJPh* xciii (1971) 48-55.

ἴν' εὐθέως διακονικός εἶναι [μοι] δοκῆς

μοι del. Bentley

It is possible that μοι originated in a supralinear amplification of δοκῆς (medieval glossators, at any rate, were notoriously fond of inserting direct and indirect pronominal objects),<sup>7</sup> 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 αὐτῷ γε διακονεῖται in Parisinus Regius 2715 at *Ach.* 1017 (responding to 1046 φωνῇ τοιαῦτα λάσκων). We may compare *Ach.* 928, where the whole medieval tradition offers us

ὥσπερ κέραμον, ἵνα μὴ καταγῆ †φορούμενος

as an iambic trimeter. Elmsley's conjecture φερόμενος, founded on his correct scansion of the second syllable of καταγῆ as long<sup>8</sup> is vindicated by a fragment from the fifth century A.D., *BKT* 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, ἀντὶ τοῦ for glosses, οἶον or ὡσεὶ 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.<sup>9</sup> These condi-

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Holzinger's commentary *ad loc.*

<sup>8</sup> -τᾶ- is guaranteed by 944 καταγείη ποτ' in responsion with ψοφεῖ λάλον 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 *Binneninterpolation* (Jachmann, *loc. cit.* [n. 2] 123-144, 185-215) and turn 927 f. into one line, δός μοι φορυτόν, ἵνα μὴ καταγῆ φερόμενος, since it is, after all, the Theban, not Dikaiopolis, who will φέρειν the packaged informer.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford, 1968) 115-118 and *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1971) 17; A. Römer, *ABAW* xix (1892) 661-663.

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

\_\_\_\_\_ μὴ δῆτ' ἔμοιγ' οὕτως· ἄνευ τιμῆς βασιάνιζ' ἀπαγαγῶν  
 οὕτως δέ R: τοῦτον δέ cett. ἄνευ τιμῆς recte om. R cett. Σ<sup>V</sup>: οἶον· ἄνευ τιμῆς.  
 οὐδὲν θέλω ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ.

The text of V here combines one tradition in which οὕτως, "unconditionally," was explained in a scholion as ἄνευ τιμῆς, "without compensation," and another in which ἄνευ τιμῆς was written above οὕτως as a gloss and was then mistaken for the rectification of an omission.<sup>10</sup>

In a papyrus of the fifth century A.D. (POxy 1371), which preserves parts of the opening scene of *Clouds*, the words *ρυπαρος* and *πλ[η]θων*, standing at a good distance from the column opposite lines 44 and 45, are clearly glosses on *εὐρωτιῶν* (or *ἀκόρητος*) and *βρύων* respectively. But in a Theocritus papyrus of the same date (POxy 1618) the gloss *ἐν ἀκαλήφαις* standing over *ἐν κνίδασι* in 7.110, equally a gloss (cf. Σ<sup>K</sup> *κνιδῆ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀκαλήφη δέ ὑπ' Ἀπτικῶν*), 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 *αγνας* | *ενομασκαμπινυτασθεμιτος*, the word *ακολουθον* is written over *καμπινυ*; it is required by the sense, "attendant on . . .," and supported by respension with 48, and is thus rectification (by the second corrector) of a copyist's omission. Yet at 3.47, *ταπροσθε(ν)δ[εχ]θραφιλαθαενγλύκιστον*, the word *νυν*, also written in the second corrector's hand over *αφι*, is intended as a clarification ("what was hateful before is now welcome") and cannot be part of Bacchylides' text, for twelvefold respension guarantees the sequence  $\times - \sim \sim \times \sim \sim - . . .$ . The same absence of discrimination between the functions of superscript words is apparent in a papyrus (POxy 1617) of Aristophanes' *Wealth*. At 55

]ρη[. . .]οτι[<sup>ημων</sup>  
 i.e. πυθόιμεθ' ἂν τὸν χρησμὸν ἡμῶν ὅτι νοεῖ.

*ἡμῶν* is superscript only because it was accidentally omitted,<sup>11</sup> but at line 39

<sup>ειπεν</sup>  
 ]ιβροελακεν εκ τῶν στεμματων  
 i.e. τί δῆτα Φοῖβος ἔλακεν ἐκ τῶν στεμμάτων;

<sup>10</sup> At *Frogs* 437 R is the offender, V innocent. Cf. Leidensis Vossianus gr. Q4A at Aesch. *Prom.* 214 (Dawe, op. cit. [n. 1] 206).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. CGF 92.34 (Eupolis), POxy 852 (Eur. *Hypsipyle*) fr. 20/21.7. Ibid. fr. 1 iv 2 the clause *τὰν πόσις ἔκτα*, rectification of an omission, is formally identical with a supra-linear comment.

εἴπεν is probably a gloss on ἔλακεν, 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

Ιευτοιχεις  
]ευπορεις.[

or Herodas 1.34 in PLitLond 96

.οφ..οε  
τηνδοψιν

i.e. τὴν δ' ὄψιν with τὸ δ' (ε)ἶδος (Headlam) superscript.<sup>12</sup>

Nor is it surprising that after more than a millennium of sporadic editorial and transcriptional negligence we find at *Frogs* 202<sup>13</sup>

(in R) οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων, ἀλλ' ἀντιβιάς<sup>πρὸςταρρευματατόανβιάς.</sup>

(in V) οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων, ἀλλ' ἀντιβιάς<sup>γρ. ταρρευμάαν βιάς</sup>

or at *Frogs* 275

(in R) ὁ Ἡρακλῆς καὶ τοὺς ἐπιόρκους οὓς ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν: σὺ δ' οὐ  
δηλον(ότι)

(in V) καὶ τοὺς ἐπιόρκους οὓς ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν: σὺ δ' οὐ ἂν ὁ Ἡρ<sup>κ</sup>

καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ σμικρά· 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 τοῦ δ' ἔκλυ' ἀριστοπάτρα 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.<sup>14</sup> 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

<sup>12</sup> 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 Σ<sup>K</sup> Theocr. 11.12 θυράων.

<sup>13</sup> For conversion of glosses into variants in the medieval text of Aeschylus cf. Dawe, *op. cit.* (n. 1) 102 f.

<sup>14</sup> The likelihood of misapprehension is fortuitously increased when (as has happened in PBodmer IV at Men. *Dysc.* 944-946) a marginal gloss or comment is misplaced.



ἐκ κραιπάλης . . . ροφήσεις τρύβλιον) but the sense is again wrong,<sup>18</sup> for ἀλλοτρίας 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 διὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ὑμετέρας,<sup>19</sup> precisely as in 556 f., “and forbid the gods to go to and fro, with penis erect, through your territory (διὰ τῆς χώρας τῆς ὑμετέρας).” 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 διαφρήσετε. 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),<sup>20</sup> and *Wealth* 280–282 exhibits the intrusion of such a quotation into the text of one branch of the medieval tradition:

φράσαι δ' οὐπω τέτληκας ἡμῖν  
 ὅτου χάριν μ' ὁ δεσπότης ὁ σὸς κέκληκε δεῦρο  
 οἱ πολλὰ μοχθήσαντες κτλ.

281 recte om. RV

μ' sits ill between ἡμῖν 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 σὺ δ' ἀξιοῖς ἴσως με θεῖν, πρὶν ταῦτα καὶ φράσαι μοι) in order to amplify φράσαι (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.

R	<del>✓</del>	V
Δικ. αἰβοῖ· τουτὶ καὶ δὴ χωρεῖ τὸ κακόν· δότε μοι λεκάνην· ὡς ναυτιῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου ψύχρας ἢ ἵνα ἐμέσω· χολῆ γάρ μοι ἐπιπλέει διὰ τὰ αὐτοῦ ῥήματα.	αἰβοῖ τουτὶ καὶ δὴ γελᾷ ὁ δίκαιος·- δότε μοι λεκάνην· ὡς ναυτιῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκεί- νου ψύχρας· ἢ ἵνα ἐμέσω χολῆ γάρ μοι ἐπιπλέει διὰ τὰ αὐτοῦ ῥήματα·-	Δικ. αἰβοῖ· τουτὶ καὶ δὴ χωρεῖ τὸ κακόν· δότε μοι λεκάνην. Αδ. τυφογέρων εἶ κἀνάρμοστος.
Αδικ. τυφογέρων εἶ κἀνάρμοστος.		

<sup>18</sup> V. Coulon, *Essai sur la méthode de la critique conjecturale appliquée au texte d'Aristophane* (Paris, 1933) 180 f., denies this, translating, “votre cité qui leur (c.à.d. aux dieux) est étrangère.”

<sup>19</sup> As suggested by Dindorf and Lenting.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J. W. White's edition of the scholia on *Birds*, p. 370.

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 *δοτε μοι λεκάνην ἵν' ἐξεμέσω*, which looks rather like an incompetent attempt at anapaestic versification.<sup>21</sup>

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

Τήλεφος εἶναι Μυσὸς φάσκων δύστροπος  
 ἐκ πηριδίου  
 γνώμας τρώγων Πανδελετίους<sup>δυστρόπους</sup>

*δύστροπος* recte om. cett. -τείους Triclinius: -τίας V

The text of RV here is a conflation of one tradition in which *δυστρόπους* was a gloss on Πανδελετείους 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 *δύστροπος* constitutes only half an anapaestic metron.

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

νῦν δὲ διὰ τοῦτ' ἔξαρνος εἶναι διανοεῖ;  
 Δ<sup>α</sup> καὶ μὴν ἀποδώσεις ὦ μέλε' ἃ πρώην περ ἔλαβες. ζήτ  
 Σ<sup>τ</sup>ο τί γάρ ἂν ἀπολαύσαιμι τοῦ μαθήματος;

The Creditor 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?"<sup>22</sup> 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

<sup>21</sup> Suda λ 232 has καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης δοτε μοι λεκάνην. ἰδοῦ, χωρεῖ τὸ κακόν' δοτε μοι λεκάνην, ὡς ναυτιῶν κτλ., but with ψυχρολογίας instead of ψύχρας; cod. V of the Suda omits ἰδοῦ . . . λεκάνην, and between τὸ κακόν and δοτε codd. GM have ὁ αὐτός.

<sup>22</sup> The copyist omitted the siglum Δα. at 1230. R and V both omit ἀλλ' before ἂν 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 exclusion or inclusion to be taken later by someone else, and if the corrector'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 *μοι*) and already corrupt (*ὦ μέλε'* for *ὦ μέλ'*, and, I think, *καὶ μὴν ἀπο-* for *καὶ μὴ 'πο-*, ". . . and are you not going to pay back . . .?").<sup>23</sup> The original versification could well be ancient; *πρώην*, "some time before," "formerly," is attested in Procopius (the notion that the creditor, whose patience is at last exhausted, is claiming money lent "the other day" would be a striking misunderstanding of the situation), and the presence of *περ* shows that the versifier rejected the option *ἂ πρώην*.

At *Birds* 1343-1345 all manuscripts have

<i>οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν τοῦ πέτεσθαι γλυκύτερον.</i>	1343a
<i>ἔρῳ δ' ἐγώ τι τῶν ἐν ὄρνεσιν νόμων.</i>	1343b
<i>ὄρνιθομανῶ γὰρ καὶ πέτομαι καὶ βούλομαι</i>	
<i>οἰκεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν κάπιθυμῶ τῶν νόμων</i>	

1343b del. Dobree *ἐγώ τι] ἔγωγε ΓΕ*

The *πατραλοίας* 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." Σ<sup>v</sup> on 1343 says: "After this (*sc.* line) some have a gap (*διάλειμμα*) of one line, and Ἀριστοφά(νους[?]) πλήρωμα οὕτως"; then 1343b is quoted. It looks *prima facie* as if Aristophanes of Byzantium 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,<sup>24</sup> 1343b. There is indeed no reason why a Hellenistic edition of *Birds* should not have contained a vacant line. It appears from Σ<sup>v</sup> 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;<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> I do not know at what date the modern Greek *μὴν* = *μῆ* is first attested, but an isolated *μέν* = *μῆ* is recorded from the second century B.C. by E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, i 1 (ed. 2, revised by H. Schmoll, Berlin, 1970) 172.

<sup>24</sup> So P. Boudreaux, *Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs* (Paris, 1919) 29 f.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London, 1912) 410 f., and D. Holwerda, *Mnemosyne* IV xvii (1964) 261 f.

and a commentary of the second century A.D. on Aristophanes' *Anagyryus* (POxy 2737, *CGF* i 56) remarks (10 ff.) that the second half of one verse is missing.<sup>26</sup> The word *πλήρωμα* is not attested elsewhere in the meaning "conjunctural 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 *Anagyryus* commentary (15) π[ε]πληρωμ[έν]ο[ι] (Lobel, ed. pr.) or (ἐκ)[πληρώμ[ατ]ο[ι]ς (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 ὄρνισιν νόμων is in origin a paraphrase of the word ὀρνιθομανῶ 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<sup>R</sup> describes simply as "from Euripides' *Troades*," whereas Σ<sup>V</sup>, 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 ὀρνιθομανῶ is Σ 1281, where ἐλακωνομάνουν, "they were crazy about Sparta" is explained as τῆς τῶν Λακωνῶν ἡρῶν πολιτείας: cf. also *Knights* 61, where σιβυλλιστῆ, "he's sibyl-struck," is explained in the scholia as χρησμῶν ἐρῶ καὶ ἐπιθυμεί or simply χρησμῶν ἐρῶ. The paraphrase constitutes an iambic trimeter: by accident or by design? δ' is no problem, for at *Birds* 10 ἐντευθενὶ τὴν πατρίδ' ἂν ἐξεύροις σύ που; we find in Σ<sup>RV</sup> the paraphrase

<sup>26</sup> Cf. W. Luppe, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* xxi (1971) 99.

δύναιο δ' ἂν ἐντεῦθεν τὴν πατρίδα ἰδεῖν; τουτέστι τὰς Ἀθήνας. ἐν ὄρνισιν is a little surprising, since the scholia on *Birds* nearly always prefer the neuter plural ὄρνεα, but there are exceptions (e.g. Σ<sup>RVE</sup> 800),<sup>27</sup> and the familiarity of ἐν ὄρνισι in the sense, "in (*sc.* the play entitled) *Birds*" may have determined the phraseology. But -σιν rather than -σι looks like versification and so does ἐγώ τι or ἔγωγε, since I can find no example of a subject-pronoun inserted in a paraphrase when the text does not contain it, and if ἐγώ τι (Σ<sup>RV</sup>) 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.<sup>28</sup>

"Stage-directions" (παρεπιγραφαί) were especially likely to be incorporated into dramatic texts (Eur. *Cy.* 487 is the *locus classicus*),<sup>29</sup> and Bentley interpreted *Thesm.* 1187*b* as an interpolation of this kind:

κλαῦσι, ἦν μὴ ἴδον μέρης.	1187 <i>a</i>
ἀνακύπτῃ καὶ παρακύπτῃ ἀπειψωλημένος.	1187 <i>b</i>
εἶεν. καλὴ τὸ σκῆμα περὶ τὸ πόστιον.	1188

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, καλὴ τὸ σκῆμα being a joke against barbarian manners and taste. Since he inflects his verbs haphazardly, the verbs ἀνακύπτῃ (i.e. -τι) and παρακύπτῃ 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 ἀνακύπτῃ; would suit the Scythian's staccato style very well, but no one can feel quite easy about the continuation καὶ παρακύπτῃ, and the good Attic word ἀπειψωλημένος (cf. *Ach.*

<sup>27</sup> τὰ ἐν ὄρνισι νόμιμα in 1337 may be influenced by 1343*b*.

<sup>28</sup> J. van Leeuwen, *Prolegomena ad Aristophanem* (Leiden, 1908) 338 f., in deleting 1343*b*, supposes that Aristophanes wrote δέ, not γάρ, in 1344; Coulon, *op. cit.* (n. 18) 176 f., while leaving γάρ intact, supposes that it caused some difficulty to ancient commentators and facilitated the interpolation of 1343*b*. 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.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Page, *op. cit.* (n. 8) 112–115.

161, 592, *Lys.* 1168) is *too* good; we would have expected the stem ψωλ to figure in a comically ungrammatical observation.<sup>30</sup> 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<sup>31</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> Cf. above on gaps of this kind; and the omission of *Frogs* 1294 τὸ ξυγκλινές τ’ ἐπ’ Αἴαντι 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.<sup>33</sup>

A crude example of an artistically unexacting πλήρωμα 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 κοῦ often enough to make up a kind of iambic trimeter<sup>34</sup> (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 κοῦ 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 RAG

Text of *BKT* no. 231

Δι. τρώγοις ἄν ἐρεβίνθους; Κο. κοῦ κοῦ κοῦ.	]
Δι. τί δαί; φιβάλεως ἰσχάδας; Κο. κοῦ κοῦ.	]οῖκοῖ
Δι. τί δαί †σύκα τρώγοις ἄν αὐτός; † Κο. κοῦ κοῦ.	]κοῖκοῖ
Δι. ὡς ὄξυ πρὸς τὰς ἰσχάδας κεκράγατε.	]

801 κοῦ bis R 803 om. *Suda*: del. Bentley σῦκα A

<sup>30</sup> Moreover, ἀπεψωλημένος is applied elsewhere to persons, not to penises (Coulon, *op. cit.* [n. 18] 174).

<sup>31</sup> Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica* ii (London, 1896) ad loc. emended θεατῶν το οἰκετῶν; but I think that the commentator was influenced by 877 f., 887, 905 f.

<sup>32</sup> J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955) 104–107 emends ἀνακύπτει to ἀνασύρει “he pulls up her dress,” and envisages an *actio* quite different from what I have suggested.

<sup>33</sup> But the identity of 1295 with 1293 may have caused accidental omission of 1294 f.

<sup>34</sup> Apparently an eightfold κοῦ, with the second syllable short (despite the evidence of 801 f.), and therefore ending a trimeter ∪|∪ ∪|∪ ∪|∪ ∪||.

In 801 Dikaiopolis asks one of the girls (τρώγοις ἄν codd., τρώγοιτ' 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 σύκα in RΓ and the idiom τί δαὶ σύ; (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 δαὶ σύ; τρώγοις ἄν;—to which she replies (as in 801) with a triple κοῦ (so Elmsley). σῦκα is not a synonym of ἰσχάδες, and though it appears as a Paleologan gloss on ἰσχάδες (at *Knights* 755, *Wealth* 877, 1122) it is not a likely gloss in the *scholia vetera*, which in fact use the word ἰσχάδες themselves (e.g. Σ *Peace* 634, *Lys.* 647; cf. reflexes of ἰσχάδιον in many modern Greek dialects). The humour of the passage lies in its sexual reference; ἐρέβινθος can mean "penis" (as it does in *Frogs* 545) and it is not hard to see why ἰσχάς too could have this meaning<sup>35</sup> (σῦκον in *Peace* 1349 f. is applied to the external genitals of both sexes).<sup>36</sup> Ancient commentators on Theocritus interpreted the "foxes . . . which pick Mikon's grapes" and the "beetles which eat away the figs of Philondas" in Theocr. 5.112–115 as an allusion to people who have homosexual intercourse with Mikon and Philondas 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.<sup>37</sup> There is much to be said<sup>38</sup> for keeping αὐτός, adjusting the word order as in Parisinus 2715, and interpreting 803 as a coarse joke, τί δαὶ σύ; τρώγοις αὐτὸς 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 κοῦ κοῦ. For the layout, verb + x + ἄν (abnormal,

<sup>35</sup> Because of its resemblance to the glans covered by the foreskin.

<sup>36</sup> 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 ἰσχάς.

<sup>37</sup> Coulon, *op. cit.* (n. 18) 171 f. suggests that τρώγοις ἄν originated as an explanation of the verbless object in 802 and so generated a bad verse; but would not the versifier have written αὐτῆ, 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?

<sup>38</sup> 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 ῥαδίως παύσειεν, εἰ βούλοιτο, ταῦτ' ἄν, *Frogs* 96 f. γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἄν οὐχ εὐροῖς ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν.

One of the most 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.<sup>39</sup> 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, νῦν δ' εἴ τις ἄλλη δυστυχεστάτη γυνή" is followed in our manuscripts by (7) ἐμοῦ πέφυκεν ἢ γενήσεται ποτε, which would make sense only if we had νῦν δὴ 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.<sup>40</sup> Compare Eur. *Hp.* 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 ἔπαινον ἐν βραχεῖ θήσω μέγαν).

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

οὐ χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν.  
 μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν.  
 ἦν δ' ἐκτραφῆ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν.

1431a 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 1431b 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

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Page, *op. cit.* (n. 8) 23–31, 96, 163.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: a Reader* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969) 34.

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.<sup>41</sup>

The second passage is *Frogs* 1251–1261.

1251	Χο. τί ποτε πρᾶγμα γενήσεται;	
1252	φροντίζειν γὰρ ἔγωγ' ἔχω	1257 θαυμάζω γὰρ ἔγωγ' ὄπη
1253	τίν' ἄρα μέμψιν ἐπίσει	1258 μέμψεται ποτε τοῦτον
1254	ἀνδρὶ τῷ πολὺ πλείστα δὴ	1259 τὸν Βακχεῖον ἄνακτα
1255	καὶ κάλλιστα μέλη ποιή-	
1256	σαντι τῶν μέχρι νυνί.	1260 καὶ δέδοιχ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.
1261	Ευ. πάνυ γε μέλη θαυμαστά· δείξει δὴ τάχα.	

Here there is no useful or interesting comment in the scholia. The alternatives differ somewhat in tone, the former expressing a certain degree of intellectual excitement, the latter apprehensiveness about the audacity of Euripides. The former exhibits a completely normal pattern of glyconics and pherecrateans, the latter an unusual pattern, one glyconic followed by three pherecrateans, for which the only parallels are the wedding-song at the end of *Peace* (1341 ff., 1346 ff., two telesilleans plus three reiziana, but two of the reiziana are the cry 'Υμῶν 'Υμέναι' ὦ) 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 ἴημε Παιῶν, ἴημε Παιῶν δὲ μήποτε λείποι), to which one might add Aesch. *Pers.* 554 ff. ~ 564 ff., (two lekythia plus two pherecrateans).<sup>42</sup> The second of the two alternative versions is also remarkable (whenever it was written, and in whatever circumstances) in giving Aeschylus the title τὸν Βακχεῖον ἄνακτα, which one would not expect to find given to anyone but Dionysus. Euripides' first words, πάνυ γε μέλη 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 *Clouds* 652–654,

Στ. κατὰ δάκτυλον; νῆ τὸν Δί', ἀλλ' οἶδ'. Σω. εἰπέ δῆ.  
 Στ. τίς ἄλλος ἀντὶ τουτοῦ τοῦ δακτύλου;  
 πρὸ τοῦ μέν, ἔτ' ἐμοῦ παιδὸς ὄντος, οὔτοςί.

<sup>41</sup> But perhaps not everyone will allow me (cf. Coulon, *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 λέοντος σκυμνόν, "lion cub," have given even a passing thought to Alcibiades' father?

<sup>42</sup> Cf. A. M. Dale, *Collected Papers* (Cambridge, 1969) 7 f.

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<sup>43</sup> 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 Byzantium 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 ᾤετο περιέχειν ἄμφω. A similar point is made, though with a difference of technique, by Σ<sup>A</sup> *Il.* 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 (στιγμαί), for they express the same thing (εἰς γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶ διάνοιαν).” Σ<sup>A</sup> *Il.* 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.<sup>44</sup> The only place in the scholia on Aristophanic comedy at which we encounter sigma and antisigma is *Frogs* 151–153.

ἢ Μορσίμου τις ῥῆσιν ἐξεγράψατο.  
Δι. νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐχρῆν γε πρὸς τούτοισι κεί  
τὴν πυρρίχην τις ἔμαθε τὴν Κινησίου.

Σ<sup>V</sup> says: “Some do not write the line νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, but leave it out and write the next line as ἢ πυρρίχην κτλ. For this reason Aristophanes (*sc.* of Byzantium) 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,

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the practice of ancient editors of Homer, and the survival of the words φιλέοντι δὲ Μοῖσαι in *Pi. O.2.* 27a despite Aristophanes of Byzantium’s observation that they violated responsion (Σ<sup>4</sup>8c, 48f Drachmann).

<sup>44</sup> The difficulty of interpreting antisigma consistently in *CGF* 61.21, 24. 85.323 f., 248.1, is instructive. Cf. n. 9 above. At *Il.* ii 192 Σ<sup>A</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup>

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.<sup>46</sup> 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

<sup>45</sup> Unless, perhaps, it seemed to Aristophanes of Byzantium (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.

<sup>46</sup> On this matter in general, cf. G. Pasquali, *Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo*, ed. 2 (Florence, 1952) 397-465, and H. Emonds, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum* (Leipzig, 1941).

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<sup>47</sup> in which *Lysistrata* 187 is followed by 197, 199, 198 and then 188 (after which the fragment breaks off). The passage beginning with 197 (ὀμόσωμεν κτλ.) and that beginning with 188 (εἰς ἀσπίδ' κτλ.) can both hitch comfortably on to 187 (τῖν' ὄρκον ὀρκώσεις ποθ' ἡμᾶς;—ὄντινα;); and since 197 also hitches on to 196 (μηλοσφαγοῦσαι 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,<sup>48</sup> 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,

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

<sup>48</sup> Cf. M. D. Reeve, *PCPhS* cxcv (1969) 76, criticising D. C. C. Young, *ibid.* cxciv (1968) 65–74 on Longus, and Jachmann, *loc. cit.* (n. 4) 355 f.

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,<sup>49</sup> 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, Dürrenmatt'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, ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος, κτλ. Σ<sup>v</sup> 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".<sup>50</sup> So too on *Frogs* 1400 βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεὺς δύο κύβω καὶ τέτταρα, Σ<sup>Rv</sup> says: "Aristarchus says that this is cited as anonymous (ἀδεσπότης), 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

<sup>49</sup> *Loc. cit.* (n. 4), 368 f.

<sup>50</sup> Page, *op. cit.* (n. 8) rejects as spurious Eur. fr. 228, given as the opening of *Archelaus* in [Plu.] *Vit. X Or.* 837e, 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,<sup>51</sup> 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 ἄνακτα 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 δέδοιχ' 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.<sup>52</sup> 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.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Radermacher's commentary *ad loc.*

<sup>52</sup> Coulon, *op. cit.* (n. 18) 177 f. suggests that an unknown admirer of Aeschylus paraphrased 1252-1256, bringing out in θαυμάζω and δέδοικα the ingredients of φροντίζειν.

ἀνὴρ τέτρωται χάρακι διαπηδῶν τάφρον,  
 καὶ τὸ σφυρὸν παλίνορρον ἐξεκόκκισεν,  
 καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς κατέαγε περὶ λίθῳ πεσῶν, 1180  
 καὶ Γοργόν' ἐξήγειρεν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπίδος·  
 πτίλον δὲ τὸ μέγα κομπολακύθου πεσὸν  
 πρὸς ταῖς πέτραισι δευρὸν ἐξηύδα μέλος·  
 "ὦ κλεινὸν ὄμμα νῦν πανύστατόν σ' ἰδὼν  
 λείπω φάος γε τοῦμόν' οὐκέτ' εἰμ' ἐγώ."  
 1185  
 τοσαῦτα λέξας εἰς ὑδρορρόαν πεσῶν  
 ἀνίσταται τε καὶ ξυναντᾶ δραπεταῖς  
 ληστὰς ἐλαύνων καὶ κατασπέρχων δορί.

1181 del. Dobree 1185 γε om. R

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); *κομπολακύθου* 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 *δευρὸν 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.<sup>53</sup> The authenticity of the passage has however been defended in detail.<sup>54</sup> 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

<sup>53</sup> *Wilamowitz*, *Hermes* liv (1919) 57 f. (= *Kl. Schr.* iv 295 f.); *Page*, *WSt* lxix (1956) 125–127.

<sup>54</sup> *Ed. Fraenkel*, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome, 1962) 31–42; *A. M. Dale*, *op. cit.* (n. 42) 170–172; *K. J. Dover*, *Maia* xv (1963) 23–25.

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 Fraenkel<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> The song is divisible into eight sections, which I have marked A-H. Σ<sup>v</sup> offers a metrical analysis, which we may ascribe (in keeping with the *subscriptio*) to Heliodorus,<sup>57</sup> and that is where our troubles begin, for (a) in Σ 1329 the expected noun preceding *μνοστροφικ(ή)* 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 'Υμῶν Ὑμέναι' ᾧ; 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 1332*b*

<sup>55</sup> *Op. cit.* (n. 54) 41.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. especially H.-J. Newiger, *Wege der Forschung* cclxv (Darmstadt, 1975) 238-254, and D. Holwerda, *loc. cit.* (n. 25) 133, 270-272 (Holwerda suggests transposition of section C to follow section F).

<sup>57</sup> 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 telesilleans and reiziana in Σ *Knights* 1111 is fundamentally different from what we have in Σ *Peace* 1329. Cf. Boudreaux, *op. cit.* (n. 24) 36.

## Peace 1329-1359

- A 1329 δεῦρ' ὦ γυναῖκα εἰς ἀγρόν  
 1330 χῶπως μετ' ἐμοῦ καλῆ  
 1331 καλῶς κατακείσει.  
 1332 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.
- B 1333 ὦ τρισμακάρα ὡς δικαί-  
 1334 ὡς τάγαθὰ νῦν ἔχεις.  
 1335 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.  
 1336 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.
- C 1337 τί δράσομεν αὐτήν;  
 1338 τί δράσομεν αὐτήν;  
 1339 τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν.  
 1340 τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν.
- D 1341 ἀλλ' ἀράμενοι φέρω-  
 1342 μὲν οἱ προτεταγμένοι  
 1343 τὸν νυμφίον, ὦνδρες.  
 1344 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.  
 1345 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.
- E 1346 οἰκήσετε γοῦν καλῶς  
 1347 οὐ πράγματ' ἔχοντες ἀλ-  
 1348 λά συκολογοῦτες.  
 1349 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.  
 1350 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.
- F 1351 τοῦ μὲν μέγα καὶ παχύ,  
 1352 τῆς δ' ἥδὺ τὸ σύκον.
- G 1353 φήσεις γ' ὅταν ἐσθίης  
 1354 οἶνόν τε πίης πολύν.  
 1355 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.  
 1356 Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ.
- H 1357 ὦ χαίρετε χαίρετ' ἄν-  
 1358 δρες· κἄν ξυνέπησθέ μοι,  
 1359 πλακοῦντας ἔδεσθε.

1332 bis Vat. Pal. 67

1342 προ- Bentley: προσ- codd.

## POxy 1373

δευρω[ ]ναιεισαγρον  
 δευρωγωνναιεισαγρον  
 χωπωσμετεμουκαλη  
 κα[ ]ατακει[ ]ει:  
 υ[ ]ειαιεω

]κάρωδικαι  
 ]νυνε[ ]ειφ

## Scholia in V

- 1329 διπλῆ καὶ ἐν ἐπεισθέσει < >  
 μονοστροφικ(ῆ) περιόδων πεντα-  
 κῶλων ἰωνικῶν διμέτρων, δύο  
 καταληκτικῶν τριῶν δὲ βραχυ-  
 καταλήκτων.
- 1333 εἶτα ἐν ἐπεισθέσει τοῦ χοροῦ  
 τὸ ἴσον.
- 1334 ἐν τούτοις φέρονται κατὰ τινὰς  
 παράγραφοι ἵνα ὁ χορὸς ἀνὰ  
 μέρος αὐτὰ λέγη καὶ πάλιν τὰ εἰς  
 τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρον τοῦ χοροῦ.
- 1337 ἐν τισιν οὐ φέρεται διὰ τὰ μέτρα.
- 1346 ἐντεῦθεν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις οὐ  
 φέρεται †οὐ πεντάκωλα ἀκολου-  
 θῶς· ὡς φέρεται καὶ ἐνταυθὰ  
 ἔστιν.
- 1359 ὕφ' ὁ κορωνὶς τοῦ δράματος.  
 sub fin. Ὑμῆν Ὑμέναι' ὦ· οὐτως  
 Ἑλιόδωρος· κεκώλισται πρὸς τὰ  
 Ἑλιόδωρου.

- Σ 1329 ἐν ἐπεισθέσει Thiemann: ἐπι-  
 τέλει Σ <ὀκτὰς> White: <ἐπ-  
 τὰς> Holwerda περιόδων  
 White: περίοδος Σ βραχυκα-  
 ταλήκτων Dindorf: βραχέων  
 καταλήκτων Σ
- Σ 1334 παράγραφοι Thiemann: παρα-  
 γραφαὶ Σ χοροῦ Dindorf: κό-  
 ρου Σ
- Σ 1337 διὰ τὰ μέτρα] τὰ δ μέτρα  
 Dobree: τὰ δ δίμετρα Thie-  
 mann: τὰ διὰ μέσον tent. Hol-  
 werda
- Σ 1346 †οὐ] τὰ Thiemann: ᾧ Holwerda

⟨‘Υμῶν ‘Υμέναι’ ᾠ⟩, 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 “two telesilleans and three reiziana”) applies at any rate to the first stanza. Section B will fit the analysis only if we posit a lost reizianum, 1334*b*, before the double refrain. Section C, consisting of a repeated question and repeated answer, all reiziana, will not fit, and Σ<sup>v</sup> 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;<sup>58</sup> 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,<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup>

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

<sup>58</sup> That is to say, to the analysis in Σ 1329; but Newiger, *loc. cit.* (n. 56) 251 remarks that if (as seems probable) καὶ πάλιν 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<sup>B</sup> *Ach.* 204; White, *op. cit.* [n. 25] 397).

<sup>59</sup> This is implied by Newiger, *loc. cit.* (n. 56) 251.

<sup>60</sup> This seems to have been the view of Grenfell and Hunt in their introduction to POxy 1373.



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.<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup>

*University of St. Andrews*

<sup>62</sup> Cf. G. Thomson, *Eirene* i (1960) 51-60 on Headlam's approach to textual criticism.

<sup>63</sup> Boudreaux, *op. cit.* (n. 24) took some important steps in this direction. The commentators from whom the *scholia 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.