



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

Corso di Dottorato di ricerca
in Scienze dell'antichità
ciclo 32°

Tesi di Ricerca

**The fragments
of Didymos Chalkenteros
in the scholia to Aristophanes'
*Birds and Frogs***

SSD: L-FIL-LET/05

Coordinatore del Dottorato
ch. prof. Filippomaria Pontani

Supervisore
ch. prof. Ettore Cingano

Dottorando
Federica Benuzzi
Matricola 956286

Ai miei genitori

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 7 |
| 1.Content and goals of this study..... | 7 |
| 2.Didymos' life and works..... | 8 |
| 3.The tradition of studia comica..... | 9 |
| 3.1 <i>Aristotle and his school</i> | 9 |
| 3.2 <i>The Pleiad</i> | 10 |
| 3.3 <i>From Kallimachos to Aristarchos and his pupils</i> | 10 |
| 3.4 <i>Scholarship on comedy outside Alexandria</i> | 13 |
| 4.Greek comedy in Didymos' time and the shift in the exegetic paradigm..... | 15 |
| 5.Didymos' works on comedy and the transmission of the fragments..... | 17 |
| 5.1 <i>Fragments preserved outside the Aristophanic scholia</i> | 18 |
| 5.2 <i>The scholia to Aristophanes</i> | 19 |
| 6.The present edition..... | 21 |
| Didymi fragmenta in scholiis Avium servata..... | 22 |
| fr. 222 (= II 14.19, p. 251 Schmidt)..... | 23 |
| fr. 223a-b (= II 14.20, p. 251 Schmidt)..... | 26 |
| fr. 224 (= II 14.21, p. 251 Schmidt)..... | 28 |
| fr. 225 (= II 14.22, p. 251 Schmidt)..... | 31 |
| fr. 226 (= II 14.23, p. 252 Schmidt)..... | 36 |
| fr. 227 (= II 14.24, p. 252 Schmidt)..... | 39 |
| fr. 228 (= II 14.25, p. 252 Schmidt)..... | 45 |
| fr. 229 (= II 14.26, p. 252 Schmidt)..... | 50 |
| fr. 230 (= II 14.27, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 54 |
| fr. 231 (= II 14.28, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 58 |
| fr. 232 (= II 14.29, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 60 |
| fr. 2 (= II 14.30, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 63 |
| fr. 233 (= II 14.30 ^a , p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 68 |
| fr. 234 (= II 14.31, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 71 |
| fr. 235 (= II 14.32, p. 253 Schmidt)..... | 75 |
| fr. 236 (= II 14.33, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 78 |
| fr. 237 (= II 14.34, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 80 |
| fr. 238 (= II 14.35, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 85 |
| fr. 239 (= II 14.36, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 88 |
| fr. 240 (= II 14.37, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 91 |
| fr. 241 (= II 14.38, p. 254 Schmidt)..... | 93 |
| fr. 242 (= II 14.39, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 97 |
| fr. 243 (= II 14.40, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 100 |
| fr. 244 (= II 14.41, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 103 |
| fr. 245 (= II 14.42, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 108 |
| fr. 246 (= II 14.43, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 111 |
| fr. 247 (= II 14.44, p. 255 Schmidt)..... | 115 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| fr. 248 (= II 14.45, p. 256 Schmidt) | 120 |
| fr. 249 (= II 14.46, p. 256 Schmidt) | 122 |
| fr. 250 (= II 14.47, p. 256 Schmidt) | 127 |
| fr. 251 (= II 14.48, p. 256 Schmidt) | 132 |
| fr. 252 (= II 14.49, p. 256 Schmidt) | 134 |
| fr. 253 (= II 14.50, p. 256 Schmidt) | 137 |
| Didymi fragmenta in scholiis Ranarum servata | 140 |
| fr. 257 (= II 14.5, p. 248 Schmidt) | 141 |
| fr. 258 (= II 14.6, p. 248 Schmidt) | 147 |
| fr. 259 (= II 14.7, p. 248 Schmidt) | 149 |
| fr. 260 (= II 14.8, p. 248 Schmidt) | 153 |
| fr. 261 (= II 14.9, pp. 248f. Schmidt) | 158 |
| fr. 262 (= II 14.10, p. 249 Schmidt) | 162 |
| fr. 263 (= II 14.11, p. 249 Schmidt) | 167 |
| fr. 264 (= II 14.12, p. 249 Schmidt) | 172 |
| fr. 265 (= II 14.13, p. 249 Schmidt) | 175 |
| fr. 266 (= II 14.14, p. 249 Schmidt) | 177 |
| fr. 267 (= II 14.15, p. 249 Schmidt) | 181 |
| fr. 268 (= II 14.16, p. 250 Schmidt) | 184 |
| fr. 269 (= II 14.17, p. 250 Schmidt) | 190 |
| fr. 270a (= II 14.18, p. 250 Schmidt) | 194 |
| Conclusions | 198 |
| 1. Didymos' exegesis of the <i>Birds</i> and the <i>Frogs</i> and the six parts of grammar | 198 |
| 1.1 <i>Practiced reading aloud according to prosody</i> | 198 |
| 1.2 <i>Interpretation according to the poetic tropes present in the text</i> | 198 |
| 1.3 <i>Straightforward explanation of glōssai and historiai</i> | 199 |
| 1.4 <i>Discovery of etymology</i> | 200 |
| 1.5 <i>Calculation of analogy and judgement of poems</i> | 201 |
| 2. A partial assessment | 201 |
| Bibliography | 203 |
| Editions | 203 |
| Literature | 211 |

Introduction

1. Content and goals of this study

The present dissertation constitutes the first commented critical edition of the fragments ascribed to the Alexandrian scholar Didymos Chalkenteros (1st cent. BCE – 1st cent. CE) in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Birds* and *Frogs*. The exegetic material on these two plays alone preserves more than half of the Didymean fragments found in all the Aristophanic scholia. Overall, with 66 quotations, Didymos is by far the most frequently cited ancient commentator in the whole scholiastic corpus, and the sheer number evinces the pivotal role played by the grammarian's hypomnēmata in the history of the interpretation of Aristophanes. This study aims to provide an updated reassessment of Didymos' contribution to the centuries-old exegetic tradition on *Birds* and *Frogs*. Its ultimate objective is to reconstruct in as much detail as possible the exegetic reasoning, the sources and the influences underlying each Didymean interpretation, regardless of its actual correctness. Past inquiries into Didymean scholarship (most notably Roemer 1908, S. West 1970 and Harris 1989) have been specifically aimed at evaluating the grammarian's capability in relation to modern scholarly standards: their results, which ultimately discredited Didymos as a scholar on the basis of a limited pool of texts, had a long-lasting influence on subsequent critics, frequently causing the hasty dismissal of the ancient information linked to his name and discouraging more detailed studies on this grammarian. I will intentionally forgo this kind of evaluation of Didymos' 'competence' or 'reliability', but rather focus on the methods with which Didymos approached the Aristophanic text and responded to the needs of his readership in the socio-historical context of the Augustan era¹.

This work on Didymos' fragments in the scholia to the *Birds* and the *Frogs* will lay the foundations for a comprehensive commented edition of all Didymean fragments relating to ancient comedy, which is in preparation and will be published as part of Brill's *Supplementum Grammaticum Graecum* (edited by F. Montanari, F. Montana and L. Pagani) in the foreseeable future².

¹ The cultural context of Didymos' time is described in § 4.

² The choice of English and of the Greek form of author and place names, as well as the use of a positive critical apparatus and the division of the bibliography in "Editions" and "Literature", is in compliance with *SGG* procedural guidelines.

2. Didymos' life and works

The few available data on Didymos' life come from the 10th century lexicon *Suda*. The entry δ 827 A. (T 1 C.-Pr.³) defines him as “an Aristarchean grammarian from Alexandria, active at the time of Antonius and Cicero (44-43 BCE) and up until Augustus” (*i.e.* possibly until 14 CE). Another entry from the same lexicon (T 2⁴) states that he was a contemporary of Juba of Mauretania (~ 50-23 BCE). Didymos' life therefore spanned a good part of the first century BCE and the beginning of the first century CE⁵.

His immense exegetic output – between 3500 (T 1, 5⁶) and 4000 books (T 14)⁷ – gained him the long-lasting reputation of tireless scholar (T 8, 9, 10, 12, 13⁸) as well as some stark criticism regarding his alleged inaccuracy (T 6⁹), exemplified by the nicknames χαλκέντερος, “bronze-guts” (T 1, 10, 12¹⁰), and βιβλιολάθας, “book-forgetter” (T 5¹¹). The amount of works that can be reconstructed from the available evidence is in fact remarkable: a first attempt at listing all of Didymos' works was carried out by Schmidt (1854, 11-13). In his edition of Didymos' fragments in the scholia to Pindar, Braswell (2017, 40-103) offered an updated critical catalogue, only recently surpassed by the checklist redacted by Coward-Prodi (*forthc.*), which is now the standard reference.

Didymos wrote running commentaries to all the main authors of Greek literature, from Homer (*fr.* 69-97¹²) and Hesiod (98f.), to the lyric poets (Alkaios, Anakreon, Pindar and Bacchylides, 100-°175), the playwrights both of tragedy (Sophokles, Euripides, Ion and Achaios, 100-207) and of comedy (Aristophanes, Menander and Phrynichos, 208-°279), the orators Demosthenes, Aischines, Hyperides, Isaios, Dinarchos, Lysias and Lykurgos (°280-321) and the historian Herodotos (322). In addition, he produced several lexicographic works, especially on the language of comedy and tragedy (°1-°49) as well as monographic treatises (323-331, °345-349, °361), miscellaneous works (°337-°344) and a paroemiographic collection (350-360). Except for some areas of his scholarly work, the remains of Didymos' exegetic production are largely understudied¹³. The most

³ Δίδυμος, Διδύμου ταριχοπόλου, γραμματικός Ἀριστάρχειος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κικέρωνος καὶ ἕως Αὐγούστου· Χαλκέντερος κληθεὶς διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ βιβλία ἐπιμονήν· φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν συγγεγραφέναι ὑπὲρ τὰ τρισχίλια πεντακόσια βιβλία.

⁴ *Suda* ι 399 A. Ἰόβας, Λιβύης καὶ Μαυρουσίας βασιλεὺς, ὃν λαβόντες καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἐπόμπευσαν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι· οὐ μὴν ἀνέϊλον διὰ τὴν παιδευσιν ... συνήκμαζε δὲ αὐτῷ Δίδυμος ὁ Χαλκέντερος, ὁ καὶ πολλὰ γράψας κατ' αὐτοῦ. ἔγραψε πάνυ πολλὰ.

⁵ General discussions on Didymos are *e.g.* in Cohn 1903a; Sandys 1906, 140-143; Pfeiffer 1968, 274-279; Montanari 1997b. For an analysis of the evidence on Didymos' immediate predecessors and successors, see Braswell 2017, 27-36.

⁶ *Suda* δ 872 A. and Ath. 4.139c (Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς – καλεῖ δὲ τοῦτον Δημήτριος ὁ Τροϊζήνιος (*SH* 376) βιβλιολάθαν διὰ τὸ πλῆθος ὧν ἐκδέδωκε συγγραμμάτων· ἐστὶ γὰρ τρισχίλια πρὸς τοῖς πεντακοσίοις – φησὶ τάδε κτλ).

⁷ Sen. *Epist.* 88.37 *quattuor milia librorum Didymus grammaticus scripsit: misererer, si tam multa supervacua legisset.*

⁸ Hier. *Epist.* 33.1; Isid. *Orig.* 6.7.1; *Suda* χ 29 A.; Const. Manasses *Chron.* 6534-6536; Manuel Holobolus *Or.* 2, 92.2.

⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.20 *nam Didymo, quo nemo plura scripsit, accidisse compertum est, ut, cum historiae cuidam tamquam vanae repugnaret, ipsius proferretur liber, qui eam continebat.*

¹⁰ *Suda* δ 872, χ 29 A. and Const. Manasses *Chron.* 6534-6536. The latter gives an alternative, more positive interpretation of the nickname (Δίδυμος χαλκέντερος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τὸ γένος, ὃν οὕτως ἐπωνόμασαν ὡς ἐν τῷ χαίρειν λόγῳ ἀπόσιτον γενόμενον ἡμέρας ἐπὶ πλείους).

¹¹ Demetrios of Troizen (*SH* 376) *ap.* Ath. 4.139c.

¹² He also dedicated a separate work to the Aristarchean recension the Homeric text (*fr.* 50-68 C.-Pr.).

¹³ Modern scholarship on Didymos has mostly focused on *P. Berol.* 9780, the papyrus commentary on Demosthenes' speeches 9, 10, 11 and 13, ascribed to the grammarian in the subscript and first edited by Diels-Schubart 1904a-b (see, among others, Körte 1905;

surprising gap in modern scholarship regards the grammarian's studies on drama, which are quantitatively very well attested: together, the fragments on tragedy and comedy (both from the hypomnēmata and from the *Tragic and Comic Vocabulary*) amount to more than half of all the extant quotations transmitted as surely Didymean.

3. The tradition of studia comica

3.1 Aristotle and his school

The first traces of organised scholarly writings on comedy and comic playwrights date back to Aristotle and the early Peripatetics¹⁴. As underlined by Lowe (2013, 344), with his *Didascaliae*¹⁵ and *Dionysiac Victories*¹⁶ on the one hand, and his *Poetics* and *On Poets*¹⁷ on the other, Aristotle laid the foundations of the two main types of scholarly engagement with dramatic texts: the chronological-pinacographical investigation, based on archival sources, and the theoretical criticism¹⁸. From the development and mutual integration of these two approaches stemmed the rich Peripatetic production on comedy, of which very little is extant: treatises entitled *On Comedy* are ascribed e.g. to Theophrastos¹⁹ and Chamaeleon²⁰, Eumelos wrote a work *On Old Comedy*²¹, while Dikaiarchos one *On the Dionysiac Contests*²². Monographs on specific comic authors are also attested in this period: Theophrastos' pupil Lynkeus seemingly wrote a treatise *On Menander*²³ and a title *On Antiphanes* is attributed to Demetrios of Phalerum²⁴, whose role in the *translatio studiorum* between the Peripatos in Athens and the Alexandrian Mouseion is now widely acknowledged²⁵.

Crönert 1907; Wilcken 1920; Mastromarco 1969; 1972; West 1970; Pearson-Stephens 1983; Harris 1989; Milns 1994; Gibson 2000; 2001; 2002; Harding 2006; Heine Nielsen 2008; Luzzatto 2011). Harpokration's quotations from the grammarian's commentary to Demosthenes are collected by Pearson-Stephens (1983, 55-61) and translated and commented by Gibson (2002, 137-156). Didymos' exegesis of Homer has been vastly studied – but mainly as a vehicle of his forerunners' (especially Aristarchos') interpretations – for instance by Lehrs 1882, 15-31; Ludwich 1884; Erbse 1959; West 2001, 46-85; Schironi 2018, 3-44. A systematic investigation of Didymos' approach to Homer and epic poetry in general is in Pagani (forthc.). The Didymean fragments in the scholia to Pindar are edited by Braswell 2017 (reviewed in Prodi 2014; a discussion of some fragments was already Braswell 2011). The work *On lyric poets* (fr. 345-349 C.-Pr.) has been studied by Grandolini 1999, while the treatise *On proverbs* (350-360) has been recently investigated by Ruta 2016. On Didymos and lyric poetry, see also Prodi (forthc.).

¹⁴ For overviews on Aristotle and early Peripatetic scholarship in general, see, among others, Pfeiffer 1968, 67-84; Montanari 2012; Novokhatko 2015, 55-59; 2020, 121-131.

¹⁵ Fr. 415-462 Gigon (618-630 Rose), discussed in Jachmann 1909; Pfeiffer 1968, 81; Bagordo 1998, 19f.

¹⁶ Tit. 135 Gigon; fr. 1 Bagordo.

¹⁷ Fr. 14-22 Gigon.

¹⁸ Nesselrath (1990, 102-130) deals with Aristotle and comedy with a specific focus on the chronological partition into "old", "middle" and "new" comedy.

¹⁹ Fr. 1f. Bagordo; discussions in Nesselrath 1990, 149-161; Bagordo 1998, 22; Lowe 2013, 345; Novokhatko 2015, 55; 2020, 127f.

²⁰ Fr. 10f. Bagordo, on which see Podlecki 1969, 120-124; Arrighetti 1987, 141-159; Nesselrath 1990, 163f.; Bagordo 1998, 26-28; Schorn 2012; Martano 2012; Lowe 2013, 345; Novokhatko 2015, 57, 2020, 129.

²¹ Fr. 1 Bagordo; also mentioned in Nesselrath 1990, 165; Bagordo 1998, 32.

²² Fr. 2-7 Bagordo; overviews in Martini 1903, 555f.; Nesselrath 1990, 162f.; Bagordo 1998, 24; Lowe 2013, 345f.; Novokhatko 2015, 57f.; 2020, 128f.

²³ According to Ath. 6.242b, on which see Bagordo 1998, 34, 151; Dalby 2000; Lowe 2013, 346.

²⁴ Fr. 194 Wehrli. See Nesselrath 1990, 163; Lowe 2013, 347.

²⁵ A complete overview is in Montana 2015a, 76-90; 2020, 154-162 (where all the relevant bibliography is quoted).

3.2 *The Pleiad*

The first scholars to deal extensively with comedy in Alexandria were the tragedians of the so-called Pleiad, a group of playwrights from different parts of the Greek world who settled in the court of Ptolemaios II Philadelphos (308-246 BCE). Among them, Lykophron of Chalcis (4th-3rd cent. BCE)²⁶ undertook the task of revising and emending the copies of comic texts preserved in the royal library²⁷. Along with this remarkable endeavour – and as a result of it – Lykophron wrote a monograph *On Comedy* in at least nine books, of which only nineteen fragments are extant²⁸. These are mostly of a glossographic nature and are often preserved in conjunction with Eratosthenes' opposing view on the same word, but it can be assumed that Lykophron also dealt with other topics²⁹. In at least one case, it is sure that Lykophron's exegesis was directly quoted by Didymos in his *Comic Vocabulary*³⁰, but it is more than likely that Lykophron's work was among the grammarian's main sources.

The first recorded hypomnēmata (*i.e.* systematic running commentaries) on Aristophanes' plays are owed instead to Euphronios (3rd cent. BCE), another member of the Pleiad and author of Priapic poems, identified by the sources as the teacher of both Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchos³¹. He is quoted twenty-seven times in the scholia to the *Clouds*, *Wasps*, *Birds*, *Frogs* and *Wealth*: the fragments deal mostly with linguistic or mythological questions and often involve the use of literary parallels³². Euphronios' commentaries were a very important source for Didymos, who adopted his predecessor's interpretations *e.g.* in fr. 227 and 249 (below).

3.3 *From Kallimachos to Aristarchos and his pupils*

According to the available evidence, Kallimachos' approach to comedy was mainly pinacographical³³. Indeed, besides his *Tables of persons eminent in every branch of learning, together with a list of their writings* (fr. 429-453 Pf.) and the more specific *Table and inventory of the dramatic poets in chronological order and from the beginning* (fr. 454-456 Pf.), no other title ascribed to him suggests direct, programmatic engagement with comic texts. In his *On Birds* (fr. 414-428 Pf.)³⁴ he dealt with ornithonyms also found in Aristophanes'

²⁶ General discussions in Bagordo 1998, 35f.; Meliadò 2019; Pellettieri 2020, 236-242.

²⁷ Tz. *Proll. Com.* XIaI-II Koster; see also *Proll. Com.* XIb-c-d Koster. The exact meaning of the verb διορθόω, used by Tzetzes to describe the activity of Lykophron and his colleagues, is still debated: Pfeiffer (1968, 105-107) took the text literally and maintained that these scholars produced critical editions, while others supposed an inaccurate usage by Tzetzes or his source (see *e.g.* Keil 1848, 244; Strecker 1884, 2f.; Lowe 2013, 350) and preferred the wording of the *Scholium Plautinum* (XIId Koster *graecos artis poeticae libros in unum collegerunt et in ordinem redegerunt*). I follow Montana's interpretation (2020, 163f.; see also Pellettieri 2020, 237-242) of διορθόω as "to revise and emend", which respects the meaning of the verb without implying that Lykophron produced canonical critical editions (like the ones produced by later Hellenistic scholars) but rather that he worked on single copies, identifying their content and authorship and correcting their text if faulty.

²⁸ The fragments were first collected, along with Euphronios' and Eratosthenes' ones, in Strecker 1884, and are now edited by Pellettieri 2020. See also Bagordo 1998, 150.

²⁹ A reappraisal of Lykophron's work and role in the tradition of Alexandrian exegesis on comedy is offered in Lowe 2013, 347-356.

³⁰ Ath. 11.501e; Lycophr. fr. 4 Pellettieri (= 25 Strecker), Did. fr. 8 C.-Pr.

³¹ On the chronologic problems posed by the identification of the Pleiad poet with the grammarian and teacher of Aristophanes and Aristarchos, see Montana 2015a, 126f.; 2020, 200-203; Novembri 2020. See also Pfeiffer 1968, 160f.

³² See *e.g.* Did. fr. 227 below.

³³ Among others, see Pfeiffer 1968, 123-140; Nesselrath 1990, 172-175.

³⁴ Martinez 2001 offers a survey of the fifteen extant fragments.

Birds, and was therefore an important source for the following scholarship on the play (see Did. fr. 228 below). Moreover, he may have discussed words found in comedy in his *Dialectical nouns* (fr. 406 Pf.).

After Lycophron's, the next known treatise *On Old Comedy* is the one written by the poet, scientist and overall polymath Eratosthenes of Cyrene (~ 276-194 BCE), in no less than twelve books³⁵. Almost all of the twenty-five occurrences of Eratosthenes' name in the scholia to Aristophanes go back to this work, and further quotations are found in other scholiastic corpora and lexica³⁶, a fact that shows the treatise's broad and long-lasting influence on successive scholarship. In his work, Eratosthenes mostly discussed specific interpretive problems posed by comic texts (such as obsolete vocabulary and content inconsistencies) but he also dealt *e.g.* with matters of authorship and history of the genre³⁷. As in Lycophron's case, the content and structure of the writing are still debated among modern critics: some suppose that the work had no internal cohesion and simply consisted of a sequence of unrelated discussions on various topics linked to ancient comedy³⁸, others assume some kind of thematic organisation³⁹. In all likelihood, Eratosthenes' *On Old Comedy* was a paramount source for Didymos: fr. 269 (below) is one example of direct quotation of the work in the grammarian's commentary to the *Frogs*.

The fundamental contribution of Aristophanes of Byzantium (~ 265-190 BCE)⁴⁰ to the ancient exegesis of comedy was threefold: firstly, he established the canonic text of the plays and was the first to give a colometric division of the choral parts; secondly, he wrote concise but informative introductions to the plays (the so-called *hypotheseis*), giving a summary of the plot and chronologic information about the dramatic contest in which each play was first performed; thirdly, he collected the lexicographic interpretations of his predecessors in his *Lexeis*, a monumental vocabulary systematically arranged in sections, spanning all literary genres⁴¹. All three aspects were essential to Didymos' own exegetic activity: in particular, the *Lexeis* must have played a primary role in the redaction of his *Comic Vocabulary*⁴². Moreover, the epitome of Aristotle's zoological writings compiled by Aristophanes of Byzantium⁴³ was probably used by Didymos in his exegesis of some passages of the *Birds* (see Did. fr. 2, 227f. and 241 below).

³⁵ On Eratosthenes' life, see Tosi 1998a; Geus 2002, 7-41; on his scholarly works, Pfeiffer 1968, 152-170; Montana 2015a, 112-118; 2020, 185-191; on the treatise *On Old Comedy* in particular, see especially Bernhardt 1822, 204-208; Strecker 1884; Geus 2002, 291-301.

³⁶ Cf. *e.g.* Harp. δ 13, μ 16 K.; Hesych. κ 1590 C.; Phot. η 51 Th.; *schol. Eur. Tr.* 1175 Schwartz; *schol. Pind. O.* 9.1k Drachmann; *schol. Apoll. Rhod.* 4.280 Wendel.

³⁷ Investigations of specific fragments of this kind are in Tosi 1998c; Benuzzi 2019b; Broggiato 2019a.

³⁸ This is the point of view of Bernhardt (1882, 204), which was later adopted by most German scholars (namely, Strecker 1884, 13; Susemihl 1891, 425f.; Knaack 1907, 383; Nesselrath 1990, 177, n. 78).

³⁹ Like Di Tullio (1915, 47) and, more recently, Geus (2002, 292).

⁴⁰ Discussions of his scholarly work on comedy can be found, most notably, in Boudreaux 1919, 25-48; Nesselrath 1990, 180-187; Montanari 1996c; Bagordo 1998, 41-44; Montana 2015a, 118-126; 2020, 193-197.

⁴¹ For a complete overview, see especially Pfeiffer 1968, 188-190, 192-202.

⁴² Boudreaux (1919, 42-47) discusses the exegeses of Aristophanes of Byzantium quoted in the Aristophanic scholia and Didymos' role in their preservation.

⁴³ And partially preserved in the Byzantine zoological sylloge of Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos (see Lambros 1885, V-XX; Berger 2012, 3-9; Zucker 2012; Hellmann 2015, 1248-1251).

New hypomnēmata to the plays of Aristophanes and Kratinos (and, possibly, Eupolis) were produced by a pupil of Aristophanes of Byzantium, Kallistratos (2nd cent. BCE)⁴⁴. The thirty fragments preserved in the Aristophanic scholia prove that the scholar's interests were not only linguistic, but covered also history and geography, as well as the identification of the *kōmōdoumenoi*. His work must have been very influential for Didymos, who in all likelihood is ultimately responsible for the preservation of many of his fragments in the scholia to Aristophanes⁴⁵.

The studies on comedy carried out by Aristarchos (~ 216-144 BCE)⁴⁶ are attested by twenty-five fragments preserved in the scholia to Aristophanes (primarily to the *Frogs*)⁴⁷. Matters of lexicography and grammar are the most represented, but Aristarchos also dealt with line distribution, as well as with historic and literary allusions. Although he did not produce a new critical edition, he also discussed textual criticism in his hypomnēma⁴⁸. In many cases his interpretations are not quoted alone, but are preceded or followed by other exegeses (sometimes ascribed to another scholar, sometimes anonymous), probably as a result of Didymos' compilative intervention (see also Did. frr. 261, 267 below)⁴⁹.

Among Aristarchos' pupils, those known to have systematically engaged with comedy are Ammonios, Chaeris and Apollonios. Ammonios (~ 170-100 BCE)⁵⁰ wrote a work entitled *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*, a catalogue of the historic figures mocked in comedy (probably arranged in thematic sections) that provided biographical information on each character, listing all the passages in which it was lampooned and distinguishing potential namesakes⁵¹. This treatise was surely an essential source for Didymos, whose interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* is well represented in his fragments (see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1): fr. 247 is likely an example of Didymos quoting directly from Ammonios' work.

Not much is known about Chaeris (2nd-1st cent. BCE)⁵², who was quoted in Didymos' hypomnēma (along with Herodikos [see below] and Eratosthenes) with regard to *Ra.* 1028 (see Did. fr. 269 below). He was the father of a scholar named Apollonios⁵³: the name occurs several times throughout the Aristophanic scholia, in annotations that deal both with the content and with the language of the plays, but modern critics are not unanimous as to whether all these references go back to the same grammarian or to two namesakes⁵⁴. Equally

⁴⁴ His fragments are collected and commented in Schmidt 1848; overviews of his scholarly work on comedy are in Boudreaux 1919, 48-51; Bagordo 1998, 45, 110f.; Montana 2008a-b; 2015, 127f.

⁴⁵ As underlined, among others, by Boudreaux (1919, 51) and Montana (2008a).

⁴⁶ Surveys of his scholarly work on drama in Boudreaux 1919, 52-74; Pfeiffer 1968, 210-233; Montanari 1996b; Montana 2015a, 130-141.

⁴⁷ Muzzolon (2005) carried out a detailed analysis of all the fragments.

⁴⁸ Textual interventions by Aristarchos are found in *scholl. Aristoph. Ra.* 191c, 970b Chantry = frr. 12, 18 Muzzolon (variant readings), *scholl. Aristoph. Ra.* 354a-c, 372c-d Chantry = frr. 15, 17 Muzzolon (division of the parodos) and *scholl. Aristoph. Ra.* 1437-1441a = fr. 28 Muzzolon (proposed athetesis).

⁴⁹ As suggested also by Muzzolon (2005, 61, 63f.).

⁵⁰ The testimonia on his life and works are investigated by D'Alessandro 2018. Discussions of Ammonios' work on comedy in Boudreaux 1919, 75f. and Montana 2015a, 156f.; 2020, 231f.

⁵¹ The most comprehensive study on the topic of *kōmōdoumenoi*-literature is still Steinhausen 1910.

⁵² On this grammarian in general, see Montana 2015b. Boudreaux (1919, 76) discusses his presence in the Aristophanic scholia.

⁵³ Cf. *schol. Aristoph. V.* 1238b Koster.

⁵⁴ Overviews in Cohn 1895a, 1895b; Rutherford 1905, 432 n. 11; Boudreaux 1919, 77; Montanari 1996a; Montana 2002.

obscure is the grammarian Antiochos of Alexandria (2nd cent. BCE ?), whose work *On the poets ridiculed in Middle Comedy* was seemingly quoted by Didymos⁵⁵.

3.4 Scholarship on comedy outside Alexandria

Although the evidence regarding the tradition of exegesis on comedy outside Alexandria is rather scanty, it is still possible to pinpoint a few key figures.

3.4.1 Pergamon

In Pergamon – the Hellenistic cultural centre outside Alexandria of which the most is known⁵⁶ – comedy was surely studied by Demetrios and Herodikos, and possibly by Krates of Mallos.

The latter was active in Pergamon at the time of Aristarchos (2nd cent. BCE) and worked primarily on Homer⁵⁷. A systematic engagement with comedy is suggested only by Tzetzes, who mentions a Krates more than once in his *prolegomena* to comedy⁵⁸. However, he may be speaking of the Athenian philosopher Krates (3rd cent. BCE), to whom an unspecified number of books *On comedy* are attributed by D.L. 4.23⁵⁹, while the fragments ascribed to Krates in the Aristophanic scholia come in all likelihood from the treatise *On Attic language* of Krates of Mallos⁶⁰.

Demetrios of Adramyttion, nicknamed Ixion (2nd cent. BCE)⁶¹, a former pupil of Aristarchos who moved to Pergamon, is quoted a handful of times in the Aristophanic scholia, in relation to matters of lexicography, paratragedy and antiquary. In two cases he bitterly criticises his teacher (see Did. fr. 267f. below). While the lexicographic fragments are easily ascribable to Demetrios' *Attic Vocabulary*, surely an important source for Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary*, the other fragments suggest that he composed a commentary on Aristophanes' plays⁶².

Like his contemporary Ammonios in Alexandria, Herodikos of Babylon (2nd cent. BCE)⁶³ composed a treatise entitled *Κωμωδοῦμενοι* in at least six books⁶⁴. Instead, his discussion of *Ra*. 1028, quoted in Didymos' hypomnēma (see fr. 269 below), probably belonged to the *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*⁶⁵.

3.4.2 Rhodes

⁵⁵ This reconstruction was first proposed by Nesselrath (1990, 76f.) and later adopted by Bagordo (1998, 77f.) and Corradi 2018.

⁵⁶ On Pergamon and Pergamene scholarship, see most notably Pfeiffer 1968, 234-237; Montana 2015a, 143-148; 2020, 217-227.

⁵⁷ General discussions of Krates are found, among others, in Pfeiffer 1968, 238-244; Broggiato 2001, xvii-xix; Pagani 2009c; Montana 2015a, 148-153; 2020, 222-228. On Krates' Homeric writings, see Broggiato 2001, xx-xi.

⁵⁸ *Proll. de com.* XIaI-II Koster.

⁵⁹ On this problem, see Bagordo 1998, 116-118; Broggiato 2001, xxv-xxvii.

⁶⁰ A survey of the fragments ascribed to Krates by the Aristophanic scholia is in Boudreaux 1919, 79-83.

⁶¹ On Demetrios' life and works, see Staesche 1883; Pfeiffer 1968, 259-261; Ascheri 2009; Montana 2015a, 155; 2020, 239.

⁶² At least on the *Wasps* and the *Frogs*, but possibly on other plays as well, as suggested by Boudreaux (1919, 84f.).

⁶³ Overviews of Herodikos are in Pagani 2009d; Montana 2015a, 157; 2020, 231f. Broggiato (2014, 41-106) provides the most complete and recent study on this grammarian.

⁶⁴ Its features and its importance for subsequent scholars are discussed in Steinhausen 1910, 46-49; Boudreaux 1919, 85f.; Broggiato 2014, 46-48.

⁶⁵ On this work in particular, see Pagani 2009d. Broggiato (2014, 48) believes instead that this fragment pertains to the *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*.

The lively intellectual environment of Rhodes was home to historians, geographers, astronomers, philosophers and grammarians. From the 2nd century BCE the island had a predominant role in the cultural landscape of the Mediterranean⁶⁶ and evidence both literary and epigraphic suggests a specific traditional connection between Rhodes and Aristophanes⁶⁷. However, only one scholar can be linked with certainty to systematic studies on comedy, and that is Timachidas. He wrote a commentary on Aristophanes' *Frogs*⁶⁸, which is quoted ten times in the scholia to the play (and once in Tzetzes' commentary): in two cases his opinion is cited along with Didymos' (see fr. 259, 262 below), but it cannot be determined whether the latter referred to the former in his hypomnēma or whether the two interpretations were compared by a later scholar⁶⁹. Moreover, Timachidas wrote a commentary on the *Flatterer*, which is the earliest known hypomnēma on any of Menander's plays⁷⁰ and might have been used by Didymos for his work on the same playwright (although very little is known about it⁷¹). Timachidas also compiled a *Glossary*, the extant fragments of which display a clear interest in dialects⁷².

3.4.3 Rome

Ancient sources provide a considerable amount of information about Greek intellectual life in Republican Rome, both with regard to specific figures and with regard to the broader historic-cultural context⁷³. However, very little is known about the scholarly activity that Greek intellectuals carried out in Rome in that period, as well as about what type of scholarly works on Greek literature were available in the city at the time⁷⁴. The evidence relating to scholarship on Greek comedy at Rome in particular is very limited⁷⁵. However, it is possible to identify at least two scholars of comedy who were active in Rome within Didymos' lifetime. Firstly, Hypsikrates of Amisos (1st cent. BCE-1st cent. CE)⁷⁶: Varro (*LL* 5.88) and later Gellius (16.12.5f.) quote him with regard to the etymology of Latin words from Greek, but he also worked on Homeric language and biography. It is reasonable to identify this Hypsikrates with the author of a book on *kōmōdoumenoi* of which someone asks a copy in a 2nd century CE private letter possibly written at Alexandria and found at

⁶⁶ The main elements of the cultural history of Rhodes are summarised by Matijašić 2020, 21-31. The first detailed and comprehensive study on the topic will be provided by Coward (in preparation).

⁶⁷ For a detailed discussion of the evidence (with further bibliography on the topic), see Matijašić 2020, 29-31.

⁶⁸ Its content and relevance are assessed in Boudreaux 1919, 88f.; Matijašić 2014, 131-137; 2020, 49-54. See also Montana 2015a, 164; 2020, 238.

⁶⁹ As acknowledged by Matijašić 2020, 53.

⁷⁰ Matijašić (2020, 59f.) discusses the extant evidence in detail.

⁷¹ See Did. fr. °278 C.-Pr.

⁷² On the *Glossary*'s main features and its relationship with Hesychios, see Matijašić 2020, 41-49.

⁷³ Among the many studies on the topic, see in particular Hillscher 1892; Rawson 1985; McNelis 2002; Migliario 2012 and § 4 below.

⁷⁴ Modern critics (like Schlunk 1974; Jolivet 2010; 2014; 2016; Bitto 2012; Montana 2016) have mostly focused on the reception of Homeric and Pindaric scholarship in Latin poetry.

⁷⁵ Some degree of scholarly reception of ancient Greek comedy can be presupposed for the Latin satirists (Horace and possibly Lucilius) and for the orators, as proposed by Ruffell 2014 and Sidwell 2014.

⁷⁶ Discussions in Bagordo 1998, 71; Perrone 2018.

Oxyrhynchus⁷⁷. Secondly, Epitherses of Nicaea (1st cent. CE), who compiled a lexicon *On Attic, comic and tragic words*⁷⁸.

4. Greek comedy in Didymos' time and the shift in the exegetic paradigm

To properly contextualize Didymos' exegesis of comedy, it is necessary to identify his target audience. This can only be achieved through the discussion of two interconnected cultural phenomena: on the one hand, the progressive change in the circumstances and outcomes of the philological activity in Alexandria, as a result of the eventual demise of the Ptolemaic monarchy (and of the patronage and close control it exerted over the Library and its intellectuals⁷⁹) and the rise of Rome as main centre of culture and learning; on the other hand, the reception of Greek comedy in the Mediterranean at the end of the Roman Republic.

For the first two centuries of its history, the Alexandrian Library was the place where philology was both practiced and 'consumed': by the will of the Ptolemies (and with their financial and political support), bookrolls were gathered, evaluated, catalogued, classified, arranged and corrected, works were edited and commented, difficult words were collected and explained, all within the Mouseion and for the small circle of people gravitating around it. The 1st century BCE saw a phase of significant changes in this respect. Firstly, the Ptolemaic patronage ended with the submission of Alexandria to the Romans (30 BCE), determining a radical change in the relationship between the library and the political power. Secondly, it has been argued that the lack of references to head librarians after the 80s BCE may be a sign of the library's decreased significance in the political agenda of the time⁸⁰. Thirdly, Rome's progressive rise to power from the 2nd century BCE onwards went hand in hand with its growth as centre of culture and learning and, consequently, as a market for education. This period saw a sharp increase in the flow of books and intellectuals from all parts of the Greek Mediterranean towards the city: entire libraries arrived in Rome as war-booty⁸¹ and members of the highly educated Greek élite reached the capital as prisoners⁸². As time went by, the city started to attract more and more Greek intellectuals, many of which opened schools of rhetoric or worked as private teachers for the élite youth⁸³. As a result of these political and societal changes, the type of works produced by the Alexandrians also evolved. With the loss of the library's leading role in the cultural context of the Mediterranean, the scholars' aims and priorities were inevitably different from those of their illustrious predecessors. The

⁷⁷ *POxy.* XVIII 2192 (M.-P.³ 2091 = *FGrHist* 190 F 12^{add.}; *CGFP* 344; nr. 11 Otranto).

⁷⁸ See Steph. Byz. v 52 Billerbeck; Bagordo 1998, 65; Meliadò 2018.

⁷⁹ An updated study on this topic is found in Schironi 2018b.

⁸⁰ The hypothesis is advanced by Hatzimichali (2013, 173f.), whose study of the cultural role of the Alexandrian library after the fire of 48 BCE greatly inspired this paragraph.

⁸¹ Such as Lucullus' library, see *e.g.* Keith Dix 2000.

⁸² Like Polybios (see *e.g.* Dreyer 2001), Alexander Polyhistor and Tyrannion (on which see Pagani 2005 and 2020 respectively).

⁸³ The identity and scholarly activity of many of these Greek intellectuals can be reconstructed on the basis of the extant evidence. The most comprehensive collection in this regard is Hillscher 1892. More recent studies on the topic are in Rawson 1985 and Migliario 2012.

preservation of previous scholarship was certainly one of their main objectives and was achieved through the redaction of compilative commentaries (of which Didymos is the prime example) and meta-scholarly monographs (*i.e.* writings concerning past philological studies, such as Didymos' *On the Aristarchean recension* and Aristonikos' *On the critical signs of Aristarchus*). This effort to summarise, condense and combine the scholarly works of the forerunners is easily understandable in the light of the socio-political shift outlined above, which confronted the Alexandrian scholars with a totally new and geographically broad group of less-specialised individuals, interested in having the erudite tools to read and teach the great Greek authors of the past at an advanced level. An overview of the reception of Old Comedy in Didymos' time will be useful to clarify the features of this new readership.

Papyrological finds from Egypt – though unavoidably partial and thus maybe not fully representative of the actual situation – show a peculiar distribution pattern for Aristophanes and Old Comedy in general, both from a chronological and from a geographical standpoint⁸⁴. There are no papyri that can be undoubtedly ascribed to Aristophanes in the Ptolemaic period (only some *adespota veteris comoediae*), while the first traces appear in Didymos' time, with a sharp increase between the age of the Antonines and the Severi⁸⁵. The geographic provenance of the finds is even more telling: except for two cases, all the other surely Aristophanic papyri come from relatively big centres, such as Oxyrhynchus, Antinoupolis and Hermoupolis⁸⁶. In other words, it seems that Aristophanes was almost exclusively read by the urban élites⁸⁷ and that he gained popularity among this wider (but still elitary) readership between the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire. The significance of Old Comedy for this new audience was in all likelihood due to a perceived similarity of the genre with rhetoric: both genres were inherently performative, both focused on current political events, both involved a broad audience⁸⁸. However, this general affinity alone would not justify the presence of Old Comedy in the syllabus of rhetorical training⁸⁹. In fact, the usefulness of Old Comedy in higher education of Roman times probably lay firstly with the many *exempla* of political rivalry that the plays portrayed⁹⁰ (and that could be studied and reused at will in rhetorical exercises⁹¹), and secondly with the central role of verbal confrontation and the pervasive occurrence of personal abuse, that made the genre a stylistic model of invective⁹².

To sum up, the target of Didymos' exegesis of comedy was not the small circle of specialists of the Alexandrian Mouseion, but a broader, polycentric and less-specialised group of readers belonging to the urban élites, who were interested in reading Greek comedy at an advanced level as part of their rhetorical training.

⁸⁴ For a detailed investigation of the evidence, see Del Corso 2017.

⁸⁵ Perrone 2011 also elaborates on the available data.

⁸⁶ See Del Corso 2017, 237.

⁸⁷ «Aristofane appare [...] un autore caratteristico, se non addirittura esclusivo, delle élites urbane» (Del Corso 2017, 237).

⁸⁸ These similarities are highlighted by Ruffell (2014, 288f.).

⁸⁹ The most explicit testimony in this respect is by Quintilian and regards Roman education, but it can easily be extended to the other cultural centers of the Mediterranean.

⁹⁰ On this topic, see Ruffell 2014, 289-293.

⁹¹ Kremmydas 2013 gives an overview of the extant papyri preserving rhetorical exercises as a testimony of advanced rhetorical education in Egypt during the Imperial era.

⁹² A recent discussion of the role of personal abuse in oratory is in Arena 2007 (where all the relevant bibliography is quoted).

Didymos' works on comedy responded to the different exegetical 'needs' of this group primarily in two ways: firstly, by summarizing the opinions of previous scholars on debated passages, thus making them easily accessible; secondly, by offering a wide typological range of elucidations (on vocabulary, *realia*, proverbs, puns, historical references, etc.) that were useful also to less specialized readers⁹³.

5. Didymos' works on comedy and the transmission of the fragments

Didymos' exegetic output with regard to comedy consisted of the redaction of running commentaries (hypomnēmata) based on the text of the plays established by Aristophanes of Byzantium⁹⁴ (see above § 3.3), and of the compilation of the *Comic Vocabulary*, a collection of difficult words found in comedy that developed alongside the commentaries, sharing much of their exegetic material⁹⁵.

Since the scholia to Aristophanes are the most important means of transmission of Didymean exegesis of comedy, the canonical plays preserved by the manuscripts are inevitably the most represented among his fragments⁹⁶. However, Didymos also commented on other plays of the Alexandrian edition of Aristophanes – such as the *Old Age* (fr. °275 C.-Pr.) – if not on all of them⁹⁷. Moreover, both a commentary to at least two plays by Menander and one to Phrynichos' *Kronos* are attested⁹⁸. The fact that the fragments of the *Comic Vocabulary* deal with words found in Kratinos, Telekleides, Pherekrates, Hermippos, Eupolis, Plato and others⁹⁹ further suggests that Didymos dedicated himself not only to the three playwrights for which the hypomnēmata are clearly attested, but also at least to the main poets of Old Comedy, as well as Menander.

With regard to the transmission of Didymos' exegesis of comedy, four groups can roughly be identified: (1) fragments dealing with the preserved plays and quoted in the Aristophanic scholia, (2) fragments dealing with the preserved plays and quoted outside the Aristophanic scholia (mainly in Athenaios, Hesychios and other lexicographers), (3) fragments dealing with the fragmentary plays and quoted outside the Aristophanic

⁹³ For a more detailed description of the main types of explanations offered by Didymos, see the Conclusions.

⁹⁴ See Boudreaux 1919, 94.

⁹⁵ On its relationship with the commentaries see Schmidt 1854, 27-29, Boudreaux 1919, 102; see also Wilamowitz 1907, 165. The redaction of the *Comic Vocabulary* must have involved a massive compilative effort, possibly carried out by a wider scholarly entourage, rather than single-handedly by Didymos (as suggested by West 1970, 288 n. 2). A similar hypothesis for Galen's Hippocratic lexicon is found in Perilli 2017, 124f.

⁹⁶ With the exception of the *Knights*, the *Clouds* and the *Assemblywomen*, the scholia to which preserve no fragment directly ascribed to Didymos. However, some fragments of the *Comic Vocabulary* deal with words found also in these plays (see e.g. Did. fr. 27a C.-Pr. on Pramnian wine, which is also mentioned at *Eq.* 107).

⁹⁷ As hypothesised by Boudreaux 1919. On the number of Aristophanes' plays (i.e. approximately 50), see *Proll. de com.* III 41, XXXa 7-20 Koster. See also e.g. Novati 1879; Boudreaux 1919, 14-17; Kassel-Austin 1984, 4f.

⁹⁸ See Did. frr. °278, °279 C.-Pr. On the number Didymos' hypomnēmata to Menander, see Theodoridis 1973.

⁹⁹ See e.g. Did. frr. 8f. and 12 (Kratinos), 11 (Eupolis and Telekleides), 7 and 13 (Pherekrates).

scholia, (4) papyri¹⁰⁰. For the sake of convenience, I will begin by analysing the second and third group, and then discuss the Aristophanic scholia.

5.1 Fragments preserved outside the Aristophanic scholia

Except for the cases where the derivation from one of Didymos' hypomnēmata is clearly stated¹⁰¹, the fragments belonging to the second and third group are generally considered to derive from the *Comic Vocabulary*, which, thanks to its lemmatization, made the grammarian's interpretations of comic language easily accessible for authors of encyclopaedic and lexicographic works from the Imperial era onwards¹⁰². Not only did Pamphilos¹⁰³ and his epitomator Diogenianos (see Hesych. *ep. ad Eul.* 1-8 C.) have it as their source, but also Galen made his own epitome of the work "in six thousand lines"¹⁰⁴. Moreover, it has been argued that the *Comic Vocabulary* was among the sources of the lost rhetorical lexicon of the grammarian Iulianus¹⁰⁵. Similarly, Harpokration might have made use of the *Comic Vocabulary* alongside Didymos' commentaries to the orators¹⁰⁶, possibly through Iulianus' lexicon, which, according to Alpers (1981, 121-123), was his source (see also Ucciardello 2006b). Among late antique lexicographers, Oros quoted the *Comic Vocabulary* in his atticist lexicon¹⁰⁷, like Orion did in his *Etymologikon*, but seemingly through a later Aristophanic hypomnēma¹⁰⁸. Hesychios clearly states his dependence on the work (through Diogenianos, see above) in the prefatory letter to his lexicon and quotes Didymos explicitly in several entries¹⁰⁹. In general, the frequent similarities between Hesychios and the Aristophanic scholia are often explained through Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary* (see fr. 227f., 241, 244, 260 below). As far as later lexicography is concerned, Photios preserves several entries ultimately deriving from the *Comic Vocabulary*¹¹⁰. Traces of Didymean exegesis of comedy can be found in non-Aristophanic scholia as well, especially in the scholiastic corpus to Apollonios of Rhodes:

¹⁰⁰ Didymos' name occurs only in *P.Flor.* II 112 (2nd cent. CE), a commentary to an unidentified Aristophanic comedy (*CLGP* Aristoph. 28). A scrap of parchment codex from the Louvre (*CLGP* Aristoph. 4, seemingly from the 6th century CE, now lost) preserved Didymos' explanation of the term *πρωτοῦ* (*Av.* 1113, see fr. 241 below). *P.Oxy.* XXXV 2737 (*CLGP* Aristoph. 27, unidentified Aristophanic play) may be an epitomized version of Didymos' commentary. Much more speculative are the identification of *P.Oxy.* XIII 1611 as excerpts from a Didymean hypomnēma to a comedy by Aristophanes and that of *P.Oxy.* XV 1801 (*CLGP* Aristoph. 3, 7, 12, 24, 26, 30, 31) as deriving from the *Comic Vocabulary*.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Did. fr. °275 (ὕπομνηματιζόμενος Δίδυμος τὸ δρᾶμα κτλ), °278 (οὕτω Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήμασι Μεγάνδρου, see Theodoridis 1973) and °279 C.-Pr. (ὅπερ ἐξηγούμενος δρᾶμα Δίδυμος κτλ).

¹⁰² See also Di Giulio (forthc.).

¹⁰³ See Ath. 11.487c-f. Discussions in Schmidt 1854, 74; Rohde 1870, 7; Cohn 1903, 463; Wendel 1949, 339; Nesselrath 1990, 77.

¹⁰⁴ The book then was lost in the fire that deprived the physician of a considerable part of his library (see Gal. *De indol.* 23b-24b).

¹⁰⁵ For this hypothesis, see Cohn 1903, Alpers 1981, 117f. and Ucciardello 2006; 2013, 11 n. 3.

¹⁰⁶ Schmidt (1854, 39f.) assigned five Didymean quotations in Harpokration's lexicon to the *Comic Vocabulary*, whereas Gibson (2002, 138) considered only four of them to be derived «from a work of Didymus having nothing to do with Demosthenes».

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Did. fr. 13 C.-Pr. *ap. Et.Gen.* s.v. *καρύκη* (see also *Et.M.* 492,51-57 Gaisford, where Oros' name is omitted, and *Et.Gud.* 301,37-43 Sturz). On Oros' use of Didymos see Alpers 1981, 118-20.

¹⁰⁸ Unless he directly quoted Didymos' hypomnēma. Indeed, when discussing Demeter's epithet *Ἀχαιά* (Aristoph. *Ach.* 709), Orion (coll. 18.21-19.5 Sturz) gives the etymology *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄχους τοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν Περσεφόνην* ("from the pain for Persephone") declaring an Aristophanic hypomnēma as his source (see *ibid.* οὕτως εὔρον ἐν Ὑπομνήματι εἰς Ἀριστοφάνην). The same etymology is ascribed to Didymos in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (*d*² 248.13-22 De Stefani *Ἀχαιά*: ἡ Δημήτηρ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς, εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ ἄχος τῆς Κόρης. οὕτω Δίδυμος). Therefore, the commentary mentioned by Orion either relied on Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary* or was actually Didymos' Aristophanic commentary itself.

¹⁰⁹ Did. fr. 9, 16, 22, 25, 30, 33 C.-Pr. *ap. Hesych.* β 1152, κ 3661, μ 1705, ο 409 C., σ 147, 742 H.

¹¹⁰ Did. fr. 12a, 24, 309b, 31, 36a C.-Pr. and Schmidt 1854, 37-39, 46-48.

the grammarian is mentioned twice with regard to words occurring respectively in Eupolis (Did. fr. 29 C.-Pr.) and Menander (fr. 35 C.-Pr.). Moreover, the scholia to Apollonios make two references to an anonymous *Comic Vocabulary*¹¹¹. These, however, cannot be linked to Didymos with certainty¹¹².

5.2 The scholia to Aristophanes

The scholia to Aristophanes constitute the first and largest group identified above. Overall, with 66 quotations (of which 33 are in the scholia to the *Birds* alone, and 14 in those to the *Frogs*), Didymos is by far the most frequently cited ancient commentator in the corpus. Nevertheless, he is not mentioned in any of the *subscriptions* that name the sources of the marginal notes to the *Birds*, *Peace* and *Clouds* in ms. V (*ad Av. παραγράφεται ἐκ τῶν Συμμάχου καὶ ἄλλων σχολίων, ad Pac. παραγράφεται ἐκ Φαείνου καὶ Συμμάχου, ad Nub. παραγράφεται ἐκ τῶν Φαείνου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν*¹¹³). This may be due to the fact that his commentary to Aristophanes did not survive into late Antiquity as a self-standing text (or, at least, was not available in this form to the compilers), but was replaced by the work of later Aristophanic scholars, who – by excerpting and reusing Didymos’ interpretations – prevented the survival of his commentary in the original redaction, and at the same time served as the only means of its fragmentary transmission. A primary role in this process, as suggested by the *subscriptions*, must have been played by Symmachos, whose scholarly activity can be placed in the 1st-2nd century CE¹¹⁴. His name occurs along with Didymos’ thirteen times in the scholia to the *Birds* and once in the scholia to the *Wealth*. For the most part, Symmachos’ interpretations differ from his predecessor’s: in these instances, the scholia rely solely on Symmachos’ commentary, since he likely quoted Didymos in order to rebut his explanation (see frr. 229, 231, 238, 242 below). On the contrary, when a scholium offers two similar interpretations, ascribing one to Didymos and the other to Symmachos, it can be assumed that the redactor had access to the Didymean material independently from his successor (see frr. 244, 248, 253), since it is unlikely that Symmachos quoted extensively his forerunner only to repeat the same interpretation¹¹⁵. However, the relationship between the two commentaries and the redaction of the scholia that quote them is often much more complex and unclear (see frr. 224, 237, 239, 243, 249, 252 below and 273 C.-Pr.)¹¹⁶.

The problem of the relationship between Symmachos’ and Didymos’ hypomnēmata and the scholia to Aristophanes is instructive of the general caution with which this scholiastic material should be treated. The corpus of scholia preserved in the extant Aristophanic manuscripts results from a process of incessant compilation, epitomation and reworking of the sources that had been going on without interruption from late Hellenistic times. Despite being by nature an instrumental (and therefore open) tradition, the textual stage

¹¹¹ Cf. *schol. Apoll. Rhod.* 4.973 ἐν τῇ Κωμικῇ λέξει τῇ συμμίκτηρ and 1613-16c Wendel ἐν τῇ Κωμικῇ λέξει

¹¹² Works entitled Λέξις κωμική are attested also for Theon of Alexandria (see Hesych. *ep. ad Eul.* 1-4; Meliadò 2015) and Palamedes of Elea (see *Suda* π 43 Adler; *Et.Gen.* α 1203 Lasserre-Livadaras; *schol. Aristoph. V.* 710a, 1108b, 1122b Koster, *Pac.* 916 Holwerda).

¹¹³ On the technical meaning of παραγράφεσθαι in the scholiastic jargon, see Montana 2010; 2014; Pagani 2014b.

¹¹⁴ He was active before the redaction of Herodian’s *On Lexical Singularity* (II p. 245 Lentz), where he is quoted.

¹¹⁵ See Schauenburg 1881, 6.

¹¹⁶ On Symmachos’ dependence on Didymos in general, see Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; White 1914, 1-1iii; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40-41; Montana 2003.

testified by the manuscripts responds to a unitary editorial aim¹¹⁷, rooted in the cultural context of the 9th-10th century CE, a time when a set of late antique running commentaries to the poet (in which the work of previous scholars was epitomised and reworked) was still to some degree in circulation¹¹⁸ (possibly along with copies of the plays that already carried some kind of marginal annotation¹¹⁹) and was merged together with lexicographical sources to form the extant marginal scholia. In other words, what we now read of the ancient Aristophanic scholars is what has survived centuries of selection, abbreviation and rearrangement, and the form in which we now read it was chosen and stabilized in a specific historic period, to respond to specific cultural premises. In short, the extant scholiastic corpus to Aristophanes' plays is an editorial product in its own right and should not be treated as a sterile container of the remains of the exegesis of the past.

Unfortunately, the ecdotic criteria adopted by the most recent editors of the scholia to the *Birds* (Holwerda 1991) and the *Frogs* (Chantry 1999) completely disregard this historic perspective on the formation of the corpus. Indeed, on the basis of Zacher's questionably generalised conclusion (1888, 674 and 680) that short and isolated notes reflect more closely the archetype while longer scholia are the product of the subsequent combination of those originally independent comments, all the Groningen editions of the Aristophanic scholia from Holwerda's scholia to the *Clouds* (1977) onwards¹²⁰ proceed to the systematic fragmentation and rearrangement of the scholiastic wording into subsections, allegedly representing the different ancient interpretations preserved by each scholium. The inherent problems of this editorial choice were already highlighted by the reviewers of the editions of the scholia to the *Clouds* and the *Wasps* (Erbse 1979, 1980; Dover 1981; Kleinlogel 1984) and have been recently reinvestigated by Montana 2017: not only does this ecdotic approach inevitably obscure the exegetically coherent structure of each scholium, but it basically changes the very object of the edition itself, *i.e.* the textual stage that the editor proposes to reconstruct. In other words, works such as Chantry's edition of the scholia to the *Frogs* look more like an edition of the sources of the scholia, rather than an edition of the actual scholiastic corpus. Paradoxically, the study of the ancient grammarians' interpretations is made more complicated, and not at all easier, by this systematic division of the scholia in separated exegetic units, especially when it comes to long annotations in which different grammarians are quoted: this is clearly showed *e.g.* by Did. fr. 257, 262 and 270a¹²¹ (below).

¹¹⁷ «[...] un articolato progetto editoriale *che* ha per obiettivo la realizzazione di un 'super-commento' analitico e, alla sua maniera, esaustivo, una *summa* esegetica [...], nel quadro di un piano consapevole e specializzato di riappropriazione su larga scala dei testi antichi» (Montana 2006, 31).

¹¹⁸ For this hypothesis, see Zuntz 1965, 273-275; Maehler 1994; 2000. The possibility of a self-standing hypomnēma to Aischylos' *Prometheus Bound* surviving into the 9th century is investigated by Ercoles 2014.

¹¹⁹ See Wilson 1967, 244-247; Montana 2006; 2011a, 152-155.

¹²⁰ Namely, Koster's edition of the scholia to the *Wasps* (1978), Holwerda's edition of the *vetera* to the *Peace* (1982) and the *Birds* (1991) and Chantry's edition of the *vetera* to the *Wealth* (1994) and the *Frogs* (1994).

¹²¹ The latter was already among the examples offered by Montana 2017, 200-221.

6. The present edition

In the light of the observations made above on the nature of the scholiastic corpus to Aristophanes' plays and the ecdotic criteria adopted by previous editors, the general principle of this edition is to present, for each Didymean fragment quoted in the scholia to the *Birds* and the *Frogs*, all the extant scholiastic material on the same word or phrase as one textual unit, arranging it in a form that respects as much as possible the way in which it is transmitted by the manuscripts, thus giving a complete picture of Didymos' interpretations in the context of their relationship to previous exegesis and of their reception in subsequent Aristophanic scholarship.

All the information relevant to the *constitutio textus* is in the critical apparatus, while a separate apparatus is dedicated to the *loci paralleli*¹²². The commentary on each fragment is organised in *lemmata* and is introduced by a brief summary of the Aristophanic passage that is the object of Didymos' exegesis, followed by some essential notes on the structure of the annotation and its transmission in the different manuscripts. As already anticipated, the numbering of the fragments is that of Coward-Prodi (frr. 222 to 270a). I have edited all the Didymean fragments in the scholia to the *Birds*, regardless of the work they come from: for this reason, fr. °2, from the work *On the wrong interpretation of words* (*ap. schol. Aristoph. Av. 768b-c-d-e* Holwerda) is also included, in the position in which it appears in the scholia, *i.e.* between frr. 232 (*ap. schol. Aristoph. Av. 737fα-fβ-e* Holwerda) and 233 (*ap. schol. Aristoph. Av. 816a-bα-bβ* Holwerda).

¹²² The Aristophanic line commented on by each Didymean fragment is printed right below the critical text and above the *loci paralleli* and the critical apparatus. The *loci paralleli* are quoted fully in the apparatus and are referred to only with author and work name (and numeric details) in the body of the commentary. Other relevant passages that do not qualify as *loci paralleli* are instead quoted in the body of the commentary or in the footnotes.

Didymi fragmenta in scholiis Avium servata

- R** Ravennas 429 (10th-11th century, Biblioteca Classense, Ravenna): see Martin 1882, 88-115; von Holzinger 1882; Zacher 1888, 529-543; Allen 1896; White 1914, lxxxviii-xc; Jones 1952; Mioni 1964, 363f.; Eberline 1980, 27f.; Diller 1983, 309-320; Holwerda 1991, XIV, XXI-XII; Orsini 2011.
- V** Venetus Marcianus gr. 474 (12th century, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venezia): see Zacher 1882; 1888, 505-528; White 1914, lxxxvi-lxxxvii; Koster 1953, 24f.; 1957, 162; 1963; Eberline 1980, 41f.; Holwerda 1991, XIV, XII-XIII.
- E** Estensis α.U.5.10 (14th century, Biblioteca Estense universitaria, Modena): see White 1914, xciii-xcv; Eberline 1980, 17; Holwerda 1991, XIV, XXIII-XIV.
- Γ** Laurentianus plut. 31.15 (14th century, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze) and Vossianus graecus F 52 (14th century, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden): see Zacher 1888, 549-554; White 1914, xc-xciii; Holwerda 1991, XIV, XXIV-XXVII.
- M** Ambrosianus gr. L 39 sup. (14th century, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano): see Zacher 1888, 554-556, 567-580; White 1914, xcv-xcvii; Eberline 1980, 15; Holwerda 1991, XV, XXIX-XXXII.
- Lh** Oxoniensis Bodleianus Holkhamensis 88 (15th century, Bodleian Library, Oxford): see Eberline 1989, 21; Holwerda 1991, XV, XXXII-XXXIII.
- M₉** Ambrosianus gr. L 41 sup. (15th century, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano): see White 1914, xcix-c; Eberline 1980, 16; Holwerda 1991, XV.
- G** Venetus Marcianus gr. 475 (15th century, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venezia): see Zacher 1888, 544-546; White 1914, lxxxvii-lxxxviii; Eberline 1980, 42f.; Holwerda 1991, XV; Muttini 2019, 17f.
- Ald** editio Aldina (Venetiis 1498): see Zacher 1888, 557-564; Eberline 1980, 45f.; Holwerda 1991, XXXIV-XXXVI.

fr. 222 (= Π 14.19, p. 251 Schmidt)

Subject: an alleged allusion to Orneai in Ar. Av. 13

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 13a-b Holwerda

οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων: ἀντὶ τοῦ “ὀρνεοπωλίων”. Δίδυμος δὲ δεινὰ φάσκειν αὐτοῦς ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων πεπονθέναι, ἐπεὶ Ὀρνεαὶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς εἰσι, πρὸ δὲ ἐτῶν δ’ κακῶς περὶ Μαντίνειαν ἀπήλλαξαν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἀποβαλεῖν Λάχητα καὶ Νικόστρατον, καθὰ καὶ Ἄνδροτιῶν φησὶν (*BNJ* 324 F 41). **VEΓM** ἄλλως, ὅτι οὕτως ἔλεγον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων, ἀντὶ τοῦ “τῶν ὀρνεοπωλίων”, **VEΓLh** ὡς τὸ “χυτράων” ἀντὶ τοῦ “χυτροπωλίων”. **EΓLh** ἢ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὸ ὀμηρικὸν (*Od.* XIII 407f.) “δήεις τὸν γε σύεσσι παρήμενον” τουτέστι συφεοῖς. ἐξῆς οὖν ἐπάγει “αἱ δὲ νέμονται / πὰρ κόρακος πέτρῃ”. **VEΓLh**

“the man from the birds”: in the sense of “the bird-market”. Didymos (says that) they claim to suffer terribly because of the birds (*ornea*), since there is a place named Orneai in Laconia, and four years before (*i.e.* 418 BCE) they (*scil.* the Athenians) failed badly around Mantinea, so that they even lost the generals, Laches and Nikostratos, according to what Androtion, too, says. Otherwise. Because they would say so (*i.e.* “the birds”) also for the places, instead of “the bird-market”, like “the pots” instead of “the pottery-market”. The usage goes back to the Homeric line “you will find him seated by the hogs”, that is “by the hog-sty”. Then it directly goes on “and they are feeding by the rock of the crow”.

Aristoph. Av. 13f. ἦ δεινὰ νῶ δέδρακεν οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων, / ὁ πινακοπώλης Φιλοκράτης μελαγχολῶν.

Aristoph. Av. 396-399 δημοσίᾳ γὰρ ἴνα ταφῶμεν, / φήσομεν πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς / μαχομένω τοῖς πολεμίσιον / ἀποθανεῖν ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς | *schol.*

Aristoph. Av. 399aa Holwerda ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς: παρὰ τὰ ὄρνεα ἐπαίξεν. ἔστι δὲ τῆς Ἀργείας πόλις, ἧς καὶ Ὅμηρος μνημονεύει λέγων: “Ὀρνεαῖς τ’ ἐνέμοντο” (*Il.* 2.570). ἴσως δέ, ὅτι ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς μάχη ἐγένετο Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀργείων | *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Av. 399 Koster* ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς] τόπος, εἰς ὃν ἐγένετο πόλεμος Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀργείων.

1 lemma om. M | ὀρνεοπωλίων Renkema rec. Holwerda, ὀρνεοπόλων VM Bekker Dindorf Dübner, ὀρνεοπολῶν EΓ | δεινὰ-ἐπεὶ cett., φησιν ὅτι M | δεινὰ φάσκειν VE, φάσκειν δεινὰ Γ | πεπονθέναι ante ἐπεὶ cett., ante ἐκ Γ | **2** Ὀρνεαὶ edd., ὀρνέαι VEM, ὄρνεαι Γ | δ’ Dobree Dindorf Dübner, τεττάρων White, δύο codd. Bekker | περὶ statim cett., postea add. Γ | Μαντίνειαν ΓM, -εαν VE | **3** Νικόστρατον cett., Καλλίστρατον E | **4** ἄλλως om. ELh | οὕτως EΓLh, οὕτως V | ἔλεγον cett., ex ἔλεγεν (?) Γ, λέγουσι Lh | ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων cett., ἐπὶ τῶν πωλούντων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων Lh | ἀντὶ τοῦ cett., ὁ ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων οὖν ἀντὶ τοῦ τῶν ὀρνεοπωλῶν ἢ τῶν Lh | τὸ E, τῶν Γ, om. Lh | χυτράων edd., χύτρων codd.

Right at the beginning of *Birds*, Euelpides and Peisetairos complain about the useless indications given by the crow and the jackdaw that they just bought from Philokrates, οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων, “the one from the bird-market”¹²³.

The annotation concerning *Av.* 13 consists of two scholia (*schol. Aristoph. Av.* 13a-b Holwerda, linked by the compilation mark ἄλλως in **VF**) and focuses entirely on the idiomatic usage of τὰ ὀρνεα, “the birds”, in the sense of “the bird-market”. While Didymos detected a historical allusion (see below), an anonymous commentator underlined that this kind of metonymy is already attested in Homer.

Ὀρνεαὶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς: the site of Orneai is actually not in Lakonia but in Argolis¹²⁴, as stated also in *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 399aα Holwerda (ἔστι δὲ τῆς Ἀργείας πόλις). In his commentary to Androtion’s fragment (*BNJ* 324 F 41), Jones (2015) maintains that «Didymos [...] inferred from the alliance with Sparta, incorrectly, that Orneai, at least at the time of the battle, was geographically situated within the territory of Lakonia». The interpretation is clearly incorrect, given that – as Thucydides clearly states¹²⁵ – Orneai fought with the Athenians, against the Spartans, at Mantinea¹²⁶. On the contrary, it is not unlikely that the wrong location of Orneai originated from epitomation in the central part of the scholium. In fact, Didymos’ argumentation seems compromised, as can be argued from the lack of a logical link connecting the statement about the existence of a place named Orneai and the account of the Athenian defeat at Mantinea in 418 BCE. What might perhaps be integrated in the exegesis of the grammarian is that Orneai, as an ally of Athens and Argo, had a significant responsibility in the defeat of its own front. Such interpretation of Didymos’ stance would fit with the general sense of the Aristophanic passage: the grammarian believed that the designation of the poulterer Philokrates as οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων in *Av.* 13 implied an allusion to Orneai (which, despite being an ally, had caused the city to lose against the Spartans), and that this allusion enhanced the idea that the help provided by the man (*i.e.* the two birds) was in fact detrimental to the protagonists. If this reconstruction is correct, Didymos’ still rather far-fetched interpretation might be explained as being influenced by the only occurrence of Orneai in *Birds*, at l. 399: in the passage (*Av.* 396-399), Peisetairos claims that in order to be buried at the public expense, he and Euelpides will just have to say they died at Orneai (δημοσίᾳ γὰρ ἴνα ταφῶμεν, / φήσομεν πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς / μαχομένῳ τοῖς πολεμίσιον / ἀποθανεῖν ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς). Besides involving the pun ἐν Ὀρνεαῖς/ἐν ὀρνεοῖς, the

¹²³ Since Fraenkel (1962) and Marzullo (1970) cast doubt on the attribution of the first 160 lines of the *Birds* as transmitted by the manuscripts, editors have not reached consensus on the matter. The most complete discussion of the problem is provided by Nesselrath 1996, who tries to defend the line distribution of the manuscripts by framing it in the development of Aristophanes’ dramaturgy. Line 13 is assigned to Euelpides by the manuscript tradition, which is followed by all modern editors up until Coulon (1928a, 23), while *e.g.* Dunbar (1995, 61), Henderson (2000, 14) and Wilson (2007a, 347) follow Marzullo (1970, 185f.) in giving it to Peisetairos.

¹²⁴ Gomme-Andrewes-Dover 1970, 107-110; Harding 1994, 151; Lafond 2000; Piérart 2001, 612f.

¹²⁵ Thuc. 5.67.2 οἱ δ’ ἐναντίοι αὐτοῖς (*scil.* τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις) δεξιὸν μὲν κέρας Μαντινῆς εἶχον, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἐκείνῳ τὸ ἔργον ἐγίνετο, παρὰ δ’ αὐτοῦς οἱ ξύμμαχοι Ἀρκάδων ἦσαν, ἔπειτα Ἀργείων οἱ χίλιοι λογάδες, οἷς ἡ πόλις ἐκ πολλοῦ ἄσκησιν τῶν ἐς τὸν πόλεμον δημοσίᾳ παρεῖχε, καὶ ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀργεῖοι, καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦς οἱ ξύμμαχοι αὐτῶν, Κλεωναῖοι καὶ Ὀρνεᾶται, ἔπειτα Ἀθηναῖοι ἔσχατοι τὸ εὐώνυμον κέρας ἔχοντες, καὶ ἱππῆς μετ’ αὐτῶν οἱ οἰκεῖοι, 72.4 προσπεσόντες (*scil.* οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι) τῶν [τε] Ἀργείων τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ πέντε λόχοις ὠνομασμένοις καὶ Κλεωναίοις καὶ Ὀρνεάταις καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς παρατεταγμένοις, ἔτρεψαν οὐδὲ ἐς χεῖρας τοὺς πολλοὺς ὑπομειναντας.

¹²⁶ To explain the text, Meiners (1890, 9) supposed that Didymos ignored the facts of the siege of Orneai narrated by Thuc. 6.7.1f., which is highly unlikely.

joke relies on the comically short duration (only one day) of the siege of Orneai, that had taken place just one year before the staging of *Birds* (416-415 BCE)¹²⁷. Therefore, the grammarian might have been led to devise an allusion to Orneai in *Av.* 13 because of the joke in l. 399.

πρὸ δὲ ἐτῶν δ' κακῶς περὶ Μαντίνειαν ἀπήλλαξαν κτλ: the death of the generals Laches (*PA* 9019, *PAA* 602280) and Nikostratos (*PA* 11011, *PAA* 717980) is reported also by Thucydides, but without their personal names (see Thuc. 5.74.3 ἀπέθανον δὲ Ἀργείων μὲν καὶ Ὀρνεατῶν καὶ Κλεωναίων ἑπτακόσιοι, Μαντινέων δὲ διακόσιοι, καὶ Ἀθηναίων ξὺν Αἰγινήταις διακόσιοι καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀμφοτέρου).

καθὰ καὶ Ἀνδροτίων φησίν: the phrasing may at first seem to derive from a comparison between Didymos' hypomnēma and Androtion's *Atthis*, but it is easier to suppose that the reference to the attidographer was originally embedded in the grammarian's explanation, since the use of historians is a typical feature of his exegesis¹²⁸.

¹²⁷ See Thuc. 6.7.1f.; Gomme-Andrewes-Dover 1970, 222; Dunbar 1995, 289.

¹²⁸ See fr. 250, 257 and 260. See also Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

fr. 223a-b (= II 14.20, p. 251 Schmidt)

Subject: the function of the basket, the pot and the myrtle carried by Euelpides and Peisetairos in *Av.* 42-45

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 43aα-β Holwerda

a) κανοῦν δ' ἔχοντε **VEΓ** καὶ χύτραν **RF** καὶ μυρρίνας **R**: τὰ πρὸς θυσίαν κομίζουσιν, ἵνα οἰκήσαντες ἐν τῇ ἰδρύσει θύσωσιν. ὅτι δὲ χύτραις ἴδρυον, εἴρηται ἐν Εἰρήνῃ (923). Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν ἀμυντήρια τῶν ὀρνέων αὐτοῦς βαστάζειν, ἀντὶ ὄπλου μὲν τὸ κανοῦν, ἀντὶ περικεφαλαίας δὲ τὴν χύτραν, ἵνα μὴ ἐφιπτάμενα τὰ ὄρνεα τύπτῃ αὐτούς, τὰς δὲ μυρρίνας πρὸς τὸ ἀποσοβεῖν. **RVEΓM**

“with a basket, a pot and the myrtle-wreaths”: they are carrying tools for the sacrifice, so that, in settling, they sacrifice in the foundation. Didymos says that they are carrying them as defensive weapons against the birds: the basket instead of the shield and the pot instead of the helmet, in order not to be hit by the birds flying above, while the myrtle branches are to scare (them) away.

b) τὰ πρὸς θυσίαν κομίζοντες, ἵνα οἰκήσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἰδρύσει θύσωσιν. Δίδυμος φησιν, ὅτι τὸ κανοῦν καὶ τὴν χύτραν καὶ τὴν μυρρίνην εἶχον ἀμυντήρια τῶν ὀρνέων, τὸ μὲν κανοῦν ἀντὶ ὄπλου, ἀντὶ περικεφαλαίας τὴν χύτραν, ἵνα μὴ ἐφιπτάμενα τὰ ὄρνεα τύπτῃ αὐτούς, τὰς δὲ μυρρίνας πρὸς τὸ ἀποσοβεῖν αὐτά. **Lh**

Carrying tools for the sacrifice, so that, in settling, they sacrifice for the foundation. Didymos says that they had the basket, the pot and the myrtle as defensive weapons against the birds: the basket instead of the armour and the pot instead of the helmet, in order not to be hit by the birds flying above, while the myrtle branches are to scare them away.

Aristoph. Av. 42-45 διὰ ταῦτα τόνδε τὸν βάδον βαδίζομεν, / κανοῦν δ' ἔχοντε καὶ χύτραν καὶ μυρρίνας / πλανόμεθα ζητοῦντε τόπον ἀπράγμονα, / ὅποι καθιδρυθέντε διαγενοίμεθ' ἄν.

Suda κ 318 A. “κανοῦν δ' ἔχοντε καὶ χύτραν καὶ μυρρίνας / πλανόμεθα ζητοῦντες τόπον ἀπράγμονα”. Σοφοκλῆς (*sic*). τὰ πρὸς θυσίαν κομίζουσιν, ἵνα οἰκήσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἰδρύσει θύσωσι. χύτραις γὰρ ἴδρυον. οἱ δὲ φασιν, ὅτι ἀμυντήρια τῶν ὀρνέων ἐβάσταζον· ἀντὶ ὄπλου μὲν κανοῦν, ἀντὶ δὲ περικεφαλαίας χύτραν, ἵνα μὴ ἐφιπτάμενα τὰ ὄρνεα τύπτῃ αὐτούς. τὰς δὲ μυρρίνας, πρὸς τὸ ἀποσοβεῖν.

2 (a) κομίζουσι cett., κομίζοντες M | **3 (a)** οἰκήσαντες codd. edd. pl., οἰκίσαντες Dindorf Dübner | ἐν VEG², ἐπὶ RGM | δὲ cett., om. M | **4 (a)** χύτραις RVE^{ac}GM, χύτρας E^{pc}Γ² | ἴδρυον cett., ἔθουον M | εἴρηται RVEGM edd. cett., καὶ Ald Bekker | **5 (a)** Δίδυμος κτλ in marg. adscriptit ὕθλος Γ^{2(p)} | αὐτούς R, αὐτὰ VEΓM | **6-7 (a)** ἀντὶ περικεφαλαίας δὲ Holwerda, περικεφαλαίας δὲ VEΓM Bekker, ἀντὶ δὲ περικεφαλαίας R Dindorf Dübner | **7 (a)** post χύτραν, * Γ | ἐφιπτάμενα cett., fort. ἐφιπταμένων Γ^{ac}, ἐφιπτάν R | **9 (a)** ἀποσοβεῖν cett., ἀσεβεῖν E

The two characters' lengthy complaint on their wanderings (Av. 27-48)¹²⁹ serves the purpose of informing the audience on the reasons, the current direction and the aim of their voyage. Among the other details, the speech mentions that Peisetairos and Euelpides are carrying with them a basket (κανοῦν), a pot (χύτρα) and some myrtle branches (μυρρίναι).

The manuscript tradition offers two alternative redactions of the scholium to Av. 43, the first is preserved unanimously by **RVEΓM**¹³⁰, the second is an isolated rephrasing attested only in **Lh**. The Didymean fragment occurs in both versions of the annotation, always introduced by a section that identifies the three items carried by Euelpides and Peisetairos as sacrificial tools¹³¹.

Δίδυμος δέ φησιν ἀμυντήρια κτλ: Didymos' interpretation establishes a connection between the three objects and the battle-scene of Il. 357-392, where Peisetairos urges Euelpides to use what they have in their luggage to fend off the birds' assault¹³². Of the three tools listed at l. 43 only the pot is mentioned again during the battle-scene at l. 358, while the basket is brought up during the sacrifice (846-863) and no further mention is made of the myrtle branches. With his exegesis, the grammarian seemingly wants to give a role to all three objects within the that scene. The use of the pot as a helmet (ἀντὶ περικεφαλαίας δὲ τὴν χύτραν, ἵνα μὴ ἐφιπτάμενα τὰ ὄρνεα τύπη αὐτούς) reflects Av. 358 (Εὐ. τί δὲ χύτρα νό γ' ὠφελήσει; Πε. γλαῦξ μὲν οὐ πρόσεισι νῶν)¹³³. With regard to the basket, Didymos imagines it was used like a big hoplite shield (ἀντὶ ὅπλου μὲν τὸ κανοῦν), while the supposed function of the myrtle branches is to scare the birds away.

¹²⁹ As for most of the first 160 lines of the play, the attribution of this passage is debated (see above n. 123): in the manuscripts, the lines are uttered by Euelpides and this is what is printed in modern editions up until Coulon (1928a, 24f.), as well as in Dunbar 1995, 62 and Henderson 2000, 18. The speech is instead assigned to Peisetairos by Marzullo 1970, 186 (see also *e.g.* Wilson 2007a, 348).

¹³⁰ And, with slight alterations (among which the omission of Didymos' name), by *Suda* κ 318 A. With regard to the *Suda* as testimony of the textual transmission of the Aristophanic *scholia*, it has long been acknowledged that «i compilatori della *Suda* conoscevano un codice aristofaneo corredato di scoli, non molto diversi da quelli che a noi sono pervenuti direttamente» (Tosi 2006, 177). In most cases, the material preserved by the lexicon shows a closer resemblance to **RV** than to the other manuscripts (see Zacher 1888, 689; Holwerda 1977, XVII). See also Adler 1928, XVIII; Tosi 2014, 21f.

¹³¹ This is the commonly accepted interpretation, see *e.g.* Kock 1894, 59; Rogers 1906, 9; Sommerstein 1987, 204; Dunbar 1995, 150; Halliwell 1998, 6.

¹³² For a detailed analysis of the scene, see Dunbar 1995, 270-272.

¹³³ The Aristophanic text allows for two possible uses of the pot, either as helmet or as shield, see Dunbar 1995, 270f.

fr. 224 (= II 14.21, p. 251 Schmidt)

Subject: the accentuation of ἐποποιῖ in Av. 58-60

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 58 Holwerda

ἐποποιῖ **VEΓ**: Σύμμαχος καὶ Δίδυμος προπαροξύνουσιν **RVEΓLh** ἀπὸ τοῦ “οἱ ἔποποι”· **RLh** οἱ δὲ περισπῶσιν, ἵν’ ἢ ἐπίρρημα ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἐποπιστί”. εἰ δὲ προπαροξύνοιτο, δῆλον ὅτι ἐσχημάτισται ἀπὸ εὐθείας τῆς ἔποπος. **RVEΓMLh**

eporoi: Symmachos and Didymos put the acute accent on the antepenultimate, from “the overseers” (*ἐporoi*). Some put the circumflex instead, so that it is an adverb in the sense of “in the language of the hoopoe”. If it is proparoxytone, it is clearly modelled on the nominative *eporos*.

Aristoph. Av. 57-60 Πε. παῖ παῖ. Εὐ. τί λέγεις, οὗτος; τὸν ἔποπα παῖ καλεῖς; / οὐκ ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδός <σ’> ἐχρῆν ἐποποιῖ καλεῖν; / Πε. ἐποποιῖ. ποιήσεις τοῖ με κόπτειν αὐθις αὐθι. / ἐποποιῖ.

Apollon. Soph. Lex. Hom. 133,19-22 B. πόποι ἐπιφώνημα σχετλιαστικόν. τινὲς δὲ ἔδοξαν σημαίνειν ὃ θεοὶ ὁ γοῦν Εὐφορίων (fr. 136 Powell) φησὶν “ἐν δὲ πόποις ἔσσαντο.” τινὲς δὲ τούτω βοηθοῦντες φασὶ συναλοιφῆν εἶναι, ἐν δὲ ἐπόποις, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπόπταις | *schol. Opp. H. 1.354 Dübner* ὃ πόποι φεῦ· θαυμαστικόν, ἀποστροφή μετ’ ἐκπλήξεως· φεῦ θεοὶ ἔποποι γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ, καὶ κατ’ ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ ἐπόποι | **Eust. Il. 98,45-99,2 (= I 155,1-5 V.)** τοῖς δὲ βιαζομένοις τὸν Ὀμηρον καὶ μετάγουσι πρὸς ἑτέρους ποιητὰς τὰ ἐκείνου ἀρέσκει λέγειν τὸ «ὃ πόποι» ἀντὶ τοῦ «ὃ θεοί», ἐπειδὴ εὐρηγται ἐν τοῖς μεθ’ Ὀμηρον οἱ θεοὶ πόποι λεγόμενοι οἰονεὶ ἔποποι κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, ὡς τὰ πάντα διοπτρεύοντες, ὅποιον δὴ τι καὶ ὁ δίοπος δηλοῖ, λέξις παρ’ Αἰσχύλῳ ἡγεμονικὴ (*Pers.* 44, fr. 232 R²).

1 προπαροξύνουσιν VEΓ²M edd. cett., προπαροξύνονται Γ, προπαροξυτόνωνς R Rutherford | ἀπό-ἐποποι om. Bekker | ἀπὸ τοῦ οἱ R, τὸ Lh | **2** περισπῶσιν VEΓMLh edd. cett., περισπωμένως R Rutherford | ἀντὶ τοῦ RVEΓ²MLh, om. Γ | ἐποπιστί cett., lac. M | ἀπὸ RV, ἀπὸ τῆς EM, ὡς ἀπὸ ΓLh | **3** εὐθείας cett., γενικῆς M

The arrival of Peisetairos and Euelpides at Hoopoe’s house is accompanied by two consecutive jokes, the second of which revolves around the pun between the common call for the slave doorkeeper (παῖ, παῖ) and the made-up ἐποποιῖ, indicated by one of the two characters¹³⁴ as the proper invocation for the ἔποψ.

The somewhat forced pun seems to have puzzled ancient commentators, who were not unanimous with regard to the accentuation of the invented call *ἐποποι. The scholium to Av. 58 consists in the summary, made by a later compiler, of two ancient interpretations of the line: on the one hand, Didymos’ stance (later accepted

¹³⁴ The manuscripts assign the line to Euelpides (as do most modern editors, see e.g. Coulon 1928a, 25f.; Sommerstein 1987, 20; Dunbar 1995, 63; Wilson 2007a, 349), but some editors (like Henderson 2000, 20) give it to Peisetairos. On the attribution of the first 160 lines of *Birds*, see above n. 123.

by his successor Symmachos¹³⁵), according to which the word had to be pronounced and written ἔποποι. On the other hand, an anonymous opinion (οἱ δέ), according to which the correct reading was ἐποποῑ.

Σύμμαχος καὶ Δίδυμος: this is the only case where Didymos and Symmachos are presented by the scholiasts as sharing exactly the same interpretation of an Aristophanic line. Indeed, some scholia quote both commentators separately, also when Symmachos' interpretation is a mere reformulation of Didymos' one (see *e.g.* fr. 253 below). More often than not, however, Symmachos disagrees with the explanations of his predecessor (see *e.g.* frs. 229 and 248 below); see also the Introduction § 5.2.

προπαροξύνουσι: despite the lack of clear evidence¹³⁶, it can be assumed that the verb προπαροξύνω (along with ὀξύνω, παροξύνω, περισπάω and the adjectives ὀξύτονος, παροξύτονος, προπαροξύτονος and περισπώμενος) belonged to a prosodic terminology already established in the Hellenistic period, roughly between the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchos' pupil Dionysios Thrax¹³⁷. Similar observations on accentuation with semantic implications can be found in Didymos' comments on Pindar¹³⁸ and on Sophokles¹³⁹.

ἀπὸ τοῦ “οἱ ἔποποι”: a nominative plural ἔποποι is only attested within the explanation given by some ancient Homeric scholars of the exclamation ὦ/ὦ πόποι¹⁴⁰, which was interpreted as an invocation to the gods as “overseers” (ὦ [ἔ]ποποι) of human events (see *e.g. schol. Opp. H.* 1.354 Dübner ἔποποι γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ, καὶ κατ' ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ ε πόποι)¹⁴¹. That this exegesis influenced Didymos' interpretation of the call *ἔποποι is made even more likely by the fact that the bird-name ἔποψ was at some point perceived by Greek speakers as paretymologically linked to the semantic field of “overseeing”¹⁴², as proved by a fragment from Sophokles' *Tereus* (fr. 581 R.² τοῦτον δ' ἐπόπτῃν ἔποπα τῶν αὐτοῦ κακῶν / πεποικίλωκε κτλ)¹⁴³ and implied by a number

¹³⁵ On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with frs. 228-231; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f. below). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

¹³⁶ Only rarely can scholia be regarded as quoting *verbatim* from ancient grammarians, therefore the use of prosodic terminology can not be dated on this basis (see Probert 2015, 938 n. 33). The only grammatical papyri dealing with prosody are from late antiquity, see in particular *P.Ant.* 2.67 (MP³ 461.200; LDAB 1117; see Wouters 1979, 216-224).

¹³⁷ See Probert 2015, 938f. On the Hellenistic scholarly tradition on accentuation see Probert 2006, 21-45; 2015, 934-947; Schironi 2018, 109-115.

¹³⁸ See *schol. Pind. P.* 4.446 ἦτοι οὖν, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος (fr. 130 C.-Pr. = 26 Braswell), προενεκτέον τὰν Πελιασοφόνον ὀξυτόνωσ, ἴν' ἢ φονευτικήν· ἢ παροξυτόνωσ, ἣτις ἦν τοῦ Πελίου φόνοσ, *N.* 10.114a Drachmann πρὸς οὓσ (scil. Ἀρίσταρχον καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρον) φησι Δίδυμος (fr. 165 C.-Pr. = 61 Braswell): ἀμφοτέρων ὑπὸ τῇ δρυὶ λοχόντων, τοῦ τε Κάστοροσ καὶ τοῦ Πολυδεύκοσ, μόνον ὁ Λυγκεὺσ τὸν Κάστορα εἶδε; μήποτε οὖν, φησὶ, δεῖ ἀναγινώσκειν τὴν παραλήγουσαν συλλαβὴν ὀξυτόνωσ τοῦ ἡμένοσ κτλ.

¹³⁹ See *schol. Soph. OC* 763 Xenis πείρα: βαρυτόνωσ ἀναγνώστέον πείρα, οὐ περισπωμένωσ. οὕτω Δίδυμοσ (fr. 183 C.-Pr.).

¹⁴⁰ See *Il.* 1.254 *et passim*, *Od.* 1.32 *et passim*. See also Plu. *De aud. poet.* 22D Δρύοπεσ δὲ “πόπουσ” τοὺσ δαίμονασ (scil. καλοῦσι).

¹⁴¹ See also Apollon. *Soph. Lex. Hom.* 133,19-22 B. ἐν δὲ ἐπόποισ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπόπταισ, Hesych. π 3006 H. πόποι παπαί. ἐπίφθεγμα σχετλιαστικόν. Ἀπίων (fr. 108 N.) δὲ φησιν, οἱ δαίμονέσ εἰσι πόποι, καὶ ἔστιν ὦ δαίμονεσ, Eust. *Il.* 98,45-99,2 (= I 155,1-5 V.) τοῖσ δὲ βιαζομένοισ τὸν Ὅμηρον καὶ μετάγουσι πρὸσ ἐτέρουσ ποιητάσ τὰ ἐκείνου ἀρέσκει λέγειν τὸ “ὦ πόποι” ἀντὶ τοῦ “ὦ θεοί”, ἐπειδὴ εὔρηγται ἐν τοῖσ μεθ' Ὅμηρον οἱ θεοὶ πόποι λεγόμενοι οἰονεὶ ἔποποι κατὰ τοὺσ παλαιοὺσ, ὡσ τὰ πάντα διοπτέουντεσ.

¹⁴² See Hesych. ε 5532 C. ἔποψ· ἐπόπτῃσ. δυνάστησ. καὶ εἶδοσ ὀρνέου. The entry might presuppose Soph. fr. 581 R.².

¹⁴³ The citation context (*i.e.* Aristot. *HA* 633a 18-27) actually ascribes the fragment to Aischyloσ, see Radt 1999, 437; Fitzpatrick-Sommerstein-Talbot 2006, 189-191. On the relationship between Aristophanes' *Birds* and Sophokles' *Tereus*, see Dobrov 1993 and 1997.

of passages of *Birds*¹⁴⁴. It is therefore plausible that, in interpreting the call for the ‘overseeing’ bird, the grammarian was reminded of the invocation for the divine overseers, ὧ (ἔ)ποποι¹⁴⁵. To further clarify Didymos and Symmachos’ paretymologic exegesis¹⁴⁶, the anonymous compiler of the scholium adds that the call ἔποποι is modelled on the nominative ἔποπος: while knocking at the door of the ‘overseeing’ bird (ἔποψ), the two protagonists do not call the slave (παῖ παῖ) but invoke the divine overseers (ἔποποι).

¹⁴⁴ For a detailed analysis, see Griffith 1987.

¹⁴⁵ The meaning of “overseers” in relation to the gods is expressed by the adjective ἐπόψιοι in Soph. *Ph.* 1040. The singular ἐπόπιος is frequently attested as epithet of Zeus (see e.g. Call. *Aet.* fr. 85 Pf. [= 187 Massimilla]; *Jov.* 82; Apoll. Rhod. 2.1133).

¹⁴⁶ On paretymology in Didymos’ exegesis, see also fr. 225, 227, 261, 262 and the Conclusions § 1.4.

fr. 225 (= II 14.22, p. 251 Schmidt)

Subject: the etymology of the toponym Lepreon.

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 149a Holwerda

τί οὐ τὸν **RVE** ἠλεῖον Λέπρεον **RVEΓ**²: καθ' ὕφασιν τοῦ ι τὸ Λέπρειον εἶπεν. ἔστι δὲ τῆς Τριφυλίας πόλις πλησίον Πύλου τῆς Πελοποννήσου. Δίδυμος δὲ φησι Λέπρεον ὠνομάσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν λέπ<ας> εἶν<αι>· διαφαίνεται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς· – πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτόθι ποικίλας τῷ χρώματι καὶ διαλεύκουσ, ὁμοίας τοῖς τὰς ὄψεις λεπριῶσι, **RVEΓ**²**MLh** καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ὠνομάσθαι ἐκ τοῦ πάθους· **RVEΓ**² – ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρώτους οἰκήσαντας τὴν πόλιν ταύτη τῆ νόσῳ κατεσχῆσθαι. **VEΓ**²**MLh**

a) τοὺς οὖν πλησιοχώρους “λεπρεώτας” αὐτοὺς καλεῖν. τοὺς δὲ μὴ βουλομένους δοκεῖν ἄχθεσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι Λέπρεον τὴν πόλιν καλέσαι. **VEΓ**² οὐδετέρως γὰρ λέγεται ἢ πόλις, τὸ Λέπρεον· ὁ δὲ ἀρσενικῶς εἶπεν. **VEΓ**²**M**

b) ἐκαλοῦντο δέ, φησί, πρότερον οἱ πολῖται “λεπρεάται” ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου πάθους· ἀχθεσθέντες δὲ ποτε τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκάλεσαν αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν λέπρεον μεταθέντες ἐπ’ αὐτῆ τὸ οἰκεῖον αὐτῶν ὄνομα **Lh**

“Why not Lepreon in Elis?”: (Aristophanes) meant Lepreion, with subtraction of the *iota*. It is a town in Triphylia, near Pylos in Peloponnese. Didymos says that it is called Lepreon either because their territory is a peak (indeed it stands out against the mountainous region) – for there are rocks of different colors and bright white, similar to those that seem to have *lepra*, and therefore (the town) is called this way because of this condition – or because those who first inhabited the city were affected by this condition.

Therefore the neighbours would call them “lepers” and, as the inhabitants did not want to give the impression that the name had been imposed on them, they called the city “Lepreon”. And the name of the city is neutrum, but (Aristophanes) used it as masculine.

And – (Didymos) says – the inhabitants were earlier called “lepers” because of that condition. But at some point, refusing the name, they called their own city “Lepreon”, thus transferring to the city their own name.

Ar. Av. 149-151 *Ep.* τί οὐ τὸν ἠλεῖον Λέπρεον οἰκίζετον / ἐλθόνθ'; *Ev.* ἴδιον νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς ὅς οὐκ ἰδὼν† / βδελύττομαι τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου.

Paus. 5.5.5 οἱ δὲ τοῖς πρώτον οἰκήσαντες ἐν τῇ γῆ νόσον φασὶν ἐπιγενέσθαι λέπραν καὶ οὕτω τὸ ὄνομα λαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκητόρων τῆ συμφορᾷ | *schol. Aristoph. Ach.* 724 **Wilson** τοὺς δ' ἰμάντας ἐκ Λεπρῶν: οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ λέπειν, ὃ ἔστι τύπτειν. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Λεπρίου πολιέματος τῆς Πελοποννήσου, οἳ μέμνηται καὶ Καλλιμαχος ἐν ὕμνοις (1.39) “Καυκόνων πολίεθρον ὃ Λέπριον πεφάτισται” κτλ | **Phot.** λ 196 **Th.** Λέπρεον· τῆς Τριφυλίας πόλις· ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου τραγῆος ὄρους· οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς κτίζοντας αὐτὴν νόσῳ χρῆσασθαι λέπρα | **Suda** α 302 ἀγορανομίας· λογιστίας, εἴρηται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπισκοποῦντων τὰ τῶν πόλεων ὄνια. καὶ ἀγορανόμοι, οἱ τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν ὄνια διοικοῦντες ἄρχοντες. Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀχαρνέσιν (723f.)

“ἀγορανόμους δὲ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καθίσταται τρεῖς τοὺς λαχόντας, τοὺς δ’ ἰμάντας ἐκ λεπρῶν”. τουτέστι λώρους, φραγγέλια. τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν φραγγέλοις ἔτυπτον οἱ λογιῆται τῆς ἀγορᾶς. λεπρῶν δὲ οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ λέπειν, ὃ ἐστὶ τύπτειν· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Λεπρέου πολιέματος τῆς Πελοποννήσου, ἧς μέμνηται καὶ Καλλιμάχος ἐν Ὑμνοῖς (1.39)· “Καυκόνων πολίεθρον, ὃ Λέπρειον πεφάτισται”. οἱ δὲ ἐκ λεπρῶν βοῶν, διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐκ λεπρῶν βοῶν δέρματα ἰσχυρὰ εἶναι. οἱ δὲ ὅτι οἱ Μεγαρεῖς λεπροὶ τὸ σῶμα, πρὸς οὓς σπένδεται. ἄμεινον δὲ λέγειν, ὅτι τόπος ἔξω τοῦ ἄστεος Λεπροὶ καλούμενος, ἐνθα τὰ βυρσεῖα ἦν. οὗ καὶ ἐν Ὀρνισί μὲμνηται· “τί δ’ οὖν τὸν ἥλιον Λέπρεον οἰκίζετε;”, β 206 βδελύττεσθαι ... καὶ βδελυττόμενον τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου. οὗτος εἶχε λέπραν. ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ καὶ εἰς μαλακίαν. ἦν δὲ καὶ κακοπράγμων καὶ ὄμοφάγος καὶ ἄλαλος. νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, ὃς οὐκ ἰδὼν βδελύττομαι τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου, λ 288 Λέπρεον· τῆς Τριφυλίας πόλις. ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου τραχέος ὄρους. οἱ δ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς κτίζοντας αὐτὴν νόσφ’ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡλίδος. οὕτω δὲ ἐκλήθη διὰ τὴν χῶραν αὐτῶν λέπειν· διαφαίνονται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς. πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτόθι ποικίλας τῷ χρώματι καὶ διαλεύκουσ ὁμοίας τὰς ὄψεις λεπριῶσιν, 289 A. Λέπρεος· Ἀριστοφάνης· βδελύττομαι τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου. οὗτος εἶχε λέπραν, ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ καὶ εἰς μαλακίαν. ἦν δὲ καὶ κακοπράγμων καὶ ὄμοφάγος καὶ ἄλαλος. νῆ τὸν θεόν, ὃς οὐκ ἰδὼν βδελύττομαι τὸν Λέπρεον ἀπὸ Μελανθίου | Tz. H. 5.20.684-686 τὸ Λέπρειον μὲν τόπος τις ἐστὶ τῆς Τριφυλίας, / ἀπὸ τοῦ πέτρας τὰς ἐκεῖ λεπράδας πεφυκέναι / καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖ λεπροῦσθαι δε ποιότητι τοῦ τόπου.

1-3 καθ’-εἶναι cett., ἐστὶ τὸ Λέπρεον πλησίον τῆς Πελοποννήσου. Δίδυμος δὲ φησι οὕτω κεκληθῆσθαι διὰ τὸ εἶναι πέτρας M | 1 ὕφεισιν VEG², ὕφαιρῆσιν RLh | τὸ Λέπρειον hic cett., post εἶπε Lh | Τριφυλίας RV, Τριφυλλίας EI² | 2 πόλις Lh Suda, om. cett. | Πύλου Dobree et Rutherford rec. White Holwerda, πολὺ codd. Bekker, πόλις Dindorf Dübner | Δίδυμος-ὄνομάσθαι cett., Λέπρεον δὲ Δίδυμός φησι ὄνομάσθαι R | Λέπρεον cett., Λέπριον Lh | ἦ-γὰρ cett., διὰ τὸ πέτρας Lh | 2-3 διὰ-ἐκ codd. edd. pl., διὰ τὸ τὴν χῶραν αὐτῶν λέπειν – διαφαίνονται γὰρ – <ἦ> ἐκ Rutherford | 3 αὐτῶν cett., αὐτὸν VEG² | λέπ<α>ς εἶν<αι> scripsi, λέπειν codd. edd. pl., λεπ<ρ>άν> εἶν<αι> conji. Toup ad Suda rec. Kakridis, λεπρόν dub. Holwerda | διαφαίνεται scripsi, διαφαίνονται codd. Suda edd. pl., διασφίγγονται dub. Holwerda | intra ὀρεινῆς et πέτρας glossam ὅπου μέλλει ἀνακόμεσθαι ad v. 146 inseruit Γ² | εἶναι statim cett., εἶναι αὐτόθι ex ? ἐαυτόθι Γ² | 3-4 καὶ διαλεύκουσ cett., om. M | 4 λεπριῶσιν cett., λεπράσιν M | τοῦτο cett., exit. dub. R | οὕτως cett., om. R | 5 πρώτως cett., πρώτους Γ² | ταύτη hic cett., post νόσφ’ Lh | κατεσχῆσθαι cett., κατασχεθῆναι Lh | 7 (a) καλεῖν cett., καλεῖ V | 9 (a) γὰρ cett., δὲ M | 10 (a) τὸ Λέπρεον cett., om. M

When faced with Peisetairos’ inquiry about the best city to settle in¹⁴⁷, Tereus lists a few possible options, all introducing specific jokes on places or individuals. Among the locations suggested is the city of Lepreon, referred to by the Hoopoe in the wrong grammatical gender (τὸν Ἡλεῖον Λέπρεον instead of τὸ Ἡλεῖον Λέπρεον) with the consequent comic switch in meaning from “Lepreon in Elis” to something to the effect of “the Elean leper” (*i.e.* the tragic poet Melanthios attacked in l. 151¹⁴⁸).

The scholiastic material regarding the city of Lepreon and Aristophanes’ joke on it in *Av.* 149 presents several interpretive difficulties. The annotation begins with an anonymous observation on the orthography of the name of the city, probably presupposing the knowledge of the alternative spelling Λέπρειον attested in Kallimachos, Strabon and Stephanos of Byzantium¹⁴⁹. Didymos’ two alternative hypotheses on the etymology of the toponym are then quoted¹⁵⁰, one concerning the conformation of the land, the other the look of its inhabitants. The explanations are made somewhat obscure by the probable corruption of the scholiastic wording (see below).

¹⁴⁷ Aristoph. *Av.* 120-122 ταῦτ’ οὖν ἰκέται νῶ πρὸς σὲ δεῦρ’ ἀφίγμεθα, / εἴ τινα πόλιν φράσειας ἡμῖν εὖερον / ὥσπερ σισύραν ἐγκατακλινηῖα μαλθακῆν.

¹⁴⁸ PA 9767, PAA 638275. See Dunbar 1995, 183; Zimmermann 1999.

¹⁴⁹ See Call. *Hymn.* 1.39; Str. 8.3.11, 3.16, 3.18, 3.21, 3.30; St. Byz. 18.112. See also Hdn. III/1,371,9 (= III/2,459,8) Lentz (~ Theognost. *Can.* 775,11 Cramer).

¹⁵⁰ On (par)etymology in Didymos’ exegesis, see also fr. 224, 227, 261, 262 and the Conclusions § 1.4.

Δίδυμος δέ φησι Λέπρεον ὠνομάσθαι: on the geographic location and the history of the site, see Baladié 1978, 280, Lafond 1999 and Heine Nielsen 2001, 543f. Some ancient commentators devised an unlikely reference to the city also in the obscure ἐκ Λεπρῶν of Il. 723f. of *Acharnians* («as commissioners of the market I appoint the three chosen by lot, these leather straps ἐκ Λεπρῶν»¹⁵¹), as *schol.* Aristoph.*Ach.* 724 Wilson shows. This kind of overinterpretation is not infrequent in Didymos' fragments (see *e.g.* fr. 222 above) and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he actually was among those (οἱ δέ) who took the complement ἐκ Λεπρῶν to refer to the city of Lepreon.

ἦ διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν λέπ<ας> εἶν<αι>· διαφαίνεται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς: the text unanimously preserved by **RVEΓMLh** reads λέπειν (“to strip off”, “to peel”). Rutherford's emendation of χώραν in χροάν (1896a, 441: «because the skin of the inhabitants peels») is surely ingenious, but entails reading διαφαίνονται γὰρ as parenthetical (in the sense of «their complexions are transparent» [*ibid.*]) and inserting an additional disjunctive ἦ before ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς, thus implying that the scholium included three, not two, different paretymologic explanations (*i.e.* the complexion of the inhabitants, the colour of the rocks and the disease of the founders of the city). Holwerda's attempt διὰ τὸ τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν λεπρόν¹⁵² (“because of the roughness of their land”) requires to intervene more on the transmitted text and, along with the proposed emendation of διαφαίνονται in διασφίγγονται, entails an unlikely idea of the inhabitants being tightly enclosed by the surrounding mountain peaks. A similar correction¹⁵³ can be found in Kakridis (1974, 50), who writes διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν λεπράν εἶναι (“because their land is rough”) but omits διαφαίνονται γὰρ. I propose to read διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν λέπ<ας> εἶν<αι>, in the sense of “because their territory is a peak”. The neutrum τὸ λέπας occurs with this meaning (exclusively as nominative and accusative) several times in 5th century Attic prose and drama¹⁵⁴, and can also be found in later poetry¹⁵⁵. The word must have been of interest to ancient and late-antique lexicography because of the potential confusion with ἡ λεπάς (“limpet”)¹⁵⁶ and was apparently perceived as linked to the adjective λεπρός, as the exegesis of the rare nominative feminine λεπράς¹⁵⁷ in Theoc. *Id.* 1.40 demonstrates (see *schol.* Theoc. *Id.* 1.40a Wendel λεπράς: ἡ τραχεῖα πέτρα, ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων λεπιζομένη. ἦ ἡ ὑψηλή, ἐπεὶ καὶ λέπας τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ὄρους φασίν. ἦ λευκὴ καὶ λέπρα εἰκουῖα). This emendation proposal is consistent not only with the location of Lepreon «on a steep hill north of modern Lepreo»¹⁵⁸, but

¹⁵¹ Sommerstein's translation (1980, 105) with adaptations. On the meaning of ἐκ Λεπρῶν see Sommerstein 1980, 194; Olson 2002, 257.

¹⁵² Holwerda 1991, 28.

¹⁵³ Originally by Toup, see White 1914, 42, where other emendation proposals are also listed.

¹⁵⁴ See *e.g.* Aeschyl. *Ag.* 283 πρὸς Ἑρμαῖον λέπας and 298 πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας, Eur. *Andr.* 295 πρὶν Ἰδαῖον κατοικίσει λέπας, Thuc. 7.78.5 ἦν δὲ λόφος καρτερός καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν αὐτοῦ χαράδρα κρημνώδης, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Ἀκραῖον λέπας.

¹⁵⁵ See Lyc. *Alex.* 420 πρὶν ἢ Τυμφορηστὸν ἀγάσαι λέπας, Nic. *Ther.* 147 λέπας ὕληεν and 634 Παρθένιον ναίουσι λέπας.

¹⁵⁶ See Amm. *Diff.* 295 N. λέπας καὶ λεπάς διαφέρει. λέπας μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ βαρυτόνως ὄρους ἀπόσπασμα, λεπάς δὲ ὀξύτόνως ἐν ταῖς πέτραις γινόμενόν τι μικρὸν ὄστρεον, Hesych. λ 662 C. λεπας: τὸ ἄναντες. καὶ τὸ τῆ πέτρα προσσχόμενον κογχυλίον. ἦ ὑψηλόν, ἀκρότατον. ὀρεινόν, *Suda* λ 284 A. λέπας: ἀκρωτήριο. Λεπάς δὲ κογχυλίου εἶδος κτλ.

¹⁵⁷ The term occurs also in Tzetzes' account of the etymology of the city-name Lepre(i)on, which, in all likelihood, was based on the ancient exegesis to Aristoph. *Av.* 149. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the word (and perhaps its Theocritean occurrence) played a role within the scholarly debate on the origin of the toponym.

¹⁵⁸ Heine Nielsen 2001, 544. See also Baladié 1978, 280.

also with Photios' entry *s.v.* Λέπρεον (λ 196 Th.), where the first proposed etymology is indeed ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου τραχέος ὄρους ("from the steep mountain that lies there"). What is more, reading λέπας εἶναι instead of λέπειν makes the following section more understandable, for διαφαίνονται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὄρεινης can be translated "indeed it (*scil.* the territory) stands out against the mountainous region".

πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτόθι ποικίλας ... ἐκ τοῦ πάθους: as already suspected by Rutherford (1896a, 442), the text of the annotation results from the erroneous conflation of different comments. In particular, the section spanning from πέτρας to πάθους looks like a tentative explanation of Didymos' first proposed etymology, but with a misunderstanding of its wording (probably due to the corruption that eventually led to the transmitted λέπειν). Indeed, the comment tries to explain in which sense the χώρα itself has λέπρα, by saying that there are rocks that somehow resemble the look of people affected by the condition (πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτόθι ποικίλας τῷ χρώματι καὶ διαλεύκους, ὁμοίας τοῖς τὰς ὄψεις λεπριῶσι). Moreover, several linguistic elements suggest that the section is in fact an addition to the pre-existing exegesis: firstly, the presence of a second γὰρ at such close distance from the first (διαφαίνονται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὄρεινης· πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι κτλ); secondly, the pleonastic διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ὠνομάσθαι, compared to the opening of the Didymean fragment (Δίδυμος δέ φησι Λέπρεον ὠνομάσθαι κτλ); thirdly, the complement ἐκ τοῦ πάθους, that cannot but be a reference to the λέπρα¹⁵⁹, which is alluded to only in the second part of Didymos' exegesis (ταύτη τῇ νόσῳ).

ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρώτους οἰκήσαντας τὴν πόλιν ταύτη τῇ νόσῳ κατεσχῆσθαι: the second etymology offered by Didymos implies that the founders of the city suffered from the skin condition known to the Greeks as λέπρα¹⁶⁰. The same piece of information is reported by Pausanias (5.5.5 οἱ δὲ τοῖς πρώτων οἰκήσασιν ἐν τῇ γῆ νόσον φασὶν ἐπιγενέσθαι λέπραν καὶ οὕτω τὸ ὄνομα λαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκητόρων τῇ συμφορᾷ) as further possible origin of the toponym, after the name of the mythical founder (Lepreos or Leprea, see Paus. 5.5.4f.).

τοὺς οὖν πλησιοχώρους "λεπρεώτας" αὐτοὺς καλεῖν ... Λέπρεον τὴν πόλιν καλέσαι: the spelling λεπρεώτας offered by VEG is an erroneous version of the expected Λεπρεάτας¹⁶¹. The correct form is preserved, instead, by the alternative redaction of the second part of the scholium in Lh (ἐκαλοῦντο δέ, φησί, πρότερον οἱ πολῖται "λεπρεάται" ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιοῦτου πάθους).

¹⁵⁹ See [Gal.] *Intr. seu medicus* 14,758 Kühn λέπρα δὲ πάθος μὲν καὶ αὐτὴ δέρματος ἐπὶ τὸ λευκότερον καὶ τραχύτερον τρεπόμενον and the Lh version of the last part of the *scholium* (ἐκαλοῦντο δέ, φησί, πρότερον οἱ πολῖται "λεπρεάται" ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιοῦτου πάθους).

¹⁶⁰ «From a medical point of view, it is difficult to define exactly what *lepra* was, since it seems to have covered a wide variety of non-infectious skin conditions» (Maxwell-Stuart 1981, 62). See also Demaitre 2007, 85-87.

¹⁶¹ See *e.g.* Thuc. 5.31.4 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐδὲν ἤσσαν ἐδίκασαν αὐτονόμους εἶναι Λεπρεάτας, Plb. 4.80.5 ὁ δὲ Φιλίδης, ὁρῶν τοὺς Λεπρεάτας ἀνδρωδῶς ὑφισταμένους καὶ τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἐγγίζοντας, ἐξεχώρησε τῆς πόλεως, Str. 8.3.16 χώραν δ' εἶχον εὐδαίμονα οἱ Λεπρεᾶται, Steph. Byz. 18.112 Σέρρειον· ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Θράκης. ἔστι καὶ πόλις Σαμοθράκης. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Σερρειεύς καὶ Σερρεώτης, ὡς τοῦ Λαύρειον Λαυρεώτης, καὶ Σερρεάτης, ὡς Λέπρειον Λεπρεάτης.

ὁ δὲ ἄρσενικῶς εἶπεν: the observation (whether Didymean or not) on the aberrant grammatical gender of the toponym in Aristoph. *Av.* 149 – *i.e.* masculine instead of neutrum – does not clarify the comic function of the replacement of the expected τό with τόν, but probably implies it.

fr. 226 (= II 14.23, p. 252 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of ἔλεγχοι in Av. 217

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 217 Holwerda

τοῖς σοῖς **VEΓ** ἔλεγχοις **RVEΓ**: “τοῖς ἔλεγχοις” Γ ἀντί τοῦ “τοῖς θρήνοις”. εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔ ἐ λέγειν. **RVEΓMLh** Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν· ὅτι οἱ πρὸς αὐλὸν ἀδόμμενοι θρήνοι <...>. τὸν γὰρ αὐλὸν πένθιμον ὑπελιήφθαι. **VEΓM**

“to your *elegoi*”: *elegoi* in the sense of “laments”. The word comes from “to say e-e”. Didymos says that the laments sung to the aulos (...). Indeed the aulos was considered mournful.

Aristoph. Av. 215-220 καθαρὰ χωρεῖ διὰ φυλλοκόμου / μίλακος ἠχώ πρὸς Διὸς ἔδρας, / ἴν' ὁ χρυσοκόμας Φοῖβος ἀκούων, / τοῖς σοῖς ἔλεγχοις ἀντιψάλλον / ἔλεφαντόδετον φόρμιγγα, θεῶν / ἴστησι χορούς.

Orion 58,7-14 Sturz (~ *Et. Gud. d 452,13-17 de St.*, cf. *Phot. Bibl. cod. 239 p. 319b Bekker = Procl. Chr. 24-27 Severyns*) ἔλεγχος, ὁ θρήνος, διὰ τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θρήνου εὖ λέγειν τοὺς κατοικοιουμένους. εὐρετὴ δὲ τοῦ ἐλεγείου. οἱ μὲν τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον, οἱ δὲ Μίμνερον, οἱ δὲ Καλλίνον παλαιότερον. ὄθεν πεντάμετρον τῷ ἠρωϊκῷ συνήπτον· οὐχ ὁμοδραμοῦντα τῇ τοῦ προτέρου δυνάμει· ἀλλ' οἷον συνεκπνέοντα, καὶ συσβεννύμενον ταῖς τοῦ τελευτήσαντος τύχαις. οἱ δὲ ὕστερον πρὸς ἅπαντας διαφορώς. οὕτω Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ποιητῶν (fr. ^o345a C.-Pr.) | **Phot. ε 574 Th.** ἔλεγχος· τοὺς θρήνους ἐκάλουν, οἱ καὶ μετὰ αὐλοῦ ἤδοντο· πένθιμος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πρῶτον ὁ αὐλός | **Et. Gen. s.v. ἐλεγεία** (textum constituit Grandolini [1999, 4], ~ *Et. Sym. ε 287 B.*, *Et. M. 326,54-327,6 G.*) ἐλεγεία· τὸ μέτρον καὶ ἀρσενικῶς ἔλεγχος ἢ ὅτι ἐπιλέγεται τῷ ἑξαμέτρῳ τὸ πεντάμετρον· ἢ παρὰ τὸν ἔλεον καὶ τὸν γόον· ἢ παρὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν θανόντων· εἰς ἐπικηδεῖαν γὰρ ἐλέγετο· ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἔ ἐ λέγειν τοὺς τεθνεῶτας· ἢ παρὰ τὸν ἔλεγον τὸν θρήνον. Δίδυμος δὲ ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο τῷ ἠρώφῳ ἐπῆδον ὡς πεντάμετρον καὶ λειπόμενον τοῦ ἠρώου μιμούμενος τὴν τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων ἀπόπασιν ἐπὶ γὰρ μόνοις νεκροῖς πάλαι ἤδοντο | **Et. Gud. d 451,14-20 de St.** [[ἐλεγεία· τὸ μέτρον]]· καὶ ἀρσενικῶς ἔλεγχος. ἢ ὅτι ἐπιλέγεται τῷ ἑξαμέτρῳ τὸ πεντάμετρον· ἢ παρὰ τὸν ἔλ[[εον]] καὶ τὸν [[γόον]]· οἱ δὲ [[παρὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν]] θανόντων· εἰς ἐπικηδεῖα γὰρ ἐγράφοντο· Δημόλεων δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέτρων παρὰ τὸ εὖ [[λέγειν τοὺς τε]]θνεῶτας [[ἢ παρὰ τὸν ἔλεγον, τὸν θρήνον· Δίδυμ]]μ[[ος δὲ ὅτι διὰ τ]]οῦ[[το τῷ]] ἢ[[ῶφ αὐτῷ ἐπῆδον ὡς πεντάμετρον λεγόμενον τῷ ἠρώφῳ μιμούμενοι τὴν]] τ[[ῶν ἀπο]]θ[[ησκόντων ἀπόπασιν· ἐπὶ γὰρ μόνοις νεκροῖς πάλαι ἤδοντο]] | **Suda ε 774 A.** ἔλεγχος· θρήνος. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔ ἐ λέγειν. ἢ οἱ πρὸς αὐλὸν ἀδόμμενοι θρήνοι· τὸν γὰρ αὐλὸν πένθιμον ὑπελιήφθαι. ἢ ὅτι πρὸς αὐλὸν ἤδοντο οἱ θρήνοι, τουτέστιν οἱ ἔλεγχοι. τὸν δὲ αὐλὸν ὕστερον ἐπικηδεῖον Μίδα, φασί, τὸν Γορδίου βασιλεύοντα περιβόμιον ποιῆσαι βουλόμενον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα ἀποθεῶσαι τελευτήσασαν.

1 ἀντί τοῦ VEΓLh, ὃ ἔστι M, om. R | εἴρηται δὲ cett., om. Lh | 2 post θρήνοι exempli gratia lacunam statui

Tereus' anapaestic song of Av. 209-222 – which prepares the audience for a (probably highly virtuosistic) aulos-solo, representing the lament of Prokne, the nightingale¹⁶² – refers to the imminent song with a variety of musical eidographic labels, namely νόμοι (l. 210), ὕμνοι (*ibid.*), θρήνος (see the verb θρηνεῖς, l. 211) and ἔλεγχοι (l. 217)¹⁶³.

¹⁶² For an encompassing study of the character in the Aristophanic play (with an emphasis on its performative and symbolic role and on its representation as an αὐλητρίς), see Barker 2004.

¹⁶³ Av. 209-222 ἄγε, σύννομέ μοι, παῦσαι μὲν ὕπνου, / λῦσον δὲ νόμους ἱερῶν ὕμνων, / οὐς διὰ θείου στόματος θρηνεῖς / τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ σὸν πολὺδακρυν Ἴτυν, / ἐλελιζομένη διεροῖς μέλεσιν / γένυος ξουθηῆς. / καθαρὰ χωρεῖ διὰ φυλλοκόμου / μίλακος ἠχώ πρὸς Διὸς ἔδρας,

This accumulation of genre labels certainly raised the attention of ancient Aristophanic commentators, especially in the complete absence, in the following lines, of an actual song corresponding to any of the categories mentioned. The scholium to *Av.* 217 focuses indeed on the identification of the exact meaning of ἔλεγχοι, the last term used by Tereus to describe Prokne’s song. The comment begins with the identification of ἔλεγχοι with θρήνοι, “laments” (see below), and the reference to one of the many ancient paretymologies¹⁶⁴ of the word ἔλεγχος (*i.e.* ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔ̄ ἔ̄ λέγειν), followed by Didymos’ interpretation.

οἱ πρὸς αὐλὸν ἀδόμενοι θρήνοι <...>. τὸν γὰρ αὐλὸν πένθιμον ὑπειλήφθαι: the scholium reports a seemingly incomplete sentence from Didymos’ hypomnēma. Indeed, the section οἱ πρὸς αὐλὸν ἀδόμενοι θρήνοι does not have any other possible translation but “the laments sung to the sound of the aulos”, a phrase that needs to be somehow integrated, *e.g.* οἱ πρὸς αὐλὸν ἀδόμενοι θρήνοι <ἔλεγχοι ἐκαλοῦντο> *vel simm.* (see Phot. ε 574 Th. ἐλέγους· τοὺς θρήνους ἐκάλουν, οἱ καὶ μετὰ αὐλοῦ ἤδοντο κτλ). Didymos’ comment condenses in few words the well known theory on the threnodic origin of elegy. This is attested from the 1st century BCE onwards both in Greek and Roman writers¹⁶⁵, and was expressed by the grammarian himself in his work *On Lyric Poets* (fr. 345a-e C.-Pr.)¹⁶⁶, in a passage preserved by the tradition of the *etymologica*¹⁶⁷. Modern critics do not agree as to what originated this theory: some argue that an important role was played by elegiac epitaphs (see Page 1936, 209f.; Gentili 1967, 50-63), while others (see Cerri 1976, 33) believe that the idea stemmed directly from the 5th century literary descriptions of the sound of the aulos as inherently mournful (which is what is seemingly implied by Didymos’ τὸν γὰρ αὐλὸν πένθιμον ὑπειλήφθαι), particularly from Pindar’s *Pythian* Twelve – where the auletic τέχνη is presented as an invention of the goddess Athena, aimed at imitating the Gorgons mourning the death of Medusa¹⁶⁸ – and from Il. 209-222 of *Birds*, where the Hoopoe anticipates the mournful nature of Prokne’s song by alluding to the violent death of the child Itys, killed by his mother to avenge her sister Philomela, raped by Tereus¹⁶⁹. Unlike the currently examined fragment, none of the elegy-related excerpts from Didymos’ *On Lyric Poets* mentions the aulos, despite clearly stating the threnodic origin of elegiac poetry¹⁷⁰. The presence of the musical instrument in Didymos’ interpretation of *Av.* 217 could also

/ ἴν’ ὁ χρυσοκόμας Φοῖβος ἀκούων, / τοῖς σοῖς ἐλέγχοις ἀντιψάλλον / ἔλεφαντόδετον φόρμιγγα, θεῶν / ἴστησι χορούς· διὰ δ’ ἀθανάτων / στομάτων χωρεῖ ξύμφωνος ὁμοῦ / θεία μακάρων ὀλοολυγή. See Barker 2004, 192: «We may reasonably ask what *sort* of music the nightingale is represented as performing; and the answer is more than a little confusing. It is too many things at once. It is a νόμος, a ὕμνος, a θρήνος, an ἔλεγχος, a sound to be recapitulated or responded to by the lyre, the inspiration and accompaniment for choral song, and specifically for choral song characterized as ὀλοολυγή. [...] We should bear in mind the fact that it is a recurrent complaint about composers of the ‘new music’ that they ignore established boundaries of genre and style, mixing every sort of music together in an incomprehensible jumble».

¹⁶⁴ A useful list is provided by Severyns 1938, 99-102.

¹⁶⁵ For an overview, see Page 1936, 209f.; Gentili 1967, 50-68; Cerri 1976, 33f. On the traditional link between the aulos and the ritual of funeral lament, see also Huchzermeyer 1931, 21f.; Wilson 1999, 80 n. 85; Steiner 2013, 177f.; Weiss 2017, 260.

¹⁶⁶ On the title of the work, see Grandolini 1999, 2f.; Braswell 2013, 98.

¹⁶⁷ A detailed, critical analysis of all the *testimonia* has been carried out by Grandolini (1999, 3-8).

¹⁶⁸ See Pind. *P.* 12.19-21 παρθένος αὐλῶν τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος, / ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρυάλας ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων / χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ’ ἐρικλάγκταν γόον.

¹⁶⁹ For an overview of the poetic passages that equate ἔλεγχος to the lament for the dead (θρήνος), see Page 1936, 206-209.

¹⁷⁰ The performative nature of elegiac poetry and its relationship to the aulos is a highly problematic topic both in ancient sources and in modern critic (see *e.g.* Huchzermeyer 1931, 30f.; Dover 1964, 187-189; Rosenmeyer 1968; West 1974, 4-21; Bartol 1993, 26-30; Aloni 2009, 168-170).

be due to the performative aspect of Prokne's dirge: this was represented on stage by a *solo* of the aulete, as can be easily deduced from Euelpides' cry of admiration at *Av.* 223f. (Εὐ. ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τοῦ φθέγματος τούρνιθίου / οἶον κατεμελίτωσε τὴν λόχμην ὅλην, "Lord Zeus, that birdy's voice! How it turned the whole thicket to honey!"¹⁷¹) and from the indication αὐλεῖ (τις), preserved by most medieval manuscripts after l. 222 and which may have already been present in the Hellenistic copies of the play available to the grammarian.

¹⁷¹ Translation by Henderson 2000, 47.

fr. 227 (= II 14.24, p. 252 Schmidt)

Subject: the bird-name κηρύλος and Aristophanes' coinage κειρύλος in Av. 299f.

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av. 299a-aa-aβ* Holwerda

ὅστις ἐστὶ κηρύλος **VF²**: <κηρύλον> Εὐφρόνιος (fr. 67 Strecker) φησι τοὺς Δωριεῖς λέγειν, “βάλε δὴ βάλε κηρύλος εἶην” (Alcm. fr. 26 Page/Davies = 90,2 Calame), τοὺς δὲ Ἀττικοὺς κειρύλον **VM₉Γ²Lh** διὰ διφθόγγου γράφειν. **M₉** φησὶ δὲ Δίδυμος τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα κηρύλος λέγεσθαι. **VF²Lh** Ἀντίγονος δέ (fr. 54A-B Dorandi; [Antig.] *Mir.* 23) φησι τοὺς ἄρσενας τῶν ἀλκυόνων κηρύλους λέγεσθαι· οὐς γηράσκοντας αἰ θήλειαι βαστάζουσι τοῖς πτεροῖς. μήποτε παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἐσχημάτικεν. **VM₉Γ²Lh**

a) ὁ δὲ Σποργίλος ἦν κουρεύς. μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ Πλάτων ἐν Σοφισταῖς (fr. 144 K.-A.): “τὸ Σποργίλου κουρεῖον, ἔχθιστον τέγος”. **VM₉Γ²** τοῦτο οὖν ἔστω σημεῖον τοῦ καὶ τὸν κειρύλον ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἠτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην. ἀντέθηκεν οὖν αὐτῷ κουρέα. **VF²**

b) ὅθεν καὶ ἀντέθηκεν αὐτῷ τὸν Σποργίλον, ὃς ἦν κουρεύς. οὗ μὲνηται καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Σοφισταῖς “τὸ Σποργίλου κουρεῖον, ἔχθιστον τέγος”. **Lh**

“What is he? A *kērylos*!”: Euphronios says that the Dorians say *kērylos* – “oh, if I were a *kērylos*” – while the Attics write *keirylos*, with the diphthong. Didymos says that the correct name is *kērylos*. Antigonos says that the male of the alcyons are called *kēryloi*. When they become old, the females carry them on the wings. Maybe (Aristophanes) modelled the word on the verb *keirein* (“to cut”).

a) Sporgilos was a barber. Plato mentions him in the *Sophists*: “Sporgilos’ barber shop, the worst place”. May this be a hint that Aristophanes perhaps derived *keirylos* from *keirein* as well. He replaced “barber” with it.

b) Therefore he replaced it (*keirylos*) with Sporgilos, who was a barber. He is mentioned also by Plato in the *Sophists*: “Sporgilos’ barber shop, the worst place”

Aristoph. Av. 299f. Πε. τίς γάρ ἐσθ' οὐπισθεν αὐτῆς; Επ. ὅστις ἐστὶ; κειρύλος. / Πε. κειρύλος γάρ ἐστιν ὄρνις; Επ. οὐ γάρ ἐστι Σποργίλος;

[Antig.] *Mir.* 23 τῶν δὲ ἀλκυόνων οἱ ἄρσενες κηρύλοι καλοῦνται· ὅταν οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ γήρωσ ἀσθενήσωσιν καὶ μηκέτι δύνονται πέτεσθαι, φέρουσι αὐτοὺς αἰ θήλειαι ἐπὶ τῶν πτερῶν λαβοῦσαι. καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκμάνος λεγόμενον τούτῳ συνφκειωμένον· φησὶν γάρ ἀσθενῆς ὢν διὰ τὸ γῆρας καὶ τοῖς χοροῖς οὐ δυνάμενος συμπεριφέρεισθαι οὐδὲ τῆ τῶν παρθένων ὀρχήσει· “οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρθενικαὶ μελιγάρυες, ἱερόφωνοι, / γυῖα φέρειν δύναται· βάλε δὴ βάλε κηρύλος εἶην, / ὅς τ' ἐπὶ κύματος ἄνθος ἄμ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτῆται / νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, ἀλιπόρφυρος ἱερός ὄρνις” | **Hesych. κ 2013 C.** κειρύλος· τοῦτον ἐνιοὶ κηρύλον λέγουσι. ἐστὶ δὲ ὄρνεν. ὁ δὲ Ἀντίγονος (fr. 54A-B Dorandi, [Antig.] *Mir.* 23) τῶν ἀλκυόνων τοὺς ἄρσενας κηρύλους φησὶ | **Suda κ 1549** κηρύλος· ὁ ἄρρην ἀλκυόνων, ὃς ἐν ταῖς συνουσίαις ἀποθνήσκει. Εὐφρόνιος (fr. 67 Strecker) φησι τοὺς Δωριεῖς λέγειν, “βάλε δέ, βάλε, κηρύλος εἶην”· τοὺς δὲ Ἀττικοὺς κειρύλον. τοὺς δὲ ἄρρενας γηράσκοντας αἰ θήλειαι βαστάζουσι τοῖς πτεροῖς, καὶ μήποτε παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἐσχημάτισται. ὁ γὰρ

Σποργίλος ἦν κουρεύς, μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ Πλάτων ἐν Σοφισταῖς (fr. 144 K.-A.): “τὸ Σποργίλου κουρεῖον, ἔχθιστον τέγος”, σ 964 A. Σποργίλος: ὃς ἦν κουρεύς, καὶ ὁ Πλάτων (fr. 144 K.-A.) φησί: “τὸ Σποργίλου κουρεῖον, ἔχθιστον τέγος” | *schol. rec. Aristoph. Pl. 589c Chantry* εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ παίζειν φασὶ τὸν κωμικὸν πρὸς ὁμοίότητα ἤχου ... τοιοῦτόν τι παίζει καὶ περὶ “κειρύλου” ἐν “Ὀρνισι” (299f.), ἐνθα καὶ διὰ τοῦ “ἦ” νοεῖται ἢ λέξις ὡς ἐπὶ ὄρνιθος οὗτω λεγομένου, καὶ διὰ διφθόγγου δὲ διὰ τινὰ κουρέα ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ “κεῖρω” | *schol. Tz. Lyc. 387 (p. 146,16 Scheer)* κηρύλος ὁ ἄρσην ἀλκυῶν παροξυτόνως διὰ τοῦ ἦ καὶ ἔστι Δωρικόν, κειρύλος δὲ διὰ διφθόγγου καὶ ἔστι προπαροξυτόνον ἀττικῶς, ὡς φησιν Εὐφρόνιος. ... περὶ τῶν κηρύλων καὶ ἅ φησιν Ἀντίγονος λεκτέον· γηράσαντας τοὺς ἄρσενας ἀλκυόνας αἰ θήλειαι βασιτάζουσι τοῖς πετροῖς, ἐν δὲ τῇ συνουσίᾳ γηράσαντες † οἱ ἄρρενες τελευτῶσι.

1 (lemma) κηρύλος edd., κήρυλος (e κηρύλος?) V, κειρύλος Γ² | κηρύλον suppl. Renkema, post λέγειν White | Δωριεῖς λέγειν cett., Δωριεῖς κηρύλος λέγειν Lh | βάλε Lh *Suda* edd. pl., βάλλε VM₉Γ² Bekker | δῆ edd. pl., δὲ cett. Bekker, om. M₉ | 2 βάλε VLh edd. pl., βάλλε M₉Γ² Bekker | κηρύλος Lh, κήρυλος V, κειρύλος Γ² (η s.l. add.), κηρύλλος M₉ | δὲ hic VI², post Ἀττικὸς Lh, om. M₉ | κειρύλον M₉Γ² (η s.l. add. Γ²) edd., *schol. Tz. Lyc. 387*, κήρυλον cett. | 3 φησὶ δὲ Δίδυμος VI², Δίδυμος δὲ Lh | κήρυλος VI²Lh White (ει s.l. add. Γ²), κειρύλος edd. | 3-4 Ἀντίγονος-κηρύλους cett., ὁ δὲ Ἀντίγονος κηρύλλους τοὺς ἄρσενας τῶν ἀλκυόνων M₉ | φησὶ hic VI², post ἀλκυόνων Lh | κηρύλους VLh, κηρύλους Γ² (ει s.l. add.) | οὗς γηράσκοντας Γ², οὗς καὶ γηράσκοντας VLh, γηράσκοντας om. M₉ | 5 μήποτε cett., om. M₉, μήποτε δὲ Lh | post κείρειν, διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς εὐτελῆ add. M₉ | ἐσχημάτικεν V, ἐσχημάτιζεν Γ², ἐσχημάτισεν Lh, om. M₉ | 6 (a) ἦν κουρεύς cett., κουρεύς ἦν M₉ | 6-7 (a) μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ cett., om. M₉ | 7 (a) Πλάτων VM₉, πλάττων Γ² | 9 (a) κειρύλον scripsi, κηρύλον VI² (ει s.l. add. Γ²) edd. | 9 (b) τέγος scripsi, τέλος Lh | 10 (a) ἠτυμολογηκέναι edd., ἐτυμολογηκέναι VI²

Aristophanes turns the gradual entrance of the Birds on stage (ll. 268-304) in a succession of personal jokes, achieved through puns on different ornithonyms¹⁷². The aim of ll. 299f. is to attack an apparently well-known Athenian, a barber-shop owner named (or, possibly, nicknamed) Sporgilos (see below). The rhetorical question οὐ γὰρ ἔστι (*scil.* ὄρνις) Σποργίλος; (“is not Sporgilos a bird?”) seems to imply that Σποργίλος was known to the audience both as a personal and as a bird-name¹⁷³, or perhaps as a nickname intentionally derived from the bird name. This statement – which is in itself not particularly significant on the comic level, since it exploits the evidently well-known double nature of the name Σποργίλος – is introduced (and maybe potentiated) by the previous pun, based on the assonance between the poetical ornithonym κηρύλος (probably a literary alternative to the more common ἀλκυῶν, indicating the *Alcedo atthis*)¹⁷⁴ and the otherwise unattested κειρύλος¹⁷⁵. The gist of the joke is made obscure by the uncertainty of the manuscript tradition. Indeed, Γ and U are the only manuscripts that offer the reading κειρύλος both in l. 299 (although Γ simply writes the diphthong ει *supra lineam*, above the primary reading κηρύλος) and in l. 300, while the remaining testimonies unanimously carry κηρύλος in both lines. The vast majority of the editors prints κειρύλος in l. 299 as well as in l. 300¹⁷⁶, with the exception of Boissonade (1826, 220, later followed by Sommerstein 1987, 50 and Henderson 2000, 56-58), who opts for κηρύλος in l. 299 and for κειρύλος in l. 300 (thus reproducing, in fact, the primary text of Γ)¹⁷⁷.

¹⁷² See e.g. Kanavou 2011, 116-121.

¹⁷³ See Sommerstein 1987, 217; Dunbar 1995, 248; Arnott 2007, 257, 321, 326f.; Kanavou 2011, 117. Hesych. σ 1463 H. (σπέργουλος· ὄρνιθάριον ἄγριον) might prove the existence of a dialectal form somehow connected to Σποργίλος (see *GEW* 771f.; *DELG* 1040f.; *EDG* 1386).

¹⁷⁴ See Rogers 1906, xlviiii; Arnott 2007, 139f.

¹⁷⁵ The accentuation of the word is uncertain. It is generally printed as paroxytone by the editors of Aristophanes and as proparoxytone in all the editions of the scholia. I prefer the first accentuation but every occurrence of the word offered here reflects the choice of the respective editor.

¹⁷⁶ See e.g. Bothe 1829, 288; Meineke 1860, 15; Holden 1868, 326; Dindorf 1869, 87; Kock 1894, 96f.; van Leeuwen 1902, 54f.; Hall-Geldart 1906; Rogers 1906, 38; Dunbar 1995, 73; Wilson 2007, 360.

¹⁷⁷ Bergk's text (1872, 16) completely rejects the diphthongated variant.

Both editorial solutions respect the idea of a pun, but while the first ascribes the comic deformation of the bird-name already to the Hoopoe in l. 299 (presuming, in this way, an immediate recognition of the base-word by the audience), the second presents it as the result of a confusion on Peisetairos' side, in l. 300 (thus having the misunderstanding actively happen on stage¹⁷⁸).

Regardless of the preferred textual arrangement of the Aristophanic passage, the main obstacle to the understanding of the joke is represented by the *hapax* κειρύλος, a comic coinage that already puzzled ancient readers, as the scholiastic material to *Av.* 299f. shows. The annotation is articulated in two parts, the first dealing with κηρύλος and κειρύλος, the second focused on the identity of Sporgilos. In addition, a strongly abridged version of the annotation is preserved in the left margin of Γ (written by the first hand) and, partially, as glosses, in **M₉** and **Lh**¹⁷⁹. The first commentator to be quoted is Euphronios¹⁸⁰: he explained κειρύλος as the Attic version of the Doric κηρύλος, of which he gave an attestation (from Alcman, fr. 26,2 Page/Davies = 90,2 Calame)¹⁸¹. This stance entails that the grammarian read (or wrote) the diphthongated form in both lines of the Aristophanic passage (see Dunbar 1995, 246). Plausibly, Euphronios' exegesis was directly quoted (and thus preserved) in Didymos' hypomnēma.

Δίδυμος τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα κηρύλος λέγεσθαι: in spite of the unanimity of the manuscripts on the wrongly accented form κήρυλος (with the exception of the insertion *supra lineam* of the diphthong εἰ in Γ²), all editors¹⁸² except for White (1914, 72) have always printed the reading κείρυλος, implying that this was the true name of the bird according to Didymos¹⁸³. More specifically, the phrase τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα (see below) seems to entail that Didymos wanted to draw a distinction between the authentic bird-name and the comically altered one. The section μήποτε παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἐσχημάτικεν (see below) constitutes a relevant counterpart to Didymos' identification of the correct ornithonym since it signals the perception of the Aristophanic altered word being intentionally modelled on the verb κείρειν, "to cut". It seems, therefore, more reasonable, in order to explain the entire annotation, to postulate that Didymos considered the almost unanimously transmitted κηρύλος as the base-word, intentionally altered by Aristophanes in κειρύλος with an alleged reference to the verb κείρειν. This does not allow to draw any conclusions as to the Aristophanic text underlying Didymos' exegesis. Indeed, the grammarian might have either read (1) the diphthongated form in both l. 299 and l. 300,

¹⁷⁸ For similar assonance-based jokes, see e.g. Aristoph. *Pax* 453-455 (Τρ. ἡμῖν δ' ἀγαθὰ γένοιτ'. ἰὴ παιῶν, ἰή. / Χο. ἄφελε τὸ παίειν, ἀλλ' "ἰή" μόνον λέγε. / Τρ. ἰὴ ἰὴ τοίνυν, ἰὴ μόνον λέγω), 925f. (Τρ. τῷ δαὶ δοκεῖ; βούλεσθε λαρινῶ βοῖ; / Χο. βοῖ; μηδαμῶς, ἵνα μὴ βοηθεῖν ποι δέη),

¹⁷⁹ i.e. *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 299b Holwerda ὅστις ἐστὶ κηρύλος; ὁ ἄρσιν ἀλκυῶν κηρύλος λέγεται. ἐν δὲ ταῖς συνουσίαις ἀποθνήσκει. ὁ δὲ Σποργίλος κουρεὺς ἦν. διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς εὐτελεῖ.

¹⁸⁰ See Novembri 2020 (with bibliography) and the Introduction § 3.2.

¹⁸¹ The involvement of Alcman in the interpretation of *Av.* 299f. is probably also due to Aristophanes' patent paraphrase, in ll. 250-252 (ὦν τ' ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης / φῦλα μετ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτῆται, / δεῦρ' ἔτε πεισόμενοι τὰ νεώτερα) of the poet's description of the κηρύλος as the bird ὅς τ' ἐπὶ κύματος ἄνθος ἄμ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτῆται (l. 3). The allusion was clear to ancient scholars, as shown by *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 250b Holwerda (ὦν τ' ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα: ... ἔστι δὲ παρὰ τὸ Ἀλκμᾶνος κτλ).

¹⁸² See Bekker 1829b, 237; Dindorf 1838c, 174; Dübner 1842, 217; Holwerda 1991, 54.

¹⁸³ See also Sommerstein 1987, 50. More cautiously, Dunbar 1995, 246: «textual variants [...] make it uncertain which of the two (*scil.* κηρύλος or κειρύλος) the later scholar Didymos asserted [...] was the 'natural' form».

deriving κηρύλος from extra-Aristophanic evidence, or (2) the base form κηρύλος in l. 299 and κειρύλος in l. 300 (as in the primary text of Γ).

As regards the formulation τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα (which echoes Kratilos' naturalism in the Platonic dialogue), the only scholiastic parallel is *schol.* Apoll. Rhod. 1.760-762d Wendel, where the expression describes the term μήτηρ as indicative of the 'natural' (*i.e.* familial) relation between two characters¹⁸⁴. The phrase κατὰ φύσιν is scantily attested in the scholia to Aristophanes and only in *schol.* Aristoph. V. 201a Koster (κατὰ φύσιν δὲ ἦν μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν κτλ) does it seem to convey the idea of language correctness. A first attempt at explaining Didymos' τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα was made by von Leutsch (1847, 30s.)¹⁸⁵: on the basis of Didymos' opinion that "almost all birds get their names from their cries"¹⁸⁶, he supposed that the grammarian derived the ornithonym κηρύλος from the bird-cry κήρυξ. The word, however, occurs as bird-cry only in the paraphrase of Oppianus' *On Bird-catching* ascribed to Dionysios (*Av.* 2, 8, in a passage dedicated to the ἄλκυών with no reference to the κηρύλος), while it is widely attested as bird-name (see von Leutsch *ibid.*). Wackernagel (1876, 25) convincingly interpreted κατὰ φύσιν as equivalent to adjectives like ἀπαθές, ὀλόκληρον or ἐντελές, which – in the ancient theory of the "pathology" of words¹⁸⁷ – indicated the forms that had not yet undergone any kind of modification (πάθος). In addition, τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα could also be a hint that Didymos based his statement on the correct spelling of the ornithonym on evidence coming from zoological writings. Indeed, the term is found not only in Antigonos' *On Animals* (see below), but also in Aristotle's *History of Animals*¹⁸⁸ and in the Byzantine zoological sylloge of Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos¹⁸⁹, which claims to report "Aristophanes' epitome of Aristotle's *On Animals*, with the addition of the things said by Ailianos and Timotheos for each animal"¹⁹⁰, a statement that is considered true for most of the material found in the first and in part of the second book of the sylloge¹⁹¹. Ancient literary exegesis shows frequent contacts with scientific texts¹⁹²: a clear example comes from the discussion on the ἄλκυών and the κηρύλος in the anonymous *schol.* Theoc. 7.57a-b Wendel, where three zoological sources (Alexander of Myndos¹⁹³, Antigonos and Aristotle) are quoted in direct succession. Moreover, Didymos probably used Aristotle and/or

¹⁸⁴ Τιτυὸν μέγαν: τὸ "μέγαν" θαυμαστικῶς εἴρηται, ὅτι βούπαις ὧν μέγαν ἐτόξευσεν. καὶ ἦτοι πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἀκουστέον ἢ πρὸς τὸ ὑπ' ὧν εἶναι τὴν ὕβριν τῆς μητρός, ὅτι πολλάκις τὰ δεινὰ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ τὴν φύσιν οἶδε βιάζεσθαι. πρὸς δ' ὁ ποιητὴς οὐ τῷ κυρίῳ ὀνόματι ἐχρήσατο, ἀλλὰ τῷ κατὰ φύσιν, μητέρα εἰπών.

¹⁸⁵ Later followed by White 1914, 72.

¹⁸⁶ Ath. 9.392f Πρατίνας δ' ἐν Δυμαίνας ἢ Καρυάτισιν (*TrGF* 4 F 1 Sn.) ἀδύφωνον ἰδίως καλεῖ τὸν ὄρνυγα, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τι παρὰ τοῖς Φλιασίοις ἢ τοῖς Λάκωσι φωνήεντες, ὡς καὶ οἱ πέρδικες. καὶ ἡ σιαλὶς δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου ἂν εἴη, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος (fr. 32 C.-Pr.), ὀνομασμένη. σχεδὸν γὰρ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ὀρνέων ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἔχει τὴν ὀνομασίαν.

¹⁸⁷ On this field of ancient grammatical enquiry and on the monographs *Περὶ παθῶν* written by Didymos (fr. °328 C.-Pr.), Apollonios Dyskolos and (possibly) Tryphon, see Wackernagel 1876; Braswell 2017, 89; Valente 2015 (with further bibliography).

¹⁸⁸ *HA* 593b περὶ δὲ τὴν θάλατταν καὶ ἄλκυών καὶ κήρυλος.

¹⁸⁹ *Exc. Const. De nat. An.* 1.23 Lambros τῶν δὲ περωτῶν ὀρνίθων ἃ μὲν ἐστὶν εἶδη νυκτερινὰ ἃ δὲ ἡμερινὰ, καὶ ἃ μὲν θάλασσια ἃ δὲ ποτάμια ἃ δὲ χερσαῖα. ... θάλασσια δὲ ἄλκυών, κήρυλος, αἰθουα, λάρως, χαραδριός, καταρράκτης, κέπφος, κίγκλος. The title given by the manuscript tradition is *Συλλογὴ τῆς περὶ ζῴων ἱστορίας, χερσαίων πτηνῶν τε καὶ θαλαττίων, Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ μεγάλῳ βασιλεῖ καὶ αὐτοκράτορι φιλοπονηθεῖσα* (see Zucker 2012, 2).

¹⁹⁰ *Exc. Const. de nat. an. pro.* 4-6 Ἀριστοφάνους τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ζῴων ἐπιτομή, ὑποτεθέντων ἐκάστῳ ζῴῳ καὶ τῶν Αἰλιανῶ καὶ Τιμοθέῳ καὶ ἑτέροις τισὶ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρημένων.

¹⁹¹ See Lambros 1885, V-XX; Berger 2012, 3-9; Zucker 2012; Hellmann 2015, 1248-1251.

¹⁹² See Hellmann 2015, 1245-1251.

¹⁹³ On the polymath Alexander of Myndos (1st cent. BCE – 1st cent. CE), see Wellmann 1891 and Arnott 1987.

Aristophanes' epitome in a few more cases (see fr. 2, 228 and 241). His expression τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα might therefore reflect the influence of zoological writings on his interpretation.

Ἀντίγονος δέ φησι τοὺς ἄρσενας τῶν ἀλκυόνων κηρύλους λέγεσθαι κτλ: the quotation can be attributed to the work *On Animals* (*Περὶ ζῴων*) composed by Antigonos of Carystos in the 3rd century BCE. The anecdote clearly depends on Alcman's composition (fr. 26 Page/Davies = 90,2 Calame, on which Euphronios' exegesis also relies, see above)¹⁹⁴ as shown by the corresponding passage in the *Collection of Incredible Stories* (*Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή*) preserved by the Palat. gr. 398 ([Antig.] *Mir.* 23)¹⁹⁵. It cannot be excluded that the quote was in fact originally embedded in Didymos' comment: although this would be the only case of direct use of Antigonos by the grammarian, the hypothesis is supported by the reference to Antigonos in Hesychios' entry *s.v.* κηρύλος (κ 2013 C.), which could easily rely on Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary*¹⁹⁶. In particular, if – as suggested above – Didymos believed the authentic bird-name to be κηρύλος (and not κείρυλος, as all editors of the scholia to Aristophanes suppose), a quotation of Antigonos' *On Animals* would be undoubtedly consistent with the exegetic sequence.

μήποτε παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἐσχημάτικεν: the cautious tone¹⁹⁷, expressed through the adverb μήποτε¹⁹⁸, may suggest the ascription of this section to Didymos' interpretation. The expression is paralleled by ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν κτλ at the end of the second part of the annotation. Besides being widely used in its generic meaning of “to depict”, “to represent”, the verb σχηματίζω also occurs when the scholia explain puns that involve linguistic coinages¹⁹⁹. With regard to the supposed derivation of κηρύλος from κείρω (supported by the identification of Sporgilos as κουρεύς, “barber”, see below), it has to be noted that the verb was paretymologically linked, at some point, also to another bird-name, *i.e.* κείρις²⁰⁰ (which is equated to the ἀλκυόν in Hdn. III/2, 532,3 Lentz κείρις: ὄρνεον. ἰέραξ. οἱ δὲ ἀλκυόνα, see also Hesych. κ 2011 C.). The only clear attestation of this paretymology is in Ovid's account of the myth of Skylla's metamorphosis (see Ov. *Met.* 8.147f. *plumis in avem mutata vocatur / ciris et a tonso est hoc nomen adepta capillo*²⁰¹). In the absence of any other Greek occurrences of the ornithonym κείρις²⁰², Ovid's potential sources cannot be identified. However, Kallimachos' *Aitia* might have played a role, if Pfeiffer's integration Κ]εῖριπν in ll. 4 and 9 of fr. 113

¹⁹⁴ See Dunbar 1995, 247; Hinge 2006, 296. According to Clausen (1881, 69f.), Antigonos was actually Euphronios' source.

¹⁹⁵ ff. 243v-261v. For a discussion on the highly debated relationship between Antigonos of Carystos and the *Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή*, see Dorandi 1999 XI-XXXII; 2005, 121-124; Ronconi 2007, 33-75.

¹⁹⁶ On the relationship between Hesychios and Didymos, see Schmidt 1854, 29-36 and the Introduction § 5.1.

¹⁹⁷ See Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and Did. fr. 229, 230, 237, 267, 269 (below).

¹⁹⁸ The adverb was long considered a mark of Didymeian authorship in anonymous exegetic material, but its relevance was later challenged (see *e.g.* Boudreaux 1919, 110-112; Wilson 1984, 93f.; Montana 1996, 30 n. 64).

¹⁹⁹ See *e.g. schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1043 Holwerda Ὅτοτύξιοι] ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀτοτύξιν ἐσχημάτισεν.

²⁰⁰ κείρις and κηρύλος were already assimilated by Lobeck (1843, 123). Kakridis (1974, 74) highlights the identity between Didymos' paretymology of κηρύλος and the paretymology of *ciris* in Latin sources, but does not draw any further conclusions.

²⁰¹ The complete narration covers ll. 17-151. The same myth must have been treated by Parthenios (*SH* 637, fr. 24 Lightfoot), besides being quickly alluded to in Verg. *G.* 1.404-409 and being at the centre of the pseudo-Vergilian *Ciris* (for a general discussion on the problematic authorship of the *Ciris* and its relationship with Ovid, see Bömer 1977, 13-17).

²⁰² With the exception of Planudes' translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (8.189s. κείρις καλεῖται, κὰκ τοῦ κεκαρμένου / πλοκάμου τοῦνομα τοῦτ' ἐπορίσατο).

(= fr. 63 Massimilla) is correct²⁰³. The link between the two works would be even more cogent if one of the occurrences of the accusative Κ]εῖριν in the *Aitia* were instead interpreted as an itacistic spelling of the infinitive κείρειν. Though highly speculative, the hypothetical backdating of the paretyymology of κείρις from κείρω to Kallimachos²⁰⁴ would allow to consider the passage of the *Aitia* as the potential source not only of Ovid's explanation of the name *ciris* but also of Didymos' explanation of Aristophanes' κειρύλος. Indeed, the grammarian – aware of (or himself postulating) the similarity between κείρις, ἄλκυών and κηρύλος, later attested by Herodian (see above) – might have been influenced by the paretyymology of the first ornithonym in his interpretation of Aristophanes' coinage²⁰⁵.

ὁ δὲ Σποργίλος ἦν κουρεύς. μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ Πλάτων κτλ: the section concerning Sporgilos – which is framed by the two references to the alleged paretymologic alteration of the bird-name κηρύλος in κειρύλος on the base of the verb κείρω – is easily ascribable to Didymos not only because of his widely attested interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* (see fr. 257, 259, 266, 268 below), but also because the identification of Sporgilos as a barber (thanks to a line from Plato's *Sophists*) is consistent with the reconstructed explanation of the passage: Didymos considered κηρύλος the authentic ornithonym (and possibly used Antigonos' *On Animals* as supporting evidence) and suggested that the Aristophanic κειρύλος was a comic coinage (ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἠτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην) implying a reference to the verb κείρω and thus to the famous barber Sporgilos. The verb μνημονεύω (see also μέμνηται **Lh**) falls into the second category identified by Chronopoulos (2011, 212f.), since it presents the mockery as «one more instance of public or private discussions about the person ridiculed» (*ibid.*), without defining it as a speech act specific of comedy (as happens with κωμωδεῖται and its synonyms), but also without considering the lampooning portrayal as historically accurate.

τοῦτο οὖν ἔστω σημεῖον τοῦ καὶ τὸν κειρύλον ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἠτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην κτλ: the unanimous choice of the editors²⁰⁶ of adopting, in this case, the reading κηρύλον (κήρυλον **V**), transmitted by **VΓ**² instead of the diphthongated form hinted at by the εἰ added *supra lineam* by **Γ**² cannot be accepted. Indeed, on the base of the proposed interpretation of the entire exegetic sequence, one needs to restore κειρύλον, since the expression ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἠτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην cannot but refer to the allegedly modified form κειρύλος.

²⁰³ The integration has been generally accepted by the subsequent critics, see Massimilla 1996, 374f.; D'Alessio 1996, 544f. n. 1; Harder 2012, 870-873.

²⁰⁴ See O'Hara 2017, 33, 263s.

²⁰⁵ On paretyymology in Didymos' exegesis, see also fr. 224, 225, 261, 262 and the Conclusions § 1.4.

²⁰⁶ See Bekker 1829b, 237; Dindorf 1838c, 175; Dübner 1842, 217; White 1914, 72; Holwerda 1991, 55.

fr. 228 (= II 14.25, p. 252 Schmidt)

Subject: identification of the bird named κερχνης

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 304a-b Holwerda

πορφυρίς Γ: ἡ πορφυρίς ἀναγράφεται **VI** (*scil.* ἐν τοῖς Καλλιμάχου, fr. 423 Pf.²⁰⁷) κερχνης δὲ οὐ, Γ ἀλλὰ κερχνή. Γ² καὶ ἡ κολυμβίς δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ὁ δρύοψ καὶ ἡ ἀμπελίς. Γ κερχνης δὲ οὐκ ἀναγράφεται, ἀλλὰ κερχνή. Δίδυμος δὲ τὸν μικρὸν ἰερακά φησιν. **VI**

porphyris: the *porphyris* is listed (in Kallimachos' *On birds*). The *kerchnēis*²⁰⁸ is not, but the form *kerchnē* is. The *kolymbis* also occurs (there) as well as *dryops* and *ampelis*. The *kerchnēis*, instead, is not mentioned, but the *kerchnē* is. Didymos says it is a small raptor.

Aristoph. Av. 304 πορφυρίς, κερχνης, κολυμβίς, ἀμπελίς, φήνη, δρύοψ.

Aristot. GA 750a τὰ δὲ γαμψώνυχα τὴν βάσιν ἰσχυρὰν ἔχει καὶ τὰ σκέλη πάχος ἔχοντα διὰ τὸν βίον· ὥστε διὰ πάσα ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας οὐτ' ὀχευτικά ἐστὶν οὔτε πολύγωνα. μάλιστα δὲ ἡ κερχνης πολύγονον, **HA 558b** τὰ δὲ γαμψώνυχα πάντα ὀλιγόγωνα ἐστὶν, ἕξω κερχνίδος· αὐτὴ δὲ πλείστα τίκει τῶν γαμψώνυχων, **593b-594a** ἔστι δὲ τὸ τῶν ὄρνεων γένος πᾶν μὲν ὀλιγόποτον, οἱ δὲ γαμψώνυχοι καὶ ἅπτοιοι πάμπαν, εἰ μὴ τι ὀλίγον γένος καὶ ὀλιγάκις. μάλιστα δὲ τοιοῦτον ἡ κερχνης | **Hdn. III/2 531,21 Lentz** κερχνης, κέρκνος, ἰεραξ | **Ael. NA 2.43** ἔστι φῶλον ἰεράκων, καὶ καλεῖται κερχνης, καὶ ποτοῦ δέεται οὐδέν, **2.4** γένη δὲ ἰεράκων πλείονα ἄρα ἦν, καὶ ἔοικεν ὑπαινίττεσθαι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη τοῦτο. φησὶ γοῦν (*seqq.* *Av.* 1178-1181), **13.25** Ἴνδοι γὰρ οὐκ ἐκφαυλίζουσι ζῶον οὔτε μὴν ἡμερον οὐδὲ ἄγριον οὐδέν. αὐτίκα γοῦν δωροφοροῦσι τῶν ὑπηκόων οἱ διὰ τιμῆς ἰόντες γεράνους τε καὶ χήνας ἀλεκτορίδας τε καὶ νήττας καὶ τρυγόνους τε καὶ ἀτταγᾶς, προσέτι πέρδικας τε καὶ σπινδάλους (ἔστι δὲ ἐμπερές τῶ ἀτταγᾶ τοῦτο γε) καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις τῶν προειρημένων βραχύτερα, βωκκαλίδας καὶ συκαλίδας καὶ τὰς καλουμένας κερχνίδας | **Hesych. δ 2433** δρύοψ· ὄρνεόν τι διαφέρειν τοῦ δρυοκολάπτου, **κ 1968** κερχνίλης κερχνης, τριόρχης, **1970** κερχνης· ὄρνεου εἶδος, **2370** κερχνη· τὸ ἐκ τῆς μελίνης ἐψημα. ἢ τὰ νῶτα τῶν ἰχθύων. καὶ ὄρνεου εἶδος. καὶ ἡ μελίχρους, **3399 C.** κολυμβίς· ὄρνις ποιός | **Phot. κ 619 Th.** κερχνης· ὄρνεον | **Exc. Const. de nat. an. 1.22 Lambros** (= *Suda* ε 2556 A.) γαμψώνυχα δὲ εἴρηται ὅσα τῶν περωτῶν τὴν ἐπιρρυγίδα γεγάμψωκεν ὑπὸ τὴν γένυν, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ τε ἀετὸς καὶ ὁ ἰεραξ καὶ κερχνη ἄλλα τε τὰ μὴ πίνοντα | *schol.* **Aristoph. Av. 302** κορυδός, ἐλεᾶς: ὁ κορυδός παρὰ Ἀριστοτέλει κορυδὸν λέγεται, εἰ μὴ ἕτερός ἐστιν· ποικίλα γὰρ τὰ ὀνόματα. ὁ δὲ ἐλεᾶς μήποτε ἐλείας ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς Καλλιμάχου (fr. 421 Pf.) ἀναγραφόμενος· φησὶ γάρ· “ἔλεια μικρὸν, φωνὴ ἀγαθόν”. ἀναγράφεται δὲ καὶ ἡ ὑποθυμὶς καὶ ὁ νέρτος καὶ ὁ ἐρυθρόπους καὶ ἡ πορφυρίς καὶ ὁ δρύοψ καὶ ἡ ἀμπελίς, **589b Holwerda** κερχνηίδων: μήποτε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν οὐχὶ “κερχνης” γραπτέον, ἀλλὰ σὺν τῶ ἰ “κερχνης”, ὡς Νηρηίς. νῦν γὰρ “κερχνηίδων” εἶπεν.

1 κερχνης Γ, κερχνης Bekker, κερχνης Holwerda | **1-2** κερχνης-κερχνή cod. Bekker, κερχνης δὲ οὐκ ἀναγράφεται, ἀλλὰ κερχνη Dindorf Dübner White | **2** κερχνή Γ², κερχνή Holwerda | pr. ἢ Γ^{bc}, γὰρ Γ^{ac} | pr. δὲ Γ², om. Γ | φαίνεται Γ, φέρεται dub. Holwerda | ὁ postea inser. Γ | κερχνης Γ, κερχνης acc. om. V | **2-3** κερχνης-κερχνή om. Bekker Dindorf Dübner | **3** κερχνή Γ, κερουμή V

The long list that concludes the entrance of the Chorus (*Av.* 302-304) is a mixture of common bird-names found frequently throughout Greek literature and mostly easy to identify (like κίττα, τρυγόν, κορυδός,

²⁰⁷ See *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 302 ὁ δὲ ἐλεᾶς μήποτε ἐλείας ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς Καλλιμάχου (fr. 421 Pf.) ἀναγραφόμενος κτλ, 303a Holwerda καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς Καλλιμάχου (fr. 422 Pf.) ἀναγράφεται “κέβλη” κτλ.

²⁰⁸ I follow the spelling adopted in Holwerda' edition (1991, 56).

περιστερὰ, ἰέραξ, φάσσα, κόκκυξ, κολυμβίς, φήνη²⁰⁹), and rather obscure ones, sometimes occurring only in this Aristophanic passage, such as ὑποθυμῖς, νέρτος, ἐρυθρόπους, κεβλήπυρις, πορφυρίς, κερχνής, ἀμπελῖς and δρύοψ²¹⁰.

The interest of ancient scholars for the names of the Chorus members is well attested in the related scholiastic material. This evidently relies on the work of a commentator that compared Aristophanes' list with two of the most important ornithological works of Greek antiquity, namely Aristotle's zoological books²¹¹ and Kallimachos' *On birds*. In *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 303a Holwerda, the quotation from Kallimachos' work apparently acts as piece of evidence for Symmachos' statement that the bird-name κεβλήπυρις should be considered as two separate words²¹². This suggests that Symmachos is in fact the main source of the scholiastic material on *Av.* 302-304 (and thus of Didymos' fragment), although it is more than likely that the commentator did not have direct access to the Callimachean work, but rather reused the relevant parts quoted by his predecessor Didymos²¹³. With regard to the five ornithonyms said by the scholium to have featured in Kallimachos' *On Birds*, each case has to be investigated separately. Firstly, the statement on the πορφυρίς is confirmed by a passage from the *Learned Banqueters* (Ath. 9.388 d-e²¹⁴), where the author is quoted explicitly in relation to the difference between the πορφυρίς and the πορφυρίων. These are identified as two separate birds, although in all likelihood πορφυρίς is simply a rare poetic variant (attested only in *Aristoph. Av.* 304 and in the two fragments by Ibykos [317a-b P.] quoted by Athenaios in the same passage) of the common name πορφυρίων²¹⁵. As far as the κολυμβίς is concerned, Athenaios' digression on the νήτται (9.395c-f²¹⁶) includes a reference to the μικρὰ κολυμβίς²¹⁷ that, however, seems to derive from Alexander of Myndos²¹⁸, while at the

²⁰⁹ See Arnott 2007 *s. vv.*

²¹⁰ For the items not discussed below, see Arnott 2007 *s. vv.* Kakridis (1974, 75) underlines that the order in which the birds are mentioned is not casual, but shows some groupings (small birds, birds of prey, ornithonyms relating to the colour red and bird-names ending in *-is*).

²¹¹ See *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 302 Holwerda ὁ κορυδὸς παρὰ Ἀριστοτέλει κορυδῶν λέγεται [HA 609a7], εἰ μὴ ἕτερός ἐστιν· ποικίλα γὰρ τὰ ὀνόματα.

²¹² See *ibid.* μήποτε οὐχ ἓν ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ δύο, φησὶν ὁ Σύμμαχος· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς Καλλιμάχου ἀναγέγραπται “κέβλη” ἴεταματ' Ἐρμίππου Τετραμέτροις [fr. 6 W., test. 8 K.-A.] “καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα ἴτον πρῶν†, ὅστις ὦν κέβλη· πυρίς †τίς† ὀνομάζετο”. ὥστε ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐκεῖ ἡμάρτηται τὸ ἐν περὶ τὴν γραφὴν. See also Clausen 1881, 4; Martínez 2001, 56.

²¹³ See Schauenburg 1881, 13. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 229-231; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

²¹⁴ πορφυρίς. Καλλιμάχος δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὀρνίθων (fr. 414 Pf.) διεστάναι φησὶ πορφυρίωνα πορφυρίδος, ἰδίᾳ ἐκάτερον καταριθμούμενος· τὴν τροφήν τε λαμβάνειν τὸν πορφυρίωνα ἐν σκότῳ καταδύομενον, ἵνα μὴ τις αὐτὸν θεάσῃται. ἐχθραίνει γὰρ τοὺς προσιόντας αὐτοῦ τῇ τροφῇ. τῆς δὲ πορφυρίδος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ὀρνισιν μνημονεύει (304). Ἴβυκος δέ (fr. 317a P.) τινὰς λαθιπορφυρίδας ὀνομάζει διὰ τούτων· “τοῦ μὲν πετάλοισιν ἐπ' ἀκροτάτοις ἰζάνοισι ποικίλαι πανέλοπες, / αἰολόδειροι λαθιπορφυρίδες καὶ ἀλκυόνες τανυσίπτεροι”. ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ φησιν· “αἰεὶ μ', ὦ φίλε θυμέ, τανύπτερος ὡς ὄκα πορφυρίς” (fr. 317b P.).

²¹⁵ See Sommerstein 1987, 218; Dunbar 1995, 253f.; Arnott 2007, 286-288.

²¹⁶ νήτται. τούτων, ὡς φησιν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μύνδιος (fr. I.20 Wellmann), ὁ ἄρρη μείζων καὶ ποικιλωτέρος. τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον γλαυκίον διὰ τὴν τῶν ὀμμάτων χροίαν μικρῶ ἔλαττον ἐστὶ νήττης. τῶν δὲ βοσκᾶδων καλουμένων ὁ μὲν ἄρρη κατάγραφος· < . . . > νήττης. ἔχουσι δὲ οἱ ἄρρητες σιμὰ τε καὶ ἐλάττονα τῇ συμμετρῷ τὰ ρύγχη. ἡ δὲ μικρὰ κολυμβίς, πάντων ἐλαχίστη τῶν ἐνὸνδρων, ῥυπαρομέλαινα τὴν χροίαν καὶ τὸ ρύγχος ὀξὺ ἔχει σκέπον τε τὰ ὄμματα, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ καταδύεται. . . . τῆς δὲ νήττης καὶ κολυμβάδος, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὸ νήχεσθαι καὶ κολυμβᾶν εἴρηται, μνημονεύει μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων λιμναίων πολλῶν Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἀχαρνεῦσι διὰ τούτων (875)· “νάσσας, κολοιούς, ἀτταγᾶς, φαλαρίδας, / τροχίλους, κολύμβους”. μνημονεύει αὐτῶν καὶ Καλλιμάχος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὀρνέων (fr. 417 Pf.).

²¹⁷ For the identification of the birds, see Dunbar 1995, 255 and Arnott 2007, 159.

²¹⁸ See Wellmann 1891 and Arnott 1987.

end of the same paragraph Kallimachos' name is linked to the κολυμβάς, on which the poet apparently built a pareymology for the verb κολυμβάω²¹⁹. Moreover, the scholium claims that the δρύοψ also had a place in Kallimachos' *On Birds*: the word occurs as ornithonym exclusively in this Aristophanic passage, while the standard name – provided that the two words actually identify the same bird²²⁰ – is δρυοκολάπτης (“woodpecker”, also spelled δρυκολάπτης in Av. 480 and 979). The only other occurrence of δρύοψ as bird-name is Hesych. δ 2433 C. (δρύοψ· ὄρνεόν τι διαφέρον τοῦ δρυοκολάπτου), an entry that clearly reflects the exegetic aim of differentiating the Aristophanic δρύοψ from the bird commonly known as δρυοκολάπτης. Actually, it is not unplausible that the observation on the difference between the two terms goes back to Kallimachos' ornithological work. Indeed, his interest in the differentiation of birds and bird-names emerges clearly by several fragments of his work²²¹. With regard to the ἀμπελίσ²²², the statement of the scholium is equally unparalleled. The word occurs only in this Aristophanic passage and twice in Pollux (6.52 and 77). Of particular interest is Poll. 6.52²²³ where the bird-name is mentioned among others (*i.e.* πέρδιξ, περιστέρα, φάττα and τρύγων) that were surely included in Kallimachos' work²²⁴: a more or less direct dependence of Pollux from it cannot be excluded. Finally, according to the scholium, Kallimachos included a κερχνή in his ornithological collection, against the third declension form transmitted in Av. 304. The spelling ascribed by the scholium to Kallimachos' work can hardly be understood as the reading that the scholar found (or even inserted) in this passage of *Birds*²²⁵. Indeed, though metrically plausible in l. 304, the first declension form of the ornithonym is excluded by the genitives κερχνῆδος and κερχνῆδων, and by the accusative κερχνῆδας, all occurring further below in the text of the play²²⁶. This had already been observed by some ancient commentator of Aristophanes, as shown by *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 589b Holwerda (κερχνῆδων: μήποτε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν οὐχὶ “κερχνῆς” γραπτέον, ἀλλὰ σὺν τῷ ἰ “κερχνῆς”, ὡς Νηρηίς). At the same time, it is highly unlikely that Kallimachos' ornithological collection completely overlooked the evidence of *Birds*. Therefore, the scholiastic evidence is once more to be taken cautiously, without excluding some degree of confusion, due not only to the possibly indirect use of the treatise *On Birds* by the source of the annotation, but also to the many other coexisting spellings of the ornithonym (κέγγρη [see below], κερχνῆς, κερχνῆς, κερχνίλης, κερχνίνης, κερχνίς)

²¹⁹ Call. fr. 417 Pf., see Martínez 2001, 56.

²²⁰ See Dunbar 1995, 256; Arnott 2007, 64.

²²¹ See fr. 414 (on πορφυρίων and πορφυρίς, see above), 416 (Καλλιμάχος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ ὄρνέων ὡς διαφορὰς ἐκτίθεται φάσσαν, πυραλλίδα, περιστεράν, τρυγόνα) and 418 Pf. (Καλλιμάχος δέ φησι δύο γένη εἶναι σκωπῶν καὶ τοὺς μὲν φθέγγεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ οὐ. διὸ καὶ καλεῖσθαι τοὺς μὲν σκῶπας αὐτῶν, τοὺς δ' ἀείσκωπας· εἰσὶ δὲ γλαυκοί). See also Hellmann 2015, 1245.

²²² For the identification of the bird, see Sommerstein 1987, 218; Dunbar 1995, 255; Arnott 2007, 22.

²²³ κίχλαι, κόσσοφοι, σπινίδια, ἀλεκτρούνες ἀλεκτορίδες, πέρδικες, γέρανοι, χῆνες, νῆτται, περιστεραί, φάτται, τρυγόνες, ταοί, ἀτταγαί, ἀμπελίδες, ἄς νῦν ἀμπελίονας καλοῦσιν, φασιανικοὶ ὄρνιθες.

²²⁴ See fr. 415 ὁ πέρδιξ ἐστὶ μὲν χερσαῖος ... τὰ αὐτὰ ἰστορεῖ καὶ Καλλιμάχος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὄρνέων and 416 Pf. (above).

²²⁵ However, Martínez (2001, 58) considers this as a possibility.

²²⁶ See Av. 588f. πρῶτα μὲν αὐτῶν τὰς οἰνάνθας οἱ πάρνοτες οὐ κατέδονται, / ἀλλὰ γλαυκῶν λόχος εἷς αὐτοὺς καὶ κερχνῆδων ἐπιτρίψει, 1335f. οὐ τοι μὰ τὰς κερχνῆδας ἔτι σου σῆχσομαι, / οὕτως ὄραν σε δειλὸν ὄντα καὶ βραδύν and 1453-1456 ἀλλὰ πτέρου με ταχέσι καὶ κούφοις πτεροῖς / ἰέρακος ἢ κερχνῆδος, ὡς ἂν τοὺς ξένους / καλεσάμενος κᾶτ' ἐγκεκληκῶς ἐνθαδὶ / κατ' αὐτὸ πέτωμαι πάλιν ἐκεῖσε. See also Ath. 2.65e ὅτι τὸ στρουθάριον παρ' ἄλλοις τε καὶ δὴ καὶ παρ' Εὐβούλῳ (fr. 120 K.-A.): “περδίκια / λαβὲ τέτταρ' ἢ καὶ πέντε, δασύποδας <δὲ> τρεῖς, / στρουθάρια θ' οἷον ἐντραγεῖν, ἀκανθυλλίδας, / <καὶ> βιττάκου, σπινίδια, κερχνῆδας / τὰ τ' ἄλλ' ἄττ' ἂν ἐπιτύχῃς”.

attested by several literary texts²²⁷. The fact that three out of five birds ascribed to Kallimachos' work also appear in Hesychios' lexicon (δ 2433, κ 2370, 3399 C.), strongly suggests that they were mentioned in Didymos' hypomnēma and were listed in his *Comic Vocabulary*²²⁸.

As far as the manuscript transmission is concerned, V and Γ offer two different redactions. In particular, Γ has a section on κολυμβίς, δρύοψ and ἀμπελίσ that is absent in the Venetus. Moreover, Γ repeats twice the statement on the absence of the bird-name κερχνηίς (and the presence of κερχνή instead) in Kallimachos' *On Birds*²²⁹. The discrepancies might be explained in two ways. On the one hand, the wording of Γ might have originated from the conflation of two separate comments, one dealing with πορφυρίς, κερχνηίς, κολυμβίς, δρύοψ and ἀμπελίσ, one focused only on κερχνηίς and including Didymos' exegesis (*i.e.* coinciding with the material carried by V). On the other hand, Γ might have simply misread his model and erroneously copied the last portion of the preceding *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 302 Holwerda (ἀναγέγραπται δὲ καὶ ἡ ὑποθυμὶς καὶ ὁ νέρτος καὶ ὁ ἐρυθρόπους καὶ ἡ πορφυρίς καὶ ὁ δρύοψ καὶ ἡ ἀμπελίσ) after the section on the κερχνηίς, then starting again with the same bird after the part inserted by mistake in the scholium²³⁰.

Δίδυμος δὲ τὸν μικρὸν ἰερακά φησιν: the explanation “a small raptor”²³¹ clearly depends on Aristoph. Av. 1179-1181, where the ornithonym is mentioned among the ἰερακες ἱπποτοξόται. Moreover, authors earlier than Didymos dealt extensively with the identification of the bird and might have represented important sources for him. In particular, the κέγγρη (one of the alternative spellings of the same bird-name) is said by Aristotle to belong to the γαμφώνυχοι, “with crooked talons” (*i.e.* birds of prey, see Aristot. GA 750a, HA 558b, 593b-594a). The same taxonomy can be found at the beginning of the Byzantine zoological collection of Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos (*Exc. Const. de nat. an.* 1.22 Lambros), where the κέγγρη is listed, along with the ἰεραξ, within the group of the γαμφώνυχα. Since the first and part of the second book of the sylloge come, in all likelihood, from the epitome of Aristotle's zoological works compiled by Aristophanes of Byzantium (as declared in the title²³²), the presence of the same classification of the κέγγρη in Aristotle's zoological writings and in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos' work can be considered to go back to the

²²⁷ A complete overview of all the passages is in Arnott 2007, 133.

²²⁸ The frequent similarities between Hesychios and the Aristophanic scholia are often due to Didymos' lexicon on comedy. See Schmidt 1854, 29-36 and the Introduction § 5.1.

²²⁹ In fact, the first instance initially consisted only of the negative statement κερχνηίς δὲ οὐ, and was later integrated *supra lineam* with ἀλλὰ κερχνή by the first corrector of Γ, who was evidently comparing the *scholium* with an alternative redaction, closer to that preserved by V (on the similarities between the interventions of the first corrector of Γ and the *scholia* carried by V, see Zacher 1888, 551).

²³⁰ None of the two reconstructions fits with Holwerda's two rather arbitrarily posited *scholia*, namely *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 304a πορφυρίς Γ: ἡ πορφυρίς ἀναγέγραπται, VΓ κερχνηίς δὲ οὐ, Γ ἀλλὰ κερχνή. Γ² (with a misreading of the intervention of Γ² that is clearly κερχνή and not κερχνηίς) and *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 304b καὶ ἡ κολυμβίς δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ὁ δρύοψ καὶ ἡ ἀμπελίσ. Γ κερχνηίς δὲ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται, ἀλλὰ κερχνή. Δίδυμος δὲ τὸν μικρὸν ἰερακά φησιν. VΓ.

²³¹ The term ἰεραξ «is the name given in Aristotle (HA 620a17– b5) and ancient Greek generally to all diurnal raptors smaller than the larger Eagles and Vultures (*i.e.* with a length less than about 60 cm) but excepting Kites» (Arnott 2007, 99).

²³² Ἀριστοφάνους τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ζῴων ἐπιτομή, ὑποτεθέντων ἐκάστῳ ζῴῳ καὶ τῶν Αἰλιανῶ καὶ Τιμοθέῳ καὶ ἑτέροις τισὶ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρημένων. See Lambros 1885, V-XX; Berger 2012, 3-9; Zucker 2012; Hellmann 2015, 1248-1251. A detailed analysis of the text is offered by Zucker 2012.

Alexandrian scholar, whose epitome might have been among Didymos' sources as well²³³. However, the closest extant parallel to the exegesis of the grammarian is in fact Ailianos, who – besides alluding to the small size of the bird (see Ael. *NA* 13.25) – mentions the κέγχρη as φῦλον ιεράκων (see *ibid.* 2.43) and as γένος ιεράκων (see *ibid.* 12.4). Rather interestingly, in this last passage Ailianos quotes directly Aristoph. *Av.* 1178-1181, thereby implying that, with his list of *ιέρακες ιπποτοξόται*, the comic playwright might be alluding to the difficult classification of the several γένη ιεράκων (see *ibid.* 12.4 γένη δὲ ιεράκων πλείονα ἄρα ἦν, καὶ ἔοικεν ὑπαινίττεσθαι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης τοῦτο)²³⁴.

²³³ Didymos might have used Aristotle's zoological works (either directly or through the epitome of Aristophanes of Byzantium) also in *fr.* 2, 227, 241.

²³⁴ For an overview of ancient classifications of *ιέρακες* (from Aristotle and Kallimachos to Plinius and Ailianos), see Arnott 2007, 100.

fr. 229 (= II 14.26, p. 252 Schmidt)

Subject: identification of the “knife-maker monkey” of Av. 440f.

Source: scholl. Aristoph. Av. 440α-β, 440-441α, 441a Holwerda

ἦνπερ ὁ πίθηκος **RF** τῆ γυναικὶ διέθετο **Γ**: Σύμμαχος· Αἰσωπείου λόγου ἢ τοιούτου τινὸς ἔοικε μεμνησθαι. **VFM** Καλλίστρατος δὲ τοσοῦτόν φησιν· ἐκ διηγηματίου τινὸς εἴλικυται. **VF** καὶ Δίδυμος, ὅτι αἰσχρὸς τις τὴν ὄψιν συνεχῶς τῆ γυναικὶ πληκτιζόμενος συνέθετο ἐπὶ φίλων μήτε τύπτειν μήτε τύπτεσθαι μήτε δάκνειν αὐτὸν φιλοῦντα μήτε δάκνεσθαι. **RVFMLh** οἷον “σὺ μὲν οὐχ ἐλκύσεις τῶν ὀρχιπέδων, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τῶν τριχῶν”. ἔοικε δὲ Παναίτιον κωμωδεῖν, **RVFLh**

a) ὄν καὶ ἐν Νήσοις (fr. 409 K.-A.) “καταλιπὼν Παναίτιον πίθηκον”. ἐνθα καὶ μαγείρου πατρὸς. **VF** πίθηκον δὲ αὐτὸν εἶπε διὰ τὸ πανοῦργον, μαχαιοποιὸν δὲ τὸν μαχαίραις ἐργαζόμενον **RVF** ὡς μάγειρον. καὶ γὰρ ἐν Νήσοις μαγείρου πατρὸς αὐτόν φησιν. **VF** ἢ καὶ αὐτόθι μαχαιοποιόν φησιν. **V**

b) ὄν καὶ πίθηκον λέγει διὰ τὸ πανοῦργον. καὶ ἐν Νήσοις μαγείρου πατρὸς αὐτόν λέγει. μαχαιοποιὸν δὲ ἢ ὡς μαχαίρας ποιοῦντα ἢ ὡς μάγειρον. **Lh**

ἄλλως. **V** ὁ μαχαιοποιός **Γ**³ : ὁ Παναίτιος. μάγειρος δὲ μικροφυῆς ἦν. **VM₉Γ**³ διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτόν ὡς καταλαβόντα τὴν γυναῖκα ἑαυτοῦ μοιχευομένην. ἐδυναστεύετο γὰρ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς μεγάλης οὔσης. **RVM₉ΓΓ³MLh**

“(the pact) that the monkey made with the woman”: Symmachos: “he seems to be alluding to an Aesopic fable or something of the sort”. Kallistratos says this: “(the reference) is drawn from some short tale”. And Didymos (says) that an ugly-looking man, always fighting with his wife, made a pact in front of his friends neither to beat nor to be beaten, neither to bite nor to be bitten while making love, something like “you will not pull at my balls and I will not pull your hair”. He seems to be lampooning Panaitios

whom (he derides) also in the *Islands*: “leaving Panaitios, the monkey”. There, he is also son of a cook. He called him monkey for his being cunning, and knife-maker, the one who works with knives, because he was a cook. Indeed, in the *Islands* he says that he is the son of a cook or he says he is a knife-maker there as well.

whom he also calls monkey for his being cunning. And in the *Islands* he says he is son of a cook. “Knife-maker” is either because he makes knives or because he was a cook.

Otherwise. Panaitios was a cook of low stature. He ridicules him for keeping his own unfaithful wife. Indeed, he was overpowered by her because she was big.

Aristoph. Av. 438-442 μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω ἴγὼ μὲν οὐ, / ἦν μὴ διάθωνταί γ' οἶδε διαθήκην ἐμοὶ / ἦνπερ ὁ πίθηκος τῇ γυναίκι διέθετο, / ὁ μαχαιροποιός, μῆτε δάκνειν τούτους ἐμὲ / μῆτ' ὀρχίπεδ' ἔλκειν μῆτ' ὀρύττειν.

Her. Phil. 114 P. μεῖραξ καὶ μεῖράκιον ὅτι διαφέρει εἴρηται ἐν τῇ περὶ τοῦ γέροντος καὶ πρεσβύτου διαφορᾷ (42). νῦν δὲ κατ' ἄλλην ἔννοιαν Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. *146 K.-A.) τὴν ὀνομασίαν κατέταξε· φησὶ γοῦν ἐν Γήρα (γῆρω cod.) † “μεῖρα γέρον πληκτικζομένην ὠρκεῖς μεираκίω τῶ” †. ὑπομνηματιζόμενος Δίδυμος (fr. °275 C.-Pr.) τὸ δρᾶμα καὶ προσθεῖς τὸν στίχον ἐπιλέγει ὅτι μεῖραξ μὲν θῆλυ, μεῖράκιον δὲ ἄρρεν | **Suda δ 565 A.** διαθήκην διαθώμεθα, ἦν διέθετο πίθηκος τῇ γυναίκι· ἀντι τοῦ συνθήκην. αἰσχρὸς γάρ τις τὴν ὄψιν συνεχῶς τῇ γυναίκι διαπληκτικζομένος διέθετο ἐπὶ φίλων, μῆτε τύπτειν μῆτε τύπεσθαι μῆτε δάκνειν, ὡς αὐτὸν φιλοῦντα, μῆτε δάκνεσθαι. οἶον, σὺ μὲν οὐχ ἐλκύσεις τῶν ὀρχιπέδων, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τῶν τριχῶν. εἶκοι δὲ τὸν Παναίτιον κωμωδεῖν· ὡς καὶ ἐν Νήσοις· καταλιπὼν ἀναίτιον πίθηκον. ἔνθα καὶ μαγείρου πατρὸς εἶναι λέγει αὐτόν. πίθηκον μὲν διὰ τὸ πανοῦργον, μαχαιροποιὸν δὲ τὸν μαχαίρας ἐργαζόμενον, ὡς μάγειρον. αὐτόθεν οὖν φησιν αὐτὸν μαχαιροποιόν. ὁ γὰρ Παναίτιος μάγειρος μικροφυῆς ἦν. διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς καταλαβόντα τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μοιχευομένην· ἐδυναστεύετο γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῆς μεγάλης οὔσης.

a 1 ante lemma {σύμμαχος αἰσωπειῶν λόγου} Γ | **2** δὲ Γ, om. V | καὶ Δίδυμος VΓ, Δίδυμος δὲ M, Δίδυμός φησι Lh, om. R | **3** αἰσχρὸς τις τὴν ὄψιν VΓM, αἰσχρὸς τις ἦν τῇ ὄψι (sic) R, αἰσχρὸς τις ἦν ὁ Παναίτιος τὴν ὄψιν Lh | post συνεχῶς add. δὲ Lh | πληκτικζομένος RVM, διαπληκτικζομένος Lh, πλησιαζόμενος Γ | φίλων cett., φίλω V | τύπτειν μῆτε cett., om. M | **4** αὐτόν cett., om. Γ | **5** Παναίτιον bis V | **6 (a)** Νήσοις V, Νῆσοι Γ | **9 (a)** post πανοῦργον add. εἶναι R | τὸν RΓ, τὸ V | μαχαίρας VΓ, μαχαίρας R | **13** δὲ αὐτόν cett., δὲ αὐτοῦ Γ, τὸν Παναίτιον Lh | post αὐτόν, add. Παναίτιον τὸν μαχαιροποιόν M | **14** καταλαβόντα hic RVM₉Γ³Lh, post γυναῖκα M | ἐαυτοῦ M₉Γ³M (ante γυναῖκα M), αὐτοῦ RVLh | οὔσης RVM₉Γ³MLh, οὔσης μικροφυῆς αὐτὸς ὧν Γ

After being spared by the Birds who were threatening to kill him and Euelpides (Av. 336-374), Peisetairos is finally asked to explain his project. However, in order to protect himself from the risk of further attacks by the Chorus, the protagonist requires the Birds to make a pact with him, “the pact that the monkey, the knife-maker, made with his wife”. The obscure reference to the πίθηκος μαχαιροποιός originated several contradicting interpretations among ancient scholars.

The first redaction of the scholium probably derives from the work of a late compiler, who excerpted Symmachos’ comment on Av. 440, where both Kallistratos and Didymos were quoted²³⁵. Instead, the second redaction, introduced by the usual ἄλλως in V, reports only the identification of the “knife-maker monkey” with Panaitios and therefore might represent the remains of a direct excerpt from Didymos’ hypomnēma (see below)²³⁶.

καὶ Δίδυμος, ὅτι αἰσχρὸς τις τὴν ὄψιν κτλ. in order to explain the obscure expression, Didymos gives a loose paraphrase²³⁷ of Il. 440-442, replacing the monkey with “an ugly man” and interpreting the pact within an erotic context (φιλοῦντα), as an agreement between the husband and wife to not hurt each other during intercourse²³⁸. The interpretation respects the meaning of the passage: the pact between the ugly man and his woman mirrors the one that Peisetairos would like to make with the Birds, in that it implies the avoidance of

²³⁵ See Schauenburg 1881, 31. On Kallistratos, see Schmidt 1848; Boudreaux 1919, 48-51; Bagordo 1998, 45, 110f.; Montana 2008a-b; 2015, 127f. and the Introduction § 3.3. On Symmachos’ exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos’ work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228; 230f.; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

²³⁶ A similar situation can be surmised for fr. 269 (see below), as convincingly argued by Montana (2017, 215-221).

²³⁷ On the concept of ‘close’ and ‘loose’ paraphrase in ancient exegesis and especially in Aristarchos, see Schironi 2018, 76-90.

²³⁸ Aristophanes exploits the ambiguity of the three prohibitions (μῆτε δάκνειν ... / μῆτ' ὀρχίπεδ' ἔλκειν μῆτ' ὀρύττειν), which are equally valid in a sexual context as well as in fighting, see Dunbar 1995, 305.

mutual damage within a positive exchange for both parts (*i.e.* the couple having intercourse, Peisetairos giving the Birds the knowledge of their supremacy and the project of a Bird-city, and becoming their leader in exchange). The scene evoked by the grammarian closely resembles a line from Aristophanes' *Old Age*²³⁹, preserved by Herennios Philon along with Didymos' comment on it (Her. Phil. 114 P.; Did. fr. °275 C.-Pr.), seemingly describing a girl in the act of *πληκτίζεσθαι* a young man's testicles²⁴⁰. It seems likely that Didymos was influenced by this passage of the *Old Age* in his explanation of the mysterious pact mentioned at Av. 439f.

ἔουκε δὲ Παναίτιον κωμωδεῖν κτλ: the identification of the *kōmōdōumenos* with a specific person might at first seem to clash with the generic, autoschediastic interpretation (αἰσχρὸς τις τὴν ὄψιν) given by the grammarian. However, because of the cautious tone (ἔουκε ... κωμωδεῖν) often observed in other Didymeian fragments²⁴¹ and given the grammarian's well-attested interest in the *kōmōdōumenoi*²⁴², it cannot be excluded that the paraphrastic section and the tentative identification of the knife-maker monkey with Panaitios coexisted in the original Didymeian exegesis, possibly as two mutually excluding options. The identification is based on the comparison (either direct or mediated through a *kōmōdōumenoi*-handbook²⁴³) with Aristophanes' *Islands*. The most immediate *trait-d'union* between the two passages was the word *πίθηκος*, designating both Panaitios in the *Islands* and the unknown knife-maker in the *Birds*. However, two more people are called "monkey" in the preserved Aristophanic plays, *i.e.* Kleisthenes and Kleigenes²⁴⁴. Moreover, Phrynichos' *Monotropos* – which was produced at the same festival as *Birds*, as the *hypothesis* attests²⁴⁵ – listed four prominent men on the Athenian scene (Lykeas, Teleas, Peisandros and Exekestides²⁴⁶) and called them "big monkeys"²⁴⁷. In the presence of so many figures labelled "monkey"²⁴⁸, the tentative choice of identifying the one in Av. 440 with Panaitios evidently relied also on the second nickname given by Aristophanes, *i.e.* ὁ *μαχαροποιός*²⁴⁹. In a rather far-fetched attempt, Didymos (if this part of the scholium is indeed ascribed to him, as previously suggested) or another ancient scholar linked the word to the fact that Panaitios, in the

²³⁹ Or perhaps from the *Anagyros*, given the transmitted *ἐν γήρῳ*, see Kassel-Austin 1984, 98.

²⁴⁰ On the different attempts at emending this line of the *Old Age*, see Kassel-Austin 1984, 98.

²⁴¹ See Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and Did. fr. 227 (above), 230, 237, 267 and 269 (below).

²⁴² See below fr. 237, 245-247, 249, 257, 259, 266, 268 and the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1.

²⁴³ Such as the one compiled by Ammonios, which Didymos used directly (see fr. 247 below). See also fr. 237, 257 and the Introduction § 3.3.

²⁴⁴ PA 8525, PAA 575540 and PA 8488, PAA 575065 respectively. See *Ach.* 117-121 (καὶ τοῖν μὲν εὐνούχοιν τὸν ἕτερον τουτονὶ / ἐγὼ δ' ὅς ἐστι, Κλεισθένης ὁ Σιβυρτίου. / ὃ θερμόβουλον προκτὸν ἐξυρημένε. / τοιόνδε γ', ὃ πίθηκε, τὸν πάγων' ἔχων / εὐνοῦχος ἡμῖν ἦλθεσ ἐσκευασμένος;) and *Ra.* 708-713 (οὐ πολὺν οὐδ' ὁ πίθηκος οὗτος ὁ νῦν ἐνοχλῶν, / Κλειγένης ὁ μικρός, / ὁ πονηρότατος βαλανεύς ... / χρόνον ἐνδιατρίψει).

²⁴⁵ See *hyp.* A4 Holwerda ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Χαβρίου ἄρχοντος εἰς ἄστου διὰ Καλλιστράτου, ὃς ἦν δεῦτερος τοῖς Ὀρνισιν πρῶτος Ἀμειβίας Κωμασταῖς, τρίτος Φρύνιχος Μονοτρόπῳ. **RVEΓMLh**

²⁴⁶ See PAA 388087, 610125 (PA 9191), 771270 (PA 11770), 878910 (PA 13500). See also Dunbar 1995, 304; Stama 2014, 152-154.

²⁴⁷ Phryn. fr. 21 K.-A. μεγάλους πιθήκους οἶδ' ἑτέρους τινὰς λέγειν, / Λυκέαν, Τελέαν, Πείσανδρον, Ἐξηκεστιδῆν. / :: ἀνωμάλους εἶπας πιθήκους <...> / ὁ μὲν γε δειλός, ὁ δὲ κόλαξ, ὁ δὲ νόθος <...>.

²⁴⁸ These are the preserved instances, but the number of people depicted as apes might have been even higher, given the pervasiveness of the monkey imagery in ancient Comedy (see *e.g.* McDermott 1935; 1938; Lilja 1980).

²⁴⁹ Two famous Athenian *μαχαροποιοί* were Demosthenes, father of the orator Demosthenes (PA 3595, APF 3597, PAA 318615), and Sophokles' father Sophillos (PA 12820, PAA 828740). Since the former «certainly died before the end of the archon year 376/5» (Davies 1971, 126), it cannot be excluded that he was already famous as owner of a knife-factory in 414 BCE. As far as the latter is concerned, the information comes from Istros (*FGrHist* 334 F 33), quoted (and dismissed) in the *Vita Sophoclis*.

Islands, was said to be the son of a cook²⁵⁰ (or even a cook himself, according to the second version of the scholium, ὁ Παναίτιος, μάγειρος δὲ μικροφυῆς ἦν). This implied giving μαχαιοποιός the unlikely meaning of “the one who works with knives” (μαχαιοποιὸν δὲ τὸν μαχαίραις ἐργαζόμενον ὡς μάγειρον. καὶ γὰρ ἐν Νήσοις μαγείρου πατρὸς αὐτὸν φησιν)²⁵¹. The embarrassment of later commentators with regard to this forced interpretation is made clear by the added segment ἢ καὶ αὐτόθι (*scil.* ἐν Νήσοις) μαχαιοποιὸν φησιν (only preserved in **V** and, less clearly, in *Suda*). This integrates the preceding statement that “in the *Islands* Aristophanes says that Panaitios is the son of a cook” and tries to give an alternative piece of evidence for the identification of the μαχαιοποιός with Panaitios, by hypothesising that Aristophanes, in the same play (αὐτόθι), “calls him knife-maker”.

μάγειρος δὲ μικροφυῆς ἦν. διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν κτλ.: the explanation of the joke given in the second redaction distinguishes between the characteristics of the mocked figure that are considered historical (and thus the cause the lampoon, *i.e.* Panaitios being a cook of low stature) and the actual mockery, signalled by διαβάλλει ... ὡς (he was overpowered by his wife, who was bigger than him)²⁵². Along with κωμῳδέω + ὡς/ἐπὶ (see fr. 237, 257, 266, 268), διαβάλλω + ὡς/ἐπὶ is the standard phrasing used by ancient commentators of comedy to refer to jokes on specific figures (see fr. 2, 234, 247, 268 below). Both formulations highlight a specific interest in «the role of the comic poet in presenting a particular satirical image of the *komodoumenos*»²⁵³.

²⁵⁰ «A type of gibe which in Old Comedy is normally directed at politicians» (Sommerstein 1996, 346 n. 135).

²⁵¹ See Sommerstein 1987, 225; Dunbar 1995, 304.

²⁵² On the different rephrasings of jokes in *kōmōdoumenoi*-scholia, see Chronopoulos 2011.

²⁵³ Chronopoulos 2011, 213f. See also Nünlist 2009, 214.

fr. 230 (= II 14.27, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the participle βλιμάζοντες in Av. 530

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 530b-a-c-f Holwerda

a) βλιμάζοντες **R:** βλιμάζειν κυρίως τὸ τοῦ ὑπογαστρίου καὶ τοῦ στήθους ἄπτεσθαι, ὅπερ ἐποιοῦν οἱ τὰς ὄρνιθας ὠνούμενοι· οἰονεὶ θλιβομάζειν. **RVΓ³MM₉** Δίδυμος δέ· βλιμάζοντες: ἀντὶ τοῦ “κακοῦντες”. **RVΓ³M** ἀποτίλλουσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσιν. **RVΓ³** ἄλλως **V** ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ἡ λέξις. Καλλίστρατος: ἀντὶ τοῦ “ψηλαφᾶν”. **VM₉Γ³** ἔοικε δὲ πλέον τι σημαίνειν, τὸ “μετὰ συντονίας”. **VI³**

blimazontes: *blimazein* properly means “to touch the lower belly and the breast”, which is what bird buyers used to do. Like *thlibomazein*. Didymos: *blimazontes* in the sense of “maltreating”, since they pluck them and eat them up. Otherwise. (The line is signalled) because the word is modern. Kallistratos: in the sense of “to feel about for”. It seems to mean something more, “with strength”.

b) νεωτερικὴ ἡ λέξις τὸ “βλιμάζειν”. ἔστι δὲ κυρίως τὸ ἄπτεσθαι τοῦ ὑπογαστρίου καὶ τοῦ στήθους, ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ τὰς ὄρνιθας ὠνούμενοι ἐρευνῶντες, εἰ παχεῖς εἶεν. πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὰ πτερὰ αὐτῶν τίλλουσιν. **Lh**

βλιμάζοντες] τῶν ὑπογαστρίων πτερῶν ἀπτόμενοι καὶ ψηλαφῶντες, εἰ παχεῖς. **Lh**

The word *blimazein* is modern. It properly means “to touch the lower belly and the breast”, which is what bird buyers do, checking if they are fat. Oftentimes they also pluck their feathers out.

blimazontes] touching the feathers of the lower belly and groping (to check) if they are fat.

Aristoph. Av. 530 οἱ δ' ὠνούνται βλιμάζοντες, **Lys. 1163f.** τὰν Πύλον, / τῶσπερ πάλοι δεόμεθα καὶ βλιμάδδομες.

P.Berol. inv. 9965 (MP³ 2121.01; LDAB 7028) l. 9 βλε[ι]μ[ά]ζει· βαστάσει· Ἀθηναῖοι | **Luc. Lex. 12** “Μῶν ἐκεῖνον,” ἦν δ' ἐγώ, “φῆς Δίωνα τὸν καταπύγονα καὶ λακκοσχέαν, τὸν μύρτωνα καὶ σχινοτρῶκταν νεανίσκον, ἀναφλῶντα καὶ βλιμάζοντα, ἦν τινα πεῶδη καὶ πόσθωνα αἰσθηται; | **Erot. fr. 16 Nachmanson** ἐβλιμάσθη· ἐπίσθη, ἐμαλάσθη, ἐθλίβη. εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ βλίσειν, ὃ ἐστι μαλάττειν, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ὀρνισί φησιν: “εἶτα λαβόντες πολλοῦσ' ἀθρούς· / οἱ δ' ὠνούνται βλιμάζοντες”. ὁμοίως καὶ Σοφοκλῆς μέμνηται τῆς λέξεως ἐν Πανδώρα (fr. 484 R.²) | **Harp. κ 63 K.** (~ Phot. κ 784 Th., *Suda* κ 1802 A.) κλιμάζει· Δειναρχος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Συνηγορία Αἰσχίνη κατὰ Δεινίου (fr. IX.3 C.): “ὅταν οὖν ἀπολογούμενος κλιμάζει καὶ παραγή τοῦς νόμους.” ἀντὶ τοῦ παρακλίνη καὶ παρατρέπη. μήποτε δὲ δεῖ γράφειν βλιμάζει, ἢν' ἢ οἷον θλίβη καὶ βιάζεται | **Tim. Soph. β 8 V.** βλιμάζειν· πειράζειν | **Hesych. β 710** βλιμάζειν· ὑποθλίβειν τοὺς μαστοὺς, **741** βλιμάζειν· τὸ τιθολαβεῖν. οἰονεὶ θλίβειν ἢ βαστάζειν, καὶ τὸ τοὺς ὄρνιθας ἐκ τῶν στηθῶν πειράζειν. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀρνισιν (530), **743 C.** βλιμάξει· βαστάσαι. ἀτιμάσαι | **Et. Gen. β 146 L.-L.** (~ *Et. Sym.* β 127 L.-L. [β 148 Berger]; *Et. M.* β 177 L.-L. [200,37-58 G.]; cf. [Zon.] 394,20-26 T.) βλιμάζειν· τὸ τιθολαβεῖν, ἤγουν τὸ ψηλαφᾶν τὰ στήθη καὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς καὶ καταμανθάνειν τῆ ἀφῆ, ἄπτεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἀπορρήτων μελῶν τῶν γυναικείων καὶ διεγείρειν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ὡς φησιν Κρατῖνος (fr. 335 K.-A.): “ὡς μαλακὸν καὶ τέρεν τὸ χρωτίδιον, ὃ θεοί· / καὶ γὰρ ἐβλίμαζον αὐτήν, ἢ δ' ἐφρόντιζεν οὐδὲ ἔν”. λαμβάνεται δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τὰ κηρία τῶν μελισσῶν

τρυγᾶν. εἰρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ φλίβω, ὅθεν Ὀμηρος φλιά, οἶον καὶ “ὡς πολλῆς φλιῆς παραστὰς φλίγεται ὦμος” (*Od.* 17.221): οὗ παράγωγον φλιμάζω, καὶ ὡς φλίβω θλίβω, οὕτως φλιμάζω βλιμάζω. Φαινὸς δὲ καὶ Σύμμαχος παρὰ τὸ φλιμάζειν τοῦ μαζοῦ ἐγκεκλιμένου | **Phot. β 168** βλιμάζειν· τὸ πειράζειν καὶ ψηλαφᾶν καὶ ἄπτεσθαι τῶν ἀπορρήτων μελῶν τῶν γυναικείων καὶ διεγείρειν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, <ὡς φησι Κρατῖνος (fr. 335 K.-A.)· “ὡς μαλακὸν καὶ τέρεν τὸ χρωτίδιον, ὃ θεοί· καὶ γὰρ ἐβλιμάζον αὐτήν, ἢ δ’ ἐφρόντιζεν οὐδὲ ἔν”>, **169** βλιμάζειν· τὸ ταῖς χερσὶ διαθλίβειν. καὶ τὸ τὰ κηρία θλίψαι βλίσαι λέγεται, **170 Th.** βλιμάζειν· τὸ ἐκθλίψαι καὶ τὸ τιθολαβεῖν καὶ ψηλαφᾶν. οὕτω Φερεκράτης (fr. 232 K.-A.) | **Suda β 341 A.** βλιμάζειν: κυρίως τὸ τοῦ ὑπογαστρίου καὶ τοῦ στήθους ἄπτεσθαι· ὅπερ ἐποιοῦν οἱ τὰς ὄρνιθας ὠνούμενοι· οἰοῦναι θλιμάζειν. οἱ δὲ βλιμάζοντες, ἀντὶ τοῦ κακοῦντες. ἀποτιλλοῦσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσι. βλιμάζειν, τὸ ταῖς χερσὶ διαθλίβειν. καὶ τὸ τὰ κηρία θλίψαι βλίσαι λέγεται. καὶ βλιμάζων, ἀποστάζων τὸ μέλι τοῦ κηρίου. καὶ βλιμάπτομεν, ψηλαφῶμεν, ἐπιθυμοῦμεν | **schol. Tz. Aristoph. Av. 530 Koster** Καλλίστρατος: ἀντὶ τοῦ ψηλαφᾶν· κυρίως δὲ βλιμάζειν τὸ τοῦ ὑπογαστρίου καὶ τοῦ στήθους ἄπτεσθαι. Δίδυμος δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ “κρατοῦντες”· ἀποτιλλοῦσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσι.

1 (a) τὸ cett., om. R | τοῦ cett., om. M | **1-4 (a)** κυρίως-θλιβομάζειν cett., mut. Ms, qui pergit: χρῆται τῇ λέξει Καλλίστρατος καὶ Δίδυμος | **2 (a)** τοῦ cett., om. M | **2-3 (a)** ὅπερ-ὠνούμενοι cett., τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ οἱ τὰς ὄρνιθας ὠνούμενοι ποιοῦσιν M | **3 (a)** τὰς cett., τοὺς Γ³(Ald) | **3-4 (a)** οἰοῦναι θλιβομάζειν statim cett., add. mrg. V | **4 (a)** θλιβομάζειν codd., θλιμάζειν *Suda* | βλιμάζοντες cett., βλιμάζειν Γ³ | **5 (a)** κακοῦντες RV, καλοῦντες cett., κακοῦν Γ³ | post κακοῦντες sic pergit M: ἄλλος δὲ τις οὕτω φησὶν· ὅτι “ἀποτιλλόντες τὰ πτερά”. οὕτως ὀπτησάμενοι ἐσθίουσιν. ἢ “εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἐρχόμενοι” | **7 (a)** ἀντὶ τοῦ ψηλαφᾶν Γ³ edd., ἀντὶ τοῦ ψηλαφῶντες Ms, ψηλαφᾶν φησὶ αὐτ* V, ψηλαφᾶν φησὶ αὐτήν White | **7-9 (a)** ὅτι-συντονίας hic cett., ante βλιμάζειν Γ³

Peisetairos’ detailed description of the poor life conditions imposed to the Birds by mankind includes a depiction of the selling of the captured animals at the market, where the customers repeatedly touch them before choosing the best. The act of feeling the bird before buying it is expressed by the rare βλιμάζω, a verb of obscure meaning and etymology that gained the lasting attention of grammarians from the beginning of the Hellenistic age to the Byzantine era.

The exegetic material on *Av.* 530 consists of two scholia, joined by the usual ἄλλως in **V**: in both, an anonymous commentator gives his own opinion on the problem and quotes an ancient authority, Didymos in the first case, Kallistratos in the second²⁵⁴. Overall, the annotation reports only three of the many ancient interpretations of βλιμάζω that can be identified from the available evidence. The oldest explanation of the verb comes indeed from the papyrus lexicon *P.Berol.* inv. 9965 (3rd-2nd cent. BCE)²⁵⁵, where the equivalent given is βαστάζω (“to lift up”, possibly “to weigh in the hand”)²⁵⁶. Kallistratos, instead, interpreted the verb “in the sense of ‘to feel about for’”²⁵⁷, an explanation that was queried by a later commentator suggesting that the word “seems to mean something more, ‘with strength’” (ἔοικε δὲ πλέον τι σημαίνειν, τὸ “μετὰ συντονίας”). What is more, according to the etymologica²⁵⁸, Didymos’ successors Symmachos and Phaeinos²⁵⁹ explained

²⁵⁴ This quotation is discussed in Schmidt 1848, 326 n. 51. On Kallistratos in general, see Schmidt 1848; Boudreaux 1919, 48-51; Bagordo 1998, 45, 110f.; Montana 2008a-b; 2015, 127f. and the Introduction § 3.3.

²⁵⁵ See Ucciardello 2006a, 45-47; 2012, 15-27; Esposito 2012.

²⁵⁶ The interpretation is also found in Hesychios (β 710, 741, 743 C.) and Choïroboskos (*De orthogr.* p. 184 Cramer).

²⁵⁷ The same verb occurs in *Et. Gen.* β 146 L.-L., within a more complete explanation of βλιμάζω that entails a sexual meaning based on a couplet by Kratinos (fr. 335 K.-A.). If we suppose that the wording of the scholium is severely abridged, this exegesis might be ascribable to Kallistratos.

²⁵⁸ *Et. Gen.* β 146 L.-L. (~ *Et. Sym.* β 127 L.-L. [β 148 Berger]; *Et. M.* β 177 L.-L. [200,37-58 G.]; cf. [Zon.] 394,20-26 T.

²⁵⁹ On Symmachos’ exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos’ work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003. The scanty information available on Phaeinos’ exegetical activity is summarized by Montana 2015c (see also Rutherford 1905, 36, 433f.; White 1914, lxxviii; Boudreaux 1919, 161-165; Koster 1973; Matthaios 2015, 242f.; 2020, 318f.).

the verb “from *flimazein* the covered breast” (παρὰ τὸ φλιμάζειν τοῦ μαζοῦ ἐγκειμένου): they considered βλιμάζω as an alternative spelling of the otherwise unattested φλιμάζω, deliberately created by the grammarians from φλίβω, rare equivalent of the common θλίβω. The same meaning is implied by the anonymous explanation at the beginning of the scholium to Av. 530, “to touch the belly and the breast”, but with a different derivation from θλιβομάζω, an otherwise unattested compound of θλίβω (“to squeeze”) and μαζός (“breast”)²⁶⁰.

ἀντὶ τοῦ “κακοῦντες”: although the participle βλιμάζοντες clearly indicates a specific action performed by the purchasers at the bird market, the synonym given by Didymos is κακοῦντες (“maltreating”), which, besides being highly generic, introduces a negative nuance that is completely absent in the verb βλιμάζω. This interpretation has an interesting parallel in Harp. κ 63 K., where the otherwise unattested verb κλιμάζειν in a speech by Deinarchos is tentatively emended in βλιμάζειν, ἵν’ ἢ οἶον θλίβῃ καὶ βιάζεται (“*blimazē*, so that it means ‘he oppresses and violates’ [*scil.* the laws]”). The negative meaning implied by the proposed emendation is close to the one chosen by the grammarian for Av. 530. Moreover, the cautious tone (μήποτε δὲ δεῖ γράφειν κτλ.²⁶¹) may hint at a dependence of Harpokration’s entry from a Didymean commentary to Deinarchos (although a hypomnēma to the orator is not attested for the grammarian²⁶²). However, in his comment to this line of *Birds* (*schol.* Tz. Aristoph. Av. 530 Koster), John Tzetzes preserves an alternative reading of Didymos’ interpretation, with κρατοῦντες instead of κακοῦντες. The secondary meaning of κρατέω “to hold in the hand”²⁶³ would be a much more adequate equivalent for βλιμάζω, given the sense required by the passage of *Birds* (see below).

ἀποτίλλουσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσιν: the function of the two verbs is to further explain Didymos’ interpretation, by describing what people normally do to birds after buying them (they “pluck them” and “eat them up”). The two terms undoubtedly match κακοῦντες, but may also fit (though with more difficulty) with Tzetzes’ variant κρατοῦντες, in its most generic meaning of “to be superior”, “to prevail”. There can be two possible interpretations. On the one hand, if the section ἀποτίλλουσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσιν is ascribed to Didymos, then the unanimously transmitted κακοῦντες has to be taken as the equivalent originally given by the grammarian for βλιμάζοντες in Av. 530. Consequently, Tzetzes’ κρατοῦντες needs to be considered as a *varia lectio* that originated by mechanical or intentional alteration of the scholiastic wording within the tradition of the Byzantine erudite’s annotation. On the other hand, if the section is not considered a part of

²⁶⁰ It cannot be excluded that οἰοῦναι θλιβομάζειν is in fact a misunderstanding of the etymology given by Symmachos and Phaeinos: the variant οἰοῦναι θλιμάζειν preserved by the *Suda* may point in this direction. If this were the case, the anonymous section at the beginning of the annotation (along with the Didymean quotation embedded in it) could be ascribed to Symmachos and/or Phaeinos. The same interpretation of βλιμάζω as indicating the act of touching the breast (with and without sexual meaning) can be found *e.g.* in Hesych. β 710, 741 C. and Phot. β 170 Th.

²⁶¹ See Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and Did. fr. 227, 229 (above), 237, 267 and 269 (below). With regard to μήποτε as evidence for Didymean origin, see Boudreaux 1919, 110-112 and Montana 1996, 30 n. 64.

²⁶² See Braswell 2017, 83f.

²⁶³ See *e.g.* Plu. *De fortuna* 99D τοὺς δὲ παῖδας καὶ ὑποδεῖσθαι καὶ περιβάλλεσθαι διδάσκομεν καὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ λαμβάνειν τοῦ ὄρου τῇ δ’ ἀριστερᾷ κρατεῖν τὸν ἄρτον, Ath. 1.10f τρωθεὶς ἀπόλετο, ἔτι κρατῶν τὸ ποτήριον, 7.289c αὐτὸς δ’ ὁ Ζεὺς πορφύραν ἡμφιεσμένος καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχων καὶ σκῆπτρον κρατῶν κρηπίδας τε ὑποδεδεμένος περιήει μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ χοροῦ.

Didymos' original comment on the passage, but rather a later attempt at clarifying his explanation, the alternative reading κρατοῦντες may allow further observations. In particular, it cannot be excluded that the grammarian originally glossed βλιμάζοντες with κρατοῦντες, referring to the secondary meaning “to grasp”, “to hold in the hand”, and that his interpretation was then misunderstood by the scholiasts who intended κρατοῦντες in the sense of “prevailing” and felt the need to clarify the interpretation, by adding ἀποτίλλουσι γὰρ καὶ κατεσθίουσιν (and thus facilitating the corruption κρατοῦντες > κακοῦντες).

ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ἢ λέξις: in the scholiastic jargon, the adjective νεωτερικός specifically refers to post-Homeric poets²⁶⁴ and, in this case, the statement is confirmed by the literary evidence, since (apart from the scholiastic and lexicographic occurrences), the verb βλιμάζω is only found in fifth century drama (besides the passage from the *Birds*, see Aristoph. *Lys.* 1164; Cratin. fr. 335 K.-A. and Soph. fr. 484 R.)²⁶⁵ and in Lukianos' *Lexiphanes* (12).

ἔοικε δὲ πλέον τι σημαίνειν, τὸ “μετὰ συντονίας”: the somewhat obscure sentence comments on Kallistratos' *interpretamentum* ἀντὶ τοῦ “ψηλαφᾶν”, which is quoted right before and preceded by the observation on the modernity of the verb βλιμάζειν (see above). Apparently, in quoting Kallistratos, the later commentator wanted to underline that the action performed by the purchaser described by Peisetairos in *Av.* 530 was something more than the proposed “to feel about for”²⁶⁶. The generic πλέον τι is specified through the phrase μετὰ συντονίας, usually indicating physical effort (especially in medical writings, see *e.g.* Gal. *De diff. puls.* 8,669 Kühn παλαίσματά τε γὰρ ὀνομάζεται “σοφοδρά” τὰ μετὰ συντονίας τε ἄμα καὶ τάχους γινόμενα) or intensity of sound (see *e.g.* Aristot. *De audib.* 800b26, 804b24). If, as hypothesised above, Didymos' interpretation of βλιμάζοντες in *Av.* 530 was κρατοῦντες in the sense of “holding tight in the hand”, this last section (and perhaps the entire note, with the observation ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ἢ λέξις and the quotation from Kallistratos) might be considered a direct excerpt from his hypomnēma.

²⁶⁴ «Les Néωτεροι sont [...] des poètes, appartenant à tous les genres et à tout les époques, depuis Hésiode jusqu'à Euphorion – en d'autres termes, *tous le poètes postérieurs à Homère et antérieurs à Aristarque*» (Severyns 1928, 42; author's italics). For the most complete and still unsurpassed investigation of the words Νεώτεροι and νεωτερικός in the scholia, see *ibid.* 31-61. Homeric scholars could athetise a line if it contained a word considered νεωτερική, see *e.g. schol.* Ariston. *Il.* 7.475a [A] ἄλλοι δ' ἀνδραπόδεσσι <τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν>: ἀθετεῖται, ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ὀνομασία τοῦ ἀνδράποδον and *schol.* *Od.* 2.206b1 Pontani Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὑπόπτει τον στίχον, νεωτερικὸν λέγων ὄνομα τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς. The adjective also indicates poetic innovations in mythical accounts (see *e.g. schol.* *Od.* 11.300 Dindorf Κάστορα—καὶ—Πολυδεύκεα] ὅτι οὐ παραδίδωσιν ἐκ Διὸς Κάστορα καὶ Πολυδεύκην, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ νεωτερικὰ ταῦτα, *schol.* Aeschyl. *Eu.* 1a-b Smith τοῦτο γὰρ νεωτερικὸν καὶ Εὐριπίδειον, *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 574 Holwerda νεωτερικὸν τὸ τὴν Νίκην καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα ἐπτεροῦσθαι).

²⁶⁵ Phot. β 170 Th. attests that the word occurred in Pherekrates as well, but the reference of the comic playwright might have originated from a confusion with Κράτης, a widespread corruption of the original Κρατίνος (see *Et. Gen.* β 146 L.-L. and *Et. Sym.* β 127 L.-L. [β 148 Berger]).

²⁶⁶ The verb ψηλαφᾶν can describe, for instance, the act of feeling something with the fingers (see Aristot. *HA* 571a ἔτι δ' ἄν τις ψηλαφᾷ καὶ τρίβῃ τοῖς δακτύλοις, τὸ μὲν στέαρ λεῖον φαίνεται, τὸ δ' ὀφὸν τραχύ) or of stroking a horse (see Poll. 11.183).

fr. 231 (= II 14.28, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the expression τοῖσιν ἐρῶσι σύνεσμεν in Aristoph. Av. 704

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av. 704α-β* Holwerda

a) καὶ τοῖσιν ἐρῶσι **REG**: Σύμμαχος· διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐραστὰς ὄρνιθας εὐγενεῖς χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς ἐρωμένοις. Δίδυμος δέ· ἐπεὶ ἡ σίττη καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὄρνεον δεξιὰ πρὸς ἔρωτας φαίνεται· “ἐγὼ μὲν, ὃ Λεύκιππε, δεξιῇ σίττη” (*adesp. ia. 52 W.² = Hippon. fr. 192 D.*). **RVEΓM**

“and with the lovers”: Symmachos: because lovers give high-bred birds to the beloved. Didymos: because the nuthatch and similar birds seem to be favourable (omens) for love encounters: “I, Leukippos, the nuthatch to the right”.

b) διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐραστὰς ὄρνιθας εὐγενεῖς διδόναι τοῖς ἐρωμένοις δεξιὸς πρὸς ἔρωτα, οἷα ἡ σίττη τὸ ὄρνεον. **Lh**

Because lovers give high-bred birds to the beloved, birds that are favourable to love, for instance the bird (called) nuthatch.

Aristoph. Av. 703f. ὡς δ' ἐσμὲν Ἐρωτος / πολλοῖς δῆλον· πετόμεσθ' αὖτε γὰρ καὶ τοῖσιν ἐρῶσι σύνεσμεν.

Suda α 643 A. ἀεὶ τοῖς ἐρῶσιν σύνεσμεν· Ἀριστοφάνης περὶ ὄρνιθων. διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐραστὰς ὄρνιθας εὐγενεῖς χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς ἐρωμένοις. καὶ ἡ σίττη δὲ καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὄρνεον δεξιὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἔρωτας φαίνεται. “ἐγὼ μὲν, ὃ Λευκίππη, δεξιῇ σίττη” (*adesp. ia. 52 W.² = Hippon. fr. 192 D.*). ἡ νῦν οἷμαι λεγομένη σιτάρης.

1 (a) καὶ τοῖσιν E, καὶ γὰρ τοῖσιν Γ, καὶ τοῖς R | Σύμμαχος statim cett., postea add. E | τὸ EΓ²M, om. RVΓ | **4 (a)** φαίνεται RVEΓ²M, καταφαίνεται Γ | **5 (a)** ὃ Λεύκιππε Bentley rec. edd. pl., ὡς λευκίππη codd. (λευκίππηV) Bekker | δεξιῇ RVEΓ²M, om. Γ

Galvanised by Peisetairos' narration of their lost greatness (Av. 466-538) and by the project of building a city in the sky (550-638), the Chorus presents the audience with a new bird-centered cosmogony and theogony. The account ends with the Birds stating that they are sons of Eros (703f. ὡς δ' ἐσμὲν Ἐρωτος / πολλοῖς δῆλον), on the basis of the common feature of being winged and the traditional association with lovers (704 πετόμεσθ' αὖτε γὰρ καὶ τοῖσιν ἐρῶσι σύνεσμεν)²⁶⁷. The second reason adduced by the Chorus brought about different explanations in ancient scholarship.

²⁶⁷ Plenty of iconographic attestations show Eros with different kinds of birds, like swans, ducks, geese, cocks and doves, see e.g. Hermay-Cassimatis-Vollkommer 1987, 870-872.

The annotation on *Av.* 704 preserves the interpretations of Symmachos and Didymos, the former probably quoting the latter in his *hypomnēma*²⁶⁸. Symmachos' explanation relies on the immediately following lines, where the Birds state that many adult lovers manage to seduce reluctant young boys by giving them birds²⁶⁹.

ἐπεὶ ἢ σίττη καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὄρνεον κτλ. Didymos' explanation of the expression "we keep company with lovers"²⁷⁰ revolves around the idea that the flight of birds is propitious for love encounters²⁷¹. This concept is found in two very similar iambic passages: one is the anonymous line quoted by the grammarian (*adesp. ia.* 52 W.²) where the favourable bird is the nuthatch²⁷², the other is a couplet by Hipponax (fr. 16 W.² = fr. 23 D. ἐγὼ δὲ δεξιῶι παρ' Ἀρήτην / κνεφαῖος ἐλθὼν ῥωιδιῶι κατηγλίσθην), where the same role is played by the heron. This last fragment, depicting an encounter between the poet and Arete, is interpreted by modern critics as a parody of the *omen faustum* accompanying Odysseus and Diomedes in *Il.* 10.274f. (τοῖσι δὲ δεξιὸν ἦκεν ἐρωδιὸν ἐγγυς ὁδοῖο / Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη)²⁷³, and the same interpretation can be extended to the anonymous line quoted by Didymos (*adesp. ia.* 52 W.²), which is indeed ascribed to Hipponax in Degani's edition (fr. 192). The ascription is further confirmed by the similarity with a sentence pronounced by the fictitious Hipponax in *Call.* fr. 191,56 Pf. (εἴρεν δ' ὁ Προυσέληνο[ς] αἰσίῳ σίττη / ἐν τοῦ Διδυμέος τὸν γέρ[ο]ντα κωνήῳ)²⁷⁴. The comparison with the description of the night encounter with Arete allows to suppose that the line quoted by Didymos also came from a similar romantic context, but a homoerotic one (as shown by the vocative Λέυκιππε) and therefore closer to the scene evoked in *Av.* 704-707. It has to be noted that, despite only quoting the line regarding the nuthatch, Didymos states that "a similar bird" was also propitious to love encounters. Given the similarity between the two iambic fragments discussed above, the grammarian's wording ἐπεὶ ἢ σίττη καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὄρνεον δεξιὰ πρὸς ἔρωτας φαίνεται might be interpreted in two ways: either Didymos, while quoting the line on the nuthatch, had an unclear recollection of the parallel passage on the heron and simply alluded to it by saying that "a similar bird" had the same propitiatory role, or his comment originally included both iambic passages but was later epitomized and rephrased, with the reference to the heron being reduced to "a similar bird" (although the two species are anything but similar²⁷⁵). Regardless, the grammarian's interpretation seems overcomplicated and probably reflects a conscious effort to display his erudition.

²⁶⁸ See Schauenburg 1881, 31. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228-230; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

²⁶⁹ *Av.* 705-707 πολλοὺς δὲ καλοὺς ἀπομωμοκότας παῖδας πρὸς τέρμασιν ὥρας / διὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν ἡμετέραν διεμήρισαν ἄνδρες ἐρασταί, / ὁ μὲν ὄρνυγα δούς, ὁ δὲ πορφυρίων', ὁ δὲ χῆν', ὁ δὲ Περσικὸν ὄρνιν. For the iconographic evidence, see Dover 2004, 92.

²⁷⁰ The line probably plays on the frequently attested sexual meaning of the verb σύνειμι (perhaps an allusion to Zeus' bird transformations in the myths of Leda/Nemesis [swan] and Asterie [eagle] is implied).

²⁷¹ The Chorus discusses the augural role of birds in *Av.* 716-722.

²⁷² See Arnott 2007, 314. The dative δεξιῇ σίττη is easily restored through comparison with Hippon. fr. 16 W.2 = fr. 23 D.

²⁷³ See e.g. Degani 1984, 48; 2007, 89.

²⁷⁴ With regard to the role of Hipponax in Kallimachos' first *iambus*, see Degani 1984, 44-50; Cozzoli 1996; Kerkhecker 1999, 11-48; Acosta-Hughes 2002, 21-59.

²⁷⁵ On the ἐρωδιός see Arnott 2007, 73-76.

fr. 232 (= II 14.29, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the adjective λοχμαία and the identity of the addressee in Aristoph. Av. 737

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 737fα-fβ-e Holwerda

a) Μοῦσα λοχμαία] τὴν ἑαυτῶν λέγει· οἶον
“λοχμίδα”. Δίδυμος· ὅτι ἐγκεκρυμμένοι ἐν ταῖς
λόχμαις φωνεῖν εἰώθασιν. **VEΓ**²

b) Μοῦσα λοχμαία] τὴν ἑαυτῶν λέγει, ἐπεὶ ἐν
λόχμαις εἰώθασιν φωνεῖν κεκρυμμένοι. καὶ
τοῦτο τοῦ εἰρημένου ὄρνέου ἢ τῆς ἀηδόνας. **Lh**

ἄλλως. **V** μέλος ᾗ <οἶ> ὄρνιθες οικείως λοχμαίαν Μοῦσαν καλοῦσι. διὰ μέσου τὸ τῆς φωνῆς μίμημα
καλῶς ἐπιμίγνυσι τὸ τῆς ὄρνιθειας. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἐξῆς οὕτως· “Μοῦσα λοχμαία ποικίλη, μεθ’ ἧς ἐγὼ νόμους
ἱεροῦς ἀναφαίνω”. **RVEΓM**

(“Muse of the bushes”): the Chorus mean their
own (Muse), in the sense of *lochmis*. Didymos:
because they are used to utter their cries while
hidden in the bushes (*lochmai*).

(“Muse of the bushes”): the Chorus mean their
own (Muse), because they are used to utter
their cries while hidden in the bushes
(*lochmai*). And this is typical of the said bird,
that is the nightingale.

Otherwise. Song with which <the> birds naturally invoke the Muse as “of the bushes”. The imitation of
the voice of the birds is well mixed in the middle. And so it goes on: “Muse of the bushes, intricate, with
whom I bring forth sacred melodies”.

Ar. Av. 737 Μοῦσα λοχμαία.

Suda λ 714 A. λοχμαία μοῦσα: ἡ τῶν ὄρνιθων. ἐγκεκρυμμένοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς λόχμαις εἰώθασιν φωνεῖν.

1-3 (a) in marg. int. E, gl. Γ² | **1 (a)** ante τὴν, πρὸς τὴν ἀηδόνα Γ² | **1-2 (a)** οἶον λοχμίδα om. Bekker | **4** ante μέλος, ἀντι τοῦ add. R | ᾗ <οἶ> scripsi, ὡς
codd. edd. | ὄρνιθες Γ, ὄρνιθων REΓ² Bekker Rutherford Holwerda, ὄρνιθος VM Dindorf Dübner White | οικείως-καλοῦσι om. Rutherford | καλοῦσι
codd. edd. cett., καλουσῶν Holwerda | **5** καλῶς Holwerda, καὶ codd. Bekker | τὸ cett., τῷ E Bekker | ὄρνιθειας Holwerda coll. scholl. ad Av. 744,
ἀνθρωπειας codd. Bekker | **6** ἀναφαίνω cett., om. E

The ode that opens the second part of the parabolic section (Av. 737-800) begins with a hymn-like
invocation to the Muse²⁷⁶, who is defined with the otherwise unattested adjective λοχμαία, “of the bushes”.

The scholiastic material, in spite of some textual difficulties (see below), allows to reconstruct the ancient
debate concerning the apostrophe in Av. 737. This did not only concern the meaning of the *hapax* λοχμαία, but

²⁷⁶ The same happens in *Ach.* 665-675; *Pax* 775-780, *Ra.* 674-685.

also focused on the addressee, identifiable either as the Nightingale (on scene since l. 666 and object of the *kommation* in ll. 677-684) or with an actual divine Muse inspiring the song of the Chorus²⁷⁷.

τὴν ἑαυτῶν λέγει: the phrasing τὴν ἑαυτῶν (*scil.* Μοῦσαν) clearly identifies the Μοῦσα λοχμαία with an actual divine Muse inspiring the Birds, in opposition to the Nightingale on stage, which some scholars believed was the addressee of the invocation: the Nightingale is indeed mentioned both at the beginning of the redaction of Γ² (πρὸς τὴν ἀηδόνα) and at the end of the one of Λh (καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ εἰρημένου ὀρνέου ἢ τῆς ἀηδόνας).

οἶον “λοχμίδα”: there are no other known occurrences of the word λοχμῖς except for this one, which might have originated from an erroneous recollection of the rare adjective λόχμιος, -α, -ον, equivalent in meaning to the Aristophanic *hapax* λοχμαῖος, -α, -ον and only found twice in Greek literature: one occurrence is in an epigram by Agathias, where the word describes the animal offered to Pan ὑλοβάτης (AP 6.32 = 62 Viansino), the other comes from a pseudo-Lucianic work ([Luc.] *Philopatr.* 10).

Δίδυμος· ὅτι ἐγκεκρυμμένοι ἐν ταῖς λόχμαις κτλ: the participle ἐγκεκρυμμένοι might indicate the grammarian’s awareness of the correct etymology of λόχη, *i.e.* from λόχος < λέχεται (“hideout”, but also “childbed”)²⁷⁸. The plural subject of ἐγκεκρυμμένοι ... φωνεῖν εἰώθασιν cannot be identified with certainty. On the one hand, the preceding τὴν ἑαυτῶν κτλ could suggest that Didymos explained the adjective λοχμαία with the behaviour of all birds who sing in the woods, and therefore believed the apostrophe to be addressed to the divine Muse of the birds. However, the clear association between the Nightingale and the λόχη underlined by Aristophanes in Av. 202-204 (δευρὶ γὰρ ἐμβὰς αὐτίκα μάλ’ εἰς τὴν λόχημν, / ἔπειτ’ ἀνεγείρας τὴν ἐμὴν ἀηδόνα, / καλοῦμεν αὐτούς) and 206-208 (ὦ φίλτατ’ ὀρνίθων σύ, μή νυν ἔσταθι / ἀλλ’, ἀντιβολῶ σ’, ἄγ’ ὡς τάχιστ’ εἰς τὴν λόχημν / εἴσβαινε κἀνεγείρε τὴν ἀηδόνα), and recognised by the anonymous *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 222c Holwerda (“αὐλεῖ”: τοῦτο παρεπιγράπται δηλοῦν, ὅτι μιμεῖται τις τὴν ἀηδόνα ὡς ἔτι ἔνδον οὔσαν ἐν τῇ λόχημν), might hint at a possibly lost subject αἱ ἀηδόνας (with an original ἐγκεκρυμμένα).

εἰώθασιν: the verb has several meanings in the scholiastic jargon and occurs twice more in the Aristophanic scholia along with Didymos’ name (see below fr. 243, 270). Besides signalling specific lexical usages and linguistic/grammatical features²⁷⁹, it often introduces simplistic, generalized statements based on the content of the passage: from moralizing explanations of proverbs²⁸⁰ to observations on cults, habits (including animal habits, as in the present scholium) and institutions²⁸¹ (see also Nünlist 2009, 11).

²⁷⁷ See Dunbar 1995, 462.

²⁷⁸ See GEW 111; DELG 634; EDG 852f.

²⁷⁹ See *e.g.* *schol.* Aristoph. Ach. 114a Wilson ἄλλως: ἠλιθίως καὶ ματαίως ... οἱ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ εἰώθασιν προστιθέναι τὴν τὴν, λέγοντες τὴν ἄλλως, *schol.* Aeschyl. Pr. 592b Ἥρα στουγητός: διὰ τὸν ζῆλον. τὸ δὲ ἴδιωμα Ἀττικόν· εἰώθασιν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τὰ εἰς ἡ λήγοντα θηλυκὰ διὰ τοῦ ὅς ἐκφέρειν, *schol.* Dem. 2.42 μέγας ἠὲξήθη] εἰώθασιν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ προλαμβάνειν ἐν συντάξεσι καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ μέρους λέγειν τὸ πᾶν ... ὡσπερ κἀνταῦθα ‘μέγας ἠὲξήθη’· ἔστι γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ ‘ἐγένετο μέγας’.

²⁸⁰ See *e.g.* *schol.* Aristoph. Ach. 638c Wilson παρὰ τὴν παροιμίαν τὸ “ἐπ’ ἄκρων ὀνύχων” ἔπαιξεν οὗτος “ἐπ’ ἄκρων τῶν πυγιδίων” εἰπών. ... εἰώθασιν γὰρ οἱ ἀλαζόνες ἐπ’ ἄκρων ὀνύχων βαδίζειν κτλ.

²⁸¹ See *e.g.* *schol.* Aristoph. Ach. 22b Wilson εἰώθασιν δύο ὑπηρεταὶ κεχρισμένον σχοινίον μίλτω ἤγουν βάμματι κοκκίνῳ ἐκτείνειν διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον διώκειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησι καὶ Πλάτων ὁ κωμικός: “ὅσοι δὲ ἐχρίοντο ἐξέτινον ζῆμίαν”, Eq. 755a ὡσπερ ἐμποδίζων ἰσχάδας] Σύμμαχος οὕτως: ἀπὸ τῶν μελισσῶν ἢ μεταφορά. εἰώθασιν γὰρ οἱ μελισσοῦργοι ἰσχάδας συγκεκομμένας

μέλος ᾗ <οί> ὄρνιθες οἰκείως λοχμαίαν Μοῦσαν καλοῦσι: the adverb οἰκείως stresses that the invocation of the Muse as λοχμαία corresponds to the Birds' "nature". The emendation of the unanimously transmitted ὡς in ᾗ <οί> restores the sentence to its role of summary of ll. 737-757. Previous editors had accepted the plural genitive ὀρνίθων of REΓ² and either divided the text with interpunction²⁸² ("song as of birds. Naturally they invoke the Muse as 'of the bushes'") or emended καλοῦσι in καλουσῶν²⁸³ ("song as of birds naturally invoking the Muse as 'of the bushes'"), in both cases with unconvincing results.

ρίπτειν ταῖς μελίσσαις, *schol.* Apoll. Rhod. 2.132-4c καπνῶ τυφόμεναι: ... εἰώθασι δὲ καπνίζειν κόνουζαν· δριμύς γὰρ μάλιστα ὁ ταύτης καπνός.

²⁸² See Bekker 1829b, 247; Dindorf 1838c, 207; Dübner 1842, 226; White 1914, 140.

²⁸³ See Holwerda 1991, 116.

fr. 2 (= Π 14.30, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the verb ἐκπερδικίσαι in Av. 768

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 768b-c-d-e Holwerda

ἐκπερδικίσαι: διὰ τὸ πέρδικα αὐτὸν (*scil.* τὸν Πεισίου) γενέσθαι. εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς πέρδικας **VEΓ** καταλαμβανομένους ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων μηχανᾶσθαι τοιαύτην σωτηρίαν. λαμβάνοντες γὰρ κάρφη τοῖς ποσὶν ὑπτίους ἑαυτοὺς ρίπτουσι, καὶ οὕτως ἐπικαλύπτουσι καὶ ἐκκλίνουσιν. **RVEΓ**

a) ἄλλως. **VEΓ** ἀντὶ τοῦ “φυγεῖν”. **VEΓM** διαβάλλει δὲ (*scil.* τὸν Πεισίου) ὡς κατεγνωσμένον ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ καὶ φυγῇ ζημιωθέντα (*ad* 766). οἱ δὲ πέρδικες πανοῦργοι ὄντες εὐχερῶς διαδιδράσκουσι τοὺς θηρευτὰς **VEΓ** πολλάκις ὑπτιοὶ γενόμενοι καὶ ἐπιβάλλοντες ἑαυτοῖς κάρφη. **EG³** φησὶν οὖν ὅτι· καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν γενόμενος δύναται πάλιν φυγεῖν. **VEΓ³** ἄλλως. ἐξάγων τοὺς νεοσσοὺς ὁ πέρδιξ εἰς κατανομήν ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων ἴδη, συρίζει· οἱ δὲ ὑπτίους ἑαυτοὺς τιθέασιν, ὡς μηδὲ ψηλαφῶντά τινα ἐπιγνῶναι. εἶτα ὀλίγον προελθόντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πάλιν συρίζει ὁ πατήρ· οἱ δὲ ἐξίπτανται. τοῦτο οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκπερδικίσαι. **VEΓ³M** ἄλλως. Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ διεφθορίας λέξεως οὕτως· ἐπὶ ἴδη τὸν θηρευτὴν ἢ πέρδιξ, προκαλινδεῖται αὐτοῦ ἐπισπωμένη πρὸς ἑαυτήν. ὡς δὲ γίνεται περὶ τὸ ἀγρεῦσαι αὐτήν, οἱ νεοσσοὶ φεύγουσιν· εἶτα καὶ αὐτὴ διαδράσα ὕστερον αὐτοὺς συνάγει. **VEΓ**

b) ἐκφυγεῖν. διὰ τοῦ ἐκπερδικίσαι δὲ διαβάλλει τοῦτον (*scil.* τὸν Πεισίου) ὡς κατεγνωσμένον ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ καὶ φυγῇ ζημιωθέντα (*ad* 766). οἱ γὰρ πέρδικες πανοῦργοι ὄντες εὐχερῶς διαδιδράσκουσι τοὺς θηρευτὰς. πολλάκις γὰρ ὑπτιοὶ γενόμενοι καὶ ἐπιβάλλοντες ἑαυτοῖς κάρφη λανθάνουσι. Δίδυμος δὲ φησὶν ὅτι ἐπὶ ἴδη τὸν θηρευτὴν ἢ πέρδιξ, προκυλινδεῖται αὐτοῦ ἐπισπωμένη πρὸς ἑαυτήν. ὁ δὲ γίνεται περὶ τὸ ἀγρεῦσαι αὐτήν καὶ οἱ νεοσσοὶ φεύγουσιν· εἶτα καὶ αὐτὴ διαδράσα συνάγει τούτους πρὸς ἑαυτήν. **Lh**

ekperdikisai: because (the son of Peisias) is a partridge (*perdix*). (The verb) comes from the fact that the partridges, when they are caught by men, contrive the following way of safety. Taking twigs with their paws, they throw themselves on their back and so they cover up and avoid (the danger).

Otherwise. In the sense of “to flee”. He mocks him for being convicted of treason and punished with the exile. The partridges, being cunning, escape easily from the hunters, often by laying on their back and throwing twigs on themselves. Therefore he means: “being among us he can flee again”. Otherwise. Leading the nestlings to the pasture, the partridge, when he sees a man, makes a sound. They lay on their back so that nobody notices (them), not even by touching (them). Then, when the man has gone further away, the father makes another sound and the nestlings fly away. This is the act of *ekperdikizein*. Otherwise. Didymos, in the work *On the wrong interpretation of words*, says the following: “if he sees the hunter, the partridge falls before him, drawing the attention onto himself. When the hunter is about to seize him, the nestlings run away. Later, the partridge, after escaping, summons them up”.

“to run away”. With the verb *ekperdikisai* he mocks him for being convicted of treason and punished with the exile. Indeed, the partridges, being cunning, escape easily the hunters, because they often escape their notice by laying on their backs and throwing twigs on themselves. Didymos says that when the partridge sees the hunter, he falls before him, drawing attention onto himself. The hunter is about to seize him and the nestlings run away. Later the partridge, after escaping, summons them up to himself.

Aristoph. Av. 766-768 εἰ δ' ὁ Πεισίου προδοῦναι τοῖς ἀτίμοις τὰς πύλας / βούλεται, πέρδιξ γενέσθω, τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον· ὡς παρ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν αἰσχρὸν ἔστιν ἐκπερδικίσαι.

Aristot. HA 613b18-21 ὅταν δέ τις θηρεύῃ περιπεσὼν τῇ νεοττιᾷ, προκυλινδεῖται ἢ πέρδιξ τοῦ θηρεύοντος ὡς ἐπίληπτος οὔσα, καὶ ἐπισπᾶται ὡς ληψόμενον ἐφ' ἑαυτήν, ἕως ἂν διαδράσῃ τῶν νεοττῶν ἕκαστος· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπτᾶσα αὐτὴ ἀνακαλεῖται πάλιν | **Ath. 9.389a** φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης περὶ τοῦ ζῴου τάδε (fr. 346 Rose, 256 Gigon)· ‘ὁ πέρδιξ ἐστὶ μὲν χερσαῖος, σχιδανόπους, ζῆ δὲ ἔτη πεντεκαίδεκα, ἢ δὲ θήλεια καὶ πλείονα. πολυχρονιώτερα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὄρνισι τῶν ἀρρένων τὰ θήλεια. ἐπράζει δὲ καὶ ἐκτρέφει καθάπερ ἢ ἀλεκτορίς. ὅταν δὲ γνῶ ὅτι θηρεύεται, προελθὼν τῆς νεοττιᾶς κυλινδεῖται παρὰ τὰ σκέλη τοῦ θηρεύοντος, ἐλπίδα ἐμποιῶν τοῦ συλληφθήσεσθαι, ἐξαπατᾶ τε ἕως ἂν ἀποπτῶσιν οἱ νεοττοὶ· εἶτα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξίπταται. ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ ζῶον κακότηδες καὶ πανοῦργον, ἔτι δὲ ἀφροδισιαστικόν | **Orig. in Jerem. hom. 17.1** ἐπὶ τὸ διαβόητον ζήτημα ἐληλύθαμεν ἰδεῖν τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πέρδιξ, περὶ οὗ νῦν φησιν ἡ γραφή· “ἐφώνησε πέρδιξ, συνήγαγεν ἃ οὐκ ἔτεκε...” (Je 17.11f.). ἐκ τοῦ περὶ φύσεως ζῴων δεῖ ἀναλαβεῖν τίνα ἱστορήται περὶ τοῦ πέρδικος, ἵνα εἰδότες τὰ περὶ τὸ ζῶον εἰδῶμεν πότερον ἐπὶ κρείττονος τάξει <δεῖ> νῦν λεγόμενον τὸν πέρδικα ἢ ἐπὶ χείρονος. λέγεται δὴ τὸ ζῶον εἶναι κακοηθέστατον καὶ δόλιον καὶ πανοῦργον, καὶ ἀπατᾶν βουλόμενον τοὺς θηρεύοντας καὶ πολλακτικῶς κυλιόμενον περὶ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ θηρεύοντος, ἵνα αὐτὸν περισπάσῃ ὡς ἐγγυθὸν τὸ ζῶον πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἦκειν ἐπὶ τὴν καλιάν, καὶ ἠνίκα ἐὰν στοχάσῃται περιεσπακῆναι τὸν θηρευτὴν καὶ τὰ νεοσσία πεφευγῆναι, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφίπταται | **Ael. NA 3.16** ἐὰν δὲ πέρδιξ ἴδῃ τινὰ προσιόντα καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοντα καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς βρέφεσιν, ἐνταῦθα

αὐτὸς μὲν ἑαυτὸν πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν κυλῖει τῶν τοῦ θηρατοῦ, καὶ ἐνδίδωσιν ἐλπίδα τοῦ δύνασθαι συλλαβεῖν εἰλούμενον. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπικύπτει εἰς τὴν ἄγραν, ὁ δὲ ἐξελίττει ἑαυτὸν· καὶ διαδιδράσκει καὶ γίνεται πρὸ ὁδοῦ τὰ βρέφη. ὅπερ οἷον συννοήσας ὁ πέρδιξ, θαρρῶν ἤδη τῆς ἀσχολίας τῆς ματαίας ἀπαλλάττει τὸν ὀρνιθοθήραν ἀναπτὰς, καὶ τοὺς νεοττοὺς καταλαβὼν καὶ εἰσάσας τὸν ἄνδρα κεχρηνῶτα. εἶτα ἐν ἀδείᾳ ἢ μήτηρ γενομένη καὶ ἐν καλῷ στάσῃ τὰ βρέφη καλεῖ. οἱ δὲ αὐτῇ προσπέτονται γνωρίσαντες τὸ φώνημα.

1 τοὺς VEG³, om. Γ | 2 καταλαμβανομένους–τοιαύτην VEG, καταλαμβανόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μηχανῶνται οὕτω τὴν R | λαμβανόντες RVEG³, λαμβάνουσι Γ | γὰρ cett., om. R | 3 ἐκκλίνουσι cett., ἐγκλίνουσι Γ | 4 (a) ἄλλως VΓ, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ E | 5 (a) ὡς cett., καὶ Γ | 12 (a) φυγεῖν V, φεύγειν EΓ³ | ἄλλως VEG³, καὶ γὰρ M | τοὺς νεοσοῦς hic VEG³, post πέρδιξ M | 14 (a) τιθέασιν M, τιθεῖσιν VEG³ | 15 (a) post εἶτα, {προ} E | 15-16 (a) ὀλίγον–ἀνδρός VEG³, παπαρελθόντες (sic) M | 16-17 (a) ὁ πατήρ VEG³, om. M | οἱ δὲ VEG³, καὶ M | 17 (a) ἐξίπτανται EΓ³M, ἐξήπταται V | 18 (a) ἄλλως V, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ EΓ³ | 21 (a) ἐπισπωμένη EΓ³, ἐπισπωμένως V | 22 (a) νεοσοῖ VE, νεοττοὶ Γ³ | 23 (a) διαδράσα EΓ³, διαδράσαι V

The *epirrhema* – consisting in the invitation to the audience to join the City of the Birds and enjoy the freedoms it offers (Av. 753-768) – ends with a reference to “the son of Peisias”²⁸⁴. He is the addressee to whom the Chorus give an unclear piece of advice (767f. πέρδιξ γενέσθω, τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον / ὡς παρ’ ἡμῖν οὐδὲν αἰσχρὸν ἐστὶν ἐκπερδικίσαι) involving a pun between πέρδιξ (“partridge”) and the *harax* ἐκπερδικίσαι (“to run away like a partridge”)²⁸⁵.

The annotation dealing with the verb ἐκπερδικίσαι results from the compilation of four comments, separated from one another by the adverb ἄλλως. All four notes focus the interpretation on the defensive behaviour of the partridge in the presence of hunters²⁸⁶. However, while the first two state that the animal copes with the danger by making itself invisible with the aid of twigs, the remaining two sections present different versions of this explanation. Namely, according to the third anonymous exegesis, it is not the adult partridge that deliberately falls to the ground but the young chicks, obeying the signal given by the parent. Finally, Didymos’ explanation gives a fourth variant of the account.

Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ διεφθορίας λέξεως οὕτως: the scholium to Av. 768 is one of the two cases in all the scholia to Aristophanes in which the Didymean material quoted is explicitly said to derive from a non-hypomnematic work (the only other example being fr. °3 C.-Pr., from the work *Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων*, *On the different meaning of words*). What is more, the scholium preserves one of the two extant quotations from Didymos’ *Περὶ διεφθορίας λέξεως*. The other fragment (Did. fr. °1 C.-Pr.), concerning the substantive παροψίς in Pherecr. fr. 157 K.-A., comes from Ath. 9.368b, where the work is referred to with a slightly different title, *i.e.* *Περὶ παρεφθορίας λέξεως*²⁸⁷. As can be expected from the exiguity of the evidence, what is known about the treatise is very little. Along with the already mentioned *Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων*, the *Περὶ*

²⁸⁴ With regard to the debated identification of the mocked character, see *e.g.* Dunbar 1995, 473f.

²⁸⁵ See also the gloss in **VEΓΓ³M** ἀποδρᾶναι. ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πέρδικος πανουργίας (*schol.* Aristoph. Av. 768aa). The most effective translations of the wordplay give up the correct equivalent of the Greek ornithonym in favour of other bird-names (an example could be “let him become a duck, a chick of his father, since among us it is not shameful to duck the danger”). See also *e.g.* Mastromarco-Totaro 2006, 199: «si faccia quaglia, degno pulcino di suo padre: ché presso di noi non c’è nulla di male a... squagliarsela».

²⁸⁶ For an overview, see Arnott 2007, 254-256. Similar defensive behaviour was observed by Greek writers also for the quail (see *ibid.* 237).

²⁸⁷ παρὰ τῷ τὸν Χείρωνα δὲ πεποιηκότι τὸν εἰς Φερεκράτην ἀναφερόμενον (fr. 157 K.-A.) ἐπὶ ἡδύσματος ἢ παροψίς κεῖται καὶ οὐχ, ὡς Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ παρεφθορίας λέξεως (fr. °1 C.-Pr.), ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγγείου.

παρεφθορίας (or διεφθορίας) λέξεως belongs to the group of lexicographical writings ascribed to the grammarian, which includes four more titles, namely *Περὶ ἀπορουμένης λέξεως*, *Λέξεις τροπική*, *Λέξεις κωμική* and *Λέξεις τραγική*²⁸⁸. Despite looking similar, these titles imply inherently different meanings of the word λέξις: firstly, the collective singular in *Λέξεις τροπική*, *Λέξεις κωμική* and *Λέξεις τραγική*, indicating the “diction”, *i.e.* the set of words and expressions that are typical of a specific style or genre; secondly, the concrete plural in *Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων*; thirdly, the less clear singular of *Περὶ ἀπορουμένης λέξεως* and *Περὶ παρεφθορίας* (or *διεφθορίας*) λέξεως. For these last two titles, the best interpretation of λέξις seems to be the first. If this assumption is correct, the two works dealt respectively with a set of words that the grammarian considered “puzzling” (ἀπορουμένη) and “corrupt” (παρεφθορῶν/διεφθορῶν).

The nature of the “corruption” of the words collected by the grammarian is rather difficult to determine: according to the examples of grammatical usages of φθείρειν, παραφθείρειν, διαφθείρειν (and related words) listed by Schmidt (1854, 15-19)²⁸⁹, the Didymean writing should have dealt with words that had undergone phonetic alterations over time. This hypothesis cannot be ruled out, but surely does not match with the two surviving fragments of the work, which show no references (either in Didymos’ *ipsisima verba* or in their quotation contexts) to any sort of formal ‘corruption’ (see Braswell 2017, 41). Similarly, Braswell’s statement (*ibid.*) that «in both cases Didymos is treating the use of a word in what he considered the wrong sense» (*i.e.* that the grammarian criticised the use of ἐκπερδικίσαι in Aristoph. *Av.* 768 and the use of παροψίς in the *Cheiron* ascribed to Pherekrates) does not find support in the two fragments. In fact, the two fragments on ἐκπερδικίσαι and παροψίς might be better understood if the participle in the title of the work had a different meaning than the one assumed by Schmidt (1854, 15f., followed by Cohn 1903a, 464f.) and Braswell (2017, 41). In particular, rather than phonetic or semantic, the ‘corruption’ suffered by the words collected in the *Περὶ παρεφθορίας* (vel *διεφθορίας*) λέξεως was probably an interpretative one, *i.e.* the real meaning of the terms had been obscured by the wrong interpretations of Didymos’ predecessors. The verb παραφθείρω is used exactly in this sense in *schol. Hrd. | Choer. (?) Il.* 1.493a [A] ὥστε ἐὰν θελήσῃ ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος ἀναγινώσκειν „ότεδὴ“ ὡς δηλαδὴ, πρῶτον τὴν μὴ οὖσαν χρῆσιν παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ παραλήψεται, δεύτερον τὸ σημαινόμενον παραφθείρει (“Therefore, if Aristarchos wants to read ὅτεδὴ like δηλαδὴ, firstly he admits a usage that is not present in the poet and secondly he falsifies the meaning”).

That Didymos rectified the interpretations of his forerunners only in this work is highly unlikely. On the contrary, words like ἐκπερδικίσαι and παροψίς presumably were discussed both in the hypomnēmata to the

²⁸⁸ Did. fr. °4, °5, 6-38 and °39-°49 C.-Pr. See Schmidt 1854, 15-111; Montana 2015a, 175f.; 2020, 250f.; Braswell 2017, 42-46; Coward-Prodi (forthc.). Overall, of these six writings no more than seven sure fragments are still extant: two come from Harpokration’s *Lexicon of the then orators* (Did. fr. °4, °47 C.-Pr.), one from Athenaios (Did. fr. °1 C.-Pr.), one from the *recensio* B of the *Synagoge* (Did. fr. °5 C.-Pr.), one from Oros (Did. fr. °13 C.-Pr.) and two from the Aristophanic *scholia* (the currently examined fr. °2 and the already mentioned fr. °3 C.-Pr. in *schol. Aristoph. Pl.* 388b Chantry). What is more, the *Comic Vocabulary* and the *Tragic Vocabulary* have an important testimony in Hesych. *ep. Eul.* 1.1-5.

²⁸⁹ See *e.g.* Phryn. *PS* 116,4f. de B. ὕριστος (cf. Aristoph. fr. 581 l. 5 K.-A.): ὁ διαφθείροντες οἱ ἰδιῶται βρίσχον καλοῦσιν, *Lyd. Mag.* 18.23f. καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὰς οἱ μὲν Ῥωμαῖοι ἰούβας, οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τούφας, βραχὺ τι παραφθαρείσης τῆς λέξεως, *schol. Apoll. Rhod.* 2.709 (p. 182,12f. Wendel) τὸ πρότερον Λαρνασσὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὕστερον δὲ κατὰ φθορὰν τοῦ στοιχείου Παρνασσός.

works where they occurred and in the specific treatise *Περὶ παρεφθορίας* (vel διεφθορίας) λέξεως²⁹⁰. In fact, all of the grammarian's lexicographic works – and not only the *lexica* to comedy and tragedy, as usually maintained²⁹¹ – must have had a very close dependence on his running commentaries, developing alongside them through rearrangement of the same exegetic material²⁹².

ἐπὸν ἴδη τὸν θηρευτὴν ἢ πέρδιξ, προκαλινδεῖται κτλ. Didymos' source for the description of the partridge's defensive behaviour is ultimately the pseudo-Aristotelic ninth book of the *Historia Animalium* (613b18-21)²⁹³. However, the presence of the same account in Ath. 9.389a and, with some variations, in Origenes' homily to *Je* 17.11f. constitutes valuable evidence to presuppose that the grammarian, the author of the *Learned Banqueters* and the 3rd century theologian drew from the epitome of Aristotle's zoological works compiled in Alexandria by Aristophanes of Byzantium²⁹⁴.

²⁹⁰ Despite the lack of clear evidence for a commentary to Pherekrates, a reference to a Didymean hypomnēma to Phrynichos' *Kronos* (see Ath. 9.371f) and the discussion of terms found in Pherekrates and other playwrights in the fragments of Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary* strongly suggest that the grammarian did not exclusively comment on Aristophanes' plays, but probably dealt with all the main playwrights of the *archaia* (as well as with Menandros, see *Et. Gud.* 338,20-25 S.). See the Introduction § 5.

²⁹¹ With regard to the *Λέξις κωμική* and the *Λέξις τραγική*, see Schmidt 1854, 91 («quae Chalcenterus noster per commentarios sparsim effuseque ediderat, haec maximam partem collecta breviataque iterum in lexica recepit») and Cohn 1903a, 462 («es liegt in der Natur der Sache, dass die beiden Wörterbücher sich mit den Commentaren zu den Tragikern und Komikern sehr nahe berührten»). See also Boudreaux on the *Λέξις κωμική* (*id.* 1919, 100: «pour la composer Didyme avait tiré parti avant tout de ses propres commentaires») and the Introduction § 5.

²⁹² See e.g. Arrighetti 1987, 200; Tosi 1994, 172; Ucciardello 2012, 44f. The origin of these collections might be traced back not only to Didymos himself, but possibly also to a compilative intervention by his entourage or 'school', or even by his immediate successors, without this implying the loss of the original authorship of the exegetic material.

²⁹³ For an overview on ancient and modern opinions concerning the authenticity of the books of the *History of animals*, see Berger 2005, 4-13.

²⁹⁴ See Scott 1992; Berger 2012, 6. On the epitome, see Lambros 1885, V-XX; Berger 2012, 3-9; Zucker 2012; Hellmann 2015, 1248-1251 and *Did.* fr. 228 above. Didymos probably used Aristotle's zoological works (either directly or through the epitome of Aristophanes of Byzantium) also in *fr.* 227f. and 241.

fr. 233 (= II 14.30^a, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the joke on the possible name of the city of Birds in Av. 814-816.

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 816a-ba-bβ Holwerda

οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνη **REG**: Δίδυμός φησιν· οὐδ' ἂν σπάρτῳ χρησαίμην, **VEGM** οὕτω μισῶ τὴν Σπάρτην. χαμεύνη δὲ ταπεινὴ κλίνη. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα εἴληφεν. **RVEGM**

a) ἄλλως. **RVEG³** οὐδ' ἂν τὴν χαμεύνην ὀνομάσαιμι σπάρτην, εἴ γε κειρίας ἔχοιμι, καὶ μὴ σπαρτίων δεῖσαιμι αὐτὴν ἐντεῖναι. **RVEG³M** ἡ δὲ χαμεύνη εὐτελής ἐστίν. **EG³M** ἡ δὲ κειρία εἶδος ζώνης ἐκ σχοινίων παρεοικὸς ἰμάντι, ἧ δεσμοῦσι τὰς κλίνας. **RVEG³M**

b) οὐδὲ τὴν χαμεύνην, φησί, τουτέστι τὴν κοίτην, καλέσαιμι σπάρτην, εἶγε κειρίαν ἔχοιμι, καὶ μὴ σπαρτίων δεηθεῖν αὐτὴν ἐντεῖναι. κειρία δὲ ἐστὶ ζώνη ἐκ σχοινίων ἢ ἐρίων πεπλεγμένη, ἐν ἧ δεσμοῦσι τὰ βρέφη· οἱ δὲ φασιν· ἐν ἧ δεσμοῦσι τὰς κλίνας. **Lh**

“not even the *chameunē*”: Didymos says: “I would never use rope (*sparton*), so deep is my hate for Sparta”. The *chameunē* is a low bedstead. From this (*i.e.* from *chamai*, “on the ground”) it received its name.

Otherwise. “I would not call my *chameunē* ‘Sparta’, if I had linen girths (*keiriai*) and did not need ropes (*spartia*) to tie it”. The *chameunē* is cheap. The *keiria* is a type of band of cords, looking somewhat like a leathern strap, with which they tie the beds.

“I would not – he says – call my *chameunē* (that is the bedstead) ‘Sparta’, if I had a linen girth (*keiria*) and did not need to ropes (*spartia*) to tie it”. The *keiria* is a band woven with cords and wool, in which they would wrap newborns. But some say “in which they would wrap the beds”.

Aristoph. Av. 812-816 Εὐ. φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἡμῖν ὄνομα' <ἄρ'> ἔσται τῆ πόλει; / βούλεσθε τὸ μέγα τοῦτο τοῦκ Λακεδαιμόνος / Σπάρτην ὄνομα καλῶμεν αὐτήν; Πε. Ἡράκλεις / σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θείμην ἐγὼ τήμῃ πόλει; / οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνη. Εὐ. πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ' ἔχων.

Tim. Lex. χ 2 V. χαμεύνια. τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς στρωννύμενα | **Hesych. χ 141** χάμευνα· ταπεινά, **143 C.** χαμεύνη· στιβάς, καὶ ἡ ταπεινὴ κλίνης. καὶ χαμεύνης· ὁ χαμαὶ κοιμώμενος | **Syn. χ 16 C.** χάμευνα· ταπεινὴ καὶ εὐτελής κλίνη, καὶ στιβάς | **Et. M. 806,28f.** χαμεύνα· ταπεινὴ, εὐτελής κλίνη καὶ στιβάς· καὶ χαμεύνια, κραββάτια ταπεινά | **[Zon.] 1842,18f. T.** χαμεύνα. ταπεινὴ καὶ εὐτελής κλίνη. καὶ χαμεύνια, ἡ ξηροκοιτία | **schol. Pl. Symp. 220d1 Cufalo** χαμεύνια] ταπεινά κλινίδια | **Suda χ 75 A.** χαμεύνης· ὁ χαμαὶ εὐναζόμενος. καὶ θηλυκὸν χαμεύνη, ταπεινὴ κλίνη. Ἀριστοφάνης· “οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνη πάνυ γε κειρίαν γ' ἔχων” | **Eust. Od. 1748,62-64 (= II 58,20-24 S.)** περι δὲ χαμαιευνάδων συῶν προέγραπται ... ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι ἐπὶ συῶν ἡ λέξις αὕτη κυρία. ἄνθρωποι μὲντοι χαμαιεῦναι παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐν Ἰλιάδι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ χαμεῦναι καὶ χαμαιευνάδες παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ψίαθοι καὶ στιβάδες, οἱ φασὶ καὶ ὅτι χαμεύνα ἢ ταπεινὴ κλίσσις καὶ στιβάς.

1-2 Δίδυμος–εἴληφεν post κλίνας M | **1** χαμεύνη RΓ Holwerda, χαμεύνη E Rutherford White, χαμεύνην Bekker Dindorf Dübner | ἂν σπάρτῳ M Bekker Holwerda, ἂν σπάρτον ῥ V Dindorf Dübner, ἄσπαρτον ῥ EG, ἂν σπαρτίῳ White | χρησαίμην statim cett., ex ἐχρησάμην Γ | **3 (a)** ἄλλως RV edd. pl., εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ EG³ Bekker | **4 (a)** κειρίας RVM, κειρίας EG³ | **5 (a)** σπαρτίων Holwerda, σπαρτίων RVEG³M edd. pl., σπαρτίου G | αὐτὴν M, αὐτὸν RV,

The parabasis ends with a catalogue of the advantages of having wings (Av. 785-800), thus anticipating the entrance on stage of Peisetairos and Euelpides dressed up as birds (801-808) and ready to begin the foundation of the new city by choosing its name. The first suggestion – made by Euelpides and clearly aimed at prompting «some hearty boos from the audience» (Dunbar 1995, 489) – is Σπάρτη. The toponym allows a pun relying both on the similarity with σπάρτον/σπαρτίον, “rope” (but it cannot be excluded that a feminine σπάρτη with the same meaning was also in use²⁹⁵), and on the twofold meaning of τίθημι in the context, namely “to bestow (a name)” and “to attach” (see Sommerstein 1987, 105: «Do you think I’d use Sparta as a name for my city? I wouldn’t even use esparto cords for a bedstead»).

The two interpretations of the passage preserved by the scholium (*i.e.* Didymos’ and an anonymous one) seem to presuppose different attributions of the second part of l. 816 (πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ’ ἔχων) and overall reflect diverging interpretations of Av. 814-816. In particular, the paraphrase contained in the second comment overlooks the ambivalence of θεῖην and evidently considers Ἡράκλεις-ἔχων as pronounced by the same character (οὐδ’ ἂν τὴν χαμεύνην ὀνομάσαιμι σπάρτην, εἴ γε κειρίας ἔχοιμι κτλ). In fact, the unity of l. 816 was not questioned by any modern editor²⁹⁶ before Geissler’s suggestion (1954, 42f.) of considering πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ’ ἔχων a reaction to the preceding sentence, a convincing solution that was later universally adopted²⁹⁷.

οὐδ’ ἂν σπάρτῳ χρησαίμην, οὕτω μισῶ τὴν Σπάρτην: Didymos’ loose paraphrase²⁹⁸ of the sentence οὐδ’ ἂν χαμεύνη (σπάρτην θείμην) involves (1) the replacement of the implied σπάρτην with the neutrum commonly designating the rope, and of the deliberately ambiguous θείμην with the plain χρησαίμην, (2) the explicitation of the obvious reason for the refusal of the σπάρτον, namely the hate for Sparta. The lack of any reference to the κειρία might constitute an *argumentum e silentio* to suppose that the grammarian (unlike the anonymous commentator) actually read πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ’ ἔχων as a response, separated from the preceding lines.

χαμεύνη δὲ ταπεινὴ κλίνη. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα εἴληφεν: the exegesis also includes a correct explanation of the word χαμεύνη, the origin of which is linked to its ταπεινότης (and implicitly to the adverb χαμαί)²⁹⁹.

²⁹⁵ «It is uncertain if fem. σπάρτη could mean, like neut. σπάρτον, σπαρτίον, *rope* or *cord* (of esparto grass) [...] Aristoph. may have depended on the general similarity of Σπάρτη to the words meaning *rope*» (Dunbar 1995, 489f.).

²⁹⁶ See Beck 1782, 86; Boissonade 1826, 253; Meineke 1860, 35; Felton 1864, 58; Holden 1868, 343; Dindorf 1869, 94; Bergk 1872, 39; Green 1894, 58; van Leeuwen 1902, 127; Hall-Geldart 1906; Rogers 1906, 112; Coulon 1928b, 63. Some doubts, but without changes in the printed text, in Bothe (1829, 339: «rarior haec significatio τοῦ πάνυ γε») and Kock (1894, 164: «das πάνυ γε [...] kann hier nicht richtig sein»).

²⁹⁷ See *e.g.* Kakridis 1974, 159f.; Dunbar 1995, 92 and 490; Wilson 2007a, 386. Geissler’s proposal is ignored by Sommerstein (1987, 104) and Cantarella 1956, 134, who accept the transmitted text, while Fraenkel (1959, 19f.) suggests an additional separation (*i.e.* Εὐ. Ἡράκλεις, / σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θείμην ἐγὼ τήμῃ πόλει; / Πει. οὐδ’ ἂν χαμεύνη; / Εὐ. πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ’ ἔχων). In fact, the entire section of ll. 811-819 presents issues of line-to-speaker attribution. For an overview, see Dunbar 1995, 489-491.

²⁹⁸ On the concept of ‘close’ and ‘loose’ paraphrase in ancient exegesis and especially in Aristarchos, see Schironi 2018, 76-90.

²⁹⁹ See GEW 1071, DELG 1245, EDG 1612.

fr. 234 (= II 14.31, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the plain of Phlegra in Av. 824

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 824a Holwerda

τὸ Φλέγρας πεδῖον **RVEΓ**: ἔξωθεν ὑπακουστέον τὸν “ἦ” διασαφητικὸν σύνδεσμον. βέλτιον, φησί, πιστεύειν τὰ χρήματα τούτων ἐν Νεφελοκοκκυγία ἀποκεῖσθαι ἢ εἰς τὸ Φλέγρας πεδῖον. διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸ ὡς κάκεινο πεπλασμένον ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν. **RVEΓM** ἔστι δὲ τῆς Θράκης **RVEΓ** πεδῖον. Δίδυμος δὲ φησι: διὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς Φλέγρας καὶ τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας. **REΓ**

“The plain of Phlegra”: an explanatory connective *ē* must be supplied. (Aristophanes) means: “it is better to believe that their wealth is stored in Nephelokokkygia than in the plain of Phlegra”. He mocks this (place) for being made up by the poets as well. It is a plain in Thrace. Didymos says: “because of the similarity between the names of Phlegra and Nephelokokkygia”.

Aristoph. Av. 821-825 Εὐ. ἄρ' ἐστὶν αὕτη γ' ἢ Νεφελοκοκκυγία, / ἵνα καὶ τὰ Θεογόνους τὰ πολλὰ χρήματα / τὰ τ' Αἰσχίνου γ' ἅπαντα; Πε. †καὶ λῶστον† μὲν οὖν / τὸ Φλέγρας πεδῖον, ἵν' οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς γηγενεῖς / ἀλαζονευόμενοι καθυπερηκόντισαν.

Hdn. III/1 265,8 Lentz (~ Steph. Byz. φ 77 B.-N.H., *schol.* Tz. Lyc. 1404 Scheer) Φλέγρα πόλις Θράκης, ἣν Εὐδοξος (fr. 310 Lasserre) μετὰ ταῦτα Παλλήνην φησὶ κληθῆναι | **Et. Gen. a 1422 L.-L.** αὐτόγυον: “πρὸς δὲ καὶ αὐτόγυον στιβαροῦ ἀδάμαντος ἄρτρον / ἤλασεν. Ἡελίφ τίνων χάριν, ὅς ῥά μιν ἵπποις / δέξατο, Φλεγραίη κεκμηῖα δηϊοτήτι” (Apoll. Rhod. 3.232-234). Φλέγρα ὄρος Θράκης, ὅπου συνέστησαν οἱ θεοὶ πρὸς Τιτάνες μάχην. εἴρηται δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ φλεγγῆνα τοὺς Γίγαντας τῷ κεραυνῷ Διὶ ἀνθισταμένους. αὐτόγυον δὲ δύο εἶδη εἰσὶν ἀρότρων, τὸ μὲν καλεῖται πηκτόν, τὸ δὲ αὐτόγυον ... οὕτως σχόλιον εὐρον εἰς τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά | **schol. Apoll. Rhod. 3.233-34b** (p. 226,14f. Wendel) Φλεγραίη: Φλέγρα πεδῖον Θράκης περὶ Παλλήνην, ἔνθα οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς Γίγαντας κατεπολέμησαν, **1227b** (p. 254,6f. Wendel) Φλεγραῖον: τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Φλέγρας: Φλέγρα δὲ πεδῖον Θράκης περὶ Παλλήνην | **schol. Lyc. 115 Scheer** Φλεγραία τὸ πρὶν ἐκαλεῖτο ἢ Θράκη διὰ τὸ τοὺς Γίγαντας ἐκεῖ πεφλέχθαι | **Suda φ 528 A.** Φλεγραίας πεδῖον: Θρακικόν. Ἀριστοφάνης (Av. 824f.): “ἵνα περ τοὺς γηγενεῖς ἀλαζονευόμενους καθυπερηκόντισαν” | **Et. M. 795,55 G.** φλεγραία: ὄρος Θράκης | **schol. Tz. Aristoph. Av. 824 Koster** Φλέγρας πεδῖον] ἔστι πεδῖον τῆς Θράκης | **schol. Tz. Lyc. 115 Scheer** Φλεγραίας Θρακικῆς, ὅτι ἐκεῖσε οἱ Γίγαντες ἐφλέχθησαν | **schol. Pind. N. 1.101 Drachmann** Φλέγρα τόπος ἐν Θράκη καὶ κόμη, ἔνθα οἱ Γίγαντες ἀνηρέθησαν ὑπὸ θεῶν

1 διασαφητικὸν hic cett., post σύνδεσμον M | 2 πιστεύειν hic cett., post χρήματα Γ | 3 αὐτὸ cett., αὐτὰ M | κάκεινο cett., om. M | πεπλασμένον cett., πεπλασμένα M | Θράκης cett., θρα (in fine pag.) V | 4 τῶν ὀνομάτων codd., τῶν πολισμάτων dub. Gulick ap. White, fort. expungendum | τῆς Φλέγρας καὶ τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας codd., τῶν Φλέγρα καὶ Φλεγγῆαι· οἱ Φλεγγῆαι γὰρ ἀλαζονεστάτοι scripsit Rutherford

The scene of the naming of the bird-city (Av. 809-825) culminates in the choice of the toponym Nephelokokkygia and ends with three lines (823-825 †καὶ λῶστον† μὲν οὖν / τὸ Φλέγρας πεδῖον, ἵν' οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς γηγενεῖς / ἀλαζονευόμενοι καθυπερηκόντισαν) that seem to draw some sort of comparison between the rising polis and the plain of Phlegra, the mythical site of the battle between the Olympians and the Giants³⁰⁰.

³⁰⁰ Cf. Hes. fr. 43a,65 M.-W. (but there ἐν Φλέγγρη δ]ε is Merkelbach's integration); Pind. N. 1.67; Aeschyl. Eum. 292-298; Eur. HF 1190-1192, Ion 988; discussions e.g. Oberhummer 1941; Latacz 1998, 1069f.

Because of its obscure meaning within the whole passage and because of the unusual superlative λῶστον (see e.g. Dunbar 1995, 493f.), the paradosis has been increasingly questioned since the beginning of modern scholarship on Aristophanes and still remains a *locus perdifficilis*³⁰¹. Overall, one can identify three approaches to the text: firstly, emending either λῶστον (see Bentley [*Em. In.* 340] λῶον ... <ῆ>³⁰²) or καὶ λῶστον (in κάλλιστον³⁰³, μᾶλλον³⁰⁴, κάλλιον³⁰⁵ or κατέλαβον³⁰⁶); secondly, supposing the loss of one or more lines (see van Herwerden 1906, 71f. and Dunbar 1995, 494); thirdly, accepting the transmitted text (see Coulon 1928a, 63³⁰⁷; Kakridis 1974, 161). A further, tentative hypothesis could be to assume that the original location of ll. 823b-825 was between l. 816 and l. 817 and that their misplacement caused the fall of some words after τὰ τ' Αἰσχίνου γ' ἅπαντα and before †καὶ λῶστον† μὲν οὖν³⁰⁸:

Ευ. φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἡμῖν ὄνομ' <ἄρ'> ἔσται τῆ πόλει; (812)

βούλεσθε τὸ μέγα τοῦτο τοῦκ Λακεδαίμονος (813)

Σπάρτην ὄνομα καλῶμεν αὐτήν;

Πε. Ἡράκλεις; (814)

σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θείμην ἐγὼ τήμῃ πόλει; (815)

οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνη.

Ευ. πάνυ γε, κειρίαν γ' ἔχων. (816)

< ✕ ≡ ∪ ≡ × ≡ ∪ >

Πε. †καὶ λῶστον† μὲν οὖν (823b)

τὸ Φλέγρας πεδίον, ἴν' οἱ θεοὶ τοὺς γηγενεῖς (824)

ἀλαζονευόμενοι καθυπερηκόντισαν. (825)

<...>

Πε. τί δῆτ' ὄνομ' αὐτῆ θησόμεσθ';

Χο. ἐντευθενὶ (817)

ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν καὶ τῶν μετεώρων χωρίων (818)

χαῦνόν τι πάνυ.

Πε. βούλει Νεφελοκοκκυγίαν; (819)

Χο. ἰοὺ ἰοῦ.

³⁰¹ Doubts are uttered e.g. by Beck 1782, 86; Green 1894, 134; Kock 1894, 165 and van Leeuwen 1902, 128f. Among more recent critics, see e.g. Wilson 2007a, 387.

³⁰² Accepted only by Reiske (1754, 211) and, later, by Sommerstein (1987, 106) and Henderson 2000, 130.

³⁰³ See Blaydes 1842, 59; Bergk 1872, v; Merry 1889b, 47 and van Herwerden 1906, 71.

³⁰⁴ See Dindorf 1869, 94.

³⁰⁵ See Blaydes 1882, 94.

³⁰⁶ See Wilson 2007a, 387; 2007c, 123f.

³⁰⁷ See von der Mühl's criticism (1928, 622).

³⁰⁸ van Herwerden (1906, 71f.) offers a similar but much less likely suggestion: «nata est mihi suspicio haec verba propter similem sententiam quondam a lectore e deperdita fabula sive ipsius Aristophanis sive alius comici in margine adscripta fuisse et sic devenisse in textum» (*ibid.*). The proposal is clearly influenced by the unclear ὁμοιότης τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς Φλέγρας καὶ τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας mentioned by Didymos (see below).

| | |
|---|--------|
| καλόν γ' ἀτεχνῶς <σὺ> καὶ μέγ' ἠῦρες τοῦνομα. | (820) |
| Εὐ. ἄρ' ἐστὶν αὕτη γ' ἡ Νεφελοκοκκυγία, | (821) |
| ἵνα καὶ τὰ Θεογένους τὰ πολλὰ χρήματα | (822) |
| τά τ' Αἰσχίνου γ' ἅπαντα < \approx x - υ - > | (823a) |
| Χο. λιπαρὸν τὸ χρῆμα τῆς πόλεως. τίς δαὶ θεὸς | (826) |
| πολιοῦχος ἔσται; τῷ ξανοῦμεν τὸν πέπλον; ³⁰⁹ | (827) |

In this reconstruction, the “plain of Phlegra” would be a second hyperbolic name-proposal, a comic response to the suggestion of Σπάρτη involving a joke on the representation of the gods within the *Gigantomachia*³¹⁰. Dindorf’s conjecture μάλλον μὲν οὖν in 823b³¹¹ fits particularly well with this interpretation (“rather than ‘Sparta’ [let us call the city] ‘plain of Phlegra’...”). However, if this were the case, the corruption should have occurred rather early in the manuscript transmission of the play, since a fragment of a papyrus *codex* dating from the 5th-6th century CE (*P. Berol.* 13231³¹²) carries the first letters of ll. 819-829 in the same sequence of the medieval manuscripts. That the transmitted text posed problems to ancient readers as well is clearly proved by the scholiastic material concerning Av. 824, and especially by the first anonymous section, which consists of four elements: firstly, an observation on the necessity of supplying an ἦ in the Aristophanic text; secondly, a rather unrealistic paraphrase of ll. 823f. depending on the integration proposed (βέλτιον ... πιστεύειν τὰ χρήματα τούτων ἐν Νεφελοκοκκυγία ἀποκεῖσθαι ἢ εἰς τὸ Φλέγρας πεδῖον); thirdly, a tentative explanation of the joke implied by the allusion to the plain of Phlegra (*i.e.* the place is a poetic invention, just as the birds’ city) and, finally, a reference to its location in Thrace³¹³. Since this last statement seemingly clashes with the preceding one on the fictitious nature of the place, a conflation of material of different provenance cannot be excluded. The interpretation of the following Didymean fragment, however, is equally complex.

διὰ τὴν ὁμοίτητα τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς Φλέγρας καὶ τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας: the interpretation of Didymos’ comment depends ultimately on the meaning assigned to the term ὁμοίότης. Rutherford (1896a, 495f.) believed that it indicated a resemblance of sound and that the Aristophanic text commented on by the grammarian read

³⁰⁹ “EU. Let’s see then, what name will our city have? Do you want us to give it that great name from Lakedaimon, Sparta? PE. By Herakles, could I ever use ‘Sparta’ for my city? I could never even use esparto for my bedstead! EU. Sure, if you could afford bed slats! <...> PE. †and the best† the Plain of Phlegra, where the Gods completely overshoot the Earthborn at bragging! <...> Then what name will we give it? CH. Something airy, from the clouds and the aerial spaces. PE. Do you like “Nephelokokkygia”? CH. Yes, yes! You found an absolutely beautiful and great name! EU. Sure, this must be the same Nephelokokkygia where all of Theogenes’ riches are, and all of Aischines’. <...> CH. A golden shiny business, this of the city! Now what god will be its guardian? For whom shall we weave the robe?”.

³¹⁰ On the influence of this narration onto Aristophanes’ *Birds*, see Dunbar 1995, 7-9.

³¹¹ See Aristoph. *Ra.* 240-242 Δι. ἀλλ’, ὃ φιλοδὸν γένος, / παύσασθε. Βα. μάλλον μὲν οὖν / φθελγόμεσθ’(α). Further support to the conjecture may be provided by the anonymous paraphrase of the passage preserved in the *scholium*, which seems to entail a comparative (see βέλτιον) in the Aristophanic text (see *e.g.* White 1914, 156).

³¹² See Schubart-Wilamowitz 1907, 99-112; Maehler 1984, 18-29; Ioannidou 1996, 141f.

³¹³ This is the most widespread piece of information concerning the toponym (see the parallel passages listed above).

τὸ Φλεγυῶν πεδῖον³¹⁴, a reconstruction involving the replacement of the transmitted τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας at the end of the scholium with Φλέγυαι, “Phlegyans”, a mythical people famous for its insolence and impiety³¹⁵. In all likelihood, as already hypothesised by White (1914, 156), the similarity underlined by Didymos was not phonetic but conceptual, implying that both toponyms denoted made-up places (just as underlined in the third section of the anonymous part of the scholium, διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸ ὡς κάκεινο πεπλασμένον ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν), although the genitive τῶν ὀνομάτων hints at a formal kind of resemblance. Gulick’s proposal (*ap.* White 1914, 156) of πολισμάτων instead of ὀνομάτων is perhaps too ingenious, since τῶν ὀνομάτων might well be a later addition trying to explain an unclear διὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῆς Φλέγρας καὶ τῆς Νεφελοκοκκυγίας. Regardless, Didymos’ interpretation cannot but be aimed at justifying a text identical to the one transmitted by the manuscripts, with the problematic contiguity of the newly invented city-name with the reference to the plain of Phlegra.

³¹⁴ See Rutherford 1896, 496: «Who is to say that Didymus did not edit or even find in the text the reading τὸ Φλεγυῶν πεδῖον, in which there would be a triple reference to the people Φλεγύαι, to the bird φλεγύας [...], and to the plain of Phlegra?».

³¹⁵ Cf. *Il.* 13.302; *h.Ap.* 3.278; Hesych. φ 587 C.

fr. 235 (= II 14.32, p. 253 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the expression Ἄρεως νεοττός in *Av.* 835

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 835a-b-d Holwerda

Ἄρεως νεοττός **VE**: νεοττοὶ τινες ἀλεκτρυόνες λέγονται, ὡς καὶ μηδικοί. ἴσως δέ τις ἦν καλὸς παῖς Νεοττὸς τοῦνομα, πρὸς ὃν παίζει· “ὦ Νεοττὲ δέσποτα”. **VEΓ³Lh** οὕτω Δίδυμος. **VEΓ³MLh** ἄλλως, **VELh** ἐπεὶ μάχιμος ὁ ἀλεκτρυὼν **RVEΓMLh** καὶ βασιλεὺς Μήδων, ὡς προεῖρηται. **Lh** φασὶν δὲ αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα κατασταθῆναι ὑπὸ Ἄρεως ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἡφαίστου τηρεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἄφιξιν διὰ τὴν μοιχείαν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης. ὁ δὲ ἀπεκοιμήθη. φωραθεὶς οὖν ὁ Ἄρης εἰς τὸ ὄρνειον αὐτὸν μετέβαλεν **RVEΓM** ὡς ἡμεληκότα τῆς φυλακῆς. **R**

“a *neottos* of Ares”: some cocks are called *neottoi*, as well as “Median”. Perhaps there was a handsome boy called Neottos, at whom the line “o lord Neottos” is aimed. So says Didymos. Otherwise. Because the cock is warlike and is king of the Medes, as already said (*Av.* 483-485). They say that the cock – who was formerly a man – was put by Ares in Hephaistos’ house to watch over his departure because of Ares’ adulterous relationship with Aphrodites. But the cock fell asleep. Therefore, Ares, being discovered, turned him into the bird because of his carelessness in the surveillance.

Aristoph. Av. 832-836 Χο. τίς δαὶ καθέξει τῆς πόλεως τὸ Πελαργικόν; / Πε. ὄρνις ἀφ’ ὑμῶν, τοῦ γένους τοῦ Περσικοῦ, / ὅσπερ λέγεται δεινότατος εἶναι πανταχοῦ / Ἄρεως νεοττός. *Ev.* ὦ νεοττὲ δέσποτα / ὡς δ’ ὁ θεὸς ἐπιτήδειος οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ πετρῶν.

Ar. Byz. fr. 206 S. (~ *Ael. NA* 7.47; *Eust. II.* 753,54 = II 720,1 V.) τῶν δὲ ὀρνίθων τὰ νέα, νεοττοὶ καὶ ὀρτάλιχοι, προστιθεμένου, καὶ τοῦ παρασήμου τῆς ιδιότητος, οἷον νεοττοὶ ἀλεκτρυόνων | [**Demetr.**] *Eloc.* 160 καὶ εἰκασία δ’ εἰσὶν εὐχάριτες, ἂν τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα Μήδω εἰκάσης, ὅτι τὴν κυρβασίαν ὀρθὴν φέρει· βασιλεὶ δέ, ὅτι πορφύρεός ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι βοήσαντος ἀλεκτρυόνος ἀνατηδῶμεν, ὥσπερ καὶ βασιλέως βοήσαντος, καὶ φοβούμεθα | **Suda a 3824 A.** (~ *Ael. Dion.* a 171 E.) Ἄρεοπαγίτης· διαφορεῖται. καὶ παροιμία, Ἄρεοπαγίτης, ἐπὶ τῶν σκυθρωπῶν καὶ ὑπερσέμων καὶ σιωπηλῶν. καὶ Ἄρεως νεοττός, καὶ Ἄρεως παιδίον, ἐπὶ τῶν θραυστάτων. κέχηται τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ Πλάτων Πεισάνδρῳ (fr. 112 K.-A.), τῷ δὲ δευτέρῳ Ἀλεξανδρίδῃ Πεισάνδρῳ (*i.e.* Ἀναξανδρίδῃ Πανδάρῳ, fr. 39 K.-A.) | **Coll. Ath. V_A 55 S.-S.** ἄλλος Ἄρεως νεοττός. ἐπὶ τῶν πάνυ θρασέων | **schol. Aristoph. Ach. 871b Wilson** ὀρτάλιχων δὲ τινὲς τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων, κατὰ τὴν τῶν Βοιωτῶν διᾶλεκτον, **schol. Aristoph. Av. 277** τοὺς ἴεγκυμάτων ὄρνεις περσικούς φασὶ πρὸς τὸ ξένον τῆς θέας· ζητεῖται δέ, εἰ ὄντως καλεῖται τις ὄρνις μῆδος, **485 Holwerda** ὥστε καλεῖται Περσικὸς ὄρνις· μήποτε καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθε (*Av.* 277-279) τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα Μήδον ὄρνιν καλεῖ, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας Μήδους ἔλεγον | **schol. Nic. Alex. 294b** αἰχμητῆσι νεοσσοῖς· τοῖς ἀλεκτρυόσι, δηλαδή· οὗτοι γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλους πολεμισταὶ γίνονται, **c Geymonat** αἰχμητῆσιν νεοσσοῖς] τοῖς ἄρρεσι τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων | **Macar. 2.31** Ἄρεως νεοττός· καὶ Ἄρεως παιδίον· ἐπὶ τῶν θραυστάτων | **Apost. 4.7** Ἄρεως νεοττόν· ἐπὶ τῶν φιλοπολέμων.

1 ante νεοττοί, ἢ Lh | ante ἴσως, ἢ Lh | δὲ cett., om. Lh | τις ἦν VLh, τισι EΓ³ | **1-2** νεοττοί–Δίδυμος inter text. versus Γ³ | **2** post δέσποτα, εἰπὼν Lh | post οὕτω, φησὶ καὶ M | ἄλλως V, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ E, ἢ Lh | **3** ἐπεὶ cett., ἐπειδὴ MLh | μάχιμος hic cett., post ἀλεκτρυόνων M | ὁ cett., om. M | δὲ cett., om. V | **4** ὑπὸ cett., ὑπὲρ V | Ἄρεως cett., Ἄρεως EM | 5 φωραθεὶς οὖν cett., καὶ φωραθεὶς M | τὸ cett., om. M | post τὸ, τοιοῦτον R | ὄρνειον hic cett., post μετέβαλεν R | μετέβαλεν cett., μετέβαλλεν Γ

Peisetairos' suggestion of the cock as θεὸς πολιοῦχος is not explicit. Rather, the ἀλεκτρυών is alluded to (Av. 833-835) through two definitions: “a bird of Persian breed” (ὄρνις ... τοῦ γένους τοῦ Περσικοῦ) and “Ares' most fearsome chick” (δαινότατος ... Ἄρεως νεοττός). This last expression echoes l. 767 (τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον, see fr. 2 above), where Aristophanes is most probably «reliteralizing' a metaphorical and already proverbial expression for child taking after parent»³¹⁶. As far as Ἄρεως νεοττός is concerned, the playwright might have either created the expression *ad hoc* (playing at the same time with the proverbial τοῦ πατρὸς νεόττιον, a possibly well-known saying Ἄρεως νεοττός³¹⁷ and with the widespread Homeric line-ending ὄζος Ἄρηος, “scion of Ares”³¹⁸), or reused an already-existing proverb Ἄρεως νεοττός, punning on a similar ‘reliteralization’ as in l. 767. The second option finds support in *Suda* α 3824 A., that attests that the comic playwright Plato also used the expression Ἄρεως νεοττός in his *Peisandros* (fr. 112 K.-A.)³¹⁹, possibly with a reference to the protagonist and with a paratragic intent (see Dunbar 1995, 498).

The scholium to Av. 835 joins Didymos' exegesis (see below) with an anonymous comment³²⁰ focused on the features ascribed to the cock by Peisetairos, namely the Persian origin (explained through a reference to the preceding ll. 483-485), the fact of being δαινότατος³²¹ and the relation to the War-god (illustrated through an account of the mythical transformation of Ares' attendant into a cock³²²).

νεοττοὶ τινες ἀλεκτρυόνες λέγονται: unlike the anonymous interpretation, Didymos' exegesis (at least in the form preserved by the scholium) does not deal with Ἄρεως νεοττός – although it is plausible that the grammarian was aware of the parallel offered by Plato's *Peisandros* (fr. 112 K.-A., see above) – but rather clarifies the meaning of νεοττός, by identifying it as a designation for “some” cocks (τινες ἀλεκτρυόνες). A similar synonymy between νεοττός and ἀλεκτρυών is found in *schol. Nic. Alex.* 294b Geymonat (αἰχμητῆσι νεοσσοῖς· τοῖς ἀλεκτρυόσι, δηλαδῆ). An important source for Didymos' interpretation must have been the treatment of the word in the work *On the names of ages* of Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 206 S.), where

³¹⁶ Dunbar 1995, 474. But see Tosi 2017c, 141.

³¹⁷ See Spyridonidou-Skarsouli 1995, 397.

³¹⁸ *Il.* 2.540 *et passim*; Eur. *IA* 201. See e.g. van Leeuwen 1902, 131; Sommerstein 1987, 253; Dunbar 1995, 474.

³¹⁹ The play was produced between 422 and 411 BCE (see Pirrotta 2009, 222). Along with Plato's fragment, the *Suda* also quotes Anaxandrides' expression Ἄρεως παῖδιον (fr. 39 K.-A. For the doubtful ascription to the play *Pandaros*, see Kassel-Austin 1991, 257; Millis 2015, 185). In fact, the entry might ultimately rely on an earlier and more complete version of the alphabetic *corpus* of proverbs constituting the fifth and last part of the Athos manuscript (Par. suppl. 1164; see Spyridonidou-Skarsouli 1995, 3-5). Indeed, that Coll. Ath. V_A dealt with the expression can be seen s.v. ἄλλος Ἄρεως νεοττός (see above *id.* 396-399), but – since the synonymic juxtaposition of *Hauptsprichwort* and *Nebensprichwörter* is a typical feature of the *corpus* (see *id.* 11f.) – the sequence of Ἀρεοπαγίτης ... Ἄρεως νεοττός, καὶ Ἄρεως παῖδιον in the *Suda* allows to suppose that a less epitomised form of the Athos-collection was the source for the lexicographical entry.

³²⁰ **M** omits the first part of the scholium but retains Didymos' name, thus ascribing the following anonymous comment to him.

³²¹ See also the note Ἄρεως νεοττός: ἐπεὶ ἄλκιμος καὶ μάχιμός ἐστιν (*i.e. schol. Aristoph. Av.* 835c Holwerda, linked to the *scholium* to Av. 833 in **VEΓM** and preserved as an independent gloss in **Lh**).

³²² A more detailed version is preserved as a separate note by **Lh**: ἱστορία περὶ τοῦ ἀλεκτρυόνος. φασὶ γὰρ ὡς Ἄρεος ἦν ὀπαδός. καὶ καταστάς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φύλαξ, ὅτε πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην εἰσηλθε τὴν Ἥφαιστου γυναῖκα, ὥστε τὸν ὄρθρον σκοπεῖν ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἥλιος τὸ ὑπὲρ γῆν ἀνέρχεσθαι ἄρχεται ἡμισφαίριον – ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ καιρῷ εἴωθεν Ἥφαιστος ἐπανάρχεσθαι οἴκαδε τοῦ ἔργου πανόμενος – ἔλαθεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸ βαρυτάτῳ κατασχεθεῖς. λαμπύρας οὖν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοφῶρῳ ληφθεὶς Ἄρης μοιχεύων καὶ καταγνωσθεὶς ὠργίσθη, καὶ ἀλεκτρυόνα τὸν ὀπαδὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς ὄρνιν μετέβαλεν. ὁ δὲ μεμνημένος τὴν ὄραν ἐκείνην ἄρχεται ἄδειν τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου προαισθόμενος ἄνοδον. δῆλος δὲ ἐστίν, ὡς φασί, τῷ τε λόφῳ, τοῖς κέντροις καὶ τῷ θυμῷ. ὄρα δέ, ὅπως καὶ τοῦτον τὸν μῦθον εὐφυῶς συνέθεντο.

νεοττός and ὀρτάλιχος are said to refer to young birds in general (τῶν δὲ ὀρνίθων τὰ νέα, νεοττοὶ καὶ ὀρτάλιχοι, προστιθεμένου, καὶ τοῦ παρασήμου τῆς ιδιότητος, οἷον νεοττοὶ ἀλεκτρούων³²³). The lack of a reference, in the Didymean fragment, to the young age of the νεοττοί is paralleled by a scholium to the *Acharnians*, dealing with the term ὀρτάλιχος (*schol.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 871b ὀρταλίχων δὲ τινὲς τῶν ἀλεκτρούων, κατὰ τὴν τῶν Βοιωτῶν διάλεκτον).

ὥς καὶ μηδικοί: in all likelihood, the adjective refers to *Av.* 483-485 where it is said that the cock ἐτυράννει / ἦρχέ τε Περσῶν πρότερον πολλῶ Δαρείου καὶ Μεγαβάζου, / ὥστε καλεῖται Περσικὸς ὄρνις ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔτ' ἐκείνης. The scholium to l. 485 tentatively suggests that one of the members of the Chorus, the one called Μῆδος (*Av.* 277), is actually to identify with the cock, because of the synonymy between the ethnics Πέρσης and Μῆδος (ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας Μῆδους ἔλεγον). The rhetorical treatise *On style*³²⁴ uses the cock and the Mede to exemplify a good simile, thus showing the paradigmatic value later assumed by Aristophanes' jokes on the commonly acknowledged Persian derivation of the bird (not native to mainland Greece³²⁵) and on its popular designation of “Persian bird”³²⁶ (see also Cratin. fr. 279 K.-A. ὥσπερ ὁ Περσικὸς ὄραν πᾶσαν καναχῶν ὀλόφωνος ἀλέκτωρ).

ἴσως δὲ τις ἦν καλὸς παῖς Νεοττός τοῦνομα πρὸς ὃν παίζει· “ὦ Νεοττὲ δέσποτα”: after clarifying the meaning of νεοττός, Didymos concentrates on the exclamation ὦ νεοττὲ δέσποτα. The grammarian suggests that Euelpides' answer implies a misunderstanding of the ornithonym νεοττός for an alleged personal name (or nickname) Νεοττός, with a resulting ὀνομαστί joke. This interpretation of the second part of l. 835 is surely influenced by the three other similar exclamations found in Aristophanes, which all involve proper names, *i.e.* *Ach.* 247 ὦ Διόνυσε δέσποτα, *Lys.* 940 ὦ Ζεῦ δέσποτα³²⁷ and especially *V.* 389 ὦ Λύκε δέσποτα, where the name of the invoked hero is also the name of an animal. Didymos' definition of the alleged *kōmōdoumenos* as a “beautiful boy” may just derive from the basic meaning of the term, *i.e.* “young cock”, but a possible role could have also been played by homoerotic poetry. Indeed, there are at least three extant examples of young boys being called δεσπότης by the lover: one is much earlier than Didymos, by Dioscorides³²⁸, and two are slightly later than him, by Strato³²⁹.

³²³ See Philox. Leuc. *PMG* 836b,35 ἀλεκτρούων τε νεοσσοί.

³²⁴ For an overview on the ongoing debate regarding the work's date and authorship, see de Jonge 2009.

³²⁵ See *e.g.* Arnott 2007, 16f.

³²⁶ See Rhys Roberts 1902, 239; Chiron 1993, 115; Lombardo 1999, 155; Marini 2007, 239.

³²⁷ The same phrase occurs in *adesp. com.* fr. 258 *CGFP* 1. 25.

³²⁸ Diosc. *AP* 12.169 = *HE* 1503-1506 ἐξέφυγον, Θεόδωρε, τὸ σὸν βάρος, ἀλλ' ὅσον εἶπας / ἐξέφυγον τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμονα πικρότατον, / πικρότερός με κατέσχευεν. Ἀριστοκράτει δὲ λατρεύων / μυρία δεσπότησιν καὶ τρίτον ἐκδέχομαι.

³²⁹ Strat. *AP* 12.196 = 37 Floridi ὀφθαλμοὺς σπινθηρᾶς ἔχεις, θεόμορφε Λυκίνε, / μᾶλλον δ' ἀκτίνας, δέσποτα, πυρσοβόλους. / ἀνωπὸς βλέψαι βαιὸν χρόνον οὐ δύναμαί σοι, / οὕτως ἀστράπτεις ὄμμασιν ἀμφοτέροις and 246 = 88 Floridi ζευγὸς ἀδελφειῶν με φιλεῖ· οὐκ οἶδα, τί' αὐτῶν / δεσπότησιν κρίνω· τοὺς δύο γὰρ φιλέω. / χῶ μὲν ἀποστείγει, ὁ δ' ἐπέρχεται· ἔστι δὲ τοῦ μὲν / κάλλιστον τὸ παρὸν, τοῦ δὲ τὸ λειπόμενον. For a complete survey of the usage of δεσπότης and δέσποινα in Greek and Latin love poetry, see Floridi 2007, 240.

fr. 236 (= II 14.33, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of ἐπὶ πετρῶν in *Av.* 836

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 836a-b Holwerda

ὡς δ' ὁ θεὸς ἐπιτήδειος **ΕΓ**³: Δίδυμός φησι τὸ πελαργικὸν τεῖχος ἐπὶ πετρῶν κεῖσθαι. **RVEI**³**MLh** καὶ ὁ ἀλεκτρυὼν οὖν ὡς θεὸς οἰκίσει ἐπὶ πετρῶν. **Lh** ἄλλως. **ΕΓ**³**M** τὸ πελαργικὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τραχύ. ἀλλὰ διὰ τί ἐπιτήδειος ἐπὶ πετρῶν οἰκεῖν, εἴπερ ἀλεκτρυὼν ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ τὸν πελαργὸν λέγει ἅμα παίζων καὶ πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα. ἀλλὰ διὰ τί περσικὸν ἢ Ἄρεος νεοττός; **VEI**³**M**

“How well suited the god”: Didymos says that the Pelargic wall stood on rocks. Therefore, the cock will reside as god on the rocks. Otherwise. Because the Pelargic wall is also rugged. But why is it well suited to reside on rocks, if it is a cock? Unless (Aristophanes) means the stork (*pelargos*), making a pun at the same time with the bird-name. But then why call it “Persian” and “Ares’ cockerel”?

Aristoph. Av. 832-836 Χο. τίς δαὶ καθέξει τῆς πόλεως τὸ Πελαργικόν; / Πε. ὄρνις ἀφ' ὑμῶν, τοῦ γένους τοῦ Περσικοῦ, / ὅσπερ λέγεται δεινότατος εἶναι πανταχοῦ / Ἄρεος νεοττός. *Ev.* ὃ νεοττὲ δέσποτα / ὡς δ' ὁ θεὸς ἐπιτήδειος οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ πετρῶν.

Her. 5.64 Κλεομένης δὲ ἀπικόμενος ἐς τὸ ἄστυ ἅμα Ἀθηναίων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι ἐπολιόρκει τοὺς τυράννους ἀπεργμένους ἐν τῷ Πελαργικῷ τείχῃ | **Aristot. Ath. 19.5** (~ *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 1153 Hangard = Aristot. fr. 395 Rose, 474 Gigon, 4 Montana) Κλεομένην ἐξέπεμψαν τὸν βασιλέα (*scil.* οἱ Λάκωνες) στόλον ἔχοντα μείζω κατὰ γῆν, ὃς ... κατακλείσας τὸν Ἰππῖαν εἰς τὸ καλούμενον Πελαργικὸν τεῖχος, ἐπολιόρκει μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων | **Dion. Hal. 1.28** Μυρσίλος δὲ (*BNJ* 477 F 9) τὰ ἔμπαλιν ἀποφαινόμενος Ἑλλανίκῳ (*BNJ* 4 F 4) τοὺς Τυρρηνοὺς φησιν, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐξέλιπον, ἐν τῇ πλάνῃ μετονομασθῆναι Πελαργούς, τῶν ὀρνέων τοῖς καλουμένοις πελαργοῖς εἰκασθέντας, ὡς κατ' ἀγέλας ἐφοίτων εἰς τε τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὴν βάρβαρον· καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸ τεῖχος τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, τὸ Πελαργικὸν καλούμενον, τούτους περιβαλεῖν | *schol.* **Aristoph. Av. 832 Holwerda** τῆς πόλεως τὸ πελαργικόν: ὅτι Ἀθήνησι τὸ πελαργικὸν τεῖχος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει, οὗ μὲνηται *Καλλιμάχος* (fr. 97 Pf. = 200 Massimilla)· Τυρσηνῶν τείχισμα πελαργικόν.

2 ἄλλως ΕΓ³, ἀλλὰ Μ | post τὸ, γὰρ V | 3 τί ΕΓ³, τ V, τὸ Μ | ἐπὶ πετρῶν οἰκεῖν hic VEI³, post ἐστίν Μ | λέγει Μ, om. VEI³

The choice of the cock as city's guardian is received with enthusiasm by Euelpides, who underlines that the bird will be ἐπιτήδειος οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ πετρῶν, “well-suited to reside on rocks” (*Av.* 836).

Unlike Didymos, who only focuses on ἐπὶ πετρῶν as a metaphor indicating “the Pelargic” (*Av.* 832), the anonymous commentator quoted in the scholium after him also questions the cock's aptitude to living “on rocks”, tentatively suggesting that Aristophanes played instead on the assonance between τὸ Πελαργικὸν and πέλαργος (“stork”).

Δίδυμός φησι τὸ πελαργικὸν τεῖχος ἐπὶ πετρῶν κεῖσθαι: the identification of τὸ Πελαργικὸν with the Athenian wall called “Pelargic” is carried out in the anonymous scholium to *Av.* 832 (ὅτι Ἀθήνησι τὸ πελαργικὸν τεῖχος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει), where Kallimachos' phrase Τυρσηνῶν τείχισμα πελαργικόν (fr. 97 Pf. =

200 Massimilla) is used as evidence³³⁰. Since Didymos' exegesis implies the identification of Aristophanes' τὸ Πελαργικόν as τὸ Πελαργικόν τεῖχος, it is tempting to ascribe the comment on l. 832 (with the quotation from Kallimachos) to him. However, Kallimachos is not the only author clearly stating that "the Pelargic" was a wall: further occurrences are in Herodotos (5.64), Aristotle (*Ath.* 19.5) and Myrsilos (*BNJ* 477 F 9)³³¹. The latter clearly describes "the Pelargic" as τὸ τεῖχος τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ("the wall around the acropolis", therefore, with its foundations on the rocky outcrop where the acropolis lay)³³²: this is most probably the main information underlying Didymos' (almost surely correct³³³) exegesis of Aristophanes' ἐπὶ πετρῶν.

καὶ ὁ ἀλεκτρῶν ὄν ὡς θεὸς οἰκῆσει ἐπὶ πετρῶν: the paraphrase of the exclamation of l. 836³³⁴ is only preserved by **Lh** and probably did not originally belong to Didymos' hypomnēma.

³³⁰ There is no agreement among modern scholars with regard to the original name of this Athenian wall (see e.g. Sommerstein 1987, 252; Dunbar 1995, 497f.; Massimilla 2010, 440f.; Harder 2012, 751), referred to alternatively as Πελαργικόν and Πελασγικόν in ancient sources (see e.g. Hdn III/1 152,22f. Lentz ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἀθήναις τεῖχος "Πελαργικόν" ἤτοι Πελασγικόν ὡς ὁ κωμικὸς δηλοῖ ἐν τοῖς Ὀρνισιν [v. 832] and Phot. π 541 Th. Πελαργικόν· τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν Τυρρηνῶν κατασκευασθὲν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τεῖχος· τούτους γὰρ κληθῆναι Πελαργούς, οἷον Πελασγούς, ὡς πλανήτας τινάς).

³³¹ Unlike them, Thucydides considers τὸ Πελαργικόν an area of Athens (2.17 τὸ τε Πελαργικόν καλούμενον τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, ὃ καὶ ἐπάρατόν τε ἦν μὴ οἰκεῖν). See D'Alessio 2007, 510 n. 15.

³³² See also Paus. 1.28 τῆ δὲ ἀκρόπολει, πλὴν ὅσον Κίμων ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτῆς ὁ Μιλτιάδου, περιβαλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν λέγεται τοῦ τείχους Πελασγούς οἰκῆσαντάς ποτε ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. Harder (2012, 753) suggests a less likely location of τὸ Πελαργικόν at the foot of the Hymettos (see Hdt. 6.132 Πελασγοὶ ἐπέιτε ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐξεβλήθησαν, εἴτε ὧν δὴ δικαίως εἴτε ἀδίκως· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα, ὅτι Ἐκαταῖος μὲν ὁ Ἠγησάνδρου [*FGH Hist* 1 F 127] ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι λέγων ἀδίκως· ἐπέιτε γὰρ ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὴν χώραν, τὴν σφι αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὸν Ὑμησσὸν εὐόσαν ἔδοσαν οἰκῆσαι).

³³³ See Dunbar 1995, 498.

³³⁴ See e.g. Bekker 1829b, 132: «ut idoneus erit ille deus ad incolendas petras!»; Droysen 1869b, 67: «der Gott versteht's, „auf eitel hohen Spitzen zu gehn“»; Coulon 1928a, 64: «car ce dieu-là est bien fait pour habiter sur des rochers!»; Kakridis 1974, 163: «καὶ πόσο κατάλληλος ὁ θεὸς να κατοικῆ σὲ βράχια!»; Sommerstein 1987, 107: «and how well suited the god is to living on rocks!»; Mastromarco-Totaro 2006, 207: «è un dio adatto a vivere sulle rocce».

fr. 237 (= II 14.34, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: identification of Kleokritos, mocked in Av. 876.

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 876b-d-e-f-c Holwerda

Κυβέλη **ΕΓ**²: Κυβέλην φασὶ τὴν Ῥέαν παρὰ τὰ Κύβελα ὄρη. ὀρεία γὰρ ἡ θεός. διὸ καὶ ἐποχεῖται λεόντων ζεύγει. **RVEΓ**²**MLh** τὸ δὲ “μητὲρ Κλεοκρίτου” παρ’ ὑπόνοιαν ἐπήγαγεν βουλόμενος αὐτὸν διαβαλεῖν ὡς στρουθόποδα, τουτέστι μεγαλόπουν. ἐκωφδεῖτο δὲ ὡς ξένος καὶ δυσγενής. **RVEΓ**²**M** Σύμμαχος προεῖρηκεν ὅτι ξένος καὶ τάχα ὑποκριτής. νῦν δὲ ἐμφαίνεται ὅτι καὶ τὴν ὄψιν στρουθώδης. **RVEΓ**² ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· μητὲρ Κλεοκρίτου. ὅτι ὡς γυναικίας καὶ κίναϊδος κωμωδεῖται. ἐν δὲ τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Ῥέας μαλακοὶ πάρειςιν. καὶ ἴσως ἕτερος ἂν εἴη τοῦ παρ’ Εὐπόλιδος ἐν Δήμοις (fr. 136 K.-A., 39 Telò) καὶ Κόλαξιν (fr. 177 K.-A.). **RVEΓΓ**² ἄλλως. **V** στρουθὲ μητὲρ **ΕΓ**²: Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ “βάσκ’ ἴθι, Ἴρι ταχεῖα, τὸν Ἐκτορι μῦθον **VEΓ**² ἐνίσπες” (*Il.* XI 186) ἐπιμερισμῷ φησι τὸν Χάρητα (immo Χαίριδα, fr. 7 B.) λέγειν βαρύνειν Ἀττικοὺς <τὸ> “στρουθός”, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐν τῷ [ι]ζ’ τῆς καθόλου (III/1 144,9-24 Lentz) λέγων καὶ Τρύφωνα μεμνησθαι ἐν β’ Περὶ ἀττικῆς προσωδίας (fr. 1 von Velsen). **VEΓ**³

“Kybele”: they call Rhea “Kybele” with reference to the Kybela mounts. Indeed, the goddess is from the mountains. Therefore, she is also carried by a couple of lions³³⁵. (Aristophanes) used the expression “mother of Kleokritos” because he wanted to mock him in an allusive way as ostrich-footed, which means “with large feet”. He was mocked as foreigner and low-born. Symmachos had already said that (Kleokritos was) a foreigner and perhaps an actor. Now (Aristophanes) shows him also as looking like an ostrich. Didymos: “mother of Kleokritos”. He mocks him as a weakling and a catamite. Effeminates participate in the mysteries of Rhea. And perhaps the one mentioned by Eupolis in the *Demes* and the *Flatterers* might be another one. Otherwise. “Ostrich mother”: in the comment to the line “up go, swift Iris, and report this word to Hektor”, Herodianos states that Chairis says that the Attic writers put the accent on the penultimate on the word “ostrich”. Similarly, in the sixth book of the *General (accentuation)* he says that Tryphon mentioned this in the second book *On Attic accentuation*.

Aristoph. Av. 876 δέσποινα Κυβέλη στρουθὲ, μητὲρ Κλεοκρίτου.

Aristoph. Ra. 1437f. εἴ τις πτερώσας Κλεόκριτον Κινησία, / ἄρειεν αὔραις πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα— | **Suda κ 2586 A.** Κυβέλη: ἡ Ῥέα. παρὰ τὰ Κύβελα ὄρη· ὀρεία γὰρ ἡ θεός· διὸ καὶ ἐποχεῖται λεόντων ζεύγει. τὸ δὲ μητὲρ Κλεοκρίτου παρ’ ὑπόνοιαν εἶπε, βουλόμενος αὐτὸν διαβαλεῖν ὡς στρουθόποδα, τουτέστι μεγαλόπουν. ἐκωφδεῖτο δὲ ὡς κίναϊδος καὶ ξένος καὶ δυσγενής καὶ Κυβέλης υἱός· ἐπεὶ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Ῥέας μαλακοὶ πάρειςιν. ἦν δὲ καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ὀρνιθώδης. εἰρηται οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν κίναϊδων ἡ παροιμία | **schol. Aristoph. Ra. 1437a** ὁ Κινησίας λεπτός ἦν, ὁ δὲ Κλεόκριτος μοχθηρός, **b Chantry** ὡς λεπτός σφόδρα ὦν κωμωδεῖται καὶ ὡς ξένος καὶ ὡς κόλαξ. ἐμνήσθη δὲ καὶ τοῦ Κινησίου, ὡς τούτου καὶ τοῦ Κλεοκρίτου ὁμοφρονούντων

³³⁵ This iconography is widely attested in archaeological remains, see e.g. Simon 1997, 759-761; Bøgh 2007, 307.

| *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Av. 876 Koster* Κυβέλην φασὶ τὴν Ῥεάν διὰ τὰ Κύβελα ὄρη· ὄρεια δὲ ἡ θεός. τὸ δὲ “μήτηρ Κλεοκρίτου” διαβάλλει αὐτὸν ὡς στρουθόποδα.

1 Κυβέλην–Ῥεάν cett., τὴν Ῥεάν φησὶ Lh | παρὰ τὰ RELh, παρὰ τὸ τὰ V, παρὰ τὰς Γ², ἀπὸ τοῦ M | post Κύβελα, ὁ δηλοῖ M | ὄρη cett., ὄρεια E | ὄρεια cett., ὄρεινῆ M | καὶ cett., om. R | 1-2 λεόντων ζεύγει cett., ζεύγει λεόντων Lh | **2** ὑπόνοια cett., ὑπόνοια V | διαβαλεῖν RVM *Suda*, διαβάλλειν EΓ² | **3** μεγαλόποιν RVT², μεγαλόποιν E, μεγαλόποδα M | καὶ δυσγενῆς cett., om. R | **3-4** καὶ–ξένος om. EΓ² | Σύμμαχος–στρουθώδης (Im. Κυβέλη στρουθῆ) sep. RV | **4** ἐμφαίνεται EΓ², φαίνεται RV | **5** ὁ Δίδυμος cett., δίδυμος δὲ Γ | μήτηρ Γ, μητέρα cett. | Κλεοκρίτου cett., λεοκρίτου V | κίναϊδος cett., κύναιδος Γ | στρουθῆ–προσφθιάς post Κόλαξιν E | **5-7** ὁ–Κόλαξιν post 872a Γ | **7-8** στρουθῆ–μῦθον post schol. in v. 874 Γ² | τὸν V, τὸνδ’ EΓ² | Ἔκτορι EΓ², Ἔκτορα V | 8 ἐνίσπες edd., ἐνίσπες V, ἐνισπε E, ἐνισ’ Γ³ | Χαρήτα EΓ³, Χαρίτα V | 9 Ἀττικῶς Küster, Ἀττικῆς V, Ἀττικῆ E, Ἀττικῶς (?) Γ³ | τὸ suppl. Küster | **8-10** ἐνίσπες–προσφθιάς in calce Γ³

The priest’s prayer introducing the sacrifice for the foundation of Nephelokokygia (*Av.* 859-894) is filled with a number of wordplays mixing the names of the deities with several ornithonyms and some personal references. The invocation to “the chaffinch Sabazios” and to “the Great Ostrich Mother of gods and men” (l. 875) triggers Peisetairos’ exclamation δέσποινα Κυβέλη στρουθῆ, μήτηρ Κλεοκρίτου (“o ostrich lady Kybele, mother of Kleokritos!”). Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.4.20) attests the existence in 403 BCE of a Kleokritos τῶν μυστῶν κῆρυξ (“herald of the initiates”, *PA* 8570, *PAA* 576825), easily identifiable with the ‘son of Kybele’ of the Aristophanic line³³⁶. However, the point of the reference to the ostrich is unclear, despite the general unanimity of recent scholarship on Kleokritos’ fatness being the reason for the mockery³³⁷. In fact, since Kleokritos is also mocked in a highly debated passage of Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (ll. 1437-1441)³³⁸, where he is imagined by Euripides as soaring over the sea with the dithyrambographer Kinesias as his wings, the two references have been taken by some to indicate that the man was, on the contrary, remarkably thin³³⁹. In all likelihood, it was not simply Kleokritos’ outer appearance that made both jokes in *Av.* 876 and *Ra.* 1437 immediately comprehensible to the audience. Rather, the link between the man and the ostrich must have already been well-known to the audience (regardless of its origin) and was actually the condition for the two jokes to be understood: Kleokritos was known as “the ostrich”, so he could be lampooned both as the son of “the ostrich lady Kybele” and as flying with the aid of Kinesias (since the ostrich cannot fly)³⁴⁰.

The exegetic material on *Av.* 876 is variously distributed in the manuscripts, so that the text here printed does not fully mirror any of the testimonies. The annotation begins with the same section (Κυβέλην–δυσγενῆς) in all manuscripts, but after that the order in which the three authorities (Didymos, Symmachos and Herodianos) are quoted is different: in **V** the sequence is Didymos-Herodianos-Symmachos, in **E** it is Symmachos-Herodianos-Didymos, whereas in **R** Didymos is followed by Symmachos (and Herodianos is

³³⁶ That this prominent figure coincides with the archon of 413-412 BCE (*PA* 8569, *PAA* 576820) is uncertain, if not unlikely (see *e.g.* Dunbar 1995, 513; Telò 2007, 623)

³³⁷ See Sommerstein 1987, 257; Dover 1993, 376; Dunbar 1995, 512; Telò 2007, 624; Olson 2017, 462. But this interpretation can be found already *e.g.* in Welcker 1812, 220; Felton 1864, 182; Dindorf 1882, 327; Merry 1889, 49; Green 1894, 136; Van Leeuwen 1896, 14; 1902, 13; Tucker 1906, 256.

³³⁸ See *e.g.* Dover 1993, 373-376. The passage was problematic for ancient commentators as well, as shown by Aristarchos’ proposal of athetising the passage (a proposal accepted by Apollonios, but for different reasons), see *schol. Aristoph. Ra.* 1437-1441a-b Chantray.

³³⁹ See Fritzsche 1845, 435: «gracilis atque procerus»; Kock 1898, 213: «dünn und schwächig».

³⁴⁰ See Rogers 1902, 219; 1906, 122. Kinesias’ ‘aerial’ nature emerges clearly by his scene in *Av.* 1372-1409.

absent) and in Γ² Symmachos precedes Didymos (again with no mention of Herodianos). This is the most plausible reconstruction: (a) an anonymous commentator (possibly the redactor of the scholium) took the joke on Kleokritos to be aimed at the man's big feet³⁴¹, but then added the autoschediastic ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ ὡς ξένος καὶ δυσγενής, clearly derived from the reference to the foreign goddess Kybele; (b) the redactor quoted Symmachos, who “had previously said” (presumably with regard to *Ra.* 1437)³⁴² that the man was lampooned as ξένος καὶ τάχα ὑποκριτής (see below); (c) the redactor integrated Symmachos' comment by noting that the mockery in *Av.* 876 concerns Kleokritos' στρουθῶδης appearance, and by inserting (d) a seemingly direct quotation from Didymos' hypomnēma (see below). A scholium of different provenance is then added (as signalled by ἄλλως in **V**), which preserves an excerpt from Herodianos' grammatical comment to *Il.* 11.186³⁴³, focused on the accentuation of the word στρουθός and based on the authority of the grammarians Chaeris and Tryphon³⁴⁴.

ὡς γυναικίας καὶ κίναϊδος κωμωδεῖται: the verb κωμωδεῖται shows a high level of awareness «that the features attributed to the *kōmōdoumenos* are elements of a particular speech act, the act of ridicule»³⁴⁵ and therefore distinguishes this comment from the ones that acritically take the information deriving from the jokes as historical³⁴⁶.

ἐν δὲ τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Ῥέας μαλακοὶ πάρεισιν: unlike the other commentators featured in the scholium, Didymos does not discuss the role of the ostrich in the joke against Kleokritos. On the contrary, the exegesis focuses exclusively on the link between the mocked figure and Kybele, and evidently relies on two elements: firstly, the identification between the Phrygian Kybele and the Cretan Rhea, which was current in Didymos' time and iconographically attested from the 6th century BCE onwards³⁴⁷ and present in literary evidence as

³⁴¹ As observed by Kock (1894, 172), a completely opposite view on the adjective στρουθόπους (likely based on the alternative meaning of στρουθός as “sparrow”) can be found in a fragment by Eudoxos (fr. 340 Lasserre), carried by Plin. *NH* 7.24 *Eudoxus in meridianis Indiae viris plantas esse cubitales, feminis adeo parvas ut struthopodes appellentur.*

³⁴² See Schauenburg 1881, 31. Internal references in the Aristophanic *scholia* have been thoroughly examined by Rutherford 1905, 42f. and Boudreaux 1919, 147-150. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228-231; 238f.; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

³⁴³ This piece of exegesis is actually preserved in *schol.* Hdn. | Ep. Hom. *Il.* 2.311 (A) στρουθοῖο: ὡς ἀπὸ ὄξυτόνου εὐθείας ἢ ἀνάγνωσις. Χαίριδι (fr. 7 Berndt) δὲ ἤρσκε βαρύνειν, καὶ ἴσως ἐπεὶ τὰ εἰς θος λήγοντα δισύλλαβα μονογενῆ, φύσει μακρᾶ παραληγόμενα, ἐβαρύνετο, Ξοῦθος, „Ζῆθος“ (*Od.* 11.262, 19.523) καὶ „μῦθος“ (*Il.* 5.493), ἔχει δὲ ἡ τετριμμένη ἀνάγνωσις ἀφορμὴν τὸ ἐγκεῖσθαι τὸ θέειν· ἐτυμολογοῦσι γὰρ τὸ ζῆον παρὰ τὸ μετὰ οἴστρου θέειν. τὰ δὲ παρὰ τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα ἐωρῶμεν ὄξυτόμενα, ὡσπερ τὸ ἀγαθός καὶ βοηθός (see also Hdn. III/1 144,9-24 Lentz [~ III/2 947,1-948,7] τὰ εἰς θος λήγοντα καθαρὰ μονογενῆ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα φύσει μακρᾶ βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, κῶθος, οὕτως ὁ κωβίος, μῦθος ... σημειῶδες ἄρα τὸ στρουθός ὄξυτόμενον· Χαίρις [fr. 7 Berndt] δὲ φησιν Ἀττικὸς βαρύνειν τὸ ὄνομα, ὡς καὶ Τρύφων μέμνηται ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσωδίας, ἴσως μέντοι παρήλλαξε τῶν προκειμένων, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀρσενικῶς λέγεται “καλοὶ δέ σ' ἄγον / ὠκέες στρουθοῖ” [Sapph. fr. 1.9-10 V.] καὶ θηλυκῶς “αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκν' ἔφαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν” [*Il.* 2.326]).

³⁴⁴ See Ippolito 2008; Montana 2015b.

³⁴⁵ Chronopoulos 2011, 213.

³⁴⁶ See e.g. *schol.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 388a Wilson οὗτος ὁ Ἰερώνυμος μελῶν ἐστὶ ποιητῆς καὶ τραγωδοποιὸς ἀνόμαλος καὶ ἀνοικονόμητος, διὰ τὸ ἄγαν ἐμπαθεῖς γράφειν ὑποθέσεις καὶ φοβεροῖς προσωπεῖοις χρῆσθαι. ἐδόκει δὲ κροτεῖσθαι. See Chronopoulos' classification (2011, 212) of the different types of rephrasing of personal jokes in the scholia, and Nünlist 2009, 214.

³⁴⁷ See e.g. Nilsson 1967, 298; Pachis 1996, 199; Rein 1996, 228; Simon 1997; Bøgh 2007.

early as Hipponax³⁴⁸; secondly, the generally negative reputation of the goddess and her worshippers, which was already widespread in the 5th century BCE because of the «general tendency of growing anti-orientalism»³⁴⁹ and was common in Roman times because of the link with effeminacy, deriving from the apparently frequent practice of (self-)castration among the initiates³⁵⁰. Moreover, the relevance of the μυστήρια in the interpretation of the joke may indicate that the grammarian was aware of Xenophon’s passage (*Hell.* 2.4.20) that confirmed Kleokritos’ role as τῶν μυστῶν κῆρυξ.

καὶ ἴσως ἕτερος ὢν εἴη τοῦ παρ’ Εὐπόλιδος ἐν Δήμοις καὶ Κόλαξι: two possible conclusions can be drawn from Didymos’ doubtful tone³⁵¹. On the one hand, the grammarian may here not be using a *kōmōdoumenoi* handbook (as supposed for other instances³⁵²) and might be independently comparing the Aristophanic Kleokritos with his namesake in Eupolis’ plays, concluding that the two are not necessarily the same person; on the other hand, he may be challenging a *kōmōdoumenoi*-related source that reported both Aristophanes’ and Eupolis’ passages under the same entry³⁵³. In either case, although the text does not offer any more details, it cannot be denied that the grammarian «must have had some reason for potentially dissociating Eupolis’ Kleokritos from Aristophanes’» (Olson 2017, 462): perhaps the mockery in the *Demes* and the *Flatterers* was perceived by Didymos as incompatible with the jokes found in Aristophanes (or, rather, with his interpretation of such jokes). However, although it cannot be excluded that Eupolis actually lampooned a different Kleokritos (possibly the archon of 413-412 BCE), the figure mocked in Aristoph. *Av.* 876, *Ra.* 1437 and Eup. fr. 139, 177 K.-A. was in all likelihood the same (see *e.g.* Telò 2007, 623).

Despite the strongly epitomised form of the scholium, the text allows some further observations on the relationship between Didymos’ and Symmachos’ interpretations. According to the scholiast, the latter’s exegesis was not a comment to *Av.* 876, but to the prior occurrence (προεῖρηκεν) of Kleokritos’ name in Aristophanes’ plays, *i.e.*, almost surely, *Ra.* 1437³⁵⁴. Symmachos’ definition of Kleokritos is twofold: he is “a foreigner and perhaps an actor” (ξένος καὶ τάχα ὑποκριτής). If the element of the foreign ancestry may again be explained as a simple-minded reading of the joke of *Av.* 876 (see above), there is no extant evidence describing Kleokritos as an actor. The tentative tone of the suggestion may result from Symmachos doubting either his own interpretation of a specific source, or his recollection of a (now lost) source that he did not, or could not, directly check. In the first case, the grammarian might have made an audacious deduction from Xenophon’s passage (where the herald of the initiates is said to be εὐφῶνος, an adjective typically associated

³⁴⁸ According to *schol.* Tz. Lyc. 1170 Scheer ὁ Ἰππώναξ (fr. 156 W.² = 167 D.) Κύβηλιν τὴν Πέαν λέγει, παρὰ τὸ ἐν Κυβέλλα πόλει Φρυγίας τιμᾶσθαι. See also Gulick 1894, 86f.

³⁴⁹ Bøgh 2007, 307.

³⁵⁰ See *e.g.* Alvar 2008, 246-261.

³⁵¹ On Didymos’ typically cautious tone, see Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and Did. fr. 227, 229, 230, 267, 269.

³⁵² See fr. 229, 247, 257. On Didymos’ general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 245-247, 249, 257, 259, 266, 268.

³⁵³ For criticism towards a *kōmōdoumenoi*-related source, see fr. 247.

³⁵⁴ The ancient canonical order of Aristophanes’ plays – and hence almost certainly the order in which the plays were commented at least until Symmachos’ time – was indeed alphabetic (see *e.g.* Boudreaux 1919, 151).

with actors³⁵⁵) or from the fact that, in *Ra.* 1437, Kleokritos is paired with another man of the stage, the dithyrambographer Kinesias. In the second case, he might have simply been unsure of the correctness of his recollection. However, the possibility has to be taken into account that Symmachos' uncertainty in defining Kleokritos as an actor derived from the fact that the passage(s) that presented the man as a ὑποκριτής could not be unequivocally linked to the figure mocked by Aristophanes. In other words, Symmachos may have followed Didymos in his doubting the association of all the figures named Kleokritos under the same *kōmōdoumenos* and may reveal, with the expression τὰχα ὑποκριτής, that the character mocked by Eupolis in the *Demes* and the *Flatterers* was described indeed as an actor.

³⁵⁵ See *e.g.* Diod. 15.7.2 ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος ... ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς εὐφωνοτάτους τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, Luc. *Salt.* 68 ὁ δὲ ὄρχηστής τὰ πάντα ἔχει συλλαβῶν, καὶ ἔνεστιν ποικίλην καὶ παμμυγῆ τὴν παρασκευὴν αὐτοῦ ἰδεῖν, αὐλόν, σύριγγα, ποδῶν κτύπον, κυμβάλου ψόφον, ὑποκριτοῦ εὐφωνίαν, ἀδόντων ὁμοφωνίαν.

fr. 238 (= II 14.35, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the question τίς ὁ κόθορνος τῆς ὁδοῦ;

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 994a-b-c Holwerda

τίς **E** ὁ κόθορνος **ΕΓ**: οἷον “τί ὑποδησάμενος πάρει;” **VEΓM** οὕτω μὲν Σύμμαχος. **ΕΓM** Δίδυμος δὲ πρὸς τὸ<ν κόθορνον, ὅ>τι ὑποδέδεται τῷ <τ’ ἀριστερῷ ποδί καὶ τῷ> δεξιῷ. **RVEΓM** “τίς **RVΓM** ἐστὶν **RV** ἢ ἐπίνοια τῆς ὁδοῦ;” **RVΓM**

“What is the *kothornos*...?”: in the sense of “with which shoes do you come forward?” so (says) Symmachos. Didymos: in reference to <the *kothornos*, because> it can be worn <both on the left foot and> on the right. “What is the idea of the journey?”.

Aristoph. Av. 992-994 ἕτερον αὐ τοῦτι κακόν. / τί δ’ αὐ σὺ δράσων; τίς ἰδέα βουλευματος; / τίς ἢ ἴπνοια, τίς ποθ’ οὔρνις τῆς ὁδοῦ;, **Ra.** 539f. τὸ δὲ μεταστρέφεται / πρὸς τὸ μαλθακώτερον / δεξιῷ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐστὶ / καὶ φύσει Θηραμένους.

Diog. 4.72 εὐμεταβολώτερος κοθόρνον: ἐπὶ τῶν πᾶσιν ἐφαρμοζόντων. ἔστι δὲ εἶδος ὑποδήματος ἐφαρμοζόν τοῖς δυσὶ ποσίν | **Zen.** 3.93 (~ *Suda* ε 3582 A.) εὐμεταβολώτερος κοθόρνον: κόθορνος ἐστὶν ὑπόδηματος εἶδος ἐφαρμοζόντος καὶ δεξιῷ καὶ ἀριστερῷ ποδί· ὅθεν καὶ Θηραμένην, τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν λ’, κόθορνον ἐκάλουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. ἐπὶ τῶν στρεφομένων οὖν συνεχῶς ἢ παροιμία εἶρηται | **Hesych.** κ 3214 C. κόθορνος· ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ποσὶ πεποιημένον. τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξίν ἐφαρμόττειν φασὶ τὸ ὑπόδημα τὸ κόθορνον | **Syn.** κ 370 C. κόθορνος· ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτεροδέξιον | **Phot.** ε 2248 εὐμεταβολώτερος κοθόρνον· κόθορνος ὑπόδημα ἀρμόζον δεξιῷ τε καὶ εὐωνύμῳ ποδί· ὅθεν καὶ Θηραμένην τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα κόθορνον ἐκάλουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι· ἐπὶ τῶν συστρεφομένων οὖν συνεχῶς ἢ παροιμία κεῖται, κ 836 κόθορνος· ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτεροδέξιον, κ 857 Th. κόθορνος· ὑπόδημα ἀρχαῖον κοινὸν ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν, ταῦτ’ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ποσίν ἐφαρμόττων | *Suda* κ 1909 A. κόθορνος: ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτεροδέξιον. Ἀριστοφάνης: τίς ὁ κόθορνος τῆς ὁδοῦ; οἷον τί ὑποδησάμενος πάρει; οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ Θηραμένης, Ἀθηναῖος ῥήτωρ, μαθητὴς Προδίκου τοῦ Κεῖου. εἶρηται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ στρεφομένου συνεχῶς. οὗτος γὰρ καὶ τοῖς λ’ συνέσπευδε καὶ τῷ πλήθει. ὅτι ὁ κόθορνος ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξὶ πρὸς τὰς ὑποδέσεις ἀρμόττει | *schol. Aristoph. Nu.* 361a Holwerda διδάσκαλος δὲ ἦν οὗτος (*scil.* ὁ Πρόδικος) καὶ Θηραμένους τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου κοθόρνον, δς τῆς τῶν τριάκοντα τυραννίδος μετέσχεν. κόθορνος δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο οὗτος, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς τριάκοντα συνέσπευδε καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος τὸ ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτέροις ἀρμόζει τοῖς ποσίν, **Ra.** 47b Chantry τί κόθορνος; τινὲς ὅτι ὁ κόθορνος εἰς ἀμφοτέροις τοὺς πόδας ἀρμόζει. ἔνθεν καὶ Θηραμένης “κόθορνος” λέγεται, ὅτι τοῖς καιροῖς καθομιλεῖν δύναται. ὁ δὲ Ξενοφῶν ἐν Ἑλληνικοῖς (2.3.30f.) ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ποσίν ἀρμόζειν αὐτόν φησιν, **Ec.** 346 Regtuit κοθόρνω: κόθορνος εἶδος ὑποδήματος, ἀρμόζον ἀμφοτέροις ποσίν.

1 μὲν ΓM, om. E | Δίδυμος δὲ ΕΓM (δὲ om. E), καὶ Δίδυμος οὕτω R, Δίδυμος οὐ (sic) V, om. Bekker | 2 πρὸς τὸ cett., om. R, πρὸς τί White | τὸ<ν κόθορνον, ὅ>τι supplevi, πρὸς τὸ <“τίς ὁ κόθορνος τῆς ὁδοῦ;” πρὸς> τί suppl. Holwerda | ὑποδέδεται RVEΓ² Bekker Dindorf Dübner, ὑποδέχεται ΓM, ὑποδέδεται Zacher White Holwerda | τῷ <τ’ ἀριστερῷ ποδί καὶ τῷ> δεξιῷ supplevi coll. Zen. 3.93, τῷ δεξιῷ ΕΓ² Bekker, τὸ δεξιόν RVΓM Dindorf Dübner, τὸ ἀμφοτεροδέξιον Zacher Rutherford White, τῷ δ’ ἔξει ὁδῷ; Holwerda | 3 ὁδοῦ RVEΓ², θεοῦ Γ

The construction of Nephelokokygia brings about a succession of encounters (the first of two series of the so-called ‘intruder-scenes’ in the play³⁵⁶) between Peisetairos and five stock characters: the Priest (Av. 863-888), the Poet (904-953), the Oracle-monger (959-990), the Inspector (1021-1031) and the Decree-seller

³⁵⁶ Av. 903-1057 and 1337-1469. See Dunbar 1995, 9 and 520.

(1035-1054). The sequence is interrupted at l. 992 by the appearance of a historical figure, the geometer and astronomer Meton (*PA* 10093, *PAA* 647810)³⁵⁷. Peisetairos' reaction to his entrance on stage is a series of questions (993f.) that presents a textual problem. The paradosis reads τί δ' αὖ σὺ δράσων; τίς ἰδέα βουλεύματος; / τίς ἢ ἴπινοια, τίς ὁ κόθορνος τῆς ὁδοῦ; (“What have you come to do? With what kind of intent? / What is the purpose, what is the buskin of your journey?”). Although most modern editors accept the text as transmitted by the manuscripts³⁵⁸, Blaydes' (1882, 109) emendation of τίς ὁ κόθορνος in τίς ποθ' οὔρνις (“What is the bird [*i.e.* the omen] of your journey?”) – already anticipated by van Eldick's (1764, 36) τίς ποτ' ὄρνις – is adopted by van Leeuwen (1902, 152) and Wilson (2007a, 394), while Sommerstein (1987, 120) dubiously suggests τίς ἢ ἴπινοια τῆς κοθορνωτῆς ὁδοῦ (“What is the purpose of your *buskin'd* journey?”), with the otherwise unattested adjective *κοθορνωτός. If the line is indeed corrupt, the error must have occurred very early in the tradition of Aristophanes, since the scholia comment on τίς ὁ κόθορνος, without traces of any other variant.

The annotation, in the form preserved by **ΕΓΜ**, consists of the juxtaposition of two excerpts from Symmachos' and Didymos' hypomnēmata³⁵⁹. Symmachos' comment – which constitutes a separate interlinear gloss in **V** (with the omission of the grammarian's name) and is completely absent from **R** – paraphrases τίς ὁ κόθορνος; with the question τί ὑποδησάμενος πάρει; (“With which shoes do you come forward?”). The exegesis seems different from Didymos' one. This, however, is made unclear by evident corruption in the text.

Δίδυμος δὲ πρὸς τὸ <ν κοθόρνον, ὄ>τι ὑποδέδεται κτλ: there have been several attempts at bettering the wording of the scholium, since the paradosis Δίδυμος δὲ πρὸς τὸ τί ὑποδέδεται (**RVEΓ**², ὑποδέχεται **ΓΜ**) τὸ δεξιόν (**RVΓΜ**, τῷ δεξιῷ **ΕΓ**²) is problematic. The accusative would imply the dubious meaning “why does he have his right boot on?”, while the dative would result in a translation such as “what is he wearing on his right foot?”, which is equally unconvincing. Zacher³⁶⁰ emended the verb in ὑποδέδεται – assuming that Didymos paraphrased τίς ὁ κόθορνος with another direct question, in the second person singular – and wrote τὸ <ἀμφοτερο>δέξιον (“why are you wearing the ambidextrous [shoe]?”), on the base of *Syn.* κ 370 C., *Phot.* κ 836 Th. and *Suda* κ 1909 A., where κόθορνος is glossed with ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτεροδέξιον. Holwerda accepts the emendation of the verb, but writes τῷ δ' ἔξει <ὄδ>ῶ; entailing that Didymos paraphrased τίς ὁ κόθορνος with two questions. This solution, however, involves a substantial integration in the preceding sentence, based on a supposed *saut du même au même*: Δίδυμος πρὸς τὸ <“τίς ὁ κόθορνος τῆς ὁδοῦ;” πρὸς> τί ὑποδέδεται; τῷ δ' ἔξει <ὄδ>ῶ; (“Didymos, with regard to ‘what is the *kothornos* of the journey’: ‘with which intent have

³⁵⁷ For a recent reading of Meton's scene as an example of Aristophanic satire of intellectuals, see Amati 2010.

³⁵⁸ See *e.g.* Brunck 1783, 197; Boissonade 1826, 264; Dindorf 1835, 351; 1869, 95; Kock 1894, 184; Rogers 1906, 136; Dunbar 1995, 99; Henderson 2000, 152.

³⁵⁹ See also *frr.* 243f., 247, 249, 253. Despite acknowledging the obscurity of the text, Schauenburg (1881, 9) maintains that the redactor of the scholium found Didymos' comment quoted in Symmachos' hypomnēma. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with *frr.* 224; 228f.; 231; 237; 239; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

³⁶⁰ *ap.* White 1914, 186.

you put your shoes on?', 'on which road do you come forward?'): the integration seems unproblematic in Holwerda's edition, where Didymos' and Symmachos' comments are printed as separate items (*i.e. scholl. Aristoph. Av. 994a and 994b respectively*)³⁶¹, but is clearly pleonastic when the annotation in its entirety is taken into consideration. An alternative integration – also implying a *saut du même au même* in the second part – is πρὸς τὸ <ν κόθορννον, ὄ>τι ὑποδέδεται <τῷ τ' ἀριστερῷ ποδί καὶ> τῷ δεξιῷ. The idea that the *kothornos* was an ambidextrous boot can be found not only in several other Aristophanic scholia (see *schol. Aristoph. Nu. 361a Holwerda; Ra. 47b Chantry; Ec. 346 Regtuit*), but also in the lexicographical tradition (see Hesych. κ 3214 C.; *Syn. κ 370 C.*; Phot. κ 836, 857 Th.; *Suda κ 1909 A.*), as well as in the paroemiographic collections of Diogenianos and Zenobios, which – in this case – are the sources closest to Didymos³⁶². In particular, Zenobios (3.93) describes the *kothornos* as a ὑποδήματος εἶδος ἐφαρμόζοντος καὶ δεξιῷ καὶ ἀριστερῷ ποδί. In fact, Didymos himself might have dealt with the proverb εὐμεταβολώτερος κοθόρνου in his paroemiographical work entitled *Against the Compilers of Works on Proverbs*³⁶³, offering the same explanation of κόθορννος there and in his Aristophanic commentary. The fact that Zenobios' entry on εὐμεταβολώτερος κοθόρνου also contains typical *kōmōdoumenos*-information on Theramenes and his nickname κόθορννος may be a further hint at its dependence on the grammarian. Moreover, a codex of Photios' *Library*³⁶⁴ proves that Didymos' paroemiographical work included the proverb δεξιὸν εἰς ὑπόδημα, ἀριστερὸν εἰς ποδάνιπτρα ("the right foot in the shoe, the left in the basin"), also used in reference to those always ready to make the most of every situation³⁶⁵. In short, although the first part of the integration (πρὸς τὸ <ν κόθορννον, ὄ>τι) is less easily explicable on palaeographic grounds, this solution is consistent with the Aristophanic text: Didymos assumed that Aristophanes used the term κόθορννος metaphorically, playing on its actual meaning of "ambidextrous shoe" to highlight the ambiguity of the direction of Meton's journey and thus of the purpose of his appearance. In this perspective, the last section of the scholium (τίς ἐστὶν ἢ ἐπίνοια τῆς ὁδοῦ;) has to be understood as Didymos' paraphrase of the entire line.

³⁶¹ On the problematic ecdotic criteria of Holwerda's and Chantry's editions, see the Introduction § 5.2.

³⁶² That Diogenianos relied on Didymos can be supposed on the base of the prefatory letter to Hesychios' lexicon (*ep. Eul. 1-16 πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν παλαιῶν τὰς κατὰ στοιχεῖον συντεθείκασιν λέξεις, ὃ πάντων ἐμοὶ προσφιλέστατε Εὐλόγιε· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς μόνως ὡς Ἀππίων καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀρχιβίου· οἱ δὲ τὰς κωμικὰς ἰδίᾳ καὶ τὰς τραγικὰς ὡς Θέων καὶ Δίδυμος καὶ ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι ὁμοῦ δὲ πάσας τούτων οὐδὲ εἷς. Διογενιανὸς δὲ τις μετὰ τούτους γεγωνὸς ἀνὴρ σπουδαῖος καὶ φιλόκαλος, τὰ τε προειρημένα βιβλία καὶ πάσας τὰς σποράδην παρὰ πᾶσι κειμένας λέξεις συναγαγὼν, ὁμοῦ πάσας καθ' ἕκαστον στοιχεῖον συντέθεικε ... καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ὅσας οἷός τε ἦν παροιμίας εὐρεῖν, οὐδὲ ταύτας παρέλιπεν). On the debate concerning the ascription to Diogenianos of the collections of proverbs transmitted by the manuscripts under his name, see Montana 2003a. Zenobios' dependence on Didymos, instead, is clearly stated in the title of his collection: *Ἐπιτομὴ ἐκ τῶν Ταρραίων καὶ Διδύμου παροιμιῶν συντεθείσα κατὰ στοιχεῖον*. For an overview on the opinions of modern scholars with regard to the relationship between Didymos' and Zenobios' works, see Bühler 1987, 36f. n. 16. On the relationship between Didymos' commentaries on Aristophanes and his paroemiographic collection, see Ruta 2016.*

³⁶³ See the Conclusions § 1.2.2.

³⁶⁴ Phot. *Bibl. cod. 279* (summarising the *Chrestomathia* of Helladios Besantinos) 533b ὅτι παροιμίαν εἶναι φησι τὸν δεξιὸν ὑποδεῖσθαι πόδα, τὸν δ' ἀριστερὸν νίξειν· φησι γὰρ ὁ Πολέμων (fr. 101 Preller), ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Δίδυμος (fr. 351 C.-Pr.), δεξιὸν εἰς ὑπόδημα, ἀριστερὸν εἰς ποδάνιπτρα. The proverb was already included in the *Metrical Proverbs* of Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 361 S. *ap. Suda δ 231 A.*).

³⁶⁵ See Tosi 2017, 493f.

fr. 239 (= II 14.36, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: the sense of the analogy between the sky and the oven called *πνιγεύς*

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1001b Holwerda

κατὰ πνιγέα μάλιστα **ΕΓ**: ὥσπερ, φησί, πνιγεύς περίκειται τῇ γῆ. τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς ἀδιανόητα. πνιγεύς δὲ ὁ κρίβανος ἢ ἡ κάμινος. **REGM**

προσθιθεὶς οὖν **RVEΓ** ἐγὼ **Γ**: Δίδυμος· τοιοῦτος ἀήρ ἐστι τῇ γῆ περικείμενος, ὅμοιος πνιγεῖ, καθαπερεὶ πῶμά τι περικείμενος. τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς, φησὶν ὁ Σύμμαχος, ἐπίτηδες ἀδιανόητα. **RVEΓM**

“a lot like a *pnigeus*”: he says “it covers the earth like a *pnigeus*”. What follows is nonsense. The *pnigeus* is the *kribanos* or the *kaminos*.

“so, if I position (this ruler...)”: Didymos: the sky lies all around the earth like a bell-oven, covering it like a lid. What follows (*i.e. Av.* 1001-1003), says Symmachos, is deliberate nonsense.

Aristoph. Av. 1000f. αὐτίκα γὰρ ἀήρ ἐστι τὴν ἰδέαν ὅλος / κατὰ πνιγέα μάλιστα.

Aristoph. Nu. 95-97 ἐνταῦθ' ἐνοικοῦσ' ἄνδρες, οἳ τὸν οὐρανὸν / λέγοντες ἀναπειθουσιν ὡς ἔστιν πνιγεύς, / κάστιν περὶ ἡμᾶς οὗτος, ἡμεῖς δ' ἄνθρακες | **Poll. 7.110** ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρακίων κάμινος πνιγεύς, **10.54** ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς μονίπτοις δέοιτ' ἄν τις ἔχειν σάγην, ἔποχον, ἔφιππον, κημούς, φιμούς, ψάλια, χαλινοὺς, πνιγέα—καὶ γὰρ τὸν πνιγέα ἐπὶ ἵππου Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἀναγύρω (fr. 64 K.-A.) λέγει—φάλαρα, παρώπια, ἀνθήλια | **Hesych. π 2646 H.** πνιγεύς· ὁ φιμός τῶν κτηνῶν. καὶ τοῦ ὑδραυλικοῦ ὄργανου μέρος. ἢ κλίβανος | **Suda π 1830** πνιγεύς· ὁ φοῦρνος, ὁ κρίβανος. κυρίως, ὅπου οἱ ἀνθρακες συμπνίγονται. διὸ ἐπιλέγει· “ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀνθρακες”, **1832** πνιγηρά· ἡ καυματώδης, καὶ θερμὴ· πνιγεύς γὰρ ἡ κάμινος. ἅμα δὲ ὅτι πνίγει τῷ χρόνῳ τὸ σχοινίον καὶ τὸ θρανίον. Ἀριστοφάνης· μία μὲν ἐστὶν ἀπὸ κάλω καὶ θρανίου. καὶ Ἀρριανός· τὰ δὲ βράχη πρὸς τῷ αἰγιαλῷ ἐπέκειον ἀνθρώποι ἐν καλύβαις πνιγηραῖς, **φ 629 A.** φοῦρνος· πνιγεύς, ὁ κρίβανος, ὅπου οἱ ἀνθρακες συμπνίγονται | *schol. Aristoph. Nu. 96a* οὕτως ὁ κρίβανος. κυρίως ὅπου οἱ ἀνθρακες συμπνίγονται· διὸ ἐπιλέγει “ἡμεῖς δ' ἀνθρακες”. λέγει δὲ τὸν φοῦρνον, **96b** ἢ τῶν ἀνθράκων κάμινος· διὸ ἐπιλέγει “ἡμεῖς δ' ἀνθρακες” διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου θερμαίνεσθαι, **96c** κυρίως πνιγεύς ἔνθα οἱ ἀνθρακες ἔχονται καὶ πνίγονται, **96d Holwerda** ταῦτα πρότερος Κρατῖνος ἐν Πανόπταις δράματι (fr. 167 K.-A.) περὶ Ἰππωνος τοῦ φιλοσόφου (38 A 2 D.-K.) κωμῶδων αὐτὸν λέγει· ἄφ' οὗ στοχαζόμενοι τινὲς φασιν, ὅτι μηδεμίαν ἔχθρας χάριν Ἀριστοφάνης ἦκεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Νεφέλων ποίησιν, ὅς γε μήτε ἴδιον μήτε ἀρμόττον, ἀλλὰ μὴδὲ πρὸς ἐν ἐγκλημα ἦλθε Σωκράτους. δύο γὰρ κατ' αὐτοῦ ταῦτα προθεῖς ἐγκλήματα, τὸ περὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ἔστι πνιγεύς, καὶ ὡς ἰκανός ἐστι τὸν ἥττω λόγον διδάσκειν καὶ τὸν κρείττονα, τὸ μὲν κοινὸν τῶν φιλοσόφων ἀπάντων ἐπήγαγεν ἐγκλημα, φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι Ἰππων κωμωδηθῆναι φθάσας· τὸ δὲ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων οὐδὲ τὸ σύνολον ἐπικοινωνεῖ φιλοσοφία—οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐπαγγέλλονται οἱ φιλόσοφοι, δεινοὺς ποιήσιν λέγειν—ἴδιον δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτο μᾶλλον <τῆς> ῥητορικῆς· <ὡς> ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις τὸν φιλόσοφον καθαρεύειν. <οἱ δ', ὅτι ὀλόκληρον εἰς αὐτὸν συνέταξε δρᾶμα, δι' ἔχθραν νομίζουσιν αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι οὐκ ὀρθῶς οἴονται. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ Δίφιλος εἰς Βοΐδαν τὸν φιλόσοφον (34 D.-K.) ὀλόκληρον συνέταξε ποίημα, δι' οὗ φοῦκ' εἰς δουλείαν ἐρπαινετο <ὁ> φιλόσοφος· οὐ διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἔχθρός ἦν. ἔπειτα Εὐπολις, εἰ καὶ δι' ὀλίγων ἐμνήσθη Σωκράτους (cf. fr. 386, 396 K.-A.), μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν ὅλαις ταῖς Νεφέλαις αὐτοῦ καθήγατο | **Et. M. 677,34-45 G.** πνιγεύς· παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ὁ φοῦρνος. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ὑδραυλικοῦ ὄργανου μέρος· τί σημαίνει καὶ τὸν φιμόν. καὶ γίνεται παρὰ τὸ πνίγω· ὁ δευτέρος ἀόριστος, ἐπνίγον, ἐξ αὐτοῦ. πνίγος οὐδετέρως, καὶ σημαίνει τὸ καῦμα καὶ τὸ θέρος· καὶ παρώνυμον πνιγεύς καὶ σημαίνει τὸν κρίβανον καὶ τὸν φιμόν τῶν ὑπόζυγιων· τοῦ μὲν προτέρου τὸν οὐρανὸν λέγοντος, “ὡς ἔστι πνιγεύς” (Aristoph. Nu. 96)· τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου, “περίθες σεαυτῶν πνιγέα” (ad Aristoph. fr. 64 K.-A.)· ἀντί τοῦ τῶν φιμόν. καὶ ἔστι τοῦ μὲν πνίγος τὸ ἰμακρὸν, ὡς γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὸ τὴν πνοὴν ἄγχειν, πνίγος καὶ πνίγος· τοῦ δὲ πνιγεύς, βραχὺ, ἀπὸ δευτέρου ἀορίστου γινόμενον.

1 ὥσπερ cett., ὡς R | φησί hic ΕΓ, post πνιγεύς M, om. R | post φησί, Σύμμαχος ins. Schnee | post pr. πνιγεύς, οὖν R | post alt. δὲ, οὗτος EM, οὕτως ἡ Γ | **3** post Δίδυμος, φησί M | καθαπερεὶ cett., καθάπερ R | **4** πῶμά cett., πῶμά M | φησὶν cett., om. R | ὁ ΕΓ²M, om. RVΓ | Σύμμαχος codd., del. Schnee | ἐπίτηδες RV, φησι Γ, om. EM

Peisetairos asks Meton about the instruments he is carrying, defined by the latter *κάνονες ἀέρος* (“sky rulers”). To explain their functioning, Meton begins by stating that the sky is *τὴν ιδέαν ὄλος / κατὰ πνιγέα μάλιστα* (“in its entirety a lot like a *πνιγέυς* in shape”). The term *πνιγέυς* indicates a bell-shaped ceramic oven used to bake bread³⁶⁶. The analogy between this common cooking utensil and the sky also occurs at the beginning of *Clouds* (l. 95-97), where Strepsiades, describing the *φροντιστήριον*, declares *ἐνταῦθ’ ἐνοικοῦσ’ ἄνδρες, οἱ τὸν οὐρανὸν / λέγοντες ἀναπείθουσιν ὡς ἔστιν πνιγέυς, / κᾶστιν περὶ ἡμᾶς οὔτος, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἄνθρακες* (“there live men that can convince you with their words that the sky is a bell-oven and is all around us, and we are the charcoal”). The related scholium informs that, before Aristophanes, Kratinos had lampooned the philosopher Hippon ascribing him the same *πνιγέυς*-analogy (fr. 167 K.-A.; 38 A 2 D.-K.). In all likelihood, this was a stock joke used by playwrights to ridicule intellectuals in general.

The annotation consists of two parts, variously arranged in the manuscripts³⁶⁷ and therefore printed as separate items in the present edition: one contains Didymos’ and Symmachos’ interpretations (the former probably quoted by the latter)³⁶⁸, the other is an epitomised version of the same scholium, without the two commentators’ names but with the addition of the gloss *πνιγέυς δὲ ὁ κρίβανος ἢ ἡ κάμινος*. This piece of lexicographic information probably synthesises two competing interpretations of the word *πνιγέυς*, which is glossed with *κρίβανος* (a term indicating a small oven³⁶⁹) in Hesych. π 2646 H., *Suda* π 1830, φ 629 A. and *schol. Aristoph. Nu.* 96a Holwerda and with *κάμινος* (generally “oven”, “furnace”) in Poll. 7.110, *Suda* π 1832 A. and *schol. Aristoph. Nu.* 96b Holwerda. While Didymos focuses on the metaphor used by Meton, Symmachos underlines that the rest of the geometer’s lines (1001-1009) is “deliberate nonsense” (see also *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1004 Holwerda *διόλου ἀνοηταίνει*), an intentionally unintelligible speech with which Aristophanes aimed at mocking Meton³⁷⁰.

Δίδυμος· τοιοῦτος ἄῆρ ἐστι τῆ γῆ περικείμενος κτλ: Didymos’ use of the verb *περικεῖμαι* may echo the only other occurrence of the *πνιγέυς*-analogy in the *Clouds*, where the sky/oven is said to be *περὶ ἡμᾶς* (l. 96). The analogy was at the centre of the ancient interpretive debate concerning the composition of the *Clouds* in relation to the alleged personal enmity between Aristophanes and Socrates, a debate summarised by *schol. Aristoph.*

³⁶⁶ See Sparkes 1962, 128; Paulas 2016, 577. On the various meanings of *(κατὰ)πνίγω* to describe different cooking methods, see De Martin (in preparation).

³⁶⁷ The order followed here (*i.e.* with the epitomised version preceding the one with the grammarians’ names) is found in all manuscripts except for **R**. In **EF** the two notes have two distinct lemmata (*κατὰ πνιγέα μάλιστα* and *προστιθεὶς οὖν ἐγὼ* respectively), while in **RM** they are one continuous scholium (**R** joins the two parts with *ἄλλως*). **V** omits the epitomised version.

³⁶⁸ On Symmachos’ exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos’ work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237f.; 242-244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

³⁶⁹ The limited size of the *κρίβανος* is made clear by Aristoph. *Ach.* 85f. *εἴτ’ ἐξένιξε (scil. ὁ βασιλεὺς), παρετίθει θ’ ἡμῖν ὄλους / ἐκ κριβάνου βοῦς*, where the idea of oven-baked oxen is a clear hyperbole. On the *κρίβανος*, see Dalby 2003, 101. According to Herodotos, whole oxen were roasted in the *κάμινος* (1.133 *οἱ εὐδαίμονες αὐτῶν βοῦν καὶ ἵππων καὶ κάμηλον καὶ ὄνον προτιθέαται ὄλους ὀπτῶς ἐν καμίνοισι*). Therefore, the term *κρίβανος* seems a more accurate gloss for *πνιγέυς* than *κάμινος*.

³⁷⁰ The concept of *ἀδιανόητα* is widespread in the Aristophanic scholia (see *scholl. Aristoph. V.* 1309a Koster [Did. fr. 216 C.-Pr.]; *Pac.* 1077, 1078a-b Holwerda; *Av.* 66d, 953aβ, 1377b, 1395 Holwerda) and this shows that ancient scholars of comedy understood nonsense to be an integral part of the comic mechanism, rather than something to correct. For a comprehensive study on the subject, see Kidd 2017.

Nu. 96d Holwerda. In his *Apology*, Plato had strongly championed the idea that the playwright had attacked the philosopher out of personal hatred (φθόνος and διαβολή in *Ap.* 18c-19d, ἔχθρα in the scholium to *Nu.* 96). The annotation brings into comparison: (1) Kratinos' *All-Seeing Ones* (fr. 167 K.-A.), where the πνιγύς-analogy was ascribed to Hippon (thus proving that this was a generic accusation against intellectuals, rather than a personal attack against Socrates), (2) a ποίημα written by a Diphilos against Boidas³⁷¹, presented as instance of a composition entirely written against a philosopher, (3) Eupolis, who is said to have attacked Socrates less often than Aristophanes but much more effectively (the only extant examples are *Eup.* frs. 386, 396 K.-A.). Such an articulate discussion is surely ancient. Whether Didymos had a role in it cannot however be ascertained.

³⁷¹ The identification of this Diphilos with the author of a *Theseid* in choliambos quoted by Didymos in his commentary to Pindar (fr. 124 C.-Pr. *ap. schol.* *Pind. O.* 10.83a-b Drachmann, discussed by Braswell 2017, 167-170) is possible but not provable (see Di Marco 1997).

fr. 240 (= II 14.37, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of ὄξις ἱερακίσκος in Av. 1112

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1112 Holwerda

ὄξις ἱερακίσκον **REG**: ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀρπάγην ὄξειαν”. Δίδυμος: τάχος ὡς ἱέρακος, ἵνα ταχέως φύγη.
RVEΓMLh

“(we will give you) a small and quick hawk”: in the sense of “a sharp hook”. Didymos: “swiftness like that of a hawk, so that you flee quickly”.

Aristoph. Av. 1111f. κἂν λαχόντες ἀρχιδιον εἶθ' ἀρπάσαι βούλησθέ τι, / ὄξις ἱερακίσκον εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῖν δώσομεν.

1 ἀρπάγην White, ἀρπαγὴν codd. et edd. cett. | post ὄξειαν M add. ἀρπακτικὸν γὰρ καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ὄρνειον | Δίδυμος cett., om. RLh | ante τάχος, ἢ Lh | ὡς cett., om. RLh

In the *antepirrhema* of the second parabasis of *Birds* (ll. 1102-1117) the Chorus directly addresses the judges of the dramatic contest promising hefty rewards if the play is awarded the first prize. The bribes offered all imply puns on birds, namely the γλαῦξ, ‘little owl’ (at the same time a metaphor for Athen’s coins, on which the bird was always represented), the αἰετός, ‘eagle’ (used to describe the shape of temple roofs), the ἱερακίσκος, ‘little hawk’ and the πρηγορεῶν ‘bird’s crop’ (metaphors relating to the ability of appropriating wealth while in office and food while at banquets, see below).

The scholiastic material concerning Av. 1102-1117 shows that Didymos had surely dealt with the last two terms, but the notes on ll. 1106 (γλαῦκες ὑμᾶς οὔποτ' ἐπιλείψουσι Λαυρειωτικάι) and 1110 (τὰς γὰρ ὑμῶν οἰκίας ἐρέψομεν πρὸς αἰετόν) are possibly also owed to him: in *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1106ba³⁷², the Didymean origin can be supposed on the base of a reference to Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328 F 200), an Attidographer also quoted elsewhere by the grammarian³⁷³, whereas *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1110b³⁷⁴ mentions Ion’s *Agamemnon*, on which Didymos had written a commentary (see Ath. 11.468d-e; Did. fr. °204 C.-Pr.; *TrGF* 19 ad F 1, 2). In both cases the absence of the grammarian’s name would be easily explicable with epitomation.

³⁷² ἢ γλαῦξ ἐπιχάραγμα ἦν τετραδράχιμον, ὡς Φιλόχορος (*FGrHist* 328 F 200). ἐκλήθη δὲ τὸ νόμισμα, τὸ τετράδραχμον, τότε γλαῦξ— ἦν γὰρ γλαῦξ ἐπίσημον καὶ πρόσωπον Ἀθηναῖς—τῶν προτέρων διδράχμων ὄντων ἐπίσημόν τε βοῦν ἐχόντων. **RVEΓ**

³⁷³ See Harp. π 63 K. (~ Phot. π 776 Th.; *Suda* π 1313 A.) περίστοιχοι Δημοσθένει ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Νικόστρατον (53.15) περὶ τῶν Ἀρεθουσίου ἀνδραπόδων “φυτευτήρια ἐλαῶν περιστοίχων κατέκλασεν”. Δίδυμος δὲ (300a C.-Pr.) τι γένος ἐλαιῶν περιστοίχους καλεῖ, ἃς Φιλόχορος στοιχάδας προσηγόρευσε (*FGrHist* 328 F 180). μήποτε δὲ περιστοίχων κέκληκεν ὁ ῥήτωρ τὰς κύκλω περὶ τὸ χωρίον ἐν στοιχῷ πεφυκίας. See Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 76. For Didymos’ use of historians in general see Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

³⁷⁴ τὰς γὰρ τῶν ἱερῶν στέγας πετὰ καὶ αἰετοῦς καλοῦσιν, ὡς φησὶν Ἴων ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι. **RVEΓ**

ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀρπάγην ὀξεῖαν”: the first anonymous explanation identifies the ἱερακίσκος with a tool named ἀρπάγη, a hook used to draw up buckets. Except for a few occurrences in historic-polioretic works³⁷⁵ and in Pollux³⁷⁶, the term is mostly attested in grammatical treatises and lexica concerned with the difference between ἀρπάγη and ἀρπαγή³⁷⁷. As can be expected, the manuscript tradition of the Aristophanic scholia is unanimous in presenting ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἀρπαγὴν ὀξεῖαν” (“in the sense of ‘swift robbery’”). This banalisation was evidently problematic for the scribe of **M**, who tries to explain it by adding ἀρπακτικὸν γὰρ καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ὄρνεον (“since the bird is rapacious and quick”). Rather surprisingly, despite the abundant evidence on the tool named ἀρπάγη, all editors – apart from White (1914, 206), who correctly restores the paroxytone form – print ἀρπαγὴν.

Δίδυμος· τάχος ὡς ἱέρακος κτλ.: Didymos interprets the expression as a metonymy indicating the swiftness of the hawk. Since the other puns in the Aristophanic passage revolve around physical objects (the coins, the roofs, the birds’ crop), the anonymous interpretation seems more likely than the Didymean one.

³⁷⁵ See *e.g.* Ph. *Bel.* 100.44; D.C. 66.4.

³⁷⁶ See Poll. 10.31 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ φρεάτων ἢ λάκκων τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπαντλεῖς, δέοιτ’ ἂν σκευῶν ἀντλητήρος, ἀντλίας, ἰμονιάς, ἰμάντος, κάλου, σχοινίου, κάδου, τροχαλίας, τάχα δὲ καὶ κηλωνεῖου. μέρη δὲ τροχαλίας τονία τοπεῖα ἀξόνια. τῷ δὲ προσδεῖ καὶ ἀρπάγης καὶ κρεάγρας καὶ λύκου· οὕτω γὰρ ἐκάλουν τὰ σκευὴ οἷς τοὺς ἐκπεσόντας τῶν κάδων ἐκ τῶν φρεάτων ἀνέσπων· ὅτι γὰρ καὶ κρεάγραν καλοῦσι τὴν ἀρπάγην, δηλοῖ ἐν Ἐκκλησιαζούσαις (1002) Ἀριστοφάνης λέγων “τί δῆτα κρεάγρας τοῖς κάδοις ὠνοίμεθ’ ἄν;”

³⁷⁷ See *e.g.* Amm. *Diff.* 73 N. ἀρπαγή καὶ ἀρπάγη διαφέρει παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς Ἀττικοῖς, ὡς φησι Τρύφων ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Περὶ Ἀττικῆς προσφθίας (fr. 12 Vels.). ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ ὀξευτόνως προενεγκώμεθα καθάπερ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ, τὴν αἰφνίδιον καὶ μετὰ βίας ἀφαίρεσιν δηλώσει· ἐὰν δὲ βαρυτόνως ἀρπάγην ὡς Ἀνάφη, ἐν ἧ ἐκ τῶν φρεάτων τοὺς κάδους ἐξαίρουσιν.

fr. 241 (= II 14.38, p. 254 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of πρηγορεῶν

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1113b-c-a Holwerda

a) πρηγορεῶνας **ΕΓ**: κυρίως τῶν ὀρνίθων ὁ λεγόμενος πρόλογος. ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ συναθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν. **ΕΓΜ**

b) πρηγορεῶνας κυρίως καλοῦσι τοὺς τῶν ὀρνίθων φάρυγγας διὰ τὸ εὐρεῖς εἶναι καὶ τὴν τροφήν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀθροίζεσθαι. **Lh**

[πρηγορεῶνας **RV**] Δίδυμος δὲ τοὺς βρόγγους τῶν ὀρνέων, τοὺς λεγομένους προλόβους, **RVEΓMLh** ὅτι <προ>συλλέγεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ σιτία. **RVEΓΜ** λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων πρηγορεῶν πάλιν ὁ βρόγγος. **RVEΓMLh** ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προαθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν. **RVEΓLh**

Prēgoreōnes: properly the so-called *prologos* of the birds. Both (*prēgoreōn* and *prologos* come) from the fact that they gather the food there.

They properly call *prēgoreōnes* the birds' throats because they are large and the food is collected in them.

Didymos (says that *prēgoreōnes* are) the birds' throats, the so-called *proloboi*, because the food is <first> collected in them. The throat is called *prēgoreōn* for people too. Both (*prēgoreōn* and *prologos* come) from the fact that they first collect the food there.

Aristoph. Av. 1113 ἦν δὲ που δειπνήτε, πρηγορεῶνας ὑμῖν πέμψομεν.

Aristoph. Eq. 374 τὸν πρηγορεῶνὰ σοῦκτεμῶ | **Poll. 2.204f.** ἐπίκειται δ' ἄρτηρία τε καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ καρδίας εἰς ῥάχιν ἀνατεινούσας φλεβῖν. πλέγματα δ' αὐτὸν ποιεῖ τέτταρα, ἢ ὡς ἔνιοι τρία, φλέβες ἄρτηρια νεῦρα· τοὺς γὰρ ὑμένας ἐξαίρουσιν. καὶ ὄρνισι μὲν ὁμοίον τι τούτῳ πρόσκειται, πρηγορεῶν καλούμενον, ἔνθα προαθροίζεται ἡ τροφή· τῶν δὲ μηρυκαζομένων τὴν πρώτην κοιλίαν ἦνυστρον καλοῦσιν. ὁ δὲ βρόγγος στομάχου προκείμενος, εἰς πνεύμονα ἀνανεύων, τῇ γλώττῃ καὶ τῷ στομάχῳ προσπέφυκεν, ἐρρίζεται δ' ἐν μέσῳ τῷ πνεύμονι | **Hesych. π 3259** πρηγορεῶν· τῶν ὀρνέων ὁ πρόλογος (-λογος cod.), ὅτι προσυλλέγεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ σιτία, **3566 H.** πρόλογος· ὁ περιτιθέμενος τοῖς προελθοῦσιν ἐπὶ δεῖπνον. καὶ ὁ γαργαρεῶν τῶν ὀρνίθων, ὃν οἱ παλαιοὶ πρηγορεῶν | **Phot. π 1157 Th.** πρηγορεῶν· ὁ πρᾶτης καὶ προαγορευῶν καὶ προλέγων | *schol. Aristoph. Eq. 374a Jones-Wilson* τὸν πρηγορεῶνα· τὸν λεγόμενον γαργαρεῶνα. ... κυρίως δὲ ἡ τῶν ὀρνέων φάρυγξ, ἐν ἧ ἀγείρεται ἡ τροφή. **VEΓ²ΘM** | **Suda π 2412** πρηγορεῶνας· τοὺς βρόγγους τῶν ὀρνέων, κυρίως τοὺς λεγομένους προλόγους, ὅτι συλλέγεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ σιτία. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων προηγορεῶν πάλιν ὁ βρόγγος. ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν. ἢ φάρυγγας ὀρνέων, **2413 A.** πρηγορεῶν· ὁ λεγόμενος γαργαρεῶν, ὁ λαμιός. πρηγορεῶν δὲ κυρίως ὁ ἐχίνος τῶν ὀρνίθων, ὅπου προαγείρεται ἡ τροφή | **[Zon.] 1572,16 T.** πρηγορεῶν. ὁ λαμιός ἢ τόπος, ὅπου ἀγείρεται ἡ τροφή. παρὰ τὸ ἀγείρειν. οὕτως λέγει Ἀπολλώνιος.

1 (a) πρηγορεῶνας E, πρηγορεῶν Γ | post κυρίως, λέγεται Γ | ὁ hic EM, ante τῶν Γ | **2 (a)** λεγόμενος EM, om. Γ | πρόλογος EΓΜ^{ac}, πρόλοβος M^{pc} | **4** βρόγγους cett., βρόγχους Γ | post βρόγγους, φησί Lh | post ὀρνέων, κυρίως RV | πρόλόβους Bekker Dindorf Dübner Rutherford, προλόγους RVEΓ²M, προβόλους Lh, τῶν ὀρνέων Γ | **5** δὲ cett., om. M | **6** βρόγγους cett., βροῦχος Γ | δὲ cett., om. Lh | ἀπὸ cett., ἐκ V | προαθροίζειν cett., συναθροίζειν EΓ

The term *πρηγορεών* occurs twice in Aristophanes. In *Av.* 1113 the Chorus tries to bribe the judges of the theatrical contest by offering them birds' crops (*πρηγορεῶνας ὑμῖν πέμψομεν*) to steal as much food as possible from the banquets they will be invited to, while in *Eq.* 374 the word is used by the Sausage-seller to refer to Paphlagon's throat (*τὸν πρηγορεῶνά σουκτεμῶ*), within the sequence of mutual threats that constitute the first *pn̄igos* of the *agōn* (ll. 367-381).

The scholiastic material on *Av.* 1113 suggests that there were two interpretations of the term. On the one hand was Didymos, who identified *πρηγορεών* with the birds' βρόγχος or πρόλοβος (banalised in πρόλογος early in the lexicographical tradition, see below). On the other hand was an anonymous explanation: φάρυγξ. The independence of the two interpretations is made especially clear by **V** – which presents Didymos' explanation in the lower margin and the phrase φάρυγγας ὀρνέων as a separate interlinear gloss (*i.e. schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1113da Holwerda) – and by *Suda* π 2412 A., where the Didymean interpretation (deprived of the grammarian's name) is followed by ἡ φάρυγγας ὀρνέων³⁷⁸. This last explanation is also found at the end of *schol.* Aristoph. *Eq.* 374a Jones-Wilson and according to Montana (2012, 46f.) this was the original exegetical context of the equivalence between *πρηγορεών* and φάρυγξ. The first part of the scholium as preserved by **EFGM** is a rephrasing of Didymos' interpretation, probably derived from a lexicon, given the lemmatisation in the nominative singular (see below).

Δίδυμος δὲ τοὺς βρόγχους τῶν ὀρνέων: in medical works, the word βρόγχος appears to be a less widespread alternative for τραχεῖα ἀρτηρία, the usual denomination of the bronchial tube³⁷⁹, whereas the φάρυγξ is defined by Aristotle as the anatomical part responsible for the transit of breath and voice³⁸⁰. There is no evidence outside the Aristophanic scholia connecting either the βρόγχος or the φάρυγξ to the digestive system. In all likelihood both Didymos' interpretation and the anonymous one used βρόγχος and φάρυγξ respectively in the more generic sense of “throat” and not as indicators of a distinct anatomical part of the bird. In fact, since in the Byzantine grammatical tradition βρόγχος and φάρυγξ jointly gloss λαίμος (“throat”)³⁸¹, it is possible that the two words were perceived as synonyms already in Didymos' time. Therefore, even though they were two independent explanations, they both identified the Aristophanic word with roughly the same body part.

τοὺς λεγομένους προλόβους: Bekker (1829, 257), Dindorf (1838, 240), Dübner (1842, 235) and Rutherford (1896, 525) emend the almost unanimously transmitted πρόλογος and προλόγους in πρόλοβος and προλόβους, supposing a banalisation of the rare word indicating the bird's crop in Aristotle's zoological works (see *HA*

³⁷⁸ On the dependence of the *Suda* from an Aristophanic manuscript close to **RV**, see Zacher 1888, 689; Holwerda 1977, XVII.

³⁷⁹ See Gal. 2,590 Kühn ἕτερον δὲ γένος ἀρτηριῶν, ἃς ὀνομάζουσι τραχείας, ἐν τραχήλῳ μὲν μία μεγίστη, καθ' ὅλον δὲ τὸν πνεύμονα ταύτης ἀπονεμήσεις πολλαί. τῷ δ' ἄνω πέρατι τῆς εἰρημένης ἐν τραχήλῳ μεγάλης ἀρτηρίας οἷον κεφαλὴ τις ἐπίκειται μόριον, ὁ προσαγορευόμενος λάρυγξ. ὀνομάζεται δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τῶν νεωτερικῶν ἀνατομικῶν βρόγχου κεφαλῆ, διότι καὶ αὐτὴν ὅλην τὴν τραχεῖαν οὐ μόνον οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ βρόγχον καλοῦσι.

³⁸⁰ See *e.g.* Aristot. *PA* 664a 17-19 ὁ μὲν οὖν φάρυγξ τοῦ πνεύματος ἔνεκεν πέφυκεν· διὰ τούτου γὰρ εἰσάγεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὰ ζῷα καὶ ἐκπέμπει, ἀναπνέοντα καὶ ἐκπνέοντα, 664a 35-664b 1 ἡ δὲ καλουμένη φάρυγξ καὶ ἀρτηρία συνέστηκεν ἐκ χονδρώδους σώματος· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἀναπνοῆς ἔνεκεν ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ καὶ φωνῆς.

³⁸¹ See *e.g.* *Et. Gen.* β 232 βρόγχος λέγεται ὁ λαίμος καὶ ὁ φάρυγξ, 276 L.-L. βρόγχος· ὁ λαίμος, ὃν καὶ φάρυγγα καλοῦσι, *Et. Gud.* d² 290,15-16 De Stefani βρόγχος δὲ ὁ φάρυγξ· πᾶν γὰρ φθέγμα ἐκ βρόγχου καὶ φάρυγγος φέρεται.

508b,27-509a,15; PA 674b,17-34). White's choice of maintaining the transmitted forms (1914, 206; followed by Holwerda 1991, 171) is based on the evidence provided by a (now lost) scrap of parchment codex originally preserved in the Louvre museum and tentatively dated to the 6th century CE (MP³ 140; LDAB 387; Aristoph. *CLGP* 4; see Montana 2012a): in the *verso*, the fragment preserved a marginal note to Av. 1113 reading

πρόλογος
ἢ τῶν ὀρνίθων
φάρυγξ

The parchment shows that the corruption of the rare πρόλοβος occurred quite early in the tradition of the exegesis to the *Birds*, probably also due to Didymos' explanation ὅτι συλλέγεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ σιτία (wrongly understood by later readers as an etymology, see below)³⁸². Moreover, the parchment presents the two interpretations as one exegetical unit, while the scholiastic tradition offers them as separate: this is a hint that the marginal note preserved in the parchment was drawn from a lexicon (hence the lemmatisation in nominative singular³⁸³), where the two explanations were already conflated³⁸⁴. However, since it was derived from a lexicographical source, the marginal note in the Louvre parchment can be considered a testimony only for the lemmatised version of Didymos' interpretation, that is the one transmitted by the lexica (like Hesychios') and inserted at the beginning of the annotation of the medieval manuscripts. Therefore, it does not seem fully convincing to maintain προλόγουσ in the Didymean citation that constitutes the second part of the scholium, especially in the light of the reading προβόλουσ of **Lh**, that clearly mirrors an original προλόβουσ. In all likelihood, Didymos' explanation (πρηγορεῶνασ) τοὺσ βρόγγουσ τῶν ὀρνέων, τοὺσ λεγομένουσ προλόβουσ κτλ was misunderstood by later lexicographers (see below) and reentered the scholiastic tradition (anonymised and lemmatised) with the corrupt form πρόλογουσ, inevitably causing the corruption of προλόβουσ in προλόγουσ in the Didymean fragment as well. The best textual solution thus seems to maintain the transmitted πρόλογουσ in the first part of the annotation and emend προλόγουσ in προλόβουσ in the Didymean section.

ὅτι <προ>συλλέγεται ἐν αὐτοῖσ τὰ σιτία: Hesych. π 3259 H. has προσυλλέγεται and this was probably the wording of Didymos' gloss, that the lexicographer found in the *Comic Vocabulary*³⁸⁵. It seems likely that Didymos based himself on the definition of πρόλοβουσ given by Aristotle, namely δέρμα κοῖλον καὶ μέγα, ἐν ᾧ ἢ τροφή πρώτη εἰσιούσα ἄπεπτόσ ἐστίν (*HA* 508b,28f., "a large hollow skin, into which the food first enters and lies undigested")³⁸⁶. In all likelihood, the grammarian took up the etymology implied by the passage of the

³⁸² See Montana 2012, 46f. n. 7.

³⁸³ See McNamee 1992, p. 75 nr. 1.; Montana 2012, 47.

³⁸⁴ The "synonymic adjustment" of competing interpretations of the same word is a common feature of the lexicographical tradition (see Tosi 2015). Alternatively, the compiler of the parchment might have used two separate lexica and have personally joined the two interpretations in the marginal note (see Montana, *ibid.*).

³⁸⁵ On the relationship between Hesychios and Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary*, see fr. 227f., 244, 260, the Introduction § 5.1.

³⁸⁶ Didymos seems to have used Aristotle's zoological works (either directly or through the epitome compiled by Aristophanes of Byzantium) also in fr. 2 and 227f..

History of Animals and equated πρηγορεών with πρόλοβος because to him both words conveyed the idea of food being collected “first” in the crop and only later digested. This is further confirmed by the last part of the Didymean fragment, ἀπὸ τοῦ προαθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν. In other words, Didymos’ explanation of πρηγορεών as πρόλοβος revolved around the prefix προ-. However, in the subsequent lexicographical tradition, this aspect was lost, and the Didymean interpretation was misunderstood as an etymology from the verb <προ>συλλέγω, with the inevitable corruption of πρόλοβος in πρόλογος.

λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων πρηγορεῶν πάλιν ὁ βρόγχος: the lines from Aristophanes’ *Knights* and *Birds* are the only two extant literary occurrences of the term πρηγορεών. Therefore, Didymos’ observation refers in all likelihood to *Eq.* 374, where the word indicates Paphlagon’s throat.

ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προαθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν: an almost identical phrasing is found in Pollux (2.204 πρηγορεῶν ... ἔνθα προαθροίζεται ἡ τροφή). The lexicon attributed to Zonaras (1572, 16 T.) ascribes a similar wording (πρηγορεῶν. ὁ λαιμὸς ἢ τόπος, ὅπου ἀγείρεται ἡ τροφή) to an Apollonios, whose identity can not be determined with certainty: an Apollonios, son of the grammarian Chairis, is quoted in *schol. Aristoph. V.* 1238b Koster, but the name occurs 19 more times without the patronymic throughout the Aristophanic scholia, in annotations that deal both with the content and with the language of the plays. Whether all these references go back to the same grammarian or to two namesakes is still debated among modern critics³⁸⁷.

³⁸⁷ See Cohn 1895a, 1895b; Rutherford 1905, 432 n. 11; Boudreaux 1919, 77; Montanari 1996a; Montana 2002.

fr. 242 (= II 14.39, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: potential hypotext of the expression Ἀλφειὸν πνέων in Av. 1121

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1121a-b Holwerda

ἀλλ' οὐτοσί **VEΓ** τρέχει **E**: Σύμμαχος· οὗτος οὕτω συντόμως τρέχει ὡσεὶ ὀλυμπιακὸς σταδιοδρόμος. **VEΓLh** ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· παρὰ τὸ Πινδάρου “ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ” (*N.* 1.1). διχῶς δέ τινες “Ἀλφειὸν πνέων”. **VEΓMLh**

Ἀλφειὸν πνέων] τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ δρόμου ἐδήλωσεν **M** ἀπὸ τοῦ παραρρέοντος ποταμοῦ. **MLh** ἀντὶ τοῦ “δίκην ῥεύματος ταχέως φερόμενος”. **Lh**

“But that one comes running”. Symmachos: he runs as rapidly as if he were an Olympic runner. Didymos: (with an allusion) to Pindar’s line “Alpheios’ noble sigh of rest”. Some (accentuate) “breathing Alpheios” differently (*i.e.* proparoxytone).

“breathing Alpheios”] (Aristophanes) showed the impetus of the run by alluding to the river that flows nearby. In the sense of “moving rapidly, like the current”.

Aristoph. Av. 1121 ἀλλ' οὐτοσί τρέχει τις Ἀλφειὸν πνέων.

Suda a 1362 A. ἀλλ' οὐτοσί τρέχει τις Ἀλφειὸν πνέων· Ἀριστοφάνης. Ὀλυμπιακὸς σταδιοδρόμος, ἀπὸ τοῦ παραρρέοντος ποταμοῦ.

1 post Σύμμαχος, φησιν Lh | οὗτος Γ² White Holwerda, οὕτως V, οὕτω Γ, om. ELh Bekker Dindorf Dübner | οὕτω VELh, οὕτως Γ, ras. Γ² | συντόμως VEΓ²Lh, συντόμως *Suda*, ** Γ | ὡσεὶ cett., ὡς V | ὀλυμπιακὸς EΓ, ὀλυμπικὸς V, ὀλυμπιονίκης Lh | **2** ὁ δὲ cett., om. M | Δίδυμος VEΓ²MLh, δίδυμος Γ | τὸ Πινδάρου cett., τῷ Πινδάρῳ M | ἄμπνευμα VEΓMLh, ἄμπνευσμα Γ² | ἔμπνευσμα E | σεμνὸν VEΓ²MLh, σεμνοῦ Γ | Ἀλφειοῦ EΓM, Ἀλφειοῦ VLh | **2-3** διχῶς κτλ cett., τινὲς δὲ ἄλφιον πνέων φασίν Lh | **3** Ἀλφειὸν edd., ἄλφιον ΓLh, Ἀλφειὸν EM, ἀλφιον V | **4** παραρρέοντος Lh, ῥέοντος M | **4-5** ἀπὸ-φερόμενος hic Holwerda, post σταδιοδρόμος Bekker, Dindorf Dübner (ante ἀπὸ, ἢ ins.), White (om. ἀντὶ-φερόμενος)

The first messenger’s entrance on scene is introduced by Peisetairos’ exclamation ἀλλ’ οὐτοσί τρέχει τις Ἀλφειὸν πνέων (Av. 1121): the *vis comica* of the line consists in the unexpectedly solemn expression “breathing Alpheios”, which combines a clear reminiscence of the epic formula μένεα πνείοντες (“breathing fury”, see *Il.* 2.536 *et passim*) with the metonymic use of the river Alpheios to indicate the city of Olympia and, consequently, the foot races that took place within the Panhellenic games³⁸⁸.

³⁸⁸ A similar wording is used in the depiction of the proud Kleomenes in *Lys.* 276 (Λακωνικὸν πνέων) and in Aischylos’ description of the courageous Athenians educated by his plays (see *Ra.* 1013-1017 σκέψαι τοῖνυν οἴους αὐτοὺς παρ’ ἐμοῦ παρεδέξατο πρῶτον / ... / πνέοντας δόρυ καὶ λόγχας καὶ λευκολόφους τρυφαλείας / καὶ πήληκας καὶ κνημίδας καὶ θυμοὺς ἐπταβοεῖους). See also Beck 1782, 118; Bekker 1829d, 209; Sommerstein 1987, 274.

The complexity of the phrase Ἀλφειὸν πνέων was naturally a matter of discussion among ancient Aristophanic readers, as attested by the scholium to *Av.* 1121, which offers Symmachos' «admirable paraphrase» of the line³⁸⁹, followed by Didymos' comment and by the anonymous observation on some unspecified scholars interpreting the expression διχῶς. Since one of the adverb's functions in the lexicographic and scholiastic jargon is to signal different spellings of the same word (or different words spelled similarly)³⁹⁰, all editors print Ἀλφειον, with the proparoxytone accentuation attested by **FLh** (ἄλφιον) instead of the oxytone one of **EM**, believing that the unnamed scholars considered the river Ἀλφειός different from Aristophanes' alleged Ἄλφειος. However, given that the phrase διχῶς δέ τινες “Ἀλφειὸν (or Ἄλφειον) πνέων” follows Symmachos' and Didymos' different interpretations, it cannot be excluded that διχῶς has a meaning closer to that found in a scholium to Demosthenes, where τινὲς τοῦτο τριχῶς ἐξηγοῦνται (along with the following διχῶς) means that some commentators accepted more than one explanation of the same passage³⁹¹. If this were the case though, the proparoxytone ἄλφιον of **FLh** could only be explained as stemming from a misunderstanding of διχῶς. A third interpretation of the phrase “breathing Alpheios” is then preserved by **MLh** as a separate comment (and therefore printed here separately): this was probably a rephrasing of Symmachos' exegesis (*i.e.* the river Alpheios near Olympia as a metonymy for the foot races and therefore as metaphor of messenger's hasty run) that was later misunderstood by **Lh**, taking the current of the river as a metaphor for the man's speed.

ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· παρὰ τὸ Πινδάρου “ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ”: the fragment needs to be read along with Didymos' comment on the Aristophanic expression τὴν πόλιν ... ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις (*Ra.* 704), in relation to which the grammarian (probably wrongly) devised an Aeschylean hypotext, in all likelihood *Ch.* 587-589 (fr. 264, Δίδυμός φησιν· παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου κτλ.). At first glance, it might seem that the grammarian linked the Pindaric passage with *Av.* 1121 on the base of mere resemblance in wording (ἄμπνευμα ... Ἀλφειοῦ and Ἀλφειὸν πνέων). However, any evaluation of the aptness of the parallel depends on the meaning supposed

³⁸⁹ Dunbar 1995, 594. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 243f.; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

³⁹⁰ In almost all cases the distinction is more than simply prosodic and involves at least one or two letters, see *e.g.* Hesych. α 4278 C. ἀνάδοχος καὶ ἀναδοχέυς· διχῶς ἐλέγετο, 5850 C. ἀπαύλια καὶ ἐπαύλια· διχῶς λέγεται ἡμέρα, ἐν ἧ <πρῶτον> ἐπαυλίζεται τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἡ νόμφη.

³⁹¹ *schol.* Dem. 1.71b Dilts τις ... Ὀλυμπίων] τινὲς τοῦτο τριχῶς ἐξηγοῦνται. οἱ μὲν ὄλον ὁμοῦ τὸ κῶλον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημοσθένους λεγόμενον, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν, καὶ τοῦτο διχῶς λέγουσιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὴν πεῦσιν λέγουσιν ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων πρὸς Δημοσθένην, <οἱ δὲ> ‘νυνὶ δὲ καιρὸς ἦκει τίς;’ κατὰ πεῦσιν, ἀνταποκρινόμενον ‘οὗτος ὁ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων’. The adverb διχῶς is frequently used in association with verbs like νοέω and ἐξηγοῦμαι to indicate multiple interpretations of the same word or phrase: in most cases the different exegeses are presented as mutually exclusive (see *e.g. schol. Od.* 5.379c2 Pontani ὀνόσσεσθαι κακότητος] διχῶς νοεῖται, ἢ ὀνόσσεσθαι καὶ μέμψασθαι σε τῆς κακότητος ἥτοι τῆς ταλαιπωρίας ἢς ἐπαθες, ἢ ὀνόσσεσθαι καὶ ἀπόνασθαι σε, ἥτοι ὠφελθῆναι σε τῆς κακότητος τῆς σῆς ἔνεκα, ἥτοι τῆς κακουργίας, ὅτι ἐφόνευσας τὸν ἐμὸν υἱόν, *schol. Eur. Hec.* 871 συνδράσης δὲ μή· διχῶς τοῦτο νοητέον, ἢ μὴ συνδράσης ἐμοὶ τῷ ἀποκτείναντι ... ἢ μὴ συνδράσης τῷ ἀποκτείναντι τόνδε, *schol. rec. Aristoph. Ra.* 85c Chantry ἐς μακάρων εὐωχίαν] τοῦτο διχῶς νοεῖται, ἢ ὅτι ἐτελεύτησε καὶ ἀπῆλθε πρὸς τὰς Μακάρων νήσους ... ἢ ὅτι ἀποδρὰς σύνεστιν Ἀρχελάω τῷ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεῖ). Furthermore, διχῶς occurs frequently in the Homeric scholia to signal textual changes in different phases of Aristarchos' *diorthōsis*, see *e.g. schol. Did. Id. II.* 2.517a (A) {αὐτὰρ} Φωκίῳν: τὰ τοιαῦτα διχῶς ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου εὐρίσκομεν, καὶ διὰ τοῦ εἰ „Φωκείων“, καὶ διὰ τοῦ η Φωκίῳν.

for Pindar's rare term ἄμπνευμα: Clausen's heavy criticism³⁹² derives from Mezger's translation of ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ as «des Alpheos hehrer Ruheplatz» (1880, 103), whereas the more literal meaning of «breath exhaled [...], sigh of rest» (Carey 1981, 104f.) – which is also suggested by the scholium to *N.* 1.1³⁹³ – makes Didymos' explanation much more easily understandable³⁹⁴. Indeed, the comparison between Aristophanes' and Pindar's passages is in itself sufficient evidence to prove that the grammarian understood the word ἄμπνευμα in its etymological sense, thus perceiving a similarity between the beginning of the *Nemean* One – with the imagery of Alpheios passing under the sea from Elis to emerge in Ortygia while chasing Arethusa (or Artemis)³⁹⁵ – and the scene of the messenger rushing on scene out of breath for the long run³⁹⁶. Whether such a reminiscence was actually at play in Aristophanes' text or not, Didymos' observation is another example of his tendency to display his erudition even when not immediately fitting and functional to the clarification of the commented passage (see fr. 231 above).

³⁹² Clausen 1881, 16: «perversissima est enim Didymi sententia [...]. Nam hoc Pindari ἄμπνευμα Ἀλφειοῦ locum significat, ubi quis animum corpusque remitat et relaxet. Quid igitur rei nostro versui cum Pindari loco?».

³⁹³ See *schol.* *P. N.* 1.1a Drachmann ἄμπνευμα: ἀνάμπνευμα καὶ ἀναπνοή· ἔνιοι δὲ ἀναφύσημα.

³⁹⁴ See van Leeuwen 1902, 174: «recte Didymus in scholio confert Pindari versiculum: ἄμπνευμα σεμνόν Ἀλφειοῦ, Alpei anhelitus honorificus».

³⁹⁵ See Telesill. fr. 717 P.; Paus. 5.7.2; 6.22.8; Ovid. *Met.* 5.577-641; Wentzel 1894, 1633; Carey 1981, 104.

³⁹⁶ The emphatic repetition of ποῦ in the messenger's first line (see *Av.* 1122f. ποῦ ποῦ 'στι, ποῦ ποῦ ποῦ 'στι, ποῦ ποῦ ποῦ 'στι, ποῦ, / ποῦ Πεισέταιρός ἐστιν ἄρχων;) has been interpreted by Thompson (1940, 188) as an expression of the messenger's breathlessness (see also Dunbar 1995, 594).

fr. 243 (= II 14.40, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of κατακέλευσον in Av. 1273

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1273a-b Holwerda

ὃ **E** κατακέλευσον **RVEΓ**: οἶονεῖ “σιωπὴν κήρυξον”. **RVEΓLh** ἔστι δὲ ναυτικόν. **Lh** οἱ γὰρ κελευσταὶ πολλάκις σιωπὴν παραγγέλλειν εἰώθασι “σιώπα” λέγοντες καὶ “ἄκουε” καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. οὕτω Δίδυμος, ἄλλως. **RV** ἐπειδὴ πολλάκις εἴρηκεν “ὦ” καὶ οὐκ ἐπίσχει αὐτὸν ὁ Πεισθέταιρος, ὁ ἄγγελός φησι “κατακέλευσον”, ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐρέσσουσι. **RVEΓM** καὶ “ὦ”, λέγει, “παύσασθαι παρακέλευσαί μοι”. **VEΓM** οὕτω Σύμμαχος. **V**

“O...give me the cue!”: in the sense of “ask for silence”. It is a nautical expression. Indeed, the boatswains are often used to ask for silence by saying “be quiet” and “listen” and similar phrases. So says Didymos. Otherwise. Because he has said “o...” many times and Peisetairos does not stop him, the herald says “give me the cue”, like (they give the cue) to rowers, and he says “o, tell me to stop”. So says Symmachos.

Aristoph. Av. 1271-1273 ὃ Πεισέταιρ', ὃ μακάρι', ὃ σοφώτατε, / ὃ κλεινότεα', ὃ σοφώτατ', ὃ γλαφυρώτατε, / ὃ τρισμακάρι', ὢ—κατακέλευσον.

Aristoph. Ra. 207f. Δι. κατακέλευε δὴ. / Χα. ὦ ὄπ' ὄπ. ὦ ὄπ' ὄπ | **Poll. 4.93** κατακηρῦξαι ἠσυχίαν, ὃ καὶ κατακελεύσει λέγουσιν | **Suda κ 573 A.** κατακέλευσον: ἀντὶ τοῦ σιωπὴν κήρυξον. οἱ γὰρ κελευσταὶ πολλάκις σιωπᾶν παραγγέλλειν εἰώθασι, “σιώπα” λέγοντες, καὶ “ἄκουε”, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀρνισιν (1272): “ὢ τρισμακάρι' ὢ κλεινότεατε' ὢ σοφώτατε' ὢ γλαφυρώτατε”. ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἤκουε, φησὶν, “ὢ κατακέλευσον”, ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐρέσσουσι. καὶ “ὦ”, λέγει, “παύσασθαι παρακέλευσαί μοι” | *schol. Aristoph. Av. 1395a Holwerda* ὡπ: παρακελεύεται αὐτῷ παύσασθαι τοῦ ἄδειν, ὡς οἱ ἐρέσσοντες. κέλευσμα γὰρ ἔστι τὸ “ὦ ὄπ” τῶν ἐρεσσόντων καταπαῦον τὴν κωπηλασίαν | **Eust. II. 831,29-32 (= III 152f. V.)** ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ κελεύειν οὐ μόνον ἐπιτακτικὸν ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ γενικώτερον ὀτρυντικὸν ἢ ἐπισπευστικὸν ἢ ἐρεθιστικόν. διὸ καὶ οἱ Μηχανικοὶ κελεύειν λέγονται, ὅτε τὰ οἰκεία τεχνῶνται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ναυτικοί, ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ Κωμικὸς (*Ra. 207*) ἐν τῷ “κατακέλευε δὴ”, **884,14 (= III 328 V.)** τὸ κελεύειν καὶ ἐπὶ πλοίων λέγεται, ὡς τὸ “κατακέλευε δὴ” παρὰ τῷ Κωμικῷ (*ibid.*), **1083,25-28 (= III 920 V.)** ὅτι δὲ κελεύειν οὐχ' ἀπλῶς τὸ ἐπιτάσσειν κοινότερον ἀλλὰ ποτε καὶ λέξις ἔστι ναυτική, δηλοῖ μὲν καὶ ὁ Κωμικὸς ἐν τῷ “κατακέλευε δὴ” (*ibid.*).

1 οἶονεῖ EΓLh, οἶον εἰς RV | κελευσταὶ EΓ, κελευταὶ RV | **2** πολλάκις hic cett., post σιωπὴν Γ | παραγγέλλειν cett., καταγγέλλειν E | ἄκουε EΓ, ἀκούει RV | **3** ἐπειδὴ Γ, ἐπεὶ δὲ E | εἴρηκεν RVΓ, εἴρηται E, εἶπε τὸ M | ἐπίσχει REΓ, ἐπίσχη V, ἐπίσχον M | αὐτὸν cett., αὐτῷ R | ὁ Πεισθέταιρος, ὁ ἄγγελός cett., Πεισθέταιρος, ὁ ἄγγελός E, om. M | **4** post κατακέλευσον, καὶ Γ | ὥσπερ—μοι cett., ἀντὶ τοῦ παύσασθαι παρακέλευσον M | “ὦ”, λέγει codd., τοῦ λέγειν Schnee

The herald that had been sent from Nephelokokkygia to the humans at Il. 843f. (κήρυκα δὲ πέμψον τὸν μὲν εἰς θεοὺς ἄνω, / ἕτερον δ' ἄνωθεν αὖ παρ' ἀνθρώπους κάτω) comes back on stage addressing Peisetairos with a hyperbolic sequence of adulatory vocatives (Av. 1271-1273 ὢ Πεισέταιρ', ὢ μακάρι', ὢ σοφώτατε, / ὢ

κλεινότατ', ὃ σοφώτατ', ὃ γλαφυρώτατε, / ὃ τρισμακάρι')³⁹⁷ that is left unfinished and is abruptly concluded – with a comic *aprosdoketon* – by the imperative κατακέλευσον. This is generally interpreted as the herald's request to Peisetairos «to make some reply that can serve as a signal for him end his salutation and begin delivering his message»³⁹⁸. The only two literary occurrences of the verb κατακελεύω are *Av.* 1273 and *Ra.* 207, but while in the *Frogs* the meaning is clear (Dionysos asks Charon to set the rhythm for his oaring), the sense of the herald's expression in the *Birds* passage is not as unambiguous and was indeed already discussed in antiquity.

The annotation preserved by the manuscripts results from the juxtaposition of two excerpts from Didymos' and Symmachos' commentaries respectively (as happens for 238, 244, 247, 249 and 253)³⁹⁹, with Symmachos' exegesis being a rephrasing of the one offered by his predecessor⁴⁰⁰.

ὃ κατακέλευσον οἶονεῖ “σιωπὴν κήρυξον” κτλ: Didymos' explanation of the imperative κατακέλευσον clearly implies an undeclared comparison with the only other known occurrence of the verb, at the beginning of the crossing of the Acheron in *Ra.* 207 (κατακέλευε δὴ). There, Dionysos encourages Charon to start the call ὦ ὄπ· ὄπ. ὦ ὄπ· ὄπ, with which the boatswains would normally set the rhythm for the oarsmen. In the grammarian's interpretation of the *Birds* passage, the herald acts as the oarsman, requesting a signal from Peisetairos, the boatswain. This sound comparison between literary occurrences, is followed by an apparent autoschediasm, since the idea of the boatswains requesting silence from the oarsmen clearly suits the text of *Av.* 1273. However, two more elements may have played a role in Didymos' exegesis. Firstly, *Av.* 1390-1396⁴⁰¹, where Peisetairos desperately tries to stop Kinesias' singing with the call ὦ ὄπ, used to stop the oaring⁴⁰² (in opposition to ὦ ὄπ· ὄπ, which set the rhythm). While *Ra.* 207 made clear that the verb κατακελεύω indicated the action of giving signals to the oarsmen, the exchange between Peisetairos and Kinesias at *Av.* 1390-1396 proved that the nautical call ὦ ὄπ could be used to silence the opposite speaker. In other words, if – as seems probable – both passages underlie the Didymean explanation, the grammarian considered the herald's κατακέλευσον to mean “tell me ὦ ὄπ” and then erroneously extended the metaphorical usage (*i.e.* “tell me to be quiet”) to the original context of the boatswain and the oarsmen. Actually, in interpreting κατακελεύω as σιωπὴν κηρύσσω, Didymos may be right: on the one hand, κατακελεύω may well have indicated the boatswain's action of giving any signal to the oarsmen, whether to set the boat in motion – with the rhythmic ὦ ὄπ· ὄπ. ὦ ὄπ· ὄπ – or to stop it, with ὦ ὄπ. On the other hand, metaphorical usage of nautical expressions

³⁹⁷ The repetition of ὃ σοφώτατ'(ε) has been considered problematic by some modern critics, for an overview see Dunbar 1995, 633f.

³⁹⁸ Sommerstein 1987, 283; see also Dunbar 1995, 633f.

³⁹⁹ In addition, manuscript Γ preserves the interlinear gloss σιγὴν πρόσταξον, by the second hand (*i.e. schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1273c Holwerda).

⁴⁰⁰ On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with *frr.* 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242; 244; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

⁴⁰¹ Κι. σὺ δὲ κλυὼν εἴσει τάχα. / Πε. οὐ δῆτ' ἔγωγε. Κι. νῆ τὸν Ἡρακλέα σύ γε. / ἅπαντα γὰρ δίδεμί σοι τὸν ἀέρα. / εἶδωλα πετηνῶν / αἰθεροδρόμων / οἰωνῶν ταναοδείρων— / Πε. ὦ ὄπ. / Κι. ἀλίδρομον ἀλάμενος / ἄμ' ἀνέμων πνοαῖσι βαίην. / Πε. νῆ τὸν Δί' ἧ γῶ σου καταπαύσω τὰς πνοάς.

⁴⁰² The same call is used by Charon upon reaching the shore of the Acheron (*Ra.* 180 ὦ ὄπ· παραβαλοῦ).

must have been very frequent in everyday language at Athens: in particular, the verb κατακελεύω and the call ὦ ὄπ could have been very easily applied to dialogic contexts where a speaker was monotonously droning on (just as the oarsmen would monotonously repeat the same action over and over). Similarly, in *Av.* 1390-1396 Peisetairos tries to silence Kinesias, and in *Av.* 1273 the herald begs to be silenced, since he cannot go on with his clumsy sequence of vocatives. A second element that might have influenced Didymos' interpretation is the verb κατακηρύσσω: according to Pollux (4.93 κατακηρῦξαι ἡσυχίαν, ὃ καὶ κατακελεύσαι λέγουσιν) both verbs were used to proclaim silence and his statement is confirmed by a piece of epigraphic evidence dating to the 2nd-1st century BCE, a decree of the Samian residents at Minoa, on the island of Amorgos⁴⁰³. Provided that the expression σιωπὴν κατακηρύσσειν was more widespread than the isolated evidence from Amorgos would suggest, it cannot be excluded that Didymos' exegesis of κατακελεύω was also influenced by this usage.

⁴⁰³ *IG* XII/7 237,35-39 ἐπιμεληθήτωσαν δὲ οἱ ἐπιμήνιοι τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρῃ μ[ετὰ] τὰς σπονδάς, ὅπως σιωπὴν κατακηρύξας ὁ κῆρυξ ἀναγγεῖλῃ ὅτι στεφανοῖ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Σα[μίων] ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν Μινώϊαι Ἡγησαρέτη<ν> Αἰνησι[κ]ράτου κτλ. The phrase σιωπὴν κατακηρύσσειν also occurs twice in Appianos (2.18.133 σιωπὴν τε κατακηρύξας [*scil.* ὁ Ἀντώνιος] αὐθις ἔλεγεν κτλ., 4.12.99 ἦσθεῖς ὁ Κάσσιος τῇ προθυμίᾳ κατεκήρυξεν αὐθις σιωπὴν καὶ αὐθις ἔλεγε κτλ).

fr. 244 (= II 14.41, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of σκυτάλιον/σκυτάλη

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av. 1283a-ba-c* Holwerda

σκυτάλι' ἐφόρου **VEΓ³** : σκυτάλη ἤτοι λακωνικὴ ἐπιστολὴ ἢ βακτηρία. ἐφόρου γὰρ βαρείας βακτηρίας οἱ Λάκωνες. **VEΓ³Lh** τοῦ δὲ “σκυτάλιον” τὸ α ἐκτείνεται, ὡς ἐν Ὀλκάσιν (fr. 433 K.-A.), ἔνθα καὶ τὸ Νικοφῶντος ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης Γονῶν (fr. 2 K.-A.) παρετέθη “οὐκ ἐς κόρακας τὸ χεῖρ' ἀποισεις ἐκποδῶν / ἀπὸ τοῦ σκυταλίου <...> καὶ τῆς διφθέρας”. οὕτω Σύμμαχος, ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· σκυτάλια: ἐτύμως τὰς βακτηρίας, αἷς τὰ σκύτα τύπτουσιν, ὅ ἐστι τοὺς τραχήλους “ἢ παύσει βάρκρω καλίνω κατὰ σκύτα Φρὺξ ἀνήρ” (anon. dor. fr. 16 K.-A.). **VEΓ³** ἄλλως **VEΓ³** σκυτάλη λακωνικὴ ἐπιστολὴ. **RVEΓΓ³M** οὗτοι γὰρ μέλλοντες πέμπειν στρατηγὸν εἰς πόλεμον ἐποιοῦν δύο ῥάβδους ἰσοπήχεις καὶ ἰσομήκεις, καὶ τὴν μὲν τῷ στρατηγῷ μέλλοντι ἐξιέναι εἰς πόλεμον ἐδίδουν, τὴν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς εἶων. καὶ ὅτε βούλοιντο ἀπόρρητόν τι σημαίνει τῷ ἀπόντι στρατηγῷ, ταύτη λευκὸν δέρμα περιελίζαντες ἔγραφον εἰς αὐτό. καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς λαβὼν αὐτὸ καὶ περιελίζας τῇ παρ' αὐτῷ ῥάβδῳ ἀνεγίνωσκεν. **RVEΓΓ³M**

σκυτάλι' ἐφόρου **EΓMLh**: πάλιν **E** ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἐλακωνίζον”. **VEΓMLh** καὶ ὅτι λακωνικὸν τὸ τῆς σκυτάλης. **VEΓ** ἔγραφον δὲ οὐ μόνον ταῖς σκυτάλαις ἐγχαράσσοντες τὰς ἐπιστολάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ βακτηρίαις. **EΓ**

“they carried the Spartan staff”: the *skytalē* is either a Spartan dispatch or a Spartan staff. Indeed, the Spartans carried heavy staffs. The *ā* in *skytalion* is long, as in the *Merchant Ships*. There, this verse from Nicophon’s *Birth of Aphrodites* was offered as comparison: “will you take the hands off the *skytalion* <...> and the jerkin and go to hell?”. So says Symmachos. Didymos: *skytalia*, etymologically the staffs, with which they beat the *skyta*, that is the necks: “or the Phrygian man will strike on the head with the wooden staff”. Otherwise. The *skytalē* is a Spartan dispatch. Indeed, when they were about to send a general to war, they would make two sticks of the same thickness and length: they would give one to the general going to war and they would keep the other. And in case they wanted to communicate something secret to the general that was away, they would wrap a piece of blank skin around the stick and write on it. When he received the message, the general would read it by wrapping it on his own stick.

“they carried the Spartan staff”: again in the sense of “they imitated Spartan manners” and because the use of the *skytalē* is Spartan. They would write messages not only by engraving them on the *skytalai* but also on the staffs.

Aristoph. Av. 1280-1283 πρὶν μὲν γὰρ οἰκίσαι σε τήνδε τὴν πόλιν, / ἑλακωνομάνουν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι τότε, / ἐκόμων, ἐπέινων, ἐρρύπων, ἐσωκράτων, / σκυτάλι' ἐφόρου.

Aristoph. Lys. 991f. Κι. τί δ' ἐστὶ σοι τοδί; Κη. σκυτάλα Λακωνικά. / Κι. εἶπερ γε, χαῖτη ὅτι σκυτάλη Λακωνική | **Erot. 117,6-14 N.** σκύτα: τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν τεχνόντων [καὶ] τοῦ τραχήλου, ὡς Πετρώνιος φ' ἐν κάρη φησὶν· 'φαίγ' ἀδες ὑπέκνεον καὶ πάλαι τὰ σχήματα εὐθὺς ἰδὼν καὶ τὰ σκύτα'. καὶ Ἀρχιλόγος (fr. 237 W.²) λέγων· 'πῶς φ' ἀπέπρησεν τὰν σκύταν'. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ σκύτα λέγεσθαι τὸν νοτιαῖον μυελόν. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἰνίον. οἱ δὲ τὸν μεταξὺ τοῦ μετώπου καὶ τῶν ὀφρύων τόπον, ὅπερ ἐπισκόνιον καλοῦμεν. τινὲς δὲ σκύτα εἶπον τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δέρμα. παρ' ὃ καὶ ἡ <κεφαλή> σκύτος εἴρηται | **Poll. 10.173** φαίης δ' ἂν κατ' Ἀριστοφάνην λέγοντα ἐν Ὀλκάσι καὶ "παττάλους ἐγκρούειν" (fr. 432 K.-A.), καὶ "σκύταλον ὑποσίδηρον" (fr. 433 K.-A.) | **Gal. σ 33 P.** σκύτα: τὰ κατὰ τὸν αὐχένα | **Ath. 3.85d** μνημονεύων δ' αὐτῆς (scil. τῆς τελλίνης) Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἀχνημένης σκυτάλης συγγράμματι (fr. 367 Slater) ὁμοίως φησὶν εἶναι τὰς λεπάδας ταῖς καλουμέναις τελλίνας, **10.451c-d** Ἀχαιοὺς δ' ὁ Ἐρετριεὺς γλαφυρὸς ὢν ποιητὴς περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν εἶσθ' ὅτε καὶ μελαίνει τὴν φράσιν καὶ πολλὰ αἰνιγματωδῶς ἐκφέρει, ὥσπερ ἐν Ἰριδί σατυρικῇ. λέγει γάρ· (TrGF 20 F 19) "λιθάργυρος δ' ὄλη παρηρεῖτο χρίματος πλέα τὸν Σπαρτιάτην γραπτὸν κύρβιν ἐν διπλῷ ξύλῳ". τὸν γὰρ λευκὸν ἱμάντα βουληθεὶς εἶπειν, ἐξ οὗ ἡ ἀργυρὰ λήκυθος ἐξήρητο, Σπαρτιάτην γραπτὸν ἔρη κύρβιν ἀντὶ τοῦ Σπαρτιάτην σκυτάλην. ὅτι δὲ λευκῷ ἱμάντι περιειλοῦντες τὴν σκυτάλην οἱ Λάκωνες ἔγραφον ἃ ἠβούλοντο εἶρηκεν ἰκανῶς Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀρχιλόγου (fr. 22 Michaelis) | **Hesych. σ 1189 H.** σκύτα: τὸν τράχηλον. Σικελοί | **Lex. Aἰμ. σ 5 D.** σκυτίνας: περιζώματα ἀπὸ λώρων· παρὰ τὸ σκύτος, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ δέρμα· σκύτος δὲ λέγεται τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν τεχνόντων τοῦ τραχήλου δέρμα, ὡς Πετρώνιος φησὶ· τινὲς δὲ φασὶ σκύτα λέγεσθαι τὸν νοτιαῖον μυελόν· οἱ δὲ τὸ ἰνίον· οἱ δὲ τὸν μεταξὺ τῶν ὀφρύων καὶ τοῦ μετώπου τόπον, ὅπερ ἐπισκόνιον καλοῦμεν· ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δέρμα, παρ' ὃ καὶ σκύτος εἴρηται {τουτέστιν} ἡ κεφαλή | **Suda σ 718 A.** σκυτάλη: ἐπιστολή Λακωνική. ἦν δὲ ἡ σκυτάλη ξύλον ἐξεσμένον ἐπίμηκες, δύο δὲ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους ὑπῆρχον σκυτάλαι· καὶ τὴν μὲν μίαν κατεῖχον οἱ ἔφοροι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν τῷ ἐκπεπομένῳ παρ' αὐτῶν στρατηγῷ παρεῖχον. καὶ ὅποτε ἐβούλοντο τι ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτῷ, φέροντες ἱμάντα λευκὸν περιεῖλυν τὴν σκυτάλην καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱμάντος ἔγραφον. καὶ ἀνελίττοντες παρεῖχον τὸν ἱμάντα τῷ ἀποφέροντι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν, ἵνα μὴ μανθάνωσιν οἱ ἀποφέροντες τὸ δηλούμενον ἐν αὐτῷ. ὃ δὲ στρατηγὸς δεχόμενος τὸν ἱμάντα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ σκυτάλῃ περιέλιτε καὶ ἐγίνωσκεν οὕτως τὰ γεγραμμένα. λέγεται οὖν καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ξύλον, ἀρ' οὗ καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή. Διοσκορίδης δ' ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νομίμων (FGrHist 594 F 5) τοὺς δανείζοντας ἐν Σπάρτῃ διαρεῖν σκυτάλην, δύο παρόντων μαρτύρων, καὶ γράφειν τὸ συμβόλαιον ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τμήματι· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐν τῶν μαρτύρων δίδοναι, τὸ δὲ δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχειν. ἐχρῶντο δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἀλλοίως, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ μβ' (fr. 509 Rose, 514 Gigon).

1 ante λακωνική, ἡ Lh | ἢ VΓ³, ἦτοι E, καὶ ἡ Lh | ἐφόρου cett., ἔφερον Lh | **2** οἱ cett., om. V | ὡς V, om. EΓ³ | **3** Γονῶν Ald (nisi quod γόνων habet), τὸ Γ V, γόνον E, γόνου Γ³ | τὸ χεῖρ' cett., τὰς χεῖρας E | **4** ἐκποδὸν cett., ἐκποδῶν E | post σκυταλίου, τε add. Dindorf | ἐτόμως EΓ³, ἐτοίμως V | **5** pr. σκύτα Wilamowitz ap. Kaibel, σκύταλα codd. et edd. | τοὺς EΓ³, om. V | βάκτρον V, βάκρον EΓ³ | κατὰ σκύτα E, κατασκύτα V, καὶ τὰ σκύτα Γ³ | **6** ante σκυτάλη, λέγεται δὲ Lh | post σκυτάλη, ἐστὶ R, ἦτοι Γ² add. in text. Γ | post ἐπιστολή, οὕτως Lh | **7** οὔτοι hic cett., post πέμπειν Lh | γὰρ cett., om. Lh | post εἰς, τὸν EΓ³ | ἰσοπήχεις καὶ ἰσομήκεις cett., ἴσας κατὰ τε μήκος καὶ πάχος Lh, καὶ ἰσομήκεις om. M | **8** εἰς πόλεμον, hic cett., ante μέλλοντι M, om. Lh | παρ' αὐτοῖς εἶον cett., κατεῖχον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς Lh | ante ὅτε, {ὅτι} R | βούλοιντο REΓ³, βούλοιο V, ἐβούλοντο M | **9** σημάνα cett., μνηῖσαι Lh | ἀπόντι om. Lh | ταῦτη cett., ταῦτην M, om. Lh | post δέρμα, τῇ ῥάβδῳ Lh | post αὐτὸ, εἶτα ἀνελίζαντες ἐπέστελλον Lh, ἀνελίττοντες παρεῖχον τὸν ἱμάντα τῷ ἀποφέροντι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν, ἵνα μὴ μανθάνωσιν οἱ ἀποφέροντες τὸ δηλούμενον ἐν αὐτῷ **Suda σ 718 (Ald)** | **9-10** καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς cett., ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς R, ὁ στρατηγὸς δὲ Lh | **10** αὐτὸ cett. (ex αὐτῷ R), om. M | περιελίξας RV, περιελίξας EΓ³, ἀνελίζας M | τῇ παρ' αὐτῷ ῥάβδῳ cett., om. M | **11-13** σκυτάλι'—βακτηρίας ante σκυτάλη (6) Γ | **11-12** ἀντι—σκυτάλης sub verso V | **11** σκυτάλι'—ἐλακόνιζον post ἀνεγίνωσκεν M, ante σκυτάλη (1) Lh | post σκυτάλι', οὖν M | post ἐλακόνιζον, ὄφειλεν εἶπειν Lh | **12** τῆς σκυτάλης EΓ, σκυτάλη V | ἔγραφον—σκυτάλαις EΓ², om. Γ | ταῖς E, ἐν Γ² | post καί, in text. Γ ἐν ins. Γ²

Before describing the bird-mania that has taken hold of humankind since the foundation of Nephelokokkygia, the herald briefly recalls the previous obsession for Sparta (Av. 1281 ἑλακωνομάνουν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι τότε) symbolised by the allegedly pervasive passion for long hair (1282 ἐκόμων), fasting (ἐπέινων), poor personal hygiene (ἐρρύπων), Socrates (ἐσωκράτων) and the *skytalē* (1283 σκυτάλι' ἐφόρου). The text of Av. 1283 is metrically problematic, since σκυτάλι' ἐφόρου constitutes a sequence of five *brevia*

and one *longum*, which is extremely rare as first *metron*⁴⁰⁴. Most modern editors do not alter the *paradosis*⁴⁰⁵, but there have been several attempts of emendation⁴⁰⁶, among which Porson's ἐσκυταλιοφόρου νῦν δ' ὑποστρέψαντες αὖ (1820, 185) has been the most widely adopted⁴⁰⁷.

That the metrical issue was already perceived by ancient scholars is made clear by Symmachos' comment, which takes up the first part of the annotation. To avoid the problem, the grammarian scanned σκυτάλι' with $\bar{\alpha}$, maintaining that the same occurred also in Aristophanes' *Merchant Ships*: the relevant line is not quoted in the scholium, but is preserved by Poll. 10.173 as σκύταλον ὑποσίδηρον (fr. 433 K.-A.). Symmachos then added that in the commentary to that play (the adverb ἐνθα does not make clear whether a commentary by Symmachos himself or by someone else is implied) the line ἀπὸ τοῦ σκυταλίου <...> καὶ τῆς διφθέρας from Nikophon's *Birth of Aphrodites* (fr. 2,2 K.-A.) was offered as comparison (παρετέθη)⁴⁰⁸. The exact metrical context of either line is impossible to reconstruct, since the one from the *Merchant Ships* is clearly incomplete and the one by Nikophon is lacunous in the middle⁴⁰⁹. Moreover, Symmachos' solution is invalidated by the occurrences of σκυτάλη and σκύταλον in the preserved Aristophanic plays, where the α is always short⁴¹⁰. According to Schauenburg (1881, 14f.), Symmachos had appropriated the metrical exegesis from Didymos' hypomnēma to the *Birds*: it was Didymos who referred to the line of the *Merchant Ships* and the commentary on that play, where Nikophon was quoted (the accumulation of literary parallels is in fact very frequent in Didymean exegesis⁴¹¹). However, Symmachos might also have been the one who connected Av. 1283 with the occurrence in the *Merchant Ships*, drawing Nikophon's line from the respective hypomnēma (be it by Didymos or by someone else⁴¹²). Moreover, it cannot be excluded that the commentary on the *Merchant Ships* was actually by Symmachos and that the metrical exegesis of Av. 1283 was indeed his own, as the text of the

⁴⁰⁴ See e.g. Dunbar 1995, 636.

⁴⁰⁵ See e.g. Boissonade 1826, 282; Bekker 1829a, 345; Bothe 1829, 378; Dindorf 1835a, 359; Felton 1864, 84; Bergk 1872, 54; Wilson 2007a, 407.

⁴⁰⁶ For an overview, see Kassel-Austin 1984, 236.

⁴⁰⁷ See Meineke 1860, 53; Dindorf 1869, 98; Kock 1894, 214; van Leeuwen 1902, 199; Dunbar 1995, 109; Henderson 2000, 190.

⁴⁰⁸ For this meaning of παρατίθημι, see also *schol.* Aristoph. *Eq.* 1150e Jones-Wilson ὡς φησιν Ἡραδιανός, παρατιθέμενος τὰ Σοφοκλέους ἐκ Ποιμένων κτλ., V. 1238a Koster Ἰ' Ἀρμόδιος† δὲ ἐν τοῖς Κωμωδοῦμένοις καὶ τὸν Ἄδμητον ἀνάγει γραφὴν παραθεῖς τοῦ Κρατίνου ἐκ Χειρώνων κτλ., Av. 348b Holwerda ὡς Ἀσκληπιάδης τὰ μηδέπω διδαχθείσης τῆς τραγωδίας παρατιθέμενος. Rather surprisingly, no mention of the metrical problem is made in Pellegrino 2013, 30-32.

⁴⁰⁹ Dindorf (1835b, 634; 1838, 249) was willing to accept the information of the scholium and proposed σκυτάλιου <τε>.

⁴¹⁰ See *Lys.* 991s. (Κι. τί δ' ἐστί σοι τοδί; / Κη. σκυτάλα Λακωνικά), *Ec.* 76 (ἔγωγέ τοι τὸ σκύταλον ἐξηνεγκάμην) and 78 (†τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο τῶν σκυτάλων ὧν πέρδεται†).

⁴¹¹ See e.g. Did. *frr.* 237, 245.

⁴¹² The only other reference to a commentary to the *Merchant Ships* is in *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 722a Hangard τροχίλια ἐστὶν ὁ τρόχος τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ φρέατος, δι' οὗ ἰμῶσιν. δεδήλωται δὲ περὶ τούτου καὶ ἐν Ὀλκάσιν. The tentative ascription to Didymos (see Boudreaux 1919, 94f. n. 6) relies on the fact that the following scholium (*schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 722b κατελυσπωμένην: εἰλυσπᾶσθαι κυρίως τὸ ἐπὶ γῆς ἔρπειν, ὡσπερ οἱ ὄφεις καὶ οἱ σκόληκες) is paralleled by Hesych. κ 1590 C. (κατελυσπωμένην ὁ μὲν Λυκόφρων καταρτωμένην. Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ [fr. 63 Strecker] συγκεῖσθαι τὴν λέξιν ἐκ τοῦ εἰλεῖν καὶ σπᾶσθαι): the joint quotation of Lykophron and Eratosthenes in a Hesychios-entry dealing with a word also discussed in the Aristophanic scholia points in the direction of a Didymean treatment of the word in his commentary to the *Lysistrata* and, at the same time, in the *Comic Vocabulary*. Still, the mere proximity between the note on τροχίλια (with the reference to the hypomnēma to the *Merchant Ships*) and the one on κατελυσπωμένην does not prove beyond doubt that both *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 722a and b derive from Didymos' commentary. Consequently, the sentence δεδήλωται δὲ περὶ τούτου καὶ ἐν Ὀλκάσιν must not necessarily imply that the hypomnēma on the *Merchant Ships* was by Didymos, although this remains possible.

scholium entails. Regardless, the annotation shows the juxtaposition of two excerpts, one from Symmachos' hypomnēma on *Birds*, the other from Didymos' one, as can be observed in fr. 238, 243, 247, 249, 253⁴¹³.

ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· σκυτάλια, ἐτόμως τὰς βακτηρίας: the earliest occurrence of the term σκυτάλη is in Archilochos' version of the fable of the fox and the monkey, fr. 185,1f. W.² ἐρέω τιν' ὕμιν αἶνον, ὃ Κηρυκίδη / ἄχνημένη σκυτάλη ("I will tell you a fable, O Kerykides, with a sad *skytalē*")⁴¹⁴. The debate on the exact meaning of the phrase ἄχνημένη σκυτάλη dates back to the very beginnings of Alexandrian philology, namely to Apollonios of Rhodes and Aristophanes of Byzantium, who had dealt with the expression respectively in a *Περὶ Αρχιλόχου* (Apoll. Rhod. fr. 22 Michaelis ap. Ath. 3.85d) and a *Περὶ τῆς ἀχνημένης σκυτάλης* (Ar. Byz. fr. 367 Slater ap. Ath. 10.451c-d). Apollonios described the use of the stick named *skytalē* as a tool to transfer coded messages between the city of Sparta and its army on the battlefield: the most ancient extant account of this technique is in Plu. *Lys.* 19.5-7⁴¹⁵, clearly the source of the second part of the annotation (*i.e. schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1283ba Holwerda)⁴¹⁶ and of several other descriptions of the *skytalē* in grammatical works and scholia⁴¹⁷. The interpretation given by Aristophanes of Byzantium probably differed from Apollonios' one: according to Slater (2010, 133), he considered the *skytalē* a flute, a meaning attested for σκυτάλιον⁴¹⁸. Didymos did not take into account his predecessors' interpretations and simply identified the σκυτάλι(α) of Av. 1283 with normal staffs (βακτηρία), without delving into the reason why these are presented as typically Spartan, but rather focusing on the etymology of the word⁴¹⁹.

⁴¹³ On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242f.; 247f.; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

⁴¹⁴ The same phrase seems to have occurred in Kratinos as well, according to Phot. α 3447 Th. ἀχνημένη σκυτάλη· Κρατίνος (fr. 387 K.-A.) τὴν ἄχθεσθαι ποιούσαν εἶπεν.

⁴¹⁵ ἔστι δὲ ἡ σκυτάλη τοιοῦτον. ἐπὶ ἀκτέμωσι ναύαρχον ἢ στρατηγὸν οἱ ἔφοροι, ξύλα δύο στρογγύλα μήκος καὶ πάχος ἀκριβῶς ἀπισώσαντες, ὥστε ταῖς τομαῖς ἐφαρμόζειν πρὸς ἄλληλα, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῖ φυλάττουσι, θάτερον δὲ τῷ πεμπομένῳ διδόασιν. ταῦτα δὲ τὰ ξύλα σκυτάλας καλοῦσιν. ὅταν οὖν ἀπόρητον τι καὶ μέγα φράσαι βουλευθῶσι, βιβλίον ὥσπερ ἰμάντα μακρὸν καὶ στενὸν ποιούντες περιελίττουσι τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς σκυτάλην, οὐδὲν διάλειμμα ποιούντες, ἀλλὰ πανταχόθεν κύκλω τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτῆς τῷ βιβλίῳ καταλαμβάνοντες. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντες ἂ βούλονται καταγράφουσι εἰς τὸ βιβλίον, ὥσπερ ἔστι τῆ σκυτάλη περικεῖμενον· ὅταν δὲ γράψωσι, ἀφελόντες τὸ βιβλίον ἄνευ τοῦ ξύλου πρὸς τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀποστέλλουσι. δεξάμενος δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἄλλως μὲν οὐδὲν ἀναλέξασθαι δύναται τῶν γραμμάτων συναφὴν οὐκ ἐχόντων, ἀλλὰ διεσπασμένων, τὴν δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ σκυτάλην λαβὼν τὸ τμήμα τοῦ βιβλίου περὶ αὐτὴν περιέτεινεν, ὥστε, τῆς ἕλικος εἰς τάξιν ὁμοίως ἀποκαθισταμένης, ἐπιβάλλοντα τοῖς πρώτοις τὰ δεύτερα, κύκλω τὴν ὄψιν ἐπάγειν τὸ συνεχὲς ἀνευρίσκουσαν. καλεῖται δὲ ὁμωνύμως τῷ ξύλῳ σκυτάλη τὸ βιβλίον, ὡς τῷ μετροῦντι τὸ μετρούμενον.

⁴¹⁶ The last portion of the annotation, *i.e. schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1283c Holwerda, is a concise and very confuse rephrasing of the exegetical material regarding the use of the *skytalē*. With regard to its textual transmission, the manuscripts present it in different locations: it is a separate, interlinear gloss in **V**, while it is at the very beginning of the annotation in **FLh** and at the end of it in **EM**. For this reason, it has been printed as a separate paragraph in the present edition (see above).

⁴¹⁷ See *Syn.* σ 143 C.; Phot. σ 390 Th. (= *Suda* σ 718 A.); *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 991b Hangard; *schol.* P. O. 6.154c-d-e-f-h Drachmann; *schol.* Thuc. 1.131e Kleinlogel-Alpers; *Tz. H.* 9.258.127-147.

⁴¹⁸ See Ath. 4.177a τῶν δ' ἐλύμων αὐλῶν μνημονεύει καὶ Καλλίας ἐν Πεδήταις (fr. 23 K.-A.). Ἰόβας δὲ (*FGrHist* 275 F 81) τοῦτους Φρυγῶν μὲν εἶναι εὐρημα, ὀνομάζεσθαι δὲ καὶ σκυταλείας, κατ' ἐμφέρειαν τοῦ πάχους. χρῆσθαι δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ Κυπρίους φησὶ Κρατίνος ὁ νεώτερος ἐν Θηραμένη (fr. 3 K.-A.), Poll. 4.82 σκυτάλια μέντοι μικρῶν αὐλίσκων τούνομα, Hesych. σ 1192 H. σκυτάλια· αὐλίδια, περιστρώματα [καὶ τὸ ράβδωμα].

⁴¹⁹ (Par)etymology is a typical trait of Didymos' exegesis not only of Aristophanes (see *e.g.* Did. fr. 208 C.-Pr., as well as fr. 225 and 263 below) but also of other authors, see fr. 9 (*ap.* Hesych. β 1152 C.), 99 (*ap. schol.* Procl. Hes. *Op.* 304b Pertusi), 295a C.-Pr. (*ap.* Harp. π 76 K. = Did. fr. 11 Pearson-Stephens).

αἶς τὰ σκύτα τύπτουσιν ὃ ἔστι τοὺς τραχήλους: Wilamowitz’ sensible emendation of the transmitted σκύταλα in σκύτα (*ap.* Kaibel 1899, V) is not adopted in any of the subsequent editions of the Aristophanic scholia, despite being strongly suggested by the line quoted right after (where the reading is indeed σκύτα) and by Hesych. σ 1189 H. σκύτα· τὸν τράχηλον. Σικελιοί (which might in fact derive from Didymos’ *Comic Vocabulary*⁴²⁰). The term σκύτα (with its less frequent singular σκύτον) involved by Didymos’ proposed etymology of σκυτάλιον is a Hippocratic gloss found both in Erotianos’ (1st cent. CE) and Galen’s lexic. Erotianos’ entry in particular reflects a seemingly large debate on the exact meaning of σκύτα: the identifications varied from the “middle of the neck tendons” (τὸ μεταξύ τῶν τενόντων [καὶ] τοῦ τραχήλου) *i.e.* the nape of the neck, to the spinal marrow (τινὲς δὲ φασι ... τὸν νωτιαῖον μυελόν), the occipital bone (οἱ δὲ τὸ ἰνίον), the brow bone (οἱ δὲ τὸν μεταξύ τοῦ μετώπου καὶ τῶν ὀφρύων τόπον) and the scalp (τινὲς δὲ ... τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δέρμα). The first interpretation is the closest to Didymos’ τὰ σκύτα ... ὃ ἔστι τοὺς τραχήλους and is also the only one for which Erotianos offers literary evidence, coming from Archilochos (fr. 237 W.²) and from an obscure Πετρώνιος⁴²¹. Poetic quotations in Erotianos’ lexicon are generally considered to go back to earlier, non-Hippocratic lexicography, in particular to the *Lexeis* of Aristophanes of Byzantium⁴²². It is therefore not unlikely that Erotianos and Didymos ultimately drew from a common ancient source discussing the meaning of σκύτα with the aid of several poetic quotations: Erotianos preserved the lines from Archilochos and the mysterious Πετρώνιος, while Didymos chose another (now unknown) Doric playwright (see below).

“ἢ παύσει βᾶκτρον καλίνω κατὰ σκύτα Φρύξ ἀνήρ”: the verse quoted anonymously in the scholium was attributed by Kaibel (1899, V) to Epicharmos, but is listed as anonymous doric poetry in Kassel-Austin 2001, 297 (anon. dor. fr. 16). The line – translating to “or the Phrygian man will strike⁴²³ on the head with the wooden staff” – involves the comic reversal of the proverb Φρύξ ἀνήρ πληγῆς ἀμείνων καὶ διακονέστερος, “the Phrygian man is better and more helpful when beaten”, first attested in the fifth Athos-collection (Coll. Ath. V_A 48c S.-S.)⁴²⁴.

⁴²⁰ On the relationship between Hesychios and Didymos’ *Comic Vocabulary*, see fr. 227f., 241, 260 and the Introduction § 5.1.

⁴²¹ Kaibel (1899, V) suggested the emendation of ὡς Πετρώνιος ἐν κάρη φησὶν in ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος φησὶν. The corruption might also have originated from a play title preceding the playwright’s name, *e.g.* ὡς ἐν Πίθωνι Ἐπίχαρμος φησὶν (see *e.g.* Apoll. Dys. *Pron.* 63.20 ὡς ἐν Ἀλκυόνι Ἐπίχαρμος, “αὐτότερος αὐτῶν” [fr. 5 K.-A.]).

⁴²² Mostly through the mediation of Aristophanes’ contemporary Bakcheios of Tanagra, see von Staden 1989, 485 and 493; Manetti 2003.

⁴²³ The translation follows the emendation of the transmitted παύσει in παίσει, already suggested by Dindorf (1838, 249). See also Kaibel 1899, V; Kassel-Austin 2001, 297).

⁴²⁴ The proverb appears also in Phot. δ 346 Th.; *Suda* φ 772 A.; Greg. Cypr. 3.95 [3.24 cod. Leid.]; Apost. 11.3; 18.1. See Tosi 2017, 843f.

fr. 245 (= II 14.42, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: the mockery of Opountios in the *Atalantai* and in the *Taxiarchoi*

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1294 Holwerda

Ὀπουντίῳ δ' **REΓ**³ ὀφθαλμὸν **ΕΓ**³: Δίδυμος· ὡς τοιοῦτου τὴν ὄψιν ὄντος μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ καὶ μέγα ῥύγχος ἔχοντος **RVEΓ**³**M** καὶ ὁ τὰς Ἀταλάντας γράψας (Call. fr. *4 K.-A.) καὶ Εὐπόλις ἐν Ταξίαρχοις (fr. 282 K.-A.). **VEΓ**³

“to Opountios (‘raven without) an eye’”: Didymos: both the author of the *Atalantai* and Eupolis in the *Taxiarchoi* mention him as having this appearance and also as having a big beak⁴²⁵.

Aristoph. Av. 1292-1294 Πέρδιξ μὲν εἰς κάπηλος ὀνομάζετο χολός, Μενίπῳ δ' ἦν Χελιδῶν τοῦνομα, Ὀπουντίῳ δ' ὀφθαλμὸν οὐκ ἔχων Κόραξ.

Aristoph. Av. 153f. ἔγωγ' Ὀπουντίος / οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην ἐπὶ ταλάντῳ χρυσοῦ | *schol. Aristoph. Av. 153c* ἀλλ' ἔγωγ' Ὀπουντίος· οὗτος συκοφάντης ὀπουντίος πονηρὸς καὶ μονόφθαλμος, ἔπαιξεν οὖν ὅτι· οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην τυφλός, **1292a Holwerda** ὁ μὲν “Πέρδιξ” σαφῶς ὄνομα κύριον. Μενίπῳ δὲ ἐπώνυμον ἦν χελιδῶν. τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον εἰληπται, τῷ “Ὀπουντίῳ” λέγω τὸ “κόραξ”, ὅτι ἄρπαξ καὶ ἀναιδής, ὅτι δὲ καὶ μονόφθαλμος οὗτος, προεῖρηται. οὐ πάντως δὲ ὡς ἐπώνυμον | **Suda o 478 A.** Ὀπουντίος· οὗτος ἐσυκοφαντεῖτο ὡς πονηρὸς καὶ μονόφθαλμος. Ἀριστοφάνης· “ἀλλ' ἔγωγ' Ὀπουντίος οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην ἐπὶ ταλάντῳ χρυσοῦ”. λέγει δέ, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν γενοίμην τυφλός. τοὺς οὖν τυφλοὺς οὕτω φασίν.

1 Δίδυμος cett., om. R | Δίδυμος· ὡς sic interpunct. edd. cett., punct. om. Holwerda | **1-2** μνημονεύει-ἔχοντος cett., διαβάλλει αὐτόν· εἶχε γὰρ καὶ μέγα ῥύγχος M | **3** Ταξίαρχοις Γ³ edd. cett., ταξίαρχη V, ταξίαρχαις E Bekker

The report of the herald at *Av.* 1277-1307 includes a list of bird-related nicknames attributed to prominent Athenians as a result of the spreading ὀρνιθομανία (*Il.* 1290-1299). The list is paralleled in the scholia by a remarkable amount of ancient material containing several quotations from lost comic plays and from erudite material, that can be summarised as follows: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1292d quotes from Aristophanes' *Anagyros* (*Aristoph. fr.* 57 K.-A.) and from the *παροιμιαὶ ἄμετροι* collected by Aristophanes of Byzantium (*fr.* 354 Slater); the scholium to *Av.* 1294 contains references to the plays *Atalantai* (Call. fr. *4 K.-A.) and *Taxiarchoi* (*Eup. fr.* 282 K.-A.); *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1296a cites Pherekrates' *Savages* (*fr.* 11 K.-A.) and Kratinos' *Women from Delos* (*fr.* 32 K.-A.); *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1297a quotes from Eupolis' *Cities* (*fr.* 220 K.-A.) and Phrynichos' *Recluse* (*fr.* 27 K.-A.); finally, the long annotation concerning *Il.* 1297-1299 draws explicitly from Ammonios' *kōmōdoumenoi*-handbook⁴²⁶ and offers quotations from Plato's *Man in Terrible Pain* (*fr.* 116 K.-

⁴²⁵ The causal nuance in Bagordo's translation of the scholium (2014, 140: «Didymos: weil er [d.h. Opuntios] ein solcher [d.h. ein Rabe] bezüglich seines Blicks war, und weil er eine große Schnauze hatte, erwähnt ihn sowohl der Verfasser der *Atalantai* als auch Eupolis in den *Taxiarchoi*») is grammatically unjustified.

⁴²⁶ See Steinhausen 1901, 6-45; White 1914, xxi; Boudreaux 1919, 75f.; Nesselrath 1990, 74-76; Dunbar 1995, 36; Bagordo 1998, 50 and 74-76; Montana 2006b; D'Alessandro 2018 and the Introduction § 3.3.

A.) and *Victories* (fr. 85 K.-A.), Phrynichos' *Grass-cutters* (fr. 43 K.-A.) and *Ephialtes* (fr. 4 K.-A.), and Metagenes' *Homer* (fr. 12 K.-A.). Since *scholl.* 1294, 1295ba and 1297-1299 are attributed to Didymos' authority (Did. fr. 245-247) and *scholl.* 1296a and 1297-1299 are ascribed to Symmachos, it is most likely that the whole portion of scholiastic material goes back to Didymos⁴²⁷ (and to his source, Ammonios), later quoted by his successor Symmachos (see Schauenburg 1881, 11-13; Olson 2016, 430).

ὡς τοιοῦτου τὴν ὄψιν ὄντος μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ καὶ μέγα ῥύγχος ἔχοντος: the verb μνημονεύω falls into the second category of rephrasings of personal jokes identified by Chronopoulos (2011, 212f.), since it presents the mockery as «one more instance of public or private discussions about the person ridiculed» (*ibid.*), without defining it as a speech act specific of comedy (as happens with κωμωδεῖται and its synonyms), but also without considering the lampooning portrayal as historically accurate. The term ῥύγχος is used indiscriminately in relation to birds (see also *Av.* 348, 364, 479, 672, 1138, 1155), pigs and quadrupeds in general (see Dunbar 1995, 269; Miccolis 2017, 43)⁴²⁸. Its frequency and different usages in comedy are underlined by Athenaios (3.95a-e), who quotes several passages where the word indicates either the pig's snout as a course within descriptions of meals (see *Anaxil.* fr. 19, *Axion.* fr. 8, *Theophil.* fr. 8 K.-A.⁴²⁹) or, with comic effect, a person's face or facial features (see *Arar.* fr. 1 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τὸ ῥύγχος εἰς ἡμᾶς στρέφει, *Archipp.* fr. 1 K.-A. καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχων τὸ ῥύγχος οὐτωσὶ μακρόν)⁴³⁰. Consequently, it seems reasonable to suppose that Didymos' expression μέγα ῥύγχος is not an explanation or a paraphrase of Kallias' and Eupolis' mockery of Opountios (*PAA* 748440), but rather a more or less simplified and adapted quotation from their lines⁴³¹. Just as in *Archippos'* case (see above), it is impossible to establish with certainty on which meaning of ῥύγχος – “snout” or “beak” – Kallias' and Eupolis' jokes might have relied. According to Olson (2016, 431), they might have meant either. However, since Opountios' nickname in *Av.* 1294 is “one-eyed raven”, it is reasonable to assume that a similar imagery underlied the two jokes in the *Atalantai* and the *Taxiarchoi* as well: besides lacking one eye, Opountios must have had a exceptionally long and hooked nose, that could be easily compared to a bird's beak.

καὶ ὁ τὰς Ἀταλάντας γράψας καὶ Εὐπολις ἐν Ταξιάρχους: the authorship of the play *Atalantai* was evidently uncertain in antiquity, presumably already before Didymos' time (see also *Hesych.* δ 1890 C. ὡς δηλοῖ ὁ τὰς Ἀταλάντας συνθεῖς). The confusion originated from the high number of plays named Ἀταλάντη, Ἀταλάνται and Ἀτάλαντος (by Epicharmos, Phormos, Strattis, Phyllyllios, Euthykles, Philetairos and Alexis, see *e.g.*

⁴²⁷ On Didymos' general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 237, 246f., 249, 257, 259, 266, 268.

⁴²⁸ See *e.g.* *Aristot.* *HA* 504a 19-21 στόμα δ' οἱ ὄρνιθες ἔχουσι μὲν ἴδιον δέ· οὔτε γὰρ χεῖλη οὔτ' ὀδόντας ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ ῥύγχος, 595a 16-19 ῥιζοφάγον δὲ μάλιστα ἢ ὅς ἐστι τῶν ζώων διὰ τὸ εὖ πεφυκέναι τὸ ῥύγχος πρὸς τὴν ἐργασίαν ταύτην, καὶ εὐχερέστατον πρὸς πᾶσαν τροφήν τῶν ζώων ἐστίν, 658b 27-32 τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ζώοις τοῖς τετράποσι καὶ ζωοτόκοις οὐ πόρρω τρόπον τινα διέστηκεν ἀλλήλων τὸ τῆς ὀσφρήσεως αἰσθητήριον, ἀλλ' ὅσα μὲν ἔχει προμήκεις εἰς στενὸν ἀπηγμένας τὰς σιαγόνας, ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ ῥύγγει καὶ τὸ τῶν μυκτῆρων ἐνυπάρχει μόνιον κατὰ τὸν ἐνδεχόμενον τρόπον, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις μᾶλλον διηρθρωμένον ἐστὶ πρὸς τὰς σιαγόνας, *Poll.* 2.47 ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρνίθων ῥύγχος καὶ ῥάμφος, 5.79 περὶ δὲ συδὸς εἴποις ἂν βαθύνει τῷ ῥύγγει τὴν γῆν.

⁴²⁹ See De Martin (in preparation).

⁴³⁰ See also *Phot.* ρ 169 Th. (= *Suda* ρ 282 A.) ῥύγχος· τὸ πρόσωπον. Κρατῖνος (fr. 486 K.-A.) καὶ ἕτεροι.

⁴³¹ See also Bagordo 2014, 141f.: «es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass ῥύγχος [...] zum Wortlaut des Kallias gehört hat».

Bagordo 2014, 134). The author mentioned here is most likely to be identified with the comic playwright Kallias, who was active between 440 and 431 BCE (*ibid.* 118), although the remarkable chronological distance between this play, which «must belong to 430s or earlier» (Olson 2016, 370 n. 196), and Aristophanes' *Birds* (staged in 414 BCE) made some opt for a less plausible ascription to the later playwright Strattis, certainly closer in time to Aristophanes⁴³². However, given the presence of a similar attack to Opountios in Eupolis' *Taxiarchoi* (staged «likely in the early 420s BCE»⁴³³), it seems easier to suppose that the *kōmōdoumenos* was a prominent political figure with a very long career⁴³⁴ that made him an always valid target for jokes concerning his outer appearance.

⁴³² See Storey 2003, 247; Orth 2009, 291; Bagordo 2014, 141; Olson 2016, 370 n. 196; Fiorentini 2017, 288f.

⁴³³ Olson 2016, 371.

⁴³⁴ Olson 2016, 370 n. 196.

fr. 246 (= II 14.43, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: explanation of Theogenes' and Philokles' nicknames in Aristoph. Av. 1295

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1295αα-αβ-βα-ββ Holwerda

a) κορυδὸς **ΕΓ**: μήποτε ὄξυκέφαλος ἦν εἰς τὸ ἄνω καὶ ὀρνιθώδης τὴν κεφαλὴν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ αἰσχροὺς ἦν, **RVEΓΜ** ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις (l. 168) δηλοῖ. **RVEΓ** χηναλώπηξ **REG**: πανοῦργος ἦν. διὸ ἀλώπηξ. **RVEΓΜ** καὶ ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἀναίσθητος – τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φανερόν – ἀλλὰ καὶ πονηρός. ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος Θεαγένη καὶ Φιλοκλέα φησὶν ὀρνιθώδεις εἶναι. **RVEΓ**

“lark”: perhaps (Philokles’) head had an upward pointing shape and looked bird-like. In the *Women at the Thesmophoria* (Aristophanes) shows that he was also ugly. “Goose-fox”: he was cunning, therefore “fox”. And (they say) also that he was not only stupid – this was indeed evident – but poor as well. Didymos says that Theagenes and Philokles were bird-like.

b) μήποτε ὄξυκέφαλος ἦν εἰς τὸ ἄνω ὁ Φιλοκλῆς καὶ ὀρνιθώδης τὴν κεφαλὴν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ αἰσχροὺς ἦν, ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις (l. 168) δηλοῖ. **Lh**

Θεαγένει] οὗτος πανοῦργος ἦν. οἱ δὲ καὶ ὀρνιθώδη τοῦτόν φασιν. **Lh**

Perhaps Philokles’ head had an upward pointing shape and looked bird-like. In the *Women at the Thesmophoria* (Aristophanes) shows that he was also ugly.

Theagenes] he was cunning. Some say that he also looked bird-like.

Aristoph. Av. 1295 Κορυδὸς Φιλοκλέει, Χηναλώπηξ Θεογένει (*TrGF* 24 T 7a).

Aristoph. Av. 279-282 Πε. ἕτερος αὐτὸν λόφον κατειληφώς τις ὄρνις οὐτοσί. / Ev. τί τὸ τέρας τουτί ποτ’ ἐστίν; οὐ σὺ μόνος ἄρ’ ἦσθ’ ἔποψ, / ἀλλὰ χοῦτος ἕτερος; Επ. οὐτοσί μὲν ἐστὶ Φιλοκλέους / ἐξ ἔποπος (*TrGF* 24 T 6a) | *schol.* **Aristoph. V. 1183 Koster** ὁ Θεογένης οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Ἀχαρνεύς, ὃν καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ ἀποπατεῖν κωμωδοῦσιν. δηλὸν δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ὀραις, **Pac. 928c Holwerda** διεβάλλετο γὰρ ὁ Θεαγένης εἰς μαλακίαν καὶ ὡς μωρὸς καὶ ὑώδης. ἦν δὲ ἐκ Πειραιῶς. ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ πένης εἶναι, θρύπτεσθαι δὲ ἐπὶ πλούτῳ. ἦν δὲ τὸ σῶμα παχὺς καὶ χοιρώδης. τὴν δὲ ὑηνίαν τὴν δυσωδίαν τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑδῶν, οἵπερ διαφοροῖς ἐδέσμασι χρώμενοι δυσώδη ἀποπατοῦσι, εἰς βορβόρους δὲ κυλίνονται. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος Θεαγένης, ὁ εἰς Ὀμηρον γράμματος, ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ μαλακίᾳ διεβάλλετο, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, **Av. 279a** λόφον κατειληφώς: ἀντὶ τοῦ “λόφον ἔχων”. ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις. τοῦτο δὲ φησιν, ἐπεὶ ἕτερός τις ὄρνις ἀναφαίνεται λόφον ἔχων ὡς ὁ ἔποψ. διαβάλλει δὲ τὸν Φιλοκλέα (*TrGF* 24 T 6b) ὡς ὄξυκέφαλον, **281a** οὗτος ὁ Φιλοκλῆς Ἐποπα ἐσκεύασεν ἐν τῇ Πανδιονίδι τετραλογία (*TrGF* 24 T 6c), οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ “σὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην λέγω” (F 1), **b** Φιλοκλεῖ ἐστὶ δρᾶμα Τηρεὺς ἢ Ἐποψ (*TrGF* 24 T 6c), **c** ἐν ἐνίοις ὑπομνήμασιν, ὅτι προκέφαλός ἐστιν ὁ Φιλοκλῆς ὡς ὁ ἔποψ (*TrGF* 24 T 6c): ἀλλ’ οὐδαμοῦ κεκομώδηται. εἴη ἂν οὖν τὸν Ἐποπα ἐσκευοποιηκῶς τῇ Πανδιονίδι τετραλογία, ἣν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις ἀναγράφει (fr. 619 R.). ἔστι δὲ ὁ Φιλοκλῆς (*TrGF* 24 T 2) τραγωδίας ποιητῆς καὶ Φιλοπείθους υἱὸς ἐξ Αἰσχύλου ἀδελφῆς. ὅσοι δὲ Ἀλμίωνος αὐτόν φασιν ἐπιθετικῶς λέγουσι διὰ τὸ πικρὸν εἶναι· ἄλμη γὰρ ἡ πικρία. γέγονασι δὲ Φιλοκλεῖς δύο τραγωδιῶν ποιηταί, εἷς μὲν ὁ Φιλοκλέους ἀπόγονος – ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ἴαριος Μόρσιμος, ἐκ τούτου δὲ Ἀστυδάμας,

ἐκ τούτου δὲ Φιλοκλῆς – καὶ ἕτερος ὁ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν περιπεπτοκῶς τῷ νεωτέρῳ Φιλοκλεῖ, **822a Holwerda** προεῖρηται ὅτι πένης οὗτος, ἔλεγε δὲ ἑαυτὸν πλούσιον. εἰσὶ δὲ ἄλλοι δύο Θεαγένεις, εἷς μὲν ὁ περὶ Ὀμήρου γράψας, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ μαλακίᾳ σκωπτόμενος, **Th. 168a** ἐν τοῖς Ὀρνιασιν οὐκ ἄλλως κορυδῶ αὐτὸν ὁμοίου ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅτι μικρὸς καὶ αἰσχροῦς. καὶ Τηλεκλειδῆς Ἡσιόδοις (fr. 15 K.-A.): “ἀλλ’ ἡ τάλαινα Φιλοκλέα †βδελλ***οθεν οὖν † / εἰ δ’ ἐστὶν Αἰσχύλου φρόνημ’ ἔχων”, **b Regtuit** Φιλοκλέης: τραγῳδίας ποιητής, αἰσχροῦς τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ σιμὸς καὶ μικρὸς τὸ σῶμα | **Lys. 63 Hangard** ὁ Θεογένης κομπαστῆς Ἀχαρνεύς | **Suda ε 361** Ἐκάτειον: Ἐκάτης ἄγαλμα. καὶ παροιμία, Θεαγένους Ἐκάτειον· οὗ ἐπυνθάνετο πανταχοῦ ἀπιών. ὃς Καπνὸς ἐκαλεῖτο. ἦσαν δὲ Θεαγένεις ἄλλοι β’· ὁ περὶ Ὀμήρου γράψας καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ μαλακίᾳ διαβεβλημένος, **θ 81** Θεαγένους χρήματα τὰ τ’ Αἰσχίνου: ἐπὶ τῶν πενήτων, ἀλαζονευομένων δέ. οὗτος γὰρ πένης ὧν ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν πλούσιον εἶναι. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι δύο Θεαγένεις, εἷς μὲν ὁ περὶ Ὀμήρου γράψας, ἕτερος δὲ ἐπὶ μαλακίας σκωπτόμενος. οὗτος δὲ πένης ὧν μεγαλέμπορος ἐβούλετο εἶναι, ἀλαζών, ψευδόπλοτος. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Καπνός, ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνόμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει, **π 2464** προκέφαλος· προκέφαλος ἦν ὁ Φιλοκλῆς, ὡς ἔποψ. ἦν δὲ κωμῳδίας ποιητής. εἰρηται ἐπὶ τῶν ὄξυκεφάλων, **φ 378** Φιλοκλῆς (*TrGF* 24 T 1) Πολυπείθους Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός, τοῖς χρόνοις μετὰ Εὐριπίδην. ἐπεκαλεῖτο δὲ Χολῆ διὰ τὸ πικρόν. ἔγραψε τραγῳδίας ρ’, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦτα· Ἡριγόνη, Ναύπλιος, Οἰδίπους, Οἰνεύς, Πρίαμος, Πηνελόπη, Φιλοκτιτής. Αἰσχύλου δὲ τοῦ τραγικοῦ ἦν ἀδελφιδοῦς καὶ ἔσχεν υἱὸν Μόρσιμον, τὸν τραγικόν· οὗτινος γίνεται Ἀστυδάμας ὁ τραγικός. τούτου δ’ ἕτερος Φιλοκλῆς, τραγικός, **379 A**. Φιλοκλῆς, κωμῳδίας ποιητής, αἰσχροπρόσωπος. ἦν δὲ προκέφαλος, ὡς ἔποψ, ἡγουν ὄξυκέφαλος· Αἰσχύλου ἀδελφῆς υἱός. οἱ δὲ Ἀλμίωνα αὐτὸν φασιν ἐπιθετικῶς, διὰ τὸ πικρόν εἶναι ἄλμη γὰρ ἡ πικρία. εἰρηται οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν ὄξυκεφάλων.

1 (a) κορυδὸς ΕΓ, Θεαγένει RV | **1-2 (a)** εἰς τὸ ἄνω RGLh edd. cett., ἐν τῷ ἄνω Γ², ἐν τῷ ἄνω E Bekker, om. V | **1-3 (a)** μήποτε–ἦν cett., ὄξυκέφαλος οὗτος καὶ ὀρνιθῶδες τὴν κεφαλὴν· καὶ τὸ εἶδος αἰσχροῦς M | **2 (a)** καὶ hic ΕΓ, post ἦν RV | **3 (a)** αἰσχροῦς cett., αἰσχρόν V | **5 (a)** διὸ cett., om. V | οὐ μόνον ΕΓ, ὁμώνυμον V, om. R | **6 (a)** ἀναίσθητος RΓ² edd. cett., ἀναίσθητον VEG Bekker | τοῦτο γὰρ ΕΓ edd. cett., γὰρ τοῦτο V, om. R Dindorf Dübner Rutherford | φανερόν cett., φθονερός R Dindorf Dübner Rutherford | **7 (a)** ἀλλὰ cett., om. R Dindorf Dübner Rutherford | πονηρός RΓ² edd. cett., πονηρόν VEG Bekker | Θεαγένη cett., Θεαγένην R, Θεαγένει V | **8 (a)** Φιλοκλέα cett., Φιλοκλέην R | ὀρνιθῶδες RE, ὀρθῶδες V, ὀρνιθῶδες Γ

The reference to Opountios “the one-eyed Raven” is followed by the mention of the tragic playwright Philokles, nicknamed “lark”, and of one “goose-fox”⁴³⁵ Theogenes (Theagenes in the scholium), the identification of which must have been problematic already in antiquity (see below).

The scholium – preserved in a unitary redaction except for the usual rewording in **Lh** – is for the most part anonymous, with Didymos being explicitly quoted as authority only in the last sentence⁴³⁶. However, more scholiastic material might be ascribable to him.

μήποτε ὄξυκέφαλος ἦν κτλ.: the first two sentences of the scholium focus on Philokles’ oddly shaped head as the reason for the nickname “lark”, and on the accusation of ugliness made in *Th.* 168 (*TrGF* 24 TT 7b, 8a)⁴³⁷. The section follows the common structure of *kōmōdoumenoi*-scholia, with the explanation of the mockery followed by a reference to different attacks against the same figure, found in other comic passages (see *e.g.* fr. 257 below). Since the scholium states that Philokles’ nickname derived from his ὀρνιθῶδες appearance (as confirmed also by *Av.* 279, where the tragic playwright is linked to another crested bird, *i.e.* the ἔποψ⁴³⁸), the section can be said to correspond in content to what is presented as Didymos’ view at the end of the annotation.

⁴³⁵ See Arnott 2007, 50f., 172-174.

⁴³⁶ On Didymos’ general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 237, 245, 247, 249, 257, 259, 266, 268.

⁴³⁷ A similar accusation must have been the object of Telecl. fr. 15 K.-A., preserved by the *scholium* to *Th.* 168 (see Bagordo 2013, 121-125). A fragment by the comic playwright Alexis (fr. 48 K.-A.) shows that the nickname “lark” was later given to a famous parasite «who was active in the city of Athens during the years c. 345-305» (Arnott 1996, 167).

⁴³⁸ But some ancient readers took the joke in *Av.* 279 to allude to Philokles’ tragedy *Τηρεὺς ἢ Ἐποψ* (see above *scholl.* Aristoph. *Av.* 281a-b and below).

This similarity (along with the less compelling presence of μήποτε⁴³⁹) might suggest that the two opening sentences derive ultimately from Didymean material.

Θεαγένη: the high number of attestations of the name Θεογένης/Θεαγένης⁴⁴⁰ in comedy (see Aristoph. *V.* 1183, *Pax* 928, *Av.* 822, 1127, *Lys.* 63; *Eup. fr.* 99,9, 135 K.-A.) made the identification of the mocked figure(s) a matter of debate already among ancient Aristophanic scholars⁴⁴¹. In particular, *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 822a Holwerda lists three namesakes mocked in comedy: a poor man who claimed to be rich, an intellectual who wrote on Homer (*i.e.*, clearly, Theagenes of Rhegion⁴⁴²) and a third person blamed for his μαλακία (see also *Suda* ε 361, θ 81 A.). Apparently more than three people by the same name were known to the redactor of *schol. Aristoph. Pac.* 928c Holwerda (διεβάλλετο γὰρ ὁ Θεαγένης εἰς μαλακίαν καὶ ὡς μωρὸς καὶ ὑώδης. ἦν δὲ ἐκ Πειραιῶς. ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ πένης εἶναι, θρύπτεσθαι δὲ ἐπὶ πλούτῳ. ... ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος Θεαγένης, ὁ εἰς Ὅμηρον γράψας, ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ μαλακία διεβάλλετο, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί), who erroneously merges the Homeric scholar Theagenes of Rhegion with the namesake accused of μαλακία. While describing Theogenes “the goose-fox”, the central part of the scholium to *Av.* 1295 combines the features of stupidity (ἀναίσθητος) and poverty (πονηρός) – that identify the first Theagenes of *schol. Aristoph. Pac.* 928c Holwerda – with the one of cunning (πανούργος), confirming that overlaps and confusions between namesakes were frequent in the transmission of ancient *kōmōdoumenoi* scholarship⁴⁴³. Given the amount of occurrences and exegetic material concerning the several Theogenes/Theagenes, it can be presumed that Didymos’ treatment of the mocked figure was much more comprehensive than what the final line of the scholium implies. However, trying to ascribe any of the material found in the other scholia to the grammarian would be a highly speculative attempt.

ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος ... φησὶν ὀρνιθώδεις εἶναι: Didymos’ view that the two nicknames were aimed at mocking the man’s bird-like appearance was openly criticised, with regard to Philokles, by other ancient readers, as shown by *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 281c Holwerda (ἐν ἐνίοις ὑπομνήμασιν, ὅτι προκέφαλός ἐστιν ὁ Φιλοκλῆς ὡς ὁ ἔποψ [*TrGF* 24 T 6c]: ἀλλ’ οὐδαμοῦ κεκωμώδηται) and *schol. Aristoph. Th.* 168a Regtuit (ἐν τοῖς Ὀρνισιν οὐκ ἄλλως κορυδῶ αὐτὸν ὁμοίου ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅτι μικρὸς καὶ αἰσχροῦς). The confutation relied on the existence of a play by Philokles’ entitled *Τηρεὺς ἢ Ἔποψ* (of which the first line [*TrGF* 24 F 1] was known to the source of the scholium to *Av.* 281)⁴⁴⁴: according to the anonymous interpretation, it is to this play that the Hoopoe alludes in *Av.* 281-283 (οὐτοσὶ μὲν ἐστὶ Φιλοκλέους / ἐξ ἔποπος, ἐγὼ δὲ τούτου πάππος, ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις / “Ἰπνόνικος Καλλίου καὶ Ἰπνονίκου Καλλίας”). It seems unlikely that the grammarian ignored Philokles’ play or that, despite being aware of it, refused to link it to the mockery of the playwright in *Av.* 281-283. Rather, by focusing

⁴³⁹ See *e.g.* Boudreaux 1919, 110-112; Wilson 1984, 93f.; Montana 1996, 30 n. 64.

⁴⁴⁰ With regard to the two alternative orthographies see *e.g.* Dunbar 1995, 492.

⁴⁴¹ All of the passages are listed under one entry in *PA* 6703 and *PAA* 504040, although there is no evidence pointing clearly towards a single historic figure underlying all the references in comedy (see *e.g.* Storey 2003, 147-149; Olson 2017, 460f.).

⁴⁴² Theag. 8.2,12-14 D.-K.; discussions *e.g.* in Pfeiffer 1968, 9-12; Rispoli 1980; Biondi 2015; Novokhatko 2015, 31; 2020, 62f.

⁴⁴³ On namesakes in *kōmōdoumenoi*-scholia see Steinhausen 1910, 34-39.

⁴⁴⁴ See Jachmann 1909, 37f. n. 4.

on Philokles' 'crested' head, Didymos probably aimed at offering a further interpretation that could consistently explain both the unclear 'hoopoe-genealogy' of ll. 281-283 and the nickname "lark" of l. 1295⁴⁴⁵.

⁴⁴⁵ Bechtel (1898, 40) suggests that the bird-like appearance of Philokles' head derived from a peculiar hairstyle, which closely resembled the hoopoe's and lark's crests.

fr. 247 (= II 14.44, p. 255 Schmidt)

Subject: the mockery of Meidias in *Av.* 1297f. and other comic passages.

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1297-1299 Holwerda

Μειδίας δ' ἐκεῖ **REG** ὄρτυξ **E**: ὁ μὲν Δίδυμος οὕτως· ὁ [δὲ] Ἀμμώνιος (*FGrHist* 350 F 4, fr. 4 Bagordo) ᾠήθη ἐξ ἐπιθέτου Μειδίαν ὄρτυγα καλεῖσθαι. γελοίως <δὲ> διὰ τὸ κυβευτὴν εἶναι καὶ ἐν γύρω τοὺς ὄρτυγας κόπτειν **RVEGM** οὕτως αὐτὸν νῦν Ἀριστοφάνης προσεῖπεν. **VEGM** δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο Πλάτων ἐν *Περιαλγεῖ* (fr. 116 K.-A.): “χρηστόν, μὴ κατὰ Μειδίαν ὄρτυγοκόπον”. λέγει δὲ ἐν *Ποαστρίαις* ὁ αὐτὸς (immo *Phryn.* fr. 43 K.-A.) ὡς καὶ περὶ ἀλέκτορας αὐτοῦ ἐσπουδακότος. διαβάλλεται δὲ εἷς τε πονηρίαν, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν *Νίκαις* (fr. 85 K.-A.), καὶ κλοπὴν δημοσίων, ὡς *Μεταγένης* ἐν Ὀμήρω (fr. 12 K.-A.), καὶ συκοφαντίαν. κόβαλός τε εἶναι ἐλέγετο καὶ πτωχαλαζών, ὡς *Φρόνιχος* ἐν Ἐφιάλτῃ (fr. 4 K.-A.). ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος ἤκειν, ἐώκει. ὄρτυγα δὲ λέγει, ὅτι ὄρτυγοκόπος ἦν· περὶ οὗ προεῖρηται. **VEG** φέρεται δὲ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις “ὑπὸ στυφοκόμπου”. **VEGM** καὶ σαφὲς οὐδὲν ἔστιν εὔρεῖν. Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Ζωπύρου γράφει “ὑπ’ ὄρτυγοκόμπου” καὶ ἐξηγεῖτο, ὅτι ἐγκείται τὸ μ. θέλει γὰρ εἰπεῖν “ὄρτυγοκόπου”, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ὄρτυγοκόπων. **VEG**

“and Meidias over there, (they call him) quail”: Didymos (says) the following: “Ammonios believed that Meidias was called ‘quail’ by epithet. But Aristophanes here calls him this way mockingly, because he was a gambler and he would tap the quails in the ring. This is proved by Plato in the *Man in Terrible Pain*: ‘a good man, not a quail-tapper like Meidias’. The same author, in the *Grass-cutters*, says that he took cock-fighting very seriously. He is also mocked for his dishonesty, as in Plato’s *Victories*, and for embezzlement of public funds, as in Metagenes’ *Homer*, and for being a sycophant. He was also said to be impudent and a braggart beggar, as in Phrynichos’ *Ephialtes*”. Symmachos: “*ēkein* (means) *eōkei* (‘he looked like’). He calls him ‘quail’ because he was a quail-tapper: we have already discussed this. The majority of the manuscripts has “by a *stymphokompos*”, and it is impossible to find anything clear. Dionysios of Zopyros writes “by an *ortygokompos*” and explains that the word has an *m* inserted. Indeed, it means ‘quail-tapper’, because he (*scil.* Meidias) is also one of the quail-tappers”.

Aristoph. Av. 1297f. Μειδίας δέ γε / Ὀρτυξ ἐκαλεῖτο.

[Pl.] *Alc.* 1.120a-c πρὸς Μειδίαν σε δεῖ τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον ἀποβλέπειν καὶ ἄλλους τοιοῦτους – οἱ τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράττειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν, ἔτι τὴν ἀνδραποδώδη, φαῖεν ἂν αἱ γυναῖκες, τρίχα ἔχοντες ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ὑπ’ ἀμουσίας καὶ οὐπω ἀποβληκότες, ἔτι δὲ βαρβαρίζοντες ἐληλύθασι κολακεύσοντες τὴν πόλιν ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἄρξοντες – πρὸς τοῦτους σε δεῖ, οὐσπερ λέγω, βλέποντα σαυτοῦ δὴ ἀμελεῖν, καὶ μῆτε μανθάνειν ὅσα μαθήσεως ἔχειται, μέλλοντα τοσοῦτον ἀγῶνα ἀγωνίζεσθαι, μῆτε ἀσκεῖν ὅσα δεῖται ἀσκήσεως, καὶ πᾶσαν παρασκευὴν παρεσκευασμένον οὕτως ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως | **Poll.** 9.107-109 καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ ὄρτυγοκοπεῖν παιδιά, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ὄρτυγοκοπία, καὶ οἱ παίζοντες ὄρτυγοκόποι καὶ στυφοκόποι ἐκαλοῦντο. καὶ τὸ κόπτειν τοὺς ὄρτυγας καὶ ἀνακναδάλλειν καὶ ἀνερεθίζειν, ἀνεγείρειν, παροξύνειν, καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν ὄρτυγοκοπικῶν ὀνομάτων. καὶ τῆλιά μὲν ὁμοίᾳ τῇ ἀρτοπόωιδι κύκλον ἐμπεριγράψαντες ἐνίστασαν τοὺς ὄρτυγας ἐπὶ ταῖς μάχαις ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ὁ δὲ ἀνατραπεῖς καὶ ἐκπεσὼν τοῦ κύκλου ἦτητο αὐτὸς τε καὶ ὁ τοῦ ὄρτυγος δεσπότης. καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς διετίθεντο τοῖς ὄρτυξι, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐπ’ ἀργυρίῳ. ἔσθ’ ὅτε δὲ ὁ μὲν ἴστη τὸν ὄρτυγα, ὁ δὲ ἔκοπτε τῷ

λιχανῶ ἢ τὰ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς πτερά ἀπέτιλλεν· καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐγκαρτερήσειεν ὁ ὄρτυξ, ἡ νίκη μετὰ τοῦ θρέψαντος αὐτὸν ἐγένετο, ἐνδόντος δὲ καὶ ὑποφυγόντος ὁ κόπτων ἢ τίλλων ἐνίκα. τοὺς δὲ ἠττηθέντας ὄρτυγας ἐμβοήσαντας κατὰ τὸ οἶδ' αὐτοῖς ἐξιώωντο, λήθην ἐνεργαζόμενοι τῆς τοῦ νενικηκότος φωνῆς· καὶ τὸ ἐμβοᾶν ἐντρυλίξειν ὠνόμαζον, **10.136f.** Φρύνιχος μὲν γὰρ ἐν Κρόνῳ (fr. 13 K.-A.) καὶ ἀλεκτρουπόλιον εἶρηκεν, ὥστε καὶ ἀλεκτρουπαλεῖν ἂν εἴποις. ἴσως δὲ καὶ ὄρτυγοτρόφον· ὁ γὰρ ὄρτυγοκόπος ἐστὶν ἐν χρήσει, καὶ ὄρτυγοπόλης, καὶ στυφοκόμπος δ' αὐτοῦς οἱ κομφοδοὶ καλοῦσιν, ὡς τὸ ἔκοπτον τοὺς ὄρτυγας. καὶ τὸ ἐτρύλιζον καὶ τὸ ἀνεκνάδαλλον τῶν ὄρτυγοκοπικῶν | **Olymp. in Alc. 148 Westerink** ὁ Μειδίας οὗτος ὄρτυγοκόπος ἦκουεν ὅτι τοὺς ὄρτυγας μαχίμους ἔτρεφεν. ἅμα δὲ καὶ πληκτικὸν τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, διότι φασὶν Ἀλκιβιάδου ποτὲ ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ βήματος συνηγοροῦντος ἀποπτῆναι ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὄρτυγα. Μειδίαν δὲ φησὶν οὐ τὸν δόντα Δημοσθένην τὸν κόνδυλον· οὗτος γὰρ ἐκείνου προγενέστερος ἦν | **Phot. o 531** ὄρτυγας· συστέλλοντες οἱ Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν τὸ υ· καὶ τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον βραχέως, δηλοῖ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιτάλευσιν (fr. 253 K.-A.), **532** (~ *Suda* o 642 A.) ὄρτυγοκόπος· παιδιὰ τις, ἐν ἧ ὄρτυγας ἰσῆσιν ἐν γύρῳ, οὗς τύπτουσιν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐν τῷ γύρῳ καταβαλὼν τὸν ὄρτυγα λαμβάνει ἐξῆς οὗς ἂν δύνηται· ὁ δὲ ἀποτυχῶν παρέχει θατέρῳ τοὺς ὄρτυγας τύπτειν· καὶ τοῦτο ἀνά μέρος ποιοῦσιν· λέγει οὖν ἐν Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ([Pl.] *Alc.* 1, 120a) “οὐκ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Μειδίαν δεῖ σε ἀποβλέποντα τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον καὶ τοιοῦτους ἄλλους”. ἦ ἐν Φαιδῶνι (ἐμφαίνων Leopardus ad Sudam) ὅτι οὐ πρὸς τοὺς τυχόντας ὁ ἀγὼν ἐστὶ, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀρίστους· διόπερ οὐ ραθυμητέον, **534 Th.** ὄρτυγοκοπεῖν· ἐν γύρῳ τιθέντες ὄρτυγα εἰώθασιν ἐπ' αὐτὸν βαδίζειν· ἔπειτ' ἐὰν μὲν πληγῆς ὁ ὄρτυξ ἔλθοι πτερουσόμενος, περὶ τὸν πατάξαντα γίνεται τὸ βραβεῖον καὶ ἀποφέρει τὸν ὄρτυγα· ἐὰν δὲ μείνη περὶ τὸν ἀντικρυς, καὶ ἀποφέρει τοῦτόν τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἕτερον παρὰ τοῦ λειψθέντος | **schol. Luc. JTr. 48.18 Rabe** ὁ δὲ Μειδίας ὄρτυγοκόπος ἦν, ὡς Πλάτων Περιάγει (fr. 116 K.-A.) καὶ περὶ τὰ ὅμοια δεινός· καὶ ὡς πονηρὸν δὲ καὶ κόβαλον καὶ τῶν δημοσίων νοσοφιστῆν Φρύνιχος (fr. 4 K.-A.) καὶ Πλάτων διαβάλλουσιν | **schol. [Pl.] Alc. 1.120a9-b1 Cufalo** ὄρτυγοκόπον] εἰρωνικῶς. οὗτος ἐπὶ κύκλου τοὺς ὄρτυγας παριστάς κόπτειν αὐτοὺς ἀλλήλους ἐδίδασκεν | **[Zon.] 1342,31 T.** Μειδίας, κύριον. καὶ πονηρὸς Μειδίας.

1 Μειδίας cett., μιδίας R | Δίδυμος-δὲ cett., om. M | δὲ del. Schnee | ᾠήθη cett., om. M | Μειδίαν EΓ, μιδίαν RVM | ὄρτυγα cett., ὄρτα V | **2** δὲ ins. Holwerda | γύρῳ Leopardus recc. Dübner White Holwerda, πυρῶ RVEΓ (acc. om. R) Bekker Dindorf, πυρῶ M | κόπτειν cett., σκοπεῖν V | **3** νῦν cett., om. M | προσεῖπεν-χρηστὸν cett., lac. V | Πλάτων Meineke (coll. *schol. Luc. JTr.* 48.18) recc. White Holwerda, Ἀριστοφάνης codd. Bekker Dindorf Dübner, Ἀριστοφάνης <ἐν Πελαργοῖς καὶ Πλάτων> ἐν Περιαλαγεῖ dub. Fritzsche, Ἀριστοφάνης <ἐν Δαιτάλευσι, Πλάτων> ἐν Περιαλαγεῖ Cobet (coll. *Phot.* o 531) | Περιαλαγεῖ Meursius recc. edd. cett., περιαλαγεῖ E Bekker, περὶ ἀγγείων Γ | **4** Μειδίαν EΓ, μιδίαν V | 4-5 λέγει-ἐσπουδακός post Ἐφιάλτη Fritzsche Dindorf Schneider Cobet Schmidt Clausen White | **5** ἀλέκτορας EΓ, ἀλέκτορος V | post δὲ, καὶ V | τε VE, om. Γ | **6** κλοπῆν Schneider Dübner Holwerda, κλοπῆς EΓ Bekker Dindorf White, κλόπης V | Μεταγένης E, μετὰ (acc. om. V) γένους VΓ, μετὰ γένης Γ² | συκοφαντίαν Dindorf Dübner, συκοφαντία VE, συκοφαντία Γ Bekker White | **6-7** εἶναι ἐλέγετο EΓ, ἐλέγετο εἶναι V | **7** Ἐφιάλτη Γ edd. cett., ἐπιάλη VEG² Bekker | ἦκειν Γ, ἦκειν lemma V, ἦκεν text. V, ἦκον lemma E, ἦκεν text. E | **8** ἐν EΓM, om. V | **8-9** ὑπὸ στυφοκόμπτου VE, ὑπὸ στυφοκόμπτου Γ, ὑποστυφοκόμπτου M | **9** Ζωπύρου VΓ White, Ζώπυρος E edd. cett., ζωπύρος Γ² | **10** ὄρτυγοκόμπτου VΓ, ὄρτυγοκόπου E | καὶ-ὄρτυγοκόπου VEG³, om. Γ | ὄρτυγοκόπου V, τὸν ὄρτυγοκόπον E, τ* ὄρτυγοκο* Γ³ | **11** ὄρτυγοκόπων codd. White Holwerda, ὄρτυγοκόμων edd. cett.

The list of ornithonyms used as nicknames for prominent Athenians goes on with Meidias (*PA* 9714, *PAA* 637170), called “quail”, because of his resemblance to “a quail hit on the head by the *stiphokopos*”⁴⁴⁶. The obscurity of the word (probably belonging to the jargon of the game of quail-tapping⁴⁴⁷), along with the need to identify the mocked figure, attracted the attention of several ancient scholars.

As rightly underlined by Schnee (1879, 29), the annotation concerning Meidias consists of two excerpts, one taken from Didymos’ commentary, the other from Symmachos’⁴⁴⁸. While the former refers to Ammonios (see below), the latter seems to quote an otherwise unknown grammarian, Διονύσιος ὁ Ζωπύρου (see Schauenburg 1881, 21). I have chosen the genitive preserved by VΓ (and accepted by White 1914, 236; see

⁴⁴⁶ The end of *Av.* 1297 is unanimously transmitted as Μειδίας δ’ ἐκεῖ, but Blaydes’ emendation Μειδίας δὲ γε (*id.* 1882, 136) has been accepted by several modern scholars (see e.g. Sommerstein 1987, 152; Wilson 2007a, 407; 2007c, 128). Dunbar (1995, 110) and Henderson (2000, 190), instead, do not alter the paradosis.

⁴⁴⁷ See e.g. Dunbar 1995, 643f.; Arnott 2007, 338; Pirrotta 2009, 248.

⁴⁴⁸ See also fr. 238, 243f., 249, 253. On Symmachos’ exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos’ work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242-244; 248; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

also Dunbar 1995, 644), instead of the nominative Ζώπυρος in **E** (ζωπύρος Γ²) printed by all the other editors⁴⁴⁹. Grammarians are frequently designated through genitives indicating familiar relation or discipleship (see e.g. Ἀμμώνιος Ἀμμωνίου⁴⁵⁰, Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Χαίριδος⁴⁵¹, Διονύσιος ὁ Τρύφωνος⁴⁵², Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ Ἀριστονίκου⁴⁵³). However, as Apollonios Molon’s case shows, the sources frequently oscillate between the genitive of the father’s name (Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Μόλωνος) and the patronymic used as nickname (Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων)⁴⁵⁴. It is therefore possible that the otherwise unattested grammarian was known in antiquity both as Dionysios (son) of Zopyros (as in **VI**) and as Dionysios Zopyros (as in **E**). Symmachos (if the quotation is indeed to be ascribed to him⁴⁵⁵) does not constitute a useful *terminus ante quem* in order to reduce the very high number of grammarians potentially identifiable, by mere homonymy, with Διονύσιος ὁ Ζωπύρου. Within the scholia *vetera* to Aristophanes, *schol. Aristoph. Pl.* 322c Chantry mentions an unidentified Dionysios, author of a one-volume treatise on the usage of the greeting χαίρειν⁴⁵⁶. Moreover, John Tzetzes makes more than one reference to a Dionysios seemingly involved in *studia comica* of musical nature⁴⁵⁷. Finally, on the basis of the previous occurrences, the name Διονύσιος has been integrated in a *lacuna* in *P.Oxy.* LXXVIII 5160 (col. ii, ll. 11-12), a learned commentary probably on Eupolis’ *Goats*⁴⁵⁸.

ὁ μὲν Δίδυμος οὕτως· ὁ [δὲ] Ἀμμώνιος κτλ.: the wording has led modern scholars to suspect the fall of the entire Didymean interpretation either before (see Dindorf 1838c, 426) or after (see Schmidt 1854, 255) the phrase ὁ μὲν Δίδυμος οὕτως⁴⁵⁹. This interpretation has been convincingly confuted by Schnee (1879, 28f.), who suggested the expunction of δέ. This rather uncomplicated solution betters the text, in that it allows the main interpretive opposition to emerge, *i.e.* the one between Didymos and Symmachos. In his hypomnēma, of which the scholium exceptionally offers a direct excerpt, Didymos discusses the interpretation of *Av.* 1297-1299 given by Ammonios: the author of the *Κωμωδούμενοι*⁴⁶⁰ believed that Meidias was actually nicknamed “quail” by his fellow Athenians (see below)⁴⁶¹.

⁴⁴⁹ Dindorf (1838, 253) suggested Διονύσιος δὲ καὶ Ζώπυρος (see also Dübner 1842, 493; Clausen 1881, 3).

⁴⁵⁰ Between coll. 10 and 11 of *P.Oxy.* II 221. See Pagani 2006.

⁴⁵¹ See Apollon. *Soph.* p. 162, 14-16, 171, 17-20 Bekker; *schol. Aristoph. V.* 1238b Koster; *schol. Ap. S. Il.* 3.448a (A); Montana 2002.

⁴⁵² See *Ath.* 6.255c, 11.503c, 14.641a; *Harp.* γ 18 K., ε 137 K.; *St. Byz.* μ 256, ο 1 Billerbeck; Novembri 2010.

⁴⁵³ See *Ath.* 11.481d, *schol. Hrd. Il.* 4.423a1 (A), *schol. Theocr.* 1.110a-c Wendel. According to *Suda* π 3036 A., the genitive indicates that this Ptolemaios was Aristonikos’ father (Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἀριστονίκου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ πατήρ).

⁴⁵⁴ See Schmid 1895 and Ippolito 2005.

⁴⁵⁵ On the contrary, Boudreaux (1919, 161 n. 1) believed the grammarian to be «postérieur à Symmaque».

⁴⁵⁶ περὶ τοῦ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ “χαίρειν” τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, γέγραπται Διονυσίῳ “μονόβιβλον” περὶ αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁵⁷ See *Tz. Prol. XIa I* 111, II 53 Koster, *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Pl.* 253a Massa Positano, *Nu.* 563a Holwerda; Pagani 2013

⁴⁵⁸ First edited by S. Trojahn and B. W. Henry, see Chang-Henry-Parsons-Benaïssa 2013, 114-117 and Olson 2017, 92-102. The commentary contained a remarkable amount of references to ancient grammarians, some of which have been detected by Luppe (2013): Seleukos of Alexandria (see *ibid.* 50; *Suda* σ 200 A.; Müller 1921; Ucciardello 2006c), Symmachos (see Luppe 2013, 51), Diodoros (see *ibid.*; Cohn 1903b; Pagani 2004), Aristophanes of Byzantium, Kallistratos and Aristarchos.

⁴⁵⁹ See also Steinhausen 1910, 9.

⁴⁶⁰ Didymos probably used Ammonios (see the Introduction § 3.3) or another *kōmōdoumenoi* source also in *frr.* 229, 237 and 247. On Didymos’ general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and *frr.* 237, 245, 246, 249, 257, 259, 266, 268.

⁴⁶¹ This is also Dunbar’s interpretation of the passage: «the joke here [...] may be Ar.’s malicious explanation of an already established nickname Ὀρνυξ» (*id.* 1995, 644).

γελοίως <δὲ> διὰ τὸ κυβευτὴν εἶναι: Holwerda accepts the interpunction generally adopted by the editors – *i.e.* ὁ μὲν Δίδυμος οὕτως. ὁ δὲ Ἀμμώνιος φήθη ἐξ ἐπιθέτου Μειδίαν ὄρνυγα καλεῖσθαι. γελοίως κτλ⁴⁶² – but inserts a δέ after γελοίως, thus reinforcing the opposition between the reference to Ammonios (φήθη–καλεῖσθαι) and Didymos’ interpretation (γελοίως–ἐσπουδακός): according to the latter, “quail” was not Meidias’ current nickname (as seemingly supposed by Ammonios), but a specifically Aristophanic invention aimed at mocking Meidias’ enthusiasm for gambling on quail- and cock-fights. White, wondering «how one could say that Aristophanes here calls Meidias ὄρνυξ because he bet on quails matched in the ring and yet deny that ὄρνυξ was applied to him ἐξ ἐπιθέτου» (*id.* 1914, 236), proposes a different syntactic partition of the text, with ἐξ ἐπιθέτου Μειδίαν ὄρνυγα καλεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ... τοὺς ὄρνυγας κόπτειν depending from ὁ δὲ Ἀμμώνιος φήθη, and οὕτως αὐτὸν νῦν Ἀριστοφάνης προσεῖπεν separated from the rest with a full stop (“Ammonios believed that Meidias was mockingly called ‘quail’ by epithet because he [...] would tap the quails. Aristophanes now addresses him in this way”). White’s solution is not fully satisfactory, since the sentence οὕτως αὐτὸν νῦν Ἀριστοφάνης προσεῖπεν, left self-standing, lacks real sense. In fact, the difficulty highlighted by the editor is easily removed if the meaning of the sentence ὁ [δὲ] Ἀμμώνιος φήθη ἐξ ἐπιθέτου Μειδίαν ὄρνυγα καλεῖσθαι is “Ammonios believed that Meidias was nicknamed ‘quail’ (by the Athenians, in everyday life)”, rather than “Ammonios believed that Meidias was nicknamed ‘quail’ (by Aristophanes, in the specific context of *Av.* 1297f.)”. Indeed, Ammonios might have autoschediastically drawn from the lines of *Birds* that Meidias was actually called “quail”, thus provoking Didymos’ reaction, which consisted in confuting this interpretation with the aid of other comic passages (see below).

δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο Πλάτων ἐν Περιαλγεῖ: manuscript **E** has δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν περιαγγεῖ (περὶ ἀγγεῖον Γ)⁴⁶³. The emendation Περιαλγεῖ is by Meursius (1701, 1447), who believed this to be an Aristophanic comedy by the same title of Plato’s one, while the replacement of Ἀριστοφάνης with Πλάτων was first suggested by Meineke (1826, 12; 1827, 22) on the basis of *schol.* Luc. *JTr.* 48.18 Rabe (ὁ δὲ Μειδίας ὄρνυγοκόπος ἦν, ὡς Πλάτων Περιάλγεῖ)⁴⁶⁴. The line from the *Man in Terrible Pain* (along with the reference to Phrynichos’ *Grass-cutters*⁴⁶⁵) constitutes the evidence used by Didymos to refute Ammonios’

⁴⁶² See Bekker 1829b, 260; Dindorf 1838c, 252; Dübner 1842, 238. Quite implausibly, Schmidt (1854, 255) and Schauenburg (1881, 7 n. 12) isolate γελοίως considering it a dismissive reaction to Ammonios’ interpretation.

⁴⁶³ **V** is here lacunous (see above).

⁴⁶⁴ Several modern scholars wrongly ascribe the correction of Ἀριστοφάνης in Πλάτων to Meursius (see Fritzsche 1835, 60 n. 9; White 1914, 237; Kassel-Austin 1984, 147; Pirrotta 2009, 247), despite he clearly believed that both playwrights had written a *Man in Terrible Pain* (see Meursius 1701, 1447: «est eodem titulo Platonis quoque comici fabula»). With regard to the accentuation of the play-title, see Pirrotta 2009, 238. There have been two attempts at preserving Aristophanes’ name in the *scholium*, namely Ἀριστοφάνης <ἐν Πελαργοῖς καὶ Πλάτων> ἐν Περιαλγεῖ (Fritzsche 1835, 60 n. 9) and Ἀριστοφάνης <ἐν Δαιταλεῦσι καὶ Πλάτων> ἐν Περιαλγεῖ (Cobet 1874, 379). Cobet’s integration finds support in Phot. ο 531 Th., where the word ὄρνυγοκόπος is said to have occurred in Aristophanes’ *Banqueters* (fr. 253 K.-A.). However, van Leeuwen (1902, 202f.) suspected an error in Photios’ entry, and Kassel-Austin (1984, 147) deem the attempt as *coniectura incertissima*.

⁴⁶⁵ The *scholium* wrongly ascribes the comedy to ὁ αὐτός, *i.e.* to Aristophanes. Although the same title is attested for Magnes and Krates (see *e.g.* Stama 2014), nothing suggests that Phrynichos’ authorship of the *Grass-cutters* was ever questioned in antiquity. The false ascription must therefore derive from a confusion within the transmission of the exegetic material, hence the proposed transposition of λέγει–ἐσπουδακός after the reference to the *Ephialtes* (see Fritzsche 1835, 60f. n. 9; Dindorf 1838c, 253 n. 2;

autoschediastic conclusion: by defining Meidias as a “quail-beater” and by linking him to cock-fighting, the two passages indirectly prove that the *vis comica* of Av. 1297f. lies in the man’s general reputation as a gambler on bird-fights. If this reconstruction of Ammonios and Didymos’ *querelle* is correct, one can only suppose that Ammonios, in his treatment of Meidias, simply overlooked the instances from the *Man in Terrible Pain* and the *Grass-cutters*, possibly because he considered them equivalent in content to Av. 1297f.

διαβάλλεται δὲ εἰς τε πονηρίαν κτλ: just like its synonym κωμωδεῖται, the verb διαβάλλεται highlights that the features ascribed to the lampooned figure belong to the speech act of ridicule and are not necessarily historical (see fr. 229 above and Chronopoulos 2011, 213). A different nuance is carried by ἐλέγετο, that defines the mockery as «one more instance of public or private discussions about the person ridiculed» (*ibid.*). The information regarding the accusations of dishonesty and embezzlement of public funds (found respectively in Pl.Com. fr. 85 K.-A., Metag. fr. 12 K.-A.), as well as the one of συκοφαντία (without reference) and that of being κόβαλός ... καὶ πτωχαλαζών (Phryn. com. fr. 4 K.-A.) was likely taken by Didymos directly from Ammonios’ handbook, which was arguably his primary source in his discussion of Meidias.

Schneider 1838, 76-78; Cobet 1840, 171; Schmidt 1854, 255; Clausen 1881, 66 n.1; White 1914, 236), which was later rejected by Holwerda (1991, 192). See also Stama 2014, 242f.

fr. 248 (= II 14.45, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: the objects called “wing”, “spur” and “cock’s comb” by Peisetairos at ll. 1364-1366.

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1363aα Holwerda

αὐτὸς Γ ἔμαθον **REG** ὅτε παῖς ἦ **EG**: Σύμμαχος· καθοπλίζει αὐτὸν τῆ μὲν πτέρυγι ὡς ἀσπίδι, τῷ δὲ πλῆκτρῳ ὡς ξίφει, τῷ δὲ λόφῳ ὡς περικεφαλαία. **RVEΓM** Δίδυμος δέ· ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς πτέρυγος ἀσπίδα δίδωσιν αὐτῷ, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ πλῆκτρου ξίφος. **RVEΓ** ἦλθε γὰρ ὡς ἀλεκτρυὼν πτερωθῆναι, ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς πατέρας τύπτουσιν. **RVEΓM**

“(The things that) I myself learnt when I was a boy”: Symmachos. He arms him with the wing as if with a shield, with the spur as if with a sword and with the comb as if with a helmet. Didymos: instead of the wing he gives him a shield and instead of the spur a sword. Indeed, he had come to be turned into a cock, for they beat their fathers.

Aristoph. Av. 1364-1367 ταυτηνδι λαβὼν / τὴν πτέρυγα καὶ τοῦτὶ τὸ πλῆκτρον θῆτέρα, / νομίσας ἀλεκτρυόνος ἔχειν τονδι λόφον, / φρούρει, στρατεύου, μισθοφορῶν σαυτὸν τρέφε.

1 Σύμμαχος cett., om. M | μὲν cett., om. E | **2** δὲ λόφῳ cett., λόφῳ δὲ M | μὲν cett., om. E | **3** αὐτῷ cett., ex αὐτὸν R

The second series of ‘intruder-scenes’ of the play⁴⁶⁶ involves three «applicants for wings» (Dunbar 1995, 652) coming on stage in direct succession. The first is an unidentified character who declares that he wants to move to Nephelokokkygia to avail himself of the bird law described at ll. 758f.: this allows the inhabitants of the city to fight against their fathers (τοῦτ’ ἐκεῖ καλὸν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐστίν, ἢν τις τῷ πατρὶ / προσδραμῶν εἴπη πατάξας “αἴρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ.”)⁴⁶⁷. However, his plans are thwarted by Peisetairos, who points at another bird law, the law of the stork, a bird that cares for its elderly parents⁴⁶⁸. Peisetairos then makes the most of the rebellious son’s visit and makes him join the army, by giving him a shield, a sword and a helmet. The *vis comica* of the scene is based on the fact that the three objects are called by Peisetairos “wing” (πτέρυξ), “spur” (πλῆκτρον) and “cock’s comb” (ἀλεκτρυόνος λόφος).

The explanation of this comic mechanism is the focus of Symmachos’ and Didymos’ comments preserved by the scholium on the passage⁴⁶⁹. According to the former, the equipment given by Peisetairos to the man

⁴⁶⁶ *Av.* 1337-1469. See Dunbar 1995, 9.

⁴⁶⁷ The ‘law’ derives from the popular belief that the cockerel would fight against its father (see also *Aristoph. Nu.* 1427f.).

⁴⁶⁸ See e.g. *Aristot. HA* 615b 23f.; *Ael. NA* 3.23.

⁴⁶⁹ As it frequently happens, **Lh** offers a heavily rephrased version of the scholium (*schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1363aβ Holwerda ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀλεκτρυόνες τοὺς πατέρας τύπτουσιν, ὡς ἀλεκτρυόνα αὐτὸν καθοπλίζει, τὸν πατραλοῖαν. καὶ πτέρυγα μὲν δίδωσιν ὡς ἀσπίδα,

consists of the actual bird parts (wing, spur and comb) and the humor relies on the two characters acting as if in a serious arming scene (καθοπλίζει)⁴⁷⁰.

Δίδυμος δέ· ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς πτέρυγος ἀσπίδα δίδωσιν αὐτῷ κτλ. unlike his successor, Didymos considered the *vis comica* of the scene to be based on the contrast between the objects passed from one actor to the other on stage (*i.e.* a shield, a sword and a helmet) and the names given to them by Peisetairos, namely “wing”, “spur” and “cock’s comb”. This interpretation is accepted by most modern critics (see *e.g.* Dindorf 1835c, 644; Rogers 1906, 181; Dunbar 1995, 659), although some (see Merry 1889, 69; van Leeuwen 1902, 210) follow Symmachos in understanding the props as actual bird parts. The white Argive shield is called “wing” by the Chorus in Soph. *Ant.* 110-116 (ὄς ἐφ’ ἡμετέρα γῆ Πολυνείκουσ / ἀρθεῖς νεικέων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων / ὄξεα κλάζων / αἰετὸς ἐς γῆν ὧς ὑπέρεπτα, / λευκῆς χιόνος πτέρυγι στεγανὸς / πολλῶν μεθ’ ὄπλων / ξύν θ’ ἵπποκόμοις κορύθεσσι) but an involvement of the passage in Didymos’ comment (or in Aristophanes’ lines) is highly speculative.

ἦλθε γὰρ ὡς ἀλεκτρυὼν πτερωθῆναι. unlike Symmachos’ fragment, the Didymean one does not mention the comb (ἀλεκτρυόνος λόφος). It can be reasonably assumed that a portion of scholiastic text went lost due to epitomation, especially given the grammarian’s observation that the man “had come to be turned into a cock” (with the γὰρ tightly linking the sentence to the preceding one).

ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς πατέρας τύπτουσιν. Didymos correctly explains the passage in the light of *Av.* 758f., where the “law of the cock” is proudly proclaimed by the Chorus (see above).

πληκτρον δέ τι ὡς ξίφος). On Symmachos’ exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos’ work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with fr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242-244; 247; 252f.). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

⁴⁷⁰ Ancient critics from Zenodotos onwards had a clear notion of the ‘arming scene’ (ὀπλισμός) as a typical, standardised and recurring sequence within the Homeric narrative, as demonstrated *e.g.* by *schol.* *Ariston. Il.* 3.334-335a (A); Nünlist 2009, 306-309.

fr. 249 (= Π 14.46, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: the expression τί δεῦρο πόδα σὺ κυλλὸν ἀνὰ κύκλον κυκλεῖς; and Kinesias as *kōmōdoumenos* in *Av.* 1379

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1379a-b Holwerda

τί δεῦρο **RE** πόδα σὺ κυλλὸν **REG**: ὅτι πολλάκις τὸ μὲν κυλλὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ποδὸς ἔτασσον, ὡς ὁ ποιητῆς “ὄρσεο κυλλοπόδιον” (*Il.* 21.331), τὸ δὲ χωλὸν ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός, ὡς Εὐπόλις “ὅτι χωλός ἐστι τὴν ἐτέραν χεῖρ’ **RVEΓ** οὐ λέγεις” (fr. 264 K.-A.) καὶ Εὐφρόνιος μὲν (fr. 78 Strecker) χωλὸν εἶναι τὸν Κινησίαν φησίν. ἢ τάχα, ἐπεὶ πολλάκις ἐστὶ παρ’ αὐτοῖς “ποδὶ κούφῳ” ἢ “ποδὶ λευκῷ” ἢ “πόδα τιθεῖς” ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, τὸ “κυλλόν” προσέθηκεν. ἄλλως. **VEΓ** Δίδυμος μὲν: “κύκλον”, ἐπεὶ κυκλίων ὀσμάτων ποιητῆς ἐστὶ, **RVEΓM** “κυλλόν” δέ, ἐπεὶ χωλός ἦν. **VEΓM** εἴρηται δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν Βατράχοις (153, 1437). ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις (fr. 629 R.) δύο φησὶ γεγονέναι. Σύμμαχος οὕτως: Εὐφρόνιος (fr. 78 Strecker)· ἐπειδὴ κυλλός ἦν ὁ Κινησίας, τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν. ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ πολὺ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τὸ “ποδὶ λευκῷ” καὶ “ποδὶ κούφῳ” καὶ “πόδα τιθεῖς” ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, τὸ “κυλλόν” προσέθηκεν. **VEΓ**

“why (are you here, circling in circles with) your crooked foot?”: they often used the adjective “crooked” (*kyllos*) with regard to the foot, as does the poet (*i.e.* Homer) in “arise, club-footed (*kyllopodiōn*)”. Instead, they used “crippled” with regard to the hand, as does Eupolis: “you don’t say that he is crippled in his one hand”⁴⁷¹. And Euphronios says that Kinesias was crippled. Or perhaps (Aristophanes) added (to “foot”) the adjective “crooked” because in their works (*scil.* of the dithyrambographers) there were often expressions like “with nimble foot” or “with white foot” or “setting the foot” and similar. Otherwise. Didymos: “circle” because (Kinesias) is a poet of cyclic choruses, while “crooked” because he was crippled. He is mentioned in *Frogs*. Aristotle, in the *Didaskaliai*, says that there were two. Symmachos (says) the following: Euphronios “because Kinesias was crook-footed (crippled?)”, but there is no evidence for that. But he (Aristophanes) added (to “foot”) the adjective “crooked” because in the works of the dithyrambographers there were many expressions like “with white foot”, “with nimble foot”, “setting foot” and similar.

Aristoph. Av. 1377f. ἀσπαζόμεσθα φύλρινον Κινησίαν. / τί δεῦρο πόδα σὺ κυλλὸν ἀνὰ κύκλον κυκλεῖς;

Plu. Quaest. Conv. 712A ἔτι δ’ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμονικοῖς δείπνοις ἐκάστω παρέστηκε τῶν κατακεκλιμένων οἰνοχόος, οὕτω δεήσει γραμματικὸν ἐκάστω τὸ καθ’ ἑκάστον ἐξηγεῖσθαι, τίς ὁ Λαισποδίας παρ’ Εὐπόλιδι (test. 28 K.-A.) καὶ ὁ Κινησίας παρὰ Πλάτωνι (test. 12 K.-A.) καὶ ὁ Λάμπων παρὰ Κρατίνῳ

⁴⁷¹ The translation follows the wording of the *scholium*, although the text offered by Poll. 4.188 (ὅτι χωλός ἐστι τὴν ἐτέραν χεῖρ’ εὐσόφδρα) is commonly considered the authentic version of Eupolis’ line (see Kassel-Austin 1986, 451; Olson 2016, 357).

(test. 32 K.-A.), καὶ τῶν κωμωδουμένων ἕκαστος | **Gal. in Hippoc. aph. 18a,149 Kühn** μόνους δὲ ἐμπόους προσαγορεύει τοῦπιπᾶν ἐξαιρέτους, οἷς μεταξὺ θώρακός τε καὶ πνεύμονος ἤθροισται τὸ πῦον, οὗς ὅτι συνήθως ἕκαιον οἱ παλαιοὶ μαθεῖν ἔστι καὶ ἐξ ὧν εἴρηκε Πλάτων ὁ κωμικός ἐπὶ Κινησίου κατὰ τήνδε τὴν ῥήσιν· “μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ / Εὐαγόρου ὁ παῖς ἐκ πλευρίτιδος Κινησίας / σκελετὸς, ἄπυος, καλάμινα σκέλη φορῶν, / φθόης προφήτης, ἐσχάρας κεκαυμένος / πλείστας ὑπ’ Εὐρυφῶντος ἐν τῷ σώματι” (fr. 200 K.-A.) | **Ath. 12.551a** καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης δ’ ἐν Γηρυτάδῃ λεπτοῦς τούσδε καταλέγει, οὗς καὶ πρέσβεις ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν φησιν εἰς Ἄδου πέμπεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐκεῖ ποιητὰς λέγων οὕτως (fr. 156 K.-A.): “καὶ τίς ‘νεκρῶν κευθῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας’ (Eur. *Hec.* 1) / ἔτλη κατελεθεῖν; B. ἕνα γὰρ ἄφ’ ἐκάστης τέχνης / εἰλόμεθα κοινῇ γενομένης ἐκκλησίας, / οὗς ἴσμεν ὄντας ἄδοφοίτας καὶ θαμὰ / ἐκέϊσε φιλοχωροῦντας. A. εἰσὶ γὰρ τινες ἄνδρες παρ’ ὕμιν ἄδοφοῖται; B. νῆ Δία / μάλιστά γ’, ὅσπερ Θρακοφοῖται. πάντ’ ἔχεις. / A. καὶ τίνες ἂν εἶεν; B. πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων / ἀπὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν / Μέλῃτος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων Κινησίας”. εἶθ’ ἐξῆς φησιν· “ὡς σφόδρ’ ἐπὶ λεπτῶν ἐλπίδων ὠχεῖσθ’ ἄρα / τούτους γάρ, ἦν πολλῶ ξυνέλθη, ξυλλαβῶν / ὁ τῆς διαρροίας ποταμὸς οἰχῆσεται” | **Ael. VH 10.6** ἐκωμωδοῦντο ἐς λεπτότητα Σαννυρίων ὁ κωμωδίας ποιητῆς καὶ Μέλῃτος ὁ τραγωδίας ποιητῆς καὶ Κινησίας κυκλίων χορῶν καὶ Φιλητᾶς ποιητῆς ἐξαμέτρων | **Suda κ 2671 A.** κυλλός; ὁ πεπρωμένος οὐ μόνον πόδα, ἀλλὰ καὶ χεῖρα ὁμοίως, καὶ χωλός καὶ ἐπὶ ποδὸς καὶ ἐπὶ χειρός, οἱ δὲ κύλλου ἀναγινώσκουσιν ὡς κύκνου. τὸ μὲν κυλλὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ποδὸς ἔτασσον, ὡς ὁ ποιητῆς· “ὄρσεο κυλλοπόδιον” (*Il.* 21.331). τὸ δὲ χωλὸν ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός, ὡς Εὐπόλις· “ὅτι χωλός ἐστι τὴν ἑτέραν χεῖρα, οὐ λέγεις”. (fr. 264 K.-A.) ἢ ἐπειδὴ πολὺ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τὸ “ποδὶ λευκῶ”, “ποδὶ κούφῳ”, “πόδα τιθεῖς”, τὸ κυλλὸν προσέθηκεν. Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀρνισι (1379) | **schol. Aristoph. Nu. 333a Holwerda** κυκλίων τε χορῶν: εἰς τοὺς περὶ Κινησίαν καὶ Φιλόξενον καὶ Κλεομένην, **Av. 1378 Holwerda** φιλύρινον Κινησίαν: Καλλίστρατος; χλωρόν. ἢ γὰρ φιλύρα χλωρόν· χλωρός δὲ καὶ οὗτος. Εὐφρόνιος; κοῦφον, ὡς ἂν διθυραμβοποιὸν εὐτελεῖ καὶ κοῦφα ποιοῦντα· τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸ ξύλον, κοῦφον καὶ ελαφρόν. διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὡς χωλὸν διὰ τοῦ “πόδα σὺ κυλλόν”, **Ra. 153a** Κινησίας ἦν διθυραμβοποιός, ὃς ἐποίησε πυρρίχην, **b** ὅτι ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς πολλῇ “κινήσει” ἐχρήτο, **c** ἦν Θηβαῖος, μελοποιὸς κάκιστος, **d** ἦν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὀκνηρὸς καὶ κατεσκελετευκός, **e** ἐπραγματεύσατο κατὰ τῶν κωμικῶν, ὡς εἶεν ἀχορήγητοι, **f** δοκεῖ καὶ κατησχμηνοκέναι τοῦ τῆς Ἑκάτης ἀγάλματος, διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς φησιν· “ἢ κατατιλᾷ τῶν Ἑκαταίων, κυκλίοισι χοροῖσιν ὑπάδων” (*Ra.* 366), **1437a** ὁ Κινησίας λεπτός ἦν, ὁ δὲ Κλεοκρίτος μοχθηρός, **b Chantry** ὡς λεπτός σφόδρα ὢν κωμωδεῖται καὶ ὡς ξένος καὶ ὡς κόλαξ. ἐμνήσθη δὲ καὶ τοῦ Κινησίου, ὡς τούτου καὶ τοῦ Κλεοκρίτου ὁμοφρονούντων.

1 ὡς ὁ ποιητῆς cett., om. E Bekker | **2** ὄρσεο RE, ὄρσε V, ὄρσεο Γ | κυλλοπόδιον RVEΓ², κύλλιος ποδὶ Γ | post χωλὸν ὡς V | **4** τάχα cett., πάχυν V | παρ’ cett., om. Γ | alt. ποδὶ cett., ποδῶ V | **5** τὸ cett., τὸν V | Δίδυμος–κύκλον cett. (om. μὲν M), τὸ δὲ ἀνὰ κύκλον R | post κύκλον, φησιν M | ἐπεὶ VEG, ἐπειδὴ RM | κυκλίων ἄσμάτων RVEΓ²M, κυκλιασμάτων Γ | **6** ποιητῆς ἐστὶ cett., ἦν ποιητῆς M | ἦν EΓM, ἐστὶν V | **7** φησὶ cett., φασὶ Γ | **8** κυλλός codd., fort. χωλός scribendum | Κινησίας cett., κιννησίας Γ | πολὺ EΓ, om. V | πόδα Γ, πόδω V, ποδ() E

The series of ‘intruder-scenes’ of *Il.* 1337-1469 proceeds with Kinesias. The dithyrambographer’s entrance on stage provokes Peisetairos’ comically alliterant question τί δεῦρο πόδα σὺ κυλλὸν ἀνὰ κύκλον κυκλεῖς; (*Av.* 1378⁴⁷², “why are you here, circling in circles with your crooked foot?”). Besides being a straightforward parody of the language of dithyrambic poetry (see Dunbar 1995, 666f.)⁴⁷³, the line also alludes both to the style of circular dance typical of the κύκλιοι χοροί (with some steps being surely performed by the actor on stage) and to the irregular metre just displayed in the first lines of Kinesias’ song (see *ibid.* and *Av.* 1372-1374, 1376)⁴⁷⁴.

The annotation concerning the convolute expression πόδα σὺ κυλλὸν ἀνὰ κύκλον κυκλεῖς consists of two different scholia, joined by ἄλλως in **VEΓ**: the first one reports an anonymous observation (based on evidence from the *Iliad* and from Eupolis’ *Prospaltioi*, see above) concerning the semantic difference between κυλλός and χωλός (the former being allegedly used only in relation to the foot, the latter only with regard to the hand). The same distinction occurs also in Pollux (4.188, with Eupolis’ line and *Av.* 1378 as examples for the usage

⁴⁷² Line partition in *Av.* 1373-1377 is uncertain, due to the unclear length of the verses of Kinesias’ song (see e.g. Dunbar 1995, 661-664; Wilson 2007a, 411).

⁴⁷³ On the language of New Music, see, among others, Budelmann-LeVen 2014, with the relevant bibliography.

⁴⁷⁴ Kinesias’ song is a true «musical pastiche» that combines features of different styles, from New Dithyramb, to Bacchylides and Anacreon (Hadjimichael 2014, 193). For a more detailed analysis see *ibid.*; Dunbar 1995, 668f.; Calame 2020, 121f.

of *χωλός* and *κυλλός*⁴⁷⁵), but is clearly disproved by the numerous attestations of *χωλός* used in reference to the foot or the leg⁴⁷⁶. This section is then followed by Euphronios' exegesis⁴⁷⁷ and by the last section of Symmachos' comment (see below). The second scholium results from the juxtaposition of two excerpts respectively from Didymos' and Symmachos' hypomnēmata (as observed also in 238, 243f., 247 and 253).

Δίδυμος μὲν· “κύκλον”, ἐπεὶ κυκλίων ἁσμάτων ποιητῆς ἐστὶ: while the other commentators focus exclusively on the interpretation of the adjective *κυλλός*, the grammarian dwells also upon ἀνά κύκλον κυκλεῖς, underlining the rather evident reference to the “cyclic” choruses that performed Kinesias' songs. The dithyrambographer himself is identified as κυκλιοδιδάσκαλος in *Av.* 1403 and acts as “ambassador” τῶν κυκλίων χορῶν in a fragment of Aristophanes' *Gerytades* (fr. 156 K.-A.). The close link between Kinesias and cyclic choruses emerges also from *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 366b-c Chantry, where Aristophanes' reference to the person “that soils Hekate's shrines and accompanies the cyclic choruses” (*Ra.* 366) is unanimously considered by ancient commentators as an allusion to the dithyrambographer.

“κυλλόν” δέ, ἐπεὶ χωλός ἦν: Didymos regards Kinesias' *κυλλός ποῦς* (“crooked foot”) as evidence for his being *χωλός*, arguably following Euphronios' interpretation (see Schauenburg 1881, 27f.). In all likelihood, the grammarian quoted his predecessor *nominatim*, but the name then disappeared due to epitomation, while it was preserved in the excerpt from Symmachos' hypomnēma and in the first part of the scholium. As already noted, this first occurrence of Euphronios' name in the annotation is introduced by an observation on the difference in usage between *κύλλος* and *χωλός*. Despite the order in which the two ancient exegeses are presented in the scholiastic text, it is hard not to see the anonymous distinction between *κυλλός* and *χωλός* as a reaction to Euphronios' (and Didymos') interpretation of *κυλλόν πόδα* in *Av.* 1378. Indeed, by positing a semantic difference, backed with evidence from Homer and Eupolis, the anonymous statement seemingly aims at invalidating the exegesis concerning Kinesias' lameness. In this perspective, the unanimous reading *κυλλός* in the second occurrence of Euphronios' exegesis (Σύμμαχος οὕτως· Εὐφρόνιος· ἐπειδὴ κυλλός ἦν ὁ Κινησίας) may be liable to emendation in favour of *χωλός* (see also the immediately preceding *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1378 Holwerda Εὐφρόνιος· ... διαβάλλει δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὡς χωλὸν διὰ τοῦ “πόδα σὺ κυλλόν”). With regard to its content, Euphronios and Didymos' interpretation might at first seem merely autoschediastic. However, a fragment from an unidentified comedy by Plato (see above fr. 200 K.-A. *ap.* Gal. *in Hippoc. aph.* 18a 149 Kühn) depicts Kinesias as a σκελετὸς, ἄπυγος, καλάμινα σκέλη φορῶν (“a skeleton with no buttocks, with legs like reeds”), a description that may reflect an actual physical condition involving the dithyrambographer's legs. It is therefore likely that Plato's passage played a role in Euphronios' comment, as well as in Didymos'.

⁴⁷⁵ Εὐπολις δὲ καὶ τὸν τὴν χεῖρα πεπηρωμένον χωλὸν εἶρηκεν· “ὅτι χωλός ἐστι τὴν ἑτέραν χεῖρ' εὖ σφόδρα” (fr. 264 K.-A.). οὗ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐπὶ ποδὸς Ἀριστοφάνη κυλλόν· “τί δεῦρο πόδα σὺ κυλλόν ἀνά κύκλον κυκλεῖς;” (*Av.* 1378). The same material is found also in Zen. Ath. 2.37 Bühler, *Suda* κ 2670, 2671, γ 425 A.

⁴⁷⁶ See e.g. the description of Thersites in *Il.* 2.217 (φορκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα).

⁴⁷⁷ On Euphronios, see Novembri 2020 (with bibliography) and the Introduction § 3.2.

εἴρηται δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν Βατράχοις: despite the quick and vague reference to the other occurrences of Kinesias in *Frogs* (i.e. *Ra.* 153 and 1437), it can be assumed that Didymos' commentary originally included a detailed discussion – in the typical *kōmōdoumenoi*-style⁴⁷⁸ – of all the preserved passages mocking a character named Kinesias. *Ra.* 153 informs that Kinesias had composed/choreographed a pyrrhic dance (see also *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 153a Chantry, above), while l. 1437 alludes to his slender build (which was also explicitly mocked by Plato, see above; both passages probably underlie *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 1437a). Moreover, the scholia to *Ra.* 366 show that ancient scholars identified as Kinesias the person who κατατιλᾷ τῶν Ἑκαταίων κυκλίοισι χοροῖσιν ὑπᾶδων (see also *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 153f Chantry). Information on his ethnic (Θηβαῖος, or – more likely – Ἀθηναῖος⁴⁷⁹) and his campaign against comic *chorēgiai* is only preserved by the scholia, with no other identifiable source (see *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 153c-e Chantry, above). In all likelihood Didymos' exegesis originally included most of this data and its current form can be considered highly epitomised.

ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις δύο φησὶ γεγονέναι: the core opposition of the second scholium is the one between Didymos and Symmachos, whose comments were excerpted and juxtaposed by a later redactor. If these two are the only components of the scholium, one has to assume that the quotation from Aristotle's *Didaskaliai* was embedded in Didymos' comment to *Av.* 1379. It is difficult to establish whether the grammarian could directly access the work or rather found the information in one of his sources (maybe Euphronios himself): direct engagement with the *Didaskaliai* is attested only for some scholars of the early and middle Hellenistic period, namely Kallimachos (fr. 454 Pf.), Eratosthenes (frr. 38, 97 Strecker) and Krates of Mallos (fr. 118 Broggiato). However, Aristotle's work is seemingly used to reject Kallistratos and Euphronios' statement in *schol.* Aristoph. *Pl.* 385b Chantry⁴⁸⁰, as well as Aristarchos and Apollonios' one in *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 1124 Chantry⁴⁸¹. With regard to the last case, Boudreaux (1919, 72 n. 2) assumes the refutation – and therefore the Aristotelic quotation – to be ascribable to Didymos⁴⁸². This cannot be excluded, especially in the light of his frequent use of historiographic and antiquarian material⁴⁸³. Aristotle's fragment has been alternatively interpreted either as proof of the philosopher's dealing not only with chronological matters, but also with the *kōmōdoumenoi* (in this case with the dithyrambographer and with Myrrhine's husband Kinesias in *Lysistrata*, see Meineke 1838, 229) or as evidence that there were actually two authors named Kinesias and that Stagirite did not use demotics to distinguish between namesakes that he found in his

⁴⁷⁸ On Didymos' general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and frr. 237, 245, 246, 247, 257, 259, 266, 268.

⁴⁷⁹ See Meineke 1839, 229.

⁴⁸⁰ τὸν Πάμφιλον μὲν Καλλίστρατος (see Schmidt 1848, 327 n. 53) καὶ Εὐφρόνιος (fr. 102 Strecker) τραγυδιῶν ποιητὴν φασὶ καὶ διδάξει “Ἡρακλείδας”. τὰ δὲ “λίαν ἐπιτετηδευμένα ὑπομνήματα” διστάζει πότερον τραγυκὸς ποιητὴς ἢ ζωγράφος, ὃν καθηγῆσαι φασὶν Ἀπελλοῦ. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς διδασκαλίαις πρὸ τούτων τῶν χρόνων Πάμφιλος οὐδεὶς φέρεται τραγυκός.

⁴⁸¹ τετραλογία φέρουσι τὴν Ὀρεστίαν αἱ διδασκαλία: “Ἀγαμέμνονα”, “Χοηφόρους”, “Εὐμενίδας”, “Πρωτέα” σατυρικόν. Ἀρίσταρχος (fr. 20 Muzzolon) καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος τριλογία λέγουσι, χωρὶς τῶν σατυρικῶν. On Apollonios, see Montanari 1996a.

⁴⁸² See also Muzzolon 2005, 100 n. 100. The same conclusion with regard to Kallistratos and Euphronios in the *scholium* to *Pl.* 385 is implied by Boudreaux's statement that «de Callistratos [...] a subsisté ce que Didyme en a bien voulu conserver» (*id.* 1919, 51).

⁴⁸³ See frr. 222, 250, 257 and 260. See also Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

archival sources⁴⁸⁴. Regardless, Aristotle's quotation was clearly used by later scholars within a much wider debate on the identification of the *kōmōdoumenos* (or *kōmōdoumenoi*) named Kinesias and mentioned by Plato (see above) as well as by Aristophanes. Plutarch's reference to Kinesias as 'paradigmatic' *kōmōdoumenos* in his ironic observation on the impossibility of enjoying reperformances of Old Comedy in his times (*Quaest. Conv.* 712A) indirectly proves how relevant this debate must have been in ancient scholarship, so as to be known also to Plutarch's erudite readers.

⁴⁸⁴ See see Jachmann 1909, 40: «ex illo scholio [...] id unum videmus eum demotica omnino omittentem ὁμώνυμους quos ipse variis demoticis distinctos invenisse additamentis qualia nunc in titulis extant [*scil. πρώτος, δεύτερος et similia*] distinxisse»; 45f.: «in universum Aristotelem eam rationem secutum esse vidimus ut quaecumque in archontis actis de musicis certaminibus Dionysiis Magnis Lenaeisque habiti reppererat integra traderet»; Pfeiffer 1968, 81.

fr. 250 (= II 14.47, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: the description of the hungry Triballian gods in Av. 1520-1522

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1521b-a-c, d Holwerda

πεινῶντες **E** ὥσπερ **ΕΓ** Ἴλλυριοὶ **ΕΓΛh**: Δίδυμος· ὥσπερ βάρβαροι. **REΓMLh** ἀνέπλασε δέ τι γένος θεῶν βαρβάρων Τριβαλλῶν ἀνώτατον, οἷον ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βάρβαρα ἔθνη πορρωτάτω καθεστήκασιν. περὶ δὲ Θράκην εἰσὶν οἱ Ἴλλυριοί. τινὲς δὲ Περσίδος φασὶν αὐτούς. οἱ γεωργεῖν μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσι γῆν, ληστεύοντες δὲ τρέφονται. **RVEΓMLh** τὸ δὲ “κεκριγότες” **REΓ** μίμησις ἐστὶν οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἦχον, ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν ἀσάφειαν τῶν βαρβαρικῶν διαλέκτων. **REΓLh**

κεκριγότες **REΓMLh**: οἷον ποιὰν φωνὴν ἀποτελοῦντες ἀπὸ λιμοῦ οἱ τριβαλλοὶ θεοί. **RVEΓLh** ἢ τὸ “κεκριγότες” **RVEΓ** εἰς τὴν ἀσάφειαν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν. **RVEΓM** κρίγη γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων τρισμὸς τοῖς ὁδοῦσι γινόμενος. **RVEΓMLh** ἀνωτέρω δὲ φησὶν αὐτούς οἰκεῖν, ὡς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀνωτέρω **RVEΓLh** οἰκοῦσι καὶ πορρωτέρω **RVEΓ** οἱ βάρβαροι. **RVEΓLh**

“(so) hungry (that they’re shrieking) like Illyrians”: Didymos: like barbarians. He invented a race of barbarian, Triballian gods (living) ‘most inland’, just like among men the barbarian peoples are set the furthest away. The Illyrians are around Thrace. Some say that they are from Persia. They do not have land to cultivate, but they support themselves through raids. The “shrieking” is an imitation not of the sound but of the inarticulacy of the barbarian languages.

“(they’re) shrieking”: in the sense of “the Triballian gods are producing a certain sound out of hunger”. Or “shrieking” in reference to the obscurity of their language. For the *krigē* is the shrill sound coming from the teeth of the dying. He says that they live higher up like the barbarians live inland and further away from the Greeks.

Aristoph. Av. 1520-1522 οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι θεοὶ / πεινῶντες ὥσπερ Ἴλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες / ἐπιστρατεύσειν φάσ’ ἄνωθεν τῷ Δί.

Hesych. κ 4137 C. κρίζαι· ἠχῆσαι, φωνῆσαι | [**Zon.**] **1103,14-17** Ἴλλυριοί. βάρβαροι. Θρακικοί. οἴμαι δὲ, τοὺς Βουλγάρους λέγει. Ἀριστοφάνης· “Ἴλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες”. ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιὰν φωνὴν ἀποτελοῦντες, **1195,2-4** κεκριγότες. μηδὲν διασαφρύντες. κριγμὸς γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων τρισμὸς τοῖς ὁδοῦσι γινόμενος, **1258,17-21 T.** κρίκε. συνεσχέθη. ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐψόφησεν, ἤχησεν, ποιὸν ἦχον ἀπετέλεσεν. ἀπὸ τοῦ θέματος τοῦ κρίζω. καὶ κριγὴ ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα, οἷον· “κριγὴ δὲ νεκρῶν ἄγγελός τε καὶ κήρυξ” | **Suda ι 327 A.** (~ κ **1267, 2415 A.**) Ἴλλυριοί: βάρβαροι Θρακικοί, οἱ δὲ Περσίδος αὐτούς φασιν. καὶ φησιν Ἀριστοφάνης· “Ἴλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες”. ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιὰν φωνὴν ἀποτελοῦντες. κεκριγότες οὖν διὰ τὴν ἀσάφειαν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν. κρίγη γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων τρισμὸς τοῖς ὁδοῦσι γινόμενος | **schol. D II. 16.470 (Z)** κρίκε. ἐψόφησεν, ἤχησεν, ποιὸν ἦχον ἀπετέλεσεν, **schol. ex. II. 16.470a (bT)** κρίκε: καὶ „κρίγε“ καὶ „τρίγε“. πάντα δὲ τῶν κατὰ μίμησιν. γραφικῶς δὲ ἔδειξε τὸν μὲν παρήγορον κείμενον, τὰς δὲ ἡνίας συγκεχυμένας, τοὺς δὲ ἵππους διεστηκότας, τὸν δὲ ζυγὸν ἠχοῦντα τῇ ἴπαρτρέψει, **b (T)** <κρίκε:> ἠχῆσαι ἐποίησεν | **Et. M. 538,51-539,10 G.** (= **Et. Gud. 347,21-36 de St.**) κρίκε: ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ “κρίκε δὲ ζυγόν” μιμητικῶς ἐστὶν εἰρημένον. ἐφ’ οὗ τινὲς οὐ προσεσχηκότες τῇ μιμῆσει τῆς φωνῆς ἠπόρησαν, ὡς Ἡρωδιανὸς φησι, πῶς ἀπὸ θέματος τοῦ κρίζω ὦν ὁ δευτέρος ἀόριστος, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ γ ἐστίν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ δ, ὡς τὸ φράζω ἔφραδον, καὶ στίζω ἔστιγον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ κ. ὅτι δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ κρίζω θέμα, δηλὸν ἐκ τῶν κινήματων· ὁ γὰρ ποιητὴς φησι κεκριγῖται (**Od. 24.9**)· καὶ ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα κριγὴ, ὡς παρὰ Ἰππώνακτι (fr. 54 W.², 57 D.) “κριγὴ δὲ νεκρῶν ἄγγελός τε καὶ κήρυξ”. σχηματίζει δὲ τὸ κρίζω ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς (III/2 803 Lentz) οὕτως· ἔστι μονοσύλλαβον κρῶ, ἀφ’

οὐ τὸ κράζω, καὶ κρώζω· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ κράζω γίνεται κρίζω, ὡς στάζω στίζω, σεβάζω σεβίζω. τούτου δὲ τοῦ κρίζω ἡμαρτημένον ἀόριστον παραλαμβάνεται τὸ κρίκε· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ φαμέν αὐτὸν ἡμαρτηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ πεποιθῆσθαι. οὕτω Ζηνόδοτος. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐψόφησεν, ἤχησε, ποιὸν ἤχον ἀπετέλεσε | **Eust. II. 1350,13 (= IV 904 V.)** κρίζειν, οὐ ἢ χρήσις παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ (fr. 472 K.-A.), οἷον “ἀλλὰ καὶ χαματύπη / κρίζει τις”, ὃ ἐστὶ ποιὸν τινα ἤχον ἀποτελεῖ.

1 τι RVELh, τὸ Γ, om. M | γένος cett., om. M | **2** θεῶν hic cett., post βαρβάρων V | ἀνώτατον cett., ἀνώτερον Γ | τῶν cett., om. Lh | **3** καθεστήκασιν cett., καθέστηκεν M | περὶ δὲ Θράκην εἰσὶν οἱ Ἰλλυριοὶ EΓLh, περὶ Θράκην δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ Ἰλλυριοὶ RV, οἱ Ἰλλυριοὶ δὲ εἰσι περὶ Θράκην M | **4-5** μίμησις–διαλέκτων hic cett., post θεοὶ Lh | **6** οἷον cett., ἀντὶ τοῦ ΓLh | ποιᾶν cett., οἷαν (ex οἷον) Γ | post ἀπὸ, τοῦ Lh | οἱ cett., om. Γ | **6-7** τὸ “κεκρυγότες” cett., om. Γ | **7** εἰς cett., διὰ M | **8** τρισμὸς cett., τρισμὸς Lh | γινόμενος cett., γενόμενος Γ | αὐτοὺς οἰκεῖν cett., οἰκεῖν αὐτοὺς V | **9** πορρωτέρω RVEΓ², πόρρω Γ | οἱ ELh, om. RVΓ

Lines 1494-1551 host Prometheus’ secret visit to Peisetairos, with which the Titan anticipates the upcoming embassy of the Olympian gods. Prometheus describes how the foundation of Nephelokokkygia has brought to the cessation of all traditional sacrifices, thus forcing the gods to fast (1515-1520). The Olympians, however, are not the only ones suffering: the barbarian gods are also affected. Their situation is described by Prometheus at ll. 1520-1522. The passage presents some linguistic difficulties: firstly, the comparison ὡσπερ Ἰλλυριοὶ (“like Illyrians”), placed between πεινῶντες (“hungry”) and κεκρυγότες (“shrieking”) with no clear syntactic link to either of the two verbs (thus allowing for more than one interpretation⁴⁸⁵). Secondly, the rare verb κρίζω (“to shriek”, “to creak”) only attested three other times, in the *Iliad*, in Strattis and in Menander⁴⁸⁶. Thirdly, the description of the barbarian gods in the act of marching against Zeus ἄνωθεν, “from the hinterland”.

The annotation consists of two scholia that are transmitted as separate items in **RV** (hence printed as such in the present edition) and joined in the remaining manuscripts⁴⁸⁷. The two scholia do not fully overlap in content. The first, which is preserved in its entirety only by **E**, deals (1) with the comparison ὡσπερ Ἰλλυριοί, (2) with the adverb ἄνωθεν and (3) with verb κεκρυγότες, and derives, to some extent, from Didymos’ commentary (see below). The second scholium (probably a later reworking of the material of the first) focuses only on κεκρυγότες (but adds a lexicographic note on the substantive κριγή, originally pertaining to the exegesis of Hipponax⁴⁸⁸, absent in the first) and ἄνωθεν, without mentioning the comparison with the Illyrians.

ἀνέπλασε δέ τι γένος θεῶν βαρβάρων Τριβαλλῶν: the verb (ἀνα)πλάττω belongs to the scholiastic jargon and is typically used to signal alternative versions of a well-established myth, versions considered by the

⁴⁸⁵ *i.e.* “hungry like Illyrians, and shrieking”, “hungry, and shrieking like Illyrians”, “shrieking like hungry Illyrians” and “hungry like shrieking Illyrians” (see *e.g.* Sommerstein 1987, 297; Dunbar 1995, 700f.).

⁴⁸⁶ *Il.* 16.470 κρίκε δὲ ζυγόν (“the yoke creaked”); *Stratt.* fr. 49 K.-A. ξυνιέτ’ οὐδέν, πᾶσα Θηβαίων πόλις, / οὐδέν ποτ’ ἄλλ’ οἱ πρῶτα μὲν τὴν σηπίαν / ὀπιθοτύλαν, ὡς λέγουσ’, ὀνομάζετε / ... τὸ γελᾶν δὲ κριδδέμεν (“you, the entire city of Thebes, understand nothing, nothing at all. For – as they say – you call the cuttlefish a “rear-squiter” [...] and instead of “to laugh” you say “to shriek”); *Men.* fr. 472 K.-A. ἀλλὰ καὶ χαματύπη / κρίζει τις (“but a harlot shrieks as well”).

⁴⁸⁷ *Suda* ι 327 A. is composed of the section on the provenance of the Illyrians, followed by the first part of the second scholium.

⁴⁸⁸ The gloss κριγή γὰρ ὁ τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων τρισμὸς τοῖς ὁδοῦσι γινόμενος (see also [Zon.] 1253,21 T.), along with *Et. M.* 539,1f. G. (ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα κριγή, ὡς παρ’ Ἰππώνακτι, οἷον, “κριγή δὲ νεκρῶν ἄγγελός τε καὶ κῆρυξ” [fr. 54 W.², 57 Degani]) and Hesych. κ 4094 C. (κριγή· ἢ γλαῦξ. οἱ <δὲ> δαίμονες, εἶδωλα), suggests that there was an ancient confusion between κριγή (“owl”) and κριγή (“gnashing of teeth”). See *e.g.* Degani 1984, 257f.

ancient grammarians to have been invented by the poet (see Nünlist 2009, 174-184)⁴⁸⁹. However, *πλάττω* and its derivatives occur often in scholia dealing also with made-up names⁴⁹⁰, places⁴⁹¹ and characters, as in this case. The Triballians – a Balkan people «perhaps distinct from Illyrians and Thracians»⁴⁹² but frequently associated with either of the two in ancient sources⁴⁹³ – are mentioned also in Didymos’ papyrus commentary on Demosthenes (*P. Berol.* 9780)⁴⁹⁴. While commenting on speech 11 (the spurious *Answer to Philip’s Letter*), the grammarian discusses the reference to Philip’s wounds⁴⁹⁵ by relating three episodes where the Macedonian king was injured in battle (coll. 12.43-13.7), the last of which happened in a skirmish against the Triballians⁴⁹⁶. Thanks to the only other extant source on the matter, *i.e.* Justinus’ epitome of Pompeios Trogos’ *Philippika*, it is possible to locate the episode in 399 BCE, during Philip’s return from a successful expedition in Scythia: the Triballians had stopped the march and expected to be given part of the booty to let the Macedonian army pass through their land. The resulting battle ended with Philip’s right leg being wounded, the rest of the army being dispersed and the booty being taken away by the Triballians⁴⁹⁷.

περὶ δὲ Θράκην εἰσὶν οἱ Ἰλλυριοί. τινὲς δὲ Περσίδος φασὶν αὐτούς: the indication “around Thrace” seems rather generic when compared to Appian’s description of the Illyrians’ territory (*Ill.* 1.1f.): Ἰλλυριοὺς Ἑλληνας ἡγοῦνται τοὺς ὑπὲρ τε Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θράκην ἀπὸ Χαόνων καὶ Θεσπρωτῶν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Ἰστρον. καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐστὶ τῆς χώρας τὸ μῆκος, εὖρος δ’ ἐκ Μακεδόνων τε καὶ Θρακῶν τῶν ὀρείων ἐπὶ Παίονας καὶ τὸν Ἴόνιον καὶ τὰ πρόποδα τῶν Ἄλπεων⁴⁹⁸. However, the Illyrians are simply located “in Thrace” by other authors as well, see *e.g.* Arr. *An.* 1.4 ἅμα δὲ τῷ ἦρι ἐλαύνειν (*scil.* Ἀλέξανδρον) ἐπὶ Θράκης, ἐς Τριβαλλοὺς καὶ Ἰλλυριοὺς. The opinion of “some” who located the Illyrians in Persian territory does not have parallels in the preserved

⁴⁸⁹ See *e.g. schol.* Ariston. *Il.* 1.59c (A) <παλιμπλαγθέντας> πρὸς τὴν τῶν νεωτέρων ἱστορίαν, ὅτι ἐντεῦθεν τὴν κατὰ Μυσίαν ἱστορίαν ἐπλασαν, *schol. ex. Il.* 6.142b (T) οἱ δὲ πλάττονται λέγοντες ὡς Πηλεὺς μὲν παρὰ Χείρωνος ἔμαθε τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτῆς, Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ παρὰ Πηλεῶς, ὁ δὲ οὐδένα ἐδίδαξεν. On the concept of poetical invention (and, specifically, on *πλάσμα* and *πλάττω*) in Homeric scholarship, see also Bouchard 2016, 272-289.

⁴⁹⁰ See *e.g. schol.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 612 Wilson Πρινίδης: ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου ἐπλασεν ὄνομα, ἐπειδὴ οἱ Ἀχαρνεῖς ἀνθρακεῖς. ἡ δὲ πρίνος ἐπιτήδειον ξύλον εἰς ἀνθρακας, *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 65a Holwerda Ὑποδεδιῶς ἔγωγε: ὄνομα ἐπλασεν ὀρνέου Ὑποδεδιῶς, *schol.* Aristoph. *V.* 185b Koster ἀπὸ Δρασιππίδου: πέπλακε(ν) ἵ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποδρᾶσαι.

⁴⁹¹ See *e.g. schol.* Hom. *Od.* 2.154g καὶ πόλιν αὐτῶν] πόλιν πλάττει ἰδίαν τοῖς αἰετοῖς ὁ Ὀμηρος. εἶποι δ’ ἂν τις “καὶ πόλιν αὐτῶν” τὰς τῶν ὀρῶν κορυφάς, *schol.* Aeschyl. *Pers.* 34 Σουσισκάνης] τινὲς διαιοῦσι Σουσισκάνης καὶ Πηγᾶς καὶ Ταγῶν. τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα πέπλακε καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν Αἰγυπτιακά.

⁴⁹² Stylianos 1998, 310.

⁴⁹³ Strabon considers them ἔθνος Θρακικόν (7.3.13), while they are defined ἔθνος Ἰλλυρικόν in St. Byz. τ 181 B.-N.H. See Papazoglu 1978, 9-86; Cabanes 2002.

⁴⁹⁴ The commentary covers speeches 9, 10, 11 and 13. On the ascription to Didymos in the subscript, see Diels-Schubart 1904a, XVIII; 1904b, VI f.; Pearson-Stephens 1983, III-XIV; Gibson 2002, 53f.; Harding 2006, 13-20; Luzzatto 2011. See also the Introduction § 2.

⁴⁹⁵ D. 11.21f. ἀλλ’ ἐννοεῖσθ’ ὡς αἰσχρόν ἐστι ... τὸν μὲν ἐκ Μακεδονίας ὀρμώμενον οὕτως εἶναι φιλοκίνδυνον ὥσθ’ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μείζω ποιῆσαι τὴν ἀρχὴν κατατετρῶσθαι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα τοῖς πολεμίοις μαχόμενον (“Reflect, rather, how terrible it is that [...] a man coming out of Macedonia is so fond of danger that, in order to extend his power, he is wounded in battle in every part of his body”).

⁴⁹⁶ Col. 13.3-7 τ[ρ]ίτον τραῦμα λ[α]μβάνει κατὰ τὴν εἰς Τριβάλλους ἐμβολήν, τὴν σάρισάν τινος τῶν δικομ(έν)ων εἰς τὸν δ(ε)ξιὸν αὐτοῦ μηρὸν ὠσαμ(έν)ου κ(αι) χωλώσαντος αὐτόν.

⁴⁹⁷ Iust. 9.3.1-3 *sed revertenti ab Scythia Triballi Philippo occurrunt; negant se transitum daturus, ni portionem praedae accipiant. Hinc iurgium et mox proelium; in quo ita in femore vulneratus est Philippus, ut per corpus eius equus interficeretur. Cum omnes occisum putarent, praeda amissa est.*

⁴⁹⁸ «The Greeks identify as Illyrians the people who live to the north of Macedonia and Thrace, between Chaonia and Thesprotia and the river Ister. That is the length of the country, and in breadth it stretches from the mountains of Macedonia and Thrace to Paeonia and the Ionian sea, and the foothills of the Alps» (transl. McGing 2019, 303).

literature but might have stemmed from the generalizing tendency to name (and consider) all non-Greek peoples as βάρβαροι (just as in the opening of the scholium, Δίδυμος· ὥσπερ βάρβαροι)⁴⁹⁹.

οἱ γεωργεῖν μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσι γῆν, ληστεύοντες δὲ τρέφονται: the focus on the Illyrians' raiding activities as primary means of sustenance (as a result of their lack of arable land)⁵⁰⁰ shows that Didymos linked ὥσπερ Ἰλλυριοί with πεινῶντες ("hungry like Illyrians"), rather than with κεκριγότες. Though apparently autoschediastic, the statement ληστεύοντες δὲ τρέφονται is consistent with the narrative on the Triballians in the commentary to D. 11 (see above), provided that the grammarian identified the Triballians as an Illyrian tribe (see St. Byz. τ 181 B.-N.H. ἔθνος Ἰλλυρικόν). If this is the case, further support would come from Diod. 15.36.1, which reports an episode of plundering by the Triballians σιτοδεία πιεζόμενοι ("suffering from famine") against the city of Abdera in 376-375 BCE. This piece of information probably goes back to the Sicilian historian Ephoros (4th cent. BCE)⁵⁰¹, Diodoros' main source for books 11-15 of his *Bibliothēkē*⁵⁰². It cannot be excluded that the grammarian's reference to the Illyrians'/Triballians' ληστεύειν also derived from Ephoros. It is a fact that Didymos used Ephoros in his commentary to Pindar's *Paean*s⁵⁰³. Actually, knowledge and use of Ephoros' work by Didymos is not surprising, not only in the light of the grammarian's frequent use of historians in his exegesis⁵⁰⁴, but also because Ephoros was part of the Alexandrian canon⁵⁰⁵. Given Thucydides' description (4.126.5) of the Illyrians as πλήθει ὄψεως δεινοὶ καὶ βοῆς μεγέθει ἀφόρητοι ("dreadful in appearance for their number and intolerable for the loudness of their cry"), it is probably the idea of the 'shrieking savage' rather than the one of the 'hungry barbarian' that underlies Av. 1521, although an intentional ἀπὸ κοινοῦ cannot be excluded.

τὸ δὲ “κεκριγότες” μίμησις ἐστὶν οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἦχον, ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν ἀσάφειαν κτλ: in this (possibly, but not surely, Didymeian) section, the interpretation “to make noise” preserved by a D-scholion to *Il.* 16.470 (κρίκει. ἐσόφησεν, ἤχησεν, ποιὸν ἦχον ἀπετέλεσεν) and going back to Zenodotos (see *Et. M.* 539,9f.) is rejected in favour of an alleged reference to “the inarticulacy of the barbarian languages”. The two interpretations are

⁴⁹⁹ «The Persians, Illyrians and Enchelei were always named with the same word by the Greeks: βάρβαροι» (Matijašić 2011, 304). On the Illyrians in ancient ethnographic discourse, see Wilkes 1996, 91-104; Dzino 2008, 2014; Matijašić 2011.

⁵⁰⁰ See App. *Ill.* 7, BC 5.14.145; Wilkes 1996, 168.

⁵⁰¹ See Stylianos 1998, 310.

⁵⁰² The relationship between Diodoros and Ephoros has been thoroughly investigated by modern critics and the widely accepted view is that the historian of Cyme was the almost exclusive source for Books 11-15 of *Bibliothēkē* (see e.g. Stylianos 1998, 48f.). Parmeggiani (2010, 349-394) offers the most updated and detailed discussion of the topic, with some significant revisions of the traditional perspective.

⁵⁰³ See Her.Phil. 91 Palmieri (~ Amm. *Diff.* 231 N.) θηβαῖοι καὶ Θηβαγενεῖς διαφέρει. Δίδυμος (fr. 172a-b C.-Pr.) ἐν Ὑπομνήματι τῶν παλαιῶν Πινδάρου φησὶν (fr. 66 S.-M.): “καὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀπὸ <τούτου> Θηβαγενεῖς πέμπουσι τῶν χρυσέων εἰς Ἰσμήνιον πρῶτον. τίς δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν Θηβαγενῶν πρὸς Θηβαίους, Ἐφορός φησιν οὕτως (*FGrHist* 70 F 21): ‘οὗτοι μὲν οὖν συνετάχθησαν εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν, τοὺς δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὁμόρους προσοικοῦντας ἰδίᾳ Θηβαῖοι προσηγάγοντο πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ὕστερον· οἱ ο<ὕ>ν σύμμικτοι μὲν ἦσαν πολλαχόθεν, ἐνέμοντο δὲ τὴν ὑπὸ τὸ<ν> Κιθαίων<α> χώραν καὶ τὴν ἀπεναντίον τῆς <Εὐ>βοίας· ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ μὲν σύμπαντες Θηβαγενεῖς, ὅτι προσεγένοντο τοῖς ἄλλοις Βοιωτοῖς διὰ Θηβαίων’”. See also Parmeggiani 2011, 202f.

⁵⁰⁴ See fr. 222, 257 and 260. See also Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

⁵⁰⁵ The most ancient and authoritative testimonies of a canonical selection of Greek historians (originating in Alexandria) are Cic. *De or.* 2.55-58; *Hort.* fr. 10 Sigonius, fr. 29 Straube Zimmermann; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.73-75; on which see Matijašić 2018 (in particular 18-23; 49-58).

juxtaposed as equally possible in the second scholion to *Av.* 1521, probably as a result of ‘synonymic adjustment’⁵⁰⁶ in the epitomation process.

⁵⁰⁶ On the phenomenon of ‘synonymic adjustment’ in lexis and scholia, see Tosi 2015.

fr. 251 (= II 14.48, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: rephrasing of the Triballian's utterance at *Av.* 1678f.

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1678-1681a Holwerda

καλάνι κοραυνᾶ Γ: τὴν καλὴν καὶ μεγάλην κόρην Βασίλειαν γαμεῖν. Δίδυμος οὕτως, **RVEΓ** εἰ μὴ ὀρνιθιάζει. **RVI**²

kalani korauṇā: (the Triballian gives him) the beautiful and great girl Basileia in marriage. So (says) Didymos, unless he is speaking bird-language.

Aristoph. Av. 1678f. καλάνι κόραυνα καὶ μέγαρα βασιλιναῦ / ὄρνιτο παραδίδομι.

schol. Tz. Aristoph. Av. 1678a καλάνι κοραυνᾶ] καλὴν κόρην, **b** μέγαρα βασιλιναῦ] μεγάλην βασίλισσαν.

1 κόρην cett., om. E | Βασίλειαν R, βασιλείαν VΓ, βασιλειαν E | γαμεῖν Ald, γαμεῖ codd. | Δίδυμος οὕτως cett., οὕτως Δίδυμος E | **2** ὀρνιθιάζει RV, ὀρνιθιάζειν Γ²

The Olympians' embassy travelling to Nephelokokkygia to discuss peace terms with Peisetairos is composed of Herakles, Poseidon and a representative of the Triballian gods (already mentioned at *Av.* 1529)⁵⁰⁷. Peisetairos' request to take to wife Zeus' daughter Basileia⁵⁰⁸ is accepted by Herakles but rejected by Poseidon (II. 1674-1676): the decision then rests with the Triballian, who, in his own barely intelligible Greek, states καλάνι κόραυνα καὶ μέγαρα βασιλιναῦ / ὄρνιτο παραδίδομι⁵⁰⁹.

The scholium to *Av.* 1678 consists of a rephrasing of the Triballian's reply, which is ascribed to Didymos. This is the only attempt in the scholia at deciphering the barbarian god's idiom and this is not surprising, given that the language of the two other lines previously uttered by the character (*Av.* 1615 νά, Βαισατρεῦ and 1628f. σαῦ νάκα / βακτᾶρι κροῦσα) is much less understandable. Indeed, only the first one is accompanied by a scholium, which simply describes the utterance (transmitted by the manuscripts as ναβαισατρεῦ) as ἄσημοι φωναί.

⁵⁰⁷ The embassy scene seemingly requires four speaking actors on stage at the same time, see MacDowell 1994, 331; Marshall 2013, 270.

⁵⁰⁸ See Dunbar 1995, 704. The debate on the identity of this figure is summarized by Newiger 1957, 92-103.

⁵⁰⁹ This is how the line is printed by most editors (see e.g. Bekker 1829a, 358; Dindorf 1835, 371; 1869, 103; Kock 1894, 255; Rogers 1906, 222; Dunbar 1995, 124; Henderson 2000, 240; Wilson 2007a, 424), but there have been attempts at detecting a negation either by reading Βασίλιν αὐ (= Βασίλειαν οὐ, see van Leeuwen 1902, 251) or ὄρνιτ' ὀ (= ὄρνιθι or ὄρνισι οὐ, see van Herwerden 1882, 93). Both a negative and an affirmative reply from the Triballian are dramatically possible (see Dunbar 1995, 735).

τὴν καλὴν καὶ μεγάλην κόρην Βασίλειαν: the line is glossed almost identically by Tzetzes in his commentary on *Birds* (*schol.* Tz. Aristoph. *Av.* 1678a-b), except for βασιλισσα instead of Βασίλεια.

γαμεῖν: the infinitive is only in the Aldina, while all the manuscripts have the present indicative γαμεῖ. The first can be understood as depending on an implied παραδίδωσι or παραδίδοσι αὐτῷ (“he gives the beautiful and great Basileia in marriage” or “he allows him to marry the beautiful and great Basileia”). The present γαμεῖ, in the sense of “he betroths” seems less likely.

εἰ μὴ ὀρνιθιάζει: the phrase is treated as a separate gloss by Holwerda (1991, 233), though being transmitted as part of the same scholium in **RV**. The otherwise unattested ὀρνιθιάζω can only be understood as “to speak bird-language”. The section could be ascribed either to a later commentator, opposing the grammarian’s exegesis in favour of an interpretation of the Triballian’s words as incomprehensible bird-language (see *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1615 Holwerda ναβαισατρεῦ: βαρβαρίζων συγκατατίθεται ὁ βάρβαρος θεός. αἱ γὰρ ἄσημοι φωναὶ ἀντὶ συγκαταθέσεως τίθενται), or to Didymos, doubting his own interpretation.

fr. 252 (= II 14.49, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the phrase ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες in Aristoph. Av. 1681

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1681b Holwerda

ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες **RVEΓ**: Σύμμαχος· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ τούτου νοῦς φανερός. οὐδέν τι δύναται ἴδιον τῶν χελιδόνων ἢ βάδισις, αἶ γε μηδὲ πορεία χρῶνται ὡς τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ὀρνέων, **RVEΓLh** καὶ μάλιστα τὰ μὴ πτητικά. **RVEΓ** ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος οὕτω· καταλλήλως εἶχεν, εἰ ἔλεγεν “ὡς τὰς χελιδόνας”. θέλει δὲ λέγειν· “εἰ μὴ βαδίζει πρὸς τὰς χελιδόνας”. διὸ καὶ ἐποίσει (Av. 1682) “οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι ταῖς χελιδόσι λέγει”, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτὰς βαδίζει εἰς Νεφελοκοκκυγίαν. **RVEΓLh**

“like the swallows”: Symmachos: the meaning of this line is not clear. The act of walking is not at all typical of the swallows, who do not use their feet like the other birds do, especially those who do not fly. Didymos (says) as follows: it would be appropriate if (Poseidon) said “to the swallows”. It means: “if he does not go to the swallows”. Therefore he adds “indeed, he is saying to give (her) to the swallows”, because he (*scil.* the Triballian) himself goes to them in Nephelokokkygia.

Aristoph. Av. 1680f. μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐχ οὕτως γε παραδοῦναι λέγει, / εἰ μὴ βαβάζει γ' ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες.

schol. **Aristoph. Av. 1680 Holwerda** μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐχ οὕτως γε: “μὰ τὸν Δία”, φησίν, “οὐ λέγει παραδοῦναι, ἀλλὰ βαδίζειν καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν· οὕτω δὲ αὐτὸ φησι βαρβάρως καὶ δυσφράστως, ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες”. καὶ Αἰσχύλος (fr. 50 R.) τὸ βαρβαρίζειν χελιδονίζειν φησί, καὶ Ἴων ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ (fr. 33 S.) τοὺς βαρβάρους χελιδόνας ἀρσενικῶς φησιν, ὡς Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς καθόλου φησίν (I 25,18 Lentz). τὸ δὲ “βασιλιναῦ” εἰς τὸ “βάσιν” μετέβαλεν ὁ Ποσειδῶν, παρόσον τὴν δευτέραν ἐξέτεινε.

1 ἴδιον cett., ἰδίως Γ | **2** ἢ RELh, om. VΓ | μηδὲ Bekker Dübner White Holwerda, μὴ δὲ ELh, μὲν R Rutherford, μηδὲν VΓ | πορεία cett., πορείαν Γ | **3** πτητικά statim cett., ἐ πτητικά corr. Γ | post καταλλήλως, ἄν Lh Rutherford | post εἶχεν, φησιν Lh | ὡς cett., om. Γ | τὰς cett., τοὺς E

Herakles interprets the Triballian's obscure utterance καλάνι κόραυνα καὶ μεγάλα βασιλιναῦ / ὄρνιτο παραδίδωμι (Av. 1678f.) as the god's consent to Peisetairos' request of taking Basileia to wife (1679 παραδοῦναι λέγει). Poseidon, instead, maintains that this is not what the Triballian means and exclaims (1680f.) μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐχ οὕτως γε παραδοῦναι λέγει, / εἰ μὴ βαβάζει γ' ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες (“No, by Zeus, he's not saying to hand her over! If anything, he's just twittering like the swallows”), alluding to a commonly perceived similarity between the swallow's cry and barbarian languages⁵¹⁰ and possibly even to a proverbial

⁵¹⁰ In Greek literature the swallow's call is frequently associated to an incomprehensible language, see *e.g.* Aeschyl. A. 1050-1052 ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην / ἀγνωτὰ φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη, / ἔσω φρενῶν λέγουσα πείθω νιν λόγῳ, Aristoph. Ra. 92f. ἐπιφυλλίδες ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ στωμύλιμα, / χελιδόνων μουσεῖα, 678-682 Κλεοφῶντος, ἐφ' οὗ δὴ χεῖλεσιν ἀμφιλάοις / δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται / Ὀρηκία χελιδῶν / ἐπὶ βάρβαρον ἐξομένη πέταλον. See also Arnott 2007, 48.

expression on the swallow's talkativeness⁵¹¹, reliteralised – with comic effect – in Peisetairos' response οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι ταῖς χελιδόσι λέγει (1682, “indeed, he is saying to give her to the swallows!”). The phrase βαβάζει γ' is Bentley's emendation of the paradosis βαδίζει⁵¹², almost surely a very ancient corruption, since βαδίζει was clearly the only text available to ancient Aristophanic scholars.

Their puzzlement is clearly reflected in the scholia. An anonymous attempt at making sense of Poseidon's line is in *schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1680 Holwerda, where the commentator chooses the infinitive βαδίζειν (instead of the transmitted βαδίζει), linking it to the main verb λέγει (“he is not saying to hand her over! If anything, [he is saying] to go back”) and explaining ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες as a reference to the obscurity of the Triballian's language (see above). The annotation on *Av.* 1681 is an excerpt of Symmachos' commentary, in which Didymos' interpretation was then quoted⁵¹³. While the former simply states that the expression “unless he walks like the swallows” is unclear (since the swallow walks even less than other bird species), the latter tries to understand the transmitted text.

καταλλήλως εἶχεν: within the scholiastic jargon, the adverb καταλλήλως can be used to express praise for any aspect of a poetic composition, such as a fitting simile⁵¹⁴ or an incisive description⁵¹⁵, but also to highlight grammatical accordance⁵¹⁶. A similar usage to the one found in Didymos' fragment – *i.e.* in a context of criticism, instead of praise, towards the poet – is in *schol. Soph. OC* 1119a Xenis (τὸ δὲ ἐχόμενον οὐ καταλλήλως εἶπεν· οὐ γὰρ φησιν ἀέλπτως φανέντων ἐμοὶ τῶν τέκνων μηκύνω τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ “τέκνα φανέντα, εἶτα μηκύνω τὸν λόγον”).

εἰ ἔλεγεν “ὡς τὰς χελιδόνας”: Didymos tries to make sense of the paradosis εἰ μὴ βαδίζει ὥσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες (“unless he walks like the swallows”) by suggesting an unmetrical ὡς τὰς χελιδόνας (“to the swallows”), with ὡς as local preposition, a usage found also *e.g.* in *Ach.* 65 ἐπέμψαθ' ἡμᾶς ὡς βασιλέα τὸν μέγαν (“you sent us to the Great King”) and *Pax* 103f. τί δ' ἄλλο γ' ἢ / ὡς τὸν Δί' εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; (“where else but to Zeus in heaven?”). The resulting text is then paraphrased εἰ μὴ βαδίζει πρὸς τὰς χελιδόνας.

⁵¹¹ See *Aristoph. fr.* 197 Rose, 159 Gigon μηδὲ χελιδόνας ἐν οἰκίᾳ δέχεσθαι, τουτέστι λάλους ἀνθρώπους καὶ περὶ γλῶτταν ἀκρατεῖς ὁμορφίους μὴ ποιεῖσθαι, *Thphr. Char.* 7.7 (on the λάλος, the talker) καὶ συνδικάζων δὲ κωλύσαι κρῖναι καὶ συνθεωρῶν θεάσασθαι καὶ συνδειπνῶν φαγεῖν λέγων ... ὅτι οὐκ ἂν σιωπήσειεν, οὐδ' εἰ τῶν χελιδόνων δόξειεν εἶναι λαλίστερος, *Nicostr. Com. fr.* 16 K.-A. εἰ τὸ συνεχῶς καὶ πολλὰ καὶ ταχέως λαλεῖν / ἦν τοῦ φρονεῖν παράσημον, αἱ χελιδόνες / ἐλέγοντ' ἂν ἡμῶν σωφρονέστεραι πολὺ, *Philem. fr.* 154 K.-A. ἡ μὲν χελιδὼν τὸ θέρος, ὃ γύναι, λαλεῖ, *Macar.* 5.49 λαλίστερος χελιδόνος· καί· λαλίστερος τρυγόνος. See also Diggle 2004, 275.

⁵¹² *Em. Ind.* 344. See Hesych. β 1 C. βαβάζειν· τὸ <μῆ> διηρθρωμένα λέγειν. ἐνιοὶ δὲ βοᾶν. On previous emendation attempts and on the reception of Bentley's proposal by subsequent editors, see Dunbar 1995, 736.

⁵¹³ On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with *fr.* 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 253). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

⁵¹⁴ See *schol. Aeschyl. Th.* 3b Smith σοφῶς ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ καταλλήλως τὸν ἄρχοντα τῷ κυβερνήτῃ παρεικάζει τῆς νηός.

⁵¹⁵ See *schol. ex. Il.* 6.117b (bT) ἐναργῶς ἐδήλωσε θέοντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμφιβρότης ἀσπίδος τυπτόμενον. καταλλήλως δὲ εἶπε· “τὰ σφυρὰ καὶ τὸν αὐχένα αὐτὸν ἔτυπεν ἢ ἄντυξ”.

⁵¹⁶ See *schol. Ariston. Il.* 12.159a (A) πρὸς τὴν συνήθειαν τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ὅτι καταλλήλως τῷ “βέλεα” πληθυντικῶ “ρέον” ἐπενήνοχε.

διὸ καὶ ἐποίσει οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι κτλ. the scholium does not specify which character on stage is the subject of ἐποίσει (“he adds”) or, in other words, who – according to the grammarian – is uttering Av. 1682 οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι ταῖς χελιδόσι λέγει (“indeed, he is saying to give her to the swallows!”). All manuscripts give the line to Peisetairos. However, another scholium on the same passage states “finally winning, Herakles decides that the Triballian wants to give Basileia to the birds” (*schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1679a Holwerda τὸ τελευταῖον κρατήσας ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐξ αὐτοῦ κρίνει αὐτὸν θέλειν παραδοῦναι ἡ αὐτὸν ἡ τὴν Βασίλειαν τοῖς ὄρνισιν). The phrase τὸ τελευταῖον κρατήσας suggests that this is a comment on the last line of the exchange, l. 1682, then misplaced because of the similarity between the wording of ll. 1679 (παραδοῦναι λέγει), 1680 (οὐχ οὗτός γε παραδοῦναι λέγει) and 1682 (οὐκοῦν παραδοῦναι ταῖς χελιδόσιν λέγει)⁵¹⁷. Whether Didymos too assigned l. 1682 to Herakles or rather gave it to Peisetairos, to the grammarian the scene unfolded as follows: the Triballian gives his undecipherable opinion (ll. 1678f.), Herakles interprets it as consent (1679), Poseidon protests that the Triballian “is not saying to hand her over, unless he is going to the swallows” (1680f.), Herakles (or Peisetairos) responds that the Triballian “is indeed saying to hand her over” (1682) because – Didymos explains – the Triballian is in a way ‘going to the swallows’ since he has come to Nephelokokkygia, the city of the birds (ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτὰς βαδίζει εἰς Νεφελοκοκκυγίαν).

⁵¹⁷ See Dunbar 1995, 737.

fr. 253 (= II 14.50, p. 256 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the expression ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται in Av. 1704f.

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. Av. 1705a Holwerda

ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς **REG** τέμνεται **Γ**: Σύμμαχος· πρὸς τὸ ἔθος, ὅτι <οὐ> μετὰ τῶν σπλάγχων ἔτεμνον τὴν γλῶτταν. καὶ παρ’ Ὀμήρω. οὗτος δὲ διὰ τὴν πονηρίαν τῶν δικαιολόγων φησὶν ἐκβεβλήσθαι χωρὶς τὴν γλῶτταν. Δίδυμος δέ· ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις χωρὶς ἡ γλῶσσα ἐτέμνετο, οὐ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων σπλάγχων. καὶ Ὅμηρος (*Od.* 3.331)· “ἀλλ’ ἄγε, τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας”. ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο δι’ ἄλλην αἰτίαν. οὗτος δὲ βούλεται λέγειν, ὅτι ἐξεβλήθη ἐκ τῶν σπλάγχων διὰ τοὺς ῥήτορας ἡ γλῶσσα, ἐπεὶ ταύτη τοὺς ἄλλους κακοποιούσιν. **RVEΓ** ἄλλως **VEΓ** ἀντὶ τοῦ “ὀφείλει τέμνεσθαι ἡ γλῶσσα καὶ χωρίζεσθαι τοῦ λοιποῦ σώματος.” **VEΓLh**

“the tongue is cut and set aside”: Symmachos: according to the custom, because they did <not> cut the tongue along with the entrails. Also in Homer. But he (*scil.* Aristophanes) says that the tongue is thrown away because of the baseness of the advocates. Didymos: during the sacrifices the tongue was cut separately, not along with the rest of the entrails. And Homer (says): “but come, cut the tongues”. But this happened for a different reason. He (*scil.* Aristophanes) wants to say that the tongue was thrown away from the entrails because of the orators, since they harm other people with it. Otherwise. In the sense of: “it is necessary that the tongue be cut and separated from the rest of the body”.

Aristoph. Av. 1700-1705 βάρβαροι δ’ εἰσὶν γένος, / Γοργαῖα τε καὶ Φίλιπποι. / κάπῳ τῶν Ἐγγλωττογαστό-/ρων ἐκείνων τῶν φιλίπων / πανταχοῦ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἢ / γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται.

Aristoph. Pax 1060 ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται | *schol.* **Aristoph. Pac. 1060b Holwerda** ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται: καὶ τοῦτο παροιμακὸν ἀπὸ Ὀμήρου (*Od.* 3.331) “ἀλλ’ ἄγε τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας”, ὡς φησι Καλλίστρατος (see Schmidt 1848, 326 n. 52), **PL 1110a Chantry** (~ *schol. Tz. Aristoph. PL 1110) ἡ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι τούτων] Καλλίστρατος “τῶν θυομένων” φησὶ “τάς γλώσσας τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀπονέμεσθαι, διὸ καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν ποιεῖν τῷ Ἑρμῇ τεμνομένης αὐτάς”.*

1 οὐ suppl. Schauenburg | ἔτεμνον RG, ἔτεμον VE | post ἔτεμνον, καὶ Γ | **2** γλῶτταν EG, γλῶσσαν RV | φησὶν cett., om. R | **3** γλῶτταν E, γλῶσσαν RVΓ | ἄλλων cett., om. Γ | **4** τάμνετε RVEΓ², τάμνεται Γ | ἐγένετο cett., ἐγένετο Γ | post τοῦτο, οὐ Γ | οὗτος Schnee, οὕτω codd. | δὲ cett., καὶ Γ | **5** ἐξεβλήθη cett., ἐξεβλήθη Γ | ἐπεὶ ταύτη cett., ἐπειδὴ δι’ αὐτῆς Γ | τοὺς ἄλλους hic cett., post κακοποιούσιν Γ | **6** ἄλλως VG, εἰς τὸ αὐτό E | ἡ γλῶσσα cett., τὴν γλῶσσαν (post χωρίζεσθαι) Γ

In its last intervention before the *exodos* (1694-1705), the Chorus evokes the monstrous race of the *Englōttogastores* (“those who live on their tongue”, *i.e.* the sycophants), linking their existence to the Attic

custom of setting aside the tongue of sacrificial animals, in order to burn it at the end of the ceremony or to give it to the priest or herald⁵¹⁸.

The annotation regarding the sentence ἡ γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται is composed by a scholium consisting of two excerpts from Symmachos' and Didymos' hypomnēmata respectively (juxtaposed by a later Aristophanic reader)⁵¹⁹ and by an anonymous paraphrase introduced by ἄλλως in **VI** (εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ **E**) and preserved as an interlinear gloss in **Lh**. That Didymos' quotation was not originally embedded in his successor's commentary is clearly demonstrated by the content of the two fragments. Symmachos' interpretation presents the same elements of Didymos' one, in the same order, but in a slightly epitomised form: the reference to the sacrificial custom of cutting the tongue, the citation of *Od.* 3.331 (reduced to καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ by Symmachos) and the explanation of the different meaning given by Aristophanes to the usage. In other words, Symmachos adopted and reworked Didymos' interpretation in his own commentary and it is therefore rather implausible that he also quoted directly his predecessor⁵²⁰.

Δίδυμος δέ· ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις χωρὶς ἡ γλῶσσα ἐτέμνετο κτλ.: the custom alluded to by Aristophanes both at the end of the choral intervention in *Av.* 1704f. and in *Pax* 1060 and described by the grammarian has several epigraphical attestations spanning from the 5th century BCE to the 3rd century CE⁵²¹. Its earliest literary attestation is in the *Odyssey*, in the scene of Telemachos' visit to Pylos, where, at the end of Nestor's report of the events following the fall of Troy, the goddess Athena invites the men to "cut the tongues" of the sacrificial victims and mix the wine (3.331 ἄλλ' ἄγε, τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας, κεράσθε δὲ οἶνον) and is promptly obeyed (341 γλώσσας δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλον, ἀνιστάμενοι δ' ἐπέλειβον). The specific relevance of the tongues is also evident in the rite described in *Apoll. Rhod.* 1.516-518 (οὐδ' ἔπι δὴν μετέπειτα κερασσάμενοι Διὶ λοιβάς, / ἧ θέμις, ἐστήωτες ἐπὶ γλώσσησι χέοντο / αἰθομέναις, ὕψνου δὲ διὰ κνέφας ἐμῶνοντο). The *aition* of this custom was investigated by historians like Dieuchidas of Megara (4th century BCE) and the Attidographer Philochoros (4th-3rd century BCE), which were later quoted by an ancient scholar of Apollonios of Rhodes (see *schol.* *Apoll. Rhod.* 1.516-518c)⁵²². Similarly, the scholia on the *Odyssey* preserve a fragment from Leandros' *Milēsiaka* (4th

⁵¹⁸ The identity of the god to which this act was dedicated is discussed by Kadletz 1981. See also Robertson 1991, 31f.; Dunbar 1995, 743f. On the Chorus' 'ethnographic reports' of ll. 1470-1493, 1553-1564 and 1694-1705, see Rusten 2013.

⁵¹⁹ See also frr. 238, 243f., 247 and 249.

⁵²⁰ See Schnee 1879, 32f., 36; Schauenburg 1881, 5f. On Symmachos' exegesis of Aristophanes and its relationship with Didymos' work, see the Introduction § 5.2 (along with frr. 224; 228f.; 231; 237-239; 242-244; 247f.; 252). See also Schneider 1838, 97-99; Schmidt 1854, 289; Schnee 1879, 35-46; Schauenburg 1881, 5-33; Boudreaux 1919, 153-158; Dunbar 1995, 40f.; Montana 2003.

⁵²¹ For the full list, see Robertson 1991, 49 n. 36.

⁵²² ἡ θέμις ἐστί: Διευχίδας ἐν τοῖς Μεγαρικοῖς (*FGrHist* 485 F 10) ἱστορεῖ, ὅτι Ἀλκάθους ὁ Πέλοπος διὰ τὸν Χρυσίππου φόνον φυγαδευθεὶς ἐκ τῶν Μυκηθῶν ἤρχετο κατοικήσων εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν. ὡς δὲ περιέπεσε λέοντι λυμαινομένῳ τὰ Μέγαρα, ἐφ' ὃν καὶ ἕτεροι ἦσαν ἀπεσταλμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Μεγάρων, καταγωνίζεται τοῦτον καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν αὐτοῦ εἰς πῆραν θέμενος ἤρχετο πάλιν εἰς τὰ Μέγαρα. καὶ ἀπαγγελλόντων τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ εἰσιν οἱ κατηγωνισμένοι, προσκομίσας τὴν πῆραν ἤλεγξεν αὐτούς. Διόπερ θύσας τοῖς θεοῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ τελευταῖον τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐπέθηκεν τοῖς βωμοῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔθος τοῦτο διέμεινε Μεγαρεῦσι. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ θυσιῶν (*FGrHist* 328 F 80) φησιν, ὅτι τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦ σώματος καὶ πρωτεῦόν ἐστι. καὶ Ὀμηρος (*Od.* 3.341): 'γλώσσας δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλον'.

century BCE, seemingly quoted by the grammarian Aretades⁵²³) identifying the habit as πάτριον ἔθος Ἴόνων, as well as indirect quotations from the grammarian Apion (1st century BCE-1st century CE) and the obscure Antipatros⁵²⁴, and a reference to Plutarch (see Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 612c), all advancing explanations on the custom of cutting the tongue. Didymos was surely aware of such a wide debate, as demonstrated not only by the quotation of *Od.* 3.331 embedded in his interpretation, but also by the observation that, in the Aristophanic passage, “this happened for a different reason” (ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο δι’ ἄλλην αἰτίαν), an observation which implies the allusion to (and perhaps an originally extended treatment of) the much discussed *aition* of the sacrificial custom. In taking into account the Homeric passage (and the relating scholarly debate) Didymos was likely influenced by his predecessor Kallistratos, who referred to *Od.* 3.331 in his comments on *Pax* 1060 and *Pl.* 1110 (see above *scholl.* Aristoph. *Pac.* 1060b Holwerda, *Pl.* 1110a Chantry).

οὗτος δὲ βούλεται λέγειν, ὅτι ἐξεβλήθη κτλ. modern critics are not unanimous as to what Aristophanes actually meant when he presented the sycophants as the reason for the habit of cutting and separating the tongue from the rest of the sacrificial offerings. Some suppose a parallelism between the importance of the tongue of the victims and that of the tongue of sycophants (*i.e.* their speeches) in public life⁵²⁵. Others understand the line as a subtle, yet aggressive suggestion that the tongues of public accusers be cut just like those of sacrificed animals⁵²⁶. Some believe that both ideas are implied⁵²⁷. The comic *pointe* was probably unclear to ancient commentators as well, as Didymos’ vague explanation “because (the sycophants) damage others with their tongue” seems to suggest.

⁵²³ Cf. *schol.* *Od.* 3.332d1 Pontani τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας: ἐζήτησαν διὰ τί τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον τὰς γλώσσας. οἱ μὲν ἐνόμισαν, ὧν ἐστὶ Λεάνδρος (*FGrHist* 492 F12) ἢ Ἀρητάδης, κατὰ πατρῶον ἔθος {Ἴόνων}- ἔστι γὰρ πάτριον ἔθος Ἴόνων. On Aretades, see Ippolito 2019.

⁵²⁴ Cf. *schol.* *Od.* 3.332d1 Ἀπίων (*FGrHist* 616 F38) δὲ ὅτι κράτιστον τῶν μελῶν ἡ γλῶσσα, τὰ δὲ κράτιστα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον, d2 Pontani τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας] ... ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Ἴωνες τοῦτο ἐποίουν, ζητήσκειν ἄν τις. Ἀπίων (*FGrHist* 616 F38) δὲ ὅτι ἡ γλῶσσα κράτιστον ἐν ζώοις, τὰ δὲ κράτιστα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον. Ἀντίπατρος δὲ ὅτι χρὴ αὐτῆς φείδεσθαι πρὸς κοίτην ἰόντας. Πλούταρχος δὲ ὅτι χρὴ ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου ἐχεμυθεῖν, ὅθεν καὶ παροιμίαν λέγεσθαι “μισθὸν μνάμονα συμπόταν” (*PMG adesp.* 84, see Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 612c). Antipatros may be identifiable with Antipatros of Akanthos (*FGrHist* 56 F 1a-b) and/or with the Antipatros quoted (along with Euphronios) in *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1403b Holwerda (see Montana 2018a).

⁵²⁵ See Merry 1889, 82; Green 1894, 166; Dunbar 1995, 744. See also van Leeuwen 1902, 254, who particularly stresses the sarcastic nature of the parallelism.

⁵²⁶ See Bekker 1829d, 248; Sommerstein 1987, 309.

⁵²⁷ See Coulon 1928a, 107.

Didymi fragmenta in scholiis Ranarum servata

- R** Ravennas 429 (10th-11th century, Biblioteca Classense, Ravenna): see Martin 1882, 60-87; von Holzinger 1882; Zacher 1888, 529-543; Allen 1896; White 1914, lxxxviii-xc; Jones 1952; Mioni 1964, 363f.; Eberline 1980, 27f.; Diller 1983, 309-320; Chantry 1999, x; Orsini 2011.
- V** Venetus Marcianus gr. 474 (12th century, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venezia): see Zacher 1882; 1888, 505-528; White 1914, lxxxvi-lxxxvii; Koster 1953, 24f.; 1957, 162; 1963; Eberline 1980, 41f.; Chantry 1999, x.
- M** Ambrosianus gr. L 39 sup. (14th century, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano): see Zacher 1888, 554-556, 567-580; White 1914, xcv-xcvii; Eberline 1980, 15; Chantry 1999, x.
- E** Estensis α.U.5.10 (14th century, Biblioteca Estense universitaria, Modena): see White 1914, xciii-xcv; Eberline 1980, 17; Chantry 1999, x-xi.
- Θ** Laurentianus conv. soppr. 140 (14th century, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze): see Zacher 1888, 546-548; Eberline 1980, 11f.; Chantry 1999, xi.
- Barb** Vaticanus Barberinianus gr. 126 (14th century, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano): see Eberline 1980, 35f.; Chantry 1999, xi.
- V⁵⁷** Vaticanus gr. 57 (14th century, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano): see Eberline 1980, 29; Chantry 1999, xi.
- Rs** Reginensis graecus 147 (14th century, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano): see Eberline 1980, 39f.; Chantry 1999, xi
- G** Venetus Marcianus gr. 475 (15th century, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venezia): see Zacher 1888, 544-546; White 1914, lxxxvii-lxxxviii; Eberline 1980, 42f.; Muttini 2019, 17f.
- Ald** editio Aldina (Venetiis 1498): see Zacher 1888, 557-564; Eberline 1980, 45f.

fr. 257 (= II 14.5, p. 248 Schmidt)

Subject: the character named Phrynichos mocked at *Ra*. 13

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Ra*. 13a-b Chantry

ὄνπερ **Barb** Φρύνιχος: **MEBarb** Δίδυμός φησιν ὅτι νῦν Φρυνίχου τοῦ κωμικοῦ μέμνηται, ὡς παρ' ἕκαστα ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαις φορτικευομένου (*Phryn. test.* 8 K.-A.). ἔστι δὲ πατὴρ Εὐνομίδου. κωμωδεῖται δὲ καὶ ὡς ξένος, καὶ ἐπὶ φαυλότητι ποιημάτων, καὶ ὡς ἀλλότρια λέγων καὶ κακόμετρα. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τρεῖς Φρύνιχοι. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** Φρύνιχος δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς οὐδὲν τούτων ἐποίησεν ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις αὐτοῦ. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** εἰκὸς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολωλόσιν εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτό τι. **VEΘBarb(Ald)**

“(…none of the jokes) that Phrynichos (usually writes)”: Didymos says that now (Aristophanes) mentions the comic playwright Phrynichos as writing vulgar jokes on every occasion. His father is Eunomides. He is also ridiculed for being a foreigner, for the poor quality of his plays, for plagiarising and for writing rhythmically unpoetic verses. There are also three other Phrynichoses. Phrynichos the comic playwright did none of this in his preserved plays, but it is likely that there was something of the sort in the lost ones.

Aristoph. Ra 13-15 τί δῆτ' ἔδει με ταῦτα τὰ σκευὴ φέρειν, / εἴπερ ποιήσω μῆδὲν ὄνπερ Φρύνιχος / εἴωθε ποιεῖν; καὶ Λύκις κάμειψίας / σκευὴ φέρουσ' ἐκάστοτ' ἐν κωμωδίᾳ.

schol. Aristoph. Av. 749a-b Holwerda Φρύνιχος ἀμβροσίων: οὗτος τραγωδοποιός (*TrGF* 3 T 10g S.), ὃς ἐπὶ μελοποιίας ἐθαυμάζετο. τέσσαρες δὲ ἐγένοντο Φρύνιχοι. ὁ μὲν εἷς οὗ νῦν μνημονεύει, Πολυφράδομονος παῖς, ποιητὴς ἠδὲς ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν. ὁ ἕτερος, Χοροκλέους παῖς, ὑποκριτὴς. τρίτος, Φρύνιχος ὁ κωμικὸς, οὗ μέμνηται Ἑρμῖππος ἐν Φορμοφόροις (*fr.* 64 K.-A.) ὡς ἀλλότρια ὑποβαλλομένου ποιήματα. τέταρτος δὲ ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖος τὸ γένος ὁ στρατηγὴσας τὰ περὶ Σάμον καὶ Ἀστυόχῳ προσθέμενος, ἐπιχειρήσας δὲ τῇ τοῦ δήμου καταλύσει. περὶ ὧν ἐν τοῖς Βατράχοις (*schol. Ra*. 13a-b) ἱκανῶς εἰρήκαμεν | **Suda λ 808 A**. Λύκις: λέγεται καὶ Λύκος. κωμωδεῖται δὲ ὡς ψυχρὸς ποιητὴς. Ἀριστοφάνης: τί δῆτ' ἔδει με ταῦτα τὰ σκευὴ φέρειν, εἴπερ ποιήσω μῆδὲν ὄνπερ Φρύνιχος πεποίηκε καὶ Λύκις κάμειψίας. οὗτοι οὖν οἱ τρεῖς κωμικοὶ ὑπόψυχοι. ὁ δὲ Φρύνιχος ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαις παρ' ἕκαστα ἐφορτικεῦετο. κωμωδεῖται δὲ καὶ ὡς ξένος ἐπὶ φαυλότητι ποιημάτων καὶ ὡς ἀλλότρια λέγων καὶ ὡς κακόμετρα. ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τρεῖς Φρύνιχοι. σκευηφοροῦσ' ἐκάστοτ' ἐν κωμωδίᾳ | *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Ra. 13 Koster* ὄνπερ Φρύνιχος: Φρύνιχος ἦν πρὸ Αἰσχύλου τραγωδίας ποιητὴς ἄριστος: νῦν δὲ τὸν κωμικὸν κωμωδεῖ Φρύνιχον, καὶ Λύκιν καὶ Ἀμειψίαν, περὶ ὧν ἔφθασα προειπεῖν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Φρύνιχος οὗτος πατὴρ Εὐνομίδου, κωμωδεῖται δὲ ὡς ξένος καὶ ποιητὴς φαῦλος καὶ ὡς ἀλλότρια λέγων καὶ κακονούστατα. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι Φρύνιχοι δύο.

1 ὅτι νῦν RVEΘ, ὅτε νῦν Barb, om. M | ὡς παρ' REΘBarb, ὡσπερ VM | **2** πατὴρ cett., πρὸς Barb | **3** ante κωμωδεῖται, κατὰ Barb | pr. καὶ om. MEΘBarb Bekker | tert. καὶ hic cett., post ὡς M | quart. καὶ M Chantry, καὶ ὡς RVEΘBarb edd. cett. | **5** αὐτοῦ MΘBarb, ἑαυτοῦ VE | εἶναι EΘBarb, ἐστὶ (per comp.) V | τοιοῦτό τι EΘBarb Bekker Zacher Chantry, τὸ τοιοῦτον V, τοιοῦτόν τι Dindorf Dübner

Aristophanes' *Frogs* begin with the well-known metatheatrical repartee between Dionysos and Xanthias, with which Aristophanes attacks his rivals Phrynichos, Lykis and Ameipsias on stylistic grounds⁵²⁸, accusing them of using over and over again the trite comic device of the luggage-carrying scene with its vulgar jokes (the *vis comica* of the passage lies in the fact that the two characters are themselves performing a scene of the same kind).

Didymos' exegesis focuses on the identity of the first figure mentioned by Aristophanes, Phrynichos of Eunomides, and his namesakes mocked in comedy (Aristophanes alone attacked multiple times both the tragic playwright⁵²⁹ and the politician⁵³⁰, and many other jokes surely occurred in the lost plays of the time, see below). The main issue concerning Didymos' fragment is its length. Indeed, it is common belief⁵³¹ that the scholium on *Ra*. 13 consists of two separate comments, the first belonging to Didymos, the second to another ancient commentator questioning his exegesis. The idea of two opposed statements is already in Schmidt (1854, 248) and is reiterated by Kaibel (1889, 35), Roemer (1908, 386) and Steinhausen (1910, 22f.)⁵³², before being reaffirmed by Chantry (1999, 7⁵³³; 2001, 240; 2009, 132-135). However, this assumption is not at all self-evident, as a detailed analysis of the text can show.

Δίδυμός φησιν ὅτι ... μέμνηται: the opening sentence, which stresses Didymos' authority, consists (as in all the scholia of this kind⁵³⁴) in the identification of the satirized figure. Didymos' source was in all likelihood a *kōmōdoumenoi*-handbook, perhaps the one compiled by Ammonios', which he evidently used while discussing another mocked figure, *i.e.* Meidias in *Av*. 1297-1299 (see above *Did. fr.* 247)⁵³⁵. Unlike *κωμωδεῖται* (see below), the verb *μέμνηται* presents the mockery as «one more instance of public or private discussions about the person ridiculed» (Chronopoulos 2011, 212f.), without defining it as a speech act specific of comedy, but also without considering the lampooning statement as historically accurate.

ὡς παρ' ἕκαστα ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαις φορτικευομένου: the implicit causal clause explains the reason of Aristophanes' mockery by paraphrasing the idea expressed at *Ra*. 13-15. Among the very few occurrences of

⁵²⁸ Fritzsche (1845, 5f.) maintained that *πέζομαι* (l. 3) and *ὡς θλίβομαι* (l. 5), along with ll. 8 and 10 in their entirety were actual quotations from other comedies (either by Phrynichos and Ameipsias, or by Phrynichos alone). On the expression *μηδὲν ὄνπερ Φρύνιχος / εἴωθε ποιεῖν*, see also Baier 2002, 191f.

⁵²⁹ See Aristoph. *V*. 269, 1490; *Av*. 749; *Th*. 164; *Ra*. 910, 1299.

⁵³⁰ See Aristoph. *V*. 1302; *Ra*. 689; *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys*. 313 Hangard (below).

⁵³¹ See *e.g.* Stama 2014, 42 n. 43.

⁵³² Edmonds (1957, 452 n. 1) and Kassel-Austin (1989, 394) only note the absence of the last segment in **R**. Storey (2011, 44) prints and translates the text as a unitary annotation, while Rusten (2011, 328) segments his translation by putting the biographical information and the mention of the namesakes in brackets. See also Harvey 2000, 123 n. 75.

⁵³³ The editor (*ibid.*) remarks the alleged opposition by inserting «*contra* 13a» directly in the text, between the two sections, a type of ecdotic interference that is not infrequent in his scholia to the *Frogs* (see Montana 2017 and the Introduction § 5.2).

⁵³⁴ See *e.g. schol.* Aristoph. *Ach*. 849a Wilson Κρατῖνος: οὗτος μελῶν ποιητής. κωμωδεῖται δὲ ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ καὶ ὡς ἀσέμνως κειρόμενος.

⁵³⁵ See also *frr.* 229 and 237. On Didymos' general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and *frr.* 237, 245-247, 249, 259, 266, 268. With regard to Ammonios, see Steinhausen 1901, 6-45; White 1914, xxi; Boudreaux 1919, 75f.; Nesselrath 1990, 74-76; Dunbar 1995, 36; Bagordo 1998, 50 and 74-76; Montana 2006b; D'Alessandro 2018 and the Introduction § 3.3.

φορτικεύομαι, this is the only one⁵³⁶ that preserves the etymological meaning of the verb⁵³⁷ (from the adjective φορτικός, “vulgar”).

ἔστι δὲ πατρὸς Εὐνομίδου: this piece of biographical information cannot be found elsewhere, but there is no reason to disprove it⁵³⁸. Didymos’ source (probably a *kōmōdoumenoi*-handbook, see above) could have derived it either directly from Athenian archival material or from literary evidence (by Phrynichos himself or, much more probably, by his rival playwrights, see below).

κωμωδεῖται δὲ καί: with the phrasing κωμωδεῖται ὡς κτλ Didymos keeps the level of mockery separated from that of historic reality. In other words, he does not describe Phrynichos as foreigner and a poor poet, but highlights that he was ridiculed as such⁵³⁹. The conjunction καί introduces a list of other jokes on Phrynichos, the original context of which can be reconstructed only in one case (see below). The iteration of ὡς underlines the perceived subjectivity of the mockery, again suggesting that Didymos did not consider the accusations to be factually based. Clearly Kaibel’s definition of this list as «ein Sündenregister des Phrynichos» (1889, 35) compiled by Didymos in unjustified (see below).

ὡς ξένος: Didymos (or his source) read at least one comic passage where Phrynichos was accused of being of foreign ancestry. Aristophanes’ plays preserve several instances of allegations of foreign (almost exclusively non-Greek, therefore barbarian) origin against public Athenian figures⁵⁴⁰, suggesting that ethnicity and family descent were good subject matter for jokes, as long as there was something about the person that justified the mockery⁵⁴¹. Maybe the information on the name of Phrynichos’ father actually derived from a comic passage where the playwright’s ancestry was questioned⁵⁴².

καὶ ἐπὶ φαυλότητι ποιημάτων: φαυλότης and φαῦλος are frequently used as indicators of poor moral and technical quality in literary products⁵⁴³. The presence of κακόμετρα (see below) as last point of joke in Didymos’ list suggests that here φαυλότης generally indicates other playwrights’ criticism towards the content of Phrynichos’ poems⁵⁴⁴, rather than towards their technical features.

⁵³⁶ Because of the evident dependence of *Suda* λ 808 A. from the exegetic material accompanying *Ra*. 13, the two passages can be considered as a unitary occurrence (see Zacher 1888, 707f.).

⁵³⁷ See the remaining occurrences: *schol.* Aeschyl. *Th.* 181-186 Smith (ἐμοὶ φορτικευόμενα καὶ βᾶρος ἐτόσιον νομιζόμενα), Isaac. *Conn. Porphy.* *Typic.* 1. 228 (διὰ τὸ μὴ φορτικευθῆναι τοὺς ὑμνοδοὺς ἴσως πόνῳ τῷ μείζονι) and Theophylact. *Achrid. Ep.* 16.27 (εἰ μὴ βουλοίμεθα μάτην φορτικεύεσθαι), where the meaning is rather “to fool” or “to wear out uselessly”.

⁵³⁸ See Harvey 2000, 95.

⁵³⁹ See also fr. 237 and 266. On the different rephrasings of personal jokes in the scholia, see Chronopoulos 2011.

⁵⁴⁰ These are all analysed by MacDowell (1993, 362-370).

⁵⁴¹ See MacDowell 1993, 359, 371.

⁵⁴² Surprisingly enough, Harvey’s attempt (2000, 95-97) at drawing hypothetical conclusions on the origin and the political stance of Phrynichos’ family starting from the name of the father overlooks this section of the scholium.

⁵⁴³ See e.g. Isocr. 2.44 ἥδιον γὰρ ἂν κωμωδίας τῆς φαυλοτάτης ... ἀκούσαιεν, Plu. *De aud. poet.* 20A μουσικὴ φαύλη καὶ ἄσματα πονηρὰ ... ἀκόλαστα ποιοῦσιν ἦθη, *Apophth. Lac.* 218F Περιάνδρου δὲ τοῦ ἱατροῦ ἀξιολόγου κατὰ τέχνην ὄντος ... φαῦλα δὲ ποιήματα γράφοντος.

⁵⁴⁴ Though focused on Eupolis’ reprise of Phrynichian comic material, Aristoph. *Nu.* 553-556 (Εὐπολις μὲν τὸν Μαρικᾶν πρότιστον παρεῖλκυσε / ἐκστρέψας τοὺς ἡμετέρους Ἰππέας κακὸς κακῶς, / προσθεὶς αὐτῷ γραῦν μεθύσην τοῦ κόρδακος οὔνεχ’, ἦν / Φρύνιχος

καὶ ὡς ἀλλότρια λέγων: *schol. Av. 749b Holwerda* (Φρόνιχος ὁ κωμικός, οὗ μέμνηται Ἑρμιππος ἐν Φορμοφόροις [fr. 64 K.-A.] ὡς ἀλλότρια ὑποβαλλομένου ποιήματα) informs that the accusation of plagiarism came from the comic playwright Hermippos⁵⁴⁵. The only other occurrence of ἀλλότρια λέγειν in the meaning of “to plagiarise” is found in Polybios⁵⁴⁶.

καὶ κακόμετρα: a definition of κακόμετρα (with regard to epic hexameters) is to be found in a grammatical-rhetorical miscellanea (*codex Baroccianus 72, f. 196r.*), at the end of a section entitled τοῦ θεοῦ Τρύφωνος περὶ μέτρων⁵⁴⁷. The ascription to Tryphon⁵⁴⁸, the eminent contemporary of Didymos, was contested already by zur Jacobsmuehlen (1886, 192f., 242 and 250), who proved that the text is in fact an excerpt from a late metrical treatise falsely attributed by other manuscripts to Hephaestion (see Wendel 1939, 731). Even though any sort of theoretical definition of κακόμετρα dates most probably to the late antiquity, the use of the adjective by Plutarch⁵⁴⁹ constitutes an interesting parallel for Didymos’ fragment. In the passage, κακόμετρα introduces two quotations: the first (*TrGF adesp. 400*) is an iambic trimeter that offends against Porson’s ‘law’ (see Sandbach 1961, 293; Frazier-Sirinelli 1996, 174 n. 168), the second is an hexameter that offends against Tiedke and Meyer’s ‘law’ (see Maas 1961, 64)⁵⁵⁰. Consequently, it can be inferred that – at least in the Imperial age (and probably in Didymos’ time as well) – the word κακόμετρος was a technical term indicating verses perceived as rhythmically unpoetic (the same meaning recurs in other scholia as well⁵⁵¹).

εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τρεῖς Φρόνιχοι: the brief allusion to the existence of three namesakes can be a mark of epitomation of a longer annotation. Indeed, *schol. Aristoph. Lys. 313 Hangard* (τῶν ἐν Σάμῳ στρατηγῶν: Δίδυμος καὶ Κρατερός [*FGrHist 342 F 17*] φασὶ ταῦτα αἰνίττεσθαι εἰς Φρόνιχον τὸν Στρατωνίδου κτλ) proves

πάλαι πεποίχη, ἣν τὸ κήτος ἤσθιεν) probably conveys criticism towards Phrynichos as well. The reference to accusations of φαυλότης could also allude to this passage.

⁵⁴⁵ On the actual meaning of this imputation see Stama 2014, 43f. (with bibliography) and Comentale 2017, 275f.

⁵⁴⁶ Plb. 9.2 πολλῶν γὰρ καὶ πολλαχῶς ἐξηριθμημένων τὰ τε περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας, ἔτι δὲ συγγενείας καὶ κτίσεις, λοιπὸν ἢ τὰ ἀλλότρια δεῖ λέγειν ὡς ἴδια τὸν νῦν περὶ τούτων πραγματευόμενον. In *schol. Aristoph. Eq. 299a Jones-Wilson* (ἀλλότρια τοίνυν σοφίζη: τεχνάζει· σοφίας γὰρ ἔλεγον τὰς τέχνας. τὰ ἀλλότρια λέγεις, φησὶν) the phrase glosses ἀλλότρια ... σοφίζη, “you’re stealing someone else’s tricks”.

⁵⁴⁷ The text given by von Velsen (Trypho. fr. 135) is the one first transcribed by Dawes (1781, 441f.), which lacks the last part. The section is printed in its entirety by Consbruch (1906, 353): κακόμετρον ἔστι, ὃ κατὰ πόδα ἢ διποδίαν ἢ κατὰ περίοδον ἀπαρτίζει τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ λόγου· τὸ γὰρ καθαρὸν ἠρωικὸν ἐπικόπτειν θέλει τὴν λέξιν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῶν χωρῶν ἄνευ τῶν τομῶν. ἔστι μὲν οὖν τὰ κατὰ πόδα κακόμετρα “ὑβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε· σύ δ’ ἴσχεο πείθεο δ’ ἡμῖν” (*Il. 1.214*). κατὰ διποδίαν δὲ “ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι” (*Il. 2.484 et passim*). κατὰ περίοδον δὲ “ἐνθ’ οὐτ’ Ἴδομενεὺς τλῆ μίμνειν οὐτ’ Ἀγαμέμνων” (*Il. 8.78*). γίνεται δὲ <καὶ> κακόμετρα ὅσα ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ χώρᾳ μάλιστα σπονδεῖον ἔχει “ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ αἰγείρων ὕδατοτρεφῶν <ῆν> ἄλλος” (*Od. 17.208*). τὸ δὲ ἄριστον ἠρῶδόν ἔστιν οὕτως· ἐὰν ἔχη τὸν τρίτον δακτυλικὸν τεμνόμενον τῷ τροχαίῳ, οἷον “ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα πολύτροπον” (*Od. 1.1*).

⁵⁴⁸ On the grammarian and his works see Wendel 1939, Baumbach 2002 and Montana 2015a, 180-183; 2020, 256-259.

⁵⁴⁹ *Quaest. Conv. 747F-748A* εἰ δὲ μή, (*scil. ἢ δεῖξις ἔοικεν*) τοῖς ἄγαν πεζοῖς καὶ κακομέτροις, ὡς τὰ τοιαῦτα (*TrGF adesp. 400*)· “ἐγένοντο τοῦ μὲν Ἡρακλῆς τοῦ δ’ Ἴφικλος”, “τῆσδε πατὴρ καὶ ἀνὴρ καὶ παῖς βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἀδελφοί, / καὶ πρόγονοι. κλήζει δ’ Ἑλλάς Ὀλυμπιάδα” (*SH 1146*).

⁵⁵⁰ See also Cimadori 2007, 299s.

⁵⁵¹ See *schol. Ariston. Il. 13.172a (A)* ναῖε δὲ Πῆδαιον: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει “ὅς νάε Πῆδαιον”, ἵνα κατάλληλον τὸν λόγον κατὰ συναφῆν ποιήσῃ. ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι Ὅμηρος διακόπτει τὰς φράσεις, ἵνα μὴ μακροπερίοδος γένηται. ἄλλως τε καὶ κακόμετρον τὸ ἔπος ποιεῖ, *schol. Ariston. Il. 22.379a (A)* τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα ἐσημειοῦντο πρὸς κρίσιν ποιημάτων, ὅτι σπανίως Ὅμηρος κακομέτρος ποιεῖ, *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 288 Chantry* νῆ τὸν Δία θηρίον μέγα] γρ(άφεται) “τὸ”. κακόμετρον ἀξιοῦσιν and *schol. Aristoph. Pl. 505a Chantry* οὐκ οὐκ εἶναι φημ[ι]: κακόμετρος οὗτος, ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ ἄμετρος. ὁ δὲ νοῦς δῆλος.

that Didymos also dealt in detail at least with the politician Phrynichos, quoting from Krateros' *Collection of decrees*⁵⁵². Already Steinhausen (1910, 36) suggested that the grammarian must have originally given a more complete version of the list, with biographical notes on the several Phrynichoses and detailed references to the comic passages where each figure was satirized⁵⁵³. The idea is reinforced by the comparison with *schol. Aristoph. Av. 749a-b* Holwerda, which preserves a complete list of the four *kōmōdoumenoi* named Phrynichos (*i.e.* the tragic playwright [PA 15008; PAA 965290], the actor [PA 15007; PAA 965300; 2586 Stefanis, see also Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, 363], the comic poet [PA 15006; PAA 965270] and the general [PA 15011; PAA 965420]), which might reflect a more comprehensive Didymean discussion of the four namesakes. The anonymity of the scholium and its closing sentence (περὶ ὧν ἐν τοῖς Βατράχοις ἰκανῶς εἰρήκαμεν) show that this is in fact a direct excerpt from a hypomnēma to the *Birds*, where the commentator (Didymos himself or a later annotator⁵⁵⁴) alluded to a more complete discussion on the four Phrynichoses in a comment to a line of *Frogs*⁵⁵⁵.

Φρύνιχος δὲ ... τοιοῦτόν τι: unlike the previous section (which concentrates on Phrynichos' depiction in comedy), the second part of the scholium focuses on Phrynichos' own plays. The observation dates back to a time when at least some of Phrynichos' plays were still available (and the loss of part of his oeuvre was clearly acknowledged)⁵⁵⁶ and testifies that a comparison was carried out between the accusations made by other playwrights against Phrynichos (*i.e.* the allegations of vulgarity, plagiarism and bad versification) and his extant comedies. The result of the comparison is negative, but the scholium leaves open the possibility that the criticism was based on the lost plays. In spite of Chantry and his predecessors' opinion (see above), there is no reason to consider this last segment a 'response' against an alleged Didymean 'attack' to Phrynichos. As seen above, the wording of the scholium shows that Didymos was well aware of the literary nature of the criticism towards Phrynichos. Therefore, it is not impossible that the grammarian himself compared the data given by

⁵⁵² See Meiners 1890, 10; Steinhausen 1910, 22; Carawan 2007. For Didymos' use of historians in general see fr. 222, 250 and 260. See also Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

⁵⁵³ One of the most complete lists of this kind is in *schol. Aristoph. Pac. 348e* Holwerda ὁ Φορμίων δὲ οὗτος Ἀθηναῖος τῷ γένει, υἱὸς Ἀσωπίου ... αὐτοῦ μέμνηται ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Ἰππεῦσι (l. 562) καὶ Νεφέλαις (*immo Lys. 804*) καὶ Βαβυλωνίους (fr. 88 K.-A.), Εὐπολις Ἀστρατεύτοις (fr. 44 K.-A.). ὁ δὲ δεῦτερος ἦν κωφός· μέμνηται καὶ Στράτις (fr. 6 K.-A.). τρίτος μοιχός· Κρατῖνος Ἀταλάντη (*non apud K.-A.*). τέταρτος Κροτωνιάτης ἀρχαῖος· Κρατῖνος Τροφονίω (fr. 238 K.-A.). πέμπτος ἀρχαῖος Ἀθηναῖος μετὰ Σόλωνα ἄρξας· Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις (fr. 138 K.-A.), but see also *schol. Aristoph. Nu. 1022a* Koster τῆς Ἀντιμάχου καταπυγοσύνης· οὗτος ὡς κίναϊδος καὶ εὐμορφος καὶ θηλυμανῆς κωμωδεῖται. δεῦτερος ὁ ἐπὶ πονηρίᾳ κωμωδούμενος. τρίτος ὁ Ψακάδος λεγόμενος. τέταρτος ὁ τραπεζίτης, οὗ μέμνηται Εὐπολις ἐν Δήμοις (fr. 134 K.-A.). πέμπτος <ὁ> ἱστοριογράφος· τάχα δὲ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι τῷ εὐμόρφῳ. On the lists of namesakes in scholia on *kōmōdoumenoi*, see Steinhausen 1910, 34-39.

⁵⁵⁴ Boudreaux (1919, 95) identifies the commentator with Didymos, although the only thing that can be argued from the text is that the *interpres loquens* commented on *Frogs* before commenting on *Birds*. For this and other internal references in the scholia to Aristophanes, see *ibid.* 147-150 and Rutherford 1905, 42f.

⁵⁵⁵ *Ra. 13* is actually not the only passage where a person named Phrynichos is satirized in *Frogs*: Aristophanes also mentions the politician Phrynichos in l. 689 and the tragic playwright in ll. 910 and 1299. The indication ἐν Βατράχοις of *schol. Av. 749b* could theoretically refer to any of the four passages. Actually, the relative pronoun in περὶ ὧν might indicate generally the four Phrynichoses ("we said enough about them in *Frogs*"), but also more specifically the events concerning Phrynichos ὁ στρατηγός (in this case the reference should be to *Ra. 689*). While Boudreaux (1919, 95) reports three options (cf. *ibid.*: «13 ou 688 ou 1299»), Holwerda seems to think that the reference is to *Ra. 1299* (see *id.* 1991, 118).

⁵⁵⁶ It is impossible to date even vaguely the loss of Phrynichos' work in antiquity, all the more in the total lack of direct tradition on papyrus. See Perrone 2011 for an evaluation of the survival of ancient comedy on papyrus.

his source with the plays by Phrynichos that were available to him. Moreover, the absence of this last portion of the scholium both from **R** and from the *Suda* does not constitute sufficient proof to argue that the exegetic material accompanying *Ra.* 13 comes from two separate and opposed annotations. Indeed, the tendency of **R** to severely abridge marginal notes is commonly acknowledged⁵⁵⁷.

⁵⁵⁷ See Jones-Wilson (1969, IX) and Montana (2017, 201 n. 16).

fr. 258 (= II 14.6, p. 248 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of μη μαινιό γε in Aristoph. *Ra.* 41

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 41a-b Chantry

νή Δία, **RM** μη μαινιό γε: **RMEBarb** Δίδυμος· ἀντί τοῦ “μη μανείης”. πιθανώτερον δὲ ἀντί τοῦ “ὑπέλαβέ σε μαινέσθαι ὁ Ἡρακλῆς”. ἄλλως. μη οὔτω μανείης, ὡς ὑπολαβεῖν σε τὸν Ἡρακλέα φοβηθῆναι. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)**

“Sure! Afraid that you’d gone nuts!”: Didymos (says that this stands) for “may you not be a fool”. More plausibly (this stands) for “Herakles thought that you had gone nuts”. Otherwise. “may you not be such a fool, that you think Herakles could be afraid of you”.

Aristoph. *Ra.* 40f. Δι. ὁ παῖς. Ξα. τί ἐστίν; Δι. οὐκ ἐνεθυμήθης; Ξα. τὸ τί; / Δι. ὡς σφόδρα μ’ ἔδεισε. Ξα. νή Δία, μη μαινιό γε.

*schol. Tz. Aristoph. *Ra.* 37a Koster* παιδίον, παῖ, ἡμί, παῖ: ὁ Διόνυσος κόπτει καὶ πλήττει τὴν θύραν Ἡρακλέος καὶ καλεῖ τινὰ δοῦλον ἐξελεθεῖν Ἡρακλέα· παῖς γὰρ καὶ ὁ υἱός, κυριωτέρως δὲ ὁ δοῦλος. ἀσυντηρήτου δὲ τῆς πληγῆς γεγονυῖας Ἡρακλῆς εἰθισμένος γίγασσι πολεμεῖν καὶ κενταύροις· κενταυρικῶς τις, φησί, τὴν θύραν ἐπάταξεν ἀκόσμως. ὁ Διόνυσος δ’ ἐτι ἐστὼς ἔξω ἀκούσας τοῦδε τοῦ ῥήματός φησι τῷ Ξανθίᾳ· ὁ παῖς – ἀντί τοῦ “ὁ παῖ Ξανθία” –, ἐνεθυμήθης καὶ νενόηκας, ὡς πάνυ ἐμέ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐπτοίθη; καὶ ὁ Ξανθίας ἢ ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ φησι· σίγα, μη μαινιό, ἢ ἐφοβήθη σε, μη ἄρα μανικῶς κατάσχετος εἶ τῷ νοσήματι | *schol. rec. Aristoph. *Ra.* 41d Chantry* μη μαινιό] μήπως μανίη καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοῦτο λογίζη (τοῦτο λογιζόμενος σύ Reg)

1-3 μανείης–φοβηθῆναι codd., μανείης [...] οὔτως ὡς ὑπολαβεῖν σε τὸν Ἡρακλέα φοβηθῆναι et separatim πιθανώτερον–Ἡρακλῆς Chantry | alt. μη om. MΘBarb | μανείης codd., fort. μανῆς | alt. ἀντί τοῦ VEΘBarb, ἀντί R, ὅτι M | **2** μαινέσθαι ὁ Ἡρακλῆς: RVEΘBarb, ὁ Ἡρακλῆς μαινέσθαι M | ἄλλως VM Dindorf Dübner, ἀλλά R, ἢ οὔτως E Bekker, ἢ οὐ ΘBarb, om. Rutherford | μανείης codd., fort. μανῆς | μη οὔτω μ. RMΘBarb Dindorf Dübner Rutherford, μη μ. οὔτως E Bekker, μη οὔτως μ. V

The repartee between Dionysos and Xanthias at the beginning of *Frogs* reaches one of its wittiest points at ll. 40f. After having heard Herakles’ reaction at his knocking on the door, Dionysos (who is wearing the typically Heracleian lion skin and carrying the club⁵⁵⁸) brags about having scared him. The god’s bombastic question to Xanthias (“didn’t you notice...how very afraid he was of me?”) allows the slave to comically overturn the expectations, by substituting the object complement με with the complement clause μη μαινιό γε (“Sure! Afraid that you’d gone nuts!”).

The exegetic material transmitted by the manuscripts in relation to these lines consisted originally of two redactions, as the compilation mark ἄλλως shows. The first one compares Didymos’ somewhat unclear equivalence (μη μαινιό = μη μανείης, on which see below) with the correct interpretation of the passage

⁵⁵⁸ On the symbolic meaning of Dionysos dressing as Herakles, see Lada-Richards 1999, 164f.

(“Herakles thought that you had gone insane”). The second version carries only one interpretation, that, despite its anonymity, shows a clear connection to Didymos’ and appears to be, in fact, a longer version of the grammarian’ explanation (μη οὔτω μανείης, ὡς ὑπολαβεῖν σε τὸν Ἡρακλέα φοβηθῆναι). John Tzetzes’ lengthy paraphrase of ll. 37-41 (*schol.* Tz. Aristoph. *Ra.* 37a Koster) seems to depend on the first redaction of *schol.* *Ra.* 41, although the two interpretations are reported as equally plausible (“and Xanthias either says ‘shut up! Don’t be a fool’ blaming him, or says ‘he was afraid, that you were in the grip of madness’”).

Δίδυμος ἀντὶ τοῦ “μη μανείης”: as already underlined by Chantry (1999, 10), the first redaction of the scholium reports a severely abridged version of Didymos’ comment, which is instead preserved in a longer form (but anonymously) by the second part of the annotation (μη οὔτω μανείης, ὡς ὑπολαβεῖν σε τὸν Ἡρακλέα φοβηθῆναι). Apparently Didymos – «nulla [...] particulae γε habita ratione» (van Leeuwen 1896, 13) – misunderstood the Aristophanic passage and considered μη μαίνοιο as an independent sentence, separated from the *verbum timendi* ἔδεισε. The text of the annotation allows for two alternative readings of his interpretation. One is that Didymos considered μη μαίνοιο a negative imperative. However, as μή + optative can in no way express a prohibition in Greek, we must assume that the grammarian saw μη μαίνοιο as an unusual phrasing of a negative command. Under these circumstances, one would expect the exegesis to offer a grammatical equivalent of the aberrant expression. According to the text of the scholium, though, this grammatical equivalent was μη μανείης, again with an ungrammatical optative (this time aorist) following μή. Apparently overlooking the problem, most scholars translated μη μανείης as a negative imperative (see van Leeuwen 1896, 13: «noli ita desipere»; Roemer 1908, 371: «sei kein Narr»). However, the grammatical awkwardness could be avoided by considering μη μανείης the itacistic corruption of an original μη μανῆς: μή + aorist subjunctive is indeed a fully grammatical way to express the negative imperative⁵⁵⁹. Alternatively (2), Didymos might have given μη μαίνοιο a desiderative value (see Süß 1959, 11). This seems to be the reading underlying Rutherford’s translation of Δίδυμος: ἀντὶ τοῦ “μη μανείης”, «Didymos takes it to mean “may you not lose your wits”» (see *id.* 1896a, 286). Actually, more than any other form of μαίνομαι, the aorist optative with μή seems to have been used in κοινή-Greek exclusively with a clear desiderative meaning, and almost as an idiomatic expression, as several occurrences from the Imperial age show⁵⁶⁰. Therefore, Didymos might have intended to paraphrase the Aristophanic μη μαίνοιο with the common κοινή-phrasing.

⁵⁵⁹ See e.g. LXX *Macch.* 4.10.13 μη μανῆς καὶ σὺ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σου τὴν αὐτὴν μανίαν, ἀλλὰ πεισθεὶς τῷ βασιλεῖ σῶζε σεαυτὸν (“do not be insane, you too, like your brothers, but save yourself by obeying the king”).

⁵⁶⁰ See Luc. *Pisc.* 37 μη οὔτως μανείην ἔγωγε ὡς βλάσφημον εἰπεῖν τι ἢ σκαῖόν (“may I never be so insane as to say anything defamatory or unpleasant!”), *Phal.* 1.11 μη γὰρ οὔτω μανείην, ὡς τοιούτων ἐπιθυμῆσαι κτημάτων (“may I never be so insane as to desire such things!”), *Tox.* 25 μη οὔτω μανείην ὡς περιδεῖν σε νέον καὶ καλὸν ὄντα κόρη αἰσχρᾶ καὶ λελωβημένη συγκαταζευγνόμενον (“may I never be so insane as to watch you, who are young and handsome, marry an ugly, deform girl!”), *DDeor.* 8.3 ἐγὼ δὲ μη οὔτω μανείην ὡς τὰ χεῖλη προσενεγκεῖν τῷ μαλθακῷ τούτῳ Φρυγί οὔτως ἐκτεθηλυμένῳ (“may I never be so insane as to offer my lips to such a soft, effeminated Phrygian!”), Aelian. *NA* 9.33 καὶ οὐ τί πω, ὦ βασιλεῦ καὶ θεῶν φιλανθρωπότατε Ἀσκληπιέ, ἀβρότονον ἔγωγε ἀντικρίνω τῇ σοφίᾳ τῇ σῆ: μη μανείην ἐς τοσοῦτον (“O King Asklepios, of all gods the most benevolent to mankind, I do not compare absinthe with your ability – may I never be so insane!”).

fr. 259 (= II 14.7, p. 248 Schmidt)

Subject: the character named Molon mocked at *Ra*. 55

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Ra*. 55c-a-b Chantry

μικρός, (**Ald**) ἡλίκος **EBarb(Ald)** Μόλων: **MEBarb(Ald)** παίζει. ἔστι γὰρ μεγαλόσωμος ὁ Μόλων. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως. **V** Δίδυμός δὲ φησιν ὅτι δύο Μόλωνές εἰσιν, ὁ ὑποκριτὴς καὶ ὁ λωποδύτης· καὶ μᾶλλον τὸν λωποδύτην λέγει, ὅς ἐστι μικρὸς τὸ σῶμα. Τιμαχίδας δὲ (fr. 20 Matijašić) τὸν ὑποκριτὴν νῦν λέγεσθαί φησι Μόλωνα. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)**

“Small, the size of Molon!”: he is joking, because Molon is large-bodied. Otherwise. Didymos says that there are two Molons, the actor and the thief. And he rather refers to the thief, who is of small build. Timachidas, instead, says that he now means the actor Molon.

Aristoph. Ra. 52-55 Δι. καὶ δῆτ' ἐπὶ τῆς νεῶς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοι / τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἐξαίφνης πόθος / τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἶε σφόδρα. / *Hr.* πόθος; πόσος τις; Δι. μικρὸς, ἡλίκος Μόλων.

Dem. 19.246 ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ τὰ ἰαμβεῖ' ἐκ Φοινίκος ἐστὶν Εὐριπίδου· τοῦτο δὲ τὸ δρᾶμ' οὐδεπώποτ' οὔτε Θεόδωρος οὔτ' Ἀριστόδημος ὑπεκρίναντο, οἷς οὔτος τὰ τρίτα λέγων διετέλεσεν, ἀλλὰ Μόλων ἠγωνίζετο καὶ εἰ δὴ τις ἄλλος τῶν παλαιῶν ὑποκριτῶν | **Suda μ 1053** μικρὸς, ἡλίκος Μόλων: ἐπὶ τῶν πάντων βραχέων. δύο δὲ ἐγένοντο Μόλωνες, εἷς ὑποκριτὴς, καὶ λωποδύτης, **1203 A.** Μόλων: ὄνομα κύριον. Ἀριστοφάνης: “μικρὸς, ἡλίκος Μόλων”. ἐπὶ τῶν βραχυσωμάτων ἀνθρώπων. “πόσος πόθος; μικρὸς, ἡλίκος Μόλων”. Μόλωνες δὲ δύο, ὑποκριταὶ καὶ λωποδύται | **schol. Tz. Aristoph. Ra. 55a Koster** μικρὸς ἡλίκος Μόλων: δύο Μόλωνες ἦσαν, ὁ λωποδύτης τὸ σῶμα βραχύς, καὶ ὁ ὑποκριτὴς, περὶ οὗ φησι νῦν· ἦν γὰρ πάντως μέγας τῆ ἡλικία.

1 παίζει=Μόλων bis (hic et glossa) Barb | γὰρ VMEBarb edd., δὲ Θ (Barb s.l.) | **2** δὲ cett., om. V | **3** τὸν cett., om. Ald | λέγει cett., om. R | **3** ὅς VMEΘBarb, ὡς R | μικρὸς RVMEΘBarb edd. cett., μικρὸς E Bekker | post δὲ, καὶ V | **4** νῦν λέγεσθαί φησι V Chantry, λέγεσθαι νυνὶ R Dindorf Dübner Rutherford Süß, λέγεσθαι EΘBarb Bekker, λέγει M

Dionysos' comic representation of the ‘size’⁵⁶¹ of his longing for Euripides (*Ra*. 52-55) is based on the simile with the size of a man by the name of Molon. This is almost surely to be identified with the actor⁵⁶² who, according to Dem. 19.246, competed in the main role in Euripides' *Phoenix*⁵⁶³ and who – as the context suggests – must have been famous for being large-bodied.

⁵⁶¹ Herakles' somewhat unexpected question regarding the size of Dionysos' πόθος «is a feed for the joke about Molon» (Dover 1993, 197). See also Lada-Richards 1999, 41.

⁵⁶² 346 O'Connor; PAA 658637; 1738 Stefanis; see also Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, 343.

⁵⁶³ *TrGF* fr. 803a-818 K. The date of the play is unknown, but the reference in ll. 421-423 of Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (425 BCE) constitutes a *terminus ante quem*. Jouan and van Looy (2002, 320) suggest «la décennie 438-428, plutôt au début de la période, sans qu'on puisse préciser davantage». Fritzsche (1845, 25f.) links the joke about the actor to the reference to Euripides' *Andromeda* in l. 53, supposing that Molon might also have played a role in that tragedy, the date of which (412 BCE) is attested by several Aristophanic scholia (*schol. Aristoph. Ra*. 53a Chantry; *schol. Aristoph. Th*. 1012, 1060 Regtuit; see Jouan-van Looy 1998, 152). Though chronologically possible, the connection remains hypothetical.

As for all Aristophanic passages involving personal attacks, the manuscripts preserve some exegetic material concerning the identity of the mocked figure. In this case, the annotation begins with the correct interpretation of the joke (παίζει. ἔστι γὰρ μεγαλόσωμος ὁ Μόλων) followed by the compilation mark ἄλλως and by the quotation of Didymos' interpretation of the passage, along with that of Timachidas of Rhodes⁵⁶⁴. While the latter correctly identified the *kōmōdoumenos* with the large-bodied actor Molon, Didymos misunderstood the irony of the passage and believed that the figure lampooned was instead a short-statured thief by the same name.

Δίδυμός φησιν ὅτι δύο Μόλωνές εἰσιν: this is the typical phrasing found in the scholia that discuss *kōmōdoumenoi* by the same name⁵⁶⁵. On the interaction and overlap between studies on *kōmōdoumenoi* and on namesakes in ancient scholarship, see Steinhausen 1910, 34-39.

ὁ ὑποκριτής: Didymos could have derived the knowledge of Molon's acting profession from the passage of the speech *On the False Embassy*⁵⁶⁶ (19.246), but he might have also used other (now lost) texts from which he – and other ancient commentators, such as Timachidas – deduced not only that Molon was an actor, but also that he was a notoriously big man.

λωποδύτης: in its literal meaning, the word indicates a person «who dresses in other peoples' clothes» and therefore who steals clothes from others⁵⁶⁷. That the λωποδύται were regarded as a subcategory of petty street-criminals is made clear by several comic passages⁵⁶⁸. With regard to the clothes-stealer Molon mentioned by Didymos – in the light of similar fragments, where the information provided by the grammarian about the lampooned character(s) is more or less evidently backed by textual evidence⁵⁶⁹ – it seems highly unlikely that he 'made up' a thief by this name, solely on the base of his misunderstanding of *Ra. 55*, as assumed by most modern scholars⁵⁷⁰. Rather surprisingly, no attempt has yet been made to link Didymos' fragment to a passage

⁵⁶⁴ 2nd-1st century BCE. See Matijašić 2014, 114-118; 2020, 8-11; Coward (in preparation).

⁵⁶⁵ See e.g. *schol. Aristoph. Av. 749b* Holwerda τέσσαρες ἐγένοντο Φρόνιχοι, 1556 δύο δέ εἰσι Πείσανδροι, *schol. Aristoph. Lys. 801* Hangard δύο Μυρωνίδαί ἦσαν. On Didymos' general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 237, 245-247, 249, 257, 266, 268.

⁵⁶⁶ A speech on which he might have written a commentary (see Did. fr. 288 C.-Pr. *ap. Harp. ε* 143 K.; Braswell 2017, 70).

⁵⁶⁷ *EDG* 849; see also *GEW* 106: «wer in (fremde) Kleider fährt»; *DELG* 631 «celui qui met le manteau d'autrui». The exact description of a λωποδύτης in action is given by Euelpides in *Aristoph. Av. 492-498* (ἐμὲ τοῦτό γ' ἐρώτα. / γλαῖναν γὰρ ἀπόλεσ' ὁ μόχθηρος Φρυγίων ἐρίων διὰ τοῦτον. / εἰς δεκάτην γὰρ ποτε παιδαρίου κληθεῖς ὑπέπινον ἐν ἄστει, / κάρτι καθηῦδον, καὶ πρὶν δειπνεῖν τοὺς ἄλλους οὗτος ἄρ' ἦσεν / κὰγὼ νομίσας ὄρθρον ἐχώρουν Ἀλιμουντάδε, κάρτι προκύπτω / ἔξω τείχους καὶ λωποδύτης παῖει ροπάλω με τὸ νῶτον· κὰγὼ πίπτω μέλλω τε βοᾶν, ὁ δ' ἀπέβλισε θοιμάτιόν μου).

⁵⁶⁸ See e.g. *Aristoph. Ra. 772* (where the λωποδύται are associated with the βαλλαντιστόμοι, “cutpurses”), *Aristoph. fr. *322 K.-A. = CGFP *58* (where they follow the ἄδικοι and the κλέπται) and *Aristoph. Th. 817* (where the word serves – along with γάστριδες, βωμολόχοι ε ἀνδραποδισταί – to describe men's dishonesty). *Crat. fr. 220 K.-A.* depicts the λωποδύται as πεινῶντες. See also *schol. Aristoph. Ach. 214* Wilson; Dover 1993, 287; Dunbar 1995, 341f.; Sommerstein 1999, 223; Austin-Olson 2004, 271f.

⁵⁶⁹ See e.g. *Did. fr. 257* (above), where the original context of the four accusations against Phrynichos can in one case be reconstructed (Hermippos' *Porters*) and needs to be presupposed for the other three; *Did. fr. 268* (below), where the comment on Mammakythos, Melitides, Koroibos and Boutalion surely relies on a number literary attestations, now either completely or partially lost. See also *Did. fr. 215 C.-Pr. (Δίδυμος· ὁ Καρδοπίων ζητητέος. οὐδαμοῦ κωμωδεῖται)*, where the grammarian clearly states his lack of information on the mocked figure.

⁵⁷⁰ See e.g. van Leeuwen 1896, 16: «meras nugas praebet Didymus in scholio, parvum grassatorem nescio quem spectari contendens»; Sommerstein 1999, 161: «Didymus [...] claimed that there was another Molon, a footpad, who was small!» (author's italics).

(ll. 41-44) of the well-known papyrus commentary on Eupolis' *Taxiarchoi* (*P.Oxy.* XXXV 2740 [= Eup. *CGFP* 98 = Eup. fr. 268 K.-A.])⁵⁷¹.

[]c ἐγὼ κλάειν (40)

[]ωνι τούτου μνη-

[μονεύει] χ[αῖ] Τηλεκλεί-

[δης] ὡς λωπο-

[δύτου]

The interpretation (ll. 41-44) following the partially lost lemma]ωνι⁵⁷² clarifies that the word is actually a personal name of someone who was also mentioned by the comic playwright Telekleides (fr. 73 K.-A.) for being a λωποδύτης⁵⁷³. It would not seem far-fetched to suppose that the name partially lost in the left margin was indeed Μόλ]ωνι. The integration would fit adequately with Luppe's suggested integration of a *verbum dicendi* at the beginning of the same *lacuna*⁵⁷⁴, a proposal based on the comparison with similar phrasings such as Aristoph. *Av.* 692 (Προδίκω παρ' ἐμοῦ κλάειν εἵπητε) and *Pl.* 62 (κλάειν ἔγωγέ σοι λέγω)⁵⁷⁵. If this reconstruction is right, Didymos knew of a thief named Molon from a play by Telekleides. Actually, this would not be the only evidence of the grammarian's interest in the playwright: Didymos had taken part (along with other scholars⁵⁷⁶) in the debate on the meaning of the verb τευτάζω⁵⁷⁷, which was used by Telekleides (fr. 38 K.-A.), as well as by other playwrights⁵⁷⁸. Moreover, he is probably responsible for the transmission of Telecl. fr. 40 K.-A. in Ath. *Epit.* 2.52d, where the quotation from Telekleides corroborates his explanation of the term δρυπεεῖς⁵⁷⁹. The presence of the thief Molon both in Didymos' scholium to *Ra.* 55 and in the papyrus

⁵⁷¹ I follow the line numbering adopted by Austin 1973, 114-118 and followed by Kassel-Austin 1986, 453-458 and Trojahn 2002, 109-116. See Olson 2016, 372. These lines also correspond to Telecl. fr. 73 K.-A. (see also Bagordo 2013, 285f.). The text given here is that invariably printed since Lobel's *editio princeps* (see *id.* 1968, 53; Austin 1973, 115; Kassel-Austin 1986, 455; Trojahn 2002, 111; Olson 2016, 387), except for the fragmentary letter preceding the dative ending -vi in l. 41, for which see Benuzzi 2019a. The bold type is used to isolate the *lemma* from the commentary. Overviews on the play in Storey 2003, 246-260; Kyriakidi 2007, 24f.; Olson 2016, 366-371.

⁵⁷² Although the curved trait on the margin of the lacuna has always been interpreted as a *omicron* (see Lobel 1968, 53; Austin 1973, 115; Kassel-Austin 1986, 455; Trojahn 2002, 111; Bagordo 2013, 285; Olson 2016, 387), I have argued (Benuzzi 2019a) that the correct reading is]ωνι.

⁵⁷³ That the character referred to in Eupolis' text and the λωποδύτης of Telekleides' play were in fact the same person is implied by Storey (2003, 247), but should not be taken as self-evident.

⁵⁷⁴ See Luppe 1980, 44. The estimated space is, indeed, of 8/9 letters, see Olson 2013, 387.

⁵⁷⁵ In the same direction goes Handley's proposal [λέγων Ἴας]ωνι (*ap.* Kassel-Austin 1986, 455), that still presupposes the above mentioned misreading of the traces on the left margin. No other attempts have been made at identifying the *kōmōdoumenos*, but see Lobel's observation (*id.* 1968, 54): «the only name of a λωποδύτης I can supply is Orestes, *Av.* 712, 1490, *Ach.* 1167», reprised by Austin 1973, 115 and taken by Storey (2003, 247) as evidence for the dating of Eupolis' play (see Olson 2017). Actually, there is another overlooked λωποδύτης, *i.e.* Phaullos (see *schol.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 214 Wilson).

⁵⁷⁶ Namely, Lykophron (fr. 134 Strecker), Herakleon (p. 8 Berndt) and Artemidoros.

⁵⁷⁷ See Did. fr. 36a-c C.-Pr. (*ap.* Phot. τ 219 Th.; *Suda* τ 431 A.; *Et. M.* 755, 38-50 G.).

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. Phryn. fr. 37 K.-A.; Pl.Com. fr. 95 K.-A.; Pherecr. fr. 198 K.-A.

⁵⁷⁹ These and other less compelling instances are discussed by Montana 2018b.

commentary to Eupolis' *Taxiarchoi* is surely relevant but a tentative ascription of the commentary to the grammarian solely on this basis would be highly speculative.

καὶ μᾶλλον τὸν λοποδύτην λέγει: as rightly underlined by Sommerstein (1999, 161), the identification of Molon with the thief and not with the actor derives, at the same time, from Didymos' literal-minded approach to the Aristophanic passage – which caused him not to perceive the irony of Dionysos' answer σμικρός, ἡλίκος Μόλων – and from his knowledge, derived from other comic passages, of the actor's big size.

ὅς ἐστι μικρὸς τὸ σῶμα: in all likelihood, the piece of information regarding the short stature of the thief named Molon is autoschediastically deduced from Dionysos' misread joke. Didymos knew (see above) that Molon the actor was a big man and – by excluding that he was the mocked figure in Aristoph. *Ra.* 55 – assumed that the only other Molon he knew of (*i.e.* the λοποδύτης mentioned by Telekleides and, perhaps, by Eupolis, see above) was famously short.

fr. 260 (= II 14.8, p. 248 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of κόβαλα

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Ra.* 104b-a Chantry

ἤ μὴν **M** κόβαλά **MEBarb** γ' ἐστίν: **MBarb** ἀντὶ τοῦ **R** “κακοῦργα καὶ ἀνελεύθερα”. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)**
Δίδυμος κατεστωμυλμένα, ἀπατητικά καὶ <κοβάλους τοὺς λάλους, οἱ δὲ> κακοβούλους τοὺς κοβάλους.
VMEΘBarb(Ald)

“that’s humbug!”: instead of “malicious and mean words”. Didymos (says that it means) “things blabbed out”, “deceitful things” <and (that) *kobaloi* (are) the chatterboxes. Others (say that)> the *kobaloi* are bad advisers (*kakobouloi*).

Ar. Ra. 104 ἤ μὴν κόβαλά γ' ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ.

Suet. Περὶ βλασφημιῶν (exc. byz.) 153-156 T. κόβαλος καὶ κόπις καὶ κόβακτρος καὶ βωμολόχος καὶ βόμαξ· ὁ φλύαρος | **Harp. κ 67 K.** (~ *Lex. Rhet. Bekk*^v 272,21-23, Phot. κ 849, 851 Th., *Suda* κ 1896 A.) κοβαλεία· Δείναρχος ἐν τῇ Κατὰ Πυθέου εἰσαγγελίᾳ (or. 6 fr. 9 Conomis). κοβαλεία ἐλέγετο ἢ προσποιητὴ μετ' ἀπάτης παιδιὰ καὶ κόβαλος ὁ ταύτη χρώμενος. ἔοικε δὲ συνώνυμον τῷ βωμολόχῳ· Φιλόχορος β' Ἀθίδος (*FGrHist* 328 F 6) “οὐ γὰρ ὅσπερ ἔνιοι λέγουσι, βωμολόχον τινὰ καὶ κόβαλον γίνεσθαι νομιστέον τὸν Διόνυσον.” Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν ἡ' ζῶν ἱστορίας (*HA* 597b 23) τὸν ὄπτον φησι κόβαλον καὶ μιμητὴν ὄντα ἀντορχούμενον ἀλίσκεσθαι | **Antiatt. κ 7 V.** κόβαλος· ὁ σκιραφώδης καὶ ἀειδής. Ἀριστοφάνης Βατράχοις | **Hesych. κ 3177 C.** κόβαλος· πανοῦργος, κακοῦργος, στωμύλος, λάλος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ κομψός. ἔνιοι μάταιος, ἄλλοι κροταφιστής, ἄσωτος, τωθαστής, ἀπατεών, κακόλαλος | **Et. Gen. AB s.v. κόβαλος** (~ *Et. Gud.* 332,3-8 S., *Et. M.* 524,30f., *Suda* κ 1897 A.) κόβαλος· ὁ ληστής. ἀπὸ τῆς κοπίδος κοπιβαλὸς τις ὢν. ὄθεν καὶ τὸ κοβαλεύειν καταχρηστικῶς εἴρηται τὸ μεταφέρειν τὰ ἀλλότρια μισθοῦ κατ' ὀλίγον. ἄλλοι δὲ ὢν ἐστὶν Ὀρος (Ὡρίων B) κόβαλα λέγουσιν τὰ κατεστωμυλμένα καὶ κοβάλους τοὺς λάλους ἀπὸ τοῦ κόψαι πεποιημένης τῆς λέξεως. ὄθεν καὶ κόπιν καλοῦσιν (λαλοῦσιν A) τὸν λάλον. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κομψόν. ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δὲ καὶ δημοκόπος, ὃ κληγεσόμενον μὲν ἢ παλαίστρας ἢ ἱπικῆς οὐ δὲ ἀκαρῆ (ἀκαρεῖ A) μέλει (μέλλει B). μέλει δὲ εἰς τὰ κυβεῖα ἵνα καὶ ὀρθογυκοπεῖν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι μετὰ ἄλλων κοβάλων καὶ τὰ πατρῶα ἐξωρημένων. καὶ ἄλλως (ἄλλος A) ὢν “οὗτος οὐδ' ἂν μαθητὴς εἶναι δύναίτο τῶν κοβαλεμμάτων”, *s.v. κόπις* (= *Et. Gud.* 337,55-338,2 S.; *Et. M.* 529,25-30 G.) κόπις, σύντομος, ὁξὺς τῷ λόγῳ ἤγουν λάλος, ἔνθεν καὶ ὁ δημοκόπος καὶ κόβαλος (κόβαλλος B), καὶ κατεστωμυλημένος, κόβαλοι (τὰ κατεστωμυλμένα [sic] κόβαλα B) λέγονται· καὶ τὰς τῶν λόγων τέχνας κοπίδας ἔλεγον· “μὴ τὸν Πυθαγόραν εὔρομεν ὄντων ἀληθινῶν κοπίδων” (*FGrHist* 566 F 132, μὴ-κοπίδων om. B)· Εὐριπίδης· “πῶς (πᾶς B) πρὶν ὁ ποικιλόφρων κόπις ἠδολόγος δημοχαριστής” (*Hec.* 131) | **schol. Eur. Hec. 131** κόπις] ὁ λάλος. ὄθεν καὶ <δημοκόπος καὶ> κόβαλος, ὁ κομψός· ‘καὶ μὴν κόβαλά γ' ἐστίν ὡς καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ’. κοπίδας τε τὰς τῶν λόγων τέχνας <ἔλεγον> ἄλλοι τε καὶ ὁ Τίμαιος (*FGrHist* 566 F 132) οὕτως γράφων· ‘ὥστε καὶ φαίνεσθαι μὴ τὸν Πυθαγόραν † εὐράμενον τῶν ἀληθινῶν κοπίδων μηδὲ τὸν ὑφ' Ἡρακλείτου κατηγορούμενον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν <τὸν> Ἡράκλειτον εἶναι τὸν ἀλαζονεύμενον’ (~ *Et. Gen. s.v. κόπις* = *Et. Gud.* 337,55-338,2 S., *Et. M.* 529,25-30 G.). τὰ περίεργα γὰρ τῶν λόγων καὶ τὰ κατεστωμυλμένα κόβαλα ἔλεγον, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατράχοις ‘κόβαλά γ' ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ’ | **schol. Aristoph. Eq. 270b** ἐκκοβαλικεύεται· ληστεύει· κόβαλοι γὰρ οἱ μετὰ ξύλου λησταί· τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ κορυνηφόρους καλοῦσιν. οἱ δὲ κόβαλον τὴν μετὰ ἀπάτης παιδιάν, **270c** ἐκκοβαλικεύεται· κόβαλα γὰρ καλοῦσι τὰ ἀπατήματα καὶ πανουργεύματα. ἐκκοβαλικεύεται δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ληστεύει. κόβαλοι γὰρ οἱ λησταί· τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ κυρηφόρους καλοῦσιν. οἱ δὲ κόβαλον τὴν μετὰ ἀπάτης παιδείαν, **450 Jones-Wilson** κόβαλος εἶ· προειρηκάμεν ὅτι τοὺς μετὰ ξύλου ληστὰς οὕτως ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ | **schol. rec. Aristoph. Pl. 279f** “κόβαλόν” φησιν τὸν εἰς ἐξαπάτην χρώμενον παιδιᾷ προσποιήτῃ, **g Chantry**⁵⁸⁰ κόβαλος] ληστής, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοπίδος, “κοπιβαλός”

⁵⁸⁰ The accents on κοπίδος and on both occurrences of κόπις are given as they appear in **Pald** (no accent is visible on κοπίδας), and not as printed in Chantry’s edition, where they appear as κοπίδος, κοπίς and κοπίδας. In fact, the tradition of the several exegetic texts that deal with the Aristophanic κόβαλος and the Euripidean κόπις show confusions between κόπις (“prater”) and κοπίς (“cleaver”). For instance, the *etymologica* have ἀπὸ τῆς κοπίδος *s.v.* κόβαλος and κοπίδας *s.v.* κόπις.

τις ὦν. ἄλλοι δέ, ἀπὸ τοῦ “κόψαι”, ὄθεν καὶ “κόπις”. Εὐριπίδης: “ὁ ποικιλόφρων κόπις”. ὀξὺς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ἤγουν λάλος. ἐνθεν καὶ ὁ “δημοκόπος”. καὶ τὰς τῶν λόγων τέχνας “κόπιδας” ἔλεγον.

1 ἀντί τοῦ om. Bekker | 2 Δίδυμος VEΘ, -μα MBarb | κατεστωμυλμένα VEBarb, -εστωμυμένα Θ, -εστομωμένα M | ἀπατητικά VEΘBarb, om. M | καὶ <κοβάλους τοὺς λάλους, οἱ δὲ> κακοβούλους τοὺς κοβάλους supplevi e.g. (coll. *Et. Gen. s. vν. κόβαλος et κόπις*), καὶ κακοβούλους τοὺς κοβάλους VEΘ, καὶ κακοβούλους κοβάλους Ald edd. cett. (κοβάλλους Bekker), κοβάλλους λέγουσι τοὺς πανούργους καὶ ἀπατητικούς καὶ κακοβούλους M, καὶ κακοβούλους τοὺς κακούργους Barb, κοβάλλους λέγουσι τοὺς κακοβούλους Chantry

While voicing his contempt towards contemporary tragic playwrights and praising Euripides' poetry at the same time (*Ra.* 92-103), Dionysos encounters Herakles' disagreement. Indeed, the latter dismisses the Euripidean expressions enthusiastically quoted by the god at ll. 100-102 as κόβαλα⁵⁸¹, a word frequently used by Aristophanes (see especially *Eq.* 417f. καὶ νῆ Δί' ἄλλα γ' ἐστὶ μου κόβαλα παιδὸς ὄντος. / ἐξηπάτων γὰρ τοὺς μαγεῖρους ἀν λέγων τοιαυτί κτλ) to indicate tricks and deceptive behaviours. The adjective κόβαλος can also designate people⁵⁸², often accompanied by similar words, such as πανούργος and φέναξ/φενακίζειν⁵⁸³. The term seems to have been widespread in Old Comedy in general, for Photios (α 782 Th.) states that it occurred in a play by Pherekrates (along with the adjective ὕβριστος⁵⁸⁴), and a scholium to *Aristoph. Av.* 1297-1299 (a quotation from Ammonios' *Kōmōdoumenoi* reported by Didymos in his hypomnēma, see above fr. 247) refers to Meidias being called κόβαλος in Phrynichos' *Ephialtes*⁵⁸⁵.

The scholium on *Ra.* 104 seems to reflect at least two different exegeses. On the one hand, an anonymous explanation of κόβαλα in the semantic nuance of malice and viciousness; on the other, Didymos' interpretation of the term as indicating nonsense chatter (κατεστωμυλμένα) aimed at deceiving the listener (ἀπατητικά). The beginning of an entry from Heychios' lexicon (κ 3177 C.) might preserve traces of these two sections, in the same sequence offered by the scholium (with στώμυλος reflecting the Didymean καταστωμυλμένα, see below).

⁵⁸¹ See e.g. Kock 1898, 55: «Schelmereien»; Coulon 1928b, 90: «des jongleries»; Del Corno 1992, 21: «roba da ciarlatani»; Dover 1993, 204: «dirty tricks».

⁵⁸² The substantive/adjective κόβαλος was in all likelihood an attic term originally meaning “porter”, as numerous later papyrus-occurrences of κοβαλεύειν in the sense of “to transport” prove. See e.g. *P. Lond.* I 131 col. 13 l. 296 μισθ(ὸς) Εὐχαρίστου κοβαλεύοντο(ς) θρύα εἰς οἶκ(ον) (τετράβολον), along with *Et. Gen. s.v. κόβαλος* (and the related *etymologica* entries) κοβαλεύειν καταχρηστικῶς εἴρηται τὸ μεταφέρειν ἀλλότρια κατ' ὀλίγον (see also *Suda* κ 1895 A.). All literary occurrences of κόβαλος presuppose the semantic shift towards the contemptible “rogue”. See e.g. Grégoire 1938, 287f.; Björck 1950, 46f. and 258f.; *GEW* 889; *DELG* 550; *EDG* 727f.; Willi 2003, 233; Kanavou 2011, 64 with n. 285; Stama 2014, 71.

⁵⁸³ See *Eq.* 450 Πα. κόβαλος εἶ. Αλ. πανούργος εἶ, *Ra.* 1015 μηδ' ἀγοραίους μηδὲ κοβάλους, ὥσπερ νῦν, μηδὲ πανούργους. See also *Eq.* 331f. πανουργία τε καὶ θράσει / καὶ κοβαλικεύμασιν, 635f. “ἄγε δὴ Σκίταλοι καὶ Φένακες”, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, “Βερέσχεθοί τε καὶ Κόβαλοι καὶ Μόθων, *Pl.* 279f. διαρραγείης, ὡς μόθων εἶ καὶ φύσει κόβαλος, / ὅστις φενακίζεις, φράσαι δ' οὐπω τέτληκας ἡμῖν. Moreover, Euripides is called πανούργος at l. 80 of *Frogs* (see *Ra.* 80-83 κάλλως ὁ μὲν γ' Εὐριπίδης πανούργος ὦν / κἄν ξυναποδρᾶναι δεῦρ' ἐπιχειρήσειέ μοι / ὁ δ' εὐκόλος μὲν ἐνθάδ', εὐκόλος δ' ἐκεῖ), only a few lines above Herakles' disdainful judgement of the Euripidean elocution as κόβαλα.

⁵⁸⁴ See Pherecr. fr. 173 K.-A. ὕβριστὸν ἔργον καὶ κόβαλον εἰργάσω (ἠργάσω K.-A.).

⁵⁸⁵ See *schol.* *Aristoph. Av.* 1297-1299 Holwerda κόβαλός τε εἶναι ἐλέγετο (*scil.* ὁ Μειδίας) καὶ πτωχαλαζών, ὡς Φρύνιχος ἐν Ἐφιάλτῃ (fr. 4 K.-A.). The same material (in a more epitomized form, but still with the reference to Phrynichos' play) can be found in *schol.* *Luc. JTr* 48.18 Rabe. See also Stama 2014, 69-72.

κατεστωμυλμένα: in order to explain κόβαλα, Didymos resorts to another word found more than once in Aristophanes, the verb καταστωμύλλομαι⁵⁸⁶, and more precisely to its perfect participle, used also by Aischylos in *Frogs* to refer to Euripides⁵⁸⁷. Three more texts preserve Didymos' explanation of κόβαλα as κατεστωμυλμένα, without mentioning the grammarian's name. Two of these are entries from *etymologica s. vv.* κόβαλος and κόπις: the first (*Et. Gen. AB s.v. κόβαλος ~ Et. Gud. 332,3-8 S., Et. M. 524,30f., Suda κ 1897 A.*) originally belonged to the lost atticistic lexicon compiled by Oros⁵⁸⁸ (ἄλλοι δὲ, ὧν καὶ Ἰώρος ἐστὶ, κόβαλα λέγουσι τὰ κατεστωμυλμένα), while the second (*Et. Gen. AB s.v. κόπις = Et. Gud. 337,55-338,2 S.; Et. M. 529,25-30 G.*) does not name any source. The third occurrence of κατεστωμυλμένα as gloss for κόβαλα is in a scholium to a passage from the parodos of Euripides' *Hekabe*, where the Chorus – recounting the events leading to the decision of Polyxene's sacrifice – disdainfully refers to Odysseus as ὁ ποικιλόφρων / κόπις ἠδὺλόγος δημοχαριστῆς / Λαερτιάδης (*Eur. Hec. 131-133*). In all three texts Didymos' exegesis is quoted anonymously and in conjunction with a discussion on κόπις⁵⁸⁹, a word perceived by ancient scholars as etymologically related to κόβαλος through the verb κόπτω⁵⁹⁰. The etymologic entry *s.v. κόπις* and *schol. Eur. Hec. 131* have one further element in common, namely the reference to the usage of the plural κόπιδες to indicate rhetorical devices, corroborated by a quotation from the historian Timaios (*FGrHist 566 F 132*). The fact that, in the etymologic entry, Timaios' fragment is directly followed by *Eur. Hec. 131* is a clear sign that the entry is ultimately an excerpt from a commentary on Euripides' *Hekabe*, an excerpt that also constitutes the first part of *schol. Eur. Hec. 131*. That this scholium results in turn from the compilation of two sources is made evident by the repetition of *Ra. 104* both at the beginning and at the end of the annotation. The second part of the scholium, containing Didymos' exegesis of κόβαλα (τὰ περίεργα γὰρ τῶν λόγων καὶ τὰ κατεστωμυλμένα κόβαλα ἔλεγον, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατράχοις 'κόβαλά γ' ἐστὶν, ὡς καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ'), was probably derived by the scholiast from a lemmatised source (possibly through the *Comic Vocabulary*). However, the first part of the Euripidean scholium, with the passing reference to *Ra. 104* and the extended quotation from Timaios, might be itself ascribable to the grammarian: it has long been hypothesised that the core of the scholiastic corpus on Euripides stems from Didymean material⁵⁹¹. Moreover, the use of historians

⁵⁸⁶ See Aristoph. *Th.* 461-464 οἷα καταστωμύλατο / οὐκ ἄκαιρα, φρένας ἔχουσα / καὶ πολύπλοκον νόημι', οὐδ' ἀσύνετ', ἀλλὰ πιθανὰ πάντα.

⁵⁸⁷ See Aristoph. *Ra.* 1160f. οὐ δῆτα τοῦτό γ', ὃ καταστωμυλμένε / ἄνθρωπε, ταῦτ' ἔστ', ἀλλ' ἄριστ' ἐπῶν ἔχον. It is not surprising that half of the Aristophanic occurrences of στωμύλος, στωμύλλω, στωμύλμα and their derivatives come from *Frogs* (see ll. 92, 841, 943, 1069, 1071, 1310), where the motif of empty rhetoric plays a central role.

⁵⁸⁸ 5th century CE, see Alpers 1981, 87-101.

⁵⁸⁹ See *GEW* 915: «Schwätzer»; *EDG* 749: «prater». *DELG* 564 links the meaning «bavard» to κοπις, in direct contradiction to the textual evidence.

⁵⁹⁰ *schol. Eur. Hec. 131* does not clarify the nature of the relationship between κόπις and κόβαλος. The *etymologica* and *schol. Aristoph. Pl. 279g* Chantry give two options, an anonymous one (implying for κόβαλος the meaning of ληστής, “robber” and a rather obscure derivation ἀπὸ τῆς κόπιδος κοπίβαλός τις ὧν) and the one adopted by Oros (with κόβαλος and κόπις both meaning “chatterbox” and both coming from κόπτω. For κόπτω within the semantic field of “chatter” see Poll. 6.119f. λάλος ... κόπτων τὰ ὄσα). The second solution is clearly the only one compatible with Didymos' *interpretamentum* of κόβαλα.

⁵⁹¹ Although Didymos' name is mentioned only in the *subscriptio* to the *Medea* (*schol. Eur. Med. subscr. p. 213, 26-27* Schwartz πρὸς διάφορα ἀντίγραφα Διονυσίου ὀλοσχερὲς καὶ τινα τῶν Διδύμου), he is quoted eighteen times in the scholia. See Wilamowitz 1907, 160f.: «obwohl die Anhaltspunkte schwach sind, darf man wohl dem allgemeinen Eindruck folgen und den Grundstock der Scholien

is a distinctive feature of the grammarian's exegesis⁵⁹². In other words, *schol. Eur. Hec.* 131 might consist of an excerpt from Didymos' commentary to the *Hekabe* – in which he discussed κόπις, κόβαλος/κόβαλα (making reference to *Ra.* 104) and κόπιδες (quoting Timaios) – followed by the grammarian's same exegesis of κόβαλα, derived by the scholiast from a lexicon. It was probably from the Didymeian commentary to the *Hekabe* that Oros drew the interpretation of κόβαλα as κατεστωμυλμένα (preserved under his name in the *etymologica*), rather than from the commentary to the *Frogs*⁵⁹³.

Assuming that the discussion of κόπις, κόβαλος/κόβαλα and κόπιδες in *schol. Eur. Hec.* 131 does in fact go back to a Didymeian commentary on the play, it remains unclear whether, while commenting on *Ra.* 104, Didymos limited his explanation to the sole κόβαλα or offered a more extended discussion, similar to the one preserved in the Euripidean scholium, later lost due to epitomation. Hesychios, whose lexicon overtly relies on Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary*⁵⁹⁴, explains κόβαλος as στωμύλος, λάλος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ κομψός (κ 3177 C.), therefore pointing in the direction of a broader discussion – involving at least κόβαλος, besides κόβαλα – in Didymos' exegesis of *Ra.* 104 (see below).

ἀπατητικά: the second equivalent given by Didymos for Aristophanes' κόβαλα is ἀπατητικά, “deceitful things”. A very similar interpretation is found in *scholl. Aristoph. Eq.* 270b-c Jones-Wilson, as well as in Harpokration's explanation – derived from a commentary on Deinarchos' *Against Pytheas* – of the substantive κοβαλεία (Harp. κ 67 K.). The entry also includes a quotation from Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328 F 6) attesting the use of κόβαλος by the historian. It is tempting to see Didymos' influence in this context as well⁵⁹⁵. In this case, Harpokration might have drawn from another Didymeian discussion on the same term, but this time possibly in a commentary by the grammarian to Deinarchos⁵⁹⁶.

καὶ <κοβάλους τοὺς λάλους. οἱ δὲ> κακοβούλους κτλ: this *exempli gratia* integration is based on Hesych. κ 3177 C., *schol. Eur. Hec.* 131 and the *etymologica* entries *s. vv.* κόβαλος and κόπις discussed above. Indeed, it is reasonable to suppose that the scholium to *Ra.* 104 originally included an explanation of κόβαλος as λάλος, ascribable to Didymos. In fact, the paretymologic explanation from κακόβουλος could hardly belong to the

zu diesem Drama [*scil.* die Troerinnen], wie auch den der noch dürftigeren zur Hekabe für Didymos in Anspruch nehmen»; see also Barrett 1964, 48; Merro 2008, 37-40; Cavarzeran 2016, 6; Mastronarde 2017, 9-14.

⁵⁹² See fr. 222, 250 and 257. See also Deas 1931, 20; Braswell 2017, 113-116; Phillips 2020, 447-450 and Montana 2009a, 159-163 and (forthc.).

⁵⁹³ Oros' dependence on Didymos' commentary to the *Hekabe* is proposed by Alpers 1981, 115. The evidence put forward by the scholar consists of *Et. M.* 293,40-47 G. and *schol. Eur. Hec.* 934 Schwartz, that suggest that the lexicographer made direct use of a commentary to Euripides' *Hekabe* to explain the meaning of δωριάζειν. However, the close resemblance of this exegetic material with a quotation from Ailius Dionysios in Eust. *Il.* 975,37 (= III 606,9 V.) was rather considered by Erbse (1950, 31) as proof of Oros' dependence from the atticist grammarian for the redaction his lexicon (or for a *Hekabe*-commentary of his own, as assumed – rather audaciously – by Tuilier [1968, 98]).

⁵⁹⁴ On the relationship between Hesychios and Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary*, see fr. 227f., 241, 244, the Introduction § 5.1.

⁵⁹⁵ Another instance in Harpokration's lexicon of Didymos using Philochoros as a source for Attic language is π 62/3 K. περίστοιχον Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Νικόστρατον (53.15) περὶ τῶν Ἀρεθουσίου ἀνδραπόδων “φυτευτήρια ἐλαῶν περιστοίχων κατέκλασεν”. Δίδυμος δὲ (fr. 300a C.-Pr.) τι γένος ἐλαίων περιστοίχους καλεῖ, ἃς Φιλόχορος στοιχάδας προσηγόρευσε (*FGrHist* 328 F 180). μήποτε δὲ περιστοίχον κέκληκεν ὁ ῥήτωρ τὰς κύκλω περὶ τὸ χωρίον ἐν στοίχῳ πεφυκίας.

⁵⁹⁶ A Didymeian hypomnēma to Deinarchos is not attested, but was hypothesised by Schmidt (1854, 320) on the basis of Harp. μ 11 K. (Did. fr. 315 C.-Pr.). See Braswell 2017, 83f.

grammarian, since the meaning of “bad adviser” is somewhat distant from Didymos’ interpretation of κόβαλα as empty words “blabbed out” (κατεστωμυλμένα). It seems more likely that the grammarian equated κόβαλος to λάλος, and that a section of his exegesis went lost due to inaccurate epitomation or a *saut du même au même*.

fr. 261 (= Π 14.9, pp. 248f. Schmidt)

Subject: made-up places in *Ra*. 186-194

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra*. 186b-194bβ-186a-d-c-εβ-εα Chantry

τὸ δὲ Λήθης πεδίον: **RVM** Δίδυμός φησι· **RV** χωρίον ἐν Ἄδου διατετύπωκεν **RVME(Ald)** οὕτω λεγόμενον, ὡς καὶ “τὸν Αὐαίνου λίθον” (*Ra*. 194) ἐπλασεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦς νεκροὺς αὐαίνεσθαι καὶ ἀλίβαντας εἶναι. **VME(Ald)** ἄλλως **V** τοῦτο κηρύσσει ὁ Χάρων. ὡς τόπους δὲ καταλέγει. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου, καὶ τὸ ἀδύνατον τῶν καθ’ Ἄδου δηλοῖ. τὸ “ἦ ᾽ς ὄνου πόκας”, ἀντὶ τοῦ “ἦ εἰς ὄνου πόκας”. ἀδύνατον γὰρ πόκας ἀποκείρεσθαι τῶν ὄνων. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ παροιμιῶδες ἤδη εἶναι. **RVMEΘBarbV**⁵⁷ ὄνου δὲ πόκας τὸ ἄχρηστον. οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ τοῦ ὄνου πόκαι χρησιμεύουσιν. ἡ παροιμία δὲ λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτων. ἐν ᾧ τρόπῳ φαμέν καὶ τὸ “χύτεραν ποικίλλεις” καὶ “κόπρον ἀναθυμιάς”. ἀνήνυτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἄδου. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν “ὄνου πόκας” ἀνέπλασε ποιητικῶς. **VMEΘBarbV**⁵⁷(**Ald**)

“The Plain of Oblivion”. Didymos says: “he imagined a place in Hades by this name, just as he invented ‘Auainos’ rock”⁵⁹⁷ because the dead wither (*auainesthai*) and are dry”. Otherwise. Charon is announcing this, as if he is enumerating places. From the second onwards, he also shows the impossibility of the things in Hades. “*E*’s donkey wool” stands for “*e eis* (i.e. ‘or to’) donkey wool”. It is indeed impossible to shear wool from donkeys. It seems to have already been proverbial. “Donkey wool” is what is pointless, for the wool of the donkey is of no use. The proverb refers to pointless things. Similarly we also say “you are painting pots” and “you are steaming dung”. The things in Hades are also pointless. Therefore he poetically made up “donkey wool”.

Aristoph. Ra. 185-187 Χα. τίς εἰς ἀναπαύλας ἐκ κακῶν καὶ πραγμάτων; / τίς εἰς τὸ Λήθης πεδίον, ἦ ᾽ς Ὀκνου πλοκάς, / ἦ ᾽ς Κερβερίου, ἦ ᾽ς κόρακας, ἦ ᾽ πὶ Ταίναρον; **194** Ξα. ποῦ δῆτ’ ἀναμενῶ; Χα. παρὰ τὸν Αὐαίνου λίθον.

Zen. 5.38 (~ Diogenian. 4.85; 6.99; *App. Prov.* 2.29; *Apost.* 7.79; 12.89; *Macar.* 3.56; 6.35) ὄνου πόκους ζητεῖς: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνυπόστατα ζητούντων. παρόσον τὴν ὄνον οὔτε πέξαι τίς δύναται οὔτε κείραι. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὄνον κείρεις, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτοις ἐπιχειρούντων | **Hesych. o 926 C**. ὄνου ποκαί· χωρίον ἐν ἄδου διατετύπωκεν Ἀριστοφάνης, οὕτω λεγόμενον πλάσας. ἔστι δὲ καὶ παροιμία τις· ὄνου ποκαί, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτων καὶ ἀτελῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ πέξεις τῶν ὄνων καὶ κάρσεις δύναται τι. ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοι τις ὄνον κείρεις· παρόσον οὖν τὰ ἐν ἄδου ἀνήνυτά ἐστι καὶ τὸ μηδέν, παρὰ τοῦτο τὰς τοῦ ὄνου ποκάς ἐπλασεν | **Phot. o 360** (~ *Suda* o 399) ὄνου πόκοι· παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτων· ὥσπερ αἱ τοιαῦται· “πλίνθον πλύνειν”· “ἄσκον τίλλειν”· “χύτεραν πλύνειν”, **o 363 Th**. ὄνου πόκαι· ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτων καὶ τῶν μὴ ὄντων λέγεται ἡ παροιμία ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀττικῶν· ὥσπερ αἱ τοιαῦται· “πλίνθον πλύνειν”· “ἄσκον τίλλειν”· “χύτεραν ποικίλλειν”· “εἰς κοπρῶνα θυμῶν”· Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ διὰ τὸ Κρατῖνον (fr. 367 K.-A.) ὑποθέσθαι ἐν Ἄδου σχοινίον πλέκοντα ὄνον δὲ τὸ πλεκόμενον ἀπεσθίοντα, οἷον ἀποκείροντα | **Suda a 4418** αὐαίνεται· ξηραίνεται. αἶθοι γὰρ οἱ ξηροί. καὶ αὐασμός, ξηρασία. ἡ πρώτη δασύνεται. Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 659 K.-A.)· ἐνταῦθα δὲ παιδάριον ἐξαυαίνεται. καὶ ἐτέρωθι (fr. 660 K.-A.)· ὥστ’ ἔγωγ’ ἠυαίνωμην θεώμενος. καὶ αὐαίνοιο, ξηραίνοιο, ἀφανιζέσθω. ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασι (*AP* 6.116 = *HE* 3260)· “ὁ φθόνος αὐαίνοιο, τεὸν δ’ ἔτι κῦδος ἀέξοι”. καὶ Αὐαίνου λίθος, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦς νεκροὺς εἶναι. Αὐαίνου λίθος ἦν Ἀθήνησιν, **τ 655** (~ **a 1998, γ 135**) **A**. τίς εἰς ἀναπαύλας; αὐται πορθημενικαὶ παρὰ Χάρωντος πεύσεις

⁵⁹⁷ The transliteration of the personal name reflects the absence of initial aspiration in the manuscript tradition, although Kock’s conjecture Αὐαίνου (1898, 71) is generally accepted by all modern Aristophanic editors (see below).

καὶ κηρύγματα· “τίς εἰς ἀναπαύλας ἐκ κακῶν (πόνων) καὶ πραγμάτων; τίς εἰς τὸ Λήθης πεδίον;” Λήθης πεδίον χωρίον διατετύπωκεν ἐν ἄδου οὕτω λεγόμενον ὡς καὶ τὸν Αὐαίνου λίθον. “τίς εἰς ὄνου πόκας;” οὕτω λέγουσι τὸ ἄχρηστον οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ τοῦ ὄνου πόκαι χρησιμεύουσι. λέγεται δὲ ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνήνυτων ἐν ᾧ τρόπῳ φαμέν χύτραν ποικίλλεις ἀνήνυτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν ἄδου. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ὄνου πόκας ἀνεπλάσατο ποιητικῶς | **Eust. II. 531,8-10** (= **II 40,1-3 V.**) ἰστέον δὲ ὡς τὸ μὴ ἐριοφορεῖν παροιμίαν ἐξήγηκε τὸ εἰς ὄνου πόκους ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκερδῶν καὶ ἀλυσιτελῶν, ἣν παρῳδήσας ὁ Κωμικὸς ὄνου πόκας παίζων πλάττει ὡς οἷά τι χωρίον ἐν Ἄδου, **787,7-12** (= **III 7,23-8,5 V.**) ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Παιουσανίου (= Paus. Gr. ε 21 E.) φέρεται, ὡς τὴν δορὰν ἀσπάθητόν τινες εἶπον χλαῖναν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀνύφαντον, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τῆς λεοντῆς ἢ κατὰ τὸν λέοντα παροιμία, τὸ «ζυρεῖν λέοντα», ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδύνατοις ἐπιχειρούντων. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν διὰ τὴν γενναϊότητα τοῦ λέοντος, ὃν οὐκ ἂν ζυρεῖν τολμήσῃ τις. τὸ μέντοι “πόκους ὄνου” ἄλλον τρόπον ἀδύνατον ἐστὶ, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι πέκεσθαι ὄνον, **Od. 1559,45-48** (= **I 249 S.**) καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς δὲ παίζων αὐαίνου λίθον ἐν ἄδου εἶναι πλάττει. ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐαινωθεὶς τοῦνομα, **1788,23-25** (= **II 107 S.**) ... καὶ τοὺς ὄνου πόκους, οὗς ὁ κωμικὸς εἰς πόκας παρῳδήσει.

1-2 Δίδυμος–ἐπλάσεν hic cett., post ἤδη εἶναι R Dindorf Dübner, bis (hic et post ἤδη εἶναι) V (G) Bekker | **1** τὸ RValt., om. Vpr ME | φησι R(Galt.), φησι Valt. | ἐν Ἄδου hic RValt. edd., post διατετύπωκεν Vpr. E, M (om. ἐν) | διατετύπωκεν V(bis)ME edd. cett., τετύπωκεν R Bekker | **1-2** οὕτω λεγόμενον om. Ald Bekker | **2** ἐπλάσεν ME, πλάσας Valt., om. Vpr. | αὐαίνεσθαι hic ME edd. cett., ante τοὺς Ald Bekker, αὐᾶσθαι V | **3** τοῦτο–καταλέγει hic cett., bis (hic et in init. schol.) V, in init. gl. Suda | ὁ cett., om. ΘBarb | τόπους δὲ cett., τόπον καὶ M | **4** τῶν cett., τῆ V⁵⁷ | τοῦ RVEΘV⁵⁷, τὸ MBarb | τὸ–τοῦ om. Bekker | εἰς RVV⁵⁷ edd. cett., ἐς EΘBarb Bekker, ἐπ’ M | **5** γὰρ cett., δὲ R | τῶν ὄνων cett., τὸν ὄνον R | καὶ cett., om. Θ | ἤδη RV edd. cett., om. MEΘBarbV⁵⁷ Bekker | **6-8** ὄνου–ποιητικῶς hic cett. Bekker, post ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐαίνεσθαι καὶ ἀλίβαντας εἶναι V Dindorf Dübner | **6** πόκας VV⁵⁷, πόκον MEΘBarb Bekker | αἱ cett., om. Barb | πόκαι MV⁵⁷(G) Chantry, πόκες VEBarb edd. cett., πόκοι Θ | ἡ παροιμία MEΘBarbV⁵⁷, τῆ παροιμίᾳ V | **7** ἀνήνυτων VMEΘBarbV⁵⁷, ἀνύνητων Θ, ἀνοήτων Barb supra lin. | φαμέν VEBarbV⁵⁷, φασὶ M | πρ. καὶ MEΘBarbV⁵⁷, om. V | ποικίλλεις MEBarbV⁵⁷, ποικίλην V, προκίλλεις Θ | κόπρον MEΘBarbV⁵⁷, κόπρων V | ἀναθυμῆς MEΘBarb, ἀναθυμίας V, θυμῆς V⁵⁷ | **8** οὖν VMEV⁵⁷, om. ΘBarb | ὄνου VEV⁵⁷, Barb add., om. MΘ | ποιητικῶς VMEΘV⁵⁷, Barb p.c. (ε παικτικῶς)

After his entrance on the scene, Charon lists the stops that his boat will reach in its next journey⁵⁹⁸. These include both toponyms, like τὸ Λήθης πεδίον (l. 186) and Ταίναρος (188), and vulgar expressions wittily resemanticised as place-names, such as ἐς κόρακας (188).

The exegetic material concerning the expressions τὸ Λήθης πεδίον and the obscure Ὀνουπόκαι⁵⁹⁹ of *Ra.* 186 is variously arranged in the manuscripts, although a core sequence can be identified, which is consistently reproduced in the same order and may reflect the conflation of two separate exegeses: on the one hand, the attribution of ll. 185-187 to Charon, the observation that some of the places named by him metaphorically represent τὸ ἀδύνατον τῶν καθ’ Ἄδου, the grammatical note on the apheresis of ἡ εἰς in ἡ ’ς and the reference to the possible existence of a proverb on donkey wool; on the other hand, the explanation of “donkey wool” as a proverb on pointlessness (τὸ ἄχρηστον), similar to other sayings. Further exegetic material is variously distributed around this core sequence in the different manuscripts. Didymos’ fragment is at the beginning of the annotation in all of them, except for **R** that has it at the end (in **V** the fragment is quoted twice, both at the beginning and at the end). In **RΘBarbV⁵⁷** the quotation is abridged, while **VME** preserve Didymos’

⁵⁹⁸ The scene must be imitating the actual custom of calling out the destinations of boats before their departure (see Welcker 1812, 123f.; Mitchell 1839, 45; Fritzsche 1845, 118; Droysen 1869b, 275; Kanavou 2011, 160).

⁵⁹⁹ The unanimously transmitted Ὀνουπόκας began to be regarded as dubious already in the mid-19th century (see Meineke 1860, XXIII; van Leeuwen 1896, 41; Kock 1898, 68. See also, later, Sommerstein 1999, 173; Henderson 2002, 46; Wilson 2007c, 166). The corruption must have occurred very early in the transmission of the Aristophanic text, since already Aristarchos emended the text in Ὀκνου πλοκάς (Phot. ο 363 Th., see below). However, numerous editors take the paradosis as authentic (accepting the otherwise unattested substantive πόκη) and print either ὄνου πόκας (see e.g. Mitchell 1839, 45; Fritzsche 1845, 118-120; Süß 1959, 17f.) or Ὀνουπόκας (see e.g. Coulon 1928b, 94; Rademacher 1954, 163; Dover 1993, 214f.). See also Kanavou 2011, 160; Tosi 2017a, 423; 2017b, 235-238.

interpretation in a longer form. The anonymous explanation of “donkey wool” as a proverb on pointlessness directly follows Didymos’ exegesis at the end of the annotation in **V**, as well as in Hesych. ο 926 C.⁶⁰⁰ and *Suda* τ 655 A., and can probably be ascribed to the grammarian⁶⁰¹ (see below).

Δίδυμός φησι ... διατετύπωκεν: Fritzsche (1845, 118f.) was the first to highlight that the lemmatisation of the scholium under τὸ Λήθης πεδίον (**RVM**) is probably wrong and that Didymos’ observation χωρίον ἐν Ἄδου διατετύπωκεν οὕτω λεγόμενον κτλ is in all likelihood to be referred to ἡ ᾽ς ὄνου πόκας. This hypothesis finds support in Hesych. ο 926 C., where the lemma is, indeed, ὄνου πόκαι and where no mention is made of τὸ Λήθης πεδίον. What is more, the verb διατετύπωκεν implies that the toponym was considered Aristophanes’ invention⁶⁰² and Didymos could have hardly regarded the “plain of the Lethe” as a creation of the playwright, since the place was mentioned by other authors, like Simonides (*AP* 7.25), Plato (*Resp.* 621a2-3) and an unidentified playwright (*ap.* [Plut.] *ad Ap.* 15)⁶⁰³.

ὡς καὶ “τὸν Αὐαίνου λίθον” ἔπλασεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦς νεκροῦς αὐαίνεσθαι: on πλάττω and its derivatives in the scholiastic jargon, see above fr. 250. The verb αὐαίνομαι⁶⁰⁴ occurs in two Aristophanic fragments (fr. 659-660 K.-A., see Bagordo 2016, 221-224), both preserved by a *Suda* entry (α 4418 A.), where they are followed by a reference to Αὐαίνου λίθος and by its Didymean paretyymology, ἀπὸ τοῦ αὔου τοῦς νεκροῦς εἶναι⁶⁰⁵.

καὶ ἀλίβαντας εἶναι: Didymos’ explanation of Αὐαίνου λίθος implies a second undeclared paretyymology, *i.e.* that of ἀλίβας (“dead body”, “corpse”) from the privative prefix ἀ- and the substantive λίβας (“stream”, “flow”), with the resulting meaning of “dry”⁶⁰⁶. Such derivation appears to have been well-known in the early Imperial Age, for it can also be found in Plutarch (*Quaest. Conv.* 736A ὁ δ’ ἀλίβας καὶ ὁ σκελετὸς ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς λέγονται, λοιδορουμένης τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ξηρότητος)⁶⁰⁷.

ὄνου δὲ πόκας τὸ ἄχρηστον κτλ: as already discussed, the section identifying ὄνου πόκαι as a proverb on pointlessness probably belonged to the original comment to *Ra.* 186 in Didymos’ hypomnēma. The ascription to the grammarian is even more convincing in the light of his well-attested paroemiographic interests⁶⁰⁸.

ποιητικῶς: the use of the adverb presupposes the acknowledgement of a poetic habit (see Nünlist 2009, 11) and, more specifically, an established concept of poetic license (*ibid.* 174-184 and Meijering 1987, 62-67).

⁶⁰⁰ In particular, the central section of Hesychios’ entry (οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ πέξεις τῶν ὄνων καὶ κάρσεις δύνανται τι. ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοι τις ὄνον κείρεις) is almost identical in Zenobios, while the rest of the text presents the same wording as the *Suda*. On the relationship between Hesychios and Didymos, see Schmidt 1854, 29-36 and the Introduction § 5.1.

⁶⁰¹ See Fritzsche 1845, 118f.

⁶⁰² On the verb in the scholiastic jargon, see Bouchard 2016, 272. See also Nünlist 2009, 372.

⁶⁰³ See *AL* II/2, 1956f. Among Didymos’ contemporaries, see Diod. 1.96.9; Dion. Hal. 8.52.4; Str. 3.3.4.

⁶⁰⁴ For the initial aspiration in Attic, see *GEW* 188; *DELG* 141; *EDG* 171.

⁶⁰⁵ On paretyymology in Didymos’ exegesis, see also fr. 224, 225, 227, 262 and the Conclusions § 1.4.

⁶⁰⁶ See *LSJ* 65. The real etymology is unknown (see *GEW* 72; *DELG* 60; *EDG* 67), perhaps the noun is somehow related to ἀλείφω, for anointing the body was part of the ritual preparation for the πρόθεσις (see *e.g.* Kurtz-Boardman 1971, 144).

⁶⁰⁷ See also an intrusive gloss in a passage from Kornutos (*ND* 75.12-15 L. ἐντεῦθεν ὑπονοητέον καὶ τοῦς ἀλίβαντας μεμυθεῦσθαι ἐν Ἄδου εἰσι διὰ τὴν τῆς λιβάδος ἀμεθεξίαν τῶν νεκρῶν).

⁶⁰⁸ See fr. 238 (above), 267 (below) and the Conclusions § 1.2.2.

ἐν ᾧ τρόπῳ φαμὲν καὶ τὸ “χύτραν ποικίλλεις” καὶ “κόπρον ἀναθυμῆς”: Photios’ entry on ὄνου πόκαι (ο 363 Th.) is very similar in wording to the section of the scholium that identifies the phrase “donkey wool” as a proverb on pointlessness (and that can be easily ascribed to Didymos, see above). However, the list of sayings similar to ὄνου πόκαι includes two more expressions that are not in the scholium (*i.e.* πλίνθον πλύνειν and ἀσκὸν τίλλειν) as well as a slightly different version of κόπρον ἀναθυμῆς (*i.e.* εἰς κοπρῶνα θυμῶν). In fact, assuming that Photios ultimately drew from a less epitomized version of Didymos’ comment would explain both the longer list of proverbs and, more importantly, the lexicographer’s quotation of Aristarchos: on the base of a lost occurrence from Kratinos (fr. 367 K.-A.), the scholar emended the Aristophanic text in Ὀκνοῦ πλοκάς, supposing a reference to a mythical character of the underworld forced to plait a rope «which, as he plaited it, was being eaten away by a donkey»⁶⁰⁹. This would not be the only case of Didymos quoting Aristarchos’ exegesis of Aristophanes⁶¹⁰.

⁶⁰⁹ Sommerstein 1999, 173. The scene was featured in a series of paintings ascribed to Polygnotos, that decorated a building called Λέσχη in Delphi (see Paus. 10.29). On Oknos, his literary and iconographic occurrences and his frequent association with the Danaids, see *AL* III/1, 821-827; Felten 1994, 33-35.

⁶¹⁰ See *e.g.* fr. 267 below. Overall, most of Aristarchos’ fragments preserved by the scholia to Aristophanes are probably owed to Didymos, see Boudreaux 1919, 66f.; Muzzolon 2005, 55-64.

fr. 262 (= II 14.10, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of ὄρρος

Sources: scholl. Aristoph. Ra. 222aβ-221-222dα-fβ-i-dβ-αα-b-e-c-gβ Chantry

ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἀλγεῖν ἄρχομαι <τὸν ὄρρον ὦ κοᾶξ κοᾶξ>: **RE** τὸ ὄρροπύγιον, ἢ τὸ ἰσχίον. **V** ὁ Διόνυσος λέγει, δεινοπαθῶν ἐπὶ τῷ κωπηλατεῖν. τὸν δὲ καλούμενον “ταῦρον”. μέρος δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς πυγῆς. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)** Ἡρωδιανός δὲ (II 72,27 Lenz) καὶ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ κατὰ τὴν διάλεκτον βαρέως. **REΘBarb(Ald)** διὰ τὸ συνεχὲς αὐτῶν ἐπιφθεγμα παίζων λέγει. **EΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως. **V** τὸν δὲ λεγόμενον “ταῦρον”. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν διδύμων. **EΘBarb(Ald)** Καλλίστρατος· τὴν ὄσφυν, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ὄστουν. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** πῶς οὖν ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ διώριστα· “ποία δ' ὄσφύς, ποῖος δ' ὄρρος;” (v. 964). τῇ δὲ προφορᾷ, Τιμαχίδας (fr. 21 Matijašić)· “ὄρρον”, ὡς “ὄρθόν”. **V** Δίδυμος δὲ τὴν τράμιν φησὶν, οὐχ ὡς τινες τὸ ἰσχίον. ἔνθεν καὶ τὸ ὄρρωδεῖν **VEΘBarb**, τὸν ὄρρον ἰδροῦν. Ὅμηρος (*Od.* 20.204) «ἴδιον ὡς ἐνόησα». τοῦτο γὰρ πάσχουσιν οἱ φοβούμενοι. **EΘBarb**

“I’m beginning to feel an ache (in my *orros*, ko-ax ko-ax!)”: the rump or the haunch. Dionysos is speaking, complaining loudly about the rowing. The so called “bull”. It is a part of the buttock. Herodianos (says that the word has to be pronounced) with a grave accent both because of the word and according to the dialect. (Dionysos) says (*scil.* ko-ax ko-ax) ironically, because of their uninterrupted refrain. Otherwise. The so called “bull”, the one between the testicles. Kallistratos: the loin and the sacrum. Then why is there a distinction in the *Lysistrata*: “which loin, which *orros*”? With regard to the pronounce, Timachidas (says) *orros* like *orthos* (*i.e.* oxytone). Didymos (says that *orros* means) *tramis* and not “haunch” as some (believe). From *orros* comes *orrōdein*, “to sweat in the *orros*”. Homer: “I sweated as I saw you”. For this is what happens to those who are scared.

Aristoph. Ra. 221f. ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἀλγεῖν ἄρχομαι / τὸν ὄρρον, ὦ κοᾶξ κοᾶξ.

Aristoph. Pax 1238f. ἀλλ', ὦγαθέ, / θλίβει τὸν ὄρρον. ἀπόφερ', οὐκ ὠνήσομαι, **Lys. 962-966** ποῖος γὰρ <ἔτ'> ἂν νέφρος ἀντίσχοι, / ποῖα ψυχῆ, ποῖοι δ' ὄρχεις, / ποῖα δ' ὄσφῦς, ποῖος δ' ὄρρος / κατατεινόμενος / καὶ μὴ βινῶν τοὺς ὄρθρους; | **P. Berol. 9780 col. 11 ll. 14-25** ἔνιοι δ(ἐ) [..]νομ[.]φο[.]κωτερω[.] ἡμῆνευσαν, καθά[πε]ρ τὸ ὄρρωδεῖν ἦκιστα Δημο[σθ]ενικὸν ὄν κ(αἰ) εἴ τινα ἀλ[λ]α ὁμοία τούτω[ι]· «Ὅτι δ(ἐ) χρῆ μῆτε ὄρρωδεῖν ἡμᾶς τ(ῆν) ἐκείνου ἰδύναμιν μῆτε ἀγεννῶς ἰάν[ι]ταχθ[ι]ῆ[ν]αι πρὸς αὐτόν.» ὄρρωδεῖν δεδο[ι]κέν[αι] (ἐστίν), ἀπὸ] δ(ἐ) τοῦ συμβεβηκότος τοῖς δ(ε)δι[ό]σι [π]εποιήται· τοῦνομα γ(άρ) περὶ τὸν ὄρρον [...], ὡς {ε}ἰδεδροί. Ὅμηρος· «Ἰδιον ὡς ἐνόησα, δ(ε)δάκρυνται δ(ἐ) μοι ὄσσε» κ(αἰ) ὁ κωμικὸς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατραχίοις ἐπὶ τοῦ κατεπηκότ[ο]ς Διονύσου· «Χῶ προκτὸς ἰδίει πάλα» | **Poll. 2.174** περίνεος ὀνομάζεται ἡ τράμις ἢ ὄρρος | **Gal. Gloss. o 21 P.** (= 19,127 Kühn) ὄρρωδέων· τῶν ἄχρη τοῦ ὄρρου ἐκτεινομένων. ὄρρος δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὀστέου τὸ πέρας, ὅπερ καὶ ὄρροπύγιον καλεῖται | **Erot. 124,17-125,2 N.** τράμιν· τὸν ὄρρον, ὄνπερ καὶ ὑποταύριον καλοῦμεν. ὡς καὶ Ἰππῶνάξ (fr. 114a W.² = 133 Degani) φησιν· ἐκτίλλοι τις αὐτοῦ τὴν τράμιν ὑποργάσαι. μέμνηται καὶ Ἀρχύλοχος (fr. 283 W.²) | **Ruf. Onom. 101f.** τῶν δὲ αἰδοίων, τοῦ μὲν τοῦ ἄρβενος ἢ μὲν ἀποκρεμῆς φύσις, καυλὸς, καὶ στήμα· τὸ δὲ μὴ ἐκκρεμῆς, ὑπόστημα, καὶ κύστεως τράχηλος· καὶ ἡ διὰ μέσου γραμμῆ, τραμῖς· οἱ δὲ ὄρρον ὀνομάζουσιν | **Her. Phil. Diff. 15 P.** (~ Amm. *Diff.* 80 N.; *Lex. Syn.* 55 P.; *Et. Gud. d*² 205,13-206,16 De St.) ἄρρωδεῖν καὶ ὄρρωδεῖν διαφέρει. τὸ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ο σημαίνει τὸ εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἐξηγούνται δὲ τὴν λέξιν οὕτως· ὄρρος λέγεται ὁ περὶ τοὺς γλουτοὺς τόπος, ὄντινα ταῦρον λέγουσιν· ὄθεν καὶ τῶν ὄρνέων ὁ τόπος οὗτος ὄρροπύγιον καλεῖται, οὐχ, ὡς τινες ἀνοοῦντες, ὄρθοπύγιον. ἐτόμως δ' εἴρηται, ὄρρος ὢν ὁ τῆς πυγῆς καὶ οἰνεῖ ὄρροπύγιον. οἱ δὲ εὐλαβούμενοι περὶ τινος ἀνασπᾶν

ειώθασι τὸ αἰδοῖον, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλογα τῶν ζῴων ὑποστέ<λ>λιν εἴθε τὴν οὐρὰν ὅτε τι εὐλαβεῖται. εὐλόγως οὖν ἐκ τοῦ παρακολουθοῦντος τὸ ὄρρωδεῖν εἴρηται ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐλαβεῖσθαι. καὶ Εὐριπίδης τὸν Περσέα εἰσάγει λέγοντα (fr. 130 K.): ‘τὰς γὰρ συμφορὰς τῶν κακῶς πεπραγόντων / οὐπόποθ’ ὕβρις’, αὐτὸς ὄρρωδῶν παθεῖν’. καὶ τὸ [μὲν] ὄρρωδεῖν τοιοῦτον | **Hesych. o 1316** ὄρρος· ἢ τράμις· οὐχ, ὡς τινες, τὸ ἰσχίον. ἕτεροι δὲ ἐτυμολογοῦσι καὶ τὸ ὄρρωδεῖν· οἱ γὰρ δεδουκότες ἰδίουςι τὸν ὄρρον, ὃ ἐστὶν ἰδροῦσιν, ἢ *τὸ ὄστουν τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ράχιν, **τ 1243 C**. τράμις· τὸ <τ>ρῆμα τῆς ἔδρας, ὃ ὄρ<ρ>ος. τινὲς ἔντερον. οἱ δὲ ἰσχίον | **Phot. o 526** ὄρρος· τράμις· καὶ ὄρροπύγιον· οὕτως καὶ οἱ Ἴωνες· ὄρροπύγιον δὲ παρ’ οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, **τ 415 Th**. τράμις· ὃ ὄρρος ἢ ἡ διαγραφὴ· ἢ τὸ τρῆμα τοῦ ἀρχοῦ | **schol. Aristoph. Pac. 1239b Holwerda** ὄρρος ἐστὶν ὃ ὑποκείμενος τοῖς σφαιρώμασι τόπος. δηλὸν δὲ ὅτι λαβῶν τὸν θώρακα ἐπεκάθισεν αὐτῷ ὡς λασάνφ, ἵνα μᾶλλον κινήσῃ γέλωτα, **Pl. 122d Chantry** ὄρρωδῶ· ἀπὸ τοῦ “ὄρρου”, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ μεσοπύγιον τῆς περιστερᾶς· ἐστὶ γὰρ τρομερὸν τὸ μέρος | **schol. Dem. 11.8a Dilts** ὄρρωδεῖν] τὸ φοβεῖσθαι· εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρρου καὶ τοῦ δέους· ὄρρος δὲ λέγεται ἢ πυγὴ τῶν ὀρνίθων· ὅθεν καὶ ὄρροπύγιον. ἐπειδὴ οὖν συμβαίνει ταῖς ὀρνισιν ἐν τῷ φοβεῖσθαι ἀποτατεῖν καὶ τὸν ὄρρον ἀπὸ τοῦ δέους ἐπέγεισθαι πτός τὸ ἀφοδεῦσαι, διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηται τὸ φοβεῖσθαι ὄρρωδεῖν | **schol. Luc. Lex. 2.29 Rabe** τὸ δὲ ἐδάριον τὸν ὄρρον ἀντί τοῦ ἀνεσῆρην, ἐτρίβην τὸν ὑπόταυρον ἥτις τὴν τράμιν | **Suda o 631** ὄρρωδεῖ· φοβεῖται ... ὅτι τῶν φοβουμένων εἴθε ὃ ὄρρος πρῶτος ἰδροῦν. ἐστὶ τὸ ὄρρωδεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρρου, ὃ ἐστὶ μεσοπύγιον τῆς περιστερᾶς. ἐστὶ γὰρ τρομερὸν τὸ μέρος, **632 A**. ὄρρωδία· φόβος. ἐκ τοῦ ὄρρου, ὃ ἐστὶ μέρος τῆς πυγῆς, ὃ καλούμενος ταῦρος. ἅμα μὲν ὄρρωδία ἦν, μὴ ἄρα φθάσαιεν ὀπίσω ἀναφυγόντες.

1 γ’ R, τ’ E | ὃ Διόνυσος EΘBarb Bekker Dindorf Dübner Chantry, ante ἐπὶ V, ὃ om. R Rutherford Süß | 2 λέγει EΘBarb Bekker Dindorf Dübner Chantry, om. RV Rutherford Süß | δεινοπαθῶν cett., δεινοπαθεῖ V | ἐπὶ τῷ EΘBarb, ἐπὶ τὸ RV | τὸν EΘBarb, τὸ RV | ταῦρον cett., πύρρον V (etiam gl. ταῦρον MRs) | μέρος hic cett., post πυγῆς V | 3 Ἡρωδιανὸς ER, Ἡρόδοτος ΘBarb | pr. καὶ–βαρέως EΘBarb(Ald) edd. cett., βαρύνει αὐτό R Rutherford Süß | κατὰ E, om. ΘBarb | 4 τὸν EΘ(G), τὸ VBarb | 5 Καλλίστρατος EΘBarb, οἱ δὲ V | 7 Τιμαχίδας Dindorf recc. Dübner Chantry, Τιμαρχίδας V | ὄρρον, ὡς ὄρθον Dindorf recc. Dübner Chantry, ὄρρον ὡς ὄρθον (sic) V (ὄρρον, ὡς ὄρθρον G) | 8 τράμιν VΘBarb edd. cett., τράμην E Bekker | φησὶ (G) Chantry, φα() V, om. EΘBarb edd. cett. | ἔνθεν E, ὅθεν Barb, ὅθεν δὲ Θ | ἔνθεν καὶ τὸ ὄρρ. EΘBarb, ἐτοιμολογεῖται δὲ τὸ ὄρρ. V | **8-9** τὸν ὄρρον–φοβούμενοι EΘBarb, οἱ γὰρ δεδουκότες ἰδίουςι τὸν ὄρρον V (post 226)

The chant of the Frogs – meant to give rhythm to Dionysos’ paddling (as announced by Charon at Il. 205f.) – quickly turns into a singing battle between the Chorus and the god, after the latter interrupts the song with a comic complaint on the physical pain caused by the rowing (Aristoph. *Ra.* 221f.)⁶¹¹.

Although the scene evidently entails a reference to Dionysos’ sore backside, the word ὄρρος⁶¹² has been object of a vast debate in ancient scholarship, as shown by the abundant scholiastic material on the topic. Indeed, the term occurs two more times in Aristophanes – namely at *Pax* 1239 (where a cuirass can not be used as chamber pot because θλίβει τὸν ὄρρον) and *Lys.* 964 (within a description of the effects of the forced sexual abstinence on the Athenian men)⁶¹³ – but, out of the three passages, only the line from the *Lysistrata* unequivocally links the word ὄρρος to the genitals, whereas in *Pax* 1239 and *Ra.* 222 the exact body part intended is unclear, hence the numerous ancient attempts at establishing the word’s meaning. The scholia to *Ra.* 222 alone preserve seven different interpretations of ὄρρος (*i.e.* ὄρροπύγιον, ἰσχίον, ταῦρος, μέρος τῆς πυγῆς, τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν διδύμων, ὄσφυς, τὸ ἱερὸν ὄστουν) besides Didymos’ proposed gloss τράμις, and two more are found in the scholia to *Pax* 1239 (ὃ ὑποκείμενος τοῖς σφαιρώμασι τόπος) and *Pl.* 122 (τὸ μεσοπύγιον τῆς περιστερᾶς). The exegetic material relating to *Ra.* 222 is unevenly distributed among the manuscripts and derives ultimately from the conflation of two separate ancient comments, as clearly proved by **V**, which (besides preserving the longest annotation) divides the two excerpts with the compilation-mark ἄλλως. These

⁶¹¹ See *e.g.* Corn 1999, 201: «*ko-ahx, ko-ahx* my ass, which hurts like hell!»; Holzberg (2011, 17): «es fäng schon an, mir wehzutun / an meinem Arsch, koax koax!».

⁶¹² For the etymology, see *GEW* 427; *DELG* 827; *EDG* 1110f.

⁶¹³ The three Aristophanic occurrences of ὄρρος are discussed in Henderson 1991, 111, 128, 201.

excerpts differ strongly from one another, as far as the quotation of sources is concerned. Indeed, the first one consists almost exclusively of anonymous material, except for the reference to Herodianos' accentuation of the word (II 72,27 Lentz). The second comment, instead, quotes almost in direct succession Kallistratos (see Schmidt 1848, 326 n. 51), Timachidas (fr. 21 Matijašić) and Didymos.

Αίδυμος δὲ φησὶ τὴν τράμιν: the word chosen by Didymos in order to explain the unclear ὄρρος is another specifically comic-iambic term, τράμις, found both in Archilochos (fr. 283 W.²) and Hipponax (fr. 114a W.² = 133 Degani), as attested by Erot. 124,17-125,2 N. The only Aristophanic occurrence of τράμις is at *Th.* 246 (αἰθὸς γεγένημαι πάντα τὰ περὶ τὴν τράμιν), within the scene of the depilation of the Inlaw⁶¹⁴, while Strattis used the derivative διάτραμις and Telekleides the compound τερπότηραμις⁶¹⁵. None of the passages allows an unequivocal identification of the body part that τράμις should designate. Moreover, besides presenting it as an equivalent of ὄρρος, the lexicographic tradition does not offer one unitary meaning for τράμις, but rather reflects three main interpretations: (1) τὸ τρῆμα τῆς ἔδρας⁶¹⁶, (2) ὁ περίνεος⁶¹⁷, (3) ἡ διὰ μέσου (*scil.* τῶν αἰδοίων) γραμμῆ⁶¹⁸. As a result (and because of the equally uncertain value of ὄρρος), it is impossible to ascertain what meaning of both terms the Didymean *interpretamentum* presupposed⁶¹⁹. Nevertheless, traces of Didymos' exegesis can be found not only in the lexicographic tradition⁶²⁰ and in the sources depending from it⁶²¹, but also in Lukianos' *Lexiphanes*, where τράμις and ὄρρος are used at close distance within very similar expressions (2.11-13 τὰ ἀμφὶ τὴν τράμιν μαλακίζομαι ἐπ' ἀστράβης ὀχηθεῖς, 2.29 ἀνατεθεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀστράβην ἐδάρην τὸν ὄρρον)⁶²². While commenting on *Luc. Lex.* 2.11-13, Weissenberger (1996, 176f.) underlines the allusion to the depilation-scene in Aristoph. *Th.* 246, but fails to highlight the synonymic usage of τράμις and ὄρρος, which can hardly be casual in Lukianos' learned prose and might actually presuppose the knowledge (both on the author's and on his audience's side) of the ancient scholarly debate concerning the two words⁶²³.

⁶¹⁴ See Austin-Olson 2004, 134f.

⁶¹⁵ Cf. Stratt. fr. 84 K.-A. (commented in Orth 2009, 282f.) and Telecl. fr. 72 K.-A. (discussed by Bagordo 2013, 283f.). On τράμις and its derivatives, see Henderson 1991, 21f., 203.

⁶¹⁶ See Hesych. τ 1243 C.; Phot. τ 415 Th.; *Et. M.* 763,55-57; *Suda* τ 903 A.

⁶¹⁷ See Poll. 2.174; Hesych. δ 1392 C.; *Et. M.* 763,55-57.

⁶¹⁸ See Ruf. Onom. 101f.; Phot. τ 415 Th.

⁶¹⁹ But see Chantry (2009, 172): «Didyme dit: „le périnée“ (τράμις), et non pas comme certains “la hanche”».

⁶²⁰ Namely in Poll. 2.174, Erot. 124,17-125,2 N., Hesych. ο 1316 C. (which is the closest in wording to the the Didymean fragment preserved by the scholium and derives from the *Comic Vocabulary*, see the Introduction § 5.1) and Phot. ο 526, τ 415 Th.

⁶²¹ See Arethas' scholium to *Luc. Lex.* 2.29 (on the relationship between this scholiastic *corpus* and the lexicographic tradition, see Alpers 1981, 78).

⁶²² See also Austin-Olson 2004, 134.

⁶²³ A similar conclusion (with regard to Homeric scholarship) can be found in Nesselrath 2002, where the close relationship between *Luc. VH* 2.20 and the ancient *Homerphilologie* is demonstrated by means of clear textual correspondences. Unfortunately, a systematic study of the relationship between Lukianos' literary critical writings and Alexandrian scholarship has not yet been carried out. In his conclusions on the *Lexiphanes*, Weissenberger (1996, 285) seems to assume that the author only consulted the classic works, but not the scholarship concerning them (see *ibid.*: «er selbst dürfte sich gut amüsiert haben, aus der Fülle ihm bekannter und erreichbarer Literatur, insbesondere Alter Komödie, Tragödie und medizinisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Fachschriften, daneben auch Historiographie und Gerichtsrede, die entlegensten Vokabeln zusammensuchen»). Similar observations can be found in Ledergerber 1905 and Rosen 2016, while Sidwell's conclusion (*id.* 2009, 118) «that Lucian's use of Old Comedy makes firm assumptions of the familiarity of the *pepaideumenoï* with the corpus of this genre and with the scholarship upon it» regards only the level of critic-aesthetic interpretation and not that of textual-lexicographical exegesis.

οὐχ ὡς τινες τὸ ἰσχίον: Didymos' exegesis includes the open refutation of an anonymous equivalence between ὄρρος and ἰσχίον ("haunch"), which is otherwise only alluded to at the beginning of the annotation.

ἔνθεν καὶ τὸ ὀρρωδεῖν: in Chantry's edition, this section (*schol. Aristoph. Ra. 222α-β*) is separated from the rest of Didymos' fragment (*schol. Aristoph. Ra. 222c*), although the two pieces of exegesis unequivocally belong together. The connection is proved not only by Hesychios' entry on ὄρρος (which ultimately derives from the *Comic Vocabulary*), but, even more notably, by Didymos' Demosthenic commentary *P. Berol. 9780*⁶²⁴. The papyrus offers an extraordinary parallel to the paretymologic link between ὄρρος and ὀρρωδέω found in the Aristophanic scholium⁶²⁵. Col. 11 of the papyrus preserves a discussion on the authenticity of the *Answer to Philip's letter* ([Dem.] 11). Didymos lists several pieces of evidence against the ascription to Demosthenes, the third being the presence in the text of non-Demosthenic words, such as ὀρρωδεῖν (see *P. Berol. 9780* col. 11, ll. 14-25 and Harding 2006, 221-224)⁶²⁶. The reference to the verb is followed by a digression on its etymology from ὄρρος, and by a quotation of both *Od. 20.204* (the same Homeric verse attached to the exegesis in the Aristophanic scholium)⁶²⁷ and *Aristoph. Ra. 237* (χὼ πρῶκτὸς ἰδίει πάλαι, another of Dionysos' expressions of complaint on the consequences suffered by his backside because of the rowing). The two quotations imply that Didymos understood ὀρρωδέω as a compound of ὄρρος and ἰδίω⁶²⁸, a derivation that was later accepted also by Galenos (*Gloss. ο 21 P. = 19,127 Kühn*) and by the later lexicographic tradition. According to Harding (2006, 222f.), the ascription of the stylistic argument on ὀρρωδεῖν to ἔνιοι (*P. Berol. 9780*, col. 11 l. 14) entails either that Didymos was coyly referring to his own original (par)etymologic and interpretative theory as belonging to "some"⁶²⁹, or that others before him had considered ὀρρωδέω a vulgar word because of its derivation from ὄρρος and that he had inherited the interpretation from one of his forerunners. Lossau (1964, 99) maintains that the occurrence of ὀρρωδέω in the *Answer to Philip's letter* was indeed declared suspect by one of Didymos' predecessors, but simply because the verb was a *hapax*⁶³⁰, and that he later replaced that scholar's explanation with his own theory on the 'vulgar' etymology of the word from ὄρρος. Although such a reconstruction is somewhat far-fetched, the idea of a pre-Didymean *damnatio* of ὀρρωδεῖν as ἥκιστα Δημοσθενικόν is worth considering. In particular – starting from the first editors' (highly debated⁶³¹) assumption that the papyrus is a private copy preserving only excerpts from the original commentary by Didymos⁶³² – one might perhaps regard the argumentation offered by *P. Berol. 9780* as the

⁶²⁴ On *P. Berol. 9780* and the ascription to Didymos in the subscript, see Diels-Schubart 1904a, XVIII; 1904b, VI f.; Pearson-Stephens 1983, III-XIV; Gibson 2002, 53f.; Harding 2006, 13-20; Luzzatto 2011.

⁶²⁵ The existence of the Ionic ἄρρωδέω, identical in meaning to the Attic ὀρρωδέω, makes it hard to ascertain the real etymology of the verb. In fact, the Attic form might derive from an actual folk-etymology from ὄρρος (see *GEW* 427f.; *DELG* 827; *EDG* 1111).

⁶²⁶ «It is important to note that Didymos himself does not explicitly say that the occurrence of the word ὀρρωδεῖν has some bearing on the authenticity question; he does not seem to have a strong opinion about it» (Gibson 2002, 127).

⁶²⁷ With regard to Homeric references in Didymos' scholarship, see Braswell 2017, 116-118.

⁶²⁸ On paretymology in Didymos' exegesis, see also *frr. 224, 225, 227, 261* and the Conclusions § 1.4.

⁶²⁹ See Harding 2006, 223.

⁶³⁰ Harpokration's observation πολὺ δ' ἐστὶ τοῦνομα παρ' αὐτοῖς (*scil. τοῖς ῥήτορσιν*) in his entry on ὀρρωδεῖν (ο 36 K.) might be interpreted as an ancient refutation of the idea of ὀρρωδεῖν as *hapax* in Demosthenes.

⁶³¹ See Gibson 2002, 51-54; Harding 2006, 13-20.

⁶³² See Diels-Schubart 1904a, XI, XXf.; 1904b, V.

result of the erroneous conflation of two separate but consecutive statements: on the one hand the refutation of the Demosthenic authorship of the speech because of the presence of the *hapax* “and whatever other words there are like it” (καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλα ὅμοια τούτοις, ll. 16f.), on the other hand Didymos’ digression on the etymology of the word.

fr. 263 (= II 14.11, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of κεροβάτας

Sources: *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 230ca-ba-cβ-233aα-231α-233b-αβ-230ba-αα-αβ-bβ Chantry

καὶ κεροβάτας: **EBarb** ὁ εἰς τὰ κέρατα τῶν ὀρῶν βαίνων ἢ **EΘBarb(Ald)** ὁ ἐπὶ κέρατος βαίνων [ἦ] **E** ἐπειδὴ χηλὰς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τράγου, διὸ καὶ αἰγοβάταν καὶ τραγοβάμονα λέγουσι. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)** ἢ οἷον κερατοβάτης, ἄλλως, ὁ βαίνων ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων. κέρατα δὲ φασὶ τὰ ἀκρωτήρια. ἄλλως **V** ὅτι οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καλάμῳ ἀντὶ κερατίου ἐχρῶντο. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἤδεσαν μὲν γὰρ τὸ κέρας, ἀνέφερον δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχαῖαν χρῆσιν, ὡς καὶ “χορδὰς” λέγομεν ἔτι νῦν τὰς ἐκ τῶν νεύρων, ὅτι τὸ παλαιὸν ἐντέρινα ἦσαν. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως **V** ἐπεὶ σύριγγι ἤδεται ὁ Πάν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκ καλάμων. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἠχῶ δὴ καὶ ἠδὸν ἀπὸ †τῆς λύρας† ἀνεπέμπετο. **V** ἢ ὅτι κάλαμος πάλαι ἀντὶ κέρατος ὑπετίθετο τῇ λύρᾳ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ συνηθείας “κάλαμον” καλοῦσι τὸ κέρας. ὡς Σοφοκλῆς, ἐν Αἰχμαλώτισιν (*TrGF* 36 R.²): “ὑψηρέθη σου κάλαμος ὡσπερεὶ λύρας”. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως, χηλὰς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τράγου, διὸ καὶ αἰγοβάταν καὶ τραγοβάμονα λέγουσι. **V** Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν, ἢ ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει, ἢ οἷον κερ<ατ>οβάτης, τὴν βάσιν ἔχων κερατίνην· εἵπερ ἱστορεῖται τὰ κάτω τράγου ἔχειν. ὥστε ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν κεροβάτης. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως, διὰ τὸ κεκερατωμένην ἔχειν τὴν βάσιν· οὕτω γὰρ ὠνούχεται ὥστε δοκεῖν κεκερατωσθαι. οὕτω γοῦν καὶ “αἰγίπους”. **V**

“and horn-footed (Pan)”: the one who walks on the horns of the mountains or the one who walks on horn [or], because (Pan) seems to have goat hoofs, which is why they also call him “goat-mounting” and “goat-footed”, or like *keratobatēs*. Otherwise. The one who walks on the horns. They call “horns” the peaks. Otherwise. (“The reed ... under the lyre”:) because the ancients would use reed instead of horn. Indeed, they knew the horn and referred to the ancient use with the name, like we now call “guts” the strings made of sinews, because they were originally made of gut. Otherwise. (“Tunes played on a reed”:) because Pan delights in the pipe, which is made of reeds. Moreover, a sweet sound was produced by †the lyre†. Or (“the reed ... under the lyre”) because in ancient times they would put a piece of reed underneath the lyre instead of horn and therefore they call “reed” the horn out of habit, like Sophokles (says) in the *Captive Women*: “the reed was taken away from you, like from a lyre”. (“And horn-footed [Pan]”): Didymos says: “either because he has horns, or like *keratobatēs*, having the foot made of horn, since he is represented as having the bottom half of a goat. Therefore, because of the paws, (he is called) ‘horn-footed’”. Otherwise. Because his foot is hardened into horn. Indeed he grows toenails so that they look like hardened into horn. Similarly, (he is called) also “goat-footed”.

Aristoph. Ra. 229-234 ἐμὲ γὰρ ἔστερξαν <μὲν> εὐλύροι τε Μοῦσαι / καὶ κεροβάτας Πάν ὁ καλαμόφθογγα παίζων / προσεπιτέρπεται δ' ὁ φορμικτὰς Απόλλων, / ἔνεκα δόνακος, ὄν ὑπολύριον / ἔνυδρον ἐν λίμναις τρέφω.

Her. 2.46 τὸν Πάνα τῶν ὀκτῶ θεῶν λογίζονται εἶναι οἱ Μενδήσιοι, τοὺς δὲ ὀκτῶ θεοὺς τούτους προτέρους τῶν δωδέκα θεῶν φασὶ γενέσθαι. γράφουσι τε δὴ καὶ γλύφουσι οἱ ζωγράφοι καὶ οἱ ἀγαματοποιοὶ τοῦ Πανὸς τῷ γαλαμῶν κατά περ Ἑλλήνες αἰγοπρόσωπον καὶ τραγοσκελέα, οὐτὶ τοιοῦτον νομίζοντες εἶναι μιν ἀλλ' ὁμοῖον τοῖσι ἄλλοισι θεοῖσι | **Hesych. κ 2351 C.** κεροβάτης· ὁ Πάν· ἦτοι ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει, ἢ οἰονεὶ κερατοβάτης, τὴν βᾶσιν ἔχων κερατίνην <ἐπεὶ τὰ κάτω τράγου εἶχεν> | **Phot. κ 612 Th.** κεροβάτας· ὁ Πάν· ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει ἢ κερατίνας βάσεις | **Suda κ 1415 A.** κεροβάτης· ὁ Πάν· ἐπειδὴ χηλᾶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τράγου· διὸ καὶ αἰγιόβτης καὶ τραγοβάμων καλεῖται. ἢ ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει. ἢ τὴν βᾶσιν ἔχων κερατίνον· ἱστορεῖται γὰρ τὰ κάτω τράγου ἔχων· ὥστε ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν κερατοβάτης. ἢ ὁ εἰς τὰ κέρατα τῶν ὀρνῶν βαίνων. ἢ ὁ ἐπὶ κέρατα βαίνων | **schol. Theoc. Anec. Est. 1.23 Wendel** τὰ δὲ κέρατα, ἐπειδὴ τὸν Πάνα εἶχον οἱ νομεῖς θεόν, ὁ δὲ Πάν κέρατα ἔχων παραδέδοται. τοὺς νομεῖς δὲ οἱ τὰ βουκολικὰ συνθέντες ἐμμουῦντο, ὡς ἔφημεν. καὶ τῶν θηρίων δὲ αἱ μορφαὶ τοῦ Πανὸς ἔνεκεν λαμβάνονται, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ταῖς ἐρημίαις παραδίδονται διατρίβειν, τόποις θηριώδεσι, καὶ ἅμα καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ κάτω τραγῶδη καὶ λάσια παραδίδεται ἔχειν | **Eust. proem. in Pind. 27.35-40** Μαινάλιος δὲ θεὸς ὁ Πάν ὡς Ἀρκαδικός (ἐν Μαινάλῳ γὰρ ἐτιμᾶτο Ἀρκαδίας ὄρει), κερόεις δὲ ὁ αὐτός, ἐπεὶ κερασφόρος ἐπλάττετο διὰ τὰς τῶν ὀρνῶν ἐξοχὰς τὰς ὑψηλοτάτας, αἱ <καὶ> αὐταὶ μέρος εἰσὶ τοῦ παντός, εἰς ὃ μεταλαμβάνεται καὶ ὁ Πάν· ὅτι δὲ κέρατα ἐλέγοντο καὶ αἱ ὄρειναι ὑπεροχαί, δηλοῖ ὁ γράψας ὑπικέρατα πέτραν, τὴν καὶ ὑψηλὴν καὶ εἰς ὄξυ λήγουσαν, **II. 451.3-4 (= I 712 V.)** ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι εἰς κέντρονα ἦγον εἰς Ὀμηρόκεντρον τὸ ἐπὶ Πανὸς συνετέλεσέ τι τὸ <τοῦ κέρα ἐκ κεφαλῆς> καὶ ἐξῆς, ὡς τοῦ Πανὸς κερασφόρου ὄντος κατά τὸν μῦθον.

1 pr. ὁ om. ΘBarb | alt. ἢ del. Fritzsche | **2** ἐπειδὴ cett., om. V | δοκεῖ cett., δοκεῖν ὁ Πάν V | ἔχειν RVEΘ, ἔχων Barb | τράγου REΘBarb(G) edd. cett., τράγον V, ταύρου (sic) Süß | αἰγοβάταν V Dindorf Dübner Chantry, αἰγιόβταν REΘBarb Bekker, αἰγιόβταν Rutherford | τραγοβάμων RVEBarb, τραγοβάμωνα Θ | λέγουσι RE(G), λέξ() V, λέγ() Barb, λέγει Θ | **3** κερατοβάτης edd., κερατοβάτης V | ὅτι οἱ RVEΘBarb, οἱ γὰρ M | **4** καλάμω RMEΘBarb, καλάμου V | κερατίου RVE, κερᾶτου Θ, κερατ() Barb, κέρατος M | ἐχρῶντο hic REΘBarb, post καλάμω M, om. V | ἦδεσαν—γὰρ Suda, ἢ ἦδεσαν REΘBarb, ἦδισαν V (ἔδισαν G) | ἀνέφερον REΘBarb, ἀναφαίροντας V (ἀναφέροντες G) | τῷ ὀνόματι cett. (τὸ ὄνομα G) | **5** λέγομεν ἔτι νῦν RVE, ἔτι νῦν λέγομεν Θ, ἔτι νῦν εἶναι λέγομεν Barb | ἐκ REΘBarb, om. V | ὅτι REΘBarb, γὰρ (post παλαιὸν) V | ἐντέρινα RVE, νεύρινα ΘBarb | **6** ἐπεὶ RE, ἐπειδὴ M, ἐπὶ Θ, καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ (sic) V, om. Barb | ἦδεται RMEΘBar, ἦ δὲ V (ἦδεν G) | ἐστὶν REΘ, ἦν V, οὗν Barb, om. M | **7** ἴτης λύρας† codd, τοῦ δόνακος tempt. Schuringa | κέρατος (G), κέρας V | **8-9** ὡς—λύρας hic V, post ἐχρῶντο (om. ὡς) EΘBarb | **8** ἐν V, om. EΘBarb | **9** Αἰχμαλώτισιν EΘ, Αἰχμαλώτοις Barb, Αἰχμαλώτοις V | σου EΘ, σοι V, ὁ Barb | ὡσπερὶ Dindorf coll. Poll. 4.62, recc. Dübner, Chantry, ὡς περὶ V (ὡς περὶ G), ὡσπερ EΘBarb Bekker | **10** φησιν cett., φασιν Barb | ἢ VE, ἦτοι R Dindorf, om. MΘBarb | **11** οἶον REΘBarb, οἱ V, (ὅτι G) om. M | κερατοβάτης Fritzsche Chantry (coll. Hesych. κ 2351 C.), κεροβάτης RVEΘBarb Bekker Dindorf Dübner Süß, κερωβάτης M, κερ<ατιν>οβάτης Rutherford | cett., οἰονεὶ τὴν ΘBarb | κερατίνην VME, (ante ἔχων) ΘBarb, κερατίνον R Rutherford | εἴπερ MEΘBarb edd. cett., ἦπερ V (ὄσπερ G), ὡς R Rutherford Süß | τὰ κάτω τράγου RVME, τὰ κατὰ τράγου Barb, τὰ κατὰ τράγον Θ | ἔχειν E edd. cett., ἔχ() Barb, ἔχων RMΘ Rutherford Süß, (ante τράγου) V | **12** κεροβάτης cett., κερωβάτης M

Dionysos' reiterated attempts at stopping the song of the Frogs fail once again as the Chorus responds to the god's imprecation "go to hell with your 'koax'!" (*Ra.* 226) with the enumeration of its divine protectors (229-232 "I am loved by the Muses skilled in the lyre and by horn-footed Pan who plays tunes on the reed-pipe. Apollo the phorminx-player delights in me too").

The otherwise unattested epithet "horn-footed"⁶³³ attracted the attention of ancient commentators, who tried to identify its origin and meaning. The text printed here reflects the annotation as preserved by V, where the scholiastic material concerning κεροβάτας is combined with that regarding the "tunes played on the reed-pipe" (καλαμόφθογγα) and the "reed under the lyre" (l. 232 ἔνεκα δόνακος, ὄν ὑπολύριον κτλ)⁶³⁴. Overall, the

⁶³³ See e.g. Sommerstein 1999, 57: «hornfooted Pan»; Holzberg 2011, 17: «der Bocksfuß Pan»; Halliwell 2015, 182: «goat-hoofed Pan». The expression has some parallels in Latin literature (see Verg. *Aen.* 6.591 *cornipedum ... equorum* and Hor. *Carm.* 2.19.1-4 *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus / vidi docentem – credite posteri – / Nymphasque discentis et auris / capripedum Satyrorum acutas*), see also van Leeuwen 1896, 48f.; Kock 1898, 75.

⁶³⁴ The other manuscripts divide the discussion under separate lemmata.

annotation offers two anonymous explanations of the epithet κεροβάτης, besides Didymos' one: the first (ὁ εἰς τὰ κέρατα τῶν ὀρῶν βαίνων ... ὁ βαίνων ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων. κέρατα δὲ φασι τὰ ἀκρωτήρια) is based on a secondary meaning of κέρας, *i.e.* “mountain-peak”, and results from the confusion between κεροβάτης and κεραβάτης, as already underlined by Fritzsche (1845, 138f.)⁶³⁵. The second seemingly ‘rationalises’ the epithet “horn-footed” by linking it to a condition similar to onychogryphosis⁶³⁶, thus presupposing a more anthropomorphic representation of Pan, with fully human legs and feet⁶³⁷.

Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν, ἢ ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει: the first proposed interpretation “because (Pan) has horns” entails either (1) that Didymos acknowledged the common *nomen agentis* meaning of the suffix -βάτης and understood κεροβάτης to mean “he who walks with (?) horns” (or something to that effect), or (2) that he simply equated the epithet to compounds such as κερουῆχος⁶³⁸ or κερασφόρος⁶³⁹, completely overlooking the sense of the suffix -βάτης. The earliest literary description of Pan as having horns is in the Homeric *Hymn to Pan* (δικέρωτα, ll. 2 and 37), but here the grammarian is probably referring to the universally known iconography of the god, in which the horns played a central role⁶⁴⁰.

ἢ οἷον κερατοβάτης, τὴν βᾶσιν ἔχων κερατίνην: this second explanation of the epithet relies on an etymology with syncope, *i.e.* through “contraction” from a longer form (κεροβάτης from κερατοβάτης⁶⁴¹). The method is explicitly mentioned in another Didymean fragment, probably deriving from the *Comic Vocabulary* and preserved in Harpokration's *Lexicon to the Ten Attic Orators* (with ποδοκάκκη explained as deriving from ποδοκατοχή)⁶⁴² and is used by the grammarian also to explain the obscure term βρίκελοι in Kratinos' *Seriphioi* (from βροτῶ εἴκελοι)⁶⁴³. In fact, etymology with syncope was already applied by Aristarchos to some Homeric

⁶³⁵ See *Et. M.* 504,2f. G.; *Suda* κ 1350 A.; [Zon.] 1185,12-17 T. See also Alberti 1766, 232.

⁶³⁶ There is no description of this or a similar condition in Greek medical writings.

⁶³⁷ Such an iconography is in fact attested in the 4th century BCE within the school of Polykleitos, see *AL III/1*, 1414-1417; Boardman 1997, 925. Despite the ‘rationalising’ interpretation, manuscript V connects this explanation with the adjective αἰγίπους (“goat-footed”), which is only found in *Hdt.* 4.25 (οἱ δὲ φαλακροὶ οὗτοι λέγουσι ... οἰκέειν τὰ ὄρεα αἰγίποδας ἀνδρας). The form αἰγίπους, instead, is attested twice in astrological literature (see *Ptol. Tetr.* 3.12.7; *Heph. Astr.* 139.2), while αἰγυπόδης occurs twice in the Homeric hymn to Pan and thrice in epigrammatic literature (see *H. Pan.* 1f. ἀμφὶ μοι Ἑρμείῳ φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα, / αἰγυπόδην δικέρωτα φιλόκροτον κτλ., 35-37 ἐκ δ' ἐτέλεσσε γάμον θαλερόν, τέκε δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν / Ἑρμείῳ φίλον υἷον ἄφαρ τερατωπὸν ἰδέσθαι, / αἰγυπόδην δικέρωτα πολύκροτον ἠδυέλωτα, *Nicarch. AP* 9.330 = *HE* 2728 Πᾶνα τὸν αἰγυπόδην, *Paul. Sil. AP* 6.57 = 20,3 *Viainsino* αἰγυπόδη Πάν, *adesp. AP* 16.15 αἰγυπόδης Σάτυρος).

⁶³⁸ Cf. *Babr.* 1.45.4-8 εὐράν δ' (*scil.* ὁ αἰπόλος) ἐκεῖ τάχιον εἰσδεδουκίας / αἴγας κερουῆχος ἀγρίας, πολὺ πλείους / ὧν αὐτὸς ἦγε, μείζονάς τε καὶ κρείσσους, / ταῖς μὲν φέρων ἔβαλλε θαλλὸν ἐξ ὕλης, / τὰς δ' ἰδίας ἀφῆκε μακρὰ λιμώττειν.

⁶³⁹ This is referred to Pan in *Luc. Bis Acc.* 9,9-13 (ΔΙ) μὴ πρότερον ἀπέληθης, ὧ Ἑρμῆ, πρὶν εἰπεῖν ὅστις οὗτος ὁ προσιών ἐστιν, ὁ κερασφόρος, ὁ τὴν σύριγγα, ὁ λάσιος ἐκ τοῖς σκελοῖν. (EP) τί φῆς; ἀγνοεῖς τὸν Πᾶνα, τῶν Διονύσου θεραπόντων τὸν βακχικώτατον; and *Long.* 2.24.2 ἔνθα τὸ τοῦ Πανὸς ἄγαλμα ἴδρυτο τραγοσκελές, κερασφόρον, τῆ μὲν σύριγγα τῆ δὲ τράγον πηδῶντα κατέχον.

⁶⁴⁰ For an overview of the evolution of Pan's iconography, see *AL III/1*, 1406-1439; Brommer 1956; Borgeaud 1988, 52f.

⁶⁴¹ In the text, the adjective κερατοβάτης is actually Fritzsche's conjecture, which finds support both in *Hesych.* κ 2351 C. (κεροβάτης· ὁ Πάν· ἦτοι ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει, ἢ οἰονεὶ κερατοβάτης) and in the phrase ἢ οἷον κερατοβάτης preserved only by V. In the light of this evidence, Rutherford's κερ<ατιν>οβάτης (1896, 307) seems less plausible.

⁶⁴² *Harp. π* 76 Keaney ποδοκάκκη· Δημοσθένης Κατὰ Τιμοκράτους (24.105). τὸ ξύλον τὸ ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο, ἦτοι παρεμβεβλημένου τοῦ ἐτέρου κ, ποδῶν τις κάκωσις οὔσα, ἢ κατὰ συγκοπὴν, ὡς φησι Δίδυμος (fr. 249a C.-Pr.), οἷον ποδοκατοχή.

⁶⁴³ See *Hesych.* β 1152 Cunningham βρίκελοι· οἱ μὲν τοὺς ἰστόποδας, ἀπὸ τοῦ βάρους καὶ τοῦ ξύλου· οἱ δὲ βαρβάρους· Δίδυμος (fr. 9 C.-Pr.) δὲ τὰ τραγικὰ προσωπεῖα, παρὰ Κρατίνῳ, οἷον βροτῶ εἴκελοι, ἐν Σεριφίσις (fr. 218 K.-A.).

terms⁶⁴⁴. With regard to this particular instance, the comparison with the synonymic triplet κερασφόρος-κερατοφόρος-κεροφόρος (“horned”)⁶⁴⁵ suggests that no actual semantic difference should exist between κεροβάτης and κερατοβάτης. The fact that the derivation through syncope from κερατοβάτης is linked to this second explanation and not to the first indicates that Didymos perceived at least a slight semantic difference between κεροβάτης and κερ<ατ>οβάτης. Judging from the explanation τὴν βάσιν ἔχων κερατίνην, the difference was in the suffix -βάτης, to which, in the first proposed interpretation, Didymos gave the meaning of *nomen agentis* (“he who walks”), while in κερ<ατ>οβάτης he intended it as equivalent to βάσις (“with horned step”, therefore “with hoofs”)⁶⁴⁶.

εἴπερ ἱστορεῖται τὰ κάτω τράγου ἔχειν: in the scholia, the verb ἱστορεῖται is mostly used to allude to the existence of parallel narratives (without explicitly quoting the sources), primarily with regard to myths. Instead, when the object of discussion is a historical event, ἱστορεῖται is followed by the names of the author(s) providing the parallel account (mainly historians⁶⁴⁷, but sometimes poets too⁶⁴⁸). In this case, Didymos is probably alluding to the common knowledge of Pan’s iconography, rather than to specific literary accounts⁶⁴⁹.

χηλὰς ἔχειν δοκεῖ ὁ Πᾶν τράγου, διὸ καὶ αἰγοβάταν καὶ τραγοβάμονα λέγουσιν: the anonymous observation, that introduces Didymos’ fragment in all manuscripts, seems to depend on the grammarian’s second proposed interpretation of κεροβάτης (see above), and might in fact be a later rework of his original comment, although the two compounds offered as parallels to κεροβάτης are not easily reconciled to the supposed meaning “horn-footed”. In particular, αἰγοβάτης (also αἰγιβάτης) has a clearly sexual meaning, for it appears to be a standard adjective for τράγος (see Pind. fr. 201 S.-M. αἰγιβάται / ... τράγοι γυναιξὶ μίσγονται and Phil. AP 6.99 = GPh 2729 αἰγιβάτην πολίων τράγον) and is also comically associated to goatherds by Meleagros (AP 12.41 = HE 4506f. στέργω θῆλον ἔρωτα: δασυτρώγων δὲ πίεσμα / λασταύρων μελέτω ποιμέσιν αἰγοβάταις). In all likelihood, the obscene meaning needs to be presupposed also when the adjective occurs as epithet of Pan, as in epigrammatic literature⁶⁵⁰. As far as the otherwise unattested τραγοβάμων is concerned, the adjective seems closer in meaning to the interpretation of κεροβάτης as “horn-footed”. Indeed,

⁶⁴⁴ See *schol.* [Did.] *Il.* 12.318a2 {ἀκλειεῖς;} οὕτως „ῥ’ἀκλειεῖς“ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κατὰ συγκοπὴν, ὡς τὸ „δυσκλέα“ (2.115) **T**, *schol. Od.* 14.176 **H** οὕτι χέρεια] οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος. χερεῖονα χέρεια, συγκοπή. See also *schol.* [Ariston.] *Il.* 3.44b **A** πρόμον: ὅτι κατὰ συγκοπὴν τὸν πρόμαχον εἴρηκεν, οὐχ ὡς οἱ Γλωσσογράφοι τὸν βασιλέα, 7.75a1 **A** πρόμος ἔμμεναι Ἐκτορι δίω: ὅτι ἰδίως ὡς περὶ ἐτέρου. καὶ ὅτι πρόμον τὸν πρόμαχον κατὰ συγκοπὴν and Schironi 2018, 343.

⁶⁴⁵ See *GEW* 826; *DELG* 517; *EDG* 676.

⁶⁴⁶ This meaning of the suffix -βάτης is found *e.g.* in στυλοβάτης (“column base”).

⁶⁴⁷ See *e.g. Ep. Hom.* π 116 Dyck νῶτος ... ἤδη δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀρσενικὸν ἱστορεῖται παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι (*Eq.* 3, 3) καὶ Ἐφόρω (*FGrHist* 70 F 224); *schol. Dem.* 20.130 Dilts παρὰ Ἐφόρω (*FGrHist* 70 F 209) δὲ καὶ Ἀνδροτίωνι (*FGrHist* 324 F 105) ἱστορεῖται ὡς ἐνίκησαν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους Λακεδαιμόνιοι σφόδρα.

⁶⁴⁸ See *e.g. schol. Apoll. Rhod.* 4.1750-57 Wendel ἱστορεῖται ταῦτα παρὰ Πινδάρῳ ἐν Πυθιονίκαϊς (4), ἐπιμελέστερον δὲ παρὰ Θεοχρήστῳ ἐν α’ Λιβυκῶν (*FGrHist* 761 F 1a) καὶ παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐν α’ Κυρήνης (*FGrHist* 469 F 5a).

⁶⁴⁹ Unlike in *schol. Pind. O.* 5.20e; 27b Drachmann (= Did. fr. 111a-b C.-Pr. = 8a-b Braswell τοῦτο δὲ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος ἀμάρτυρον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἱστορεῖται κτλ.), where Didymos clearly refers to literary evidence with the verb ἱστορεῖται.

⁶⁵⁰ See Theokritos (*Ep.* 5.6 = AP 9.433 = HE 3496f. ἐγγὺς δὲ στάντες λασίας δρυὸς ἄντρου ὄπισθεν / Πᾶνα τὸν αἰγιβάταν ὄφρανίσωμες ὕπνου), Nikarchos (AP 6.31 = HE 2751f. αἰγιβάτη τότε Πανὶ καὶ εὐκάρπῳ Διονύσῳ / καὶ Διοῦ Χθονίῃ ξυνὸν ἔθηκα γέρας) and Meleagros (AP 12.128 = HE 4470f. αἰπολικαὶ σὺριγγες, ἐν οὖρεσι μηκέτι Δάφνιν / φωνεῖτ’ αἰγιβάτη Πανὶ χαριζόμεναι).

τραγοβάμων can be considered fully equivalent to τραγόπους, which describes Pan in several epigrams⁶⁵¹. However, regardless of the meaning of τραγοβάμων, it must be noted that βάμων-compounds are particularly frequent in Byzantine works (see *e.g.* Sym. Neoth. *Hymn.* 38.96 ἀεροβάμων, Eust. *Serm.* 7.137.23 αἰθεροβάμων) and this could in fact support a late dating of this anonymous rephrasing.

⁶⁵¹ See Mel. *AP.* 7.535 = *HE* 4701; Nicod. *AP* 6.315 = *FGE* 2028; ‘Simon.’ *API* 232 = *FGE* 700. This assumption is supported by other rather widespread βάμων-compounds, which are always used to describe what the substantive moves or stands on (see *e.g.* Aeschyl. *Ch.* 591 πτανά τε καὶ πεδοβάμονα, fr. 225 R. λεοντοβάμων ... σκάφη χαλκήλατος, Soph. *Tr.* 1095 ἵποβάμονα στρατόν, fr. 884 R.² ὁ σκηπτροβάμων αἰετός, Eur. *Or.* 516 τετραβάμονος ὡς ὑπ’ ἀπήνας, but see also Aristot. *Phgn.* 813a3 μακροβάμων καὶ βραδυβάμων, but see Theokritos’ βροτοβάμων [*Syr.* 13 = *AP* 15.21], that according to Palumbo Stracca 2007, 116 probably has a sexual sense).

fr. 264 (= II 14.12, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: origin of the quotation κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 704a-b-c Chantry*

τὴν πόλιν **Barb** καὶ ταῦτ' **MBarb** ἔχοντες **M** κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις. **VE** Δίδυμός φησι· παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου (fr. dub. 462 R.) <...>. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἔστι δὲ ὄντως παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ (fr. 213 W.²) **VMEΘBarb** “ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις”. **VMEΘBarb[Ald]** θέλει δὲ εἰπεῖν· “καὶ ταῦτα ὄντες ἐν πολλοῖς κινδύνοις”. ἐνειστήκει γὰρ ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς πόλεμος. **RVMEΘBarb[Ald]**

“having the city and these affairs in the embrace of the waves”. Didymos says: “(with an allusion) to Aischylos’ line [...]”. Actually, it comes from Archilochos: “having their lives in the embrace of the waves”. He means: “being such things in many dangers”. Indeed, the Peloponnesian war was still present.

Aristoph. Ra. 703-705 εἰ δὲ ταῦτ' ὀγκωσόμεσθα κάποσεμνουόμεθα, / τὴν πόλιν καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις, / ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ ποτ' αὐθις εὖ φρονεῖν οὐ δόξομεν.

App. Prov. 3.37 (= *Suda* κ 1205 A.) καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις· ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄντες ἐν πολλοῖς κινδύνοις | *Suda* κ 2675 A. κύμα· Ἀριστοφάνης· “καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις”. ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄντες ἐν πολλοῖς κινδύνοις καὶ ἀνάγκαις, ὅτι τὰ μεγάλα κύματα ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ αἴγες λέγεται. ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἐπαιγίζω ἐπὶ τοῦ σφοδρῶς πνέω.

1 παρὰ cett., περὶ **M** | τῷ **V** Dindorf Dübner, τὸ **EΘBarb** Bekker Schmidt Süß Chantry, om. **M** | **2** Αἰσχύλου **MΘ(Ald)** edd. cett., Αἰσχύλ() **VEBarb**, Αἰσχύλῳ Dübner | post Αἰχύλου lacuna statuenda | παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ Dindorf Dübner Süß, παρὰ Ἀρχιλοχ() **V**, παρὰ τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ **M**, παρὰ τὰ Αἰσχύλ() **E**, παρὰ τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου **Θ** Chantry, παρὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου **Barb** | **2-3** ἔστι-ἀγκάλαις om. Bekker | **3** θέλει δὲ εἰπεῖν cett., om. **R** | **4** γὰρ cett., om. **Θ** | Πελοποννησιακὸς **R**, Πελοποννησιακὸς **ΘBarb^{pc}**, Διονύσιακὸς **VMEBarb^{pc}(Ald)**

In the epirrhema (Il. 686-705), Aristophanes advises the Athenian people to reinstate as citizens those who had lost citizenship as a result of participating in the oligarchic revolution of 411 BCE. The passage ends with the playwright's stern rebuke against the Athenians' pride (Il. 703-705). The tone of the admonition is made even more solemn by the depiction of Athens⁶⁵² κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις, “in the arms of the waves”, a grandiloquent expression that ancient scholarship identified as a literary quotation⁶⁵³.

⁶⁵² With regard to the word-order problem in *Ra. 704*, see Dover 1993, 280 and Wilson 2007c, 172.

⁶⁵³ The final section of *Suda* κ 2675 A. (“καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις” ... ὅτι τὰ μεγάλα κύματα ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ αἴγες λέγεται. ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἐπαιγίζω ἐπὶ τοῦ σφοδρῶς πνέω) seems to entail a different reading of the Aristophanic line, with ἀγκάλαις replaced by a word loosely related to αἴξ in its secondary meaning of “big waves” (possibly αἰγιαλοῖς?).

In the scholium, Didymos' *interpretamentum* of the phrase κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις is followed by the opinion of a later reader, who attributed the words to Archilochos and quoted a full iambic trimeter (fr. 213 W.²) from which the expression was allegedly taken. The annotation then ends with an anonymous paraphrase of the Aristophanic line.

Δίδυμος φησι· παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου <...>: the various readings offered by the manuscripts – παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλ() **V**, περι Αἰσχύλου **M**, παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλ() **EΘBarb** – resulted in three divergent texts by Bekker (1829, 385 παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου, followed by Schmidt 1854, 249 and Chantry 1999, 98), Dindorf (1838, 92 παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλου) and Dübner (1842, 296 παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλῳ), with different implications with regard to the content of the Didymean fragment⁶⁵⁴. If, on the one hand, Dindorf's solution is grammatically acceptable and based on the paradosis, Dübner's conjectural restoration Αἰσχύλῳ is – on the other hand – supported by the ubiquitous use, in the scholia, of παρά + dative to refer to the presence of a certain expression in a specific author⁶⁵⁵: nonetheless, the confusion of the manuscript transmission could hardly have been originated by an obvious expression such as παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλῳ. Both Dindorf's and Dübner's texts imply the intent, on Didymos' side, to signal a *verbatim* quotation from Aeschylus in *Ra.* 704. This perspective is shared by Fritzsche (1845, 268), where the Didymean exegesis is explained as an erroneous recollection of Aeschyl. *Ch.* 587-589 (πόντιαί τ' ἀγκάλαι / κνωδάλων ἀνταίων / βρύουσι κτλ)⁶⁵⁶. However, Bekker, Schmidt and Chantry's text παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου is guaranteed by another Didymean fragment, preserved by *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1121a Holwerda ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος (fr. 242, see above)· παρὰ τὸ Πινδάρου “ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἄλφειοῦ” (*N.* 1.1). The parallel illuminates the scholium to *Ra.* 704 with regard to both reading and meaning, as it shows Didymos' detecting of an alleged Pindaric hypotext in *Av.* 1121 (ἀλλ' οὐτοσὶ τρέχει τις Ἄλφειὸν πνέων) expressed through παρά τὸ + genitive of the author's name⁶⁵⁷. It is therefore rather easy to suppose a similar situation for the comment on *Ra.* 704: the grammarian's aim was to highlight an Aristophanic allusion to a passage by Aeschylus (most probably *Ch.* 587-589, as suggested by Fritzsche 1845, 268) and not a *verbatim* quotation (as implied by Dindorf's and Dübner's solutions, as well as by Chantry's translation [2009, 82]: «Didyme dit que cela vient d'Eschyle. En réalité, cela vient d'Archiloque»). If this is the case, Didymos must have quoted the Aeschylean line that he identified as hypotext for Aristoph. *Ra.* 704 (as in fr. 242) and its absence needs to be explained

⁶⁵⁴ An originally more articulate wording such as that of *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 1257a Hangard (πολλὸς δ' ἀμφὶ τὰς γένους: πρὸς τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ (fr. 44 W.2) “πολλὸς δ' ἀφ' ἧν περι στόμα”) cannot be excluded.

⁶⁵⁵ See e.g. *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 3a παρὰ τῷ Σόφορονι, 352 παρὰ Πλάτωνι τῷ κωμικῷ ἐν δράματι Ἑορταῖς, 399a Wilson καὶ παρὰ τῷ ῥήτορι ἐν τῷ <πρώτῳ> τῶν Φιλιππικῶν, *Pac.* 126a Holwerda ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ Σθενεβοῖα παρὰ τῷ τραγικῷ οὕτως, 1148b παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ τῷ ἀμοργίῳ, *Ra.* 191c Chantry παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Χρύση. See also Dickey 2007, 117.

⁶⁵⁶ See also van de Sande Bakhuizen (1877, 142), who instead thought of Aeschyl. *Ag.* 723 (πολέα δ' ἔσχ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις).

⁶⁵⁷ παρά + accusative is used rather frequently in the scholia to signal a hypotext (real or devised), underlying the commented passage (a meaning, therefore, inherently different from παρά + dative). In these occurrences the reference to the author is often achieved by means of a derivative adjective (see e.g. *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 390a Wilson παρὰ τὸ Ὀμηρικόν, *Nu.* 603 Holwerda παρὰ τὸ Εὐριπίδειον, *Pac.* 1159c Holwerda παρὰ τὸ Ἡσιόδειον, *Av.* 1240 Holwerda τοῦτό φησι παρὰ τὸ Σοφοκλεῖον).

by means of epitomation⁶⁵⁸. As far as the anonymous response ἔστι δὲ ὄντως παρὰ τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου κτλ⁶⁵⁹, the textual transmission of the pericope is as confused as the Didymean one, since the manuscripts have respectively παρὰ Ἀρχιλοχ() (**V**), παρὰ τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ (**M**), παρὰ τὰ Αἰσχύλ() (**E**), παρὰ τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου (**Θ**), παρὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου (**Barb**). The solution adopted by Süß (1911, 49, Δίδυμός φησι παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου. ἔστι δὲ ὄντως παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ κτλ) is the most convincing, as it implies that the hypotext devised by Didymos was not rejected by the later reader in favour of another alleged hypotext (as Chantry's text implies), but that it was rather refuted thanks to Archilochos' passage, that proved that the expression κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις in *Ra.* 704 was actually a *verbatim* quotation from this poet.

⁶⁵⁸ See Roemer 1908, 267: «die von ihm aufgespürte Stelle ist ausgefallen». See also *e.g.* the abovementioned *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ach.* 390a Wilson, *Nu.* 603 Holwerda, *Pac.* 1159c Holwerda, *Av.* 1240 Holwerda, where the reference to the author is always followed by the direct quotation of the supposed hypotext.

⁶⁵⁹ Debates on the identification of Aristophanes' quotes, reminiscences and borrowings from other authors were anything but infrequent in ancient scholarship. An example is offered by *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 1269a-b-c Chantry (κύδιστ' Ἀχαιῶν: Ἀρίσταρχος [fr. 24 Muzzolon] καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος [see Montanari 1996a], ἐπισκέψασθε πόθεν εἰσί. Τιμαχίδας δὲ [fr. 25a Matijašić] ἐκ Τηλέφου Αἰσχύλου [fr. 328 R.]. Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ [see Pagani 2009a-b] ἐξ Ἰφιγενείας).

fr. 265 (= II 14.13, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of λυγισμῶν

Source: *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 775b-c-d Chantry*

καὶ **M** λυγισμῶν **VME**: καμπῶν. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** γράφεται **MEΘBarb** καὶ **M** λογιμῶν. <λυγίζειν γὰρ> τὸ [δὲ] κάμπτειν. ἅμα μὲν πρὸς τὰ μέλη, ἅμα δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐξελίττειν καὶ ἀναδύεσθαι. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** καὶ **M** Ὀμηρος: “δίδη μόσχοισι λύγοισι” (*Il. XI 105*). **VMEΘBarb(Ald)** Δίδυμος δὲ λυγισμῶν **VMEΘ(Ald)** ἀπὸ τῶν συνδεσέων τοῦ λόγου **E(Ald)**

“and twistings (*lygismoi*)”: bendings. It is also written “reasonings” (*logismoi*). <To “twist”> is to bend. It refers both to body parts and to the act of unwinding and rolling up. And Homer (says): “he tied (them) with flexible twigs (*lygoi*)”. Didymos: “twistings” (*lygismoi*) from the connections of the speech.

Aristoph. Ra 774-776 οἱ δ’ ἀκροόμενοι / τῶν ἀντιλογιῶν καὶ λυγισμῶν καὶ στροφῶν / ὑπερεμάνησαν κἀνόμισαν σοφώτατον.

Poll. 4.96f. εἴποις δ’ ἂν ὀρχηστήν ... εὐκαμπῆ, λυγιστικόν ... καὶ τὰ πράγματα ... λυγισμὸν, κάμψιν | **Hesych. λ 1333** λυγίζεται· συνδεδέται. στρέφεται, **1334** λυγίζομενον· καμπτόμενον, **1336 C.** λυγισμός· ἀνάκλασις τῶν μελῶν.

1 καμπῶν **E(Ald)**, καμπτῶν **VMΘBarb**, hic edd., post γράφεται (καὶ **M**) **MEΘBarb** | λογιμῶν **Bekker Dindorf Dübner Süss**, λογιμὸν **M**, παραλογιμῶν **VE** (τουτέστι παραλογιμῶν **Ald**), ἀπὸ παραλογιμῶν **Θ**, ἀπὸ τῶν λογιμῶν **Barb**, vac. **Chantry** | **1-2** λυγίζειν γὰρ ins. **Dobree** | **2** τὸ κάμπτειν hic cett., post ἀναδύεσθαι **M** | pr. δὲ del. **Dobree** | ante ἅμα, ἴν’ ἤ **M** | **2** μέλη cett., τέλη **M** | ἐξελίττειν cett., ἐλίττειν **M** | δίδη **MΘBarb**, (δίδει **Ald**), διδυ- **VE** | μόσχοισι cett., om. **Barb** | λύγοισι **VE**, λίγοισι **M**, λέγοισι **Θ**, om. **Barb** | **4** post λυγισμῶν, γράφει **M** | ἀπὸ-λόγου codd. **Bekker Dindorf Dübner Süss**, ἀντὶ τῶν συνδεσέων τοῦ λόγου **Dobree**, om. **Chantry**

Ra. 771-778 host the account, given by the anonymous slave⁶⁶⁰, of Euripides’ accomplishments in Hades: the playwright has managed to convince his new audience of his poetic superiority over Aischylos by means of ἀντιλογία, λυγισμοί and στροφαί. The line aims at criticising Euripides’ tortuous rhetoric, but while the first of the three terms clearly reminds of sophistic, the other two allude metaphorically to wrestling, dancing and athletics⁶⁶¹.

The exegetic material concerning the term “twistings” presents some noticeable discrepancies between the manuscripts and needs some degree of emendation to be fully comprehensible. The main cause of textual corruption was the reference to the alternative reading λυγισμῶν (which is indeed attested by part of the

⁶⁶⁰ As regards the identity of this character, see Dover 1993, 50-53.

⁶⁶¹ See, among others, Blaydes 1889, 355; van Leeuwen 1896, 123; Kock 1898, 137; Radermacher 1954, 252f.; Dover 1993, 287f., Sommerstein 1999, 223.

manuscript tradition of *Frogs*⁶⁶²), for two main reasons. Firstly, the word *καμπῶν* – a simple gloss for *λυγισμῶν* as confirmed by several entries in Pollux and Hesychios (see above) – was later taken as (part of) the *varia lectio* (the manuscripts indeed read *γράφεται καμπῶν κτλ.*). Secondly, confusion inevitably arose from the comparison between the corrupt *λογισμῶν* in the Aristophanic text and the scholiastic wording *γράφεται λογισμῶν*, originating different ‘false’ *variae lectiones*, such as *λογισμόν* (**M**) and *παραλογισμῶν* (**VE**). What is more, Dobree’s integration <λυγίζειν γὰρ> (1833, 172) undeniably betters the text and is justifiable with an omission due to haplography.

Δίδυμος δὲ λυγισμῶν ἀπὸ τῶν συνδεσέων τοῦ λόγου: while the first part of the scholium features an interpretation of *λυγισμός* as “bending”, Didymos links the term to the idea of “tying together” words and concepts, clearly as a nod to Euripides’ tortuous rhetoric⁶⁶³. The Homeric quotation immediately preceding the fragment (taken from the description of Achilles in the act of tying Antiphos and Isos after having captured them) is much closer to the grammarian’s interpretation than to the anonymous exegesis and might in fact have originally belonged to Didymos’ comment⁶⁶⁴, as suggested by the identical verbal root in Homer’s *δίδη* and in the term *σύνδεσις*. With regard to the isolated *γράφει* of **M**, it probably resulted from the previous reference to the alternative reading *λογισμῶν* and should not be regarded as an indication of a textual choice or intervention by the grammarian⁶⁶⁵.

⁶⁶² In particular, by **M** – where «in rasura correxit λυ ex λο et deinde supra λυ scripsit λο prima manus» (von Velsen 1881, 76) – and **NpI**.

⁶⁶³ This is a more general meaning of *σύνδεσις*, but possibly reminiscent of the one found in grammatical treatises, where the term indicates the act of connecting different parts of speech by means of conjunctions (*σύνδεσμοι*), see e.g. *Apoll. Dys. Conj.* 225,15 Schneider *ἔτι ὅτε φαμέν οὕτως*: «ἄρα ἡμέρα ἐστὶν ἢ νύξ;» *σύνδεσιν ἐποιησάμεθα οὐ διὰ τοῦ ἄρα, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἦ.*

⁶⁶⁴ See Dobree 1833, 172, where the Homeric quotation is printed after Didymos’ fragment.

⁶⁶⁵ For a detailed discussion of the ambiguous meaning of *γράφειν* in the scholiastic jargon, see Slater 1989, 46-53; Neri 1996, 34-37. It must be noted that there is no clear evidence of Didymos’ practising textual criticism on Aristophanes’ plays, while several instances are preserved e.g. in the scholia to Pindar (some cases show a conservative approach, such as *schol. Pind. O.* 10.55c [= *Did. fr.* 123 C.-Pr. = 20 Braswell] and *P.* 7.6a Drachmann [= *Did. fr.* 135 C.-Pr. = 31 Braswell]), while others involve actual emendation attempts, such as *schol. Pind. O.* 9.34c [= *Did. fr.* 120 C.-Pr. = 17 Braswell], *O.* 10.17c [= *Did. fr.* 122 C.-Pr. = 19 Braswell] and *N.* 10.114a Drachmann [= *Did. fr.* 165 C.-Pr. = 61 Braswell]).

fr. 266 (= II 14.14, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: Phormisios, disciple of Aischylos in Aristoph. *Ra.* 965

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 965a-b-c Chantry **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)**

Δίδυμός φησιν ὅτι Φορμίσιος δραστικός ἦν, καὶ τὴν κόμην τρέφων καὶ φοβερὸς δοκῶν εἶναι. δι' ὃ καὶ Αἰσχύλου μαθητὴν φησιν αὐτὸν εἶναι. δασύς δὲ ἦν καὶ καθίει τὸν πώγωνα. κωμωδεῖται δὲ καὶ εἰς δωροδοκίαν. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)**

Didymos says that Phormisios was a man of action, who let his hair grow long and had a threatening appearance. Therefore he (Aristophanes) says that he was a disciple of Aischylos. He was hairy and let his beard grow long. He is attacked in comedy also for corruption.

Aristoph. *Ra.* 964-967 γνώσει δὲ τοῖς τούτου τε κάμοις ἐκατέρου μαθηταῖς. / τουτουμενὶ Φορμίσιος Μεγαίνετός θ' ὁ Μανῆς, / σαλπυγολογυπηνάδαι, σαρκασμοπιτυοκάμπται, / οὔμοι δὲ Κλειτοφῶν τε καὶ Θηραμένης ὁ κομψός.

Aristoph. *Ec.* 95-97 οὐκουν καλὰ γ' ἂν πάθοιμεν, εἰ πλήρης τύχοι / ὁ δῆμος ὦν κάπειθ' ὑπερβαίνουσά τις / ἀναβαλλομένη δεῖξειε τὸν Φορμίσιον; | **Ath. 6.229e-f** Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμωδιοποιός ... ἐν τῷ Πλούτῳ δράματι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ὁμωνύμου θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν τοὺς ἰχθυηροὺς φησι πίνακας ἀργυροῦς ἀναφανῆναι καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἅπαντα, λέγων ὡδί [*seqq.* Aristoph. *Pl.* 812-815]. Πλάτων δ' ἐν Πρέσβεσι (fr. 127 K.-A.): “κατέλαβον (κᾶτ' ἔλαβον Fritzsche) Ἐπικράτης τε καὶ Φορμίσιος / παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πλεῖστα δωροδοκήματα, / ὀξύβαφα χρυσᾶ καὶ πινακίσκους ἀργυροῦς”, **13.570e-f** ταῦτά σοι παραινεῖν ἔχω, ἑταῖρε Μυρτίλε. καὶ κατὰ τὴν Φιλεταίρου Κυνηγίδα (fr. 6 K.-A.) “παῦσαι γέρων ὦν τοὺς τρόπους. οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτι / οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδιστον ἀποθανεῖν βινούνηθ' ἅμα, / ὥσπερ λέγουσιν ἀποθανεῖν Φορμίσιον;” | **Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 32** Φορμισίος τις τῶν συγκατελθόντων μετὰ τοῦ δήμου γνώμην εἰσηγήσατο τοὺς μὲν φεύγοντας κατιέναι, τὴν δὲ πολιτείαν μὴ πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς [τὴν] γῆν ἔχουσι παραδοῦναι | **Suda φ 606 A.** Φορμισίος καὶ Μεγαίνετος: ὁ Φορμισίος αὐθάδης καὶ θρασὺς στρατηγιῶν. Ἀριστοφάνης: Φορμισίος καὶ Μεγαίνετος ὁ Μάνης. ὀνόματα δούλων | *schol.* **Aristoph. *Ra.* 966a-b Chantry** σαλπυγολογυπηνάδαι· σάλπιγγας καὶ λόγγας καὶ ὑπήνας ἔχοντες. τοῦτο εἰς τὸν Φορμισίον ἀποτείνει, ὡς μέγαν ἔχοντα πώγωνα. εἶπεν δὲ συνθέτως, τὸ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολέμου, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πώγωνος, ***Ec.* 97 Regtuit** (~ *Suda* φ 605 A.) τὸν Φορμισίον: οὗτος δασύς. λέγει οὖν τὸ αἰδοῖον

1 τρέφων cett., στρέφων E(Ald) | **2** δι' ὃ Süss Chantry, διὸ codd. Bekker Dindorf Dübner | φησιν αὐτόν RME Bekker Süss Chantry, αὐτόν φασιν VΘBarb, αὐτόν φησιν G Dindorf Dübner | εἶναι om. M. | δασύς Kuster rec. Chantry, βαθὺς codd. Bekker Dindorf Dübner Süss, βαθυ<γένειο> Rutherford | ἦν cett., εἶην V | καθίει cett., καθεῖη V

The first depiction of Aischylos' style given by Euripides (Il. 907-953) culminates in a boastful claim of the didactic role supposedly played by his own tragedies in Athens (l. 954 *ἔπειτα τουτουσὶ λαλεῖν ἐδίδαξα*), and in the comparison between the two playwrights' respective 'pupils', selected by the speaker among the

most prominent political figures of the time: Phormisios and Megainetos (called “Manes”) on Aischylos’ side⁶⁶⁶, Kleitophon and the astute Theramenes (see fr. 267 below) on Euripides’⁶⁶⁷.

The scholium could be easily ascribable to Didymos in its entirety⁶⁶⁸, if not for the central section *δασὺς δὲ ἦν καὶ καθίει τὸν πῶγονα*, which might seem to be in slight contradiction to the grammarian’s *τὴν κόμην τρέφων* (see below).

Φορμίσιος: Phormisios (*PA* 14945, *PAA* 962695) was a prominent political figure between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th century BCE⁶⁶⁹, mocked twice in Aristophanes (*Ra.* 965 and *Ec.* 97) and twice in fragmentary comedy⁶⁷⁰. In the line from the *Assemblywomen*, Phormisios is mocked for his hairiness, while Plato in the *Ambassadors* (fr. 127 K.-A.) and Philetairos in the *Hauntress* (fr. 6 K.-A.) offer different lampoons: the first describes Phormisios and his colleague Epikrates in the act of accepting bribes from the Persian king⁶⁷¹ (the last section of the scholium refers indeed to this play), while the second mentions Phormisios’ peculiar death during sexual intercourse.

δραστικός: as far as scholiastic literature is concerned, *δραστικός* is almost always used either in its grammatical meaning of “active”⁶⁷² or as a generic synonym of adjectives such as the Homeric *ὄτηρός* (“busy”)⁶⁷³. Only rarely is it referred to characters (whether only mentioned, or on stage)⁶⁷⁴. With regard to extra-scholiastic evidence, the adjective occurs very frequently in Diodoros’ *Library of History*: the author preserves by far the highest number of occurrences of *δραστικός*⁶⁷⁵, which he mostly uses in portraits of great generals and politicians with a remarkable inclination towards quick and effective action⁶⁷⁶. Modern translators

⁶⁶⁶ «Rough military types, that is, men of action, unpolished, unrefined and uncivil, coarse and soldierly in their outlook and manners» (Lada-Richards 1999, 269).

⁶⁶⁷ Aristotle (*Ath.* 34.3) states that Phormisios (see below), Kleitophon (*PA* 8546, *PAA* 576135) and Theramenes (*PA* 7234D, *PAA* 513930) were among those *ἐν ἑταιρεία μὲν οὐδεμιᾷ συγκαθεστῶτες, [ἄ]λλως δὲ δοκοῦντες οὐδενὸς ἐπιλείπεσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν*, and that they aimed at establishing *τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν* (see also Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 32 and Rhodes 2016, 284). «Es geht also die Schilderung des Euripides nicht auf den Unterschied in der politischen Richtung, sondern vielmehr im Charakter und in der Lebensanschauung» (Radermacher 1954, 282). Nothing else is known, instead, about Megainetos (*PAA* 636190).

⁶⁶⁸ On Didymos’ general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 237, 245-247, 249, 257, 259, 268.

⁶⁶⁹ For an overview on his career, see Lenschau 1941, 541-544; Walter 2000, 952.

⁶⁷⁰ There is no way to prove that the figures mocked in all four passages are the same person, but «the name is so rare that they probably are» (Dover 1993, 313).

⁶⁷¹ The embassy, led by Phormisios and his colleague Epikrates (*PA* 4859D, *PAA* 393945), took place between 395 and 393 BCE (see Pirrotta 2009, 259). In all likelihood, the events related to the expedition played a major role in Plato’s play *Ambassadors*. Lysias’ speech *Against Epikrates* (*Lys.* 27) most probably relates to this embassy (see Pirrotta 2009, 259).

⁶⁷² See Matthaios 1999, 253f. and 306 for Aristarchos’ category of *δραστική ἔννοια* and its probable Stoic origins.

⁶⁷³ See e.g. *schol. Od.* 1.109c-d, 4.23a1-2.

⁶⁷⁴ See the paraphrase of Aeschyl. *Th.* 554 (*ἀνὴρ ἄκομπος, χεὶρ δ’ ὄρατ’ ὁρᾶτ’ ὁ δρᾶσιμον*) given by the relating scholium (554a *σιωπᾶν μὲν εἰδῶς καὶ μὴ ἀλαζονεύεσθαι θέλων, τὴν χεῖρα δὲ δραστικός*).

⁶⁷⁵ With the exception of medical writers, where the adjective describes e.g. the effectiveness of medications, the strength of bodily movements or the influence of external factors on human health.

⁶⁷⁶ Such as e.g. Duketios, leader of the Sikeloι (Diod. 11.88.6 *Δουκέτιος ... , δραστικός δ’ ὢν, νεωτέρων ὠρέγετο πραγμάτων*), Agesilaos, king of the Spartans (Diod. 15.19.4 *ὁ δ’ Ἀγησίλαος, ὢν φύσει δραστικός, φιλοπόλεμος ἦν καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων δυναστείας ἀντείχετο, 31.4 ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος [scil. ὁ Ἀγησίλαος] δραστικός καὶ μετὰ συνέσεως πολλῆς θρασὺς καὶ παραβόλοις πράξεσι χρώμενος, 33.1 οἱ δὲ συνόντες τῷ Ἀγησίλαῳ Σπαρτιᾶται σύμβουλοι καὶ οἱ τὰς ἡγεμονίας ἔχοντες ἐθαύμαζον, πῶς δραστικός εἶναι δοκῶν Ἀγησίλαος καὶ μείζονα καὶ δυναμικωτέραν ἔχον τὴν δύναμιν οὐ διηγωνίσαστο πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους*), Alexander the Great (Diod. 17.16 *τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀντίπατρον καὶ Παρμενίωνα συμβουλευόντων πρότερον παιδοποιήσασθαι καὶ τότε τοῖς τηλικούτοις ἐγχερεῖν*

of the scholium have given the adjective a generic meaning⁶⁷⁷, but, in the light of the evidence from Diodoros, it seems reasonable to suppose that Didymos' δραστικός also implies a reference to Phormisios' political activity, which was central to Plato's *Ambassadors* (see above) and therefore well known to the grammarian.

τὴν κόμην τρέφων: according to *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 966b* Chantry, the compound σαλπιγγολογχυπηνάδαι (“beard-lance-and-trumpet types”⁶⁷⁸) specifically refers to Phormisios' long beard (τοῦτο εἰς τὸν Φορμίσιον ἀποτείνει, ὡς μέγαν ἔχοντα πώγωνα). The comic replacement of the female organ with τὸν Φορμίσιον in *Aristoph. Ec. 97* confirms indeed that Phormisios was renowned (and had been for at least a decade⁶⁷⁹) for his hairy appearance. While the line from the *Assembly-Women* might allude to general hairiness, the last element of the compound in *Frogs*, ὑπήνη, hints unambiguously at the long beard⁶⁸⁰. In this context, Didymos' phrasing τὴν κόμην τρέφων and the following δασὺς δὲ ἦν καὶ καθίει τὸν πώγωνα can be explained in different ways. Firstly, they could be part of the same Didymean exegesis, with κόμη indicating “hair” in general – not specifically “hair of the head”⁶⁸¹ – and δασὺς-πώγωνα being a more precise explanation of the same idea (in this case, the entire scholium could be ascribed to Didymos). Secondly, they could be two separate exegeses, the anonymous δασὺς-πώγωνα relating to σαλπιγγολογχυπηνάδαι in *Ra. 966* and Didymos' explanation relying either on the same adjective (but with a wrong interpretation of ὑπήνη, which seems unlikely) or on another passage on Phormisios' appearance (*Ec. 97* or even a lost text): in this case, the scholium would be a compilation of Didymos's commentary and of another unnamed source, responsible also for the reference to Phormisios' corruption (alternatively, the reference is owed to Didymos and the section δασὺς-πώγωνα was inserted later in the scholium, separating the grammarian's comment in two parts).

φοβερός δοκῶν εἶναι: several occurrences from the Imperial age onwards show the link that was traditionally perceived between long κόμη and φοβερότης⁶⁸². The connection was so strong that an ancient paretymologic

ἔργοις, δραστικός ὢν [*scil.* ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος] καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν πράξεως ἀναβολὴν ἀλλοτρίως διακείμενος ἀντεῖπε τούτοις) and Agathokles of Syracuse (Diod. 19.4 συμμαχούντων δὲ τῶν Καρχηδονίων τοῖς περὶ τὸν Σώστρατον φυγάσιν ἐγίνοντο κίνδυνοι συνεχεῖς καὶ παρατάξεις ἀδρῶν δυνάμεων, ἐν αἷς Ἀγαθοκλῆς, ποτὲ μὲν ιδιώτης ὢν, ποτὲ δὲ ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας τεταγμένος, ὑπελήφθη δραστικός εἶναι καὶ φιλότεχνος ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν καιρῶν ἐπινοεῖσθαι τι τῶν χρησίμων).

⁶⁷⁷ See Rutherford 1896, 380: «a man of an energetic character» and Chantry 2009, 110: «un homme entrepreneur».

⁶⁷⁸ Sommerstein 1999, 113.

⁶⁷⁹ And for much longer, if one accepts the low datation of the *Assembly-Women* proposed by Canfora (2014, 245-258).

⁶⁸⁰ See Kanavou 2011, 177.

⁶⁸¹ See e.g. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.1.1 ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν ἢ τοῦ γενείου κόμη, *Apollod. Bibl.* 1.34 Γῆ δὲ περὶ Τιτάνων ἀγανακτοῦσα γεννᾷ Γίγαντας ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ ... οἱ φοβεροὶ μὲν ταῖς ὄψεσι κατεφαίνοντο, καθεμίνοι βαθεῖαν κόμην ἐκ κεφαλῆς καὶ γενείων.

⁶⁸² See e.g. *Plu. Lyc.* 22.1f. κομῶντες εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐφήβων ἡλικίας, (*scil.* οἱ νεοὶ) μάλιστα περὶ τοὺς κινδύνους ἐθεράπευον τὴν κόμην λιπαρὰν τε φαίνεσθαι καὶ διακεκριμένην, ἀπομνημονεύοντές τινα καὶ Λυκούργου λόγον περὶ τῆς κόμης, ὅτι τοὺς μὲν καλοὺς εὐπρεπεστέρους ποιεῖ, τοὺς δὲ αἰσχροὺς φοβερωτέρους (and, similarly, *Lys.* 1.1f.; [*Plu.*?], *Apophth. Reg.* 189D-E; *Apophth. Lac.* 228E); *Dio Chr. Enc. Com.* 15 καὶ μᾶλλον φροντίζουσι (*scil.* οἱ φιλόκομοι) τοῦ καθαρὰν φέρειν τὴν κόμην ἢ τοῦ ἠδέως καθεύδειν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ καλοὺς τε καὶ φοβεροὺς εἶκοι ποιεῖν, ὁ δὲ ὕπνος, κἂν πάνυ ἠδὺς ἦ, βραδεῖς τε καὶ ἀφυλάκτους, *Philostr. VA* 8.7 καὶ βασιλεὺς τῆς Σπάρτης Λεωνίδας ἐγένετο κομῶν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρείας καὶ τοῦ σεμνὸς μὲν φίλοις, φοβερός δὲ ἐχθροῖς φαίνεσθαι. See also the already quoted *Apollod. Bibl.* 1.34.

explanation of the poetic term φόβη (“lock”, “curl”) implied that the word derived from the adjective φοβερός⁶⁸³.

κωμωδεῖται δὲ καὶ εἰς δωροδοκίαν: whether Didymean or not (see above), in all likelihood this section was originally followed by an explicit reference to Plato’s *Ambassadors*, later lost due to epitomation. The grammarian used the comic playwright Plato to explain Aristophanes’ text in at least two more cases (see above fr. 227, 247). On κωμωδεῖται as marker of the commentator’s awareness of the comic mechanism of personal mockery, see above fr. 237, 257 and Chronopoulos 2011, 113.

⁶⁸³ *Et. M.* 797f. G. φόβη: ἡ θρίξ· παρὰ τὸ φοβεροῦς εἶναι τοὺς κομῶντας· οἱ γὰρ παλαιοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὕτω φοβερὰν ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τὴν κόμην, ὥστε φόβην αὐτὴν προσηγόρευσαν.

fr. 267 (= II 14.15, p. 249 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of the expression οὐ Χίος, ἀλλὰ Κεῖος in *Ra.* 970

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 970f-b-a-c-d-e Chantry **VMEΘBarb(Ald)**

οὐ Χίος, ἀλλὰ Κεῖος **VE**: ὅτι δοκεῖ προσγεγράφθαι τῇ πολιτείᾳ, Ἄγνωτος αὐτὸν ποιησαμένου, ὡς Εὐπολις Πόλεσιν (fr. 251 K.-A.). **VEΘBarb(Ald)** Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ (fr. 18 Muzzolon) ὡς γεγραμμένου “Κῶος” ἐξηγεῖται ὅτι πρὸς τὸ “Χίος” εἰσήγαγε τὸ “Κῶος”: τὸν γὰρ ἀντίστροφον τῷ Χίῳ λέγεσθαι. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** τοῦτο οὖν φησιν ὅτι οὐδέποτε κακοβολεῖ ὁ Θηραμένης ὡς ἐν ἀστραγάλοις, ἀλλ’ ἐπιτυγχάνει. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἐπιπλήττει δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Δημήτριος (fr. 35 Staesche), ὡς τελέως ἀγνοοῦντι ὅτι Κεῖος ἦν. **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** παραλείπει δὲ ὅμως καὶ αὐτός, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἤττον παρὰ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν εἴρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ “Κῶος” “Κεῖος”. **ΘBarb(Ald)** Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν ὅτι δύναται καὶ τῆς παροιμίας μεμνησθαι “οὐ Χίος, ἀλλὰ Κῶος”, παρ’ ὅσον ποικίλος τις ὢν καὶ ἀγχίστροφος καθομιλῶν τοῖς καιροῖς, πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον μέρος ἀεὶ διδοῦς ἑαυτὸν, Κῶος [δὲ] ἐλέγετο εἶναι. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)**

“not a Chian, but a Keian”: because (Theramenes) seems to have been added to the list of citizens, since Hagnon adopted him, as Eupolis (says) in the *Cities*. Instead Aristarchos explains as if the reading was “Coan”, (saying) that, faced with the “Chian”, he scored the “Coan”: because it was said to be the throw opposite to the “Chian”. (Aristophanes) says this because Theramenes never has unlucky throws, like in the game of the dice, but he always wins. Demetrios rebukes Aristarchos for completely ignoring that (Theramenes) was Keian, but he in turn omits that nothing is said less accordingly to the sense than “Keian” instead of “Coan”. Didymos says that (Aristophanes) may also be recalling the proverb “not a Chian, but a Coan”, in so far as a person who is shifty and changeful and takes advantage of every situation, always turning to the winning side, is said to be a Coan.

Aristoph. Ra. 968-970 Θηραμένης; σοφός γ’ ἀνὴρ καὶ δεινός εἰς τὰ πάντα, / ὃς ἦν κακοῖς που περιπέσει καὶ πλησίον παραστή, / πέπτωκεν ἔξω τῶν κακῶν, οὐ Χίος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος.

Zen. 4.74 Κῶος Χίῳ: ὁ Κῶος ἀστράγαλος ἠδύνατο ἔξ. παροιμία δὲ ἐστὶ Χίος πρὸς Κῶον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Χίος ἠδύνατο ἐν, ὁ δὲ Κῶος ἔξ | *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 540a* Θηραμένης; οὗτος τῶν τὰ πολιτικὰ πραττόντων. σκώπτει δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς εὐμετάβολον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν ἀρμόζοντα, **b Chantry** τοῦτον διὰ τὴν ποικίλιαν τοῦ ἦθους Κόθορον ἐκάλουν, ἐπειδὴ ἑκατέρω στάσει τῇ τῶν πολιτευομένων ἑαυτὸν παρτίθει, καθομιλῶν τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ πιστοῦ προτάσων, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ κόθορος ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναῖξι πρὸς τὰς ὑποδέσεις ἀρμόττει | *schol. Areth. Plat. Lys. 7 (206e5)* **Cufalo** τῶν δὲ βολῶν ὁ μὲν τὰ ἔξ δυνάμενος Κῶος καὶ ἐξίτης ἐλέγετο, Χίος δὲ τὸ ἐν καὶ κύων. λέγεται δὲ τις καὶ παροιμία ἀπὸ τούτου, οἷον “Χίος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἔασω”, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ Στράτις Λιμνοπέδασι (fr. 24 K.-A.): “Χίος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἔῃ λέγειν” | **Suda θ 345 A.** Θηραμένης σοφός ἀνὴρ καὶ δεινός εἰς τὰ πάντα, ὃς οὐδέποτε ἐκακοβόλησεν ὡς ἐν ἀστραγάλοις, ἀλλ’ ἐπιτύχων. Θηραμένης οὐ Χίος δέ, ἀλλὰ Κεῖος φησι παρ’ ὅσον ποικίλος τις ἦν καὶ ἀγχίστροφος καθομιλεῖ τε τοῖς καιροῖς πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον μέρος ἀεὶ διδοῦς ἑαυτὸν. Κῶος δὲ ἐλέγετο | **Eust. II. 1289,64-69 (= IV 691 V.)** τῶν δὲ βολῶν, φασίν, ὁ μὲν τὸ ἔξ δυνάμενος Κῶος ἐλέγετο καὶ ἐξίτης, ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐν Χίος καὶ κύων. ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία “Χίος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἔασω”. καθ’ ἣν παρὰ Στρατιδὶ τῷ Κωμικῷ (fr. 24 K.-A.) τὸ “Χίος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἔῃ λέγειν”, ὁ παραλαλεῖ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ “οὐ Χίος, ἀλλὰ Κεῖος” ἢ “Κῶος” (*Ra.* 970), **Od. 1397,39-44 (= I 29 S.; ~ 1462,46-48 = I 119f. S.)** ἔτι λέγει ἐκεῖνος ὁ τὰ περὶ τῆς καθ’ ἧς Ἑλληνας παιδιᾶς γράψας (= Suet. *Περὶ παιδιῶν* 1.23f. T.), καὶ ὅτι τῶν κατὰ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους βολῶν, ὁ μὲν τὰ ἔξ δυνάμενος, Κῶος καὶ ἐξίτης ἐλέγετο. ὁ δὲ τὰ ἐν, Χίος. ἔτι δὲ,

καὶ κύων. ὅθεν καὶ τις παροιμία “Χῖος παραστὰς Κῶρον οὐκ ἐάσω”. ἤς μέμνηται φησι Στράτις ἐν τῷ “Χῖος παραστὰς, Κῶρον οὐκ ἐὰ λέγειν” (fr. 24 K.-A.). ἐνθα ἐνθυμητέον καὶ τὸ τοῦ κωμικοῦ “πέπτωκεν ἔξω τῶν κακῶν, οὐ Χῖος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος” (Ra. 970). καὶ νοητέον ὡς ἡ ἐσφαλταὶ ἢ γραφὴ τοῦ Κεῖος, ἢ ἀλλὰ παρῳδῆται ὑπὸ τοῦ κωμικοῦ | *schol. rec. Aristoph. Ra. 540d Chantry* ὁ Θηραμένης οὗτος ἀνὴρ πανοῦργος ἦν, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς μεταβαλλόμενος, Χῖοι γὰρ καὶ Κῖοι πόλεμον εἶχον πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ὅτε οὖν παρὰ Χίους ἦν, Χῖον ἑαυτὸν ἐκάλει· ὅτε δὲ παρὰ Κίους, Κῖον· ἦν δὲ τῆ ἀληθείᾳ Χῖος.

1 Κεῖος V Chantry, Κῖος E Bekker Dindorf Dübner | προσγεγράφθαι V(Ald), προγεγράφθαι E, προσγεγράφει Θ, προσεγεγράφει Barb | 3 Χῖος scripsi, Κῶος codd. edd. | alt. Κῶος scripsi, Χῖος codd. edd. | τὸν γὰρ ΘBarb, (τὸ γὰρ Ald), τὸν γὰρ τὸν V, τὸ γὰρ τὸν E | 4 οὖν om. M | κακοβουλεῖ Hemsterhuys (Anecdota, I 200, cf. *Suda* ἐκακοβόλησεν) recc. edd. cett., κακοβουλεῖ RMEΘBarb Bekker, κακοβουλεῖς V | 5 Δημήτριος cett., Δημόκριτος M | τελείως RVEBarb, τελείως M, om. Θ | 6 ἀγνοοῦντι VMEΘBarb, ἀγνοῶν R | Κεῖος VMΘBarb Rutherford Süss Chantry, Κῖος RE Bekker Dindorf Dübner | παραλείπει VEΘBarb, παραλείπεται M | ὁμοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς VEΘBarb, οὗτος ὁμοῦς M | 7 εἰρηται VEΘ, εὔρηται Barb, εἶρηκεν M | τοῦ MEΘBarb, om. V | Κεῖος ΘBarb Süss Chantry, Κεῖος φησί M, Κῖος VE Bekker Dindorf Dübner | δύναιται MEΘBarb, om. V | 8 μεμνησθαι bis Barb | Κῶος scripsi, Κεῖος MBarb Süss Chantry, Κῖος VEΘ Bekker Dindorf Dübner | ὦν VME, ἦν ΘBarb | καθομιλῶν scripsi, καθομίλει codd. edd. | 9 τοῖς καιροῖς MΘBarb (G, *Suda* θ 345 A., *schol. Aristoph. Ra. 540b Chantry*), τοὺς καιροὺς VE | ante διδοῦς add. δὲ M | δὲ delevi | ἐλέγετο VEΘBarb(Ald), ἔλεγε M

The list of alleged Aeschylean and Euripidean pupils of *Ra.* 965-967 (see above fr. 266) ends with the name of “the astute Theramenes” (Θηραμένης ὁ κομψός), which triggers Dionysos’ admired reaction, culminating in a joke on the politician’s ability to always get away with any difficult situation (ll. 969f. «if by any chance he falls into trouble or even finds himself close by it – hey presto, he’s fallen *out* of trouble again»⁶⁸⁴). The *pointe* of the expression πέπτωκεν ἔξω τῶν κακῶν, οὐ Χῖος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος (where the two ethnics serve as predicative of the subject) most probably lied in the parodic use of Κεῖος (the ethnic designating either Theramenes’ alleged association with Prodikos⁶⁸⁵ or his supposed foreign descent, see below) instead of the expected Κῶος, which – just as Χῖος – indicated a certain throw of the dice⁶⁸⁶.

The annotation seemingly relies on an excerpt from a post-Didymean commentary on *Frogs* (maybe Symmachos’?): the chosen interpretation (which sees in l. 970 a simple joke on Theramenes’ alleged foreign birth and uses Eupolis’ *Cities* as evidence) is followed by the quotations of Aristarchos’, Demetrios Ixion’s and Didymos’ exegeses. The first apparently considered the authentic text to be οὐ Χῖος ἀλλὰ Κῶος and explained that the Coan, the highest score in the dice game, was the opposite of the Chian, taking the expression as a reference to the politician’s skill in turning negative situation to his own advantage. This interpretation was refuted by Demetrios Ixion, who accepted the reading Κεῖος (since he believed that Theramenes was

⁶⁸⁴ Sommerstein 1999, 113.

⁶⁸⁵ See *Suda* θ 342 A.; Dover 1993, 314; Kanavou 2011, 166f.

⁶⁸⁶ See e.g. Kock 1898, 161; Dover 1993, 314. The information comes from Suetonius’ *Περὶ παιδιῶν* (quoted by Arethas and Eustathios, see below). Modern translations can be divided into literal ones (see e.g. Welcker 1812, 73: «nicht Chier, sondern Kier»; Rogers 1902, 149f.: «a Kian with a kappa, sir, not a Chian with a chi»; Muzzolon 2005, 97: «non è di Chio, ma di Ceo»; Chantry 2009, 114: «en homme non de Chios, mais de Céos») and interpretative ones (see e.g. Merry 1884, 107: «he manages to throw himself clear of the danger»; Ewans 2011, 201: «he throws a double six and turns up trumps»; Holzberg 2011, 50: «nicht ein Einser, sondern ein Sechser am Würfel»; Halliwell 2015, 213: «He always escapes with a lucky throw—for him, nothing dicey goes wrong!»). In all likelihood, the dice-metaphor extends beyond the sole l. 970. In particular, the verbs περιπέση, παραστή and πέπτωκεν (l. 969) probably belong to the dicing jargon (just as the participle παραστὰς in Strattis’ fragment, see below; Radermacher 1967, 283; Orth 2009, 138). Moreover, Hesych. μ 236 C. (Μάνης· κυβευτικοῦ βόλου ὄνομα [καὶ] βαρβαρικόν, καθάπερ Εὐβουλος [fr. 59 K.-A.] ἐν Κυβευταῖς· παρίστησι καὶ ἄλλων καταλεγόμενων βόλων <ὀνόματα>) seems to suggest that the nickname of the otherwise unknown Μεγαίνετος of *Ra.* 965 (see above Did. fr. 266) also designated a specific throw of the dice, thus implying a wider application of the dicing imagery throughout the entire passage (ll. 965-970. See Fritzsche 1845, 229; Hunter 1983, 145f.).

indeed a Keian) but did not elaborate on the meaning of the expression οὐ Χῖος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος. Lastly, Didymos supposed that the phrase echoed a proverb (see below). The wording of the scholium is affected by the very similar spelling of the three ethnics, which caused confusion in more than one case: not only was the ethnic “Keian” spelled Κῖος by part of the manuscripts⁶⁸⁷ and the modern editors up to Dübner 1842, but also the words Κῶος and Χῖος were likely swapped in Aristarchos’ fragment and the former was erroneously replaced by Κεῖος in Didymos’ comment (see below).

Δίδυμος δέ φησιν ὅτι δύναται καὶ τῆς παροιμίας μεμνήσθαι: two main features of Didymos’ exegetic approach emerge from this section, *i.e.* the interest in proverbs (see above fr. 238, 261 and the Conclusions § 1.2.2) and the unassertive tone⁶⁸⁸.

“οὐ Χῖος, ἀλλὰ Κῶος”, παρ’ ὅσον ποικίλος τις ὢν καὶ ἀγγίστροφος καθομιλῶν κτλ: the manuscripts unanimously read οὐ Χῖος, ἀλλὰ Κεῖος and καθομιλίει. The first proposed emendation is based on the fact that Χῖος and Κῶος as terms of the dicing jargon feature in two other proverbial expressions, namely Χῖος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἐάσω (“having turned out a Chian, I will not allow a Coan”, *i.e.* “having scored one with the throw of the dice, I will not allow [you] to get a six”⁶⁸⁹), listed in Suetonius’ *On Greek Games* (quoted by Arethas and Eustathios⁶⁹⁰) and apparently alluded to by Strattis in his *Lemnomena* (fr. 24 K.-A. Χῖος παραστάς Κῶον οὐκ ἐᾷ λέγειν, “having turned out a Chian, he does not let the Coan speak”⁶⁹¹), and Χῖος πρὸς Κῶον (“a Chian against a Coan”, *i.e.* “a one against a six”) preserved by Zenobios. Therefore, if the grammarian saw a possible proverbial echo in Aristophanes’ text, it is more likely that the saying he had in mind involved the two ethnics found in the other two proverbs⁶⁹². The emended participle καθομιλῶν⁶⁹³ (with the consequent expunction of the following δὲ), instead, allows to read the end of the scholium as one cohesive sentence, making sense of the otherwise isolated and obscure Κῶος δὲ ἐλέγετο εἶναι with its unspecified subject: the resulting text implies that Didymos gave an autoschediastic explanation of the ethnic, based on the common characterisation of Theramenes as a scheming opportunist and political transformist⁶⁹⁴. If this reconstruction is right, Didymos followed Aristarchos in reading οὐ Χῖος, ἀλλὰ Κῶος in Aristophanes’ text.

⁶⁸⁷ Both in the scholium and in Aristophanes’ text, see Wilson 2007b, 178.

⁶⁸⁸ See Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and Did. fr. 227, 229, 230, 237 (above) and 269 (below).

⁶⁸⁹ See Taillardat 1967, 157f.: «tel le coup de Chios, j’annulerai le coup de Cos».

⁶⁹⁰ see Taillardat 1967, 33-36.

⁶⁹¹ See Taillardat 1967, 158; Fiorentini 2017, 118-120. The implications of this joke are now impossible to reconstruct (some hypotheses are listed in Orth 2009, 138-140, see also Fiorentini *ibid.*). Orth’s translation (2009, 137: «stellt sich ein Chier dazu, dann kommt ein Koer nicht zu Wort») does not reflect the actual text, where Χῖος παραστάς refers to the subject of ἐᾷ.

⁶⁹² See Fritzsche 1845, 229.

⁶⁹³ The phrase καθομιλῶν τοῖς καιροῖς is found in *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 540b Chantry, within a description of Theramenes’ political behaviour.

⁶⁹⁴ See Aristoph. *Ra.* 540f. τὸ δὲ μεταστρέφεισθαι / πρὸς τὸ μαλθακώτερον / δεξιῶ πρὸς ἀνδρός ἐστι / καὶ φύσει Θηραμένους (with scholia) and Lys. 12.65-78. See also Buck 1995.

fr. 268 (= II 14.16, p. 250 Schmidt)

Subject: the meaning of μαμμάκυθοι and Μελιτίδαι in Aristoph. *Ra.* 990f.

Sources: *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 990a-b-d-c-991a-b Chantry

Μαμμάκουθοι **RVE** Μελιτίδαι **M**: Ἀρίσταρχος (fr. 19 Muzzolon) φησιν ὀνοματοπεποιῆσθαι. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** “πῶς οὖν”, Δημήτριος φησιν (fr. 36 S.), “εἰ δὴ σύνηθες αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα; οὐ καὶ δρᾶμα ὅλον οὕτως ἐπιγέγραπται ‘Μαμμάκουθοι’, ὃ τινες Πλάτωνος λέγουσιν;” **VEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως, **EΘBarb** ἀντὶ τοῦ “μαμμόθρεπτοι”. **REΘBarb(Ald)** Δίδυμός δὲ φησιν ὅτι Μαμμάκυθος καὶ Μελιτίδης ἐπὶ μωρία διεβάλλοντο, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Βουταλίων καὶ ὁ Κόροιβος. **RMEΘBarb** Μελιτίδην τὸν εὐήθη λέγει· παρὰ τὸ “μέλι”. **MEΘBarb(Ald)** γέγονέ τις οὕτω μωρός. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)**

“*Mammakythoi*⁶⁹⁵”: Aristarchos says that the name is a coinage. “How is this possible” says Demetrios “given that the word was usual for them? Is not an entire play entitled *Mammakythoi*, the one that some ascribe to Plato?”. Otherwise. In the sense of “brought up by their grandmother”. Didymos says that Mammakythos and Melitides were mocked for their foolishness, just as Boutalion and Koroibos. He calls “Melitides” the good-hearted, from the word “honey” (*meli*). There was a man so stupid.

Aristoph. Ra. 989-991 τέως δ’ ἀβελτερώτατοι / κεχρηγότες, μαμμάκυθοι, / Μελιτίδαι καθήντο.

Suet. Περὶ βλασφημιῶν (exc. byz.) 186-188 T. Μαμμάκυθος, Ἀμφιετίδης, Μελιτίδης· ἐπὶ μωρία διαβεβοημένοι. ὧν φασὶ τὸν τρίτον ἀριθμεῖν μὴ ἐπίστασθαι, εἰ μὴ ἄχρι τῶν πέντε, ἀγνοεῖν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ὀποτέρου τῶν γονέων ἀποκηθεῖν, τῆς τε νόμφης μὴ ἄψασθαι, εὐλαβοῦμενον τὴν πρὸς τὴν μητέρα διαβολὴν | **Ael. VH 13.15** καὶ Κόροιβον δὲ καὶ Μελιτίδην καὶ ἐκείνους ἀνοήτους φασίν | **Lib. Ep. 51** τοῦ τε γὰρ Εὐρυβάτου τὸ πονηρεῦσθαι τοῦ τε Αὐτολύκου τὸ κλέπτειν Μελιτίδου τε τὸ μωραίνειν | [**Luc.] Am. 53.6** Μελιτίδην ἢ Κόροιβον οἶε με πρὸς θεῶν, ἵνα τοῖς ὑπὸ σοῦ δικαίως κριθεῖσιν ἐναντίαν φέρω ψήφον; | **Diogenian. 5.12** ἡλιθιώτερος τῆς Πραξιῶλης: αὕτη γὰρ ἐρωτώμενη τί κάλλιστον, “Ἥλιος, ἔφη, καὶ σῦκα. Ὅμοια τῆ, Ἀνοητότερος Ἴβύκου, καὶ Κοροίβου, καὶ Μελιτίδου | **Eus. PE 14.18,17f.** οὐ γὰρ μᾶλλον Πύρρωνα θαυμάσαι τις ἂν ἢ τὸν Κόροιβον ἐκείνον ἢ τὸν Μελιτίδην, οἱ δὴ δοκοῦσι μωρία διενεγκεῖν | **Hesych. μ 216 C.** μαμμάκυθος· μωρός. ἔστι δὲ καὶ δρᾶμα πεποιημένον Πλάτωνι | **Πητ. Λέξ. 270** μαμμάκυθοι: μωροί, **271 N.** μελιτίδαι: μωροί | **Lex. Rhet. Bekk^v 279,18f.** Μελιτίδης: καὶ οὗτος τῶν εὐήθων, ὡς ὁ Μαργίτης καὶ ὁ Κόροιβος | **Phot. μ 241 Th. (~ Et. M. 577,33 G.)** Μελιτίδης· εἷς καὶ οὗτος τῶν εὐήθων, ὡς ὁ Μαργίτης· ὅς οὐκ ἤδει πλέον τῶν πέντε ἀριθμεῖν· τοιοῦτος δὲ καὶ ὁ Κόροιβος καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιετίδης | **Suda β 468 (~ μ 523)** Βουταλίων καὶ Κόροιβος καὶ Μελιτίδης ἐπὶ μωρία διεβέβληντο. Ἀριστοφάνης (seqq. *Ra.* 989-991), γ **118** γέλοιος ... καὶ ἕτερα παροιμία· γελοιώτερον Μελιτίδου, ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μωρία διαβεβλημένων. Μελιτίδης γὰρ ἀνὴρ κωμωδοῦμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπὶ μωρία κατὰ ταυτὰ τῷ Ἀμφιστείδῃ. τοῦτον δὲ φασὶν ἀριθμῆσαι μὲν πολλὰ παθόντα μέχρι τῶν ε’ καὶ πέρα μηκέτι δύνασθαι, γήμαντα δὲ τῆς νόμφης μὴ ἄψασθαι· φοβεῖσθαι γὰρ μὴ αὐτὸν ἢ παῖς τῆ μητρὶ διαβάλλῃ, ὃ δὲ Ἀμφιστείδης ἠγνόει ἐξ ὀποτέρου γονέων ἐτέχθη | **κ 2113** Κόροιβος: ὄνομα κύριον. καὶ μωρός τις, μετρῶν τὰ κύματα. Καλλιμαχος (fr. 587 Pf.) “τὸν ὄγδοον ὡς τι Κόροιβον”. ὅτι Βουταλίων καὶ Κόροιβος καὶ Μελιτίδης ἐπὶ μωρία διεβέβληντο. Ἀριστοφάνης, **μ 121** Μαμμάκυθος: ὄνομα κύριον. Ἀριστοφάνης (seqq. *Ra.* 989-991), **μ 1344 A.** μωροὶ καὶ ἀβελτεροὶ καὶ κεχρηγότες Μαμμάκυθος: Μελιτίδης, Βουταλίων, Κόροιβος | *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Ra. 990b Koster* (~ *Tz. Ep.* 1,1.3-2.1, *H.* 4.836-886, *schol. Tz. Aristoph. Nu.* 1022b Holwerda) Μακκῶ καὶ Μαργίτης τις / καὶ Μελιτίδης· καὶ Κόροιβος / σὺν οἷς καὶ Μαμμάκυθος. / καὶ Βουταλίων, μωροί: / ὁ Ὀρέστης τε, ὁ παῖς τοῦ Ἐρμοκράτους· / υἱεῖς Ἴπποκράτους τε· ἄλλοι τε πλείονες / Μακκῶ, τῷ κατόπτρῳ μὲν / τῷ ἑαυτῆς διελέγετο· / Μαργίτης ἠρώτα δε, / τίς ὁ γεννήσας ἐμέ· / Μελιτίδης δέ, συζύγῳ τῆ οἰκείᾳ, / οὐδόλωσ ἐμίγνυτο. / ὡς πνευρόφοβος / ἔασθω μοι Κόροιβος / ὅστις ἠρίθμει τὰ κύματα / ἔν, δύο καὶ τρία δε / καταριθμῶν δεξιῶς· / καὶ συγγῶν δε,

⁶⁹⁵ The lemma is transliterated according the generally accepted spelling Μαμμάκυθοι (see below).

ἀρχήθεν ἀπρηθίμει / ἐάσθων καὶ σύμπαντες, οὐσπερ προέφημεν | *schol. anon. rec. Aristoph. Nu. 985b Koster* ὁ Κηκείδης οὗτος διαβάλλεται εἰς μωρίαν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Μελιτίδης καὶ ὁ Κόρυβος καὶ ὁ Μαμάκουθος καὶ ὁ Ἰαπετὸς (*Nu.* 998) καὶ ὁ Βλιτομάμας (1001) | *Eust. Od. 1669,42-53* (= I 395,9-24 S.) σημειώσαι δὲ ὅτι, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι ἐδηλώθη, ἐπὶ Θερσίτου καὶ ἀφελῆ τινὰ πρόσωπα καὶ οὐ πᾶν σπουδαῖα εἰς Τροίαν ἐστρατεύσατο. ... ἐξ ἐκείνων δὲ καὶ κοροίβους τινὰς ἀποσκώπτομεν, μαθόντες τινὰ Κόροιβον εὐήθη Μυγδόνα Φρύγα τὸ γένος ὑστατον τῶν ἐπικούρων ἀφικόμενον τῷ Πριάμῳ δι' εὐήθειαν. ... ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν Μαμάκουθον, καὶ τὸν Μελιτίδην, καὶ τὸν Ἀμφιετίδην, οἱ διαβόητοι ἐπὶ μωρία ἦσαν, ὧν ὁ Μελιτίδης ἀριθμεῖν τε μὴ ἐπίστασθαι λέγεται εἰ μὴ ἄχρι τῶν πέντε, καὶ ἀγνοεῖν πρὸς ὀποτέρου τῶν γονέων ποκυθηεῖ, καὶ νόμφης μὴ ἄψασθαι, εὐλαβοῦμενος τὴν πρὸς μητέρα διαβολήν, *Serm. 9.152.12-20* εἰ γὰρ καὶ τινες (θετέον γάρ) ἔχθρας ἤκουσιν ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἐνεδρευτικοὶ πευθῆνες ... ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἐς τοσοῦτον Μελιτίδαι ἢ καὶ Μαμάκουθοι, ὡς μὴ ἔχειν καταστοχάζεσθαι, τίνες μὲν οἱ τῆς ὀρθότητος, τίνες δὲ οἱ τοῦ βαίνειν σκολιά | *Apostol. 5.27* γελιοτέρως Μελιτίδου: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μωρία διαβεβοημένων. Μελιτίδης γὰρ ἦν ἀνὴρ κωμφοδούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπὶ μωρία.

1 Μαμάκουθοι VE, Μαμάκουθοι R | ante φησιν, μὲν E(Ald) Bekker | ὀνοματοποιεῖσθαι V^{PE} Chantry, ὀνοματοποιεῖσθαι ΘBarb Bekker Dindorf Dübner Süss | 2 εἰ δὴ VΘBarb Chantry, εἰ μὴ E(Ald) Bekker Dindorf Dübner | οὐ Staesche, rec. Süss, οὗ codd. Bekker Dindorf Dübner Chantry | 3 ὅ τινες E(Ald), οἵτινες VΘBarb | Πλάτωνος VEBarb, Πλούτωνος Θ | λέγουσιν VE, λέγονται Θ, λέ() Barb | 4 μαμμόθρεπτοι EBarb, μαμμάθρεπτοι Θ, μαμμάθρεπτοι R | φησιν M, om. REΘBarb Bekker Dindorf Dübner Rutherford Süss | Μαμάκουθος Dindorf Dübner Rutherford Süss, Μαμάκουθος MEΘBarb Bekker Chantry, Μαμάκουθος R | Μελιτίδης codd. Bekker Rutherford Süss Chantry, Μελιτίδης Dindorf rec. Dübner | 5 διεβάλλοντο MEΘBarb Bekker Chantry, διεβέβληντο R Dindorf Dübner Rutherford Süss | Βουταλίον RMEΘ, Βοταλίον M, Ἀταλίον Barb

The second half of the *pnigos* (ll. 980-991) hosts Dionysos' appreciation of Euripides' arguments in favour of his own poetry (and especially of the didactic value the tragic playwright brags about in ll. 954-979). The god draws a comparison between the present-day, (ridiculously) cunning Athenians, imbibed of Euripidean 'wisdom', and their counterparts from the past, defined ἀβελτερώτατοι / κεχηνότες μαμμάκουθοι / Μελιτίδαι (ll. 989-991, "silly, gaping mummy's boys, as dumb as Melitides")⁶⁹⁶.

The annotation to *Ra.* 990 is a compilation of at least two excerpts, linked by the adverb ἄλλως in **EΘBarb**. The first preserves the traces of an ancient interpretative debate on the word μαμμάκουθος, involving Aristarchos – according to whom the word was Aristophanes' invention – and Demetrios Ixion, who disproved the Aristarchean interpretation on the basis of the existence of play entitled Μαμάκουθοι and ascribed by some to the playwright Plato. The second contains Didymos' comment – which focuses not only on the term μαμμάκουθοι of l. 990, but also on the mysterious appellative Μελιτίδαι (l. 991) – along with more exegetic material (independent from the grammarian) identifying μαμμάκουθος as a synonym of μαμμόθρεπτος and Μελιτίδης as deriving from μέλι ("honey")⁶⁹⁷.

Μαμάκουθος: this is the generally accepted spelling of the word, despite the diphtongated reading preserved by **VME** (μαμάκουθοι **R**) in the lemma and by **RVMEΘBarb** in the body of the annotation (accepted by Bekker 1829, 393 and Chantry 1999, 124). The manuscripts show similar orthographic discrepancies in Aristophanes' text as well: **VU** have μαμμάκουθοι, **AM** have μαμμάκουθοι, **R** has μαμάκουθοι. The only attestations of the word before Didymos' time are the titles of Plato's play (mentioned by Demetrios in response to Aristarchos) and its two *cognomines fabulae*, one ascribed to Metagenes (Ἀῶραι ἢ Μαμάκουθος⁶⁹⁸, fr. 1-5 K.-A.; see Orth 2014, 384-389) and one to Aristagoras (fr.1, 2, 5 K.-A.; see Bagordo 2014, 14-19). Nothing among the scanty

⁶⁹⁶ According to Kanavou (2011, 167), the expression «must refer to the passivity of the audience of Aeschylus' plays».

⁶⁹⁷ Fritzsche (1845, 322) accepts the derivation from μέλι by proposing the reading Μελιττίδαι.

⁶⁹⁸ On double titles in Greek drama, see Hunter 1983, 146-148 and below.

fragments of the three plays allows to draw any conclusion as to what the word μαμμάκυθος signified in each of the contexts, but it can be assumed that it had the same etymological meaning (from μάμη and κεύθω, designating «qui se cache contre sa mère» [Coulon 1928b, 133 n.1]⁶⁹⁹, therefore “mummy’s boy”) which the Aristophanic passage presupposes. Didymos’ interpretation of the word as a personal name was likely influenced by the following Μελιτίδαι, which was probably not a proper name for Aristophanes but had become one in later authors (see below). With regard to the comic plays entitled Μαμμάκυθος, it has to be assumed either that the grammarian believed them to be named after the supposed protagonist (instead of the main stock character)⁷⁰⁰ or that he ignored the evidence altogether⁷⁰¹.

Μελιτίδης: in Aristophanes’ text, the almost unanimously transmitted reading Μελιτίδαι is prosodically problematic, since the first iota is short, where the iambic sequence should have a *longum*. Modern editors have either accepted the *paradosis* (explaining it in various ways⁷⁰²) or printed Μελιτίδαι⁷⁰³. The passage might imply a joke on the deme of Μελίτη⁷⁰⁴, possibly relying on a widespread prejudice against the Athenians living there. Among them was a famous *kōmōdoumenos*, Philonides of Melite, who was mocked for being uneducated and foolish by Nikochares (fr. 4 K.-A.) and variously attacked by other playwrights of the same period (see Philyll. fr. 22; Pl.Com. fr. 65; Theopomp.Com. fr. 5 K.-A.)⁷⁰⁵. One wonders if Aristophanes’ Μελιτίδαι should be taken as an allusion to this figure, whose characterisation as an uncouth and uncultivated individual would certainly fit with the general sense of the Aristophanic passage. With regard to the text of the annotation, Dindorf’s emendation Μελιτίδης (1838b, 117; Dübner 1842, 303)⁷⁰⁶ is unnecessary. Indeed, there is no need to think that Didymos read anything different from what the scholiastic text implies. The grammarian treats Μελιτίδης as the name of a character mocked for his foolishness⁷⁰⁷ (just like μαμμάκυθοι,

⁶⁹⁹ See also *GEW* 168 «der sich bei der Mutter verbirgt»; *DELG* 663: «qui se cache dans la jupe de sa maman»; *EDG* 899: «who hides with his mother».

⁷⁰⁰ Proper names used as titles were not infrequent in Middle Comedy (see below n. 716 and Arnott 2010, 316), but Plato’s, Metagenes’ and Aristagoras’ Μαμμάκυθος clearly belong to the wide group of plays named after the main stock character: see e.g. Diphilos’ Ἄπληστος (fr. 14 K.-A.), Menander’s Ἀνδρόγυνος (fr. 50-55 K.-A.), Ἄπιστος (fr. 63 K.-A.) and Δεισιδαίμων (fr. 106-109 K.-A.), Menander’s and Mnesimachos’ (fr. 3 K.-A.) Δύσκολος, Antidotus’ Μειμίμοιρος (fr. 1 K.-A.), the many Ἄγροικος-, Κόλαξ- and Φιλάργυρος-plays. See also Storey-Allan 2005, 219.

⁷⁰¹ An entry by Harpokration (o 7 K. = Did. fr. 286 C.-Pr.; 4 Pearson-Stephens) attests that Didymos used Metagenes’ Αὔραι to explain the word οἰκίσκος in Dem. 18.97, but this does not prove that he necessarily knew its secondary title Μαμμάκυθος too.

⁷⁰² See e.g. Radermacher 1908, 453, who considered the word an ethnic designation from the Greek name of the island of Malta (Μελίτη, with a supposedly long iota, but the evidence provided is scanty, and the consequent interpretation unconvincing); Langerbeck 1958, who minimized the prosodic difficulty (see *ibid.* 49: «ist aber ein solcher katalektischer und “akephaler” Abschluss einer Reihe von iamb.Dim. wirklich bei Aristophanes unmöglich?») and considered the adjective to be derived from the deme-name Μελίτη, with an alleged reference to Callias (*ibid.* 48); Coulon 1928d, 133, Dover 1993, 313 and Sommerstein 1999, 243, who accepted the reading Μελιτίδαι (the second still highlighting the prosodic issue) with the meaning of “halfwit”, “fool”.

⁷⁰³ Which is the reading of the Parisinus 20^{ac}, also shared by some of the later occurrences of the name (see e.g. Suet. *Περί βλασφημιῶν* 188 T. and Apul. *Apol.* 24 below); see e.g. Bekker 1829a, 555; Dindorf 1835, 121; 1869, 147; Blaydes 1889, 403; Wilson 2007b, 179; 2007c, 176. Instead, Fritzsche (1845, 322, followed by van Leeuwen 1896, 153; Kock 1898, 163) thought of a patronymic from Μέλισσος/Μέλιττος and emended into Μελιττίδαι.

⁷⁰⁴ See Honigmann 1931, 541f.; Lohmann 1999, 1190. The standard demotic was actually Μελιτεύς, see e.g. *IG* II² 1141 l. 8 Ὀνήτωρ Κηφισοδώρῳ Μελιτεὺς εἶπ[εν] κτλ.

⁷⁰⁵ All four passages are preserved by *schol.* Aristoph. *Pl.* 179b Chantry. See Orth 2015, 50-54.

⁷⁰⁶ The emendation was wrongly taken as authentic by Radermacher 1908, 451, as already underlined by Langerbeck 1958, 49.

⁷⁰⁷ On Didymos’ general interest in the *kōmōdoumenoi* see the Conclusions § 1.3.1.1 and fr. 237, 245-247, 249, 257, 259, 266.

see above). In this case, his interpretation finds support in (and probably relies directly on) a couplet by Menander, *Asp.* 269f. πρὸς θεῶν, Μελιτίδῃ / λαλεῖν ὑπέιληφας; (“Good God! Do you think you’re talking to Melitides?”⁷⁰⁸), where Smicrines disdainfully rejects a proposal that he considers detrimental to his own interests. The joke implies that the audience was familiar with Melitides as a proverbial fool⁷⁰⁹. In fact, the line from Menander’s *Shield* is the oldest of a long series of occurrences – mostly from the 2nd century CE onwards –, where Melitides plays the same role of archetypal simpleton (see *e.g.* Them. *Or.* p. 330d Harduin Μελιτίδης ὁ ἀνόητος, Apul. *Apol.* 24 *apud socordissimos Scythas Anacharsis sapiens natus est, apud Athenienses catos Meletides fatuus*).

ἐπὶ μωρία διεβάλλοντο: on διαβάλλω + ὡς/ἐπί, see fr. 229 above. Didymos’ terminology (μωρία/μωρός) is reflected throughout the following tradition up to Apostolios’ paroemiographical collection (15th cent.).

καθάπερ: besides being a common substitute for ὡς when sources are mentioned⁷¹⁰, καθάπερ often introduces supplementary examples of the phenomenon commented on by the scholium (see *e.g.* – on the invention of a speaking name – *schol.* Aristoph. *V.* 836c Koster ἀλλ’ ἔοικεν ὁ Λάβης ὀνοματοποιῆσθαι ἀπλῶς, καθάπερ ὁ Δάκης παρὰ Τηλεκλείδῃ ἐν Πρωτάνεσιν [fr. 26 K.-A.]⁷¹¹).

Βουταλίων: this is for sure a personal name, attested epigraphically⁷¹². Like in the case of μαμμιάκυθος, the literary occurrences of the name are limited to the titles of two lost comedies⁷¹³, one by Antiphanes (probably known with the double title Ἄγροικος ἢ Βουταλίων⁷¹⁴, see fr. 12 and 69 K.-A.) and one by Xenarchos (test. 1 and fr. 1 K.-A.). There is no textual evidence linking Didymos to any of the two plays. Still, Didymos’ choice of Boutalion as a parallel example (see above *s.v.* καθάπερ) implies that he knew of at least one play – maybe (but not necessarily) Antiphanes’ or Xenarchos’ one – where a Boutalion was satirized for his stupidity.

⁷⁰⁸ Translation by Ireland (2010, 45). Didymos knew and engaged with Menander’s work in detail, since he wrote more than one hypomnēma on his plays (fr. °278 C.-Pr.; see Schmidt 1854, 307; Theodoridis 1973; Martina 2016, 258; Braswell 2017, 64f.).

⁷⁰⁹ See Sisti 1971, 93f.; Gomme-Sandbach 1973, 85; Arnott 1979, 47 n.1; Sommerstein 1999, 243; Jacques 2003, 20 n. 3; Beroutsos 2005, 91; Ireland 2010, 93.

⁷¹⁰ See *e.g.* *scholl.* Aristoph. *Av.* 494a καθάπερ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Αἰγεί (fr. 2 K.), 556a καθάπερ καὶ Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ δ’ λέγει (*FGrHist* 328 F 34), 1073ba καθάπερ Κρατερὸς ἱστορεῖ (*BNJ* 342 F 16b).

⁷¹¹ See also Nünlist 2009, 11.

⁷¹² Both on *ostraka* (Βουταλίῳν Μαραθόνιος, *PAA* 268635, see *AG* 1990, 89-95; *AM* 1991, 150) and once on an Athenian stone from 421/0-416/5 BCE, preserving the accounts for the statues of Athena and Hephaistos (*IG* I³ 472 l. 14 Βουταλίονος Μαραθονίῳ, *PAA* 268630). See Osborne-Byrne 1994, 90.

⁷¹³ *Suda* β 468 (~ μ 523), κ 2113, μ 1344 A. and *schol.* Tz. Aristoph. *Ra.* 990b Koster (~ Tz. *H.* 4.836-886, *schol.* Tz. Aristoph. *Nu.* 1022b Holwerda) are not taken into account as they ultimately depend on Didymos’ exegesis to *Ra.* 990f.

⁷¹⁴ See above and Konstantakos 2004. Middle-comedy plays often carried proper names as titles (see *e.g.* Alexis’ *Thrason* and *Polykleia* [fr. 96 and 190 K.-A.], Eubulos’ *Klepsydra* and *Namion* [fr. 54 and 67 K.-A.], Antiphanes’ *Malthake* and *Melitta* [fr. 146 and 149 K.-A.]). See also Arnott 2010, 316.

Κόροιβος: the name may refer to (1) the alleged first winner of the Olympic games⁷¹⁵, (2) the founding hero of Tripodiskos in Kallimachos' *Aitia*⁷¹⁶ and (3) the son of Mygdon, a minor ally of Priam in the *Little Iliad*⁷¹⁷. That the fool referred to by Didymos was indeed the Phrygian hero of the *Little Iliad* is proved by Servius' note to Verg. *Aen.* 2.341, where the grammarian – who is commenting on the brief Vergilian account of Koroibos' fortuitous arrival at Troy⁷¹⁸ – seems to ascribe the first depiction of Mygdon's son as a fool to Euphorion⁷¹⁹ (*hunc autem Coroebum stultum inducit Euphorion* [fr. 107 Cusset])⁷²⁰. Just like Melitides, Koroibos' status of stereotypical half-wit was already well established in the 3rd cent. BCE, as a fragment by Kallimachos' proves (fr. 587 Pf. ἐπὶ σοφοὶ χαίροιτε, τὸν ὄγδοον, ὥστε Κόροιβον, / οὐ συναριθμώμεν⁷²¹). For Mammakythos, Melitides and Boutalion, it is possible (and, for Melitides, almost certain) that the grammarian relied on evidence coming from comedy in order to identify the figures as μωροί: in Koroibos' case there are no occurrences of the name in comic playwrights⁷²², and Didymos' source was probably

⁷¹⁵ See Call. fr. 541 Pf.; Plb. 6.11a.3; Ath. 9.382b; Paus. 5.8.6, 8.26.3s.; Eus. *PE* 10.14.6. See also Moretti 1957, n. 1.

⁷¹⁶ fr. 30 Pf. = 32 Massimilla, see also *P. Oxy.* 22.2263 = Ag./Derc. fr. 8A Fowler = *FGrHist* 305 F 8 bis; Paus. 1.43.7f. See also Massimilla 1996, 299-302 and 305f.; Ambühl 1999a, 755; Harder 2012, 274-277.

⁷¹⁷ See Verg. *Aen.* 2.339-346; *P. Ryl.* 22 (= *PEG* fr. 2 p. 75 Bernabè); Paus. 10.27.1f. (= *PEG* fr. 15 p. 79 Bernabè); [Eur.] *Rh.* 539; Q. S. 13.169; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.341. See also Vian 1969, 135-137 n. 2; Ambühl 1999b, 755; Liapis 2012, 223; Fantuzzi 2020, 442f.

⁷¹⁸ See Verg. *Aen.* 2.339-343 *addunt se socios Ripheus et maximus armis / Iphitus ... iuvenisque Coroebus / Mygdonides: illis ad Troiam forte diebus / venerat insano Cassandrae incensus amore.*

⁷¹⁹ See Clément-Tarantino *ap.* Acosta-Hughes-Cusset 2012, 165 n. 94: «Servius mentionne le seul Euphorion comme témoin et peut-être comme origine de cette tradition». On Servius' usage of Greek sources, see Cameron 2004, 192-197.

⁷²⁰ Further proof of the identification is given by several paroemiographical and lexicographical occurrences (see *e.g.* Suet. *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* (exc. byz.) 184 T. Κόροιβος· ὁ εὐήθης, ἀπὸ τοῦ Μυγδόνοιο, Φρυγὸς τὸ γένος, ὃς δοκεῖ ὑστατος τῶν ἐπικούρων ἀφικέσθαι τῷ Πριάμῳ, δι' εὐήθειαν, Zen. 4.58 (~ Hesych. κ 3649 C., Apost. 10.3) Κοροίβου ἡλιθιώτερος· εὐήθης καὶ μωρός. ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ μωραίνοντος ἔταπτον τὸν Κόροιβον ἀπὸ τινος Κοροίβου μωροῦ, ὃν οἴονται τὸν Μύγδοιο εἶναι παῖδα τοῦ Φρυγὸς, κατὰ τὰ Τρωϊκὰ γενόμενον. τινὲς δὲ τοῦτον ἀνάισθητον φασὶ γεγονέναι, ὡς καὶ τὰ κύματα τῆς θαλάσσης ἀριθμεῖν. These texts – along with many other literary occurrences of Koroibos' name, both in prose and poetry from the 2nd cent. CE to the Byzantine age – show how the hero developed from being simply «another late ally unable to save Troy» (Fries 2014, 329) to representing the archetype of the half-wit, just as Melitides. See *e.g.* Luc. *Philops.* 3 ὃς δ' ἂν οὖν ταῦτα καταγέλαστα ὄντα μὴ οἴηται ἀληθῆ εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐμφρόνως ἐξετάζων αὐτὰ Κοροίβου τινὸς ἢ Μαργίτου νομίζῃ τὸ πείθεσθαι ἢ Τριπτόλεμον ἐλάσαι διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος ἐπὶ δρακόντων ὑποπτέρων ἢ Πᾶνα ἢ κειν ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας σύμμαχον εἰς Μαραθῶνα ... , ἀσεβῆς οὗτός γε καὶ ἀνόητος αὐτοῖς ἔδοξεν, Gal. *UP* 3.10 (3,236 Kühn) Κόροιβος ἂν ὄντως εἴη τις ὁ πρὸς τῷ μὴ θαυμάζειν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῆς φύσεως ἔργα καὶ μέμφεσθαι τολμῶν, Olymp. *In Alc.* 85, 9-14 καὶ δύναται τις κατὰ μὲν τὸ ὄλον κρείττων εἶναι, κατὰ δὲ τὸ πᾶν χειρῶν· οἷον ἐὰν εἴπωμεν τὸ ὄλον, τὸ ἀνδρεῖον γένος ὡς ὄλον κρείττον ἔστι τοῦ γυναικεῖου, οὐ μὴν καὶ πᾶν παντός, οὔτε γὰρ Θεορσίτης κρείττων Θεανοῦς, ἢ Κόροιβος, Arethas *op.* 69 p. 81 Westerink Κοροίβου, βέλτιστε, ταῦτα καὶ Μαργίτου ἢ καὶ τῆς ἀνὰ πάντων στόμασιν Ἄκκοῦς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνδρὸς ᾧ τά τε ἄλλα προσεῖναι καλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐμφρονέστατον πᾶσιν ἀοίδιμον, Man. Phil. *Carm.* 2.1.762 μὴ γοῦν Κόροιβός εἰμι καὶ γράφω μάτην.

⁷²¹ The longest version of the fragment is preserved anonymously by Pomponius Porphyryon's comment to Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.296 (where the author, with refined irony, makes Damasippos call his Stoic teacher *sapientum octavos*). The ascription to Kallimachos is to be found in *Suda* κ 2113 A. and in the *Etymologicum Symeonis* (see Gaisford 1848, 2302). See also Jahn 1867, 249 and D'Alessio 2007, 738 n. 83. As rightly underlined by Pfeiffer (1949, 406), it can not be determined «utrum iam in fabella quadam Ionica Coroebi stupidi nomen cum septem sapientibus coniunctum fuerit an hoc Callimacho proprium sit». Less cautiously, Wilamowitz (1924, 187) deduced from the text that Kallimachos was the actual inventor of a catalogue of the «sieben Vertreter der negativen Weisheit».

⁷²² However, a play featuring Priam's Phrygian ally Koroibos would not seem out of place in Middle Comedy, considering the high frequency, in this phase, of plots relating to the Trojan events (see Arnott 2010, 295f.). Similarly, Pfeiffer (1949, 406f.) supposed that the character, originally mocked «in 'fabellis Ionicis' vel in comoedia Attica», had later become a proverbial fool. For other Middle Comedy plays dealing with characters related to the *Iliad* and to Troy in general, see Alexis' three titles on Helen (fr. 70-73 K.-A.), the two plays on Philoctetes by Strattis (fr. 44f. K.-A.) and Antiphanes (fr. 218 K.-A.), Anaxandrides' *Anchises* (fr. 4f. K.-A.), *Achilles* (fr. 8 K.-A.), *Helen* (fr. 12 K.-A.), *Pandaros* (fr. 38f. K.-A.) and *Protesilaos* (fr. 41f. K.-A.), Eubulus' *Anchises* (fr. 4f. K.-A.), *Dolon* (fr. 29-31 K.-A.), *Lakones or Leda* (fr. 60-63 K.-A.), *Mysoi* (fr. 66 K.-A.) and *Phoenix* (fr. 113 K.-A.), Theophilus' *Neoptolemos* (fr. 6f. K.-A.). See also Carrière 1997, 417 («on voit surgir des sujets troyens nouveaux»). For *Odyssey*-related plays, see Revermann 2013, 110-118.

Kallimachos (and/or Euphorion)⁷²³. In fact, in its entry on Koroibos, *Suda* (κ 2113 A.) quotes Call. fr. 587 Pf. right before Didymos' exegesis of Aristoph. *Ra.* 990f. Given the lexicon's close dependence on the scholia to Aristophanes⁷²⁴, it can not be excluded that a less epitomized version of Didymos' exegesis actually included Kallimachos' distich. In the Imperial age Melitides and Koroibos occur together – as a sort of canonic duo – in Aelian (*VH* 13.15), Pseudo-Lukianos (*Am.* 53.6) and Eusebios (*PE* 14.18.17f.)⁷²⁵. All the later texts that mention jointly Melitides and Koroibos belong either to the scholiastic⁷²⁶ or to the lexicographical-paroemiographical tradition⁷²⁷. In most cases the two characters appear along with other – more or less known – proverbial fools, such as Margites⁷²⁸. The longest list of this kind is provided by John Tzetzes in his comment on Aristoph. *Ra.* 990⁷²⁹, a patchwork of Aristophanic exegesis in which the four Didymean fools are joined by Margites and by two other *kōmōdoumenoi*, in order to create a parodic catalogue of the 'Seven Fools', parallel to that (or, more precisely, those) of the Seven Sages⁷³⁰.

⁷²³ Although there is no evidence of any exegetic work by Didymos on Kallimachos, he appears to have used his poetry while commenting on Demosthenes (see Call. fr. 495 Pf. *ap. P. Berol.* 9780 col. 14 ll. 31-35 κ(αι) (ἔστιν) ὁ | λόγος τὰ νῦν τῶι Δη[μ]οσθένε[ι] περὶ τῆς | Μεγαρικῆς Ὀργάδ[ος], ἧς κ(αι) Καλλίμα-|χός που μνημονεύων φησ[ί·] «Νισαί-|ης ἀγλίθες ἀπ' Ὀργάδος»), on the *Odyssey* (see *Et. M.* 664,46-52 G. [~ *Et. Gen. s.v. περισκέπτω*] περισκέπτω: “περισκέπτω ἐνὶ χώρῳ” [*Od.* 1.426; 10.211, 253; 14.6]. τῷ ὑψηλῷ, ὅθεν ἐστὶ περισκέψασθαι διὰ τὸ ὕψος καὶ ἀπιδεῖν· ἢ ὅθεν ἐστὶ τὸ πέριξ ἰδεῖν. ἢ περισκεπτον, ὃ τις ἂν κατανοῶν θαυμάσειεν· οἶον, “ὄφρα γένωμαι / σοὶ (τι) περισκεπτον παίγνιον Ἀρσινόη” [Call. ep. 5.7f. Pf.]. Δίδυμος [fr. 93a-b C.-Pr.] ἐν ὑπομνήματι ξ' Ὀδυσσεΐας. οὕτως εὗρον ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν Ὡρον) and, most probably, on Pindar (see Pontani 2011, 110f.). A Didymean reference to Euphorion, instead, can be found in Harp. ο 14 K. ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους. Δίδυμος: “ἦτοι” φησὶ “τὴν ἡλιαίαν λέγει ὁ ῥήτωρ διὰ τὸ τῶν δικαστηρίων τὰ μὲν ἄνω τὰ δὲ κάτω ὀνομάζεσθαι, ἢ διὰ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἄξοσι γραφῆς βουστροφηδὸν γεγραμμένης ἢ τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εὐωνύμων ἀρχόμενον νόμον κάτωθεν ὀνομάζει ὁ Δημοσθένης· ὅτι γὰρ” φησὶ “βουστροφηδὸν ἦσαν οἱ ἄξονες καὶ οἱ κύρβεις γεγραμμένοι δεδήλωκεν Εὐφορίων ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλοδώρῳ [fr. 7 Cusset]).

⁷²⁴ See also *Suda* β 468 [~ μ 523] A. On the relationship between *Suda* and the Aristophanic scholia, see Zacher 1888, 689; Adler 1928, XVIII; Holwerda 1977, XVII. See also Tosi 2006, 177; 2014, 21f.

⁷²⁵ See also Diogenian. 5.12.

⁷²⁶ See e.g. schol. anon. rec. Aristoph. *Nu.* 985b.

⁷²⁷ See e.g. all *Suda*-entries listed in the *loci paralleli*.

⁷²⁸ See above *Lex. Rhet. Bekk*^V 279,18f., Phot. μ 241 Th. (~ *Et. M.* 577,33 G.) and Eust. *Od.* 1669,42-53 (= I 395,9-24 S.). Koroibos and Melitides also appear independently with other archetypal simpletons. See e.g. Melitides with Mammacythos and Amphitides in Suet. *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* (exc. byz.) 186-188 T.

⁷²⁹ The same *carmen* is also to be found, with few alterations, in Tz. *Ep.* 1.1.3-2.1, *H.* 4.836-886 and *schol.* Tz. Aristoph. *Nu.* 1022b Holwerda. See Koster (1962, 989-991) for a detailed analysis of the text. The text is identified as a para-hymn by Pizzzone 2017, 185 n. 17.

⁷³⁰ For an overview of the different lists of the Seven Sages preserved by the tradition, see Engels 2010, 9-78. Trying to link Tzetzes' *catalogus stultorum* to Kallimachos' reference to the ἐπὶ σοφοὶ in the Koroibos-fragment is surely tempting, but Tzetzes' clear dependence on Aristophanic exegetic material (which is made even clearer by the completely different set of characters Tzetzes presents, in comparison to those found in other works such as Suetonius' *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν*, *Lex. Rhet. Bekk*^V and Photios' *Lexicon*) excludes the possibility. At the same time, however, the earlier authors – particularly those from the Imperial age – might directly rely on (or at least indirectly mirror) a rhetorical catalogue of fools similar to the mythographic ones found on papyrus fragments (see van Rossum-Steenbeek 1998, 309-322 and 328-340. See also Lightfoot 1999, 247; Cameron 2004, 238-249; Zito 2014, 116-118).

fr. 269 (= II 14.17, p. 250 Schmidt)

Subject: incongruity between Dionysos' statement in *Ra*. 1028 and the preserved text of Aischylos' *Persians*

Sources: *scholl.* Aristoph. *Ra*. 1028a-aa-ba-c-ea-f et aβ-eβ-d-bβ-g Chantry

ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἦνίκ' ἤκουσα **RVE** <περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος>: ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις Αἰσχύλου “Πέρσαις”, οὔτε Δαρείου θάνατος ἀπαγγέλλεται, οὔτε χορὸς τὰς χεῖρας συγκρούσας λέγει “Ἴαυοῖ”. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πράγματα ὑπόκειται ἐν Σούσοις, καὶ περίφοβός ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ Ξέρξου ἐξ ὄνειρου τινός, χορὸς δὲ Περσῶν γερόντων διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτήν. εἶτα ἄγγελος ἀπαγγέλλων τὴν περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὴν Ξέρξου φυγὴν. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)** Χαῖρις (fr. 22 Berndt) δέ φησι· τὸ “Δαρείου” ἀντὶ τοῦ Ξέρξου· σύνηθες γὰρ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῖς τῶν πατέρων ὀνόμασι χρῆσθαι. **VEΘBarb(Ald)** πρὸς ὃν ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐν τῷ δράματι λέγεται· “Ξέρξης μὲν αὐτὸς ζῆ τε καὶ βλέπει φάος.” (299) **VEΘBarb(Ald)** Ἡρόδικος (p. 126 Düring = fr. 10 Broggiato) δέ φησι διττὰς γεγενῆσθαι <καθέσεις> †...† τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ τὴν τραγωδίαν ταύτην περιέχει τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην. δοκοῦσιν δὲ οὗτοι οἱ “Πέρσαι” ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου δεδιδάχθαι ἐν Συρακούσαις, σπουδάσαντος Ἰέρωνος, ὡς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' Περὶ κωμωδιῶν. (fr. 109 Strecker = 6 Bagordo) **VEΘBarb(Ald)** ἄλλως. **VE** Δίδυμος· ὅτι οὐ περιέχουσι θάνατον Δαρείου “οἱ Πέρσαι” τὸ δρᾶμα. δι' ὃ τινες διττὰς καθέσεις, τουτέστι διδασκαλίας, τῶν “Περσῶν” φασί, καὶ τὴν μίαν μὴ φέρεσθαι. τινὲς δὲ γράφουσι <ἀντὶ> “Δαρείου”, “τοῦ Ξέρξου”. οἱ δὲ ὅτι τοῖς κυρίοις ἀντὶ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν κέχρηται, καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ Ξέρξης. οἱ δὲ, ὅτι εἰδῶλον Δαρείου φθέγγεται, ἐκεῖ<νου> τεθνηκότος, δηλονότι. **VEΘBarb(Ald)**

“I rejoiced when I heard (of Dareios' death)”: in the preserved *Persians* by Aischylos nobody announces the death of Dareios, nor does the Chorus say “alas!” clapping their hands. Instead, the events take place at Susa and Xerxes' mother is terrified because of a dream and the Chorus of old Persians speaks with her. Then (comes) a messenger reporting the sea-fight in Salamina and Xerxes' flight. Chairis says: “‘Dareios' (death)' instead of ‘Xerxes' (death)’, for it is usual for the poets to use the names of the fathers in reference to their sons”. Against him one could say that in the play it is said “Xerxes himself is alive and sees the light of day”. Herodikos says that there were two (stagings) †...† of the death and that tragedy included the battle of Plataia. These *Persians* seem to have been staged by Aischylos in Syracusai, at Hieron's request, as Eratosthenes says in the third book *On Comedies*. Otherwise. Didymos: the *Persians* do not include Dareios' death. Therefore, some say that there were two stagings – that is two productions – of the *Persians* and that one is not preserved. Some write “Xerxes” (instead of) “Dareios”. Some (say) that they used proper names instead of the patronymics and that (the one intended) is Xerxes. Others (say) that clearly it is Dareios' ghost who is speaking, since he is dead.

Aristoph. Ra. 1028f. ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἦνίκ' ἤκουσα περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, / ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῶ χεῖρ' ὠδι συγκρούσας εἶπεν· “ἴαυοῖ.”

schol. rec. Aristoph. Ra. 1029e Chantry οὐ φέρεται τι τοιοῦτον ἐν τοῖς νῦν εὕρισκομένοις “Πέρσαις”. φασὶ δὲ ὅτι ἐν ἑτέροις Πέρσαις περὶ τούτου διέξεισιν. Ps^{add}trLvMt

a 2 ἀπαγγέλλεται VEBarb, ἐπαγγέλλεται RΘ | (ante χορὸς, ὁ Ald) | συγκρούσας hic VEΘBarb, ante τὰς R | **3** ὑπόκειται RVEBarb edd. cett., ὑπόκεινται Θ(Ald) Bekker | **4** ἀπαγγέλλων REΘBarb (G), ἀπαγγέλων V(Ald) | **5** Χαῖρις VE, χαίρει Θ (G), χαίρεις Barb | δέ VEBarb, γάρ Θ | **6** γάρ om. Barb | **7** δράματι EΘBarb, δράμματι V | βλέπει VEΘ, βλέπειν Barb | **8** διττάς γεγονέναι καθέσεις Chantry Montana, διττάς γεγονέναι τὰς θέσεις vel καθέσεις Dobree, διττάς γεγονέναι τὰς καθέσεις Dindorf Dübner, διττοῦ VEΘBarb Bekker Süß (διττὴν G) | †...† τοῦ θανάτου VEΘBarb (om. G), <ὄν μίαν ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαρεῖου θανάτου Fritzsche, <πρὸ> tempt. Montana, τοῦ θανάτου exp. Dindorf Dübner | **9** καὶ-περιέχειν VEΘBarb (ἦτις-περιέχει G) | **10** φησιν cett., φα() Barb | **11** post Διδυμος, δὲ ΘBarb | **12** καθέσεις Casaubon (*Animadv. in Ath.* p. 413) edd., καταθέσεις VΘBarb (G), θέσεις E(Ald) Bekker | **13** ἀντί suppl. Schuringa, Δαρείου exp. Dindorf | **14** τῶν cett., om. Θ(Ald) Bekker | ἐστὶν om. Bekker | **15** ἐκεῖ<νου> Dobree edd. cett., ἐκεῖ codd. Bekker

At ll. 1028f. of *Frogs*, Dionysos – who has just been reminded by Aischylos of the performance of the *Persians* – expresses his own appreciation of a specific scene, that of the announcement of Dareios’ death and of the reaction of the Chorus to the message (*Ra.* 1028f. ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἡνίκ’ ἴηκουσα περὶ† Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, / ὁ χορὸς δ’ εὐθὺς τὸ χεῖρ’ ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν· “ἰαυοῖ”). No such scene occurs in the preserved text of the Aeschylean play, nor could it be found in the *Persians* available to the ancient commentators of Aristophanes, as the exegetic material demonstrates. The problem of the inconsistency between the text of the *Frogs* and the plot of Aischylos’ play is due to the evident corruption of *Ra.* 1028⁷³¹, where the first section (until ἡνίκ’) and the last one (from περὶ onwards⁷³²) follow the metric scheme of the anapaestic tetrameter catalectic, while the central portion is clearly ametric. Although it cannot be determined where, in the course of the textual tradition of the *Frogs*, this corruption intervened and how severe it was at the time of the Alexandrian scholars, the scholia show undoubtedly that the text offered to the ancient readers the very same meaning that still troubles modern scholars.

The annotation consists of two scholia substantially overlapping in content but clearly differing in length, connected by the compilation mark ἄλλως. It has been convincingly argued by Montana (2017, 215-221) that the first and longer part (*i.e. scholl. Aristoph. Ra.* 1028aa-ba-c-ea-f Chantry) represents a direct excerpt from Didymos’ hypomnēma to the *Frogs*, while the second one (*i.e. scholl. Aristoph. Ra.* 1028 aβ-eβ-d-bβ-g Chantry) is a patent, but highly epitomized quotation from the same work. In other words, in his commentary (excerpted at the beginning of the annotation) Didymos extensively quoted the exegeses of his predecessors Chairis, Herodikos and Eratosthenes. The compiler that later quoted from the same commentary omitted all their names, only mentioning the name of his primary source, Didymos. Apart from preserving the opinions of his forerunners, the grammarian seemingly gave no original contribution to the debate. Indeed, besides the plain description of the incongruity between *Ra.* 1028 and the plot of the *Persians*⁷³³, no other piece of exegesis

⁷³¹ The most recent and complete discussion of the problem (including all the relevant bibliography) is Totaro 2006, where all modern emendation proposals are collected and evaluated. See also Wilson 2007c, 177f.

⁷³² Although it fits within the metre, the preposition περὶ is included in the *crucis*, because it is highly unlikely that the action described at l. 1028 (whatever it is) happens “with regard to Dareios’ death”, since he is already dead and features as ghost in the tragedy.

⁷³³ The recalled scenes are: Atossa’s dream (περίφοβός ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ Ξέρξου ἐξ ὄνείρου τινός, see Aeschyl. *Pers.* 159-214), the dialogue between Atossa and the Chorus (χορὸς δὲ Περσῶν γερόντων διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτήν, see Aeschyl. *Pers.* 215-248) and the

is explicitly linked to him (although two anonymous sections might be ascribed to him, see below). Still, the exegetic material relating to *Ra*. 1028 provides exceptional insight into Didymos' *modus operandi*, clearly showing his attention for the scholarly work of the predecessors and his aim to reorganise and frame the philological debate within his own commentary.

Χαῖρις δέ φησι· τὸ “Δαρείου” ἀντὶ τοῦ Ξέρξου: Chairis (2nd-1st cent. BCE, see the Introduction § 3.3) may have been Aristarchos' pupil (see Montana 2015b). Didymos quoted him also in his exegetic work on Homer and Pindar, as shown by the scholia to *Il.* 6.71⁷³⁴ and *Pind. N.* 1.49⁷³⁵.

πρὸς ὃν ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐν τῷ δράματι κτλ: the refutation of Chairis' interpretation could actually be easily ascribed to Didymos. In fact, not only does the formulation echo the grammarian's typically cautious tone⁷³⁶, but a very close wording is also found in the already mentioned Didymeian scholium to *Pind. N.* 1.49, where Chairis' opinion is followed by *πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ ἔνεστιν εἰπεῖν κτλ*, by the exegesis of another ancient scholar and then by Didymos' one. The response is based on a misunderstanding of Chairis' proposal: for him Δαρείου was a patronymic and *περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος* meant “about Xerxes', the son of the dead Dareios”. Instead, the anonymous critic (maybe Didymos) understood that the meaning presupposed by Chairis was “about the dead Xerxes, Dareios' son” and therefore highlighted that *Pers.* 299 clearly states that the King is alive after the battle of Salamis⁷³⁷.

Ἡρόδικος δέ φησι διττὰς γεγονέναι <καθέσεις>: this is the only instance of Didymos quoting Herodikos (2nd cent. BCE, see the Introduction § 3.4.1)⁷³⁸. The citation probably comes from his *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα* (on which see Pagani 2009d). Broggiato (2014, 48), instead, believes that this fragment pertains to Herodikos' work entitled *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*.

ὡς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' Περὶ κωμωδιῶν: although there are no cases of direct quotation, Eratosthenes' books *On Ancient Comedy*⁷³⁹ were undoubtedly a paramount source for Didymos. The grammarian is likely

Messenger scene (εἶτα ἄγγελος ἀπαγγέλλων τὴν περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὴν Ξέρξου φυγὴν, see Aeschyl. *Pers.* 249-531 and *hyp.* Aeschyl. *Pers.* 4f. πλὴν ἐκεῖ εὐνοῦχος ἔστιν ἀγγέλλων ἐν ἀρχῇ τὴν Ξέρξου ἦτταν, 13-15 Ξέρξης στρατευσάμενος κατὰ Ἑλλάδος, καὶ περὶ μὲν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς νικηθεὶς, ναυτικῇ δὲ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι. διὰ Θεσσαλίας φεύγων διεπεραιώθη εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν).

⁷³⁴ *schol. Did. Il.* 6.71a (A) νεκροὺς ἅμ πεδίον συλήσετε τεθνηῶτας· οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος, ὁ δὲ Ζηνόδοτος „Τρώων ἅμ πεδίον συλήσομεν ἔντα νεκρούς“. Αθηνοκλέους δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ὀμήρου παρατηρήσαντος ὅτι τῷ μὲν καμάρῳ καὶ ἑαυτὸν ὁ Νέστωρ ὑποβάλλει λέγων „κτείνωμεν“ (Z 70), τὸ δὲ κέρδος ἴδιον ποιεῖται τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐν τῷ συλήσετε, ὁ Χαῖρις (fr. 3 B.) Ὀμηρικὸν εἶναι φησι τὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας χαρακτήρα ὡς ἐν τούτοις· „ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ πάντες, ὅσοι θεοὶ εἰς' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, / σοὶ τ' ἐπιείθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος“ (E 877-8)· ἔδει γὰρ δέδμηται ὡς πειθονται ἢ ἀνάπαλιν. καὶ πάλιν· „ἀλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες· / νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἔλεσθε κατὰ στρατόν“ (Σ 297-8), καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλως ἀκμάζει ὁ Νέστωρ, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γήρωσ ἐοικεν ἀπειρηκέναι. ταῦτα ὁ Δίδυμος (fr. 55 C.-Pr.). See also *schol. Did. Il.* 2.865 (A), 6.4b (bT).

⁷³⁵ *schol. Pind. N.* 1.49c Drachmann ὁ δὲ Χαῖρις (fr. 20 Berndt) φησιν, ὅτι ὁ Χρόμιος πολλὰ συμπονήσας τῷ Ἰέρωνι κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀμοιβῆς ἔτυχεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὥστε ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ ἵπποτροφήσαι· ὡς οὖν οὗτος ἐπαθλον πόνων ἔλαβε τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, οὕτω καὶ Ἡρακλῆς πολλὰ ταλαιπωρήσας ἐπαθλον ἔσχε τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ τὸν γάμον τῆς Ἥβης ... βέλτιον δὲ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (fr. 144 C.-Pr.) ἐκεῖνο λέγειν, ὅτι κτλ.

⁷³⁶ See Clausen 1881, 34f.; Boudreaux 1919, 111 and *Did. fr.* 227, 229, 230, 237, 267 (above).

⁷³⁷ See Montana 2015b; 2017, 218f.

⁷³⁸ On Herodikos' life and works, see Pagani 2009d, Broggiato 2014a, 41-55.

⁷³⁹ The extant fragments are collected by Strecker 1884; a new commented edition by M. Broggiato is in preparation. See also Tosi 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Broggiato 2014b, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c; Benuzzi 2018, 2019b.

responsible for a good amount of the fragments of Eratosthenes' work quoted by Athenaios⁷⁴⁰, Harpokration⁷⁴¹, Hesychios⁷⁴² and, of course, the scholia to Aristophanes (see the Introduction § 3.3)⁷⁴³. Although Eratosthenes features in the discussion only as a source on the Sicilian restaging of the *Persians* (or rather of the whole tetralogy⁷⁴⁴), given the clear reference to his work *On Ancient Comedy*, it can be assumed that he also discussed the wording of *Ra.* 1028, explaining the discrepancy between Aristophanes' line and the plot of the *Persians* with a supposedly revised version of the play for the Sicilian production (his exegesis being later adopted by Herodikos).

οἱ δέ, ὅτι εἰδῶλον Δαρείου φθέγγεται κτλ: this anonymous interpretation ends the list of explanation attempts in the more epitomized part of the annotation and is absent in the longer Didymean excerpt. Although it is introduced by the unspecified οἱ δέ, it is tempting to ascribe the section to Didymos⁷⁴⁵. In all likelihood, the wording "Dareios' ghost is talking" implies a textual solution to the problem of *Ra.* 1028, namely the emendation of the transmitted *περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος* ("regarding Dareios' death") in *παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος* ("from the dead Dareios"), thus making Dionysos' line into a reference to the speech of Dareios' ghost at *Pers.* 681-842⁷⁴⁶.

⁷⁴⁰ See e.g. Ath. 11.501d (= Eratosth. fr. 25 Strecker; Did. fr. 8 C.-Pr.), with its rich doxography concerning the word *βαλανειόμαλος* (Crat. fr. 54 K.-A.).

⁷⁴¹ See e.g. Harp. μ 16 K. and Benuzzi 2018, 335-338.

⁷⁴² The close similarity between Hesych. κ 1590 C. (= Eratosth. fr. 63 Strecker) and *schol.* Aristoph. *Lys.* 722b Hangard suggests Didymos as common source.

⁷⁴³ Schmidt 1854, 44-66 listed as fragments of Didymos' *Comic Vocabulary* a large group of scholia, lexicographic entries and Athenaios' passages where only Eratosthenes was mentioned (sometimes along with Lykophron). This is obviously a rather audacious operation, although it cannot be denied that Didymos played a central role in the fragmentary survival of Eratosthenes' *On Ancient Comedy*.

⁷⁴⁴ See Broggiato 2019c, 19-26.

⁷⁴⁵ As supposed by Montana 2017, 221.

⁷⁴⁶ The change of preposition has been adopted by several modern scholars in their attempts at emending *Ra.* 1028, see Bachmann 1878, 102; von Velsen 1881, 98; Heidberg 1898-1899, 66; Willems 1919, 78.

fr. 270a (= II 14.18, p. 250 Schmidt)

Subject: the expression ἡ τοῖς ὄστράκοις / αὕτη κροτοῦσα (Aristoph. *Ra.* 1305f.)

Source: *schol.* Aristoph. *Ra.* 1305b-c-a Chantry

ποῦ ἴσθιν ἡ τοῖς ὄστράκοις **RVM**: ὅτι φαίνονται τινες ἀγοραῖοι κρούοντες τοῖς ὄστράκοις καὶ προσάδοντες τῷ κρούματι τῷ διὰ τούτων. **RVEΘBarb(Ald)** λέγεται εἰς τὴν Ὑψιπύλην ταῦτα, **RVMEΘBarb(Ald)** ἢ καθόλου τὴν Μοῦσαν αὐτοῦ· ἐπιλέγει γάρ· “δεῦρο, Μοῦσ’ Εὐριπίδου”. (1306) **VEΘBarb(Ald)** Δίδυμος δὲ προστίθησιν ὅτι **VEΘBarb(Ald)** εἰώθασιν ἀντὶ λύρας κογχύλια καὶ ὄστράκια κρούοντες ἔνρυθμόν τινα ἧχον ἀποτελεῖν τοῖς ὄρχουμένοις. **VMEΘBarb(Ald)**

“where is (that woman who rattles with) the potsherds?”: because it seems that low-class people rattled the potsherds and sung to the sound produced by them. This alludes to the *Hypsipyle* or generally to Euripides’ Muse. Indeed he adds: “come here, Muse of Euripides”. Didymos adds that they are accustomed to producing a rhythmic sound for the dancers by rattling shells and potsherds instead of (playing) the lyre.

Aristoph. Ra. 1304-1307 ἐνεγκάτω τις τὸ λύριον. καίτοι τί δεῖ / λύρας ἐπὶ τούτο; ποῦ ἴσθιν ἡ τοῖς ὄστράκοις / αὕτη κροτοῦσα; δεῦρο, Μοῦσ’ Εὐριπίδου, / πρὸς ἦνπερ ἐπιτήδεια ταῦτ’ ἄδειν μέλη.

Ath. 14.636d-e Ἐρμιππος δ’ ἐν Θεοῖς (fr. 31 K.-A.) τὸ τούτοις κρούειν κρεμβαλίαζειν εἶρηκεν ἐν τούτοις· “λεπάδας δὲ πετρῶν ἀποκόπτοντες / κρεμβαλίαζουσι”. Δίδυμος (fr. 270b C.-Pr.) δὲ φησιν εἰωθῆναι τινὰς ἀντὶ τῆς λύρας κογχύλια καὶ ὄστρακα συγκρούοντας ἔνρυθμον ἧχόν τινα ἀποτελεῖν τοῖς ὄρχουμένοις, καθάπερ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην ἐν Βατράχοις φάναί | **Phryn. PS 79.6** κροτεῖν ὄστράκοις: Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπὶ τῆς Εὐριπίδου μελοποιίας, ὅτι οὐχὶ γνήσιον <ποιητοῦ> οὐδὲ γνήσια τὰ μέλη, ἀλλ’ οἷα πρὸς ὄστρακα ἄδεσθαι, δηλονοίως ποιούντος <τοῦ> κωμικοῦ, ὅτι τὰ ἐκλελυμένα τῶν μελῶν καὶ ἀδόκιμα πρὸς τὰ ὄστρακα <κα> ἧδον, οὐχὶ πρὸς λύραν ἢ κιθάραν. λέγει δ’ οὕτως· ὄστράκοις αὕτη κροτοῦσα δεῦρο μοῦσ’ Εὐριπίδου’ | **Hesych. κ 4049 C.** κρεμβαλίαζειν (Hermipp. fr. 31 K.-A.): κογχύλια καὶ ὄστρακα συγκροτοῦντας ἔνρυθμόν τινα ἧχον ἀποτελεῖν τοῖς ὄρχουμένοις.

1 ἀγοραῖοι RVE, εἰσαγοραῖοι ΘBarb | 2 προσάδοντες VEΘBarb, προάδοντες R | λέγεται cett., λέγουσι M | post ταῦτα, ποιῶν M | 3 Μοῦσ’ Barb (et in versu cett.), Μοῦσα VEΘ | 4 κογχύλια VE, κογκάρια MΘ, κογκάλια Barb | 5 ἔνρυθμόν Ath. Diibner, εὐρόθμως VEΘBarb Chantry, εὐρυθμόν epit. Ath. Bekker Dindorf Süß, ἄρυθμον M | ὄρχουμένοις VEΘBarb(Ald), ὄρχησταῖς M | εἰώθασιν–ὄρχουμένοις hic cett., ante λέγεται M

While preparing to put Euripides’ songs to trial, Aischylos – who deems his rival’s lyrics unworthy of the solemnity of the lyre accompaniment (Aristoph. *Ra.* 1304f. καίτοι τί δεῖ / λύρας ἐπὶ τούτο;) – calls on stage Euripides’ “Muse” (l. 1306), a silent female character depicted as ἡ τοῖς ὄστράκοις / αὕτη κροτοῦσα, “that woman who rattles with the potsherds” (ll. 1305f.)⁷⁴⁷. In this way, Aristophanes attacked a musical experiment

⁷⁴⁷ Aischylos’ disparaging tone is inevitably flattened when the expression is translated as a simple ἡ κροταλίζουσα (see e.g. Rogers 1902, 199: «she that bangs and jangles her castanets»; Coulon 1928b, 146: «la joueuse de castagnettes»; Marzullo 1968, 616: «quella con le nacchere»; Del Corno 1992, 131: «la ragazza che suona le nacchere»; Paduano 1996, 179: «la suonatrice di nacchere»; Ewans 2011, 214: «that woman who beats time on castanets»). Literal translations such as those by Kock (1898, 198: «mit Scherben

recently carried out by Euripides in his *Hypsipyle* (411-408 BCE)⁷⁴⁸, with the protagonist accompanying her song with castanets mimicking the sound of clapping waves around the island of Lesbos (Eur. fr. 752f,8-14 K. = ll. 194-201 Collard-Cropp)⁷⁴⁹.

The scholium regarding the expression ποῦ ὅστιν ἢ τοῖς ὄστράκοις / αὕτη κροτοῦσα; seemingly contains three separate interpretations. The first describes the act of rattling potsherds to accompany singing as a vulgar custom and correctly identifies the scene as an attack against the experimental monody of *Hypsipyle*. The exegesis is echoed in Phot. κ 1111 Th., although the wording of the entry is heavily corrupt.⁷⁵⁰ The second, instead, considers the silent character as generic representation of Euripides' low style, rather than a specific criticism on the *Hypsipyle* (a more articulate phrasing of this interpretative stance is preserved by the grammarian Phrynichos [*PS* 79.6]). Finally, Didymos' comment offers an autoschediastic explanation of ll. 1304-1306, based on the opposition between the lyre and the potsherds, but without any reference to the obviously different status of the two instruments and with a focus on the act of dancing rather than that of singing. His interpretation is found, in an almost identical form, in Ath. 14.636d-e, within a long and varied excursus on music and its historical and technical features (616e-639a). After discussing string and wind instruments, Athenaios comes to percussions and, more specifically, to the κρέμβαλα. Dikaiarchos is the first source quoted with regard to the popularity of the instrument among women⁷⁵¹. The digression then proceeds with the incipit of an anonymous song to Artemis⁷⁵². After this reference – aimed at proving the close connection between κρέμβαλα and women – the focus shifts towards κρεμβαλιάζω, a verb that Athenaios found in Hermippos' *Gods* (fr. 31 K.-A.)⁷⁵³. Didymos' comment on *Ra*. 1305 is reported right after the quotation from the play by Hermippos, and is followed by a precise reference to the *Frogs* (καθάπερ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην ἐν Βατράχοις φάναι) that hints at the original context of the *interpretamentum*. The same

klappernde»), Sommerstein (1999, 139: «that girl who plays percussion with broken bits of pot») and Holzberg (2011, 64: «sie, die mit Topfscherben klappert») are more preferable. On the exact meaning of the word ὄστρακον in the Aristophanic passage, see below. On the character's unclear external features, see Radermacher 1954, 320; Dover 1993, 351; Sommerstein 1999, 274.

⁷⁴⁸ See Kannicht 2004b, 736.

⁷⁴⁹ The most recent study of *Hypsipyle*'s monody in relation to Aristophanes' parody is in Simone 2020. Detailed analyses of the entire Aristophanic passage can be found in van der Valk 1982, Borthwick 1994 and Di Marco 2009, 119-141. Barker (2004, 199) establishes a convincing link between this scene and the entrance on stage of Prokne in *Av*. 667ff. For a survey on the imagery of dancers and prostitutes in parodies of the New Music, see Gianvittorio 2018.

⁷⁵⁰ Phot. κ 1111 Th. κροταλίειν· οὐ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν κροτεῖν, ἀλλὰ διὰ κροτάλου· † “τῆς κροταλισίας” ὡς Εὐριπίδης (fr. 769 K.) φησὶν ὁ κωμικὸς † περὶ τῆς Ὑψιπύλης λέγων. It is possible that the entry originally included a direct quotation from *Ra*. 1305f. later gradually obscured, firstly with the easy *saut du même au même* ἢ τοῖς ὄστράκοις αὕτη κροτοῦσα <δεῦρο Μοῦσα> Εὐριπίδου and secondly with the adaptation of the participle to the lemma κροταλίειν (along with further loss of text at the beginning of the quotation). On the strong influence of the *lemma* on the *interpretamentum* in the lexicographic tradition, see Tosi 1988, 157f.

⁷⁵¹ Ath. 14.636c-d ἦν γὰρ δὴ τινα καὶ χωρὶς τῶν ἐμφυσιμένων καὶ χορδαῖς διελημμένων ἕτερα ψόφου μόνον παρασκευαστικά, καθάπερ τὰ κρέμβαλα. περὶ ὧν φησι Δικαίαρχος ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος Βίου (fr. 60 Wehrli = 72 Mirhady), ἐπιχωριάσαι φάσκων ποτὲ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς τὸ προσορχεῖσθαι τε καὶ προσάδειν ταῖς γυναῖξιν ὄργανά τινα ποιά, ὧν ὅτε τις ἄπτοιο τοῖς δακτύλοις ποιεῖν λιγυρὸν ψόφον. On Dikaiarchos and the main features of his work *On the Life of Greece*, see Ax 2001, 279-297.

⁷⁵² Ath. 14.636d δηλοῦσθαι δὲ ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ᾄσματι (*Mel. adesp.* fr. 37 [*PMG* 955] P. = Alc. fr. °284 Cal.), οὗ ἐστὶν ἀρχή· “Ἄρτεμι, σοὶ μέ † τι φρὴν ἐφίμερον ὕμνον / υνεαίτε ὄθεν ἀδε τις ἀλλὰ χρυσοφάνια † / κρέμβαλα χαλκοπάραια χερσίν”. The quotation belonged most probably to Dikaiarchos' original discussion, as supposed both by Wehrli (1967, 61) and Ax (2001, 285). See also Neri (1996, 51), who links the entire passage to the erudite discussion on the *λεπάδες* preserved by Ath. 3.85e-86a (see *ibid.* 25-55).

⁷⁵³ See Comentale 2017, 130-138.

exegetic sequence presented by Athenaios (with Hermippos' lines followed Didymos' observation and a specific reference to Aristophanes) can be found in Hesych. κ 4049 C. κρεμβαλιάζειν· κογχύλια καὶ ὄστρακα συγκροτοῦντας ἔνρυθμόν τινα ἤχον ἀποτελεῖν τοῖς ὀρχουμένοις. Even though the names both of the playwright and of the grammarian are omitted, the lemma κρεμβαλιάζειν clearly comes from Hermippos and the wording of the explanation is exactly the same. Given the two occurrences, it can be easily supposed that Hermippos' lines originally belonged to a longer version of Didymos' comment on Aristoph. *Ra.* 1305⁷⁵⁴: this is further confirmed by a closer analysis of Didymean fragment (see below).

Δίδυμος δὲ προστίθησιν: the verb is mostly used in highly articulate scholia where various exegeses are not simply juxtaposed but rather critically integrated into one coherent annotation. It can introduce a quotation from a scholar already mentioned⁷⁵⁵, but can also mark an ancient reader's exegesis that represents an addition to what has been said by another scholar⁷⁵⁶. In the present case, while highlighting the logic concatenation of the entire scholium, προστίθησιν suggests clearly that Didymos' comment is closely linked to what is said above and that the redactor perceived his interpretation as an addition to the rest of the exegetic material⁷⁵⁷. The absence of other names of commentators in the scholium leaves room for different perspectives. On the one hand, with his observation, Didymos might have been integrating the exegesis of another commentator (as in *schol.* Pind. *N.* 3.16b, see n. 756), whose name went lost due to epitomation. On the other hand, the redactor might have been intermittently quoting from Didymos' hypomnēma (as in *schol.* Apoll. Rhod. 4.272-274 and *schol.* Hrd. *Il.* 13.450a1 [A], see n. 755), and a previous mention of the grammarian might have equally gone lost in the transmission of the scholium.

εἰώθησιν: the verb covers a wide range of meanings in the scholiastic vocabulary⁷⁵⁸ and occurs twice more in conjunction with Didymos' name, both times introducing general, autoschediastic inferences from the Aristophanic context (see above fr. 232, 243).

⁷⁵⁴ But see Neri 1996, 51: «quanto a Ermippo, è senz'altro plausibile che anche il passo degli *Dèi* derivi dall'esegesi di Dicearco, che di nacchere, musica e commedia si sarà forse occupato nei *Διονυσιακοὶ ἀγῶνες* (fr. 73-89 Wehrli)»; see also Comentale 2017, 131.

⁷⁵⁵ See e.g. *schol.* Apoll. Rhod. 4.272-274 ἔνθεν δὴ τινα: Σεσόγῳσις Αἰγύπτου πάσης βασιλεὺς μετὰ Ἰβρον τὸν Ἰσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος παῖδα τὴν μὲν Ἀσίαν ὀρμήσας πᾶσαν κατεστρέψατο, ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῆς Εὐρώπης. ἀκριβέστερον δὲ ἔστι τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ παρὰ Ἡρόδοτον (2.102-110). Θεόπομπος δὲ ἐν γ' (*FGHHist* 115 F 46) Σέσωστριν αὐτὸν καλεῖ. Ἡρόδοτος δὲ προστίθησιν (102), ὅτι, εἰ μὲν τινες πολέμῳ κατέστρεψεν, στήλας ἐτίθει πῶς ἐνίκησεν. See also *schol.* Hrd. *Il.* 13.450a1 (A) Κρήτη ἐπίουρον: τοῦτο τριχῶς ἀνεγνώσθη. Ζηνόδοτος (fr. 4 p. 191 Pusch = vol. II p. 413 van Thiel) γὰρ ὡς ἐπίκουρον, ἐκδεχόμενος βασιλέα καὶ φύλακα. καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ οὕτως, ἐκδεχόμενος τὸν φύλακα. μέμνηται δὲ καὶ ὁ Δίδυμος (fr. 61 C.-Pr.) τῆς ἀποδόσεως καὶ Τρύφων (fr. 100 V.). ἐκεῖνο δὲ προστίθησιν ὁ Τρύφων ὅτι ὁ ἐπίουρος, ὡς „ἐπίσκοπος“ κτλ.

⁷⁵⁶ See e.g. *schol.* Pind. *N.* 3.16b ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος Οὐρανοῦ θυγατέρα τὴν Μοῦσαν δέδεκται ... ὁ δὲ Ἀμμώνιος προστίθησιν ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο κρέοντα κέκληκε τὸν Οὐρανὸν, ὅτι πρὶν Κρόνον βασιλεῦσαι οὗτος ἐβασίλευσεν.

⁷⁵⁷ The absence of προστίθησιν in Athenaios' passage – where the Didymean exegesis simply serves as an isolated consideration on the topic – confirms the specific function of the verb in the scholium.

⁷⁵⁸ For which see the relevant comment on fr. 232 (above).

ἀντὶ λόρας: for a similar observation on the more or less improvised substitution of noble music instruments in specific performative contexts, see Eratosthenes' comment on the allegedly Archilochean hymn to Herakles τήνελλα καλλίνικε⁷⁵⁹.

κογχύλια καὶ ὄστράκια: the word ὄστράκια⁷⁶⁰ (just like Aristophanes' ὄστρακα) can mean either "potsherds" or "shells". Since Didymos pairs it with κογχύλια it seems unlikely that the two terms should be interpreted as synonyms. Rather, here the grammarian is listing two different objects which, according to him, were habitually used as castanets, namely shells (κογχύλια) and potsherds (ὄστράκια). It is therefore even more plausible that his exegesis originally included the line from Hermippos' *Gods*, where some unnamed characters use limpets (λεπάδες) as castanets⁷⁶¹.

ἔνρυθμόν τινα ἦχον ἀποτελεῖν τοῖς ὄρχουμένοις: the here adopted reading ἔνρυθμόν (already printed in Dübner's edition, see *id.* 1842, 309) is only attested by Athenaios' tradition, in opposition to the adverb εὐρύθμως (**VEΘBarb**, printed by Chantry) and the adjective εὐρυθμόν, preserved by the epitome of the *Learned Banqueters* and accepted by Dindorf. The substantial semantic difference between ἔνρυθμος and εὐρυθμος/εὐρύθμως is highlighted by several passages, where it is made clear that ἔνρυθμος alludes to the steady beat pattern underlying and supporting a more varied rhythmic sequence, defined εὐρυθμος⁷⁶². Among the other parallels, the description of the birth of dance given by Philodemos' *On Music* constitutes an essential point of comparison, in that it refers to the clapping of hands and stamping of feet as ἔνρυθμοι καὶ τεταγμένοι κινήσεις⁷⁶³ and to the subsequently introduced musical elements as εὐρυθμοὶ φοραὶ (see n. 762).

⁷⁵⁹ *schol.* Pind. *O.* 9.1k περὶ δὲ τοῦ τήνελλα Ἐρατοσθένους (fr. 136 Strecker) φησὶν ὅτι ὅτε ὁ αὐλητῆς ἢ ὁ κιθαριστῆς μὴ παρῆν, ὁ ἔξαρχος αὐτὸ μεταλαβὼν ἔλεγεν ἔξω τοῦ μέλους, ὁ δὲ τῶν κωμαστῶν χορὸς ἐπέβαλλε τὸ καλλίνικε, καὶ οὕτω συνειρόμενον γέγονε τὸ τήνελλα καλλίνικε. ἢ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ μέλους ἐστίν· ὃ καλλίνικε χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεος.

⁷⁶⁰ Athenaios' version of Didymos' exegesis has ὄστρακα, while the Aristophanic mss. unanimously offer ὄστράκια. The insertion of a iota in an original ὄστρακα influenced by κογχύλια is not impossible, but nevertheless unlikely, as ὄστράκια is undeniably *difficilior*.

⁷⁶¹ For κογχύλιον as common interpretamentum for λεπὰς in the lexicographic tradition, see e.g. Hesych. λ 657 C. λεπὰδες· τὰ πρὸς ταῖς πέτραις κεκολλημένα κογχύλια ὄστρέων ἐλάττω and *Suda* λ 284 A. (~ *schol.* Aristoph. *Pl.* 1096ba-β Chantry) λεπὰς δὲ κογχυλίου εἶδος, ὃ ταῖς πέτραις προσπήγνυται, δυσασποσπάστος ἔχον, ἐπειδὴν τις αὐτοῦ βουληθεὶ λαβεῖν. εὐεπίφορος δὲ ἐστὶ τῷ λεπὰς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης. παρ' ὑπόνοιαν, ὥσπερ λεπὰς πέτρα, οὕτως ἢ γραῦς τῷ μειρακίῳ.

⁷⁶² See *Phld. Mus.* col. 74 l. 44-col. 75 l. 11 ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς περὶ τὴν | φ[ύ]σιν [ἀμα-|θ{ε}ίας καὶ γανώσεω[ς] συνῆ]πτον ἀλόγως καὶ ἀν[επεισ]άκτως, οἰονεὶ βιασθέ[ντες, χ]ι|ο' ἴρον ἐπὶ τὸ καὶ χειρῶ[ν κα]|| ποδῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλω[ν με]||ρῶν κινήσεις ἐνρύθμου[ς κ]||αὶ τεταγμένας 'π' οὐήσ[ε]||' ἀ' σθ[αι· τε]||ρῶθ' ἔντες δὲ καὶ τέρψ[ει κ]||άλλους καὶ καθ' ὄρασιν, | τα[ῖς] φοραῖς ἐχρῶντο τῶν [...]λω[ν] εὐρύθμοις, *Dion. Hal. Dem.* 50.50-64 (~ *Comp.* 25.52-63) ἢ μὲν (*scil.* λέξις) ὅμοια παραλαμβάνουσα μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμοὺς τεταγμένους εἴτε κατὰ στίχον εἴτε κατὰ περίοδον ... καὶ τῷ σχήματι τούτῳ τῆς κατασκευῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς μέχρι τοῦ τέλους προβαίνουσα ἑμμετρὸς τ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἔρρυθμος, καὶ ὀνόματα κεῖται τῇ τοιαύτῃ λέξει μέτρον καὶ μέλος, ἢ δὲ περιπεπλανημένα μέτρα καὶ ῥυθμοὺς ἀτάκτους ἐμπεριλαμβάνουσα καὶ μῆτε ἀκολουθίαν αὐτῶν φυλάττουσα μῆτε ὁμοζυγίαν μῆτ' ἄλλην ὁμοιότητα τεταγμένην μηδεμίαν εὐρυθμὸς μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ εὐμετρος, ἐπειδὴ διαπεποικίλται μέτροις τε καὶ ῥυθμοῖς τισιν, οὐ μὴν ἔρρυθμὸς γε οὐδὲ ἑμμετρος, *Gal. De diff. puls.* 8.515 Κίηη καὶ ἐστιν ἐναντίος τῷ ἀρύθμῳ (*scil.* σφυγμῷ) οὐχ ὁ ἔνρυθμος, πᾶς γὰρ σφυγμὸς ἐν τινὶ ῥυθμῷ, ἀλλ' ὁ εὐρυθμὸς καλούμενος. ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τούτων, ἀρύθμου λέγω καὶ εὐρύθμου, κοινὸν γένος ἐστὶν ὁ ἔνρυθμος σφυγμὸς.

⁷⁶³ A similar idea is expressed by Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 623B αἶ τε σφοδραὶ περιχάρεται τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν μὲν ἐλαφροτέρων τῷ ἦθει καὶ τὸ σῶμα συνεπαίρουσιν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν εἰς ἔνρυθμον κίνησιν, ἐξαλλομένων καὶ κροτούντων εἴπερ ὀρχεῖσθαι μὴ δύνανται.

Conclusions

1. Didymos' exegesis of the *Birds* and the *Frogs* and the six parts of grammar

Following the approach already adopted by Rutherford 1905 (for the evaluation of all Aristophanic scholia), McNamee 2007 (for the classification of the marginalia on papyri) and Schironi 2018 (for the analysis of Aristarchos' fragments on the *Iliad*), the final assessment of Didymos' exegetic achievement with regard to the *Birds* and the *Frogs* will be based on the six 'parts of grammar' – *i.e.* the six moments of the philological inquiry into any literary text⁷⁶⁴ – identified by Dionysios Thrax (2nd-1st cent. BCE)⁷⁶⁵. The comparison between the content of Didymos' fragments and the partition theorized by Dionysios⁷⁶⁶ (which probably reflects an idea of *grammatikē* that was already current in Aristarchos' circle⁷⁶⁷) will further highlight the shift in the exegetic paradigm described in the Introduction (§ 4).

1.1 Practiced reading aloud according to prosody

The act of reading aloud was an essential step for the understanding of any text, as it required the correct division of the *scriptio continua* into single words. In this process, accents had a central role⁷⁶⁸. Didymos seems to have dealt with matters of prosody only when the meaning of the text was at stake, as suggested by fr. 224, where he discusses the accentuation of the made-up call ἐποποιῶ.

1.2 Interpretation according to the poetic tropes present in the text

Almost half of Didymos' comments on the *Birds* and the *Frogs* (frr. 226, 229, 231-236, 238-240, 242f., 249-252, 258, 261, 264f., 267) are representative of the ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικούς τρόπους, since they try to explain all sorts of obscure puns and convoluted expressions «involving a figurative and not standard use of language»⁷⁶⁹. Didymos' process of decoding these expressions mostly consists in detecting allusions, which at times are rather far-fetched (see also below § 2).

1.2.1 Hypotexts

In some cases, the allusions he identifies are to other literary texts, like in fr. 242, where the solemn description of the messenger rushing on scene as 'breathing Alpheus' is considered, quite implausibly, a reference to the beginning of Pindar's *Nemean One*, or in fr. 264, where Didymos sees an echo of an

⁷⁶⁴ Dionysios' partition can be considered «la codificazione teorica di quella disciplina, la γραμματική, che integrava l'attività filologica e quella linguistica al fine di interpretare i testi letterari» (Pagani 2014a, 409).

⁷⁶⁵ See *e.g.* Lallot 1989; Montanari 1997; Pagani 2008; 2010; 2014a; Callipo 2011; Schironi 2018, 93-97.

⁷⁶⁶ Dion. Thr. 1.1.5f. γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξι· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσφθίαν, δεῦτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικούς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὑρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.

⁷⁶⁷ See *e.g.* Schironi 2018, 94.

⁷⁶⁸ See Schironi 2018, 109-115.

⁷⁶⁹ Schironi 2018, 95.

Aeschylean line in *Ran.* 704, which is instead a *verbatim* quotation from Archilochos. Sometimes, due to the loss of the text identified by Didymos as the hypotext, it is impossible to verify how plausible his interpretation is: one example is in *P.Flor.* II 112 (*CLGP* Aristoph. 28), where an interlinear addition attests that Didymos identified a *nomos* as hypotext for the Aristophanic lines commented upon; another is offered by fr. 214 C.-Pr. (*ap. schol.* Aristoph. V. 1064a Koster), where the supposed hypotext is a lost song by Timocreon of Rhodes (*PMG* 733)⁷⁷⁰.

1.2.2 Proverbs

Proverbs were another potential object of allusion that was at the centre of Didymos' attention. He supposed that the joke on Theramenes at *Ra.* 970 was based on a variation of a known proverb (fr. 267) and his interpretation of *Av.* 994 (fr. 238) and *Ra.* 186-194 (fr. 261) probably involved proverbs too. A clear paroemiographical interest can also be observed in his exegesis of the orators⁷⁷¹. However, for Didymos the study of proverbs was a self-standing field of research as well. Indeed, he compiled his own paroemiographical collection, entitled *Against the Compilers of Works on Proverbs*⁷⁷² (later epitomized by Zenobios)⁷⁷³, in which he probably drew on the previous paroemiographical tradition initiated by Aristotle⁷⁷⁴.

1.3 Straightforward explanation of *glōssai* and *historiai*

1.3.1 *Historiai*

With the term *ιστορία*, Dionysios probably referred to all the «‘matters of fact’ concerning the content of a text and requiring specific clarification»⁷⁷⁵. In the case of Didymos' exegesis of comedy, the main component of this group is represented by the fragments on the *kōmōdoumenoi*.

1.3.1.1 *Kōmōdoumenoi*

The identification and description of the targets of direct personal attacks (with the consequent discussion of possible namesakes and of the meaning and origin of the mockery) seems to have been of particular interest for Didymos and the readers of Aristophanes in his time, as demonstrated by the remarkable number of fragments dealing with the *kōmōdoumenoi* in the scholia to the *Birds* and the *Frogs* (see fr. 237, 245-247, 249, 257, 259, 266, 268). This was a field of research already practiced in the 2nd cent. BCE, so Didymos could avail himself of a well-established tradition of *kōmōdoumenoi*-literature, of which no more than a few names and titles remain (see the Introduction §§ 3.3-4): the only source of this kind that he explicitly names is Ammonios, whom he quotes and criticizes in fr. 247. In other fragments, he directly refers to the other plays and playwrights in which each *kōmōdoumenos* was mentioned and it cannot be ascertained whether he is

⁷⁷⁰ See Montana 2009b.

⁷⁷¹ See e.g. fr. 283b = 354b, 318a C.-Pr. (*ap. Harp.* π 54, τ 19 Keaney).

⁷⁷² See Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 279.530a ὅτι Δίδυμος περὶ παροιμιῶν δεκατρία βιβλία συντέταξε, πρὸς τοὺς περὶ παροιμιῶν συντεταχότας ἐπιγράμας αὐτά.

⁷⁷³ On the relationship between Didymos' and Zenobios' works, see Bühler 1987, 36f. n. 16.

⁷⁷⁴ For an overview see Tosi 1994, 179-192.

⁷⁷⁵ Schironi 2018, 96.

autonomously carrying out the comparison or if he is drawing from an intermediate source where the different passages were already collected (see fr. 237, 245, 259). In more than half of the fragments on the *kōmōdoumenoi*, Didymos uses expressions like κωμωδεῖται ὡς (fr. 237, 257, 266) and διαβάλλεται ὡς (fr. 247, 268), thus keeping the level of the historical facts separated from that of the literary mockery⁷⁷⁶. On the contrary, he reasonably assumes that the features ascribed to the character by the lampooning lines are historical (and therefore uses the verb εἰμί in his description of the *kōmōdoumenos*) when the target of the mockery is the person's outer appearance (see fr. 246, 249, 259, 266). In his investigation of the historical figures lampooned by Aristophanes, he is seemingly rather scrupulous, since he plainly declares when he lacks information on any of them, as shown by fr. 215 C.-Pr. (*ap. schol. Aristoph. V. 1178a* Κόστης· ὁ Καρδοπίων ζητητέος. οὐδαμοῦ κωμωδεῖται). At the same time, however, when he has plenty of data on a given *kōmōdoumenos*, he apparently favours the most complicated or simply abstruse explanation. Such is the case of the Alkaios mentioned (along with Ibykos and Anakreon) in *Th. 162* (whom he identifies with an obscure citharode attacked by Eupolis in the *Golden Race*, see fr. 256 C.-Pr. *ap. Aristoph. Th. 162a* Regtuit) and of the Molon of *Ra. 55*, whom he identifies *contra sensum* with a short-statured thief by the same name mentioned by Telekleides (see Did. fr. 259). These two cases show an apparent tendency to overlook the sense of a single passage, if this allows to highlight a link (namely, the presence of the same *kōmōdoumenos*) between different plays and authors.

1.3.1.2 Other 'matters of fact'

Other 'matters of fact' discussed by Didymos include problems of identification of bird species (fr. 228), inconsistencies between the contents of literary works (fr. 269) and allusions to historical events (fr. 222). In all these instances, his main interpretive tool is the use of authoritative sources (either previous Aristophanic scholars, or other authorities, like *e.g.* historians). Instead, in dealing with customs (fr. 253, 270) and matters of staging (fr. 223, 248) he seems to rely on his own judgement.

1.3.2 Glosses

A considerable portion of Didymos' fragments concerning Aristophanes is dedicated to obscure words, as was the *Comic Vocabulary* in its entirety. Almost all of Didymos' predecessors in the exegesis of the playwright must have dealt with the many glosses found in its plays (see the Introduction §§ 3.2-3.4) and thus were potential sources for the grammarian. For the most part, the explanation of difficult words involves some sort of (par)etymology (see below): only in three cases (fr. 2, 230, 260) the clarification is not directly based on an etymologic derivation.

1.4 *Discovery of etymology*

In his exegesis of Aristophanes, Didymos (like his predecessors) was frequently faced with obscure words, most of which are unattested outside the playwright's texts. He therefore resorts often to the tool of etymology

⁷⁷⁶ See Chronopoulos 2011, 212f.

(or, rather, paronymy), «the last and most advanced exegetical technique»⁷⁷⁷. The terms that he analyses by means of etymology are mostly either coinages (like ἐποποιῖ and κειρύλος, fr. 224, 227) or other types of *hapax* (like the epithets λοχμαία and κεροβάτας, fr. 232, 263), but etymology is also used with toponyms, both real and invented (like Λέπρεον and Αὐαίνου λίθος, fr. 225, 261), and with scientific/technical terms (like πρηγορεών, fr. 241). A specific etymological concept that seems to have been favoured by Didymos was syncope, *i.e.* the derivation of a word through ‘contraction’ from an originally longer form⁷⁷⁸. This method is applied to Pan’s epithet κεροβάτας (from κερατοβάτας, fr. 263), as well as to the obscure βρίκελοι in Kratinos’ *Seriphioi* (from βροτῶ εἴκελοι, see fr. 9 C.-Pr.). This procedure is explicitly mentioned in another Didymean fragment, probably deriving from the *Comic Vocabulary* and preserved in Harpokration’s *Lexicon to the Ten Attic Orators* (ποδοκάκη ... κατὰ συγκοπὴν, ὡς φησι Δίδυμος, οἷον ποδοκατοχή, see fr. 249a C.-Pr.). This approach likely pertains to the so-called “pathology”, the method with which ancient grammarians explained words through modifications (πάθη) from original forms. In fact, Didymos is the oldest grammarian known to have written a monograph *Περὶ παθῶν*⁷⁷⁹.

1.5 Calculation of analogy and judgement of poems

The last two moments of the philological inquiry identified by Dionysios are not represented in Didymos’ fragments on the *Birds* and the *Frogs*. This is actually unsurprising, if the two concepts are considered more closely. Firstly, the ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός is the process of establishing the right form (be it orthographic, prosodic or morphologic) of a word by means of comparison with similar words. This part of grammar is very closely connected to the practice of textual criticism, since analogy is a reliable method to correct a text that is not yet fixed. Similarly, the κρίσις ποιημάτων is the act of debating the authenticity of a given piece of poetry (whether an entire poem or a few lines) and, later, of discussing the literary value of a poet’s work. None of these philological activities were strictly necessary in Didymos’ time with regard to the plays of Aristophanes: their text had already been established by Aristophanes of Byzantium and debated passages had been discussed at length by Aristarchos in his commentary (see the Introduction § 3.3).

2. A partial assessment

As anticipated in the Introduction (§ 1), the present work on Didymos’ fragments in the scholia to the *Birds* and the *Frogs* forgoes any judgement on the grammarian’s contribution to the contemporary understanding of the text of Aristophanes: this line of inquiry has been pursued in the past, and its results, though debatable and

⁷⁷⁷ Schironi 2018, 342.

⁷⁷⁸ Etymologies with syncope are attested already for Aristarchos, see Schironi 2018, 343.

⁷⁷⁹ This is attested only once in *Et. Gen.* α 1312 L.-L. = Did. fr. °328 C.-Pr.). The work was commented on by Herodian (see *schol. Hdn. παθ. II.* 3.272a1, 11.160, 17.201c [A]). A treatise *Περὶ παθῶν* is ascribed by the manuscript tradition also to Tryphon, but the authorship is debated (see Ippolito 2008).

based on a limited pool of texts, have exerted an undue influence on the modern perception of Didymean scholarship⁷⁸⁰.

Still, to give an overview on the ‘correctness’ of Didymos’ exegesis of these two Aristophanic plays, it can be said that – in the cases where such an evaluation can be carried out⁷⁸¹ – the majority of his interpretations are either plausible (though at times more or less verifiable)⁷⁸² or most likely (if not surely) correct⁷⁸³. Some of the remaining fragments show a tendency towards far-fetched or overcomplicated explanations that seemingly betray the will of displaying erudition⁷⁸⁴, while a small group of them offers autoschediastic, naïve or plainly wrong interpretations⁷⁸⁵.

What seems more notable, however, is how Didymos’ exegesis is almost exclusively concerned with the elucidation of the language and the content of the plays (*i.e.* with the clarification of difficult words, puns, allusions and references to historical figures and events), sidestepping the more specifically philological aspects like textual criticism and matters of authenticity. This reflects the shift in the exegetic paradigm described in the Introduction (§ 4): the needs of the Aristophanic readership at the time of Didymos’ scholarly activity had changed, and Aristophanes’ plays were read by the urban élites as part of their rhetorical training. This new, polycentric and less-specialised group of readers was almost exclusively focused on the basic understanding of the comic language with its numerous glosses, convolute expressions and obscure puns, and of the allusions to the reality of fifth-century Athens, with its main historical events, its customs and its more or less politically prominent figures. Through the reasoned compilation and reuse of the exegeses of his predecessors, Didymos’ commentary on the *Birds* and the *Frogs* responded exactly to these needs.

⁷⁸⁰ See in particular Roemer 1908, West 1970 and Harris 1989.

⁷⁸¹ In some cases the uncertainty of the scholiastic and/or the Aristophanic text makes any assessment impossible.

⁷⁸² Frr. 2, 223, 225, 230, 232, 234, 238, 244, 245, 249, 250f., 261f., 265f., 270a.

⁷⁸³ Frr. 227, 233, 236, 239, 241, 247f., 257, 260, 269.

⁷⁸⁴ Frr. 222, 224, 229, 231, 235, 242, 259.

⁷⁸⁵ Frr. 240, 243, 246, 252, 258, 264.

Bibliography

Editions

- Acosta–Hughes – Cusset 2012 B. A.–H.–C. C., *Euphorion. Œuvre poétique et autres fragments*, Paris 2012.
- Alberti 1746 J. A., *Hesychii Lexicon*, I, Leiden 1746.
- Alberti 1766 J. A., *Hesychii Lexicon*, II, Leiden 1766.
- Alpers 1981 K. A., *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros*, Berlin-New York 1981.
- Austin 1973 C. A., *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, Berlin-New York 1973.
- Austin – Olson 2004 C. A.–S.D. O., *Aristophanes. Thesmophoriazusae*, Oxford 2004.
- Baladié 1978 R. B., *Strabon. Géographie, tome V (Livre VIII)*, Paris 1978.
- Barrett 1964 W.S. B., *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.
- Beck 1782 C.D. B., *Aristophanis Aves*, Leipzig 1782.
- Bekker 1829a I. B., *APIΣTOΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑΙ. Aristophanis Comædiæ cum scholiis et varietate lectionis*, I, London 1829.
- Bekker 1829b I. B., *APIΣTOΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑΙ. Aristophanis Comædiæ cum scholiis et varietate lectionis*, II, *Versio latina. Deperditarum fabularum fragmenta. Scholia*, London 1829.
- Bergk 1872 T. B., *Aristophanis comoedias edidit Theodorus Bergk*, II, Leipzig 1872.
- Billerbeck 2006 M. B., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, I, Berlin-New York 2006.
- Billerbeck 2014 M. B., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, III, Berlin-Boston 2014.
- Billerbeck – Neumann Hartmann 2016 M. B.–A. N.H., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, IV, Berlin-Boston 2016.
- Billerbeck – Neumann Hartmann 2017 M. B.–A. N.H., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, V, Berlin-Boston 2017.
- Billerbeck – Zubler 2011 M. B.–C. Z. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, II, Berlin-New York 2011.
- Blaydes 1842 F.H.M. B., *Aristophanis Aves*, Oxford 1842.
- Blaydes 1882 F.H.M. B., *Aristophanis Aves*, Halle 1882.
- Boissonade 1826 J.F. B., *Aristophanes*, II, Paris 1826.
- Bond 1963 G.W. B., *Euripides Hypsipyle*, Oxford 1963.

- Braswell 2017² B.K. B., *Didymos of Alexandria. Commentary on Pindar*, Basel 2017 (2013¹).
- Broggiato 2001 M. B., *Cratete di Mallo. I frammenti. Edizione, introduzione e note*, La Spezia 2001.
- Cantarella 1956 R. C., *Aristofane. Le commedie*, IV, Gli uccelli, Lisistrata, Le tesmoforiazuse, Milano 1956.
- Cantarella 1964 R. C., *Aristofane Le commedie*, V, Le rane, Le donne all'assemblea, Pluto, Milano 1964.
- Cavarzeran 2016 J. C., *Scholia in Euripidis Hippolytum. Edizione critica, introduzione, indici*, Berlin-Boston 2016.
- CLGP I 1/4 G. Bastianini-M. Haslam-H. Maehler-F. Montanari-C. Römer (eds.), *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I 1/4, *Aristophanes – Bacchylides*, Berlin-Boston 2012² (2006¹).
- Chang – Henry – Parsons – Benaissa 2012 R.L. C.-W.B. H.-P.J. P.-A. B., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LXXVIII, London 2012.
- Chantry 1994 M. C., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, III/4^a, *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Plutum*, Groningen 1994.
- Chantry 1996 M. C., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, III/4^b, *Scholia recentiora in Aristophanis Plutum*, Groningen 1996.
- Chantry 1999 M. C., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, III/1^a, *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Ranas*, Groningen 1999.
- Chantry 2001 M. C., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, III/1^b, *Scholia recentiora in Aristophanis Ranas*, Groningen 2001.
- Chiron 1993 P. C., *Démétrios. Du style*, Paris 1993.
- Cimadori 2007 S. C., *Plutarco, Quaestiones Convivales, Libro nono. Edizione critica con introduzione, traduzione e note di commento* (doctoral dissertation, Trieste), 2007.
- Collard – Cropp 2008 C. C.-M. C., *Euripides. Fragments. Aegues-Meleager*, Cambridge (MA)-London 2008.
- Conomis 1975 N.C. C., *Dinarchus. Orationes cum fragmentis*, Leipzig 1975.
- Consbruch 1906 M. C., *Hephaestionis Enchiridion cum commentariis veteribus*, Stuttgart 1906.
- Coulon 1923 V. C., *Aristophane, I, Les Acharniens, Les Cavaliers, Les Nuées. Texte établi par Victor Coulon, traduit par Hilaire Van Daele*, Paris 1923.

- Coulon 1924 V. C., *Aristophane*, II, *Les Guêpes, La Paix*. Texte établi par Victor Coulon, traduit par Hilaire Van Daele, Paris 1924.
- Coulon 1928a V. C., *Aristophane*, III, *Les Oiseaux, Lysistrata*. Texte établi par Victor Coulon, traduit par Hilaire Van Daele, Paris 1928.
- Coulon 1928b V. C., *Aristophane*, IV, *Les Thesmophories, Les Grenouilles*. Texte établi par Victor Coulon, traduit par Hilaire Van Daele, Paris 1928.
- Coulon 1930 V. C., *Aristophane*, V, *L'Assemblée des Femmes, Ploutos*. Texte établi par Victor Coulon, traduit par Hilaire Van Daele, Paris 1930.
- Diels – Schubart 1904a H. D.-W. S., *Didymos. Kommentar zu Demosthenes (Papyrus 9780) nebst Wörterbuch zu Demosthenes' Aristocratea (Papyrus 5008)*, Berlin 1904.
- Diels – Schubart 1904b H. D.-W. S., *Didymi de Demosthene commenta cum anonymi in Aristocrateam lexico*, Leipzig 1904.
- Diggle 2004 J. D., *Theophrastus. Characters*, Cambridge 2004.
- Dindorf 1822 W. D., *Aristophanis Aves*, Leipzig 1822.
- Dindorf 1835a W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, I, Oxford 1835.
- Dindorf 1835b W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, II, Oxford 1835.
- Dindorf 1835c W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, III, Oxford 1835.
- Dindorf 1838a W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, IV/1, *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, Oxford 1838.
- Dindorf 1838b W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, IV/2, *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, Oxford 1838.
- Dindorf 1838c W. D., *Aristophanis comoediae. Accedunt perditarum fabularum fragmenta*, IV/3, *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, Oxford 1838.
- Dindorf 1869⁵ W. D., *Poetarum scenicorum Graecorum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis et Aristophanis fabulae superstites et perditarum fragmenta*, IV, Leipzig 1869 (1830¹).
- Dorandi 1999 T. D., *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments*, Paris 1999.
- Dover 1993 K. D., *Aristophanes. Frogs*, Oxford 1993.

- Drachmann 1903 A.B. D., *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, I, *Scholia in Olympionicas*, Leipzig 1903.
- Drachmann 1910 A.B. D., *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, II, *Scholia in Pythionicas*, Leipzig 1910.
- Drachmann 1927 A.B. D., *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, III, *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas. Epimetrum. Indices*, Leipzig 1927.
- Dübner 1842 F. D., *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, Paris 1842.
- Dunbar 1995 N. D., *Aristophanes. Birds*, Oxford 1995.
- Edmonds 1957 J.M. E., *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, I, Leiden 1957.
- Erbse 1950 H. E., *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*, Berlin 1950.
- Erbse 1969 H. E., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, I, *Praefationem et scholia ad libros A – Δ continens*, Berlin 1969.
- Erbse 1971 H. E., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, II, *Scholia ad libros E – I continens*, Berlin 1971.
- Erbse 1974 H. E., H. E., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, IV, *Scholia ad libros K – Ξ continens*, Berlin 1974.
- Erbse 1975 H. E., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, IV, *Scholia ad libros O – T continens*, Berlin 1975.
- Erbse 1977 H. E., H. E., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, V, *Scholia ad libros Y – Ω continens*, Berlin 1977.
- Fantuzzi 2020 M. F., *The Rhesus Attributed to Euripides. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge 2020.
- Feine 1883 P. F., *De Aristarcho Pindari interprete*, Leipzig 1883.
- Fiorentini 2017 L. F., *Strattide. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Bologna 2017.
- Fitzpatrick – Sommerstein – Talbot 2006 A.H. S.-D. F.-T. T., *Sophocles. Selected Fragmentary Plays*, I, Hermione, Polyxene, The Diners, Tereus, Troilus, Phaedra, Oxford 2006.
- Floridi 2007 L. F., *Stratone di Sardi. Epigrammi*, Alessandria 2007.
- Fowler 2000 R.L. F., *Early Greek Mythography*, I, *Text and Introduction*, Oxford 2000.
- Frazier – Sirinelli 1996 F. F.-J. S., *Plutarque. Œuvres morales*, IX/3, Paris 1996.
- Fries 2014 A. F., *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus*, Berlin-Boston 2014.
- Fritzsche 1845 F.V. F., *Aristophanis Ranae*, Zürich 1845.

- Gaisford 1848 T. G., *Etymologicum Magnum*, Oxford 1848.
- Geymonat 1974 M. G., *Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaca cum glossis*, Milano 1974.
- Green 1894 W.C. G., *The Birds of Aristophanes*, Cambridge 1894.
- Hall – Geldart 1906 F.W. H.-W.M. G., *Aristophanis Comoediae*, I, Oxford 1906.
- Halliwell 1988 S. H., *Plato: Republic 10*, Warminster 1988.
- Hangard 1996 J. H., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, II/4, *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam*, Groningen 1996.
- Helmreich 1907 G. H., *Galeni de usu partium libri XVII*, I, Leipzig 1907.
- Henderson 2000 J. H., *Aristophanes*, Birds, Lysistrata, Women at the Tesmophoria, Cambridge (MA)-London 2000.
- Henderson 2002 J. H., *Aristophanes*, Frogs, Assemblywomen, Wealth, Cambridge (MA)-London 2002.
- Holden 1868³ H. H., *Aristophanis Comoediae quae supersunt cum perditarum fragmentis*, Cambridge 1868 (1848¹).
- Holwerda 1960 D. H., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, IV, *Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem*, 2, *Commentarium in Nubes*, Groningen 1960.
- Holwerda 1977 D. H., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, I/3.1, *Scholia vetera in Nubes*, Groningen 1977.
- Holwerda 1982 D. H., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, II/2, *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Pacem*, Groningen 1982.
- Holwerda 1991 D. H., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, II/3, *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Aves*, Groningen 1991.
- Hunter 1983 R. H., *Eubulus. The Fragments*, Cambridge 1983.
- Jacques 2003² J.M. J., *Ménandre*, I/3, *Le bouclier*, Paris 2003 (1998¹).
- Jones – Wilson 1969 D.M. J.-N.G. W., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, I/2, *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Equites et scholia Tricliniana in Aristophanis Equites*, Groningen-Amsterdam 1969.
- Jouan – van Looy 1998 F. J.-H. v.L., *Euripide. Tragédies*, VIII/1, *Fragments. Aigeus - Autolykos*, Paris 1998.
- Jouan – van Looy 2002 F. J.-H. v.L., *Euripide. Tragédies*, VIII/3, *Fragments. Sthénéebée - Chrysippos*, Paris 2002.

- Kakridis 1974 Th.I. K., *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΟΡΝΙΘΕΣ. ΕΡΜΕΝΕΥΤΙΚΗ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ*, Athens 1974.
- Kaibel 1899 G. K., *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, I/1, *Doriensium comoedia, mimi, phlyaces*, Berlin 1899.
- Kannicht 2004a R. K., *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, V/1, *Euripides*, Göttingen 2004.
- Kannicht 2004b R. K., *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, V/2, *Euripides*, Göttingen 2004.
- Kassel – Austin 1983 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, IV, *Aristophon – Crobylus*, Berlin-New York 1983.
- Kassel – Austin 1984 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, III/2, *Aristophanes*, Berlin-New York 1984.
- Kassel – Austin 1986 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, V, *Damoxenus – Magnes*, Berlin-New York 1986.
- Kassel – Austin 1989 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, VII, *Menecrates – Xenophon*, Berlin-New York 1989.
- Kassel – Austin 1991 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, II, *Agathenor – Aristonymus*, Berlin-New York 1991.
- Kassel – Austin 1998 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, VI/2, *Menander. Testimonia et Fragmenta apud scriptores servata*, Berlin-New York 1998.
- Kassel – Austin 2001 R. K.-C. A., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, I, *Comoedia Dorica – Mimi – Phlyaces*, Berlin-New York 1989.
- Koster 1962 W.J.W. K., *Scholia in Aristophaem*, IV, *Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem*, 3, *Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves. Argumentum Equitum*, Groningen 1962.
- Koster 1975 W.J.W. K., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, I/1a, *Prolegomena de comoedia*, Groningen 1975.
- Koster 1978 W.J.W. K., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, II/1, *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Vespas*, Groningen 1978.
- Lambros 1885 S. L., *Excerptorum Constantini De Natura Animalium libri duo. Aristophanis Historiae Animalium epitome abiunctis Aeliani Timothei aliorumque eclogis*, Berlin 1885.
- Lasserre 1966 F. L., *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos*, Berlin 1966.
- Latte 1966 K. L., *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, København 1966.
- Lentz 1867 A. L., *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, I, Leipzig 1867.

- Lentz 1868 A. L., *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, II/1, Leipzig 1868.
- Lentz 1870 A. L., *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, II/2, Leipzig 1870.
- Lightfoot 1999 J.L. L., *Parthenius of Nicaea*, Oxford 1999.
- Lobel 1968 E. L., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXXV, London 1968.
- Massa Positano 1960 L. M.P., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, IV, *Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem*, 1, *Prolegomena et commentarium in Plutum*, 1960.
- Matijašić 2014 I. M., *Timachidas di Rodi. Introduzione, edizione dei frammenti, traduzione e commento*, «ASNP» VI/1 (5th series, 2014) 113-185.
- Matijašić 2020 I. M., *Supplementum Grammaticum Graecum*, 4, *Timachidas Rhodius*, Leiden-Boston 2020.
- Meineke 1860 A. M., *Aristophanis comoediae*, II, Leipzig 1860.
- Merro 2008 G. M., *Gli scoli al Reso euripideo*, Messina 2008.
- Montana 2012a F. M., *Aristophanes 4*, in *CLGP I* 1/4, 45-47.
- Musso 1985 O. M., [*Antigonus Carystius*]. *Rerum mirabilium collectio*, Napoli 1985.
- Muzzolon 2005 M.L. M., *Aristarco negli scoli ad Aristofane*, in F. Montana (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche di Aristofane*, Sarzana 2005, 55-109.
- Page 1962 D.L. P., *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
- Pellettieri 2020 A. P., *Lycophron Chalcidensis*, in E. Dettori-A. Pellettieri, *Supplementum Grammaticum Graecum*, 3, *Glossographi and Lycophron Chalcidensis*, Leiden-Boston 2020.
- Perilli 2017 L. P., *Galenii vocum Hippocratis glossarium*, Berlin 2017.
- Pfeiffer 1949 R. P., *Callimachus*, I, *Fragments*, Oxford 1949.
- Pontani 2007 F. P., *Scholia Graeca in Odyseam*, I, *Scholia ad libros $\alpha - \beta$* , Roma 2007.
- Pontani 2010 F. P., *Scholia Graeca in Odyseam*, II, *Scholia ad libros $\gamma - \delta$* , Roma 2010.
- Pontani 2015 F. P., *Scholia Graeca in Odyseam*, III, *Scholia ad libros $\epsilon - \zeta$* , Roma 2015.
- Pontani 2020 F. P., *Scholia Graeca in Odyseam*, IV, *Scholia ad libros $\eta - \theta$* , Roma 2020.
- Radermacher 1954² L. R., *Aristophanes' 'Frösche' . Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Wien 1954 (1921¹).
- Regtuit 2007 R.F. R., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, III/2-3, *Scholia in Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusas et Ecclesiazusas*, Groningen 2007.

- Rhys Roberts 1902 W. R.R., *Demetrius. On style. The Greek text of Demetrius De elocutione*, Cambridge 1902.
- Rogers 1902 B. B.R., *The Comedies of Aristophanes in six volumes, V, The Frogs, The Ecclesiazusae*, London 1902.
- Rogers 1906 B. B.R., *The Birds of Aristophanes: acted at Athens at the great Dionysia B.C. 414*, London 1906.
- Rutherford 1896a W.G. R., *Scholia Aristophanica. Being such Comments Adscript to the Text of Aristophanes as have been Preserved in the Codex Ravennas, I*, London-New York 1896
- Rutherford 1896b W.G. R., *Scholia Aristophanica. Being such Comments Adscript to the Text of Aristophanes as have been Preserved in the Codex Ravennas, II*, London-New York 1896
- Schmidt 1848 R. S., *Commentatio de Callistrato Aristophaneo*, in A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Halle 1848, 307-338.
- Schubart – Wilamowitz 1907 W. S.-U. v.W., *Berliner Klassikertexte, V/2, Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente*, Berlin 1907.
- Slater 1986 W.J. S., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, Berlin-New York 1986.
- Sommerstein 1980 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, I, Acharnians*, Warminster 1980.
- Sommerstein 1981 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, II, Knights*, Warminster 1981.
- Sommerstein 1982 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, III, Clouds*, Warminster 1982.
- Sommerstein 1983 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, IV, Wasps*, Warminster 1983.
- Sommerstein 1985 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, V, Peace*, Warminster 1985.
- Sommerstein 1987 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, VI, Birds*, Warminster 1987.
- Sommerstein 1990 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, VII, Lysistrata*, Warminster 1990.
- Sommerstein 1994 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, VIII, Thesmophoriazusaes*, Warminster 1994.
- Sommerstein 1998 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, X, Ecclesiazusae*, Warminster 1998.
- Sommerstein 1999² A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, IX, Frogs*, Warminster 1999 (1996¹).
- Sommerstein 2001 A.H. S., *The Comedies of Aristophanes, XI, Wealth*, Warminster 2001.
- Staesche 1883 T. S., *De Demetrio Ixione grammatico*, Halle 1883.

- Stallbaum 1825-1826 J.G. S., *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, I-II, Leipzig 1825 (I), 1826 (II).
- Storey 2011 I.C. S., *Fragments of Old Comedy*, III, *Philonicus to Xenophon. Adespota*, Cambridge (MA)-London 2011.
- Süss 1959² W. S., *Die Frösche des Aristophanes mit ausgewählten antiken Scholien*, Berlin 1959 (Bonn 1911¹).
- van der Valk 1971-1987 M. v.d.V., *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, I-IV, Leiden 1971 (I), 1976 (II), 1979 (III), 1981 (IV).
- van Thiel 2014a H. v.T., *Aristarch, Aristophanes Byzantios, Demetrios Ixion, Zenodot*, Berlin-Boston 2014.
- van Thiel 2014b H. v.T., *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior*, Köln 2014.
- von Velsen 1853 A. v.V., *Tryphonis Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta*, Berlin 1853.
- von Velsen 1881 A. v.V., *Aristophanis Ranae*, Leipzig 1881.
- Vian 1969 F. V., *Quintus de Smyrne. La Suite d'Homère*, III, Paris 1969.
- Wehrli 1967² F. W., *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, I, *Dikaiarchos*, Basel-Stuttgart 1967 (1944¹).
- West 1966 M.L. W., *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford 1966.
- White 1914 J.W. W., *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes*, Boston-London 1914.
- Wilson 1975 N.G. W., *Scholia in Aristophanem*, I/1b, *Scholia in Aristophanis Acharnenses*, Groningen 1975.
- Wilson 2007a N.G. W., *Aristophanis fabulae*, I, Oxford 2007.
- Wilson 2007b N.G. W., *Aristophanis fabulae*, II, Oxford 2007.
- Zur Jacobsmuehlen 1886 H. Z.J., *Pseudo-Hephaestion de metris*, in *Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae*, X, Strasbourg 1886, 187-298.

Literature

- AG 1990 *The Athenian Agora. Results of the Excavation conducted by the American School of Classical Studies in Athens*, XXV (1990).
- AL W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, I-VI, Leipzig 1884-1937.

- Allen 1896 T.W. A., *On the Composition of Some greek Manuscripts*, II, *The Ravenna Aristophanes*, «Journal of Philology» XXIV (1896) 300-326.
- Aloni 2009 A. A., *Elegy*, in Budelmann 2009, 168-188.
- Alvar 2008 J. A., *Romanising Oriental Gods. Myth, Salvation and Ethics in the Cults of Cybele, Isis and Mithras*, Leiden-Boston 2008.
- AM 1991 *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, CVI (1991).
- Amati 2010 M. A., *Meton's City: Geometry and Utopia in Aristophanes' Birds*, «CJ» CV/3 (2010) 213-227.
- Ambühl 1999a A. A., *Koroibos* (1), in *DNP VI* (1999) 755.
- Ambühl 1999b A. A., *Koroibos* (2), in *DNP VI* (1999) 755.
- Arena 2007 V. A., *Roman Oratorical Invective*, in W. Dominik-J. Hall (eds.), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, Oxford 2007, 149-160.
- Arnott 1987 W.G. A., *In Praise of Alexander of Myndos*, in A. Bonanno-H.C.R. Vella, *Laurea Corona. Studies in Honour of Edward Coleiro*, Amsterdam 1987, 23-29.
- Arnott 1996 W.G. A., *Alexis: the Fragments*, Cambridge 1996.
- Arnott 2007 W.G. A., *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London-New York 2007.
- Arnott 2010 W.G. A., *Middle Comedy*, in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, Leiden-Boston 2010, 279-331.
- Arrighetti 1987 G. A., *Poeti, eruditi e biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa 1987.
- Ascheri 2009 P. A., *Demetrius [14] Ixion*, in *LGGA*, 2009.
- Avezzù – Scattolin 2006 G. A.-P. S. (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*, Rovereto 2006.
- Ax 2001 W. A., *Dikaiarchs Bios Hellados und Varros De vita populi Romani*, in Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf 2001, 279-310.
- Bachmann 1878 O. B., *Conjecturarum observationumque Aristophanearum Specimen I*, Göttingen 1878.
- Bagordo 1998 A. B., *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama. Mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998.
- Bagordo 2013 A. B., *Telekleides. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Fragmenta Comica 4), Heidelberg 2013.

- Bagordo 2014 A. B., *Alkimenēs – Kantharos. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Fragmenta Comica 1.1), Heidelberg 2014.
- Bagordo 2016 A. B., *Aristophanes fr. 590-674. Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Fragmenta Comica 10.9), Heidelberg 2016.
- Baier 2002 T. B., *Zur Funktion der Chorpartien in den Fröschen*, in Ercolani 2002, 188-204.
- Bakola – Prauscello – Telò 2013 E. B.-L. P.-M.-T. (eds.), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*, Cambridge 2013.
- Bartol 1993 K. B., *Greek Elegy and Iambus. Studies in Ancient Literary Sources*, Poznań 1993.
- Baumbach 2002 M. B., *Tryphon* (3), in *DNP* XII/1 (2002) 885f.
- Bechtel 1898 F. B., *Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind*, Berlin 1898.
- Bekker 1829c I. B., *APIΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑΙ. Aristophanis Comædiæ cum scholiis et varietate lectionis*, III, *Notæ in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes, Vespas*, London 1829.
- Bekker 1829d I. B., *APIΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑΙ. Aristophanis Comædiæ cum scholiis et varietate lectionis*, IV, *Notæ in Pacem, Aves, Thesmophoriazusas, Lysistratam*, London 1829.
- Bekker 1829e I. B., *APIΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑΙ. Aristophanis Comædiæ cum scholiis et varietate lectionis*, V, *Notæ in Plutum, Ranas, Ecclesiazusas*, London 1829.
- Bentley *Em. In.* R. B., *Bentleii emendationes ineditæ in Aristophanem*, V-VI, «The Cambridge Classical Journal» XIII (1816) 132-144, 336-351.
- Benuzzi 2018 F. B., *Osservazioni sulla trasmissione degli studia Aristophanica di Eratostene nella lessicografia e negli scolî*, «Eikasmós» XXIX (2018) 335-351.
- Benuzzi 2019a F. B., *Una proposta di integrazione nel commentario ai Tassiarchi di Eupoli* (P.Oxy. XXXV 2740), «ZPE» CCIX (2019) 40-42.
- Benuzzi 2019b F. B., *Eratosthenes' studia Aristophanica. The case of schol. Aristoph. Nub. 967aa-β, βα-β Holwerda*, in R. Berardi – N. Bruno – L. Fizzarotti (eds.), *On the Track of the Books. Scribes, Libraries and Textual Transmission*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 125-141.
- Berger 2005 F. B., *Die Textgeschichte der Historia Animalium des Aristoteles*, Wiesbaden 2005.

- Berger 2012 F. B., *Die Textgeschichte der Historia Animalium des Aristoteles, Aristophanes von Byzanz und die zoologische Sylloge des Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos*, «Rursus» VII (2012) 1-13.
- Biondi 2015 F. B., *Teagene di Reggio rapsodo e interprete di Omero*, Pisa-Roma 2015.
- Bitto 2012 G. B., *Lyrik als Philologie. Zur Rezeption hellenistischer Pindarkommentierung in den Oden des Horaz. Mit einer rhetorisch-literarkritischen Analyse der Pindarscholien*, Rahden 2012.
- Blau 1883 A. B., *De Aristarchi discipulis*, Jena 1883.
- Boardman 1997 J. B., *Pan* in *LIMC* VIII/1, 923-941.
- Bøgh 2007 B. B., *The Phrygian Background of Kybele*, «Numen» LIV (2007) 304-339.
- Bömer 1977 F. B., *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphose. Buch VIII-IX*, Heidelberg 1977.
- Borthwick 1994 E.K. B., *New Interpretations of Aristophanes Frogs 1249-1328*, «Phoenix» XLVIII (1994) 21-41.
- Bothe 1828 F. B. *Poetae Scenici Graecorum*, V, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΒΑΤΡΑΧΟΙ, ΠΛΟΥΤΟΣ, ΕΙΡΗΝΗ*, Leipzig 1828.
- Bothe 1829 F. B., *Poetae Scenici Graecorum*, VI, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΑΧΑΡΝΗΣ, ΣΦΗΚΕΣ, ΟΡΝΙΘΕΣ*, Leipzig 1829.
- Boudreaux 1919 P. B., *Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs*, Paris 1919.
- Broggiato 2014a M. B., *Filologia e interpretazione a Pergamo: la scuola di Cratete*, Roma 2014.
- Broggiato 2014b M. B., *Eratosthenes, Icaria and the Origins of Tragedy*, «Mnemosyne» LXVII (2014) 885-899.
- Broggiato 2019a M. B., *Licofrone, Eratostene e l'evoluzione della commedia attica*, «SemRom» n.s. VIII (2019) 273-284.
- Broggiato 2019b M. B., *A Fragment of Eratosthenes, On Old Comedy (Photius, Lexicon e 100 Theodoridis)*, «CQ» LXIX/1 (2019) 451-453.
- Broggiato 2019c M. B., *Eratosthenes and the Persian War Tetralogy of Aeschylus*, in M. Giordano – M. Napolitano (eds.), *La città, la parola, la scena: nuove ricerche su Eschilo*, Roma 2019, 17-29.
- Brommer 1956 F. B., *Pan*, in *RE* suppl. VIII 949-1008.
- Buck 1995 R.J. B., *The Character of Theramenes*, «AHB» IX/1 (1995) 14-23.
- Budelmann 2009 F. B. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge 2009.

- Budelmann – LeVen 2014 F. B.-P. LeV., *Timotheus' Poetics of Blending: A Cognitive Approach to the Language of the New Music*, «CPh» CIX (2014) 191-210.
- Cabanes 2002 P. C., *Triballoi*, in *DNP* XII/1 (2002) 793f.
- Calame 2020 C. C., *Melic Poets and Melic Forms in the Comedies of Aristophanes: Poetic Genres and the Creation of a Canon*, in Currie-Rutherford 2020, 112-128.
- Callipo 2011 M. C., *Dionisio il Trace e la tradizione grammaticale*, Roma 2011.
- Campagner 2001 R. C., *Lessico agonistico di Aristofane*, Roma-Pisa 2001.
- Canfora 2014 L. C., *La crisi dell'utopia: Aristofane contro Platone*, Roma-Bari 2014.
- Canfora 2017 L. C., *Cleofonte deve morire. Teatro e politica in Aristofane*, Roma-Bari 2017.
- Carawan 2007 E. C., *Krateros the Macedonian*, in *BNJ* 2007.
- Casaubon 1664² I. C., *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri quindecim*, Leiden 1664 (1600¹).
- Cerri 1976 G. C., *Frammento di teoria musicale e di ideologia simposiale in un distico di Teognide (V. 1041 sg.): il ruolo paradossale dell'auleta. La fonte probabile di G. Pascoli, "Solon" 13-15*, «QUCC» XXII (1976) 25-38.
- Chantry 2001 M. C., *Phrynichos dans le scholies d'Aristophane*, «RPh» LXXV (2001/2), 239-247.
- Chantry 2009 M. C., *Scholies anciennes aux Grenouilles et au Ploutos d'Aristophane*, Paris 2009.
- Chronopoulos 2011 S. C., *Re-writing the Personal Joke: Some Aspects in the Interpretation of ὄνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν in Ancient Scholarship*, in S. Matthaios – F. Montanari – A. Rengakos (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*, Berlin-New York 2011, 207-223.
- Clausen 1881 F. C., *De scholiis veteribus in Aves Aristophanis compositis*, Kiel 1881.
- Cobet 1840 G.C. C., *Observationes criticae in Platonis comici reliquias*, Amsterdam 1840.
- Cobet 1874 G.C. C., *Platonica. Ad Platonis qui fertur Alcibiadem priorem*, «Mnemosyne» II (1874) 369-385.
- Cohn 1903a L. C., *Didymos* (8), in *RE* V/1 (1903), 445-472.
- Cohn 1903b L. C., *Diodoros* (52), in *RE* V/1 (1903), 709f.

- Comentale 2017 N. C., *Ermippo. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Fragmenta comica 6), Heidelberg 2017.
- Corn 1999 A. C., *Frogs*, in D.R. Slavitt – P. Bovie (eds.), *Aristophanes, 2. Wasps, Lysistrata, Frogs, The Sexual Congress*, Philadelphia 1999, 175-273.
- Coward (in preparation) T.R.P. C., *Intellectual Life and Learning on Rhodes (168BC-AD44)*, (California Classical Studies).
- Coward – Prodi (forthc.) T.R.P. C.-E.E. P. (eds.), *Didymus and Greco-Roman Learning (BICS Suppl. 63.2)*, Oxford.
- Cozzoli 1996 A.M. C., *Il I giambo e il nuovo ἰαμβίξειν di Callimaco*, «Eikasmós» VII (1996) 129-147.
- Crönert 1907 W. C., *Neue Lesungen des Didymospapyrus*, «RhM» LXII (1907) 380-389.
- Currie – Rutherford 2020 B. C.-I. R. (eds.), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext*, Leiden-Boston 2020.
- Dalby 2003 A. D., *Food in the Ancient World from A–Z*, London 2003.
- D'Alessandro 2018 G. D'A., *Ammonio di Alessandria. Testimonia*, «SCO» LXIV (2018) 107-170.
- D'Alessio 2007 G.B. D'A., *Callimaco. Inni, Epigrammi, Ecalle, Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti. Quarta edizione ampliata e rivista*, Milano 2007.
- Damschen 2002 G. D., *Theon* (4), in *DNP* XII/1 (2002) 374.
- Dawes 1781 R. D., *Miscellanea critica. Iterum edita. Curavit, et appendicem annotationis addidit Thomas Burgess*, Oxford 1781.
- Degani 2007 E. D., *Ipponatte. Frammenti*, Bologna 2007.
- de Jonge 2009 C. d.J., review of Marini 2007, «BMCR» 2009.08.12.
- Del Corno 1992² D. D.C., *Aristofane. Le Rane*, Milano 1992 (1985¹).
- Del Corso 2017 L. D., *Aristofane in Egitto. Osservazioni sulla documentazione papirologica (e non)*, in Mastromarco-Totaro-Zimmermann 2017, 231-279.
- DELG P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1969-1980.
- Demaitre 2007 L. D., *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body*, Baltimore 2007.
- De Martin (in preparation) S. DeM., *Prokleides-Xenarchos. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Fragmenta Comica 16.7), Heidelberg.

- Di Giulio (forthc.) S. DiG., *The compiler compiled: Didymus of Alexandria in imperial scholarly and miscellaneous literature*, in Coward-Prodi (forthc.).
- Diller 1983 A. D., *Studies in Greek Manuscripts Tradition*, Amsterdam 1983.
- Di Marco 1997 M. D.M., *Diphilos* (3), in *DNP* III (1997), 680.
- Di Marco 2009 M. D.M., *La Musa di Euripide: sulla parodia dell'Ipsipile euripidea nelle Rane di Aristofane*, in M. Di Marco – E. Tagliaferro, *Semeion philias. Studi di letteratura greca offerti ad Agostino Masaracchia*, Roma 2009, 119-146.
- Di Tullio 1915 D. di T., *Gli studii sulla comedia nell'età Alessandrina e l'opera di Eratostene «Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας»*, Roma 1915.
- DNP* *Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, hrsg. v. H. Cancik – H. Schneider, I-XVI, Suppl. I-V, VII, Stuttgart-Weimar 1996-2010.
- Dobree 1833 P.P. D., *Adversaria*, II, Cambridge 1833.
- Dobrov 1993 G. D., *The Tragic and the Comic Tereus*, «AJPh» CXIV/2 (1993), 189-234.
- Dobrov 1997 G. D., *Language, Fiction, and Utopia*, in (id.) (ed.), *The City as Comedy. Society and Representation in Athenian Drama*, London 1997, 95-134.
- Dorandi 2005 T. D., *Accessioni a Antigono di Caristo*, «SCO» 51 (2005), 119-24.
- Dover 1964 K.J. D., *The Poetry of Archilochos*, in *Entretiens Hardt*, X, *Archiloque*, Genève 1964, 181-212.
- Dover 1981 K.J. D., rev. of Holwerda 1977 and Koster 1978, «CR» XXXI/1 (1981) 6-8.
- Dover 2004² K.J. D., *Greek Homosexuality. Updated and with a new Postscript*, Cambridge (MA) 2004 (1978¹).
- Dreyer 2001 B. D., *Polybios* (2), in *DNP* X 2001, 41-48.
- Droysen 1869^{2a} J.G. D., *Des Aristophanes Werke*, I, Leipzig 1869 (1835-1838¹)
- Droysen 1869^{2b} J.G. D., *Des Aristophanes Werke*, II, Leipzig 1869 (1835-1838¹)
- Dyck 1993 A.R. D., *Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research*, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II 34/1, 772-794.
- Dzino 2008 D. D., “The people who are Illyrians and Celts”: *Strabo and the identities of the ‘barbarians’ from Illyricum*, «Arheološki vestnik» LIX (2008) 415-424.

- Dzino 2014 D. D., *'Illyrians' in ancient ethnographic discourse*, «DHA» XL/2 (2014) 45-65.
- Eberline 1980 C.N. E., *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Ranae of Aristophanes*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- EDG R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden-Boston 2010.
- van Eldick 1764 E.H. v.E., *Suspicionum specimen*, Zutphen 1764.
- Engels 2010 J. E., *Die Sieben Weisen. Leben, Lehren und Legenden*, München 2010.
- Erbse 1959 H. E., *Über Aristarchs Iliasausgabe*, «Hermes» LXXXVII (1959) 275-303.
- Erbse 1979 H. E., rev. of Holwerda 1977, «Gnomon» LI/3 (1979) 227-232.
- Erbse 1980 H. E., rev. of Koster 1978, «Gnomon» LII/3 (1980) 221-224.
- Ercolani 2002 A. E. (ed.), *Spoudaiogeloion. Form und Funktion der Verspottung in der aristophanischen Komödie*, Stuttgart-Weimar 2002.
- Ercoles 2014 M. E., *Aeschylus' scholia and the hypomnematic tradition: an investigation*, «TC» VI/1 (2014) 90-114.
- Esposito 2012 E. E., *Aristophanes – schedae. P.Berol. inv. 9965*, in *CLGP I* 1/4, 235f.
- Ewans 2011 M. E., *Aristophanes. Lysistrata, The Women's Festival and Frogs*, Norman 2011.
- Felten 1994 W. F., *Oknos*, in *LIMC VII/1*, Zürich 1994, 33-35.
- Fortenbaugh – Schütrumpf 2001 W. F.-E. S. (eds.), *Dicaearchus of Messana. Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick-London 2001.
- Fraenkel 1962 E. F., *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, Roma 1962.
- Frazer 1921 J.G. F., *Apollodorus. The Library, II*, London-New York 1921.
- Fritzsche 1835 F.V. F., *Quaestiones Aristophanae*, I, Leipzig 1835.
- Garvie 2011 A.F. G., *Porson's Law Reconsidered*, in P. Volpe Cacciatore (ed.), *Seminario di studi su Richard Porson*, Napoli 2011, 21-34.
- Geissler 1954 P. G., *Lancicula satura*, in O. Hiltbrunner – H. Kornhardt – F. Tietze (eds.), *Thesaurismata. Festschrift für Ida Kapp zum 70. Geburtstag*, München 1954, 39-48.
- Gentili 1967 B. G., *Epigramma ed elegia*, in *Entretiens Hardt*, XIV, *L'épigramme grecque*, Genève 1967, 39-81.
- GEW H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1954.

- Gianvittorio 2018 L. G., *New Music and Dancing Prostitutes*, «GRMS» VI (2018) 265-289.
- Gibson 2000 C.A. G., *The critical note above col. 12 of the Didymus papyrus (P. Berol. inv. 9780)*, «ZPE» CXXXII (2000) 148.
- Gibson 2001 C.A. G., *An Amphictyonic decree, Aristotle, and the Scythians: a crux in Didymus' commentary on Demosthenes*, «GRBS» LXII/1 (2001) 43-56.
- Gibson 2002 C.A. G., *Interpreting a Classic. Demosthenes and His Ancient Commentators*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2002.
- Gomme – Andrewes – Dover 1970 A.W. G.-A. A.-K.J. D., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, IV, Books V 25-VII*, Oxford 1970.
- Grandolini 1999 S. G., *Didimo e la classificazione della poesia lirica*, «GIF» LI (1999), 1-22.
- Grégoire 1938 H. G., *Caballus = κόβαλος, κάβηλος et onus = ὄνος*, «Byz» XIII/1 (1938) 287-290.
- Griffith 1987 R.D. G., *The Hoopoe's Name (A Note on Birds 48)*, «QUCC» XXVI/2 (1987) 59-63.
- Grilli 2006 A. G., *Aristofane. Gli Uccelli*, Milano 2006.
- Hadjimichael 2014 Th.A. H., *Aristophanes' Bacchylides: Reading Birds 1373-1409*, «GRMS» II (2014) 184-210.
- Halliwell 2015 S. H., *Clouds, Women at the Thesmophoria, Frogs*, Oxford 2015.
- Harder 2012 A. H., *Callimachus. Aetia, I-II*, Oxford 2012.
- Harding 1994 P. H., *Androtion and the Atthis*, Oxford 1994.
- Harris 1989 E.M. H., *More Chalcenteric Negligence*, «CPh» LXXXIV (1989) 36-44.
- Harrison – Liapis 2013 G.W.M. H.-V. L. (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*, Leiden-Boston 2013.
- Harvey 2000 D. H., *Phrynichos and His Muses*, in D. Harvey-J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes*, London-Swansea 2000, 91-134.
- Hatzimichali 2013 M. H., *Ashes to Ashes? The Library of Alexandria after 48 BC*, in J. König – K. Oikonomopoulou – G. Woolf (eds.), *Ancient Libraries*, Cambridge 2013, 167-182.
- Heidberg 1898-1899 J.L. H., *De locis nonnullis Ranarum fabulae Aristophanis adnotatiunculae*, «Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi» VII (1898-1899) 60-67.
- Heine Nielsen 2001 T. H.N., *Triphylia*, in M.H. Hansen-(*id.*) (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2001.

- Heine Nielsen 2008 T. H.N., *Why did Megalopolis apply for membership in the Pylian Amphictyony? Some speculative answers*, in G.A. Pikoulas (ed.), *Ἱστορίες γιὰ τὴν ἀρχαία Ἀρκαδία: πρακτικά / proceedings of the International symposium in honour of James Roy*, Stemnitsa 2008.
- Hermay – Cassimatis – Vollkommer 1987 A. H.-H. C.-R. V., *Eros in LIMC III/1*, 850-942.
- van Herwerden 1906 H. v.H., *Vindiciae Aristophaneae*, Leiden 1906.
- Hillscher 1892 A. H., *Hominum litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum historia critica*, «JKPh» suppl. XVIII (1892), 355-440.
- Hinge 2006 G. H., *Die Sprache Alkmans*, Wiesbaden 2006.
- Honigmann 1931 E. H., *Melite* (9), in *RE XV/1* (1931) 541f.
- Huchzermeyer 1931 H. H., *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit*, Emsdetten 1931.
- Ioannidou 1996 G. I., *Berliner Klassikertexte, IX, Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin (P. Berol. inv. 21101-21299, 21911)*, Mainz am Rhein 1996.
- Ippolito 2005 A. I., *Apollonius [11] Molo*, in *LGGA*, 2005.
- Ippolito 2008 A. I., *Tryphon [1]*, in *LGGA*, 2008.
- Ippolito 2019 A. I., *Aretades*, in *LGGA*, 2019.
- Jachmann 1909 G. J., *De Aristotelis didascaliiis*, Göttingen 1909.
- Jahn 1867 O. J., *Satura*, «Hermes» II/2 (1867) 226-251.
- Jolivet 2010 J.C. J., *Philologues et commentaires alexandrins à Rome à la fin de la république et au début de l'empire*, in Y. Perrin (ed.), *Neronia VIII. Bibliothèques, livres et culture écrite dans l'empire romain de César à Hadrien*, Bruxelles 2010, 105-115.
- Jolivet 2014 J.C. J., *Exégèse homérique et fiction dans la poésie augustéenne*, «Lalies» XXXIV (2014) 7-74.
- Jolivet 2016 J.C. J., *Confronter les textes poétiques latins et les commentaires philologiques et exégétiques grecs: Circé, Aristote, les scholies homériques, Virgile et Ovide*, «Dictynna» XIII (2016).
- Jones 1952 D.M. J., *The Manuscript of Aristophanes, Knights (I)*, «CQ» II (1952) 168-185.

- Kadletz 1981 E. K., *The Tongues of Greek Sacrificial Victims*, «HTR» LXXIV/1 (1981) 21-29.
- Kaibel 1889 G. K., *Zur attischen Komödie*, «Hermes» XXIV (1889) 35-66.
- Kanavou 2011 N. K., *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names*, Berlin-New York 2011.
- Keith Dix 2000 T. K.D., *Lucullus' library*, «Athenaeum» LXXXVIII/2 (2000) 441-464.
- Kidd 2017 S.E. K., 'Nonsense' in *Comic Scholia*, «CQ» LXVII/2 (2017) 507-521.
- Kleinlogel 1984 A. K., rev. of Koster 1978, «BZ» LXXVII (1984) 284-290.
- Knaack 1907 G. K., *Eratosthenes*, in *RE* VI/1 (1907) 358-389.
- Kock 1894³ T. K., *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, IV, *Die Vögel*, Berlin 1894 (1864¹).
- Kock 1898⁴ T. K., *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, III, *Die Frösche*, Berlin 1898 (1856¹).
- Körte 1905 A. K., *Zu Didymos' Demosthenes-Commentar*, «RhM» LX (1905) 388-416.
- Konstantakos 2004 I.M. K., *Antiphanes' Agroikos-Plays: An Examination of the Ancient Evidence and Fragments*, «RCCM» XLVI/1 (2004) 9-40.
- Koster 1953 W.J.W. K., *A propos de quelques manuscrits d'Aristophane de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, «REG» LXVI (1953) 1-33.
- Koster 1957 W.J.W. K., *Autour d'un manuscrit d'Aristophane écrit par Démétrius Triclinius: études paléographiques et critiques sur les éditions d'Aristophane de l'époque byzantine tardive*, Groningen 1957.
- Koster 1963 W.J.W. K., *De Veneti Aristophanis aetate*, «Mnemosyne» XVI/2 (1963) 141.
- Koster 1973 W.J.W. K., *De Phaino et Symmacho commentatoribus Aristophanis*, «Mnemosyne» XXVI/3 (1973) 225-229.
- Kremmydas 2013 Ch. K., *Hellenistic Oratory and the Evidence of Rhetorical Exercises*, in *id.*-K. Tempest (eds.), *Hellenistic Oratory. Continuity and Change*, Oxford 2013, 139-163.
- Kroll 1932 W. K., *Midas* (1), in *RE* XV/2 (1932) 1526-1536.
- Kyriakidi 2007 N. K., *Aristophanes und Eupolis. Zur Geschichte einer dichterischen Rivalität*, Berlin-New York 2007.
- Lada-Richards 1999 I. L.-R., *Initiating Dionysus. Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs*, Oxford 1999.

- Lafond 1999 Y. L., *Lepreon*, in *DNP VII* (1999) 73.
- Lafond 2000 Y. L., *Orneai*, in *DNP IX* (2000) 46f.
- Lallot 1989 J. L., *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, Paris 1989.
- Langerbeck 1958 H. L., *Margites. Versuch einer Beschreibung und Rekonstruktion*, «HSPH» LXIII (1958) 33-63.
- Latacz 1998 J. L., *Gigantomachie*, in *DNP IV* (1998) 1069f.
- Ledergerber 1905 I. L., *Lukian und die altattische Komödie*, Einsiedeln 1905.
- van Leeuwen 1896 J. v.L., *Aristophanis Ranae cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Leiden 1896.
- van Leeuwen 1898 J. v.L., *Aristophanis Nubes cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Leiden 1898.
- van Leeuwen 1902 J. v.L., *Aristophanis Aves cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Leiden 1902.
- Lehrs 1882³ K. L., *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, Lipsiae 1882 (1833¹).
- Lenschau 1941 T. L., *Phormisios* (1), in *RE XX/1* (1941) 541-544.
- Leopardus 1568 P. L., *Pauli Leopardi Isebergensis Furnii emendationum et miscellaneorum libri viginti*, Antwerp 1568.
- von Leutsch 1847 E. v.L., *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Aristophanes (Fortsetzung von Band I, S. 464ff.)*, «Philologus» II (1847) 12-33.
- LGGA F. Montanari – F. Montana – L. Pagani (eds.), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*, <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/lexicon-of-greek-grammarians-of-antiquity>
- Liapis 2012 V. L., *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*, Oxford 2012.
- Lilja 1980 S. L., *The Ape in Ancient Comedy*, «Arctos» XIV (1980) 31-38.
- Lohmann 1999 H. L., *Melite* (5), in *DNP VII* (1999) 1190.
- Lombardo 1999 G. L., *Demetrio. Lo stile*, Palermo 1999.
- Lowe 2013 N. L., *Comedy and the Pleiad*, in Bakola – Prauscello – Telò 2013, 343-356.
- Ludwich 1884 A. L., *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurtheilt*, I, Leipzig 1884.
- Luppe 2013 W. L., *Zum Komödien-Kommentar P.Oxy. LXXVIII 5160*, «AFP» LIX (2013) 50-54.

- Luzzatto 2011 M.T. L., *Commentare Demostene (le strategie dell'hypomnema nel Didimo di Berlino)*, «BollClass» 32, 2011, 3-72.
- LSJ⁹ H.G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and augm. throughout by H. Stuart Jones with the assist. of R. McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars, Oxford 1940⁹ + *A Supplement*, ed. by E.A. Barber, with the assist. of P. Maas-M. Scheller-M.L. West, Oxford 1968 + *Revised Supplement*, ed. by P.G.W. Glare, with the assist. of A.A. Thompson, Oxford 1996.
- Luppe 1980 W. L., *Der Kommentar zu den „Taxiarchoi“ des Eupolis P.Oxy. 2740 (Nr. 98 Austin)*, «APF» XXVII (1980), 37-47.
- Maas 1962 P. M., *Greek Metre*, transl. H. Lloyd-Jones (from the original *Griechische Metrik*, [Leipzig-Berlin 1923] with later additions), Oxford 1962.
- MacDowell 1993 D.M. M., *Foreign birth and Athenian citizenship in Aristophanes*, in A.H. Sommerstein – S. Halliwell – J. Henderson – B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis. Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Bari 1993*, 359-371.
- MacDowell 1994 D.M. McD., *The Number of Speaking Actors in Old Comedy*, «CQ» LXIV/1 (1994) 325-335.
- Maehler 1984 H. M., *Bruchstücke spätantiker Dramenhandschriften aus Hermupolis*, «AfP» XXX (1984) 5-29.
- Maehler 1994 H. M., *Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften*, in Montanari 1994, 95-141.
- Maehler 2000 H. M., *L'évolution matérielle de l'hypomnème jusqu'à la basse époque. Le cas du POxy. 856 (Aristophane) et PWurzburg 1 (Euripide)*, in M.O. Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*, Paris 2000, 29-36.
- Manetti 2003 D. M., *Bacchius* in *LGGA*, 2003.
- Marini 2007 N. M., *Demetrio. Lo stile*, Roma 2007.
- Marshall 2013 C.W. M., *Three Actors in Old Comedy, Again*, in Harrison-Liapis 2013, 257-278.
- Martano 2012 A. M., *Chamaeleon of Heraclea: The Sources, Text and Translation*, in Martano – Matelli – Mirhady 2012, 157-338.
- Martano – Matelli – Mirhady 2012 A. M.-E. M.-D. M. (eds.), *Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea. Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick 2012.

- Martin 1882 A. M., *Les scolies du manuscrit d'Aristophane à Ravenne. Étude et collation*, Paris 1882.
- Martina 2016 A. M., *Menandrea. Elementi e struttura della commedia di Menandro*, I, Pisa 2016.
- Martínez 2001 S. M., *A propòsit del tractat Sobre les aus de Cal·límac*, «Faventia» XXIII/1 (2001), 51-69.
- Marzullo 1968 B. M., *Aristofane. Le Commedie*, Bari 1968.
- Marzullo 1970 B. M., *L'interlocuzione negli «Uccelli» di Aristofane*, «Philologus» CXIV (1970) 181-194.
- Massimilla 1996 G. M., *Callimaco. Aitia, libri primo e secondo*, Pisa 1996.
- Massimilla 2010 G. M., *Callimaco. Aitia, libri terzo e quarto*, Pisa-Roma 2010.
- Mastromarco 1969 G. M., *Esegesi demostenica in Didimo*, «AFLB» XIV (1969) 279-287.
- Mastromarco 1972 G. M., *Note al papiro berlinese di Didimo*, «AFLB» XV (1972) 241-252.
- Mastromarco 1983 G. M., *Commedie di Aristofane*, I, Torino 1983.
- Mastromarco – Totaro 2006 G. M.-P. T., *Commedie di Aristofane*, II, Torino 2006.
- Mastromarco – Totaro – Zimmermann 2017 G. M.-P. T.-B. Z., *La commedia attica antica. Forme e contenuti*, Lecce-Rovato 2017.
- Mastronarde 2017 D.J. M., *Preliminary Studies in the Scholia to Euripides*, Berkeley 2017.
- Matthaios 2015 S. M., *Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity*, in Montanari-Matthaios-Rengakos 2015, 184-296.
- Matthaios 2020 S. M., *Greek Scholarship in the Imperial Era and Late Antiquity*, in Montanari 2020, 260-372.
- Matijašić 2011 I. M., *“Shrieking like Illyrians”. Historical Geography and the Greek Perspective of the Illyrian World in the 5th Century BC*, «Arheološki vestnik» LXII (2011) 289-316.
- Matijašić 2018 I. M., *Shaping the canons of ancient Greek historiography: imitation, classicism, and literary criticism*, Berlin-Boston 2018.
- Maxwell – Stuart 1981 P.G. M.S., *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology*, I, ΓΑΛΥΚΟΣ, Leiden 1981.
- McDermott 1935 W.C. McD., *The Ape in Greek Literature*, «TAPhA» LXVI (1935) 165-176.
- McDermott 1938 W.C. McD., *The Ape in Antiquity*, Baltimore 1938.

- McGing 2019 B. McG., *Appian. Roman History, Volume II*, Cambridge (MA) 2019.
- McNelis 2002 C. McN., *Greek Grammarians and Roman Society during the Early Empire: Statius' Father and his Contemporaries*, «CA» XXI/1 (2002) 67-94.
- Meijering 1987 R. M., *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*, Groningen 1987.
- Meineke 1826 A. M., *Quaestionum scenicarum specimen primum*, Berlin 1826.
- Meineke 1827 A. M., *Quaestionum scenicarum specimen secundum*, Berlin 1827.
- Meineke 1839 A. M., *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum, I, Historiam criticam comicorum Graecorum continens*, Berlin 1839.
- Meiners 1890 W.H. M., *Quaestiones ad scholia Aristophanea historica pertinentes*, Halis Saxonum 1890.
- Meliadò 2008 C. M., *Theon [1]*, in *LGGA*, 2008.
- Meliadò 2018 C. M., *Epitherses*, in *LGGA*, 2018.
- Meliadò 2019 C. M., *Lycophron*, in *LGGA*, 2019.
- Merry 1889a W.W. M., *Aristophanes. The Birds. With introduction and notes*, I, Oxford 1889.
- Merry 1889b W.W. M., *Aristophanes. The Birds. With introduction and notes*, II, Oxford 1889.
- Meursius 1701 J. M., *Bibliotheca Attica I-VI*, in *Thesaurus Graecarum antiquitatum contextus & designatus ab Jacobo Gronovio*, Leiden 1701, 1397-1624.
- Miccolis 2017 E.R. M., *Archippos. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Heidelberg 2017.
- Migliario 2012 E. M., *Intellettuali dei tempi nuovi: retori greci nella Roma augustea*, «Quaderni del Dip.to di Lettere e Filosofia di Trento» II (2012) 109-123.
- Millis 2015 B. M., *Anaxandrides. Introduction, Translation, Commentary*, Heidelberg 2015.
- Milns 1994 R.D. M., *Didymea*, in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek history*, Oxford 1994, 70-88.
- Mioni 1964 E. M., *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane*, II, Roma 1964.
- Mirhady 2001 D.C. M., *Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation*, in Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf 2001, 1-142.

- Mitchell 1839 T. M., *The Frogs of Aristophanes*, London 1839.
- Montana 1996 F. M., *L'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele negli scholia vetera ad Aristofane*, Pisa-Roma 1996.
- Montana 2002 F. M., *Apollonius [8] Chaeridis filius*, in *LGGA*, 2002.
- Montana 2003a F. M., *Diogenianus*, in *LGGA*, 2003.
- Montana 2003b F. M., *Symmachus*, in *LGGA*, 2003.
- Montana 2004 F. M., *I grammatici alessandrini nei papiri di Aristofane*, in R. Pretagostini-E. Dettori (a c.), *La cultura ellenistica. L'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica*, Roma 2004, 371-384.
- Montana 2006a F. M., *L'anello mancante. L'esegesi ad Aristofane tra l'antichità e Bisanzio*, in Avezzù-Scattolin 2006, 17-34.
- Montana 2006b F. M., *Ammonius [2] Alexandrinus*, in *LGGA*, 2006.
- Montana 2008a F. M., *Callistratus*, in *LGGA*, 2008.
- Montana 2008b F. M., *Il grammatico Callistrato nella diadoche alessandrina*, «MH» LXV/2 (2008) 77-98.
- Montana 2009a F. M., *Storici, filologi, storici-filologi*, in F. Gazzano – G. Ottone – L. Santi Amantini (eds.), *Ingenia asiatica: fortuna e tradizione di storici d'Asia minore. Atti della prima giornata di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria. Genova, 31 maggio 2007*, Tivoli 2009, 157-181.
- Montana 2009b F. M., *Terpandrian Hypotexts in Aristophanes*, «TC» I/1 (2009) 36-54.
- Montana 2010 F. M., *Due note di lessico scoliastico: παρακείμενον σχόλιον e παραγράφεσθαι*, in *id.* (ed.), *Aner polytropos. Ricerche di filologia greca antica dedicate dagli allievi a Franco Montanari*, Roma 2010, 185-195.
- Montana 2011 F. M., *The Making of Greek scholiastic Corpora*, in F. Montanari-L. Pagani (eds.), *From Scholars to Scholia. Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Berlin-New York 2011, 105-189.
- Montana 2014 F. M., *Anything but a Marginal Question. On the Meaning of παρακείμενον σχόλιον and παραγράφεσθαι*, «TC» VI/1 (2014) 24-38.
- Montana 2015a F. M., *Hellenistic Scholarship*, in Montanari-Matthaios-Rengakos 2015, 60-183.
- Montana 2015b F. M., *Chaeris*, in *LGGA*, 2015.
- Montana 2015c F. M., *Phainus*, in *LGGA*, 2015.

- Montana 2017 F. M., *Zetemata alessandrini negli scoli alle Rane di Aristofane. Riflessioni ecdotiche*, in Mastromarco-Totaro-Zimmermann 2017, 195-229.
- Montana 2018a F. M., *Antipater*, in *LGGA*, 2018.
- Montana 2018b F. M., *Commentare i Poetae comici Graeci. Il progetto* Kommentierung der Fragmente der Griechischen Komödie *di Bernhard Zimmermann*, «RFIC» CXLVI (2018), 506-526.
- Montana 2020 F. M., *Hellenistic Scholarship*, in Montanari 2020, 132-259.
- Montana (forthc.) F. M., *Didymus and the Greek Historians*, in Coward-Prodi (forthc.)
- Montanari 1979 F. M., *Studi di filologia omerica antica*, I, Pisa 1979.
- Montanari 1994 F. M. (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994.
- Montanari 1995 F. M., *Studi di filologia omerica antica*, II, Pisa 1995.
- Montanari 1996a F. M., *Apollonios* (8), in *DNP* I (1996), 880.
- Montanari 1996b F. M., *Aristarchos* (4), in *DNP* I (1996), 1090-1094.
- Montanari 1996c F. M., *Aristophanes* (4), in *DNP* I (1996), 1130-1133.
- Montanari 1997a F. M., *Demetrios* (35), in *DNP* III (1997), 438f.
- Montanari 1997b F. M., *Didymos* (1), in *DNP* III (1997), 550-552.
- Montanari 1997c F. M., *Dionysios* (17), in *DNP* III (1997), 632-635.
- Montanari 2012 F. M., *The Peripatos on Literature*, in A. Martano-E. Matelli-D. Mirhady 2012, 339-358.
- Montanari – Matthaïos – Rengakos 2015 F. M.-S. M.-A. R. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden-Boston 2015.
- Montanari 2020 F. M. (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*, Leiden-Boston 2020.
- Moretti 1957 L. M., *Olympionikai. I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*, «MAL» (8th series) VIII/2 (1957) 53-198.
- von der Mühl 1928 P. v.d.M., review of Coulon 1928a, «Gnomon» IV (1928) 621-626.
- Müller 1921 B.A. M., *Seleukos* (44), in *RE* IIA/1 (1921) 1251-1256.
- Müller Strübing 1873 H. M.S., *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik*, Leipzig 1873.

- Muttini 2019 M. M., *Appunti sulla circolazione del Pluto di Aristofane in età umanistica (I). Gli apografi dei vetustiores e delle recensioni bizantine*, «RHT» XIV (2019) 1-40.
- Neri 1996 C. N., *Poeti, filologi e patelle*, «Eikasmós» VII (1996), 25-55.
- Nesselrath 1990 H.G. N., *Die attische mittlere Komödie*, Berlin-New York 1990.
- Nesselrath 2002 H.G. N., *Homerphilologie auf der Insel der Seligen: Lukian, VH II 20*, in M. Reichel-A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea Pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullman zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2002, 151-162.
- Nilsson 1967³ M.P. N., *Geschichte der griechischen Religion, I, Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die griechische Weltherrschaft*, München 1967 (1940¹).
- Novembri 2010 V. N., *Dionysius [16] Tryphonius*, in *LGGA*, 2010.
- Novembri 2020 V. N., *Euphronius*, in *LGGA*, 2020.
- Novokhatko 2015 A. N., *Greek Scholarship from its Beginnings to Alexandria*, in Montanari-Matthaios-Rengakos 2015, 3-59.
- Novokhatko 2020 A. N., *The Origins and Growth of Scholarship in Pre-Hellenistic Greece*, in Montanari 2020, 9-131.
- Nünlist 2009 R. N., *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge-New York 2009.
- Oberhummer 1941 E. O., *Phlegra*, in *RE XX/1* (1941), 264f.
- Olson 2014 S. D.O. (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception. Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson*, Berlin-Boston 2014.
- Olson 2016 S.D. O., *Eupolis. Heilotes – Chrysou genos (fr. 147-325). Translation and Commentary* (Fragmenta Comica 8.2), Heidelberg 2016.
- Olson 2017 S.D. O., *On Some Methodological Questions Involving the Date of Eupolis' Taxiarchoi*, in Mastromarco-Totaro-Zimmermann 2017, 307-319.
- Orth 2009 C. O., *Strattis. Die Fragmente. Ein Kommentar*, Berlin 2009.
- Orth 2015 C. O., *Nikochares-Xenophon. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Fragmenta Comica 9.3), Heidelberg 2015.
- Orsini 2011 P. O., *L'Aristofane di Ravenna. Genesi e formazione tecnica e testuale di un codice*, «Scriptorium» LXV (2011) 321-337.

- Osborne – Byrne 1990 M.J. O.-S.G. B., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, II, *Attica*, Oxford 1994.
- Pachis 1996 P. P., *Γαλλαῖον Κυβέλης ὀλόλογμα*, in E. N. Lane (ed.), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 194-222.
- Paduano 1996 G. P., *Aristofane. Le Rane*, Milano 1996.
- Pagani 2004 L. P., *Diodorus [1]*, in *LGGA*, 2004.
- Pagani 2005 L. P., *Alexander [7] Polyhistor*, in *LGGA*, 2005.
- Pagani 2006 L. P., *Ammonius [3] Ammonii filius*, in *LGGA*, 2006.
- Pagani 2008 L. P., *Dionysius [15] Thrax*, in *LGGA*, 2006.
- Pagani 2009a L. P., *Asclepiades [3]*, in *LGGA*, 2009.
- Pagani 2009b L. P., *Asclepiades [5]*, in *LGGA*, 2009.
- Pagani 2009c L. P., *Crates [1]*, in *LGGA*, 2009.
- Pagani 2009d L. P., *Herodicus Crateteus*, in *LGGA*, 2009.
- Pagani 2010 L. P., *La Techne Grammatike attribuita a Dionisio Trace e la nascita della grammatica nell'antichità greca*, «RFIC» CXXXVIII/3-4 (2010) 390-409.
- Pagani 2013 L. P., *Dionysius [9]*, in *LGGA*, 2013.
- Pagani 2014a L. P., *La Techne Grammatike e la documentazione papiracea*, «RFIC» CXLII/1 (2014) 205-217.
- Pagani 2014b L. P., *Through the Warping Glass. A Reconsideration on Venetus A subscriptions and the birth of scholiography*, «TC» VI/1 (2014) 39-53.
- Pagani 2020 L. P., *Tyrannion [1] Maior*, in *LGGA*, 2020.
- Pagani (forthc.) L. P., *Didymus and Epic Poetry*, in Coward-Prodi (forthc.).
- Page 1936 D. P., *The Elegiacs in Euripides' Andromache*, in C. Bailey *et al.* (eds.), *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford 1936, 206-230.
- Palumbo Stracca 2004 B.M. P.S., *La voce dell'usignolo, il suono dell'aulo: Aristoph. Av. 209-222 (e alcuni passi tragici)*, «RCCM» II (2004) 207-218.
- Palumbo Stracca 2007 B.M. P.S., *La dedica di «Paride Simichida»*, in G. Lozza – S. Martinelli Tempesta (eds.), *L'epigramma greco*, Milano 2007, 113-136.
- Papazoglu 1978 F. P., *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times. Triballi, Autariatae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians*, Amsterdam 1978.

- Paulas 2016 J. P., *Cooking and Baking Technology*, in G.L. Irby (ed.), *A Companion to Science, Technology, and Medicine in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Chichester 2016, 570-586.
- Pellegrino 2013 M. P., *Nicofonte. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Fragmenta Comica 15), Mainz 2013.
- Perilli 2006 L. P., *Da medico a lessicografo: Galeno e il Glossario ippocratico*, in C. W. Müller – C. Brockmann – C.W. Brunschön, *Ärzte und ihre Interpreten. Medizinische Fachtexte der Antike als Forschungsgegenstände der Klassischen Philologie*, München-Leipzig 2006, 165-202.
- Perrone 2011 S. P., *La tradizione papiracea della commedia attica antica*, in A.M. Andrisano (ed.), *Ritmo, parola, immagine. Il teatro classico e la sua tradizione*, Bari 2011, 201-220.
- Perrone 2018 S. P., *Hypsicrates*, in *LGGA*, 2018.
- Pfeiffer 1968 R. P., *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Phillips 2020 T. P., *Historiography and Ancient Pindaric Scholarship*, in Currie-Rutherford 2020, 441-460.
- Piérart 2001 M. P., *Argolis*, in M.H. Hansen – T.H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2001, 599-619.
- Pirrotta 2009 S. P., *Plato comicus. Die fragmentarischen Komödien. Ein Kommentar*, Berlin 2009.
- Pizzone 2017 A. P., *The Historiai of John Tzetzes: a Byzantine 'Book of Memory'?*, «BMGS» XLI/2 (2017) 182-207.
- Podlecki 1969 A.J. P., *The Peripatetics as Literary Critics*, «Phoenix» XXIII (1969) 114-137.
- Pontani 2011 F. P., *Callimachus Cited*, in B. Acosta Hughes – L. Lehnus – S. Stephens (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden-Boston 2011, 93-117.
- Porson 1820 R. P., *Notae in Aristophanem*, Cambridge 1820.
- Probert 2006 Ph. P., *Ancient Greek Accentuation. Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*, Oxford 2006.
- Probert 2015 Ph. P., *Ancient Theory of Prosody*, in Montanari-Matthaios-Rengakos 2015, 923-948.
- Prodi 2014 E.E. P., review of Braswell 2013 (2017²), «BMCRev» 2014.04.16.
- Pusch 1890 H. P., *Quaestiones Zenodoteae*, Halle 1890.

- Radermacher 1908 L. R., *Motiv und Persönlichkeit*, «RhM» LXIII (1908) 445-464.
- Rawson 1985 E. R., *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London 1985.
- Rein 1996 M.J. R., *Phrygian Matar: Emergence of an Iconographic Type*, in E. N. Lane (ed.), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 223-237.
- Reiske 1754 J.J. R., *Ad Euripidam et Aristophanem animadversiones*, Leipzig 1754.
- Reitzenstein 1897 R. R., *Geschichte der Griechischen Etymologica. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz*, Leipzig 1897.
- Rhodes – Zambrini – Gargiulo 2016 P.J. R. (ed.)-A. Z.-T. G. (transl.), *Aristotele. Costituzione degli Ateniesi*, Milano 2016.
- Rispoli 1980 G.M. R., *Teagene o dell'allegoria*, «Vichiana» IX (1980) 243-257.
- Robertson 1991 N. R., *The Betrothal Symposium in Early Greece*, in Slater 1991, 25-57.
- Roemer 1908 A. R., *Philologie und Afterphilologie im griechischen Altertum, II, Didymus als Erklärer des Aristophanes*, «Philologus» LXVII (1908) 366-410.
- Rohde 1870 E. R., *De Julii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus*, Leipzig 1870.
- Ronconi 2007 F. R., *I manoscritti greci miscellanei*, Spoleto 2007.
- Rosen 2016 R.M. R., *Lucian's Aristophanes: On Understanding Old Comedy in the Roman Imperial Period*, in C.W. Marshall – T. Hawkins (eds.), *Athenian Comedy in the Roman Empire*, London-New York 2016, 141-162.
- Rosenmeyer 1968 T.G. R., *Elegiac and Elegos*, «Calif. Stud. in Class. Ant.» I (1968) 217-231.
- van Rossum – Steenbeek 1998² M. v.R.-S., *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1998 (1997¹).
- Ruffell 2014 I. R., *Old Comedy at Rome: Rhetorical Model and Satirical Problem*, in Olson 2014, 275-308.
- Rusten 2013 J. R., *The mirror of Aristophanes. The winged ethnographers of Birds (1470–93, 1553–64, 1694–1705)*, in Bakola-Prauscello-Telò 2013, 298-315.
- Rutherford 1905 W. R., *Scholia Aristophanica, III, A Chapter in the History of Annotation*, London-New York 1905.
- van de Sande Bakhuyzen 1877 W.H. v.d.S.B., *De parodia in comoediis Aristophanis*, Utrecht 1877.

- Sandbach 1961 F.H. S., *Table-Talk* (Quaestiones Convivales). *Book IX*, in E.L. Minar – F.H. Sandbach – W.C. Helmbold (eds.), *Plutarch's Moralia in fifteen volumes*, IX, London-Cambridge 1961.
- Sandys 1906 J.E. S., *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages*, I, Cambridge 1906 (1903¹).
- Scattolin 2013 P. S., *Tra Didimo ed Esichio: tre casi di tradizione indiretta dell'Edipo a Colono* (vv. 312, 390. 900), «Prometheus» XXXIX (2013) 25-43.
- Schauenburg 1881 A. S., *De Symmachi in Aristophanis interpretatione subsidiis*, Halle 1881.
- Schironi 2018a F. S., *The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*, Ann Arbor 2018.
- Schironi 2018b F. S., *Enlightened Kings or Pragmatic Rulers? Ptolemaic Patronage of Scholarship and Sciences in Context*, in Ph.R. Boseman (ed.), *Intellectual and Empire in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, London-New York 2018, 22-29.
- Schlunk 1974 R.R. S., *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid*, Ann Arbor 1974.
- Schmid 1895 W. S., *Apollonios* (85), in *RE* II/1 (1895) 141-144.
- Schmidt 1854 M. S., *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig 1854.
- Schnee 1879 R. S., *Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristophanesscholien*, Berlin 1879.
- Schneider 1838 O. S., *De veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus commentatio*, Stralsund 1838.
- Schuringa 1945 J. S., *Scholia vetera ad Aristophanis Ranas codicis Ven. Marc. 474* (doctoral dissertation), Groningen 1945.
- Scott 1992 A. S., *Notes and Observations: Pseudo-Aristotle's Historia Animalium 9 in Origen*, «HThR» LXXXV/2 (1992) 235-239.
- Severyns 1938 A. S., *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*, I, *Le Codex 239 de Photius*, II, Liège 1938.
- Sidwell 2009 K. S., *The Dead Philosophers' Society: New Thoughts on Lucian's Piscator and Eupolis' Demes*, in A. Bartley (ed.), *A Lucian for our Times*, Cambridge 2009, 109-118.
- Sidwell 2014 K. S., "Letting it all hang out": *Lucian, Old Comedy and the Origins of Roman Satire*, in Olson 2014, 259-274.
- Simon 1997 E. S., *Kybele*, in *LIMC* VIII/1, 744-766.

- Simone 2020 C. S., *The Music One Desires: Hypsipyle and Aristophanes' 'Muse of Euripides'*, in L. Coe – P.J. Finglass (eds.), *Female Characters in Fragmentary Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge 2020, 162-178.
- Slater 1991 W.J. S. (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor 1991.
- Sommerstein 1996 A. H. S., *How to Avoid Being a Komodoumenos*, «CQ» XLVI/2 (1996) 327-356.
- Sparkes 1962 B.A. S., *The Greek Kitchen*, «JHS» LXXXII (1962) 121-137.
- Stama 2014 F. S., *Frinico. Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Fragmenta Comica 7), Heidelberg 2014.
- Stanford 1963² W.B. S., *Aristophanes. The Frogs*, London 1963 (1958¹).
- Steinhausen 1910 J. S., *ΚΩΜΩΔΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ. De grammaticorum veterum studiis ad homines in comoedia attica irrisos pertinentibus*, Bonn 1910.
- Steiner 2013 D. S., *The Gorgon's Lament: Auletics, Poetics and Choralities in Pindar's Pythian 12*, «AJPh» CXXXIV/2 (2013) 173-208.
- Stelter 2004 K. S., *Nebensätze bei Aristophanes. Syntax, Semantik, Pragmatik*, Wiesbaden 2004.
- Stefanis 1988 I.E. S., *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΟΙ ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΙ. ΣΥΜΒΟΛΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΠΡΟΣΟΠΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΑΤΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ*, Iraklio 1988
- Storey 2003 I.C. S., *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford 2003.
- Storey – Allan 2005 I.C. S.-A. A., *A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama*, Malden-Oxford-Victoria 2005.
- Strecker 1884 K. S., *De Lycophrone Euphronio Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus*, Greifswald 1884.
- Susemihl 1891-1892 F. S., *Die Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, Leipzig 1891-1892.
- Theodoridis 1973 Ch. Th., *Die Menanderkommentare des Didymos*, «Hermes» CI (1973) 253-256.
- Thompson 1940 D.W. T., *Aristophanes. Birds 1122*, «CR» LIV (1940) 188.
- Tosi 1988 R. T., *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci*, Bologna 1988.
- Tosi 1994 R. T., *La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo*, in Montanari 1994, 143-197.
- Tosi 1997 R. T., *Diogenianos (2)*, in *DNP* III (1997) 605f.
- Tosi 1998a R. T., *Eratosthenes aus Kyrene*, in *DNP* IV (1998), 44-47.

- Tosi 1998b R. T., *Gli Ateniesi μολγγοί: da Aristofane ad Eratostene*, «SemRom» n.s. I/1 (1998) 123-136.
- Tosi 1998c R. T., *Appunti sulla filologia di Eratostene di Cirene*, «Eikasmós» IX (1998) 327-346.
- Tosi 2006 R.T., *Note ad alcuni scoli ad Aristofane (Eur. fr. 588a K.)*, in Avezzù-Scattolin 2006, 173-180.
- Tosi 2014 R. T., *The History of Corpora Scholiastica: A Series of Unfortunate Events*, «TC» VI/1, 15-23.
- Tosi 2015 R. T., *Esichio e la semplificazione di strutture complesse nella trasmissione dei lessici*, in M. Tziatzi-M. Billerbeck-F. Montanari-K. Tsantsanoglou (eds.), *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis*, Berlin-Boston 2015, 411-417.
- Tosi 2017a R. T., *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche*, Milano 2017.
- Tosi 2017b R. T., *Proverbs in Eustathius: Some Examples*, in F. Pontani-V. Katsaros-V. Sarris (eds.), *Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike*, Berlin-Boston 2017, 229-241.
- Tosi 2017c R. T., *Proverbi in Aristofane*, in Mastromarco-Totaro-Zimmermann 2017, 115-149.
- Totaro 2006 P. T., *Eschilo in Aristofane (Rane 1026-1029, 1431a-1432)*, «Lexis» XXIV (2006) 95-125.
- Traill 1994 J.S. T., *Persons of Ancient Athens*, II, Toronto 1994.
- Traill 2003 J.S. T., *Persons of Ancient Athens*, XII, Toronto 2003.
- Traill 2009 J.S. T., *Persons of Ancient Athens*, XVIII, Toronto 2009.
- Trojahn 2002 S. T., *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur Alten Komödie*, Leipzig 2002.
- Tuilier 1968 A. T., *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide*, Paris 1968.
- Ucciardello 2006a G. U., *Esegesi linguistica, glosse ed interpretamenta tra hypomnemata e lessici. Materiali e spunti di riflessione*, in Avezzù-Scattolin 2006, 35-83.
- Ucciardello 2006b G. U., *Iulianus [1]*, in LGGA, 2006.
- Ucciardello 2006c G. U., *Seleucus [1]*, in LGGA, 2006.
- Ucciardello 2012 G. U., *Hypomnemata papiracei e lessicografia. Tra Alessandria e Bisanzio*, Messina 2012.
- Valente 2015 S. V., *Typology of Grammatical Treatises*, in Montanari-Matthaios-Rengakos 2015, 599-621.

- van der Valk 1982 M. v.d.V., *Aristophanes, Ranae 1249-1363*, «Antichthon» XVI (1982) 54-76.
- van Herwerden 1882 H. v.H., *Ad Comicos Graecos*, «Mnemosyne» X/1 (1882), 67-95.
- von Holzinger 1882 R. v.H., *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Ravennasscholien zu Aristophanes*, Wien 1882.
- Wackernagel 1876 J. W., *De pathologiae veterum initiis*, Basilea 1876.
- Walter 2000 U. W., *Phormisios*, in *DNP IX* (2000) 952f.
- Weiss 2017 N. W., *Noise, Music, Speech: The Representation of Lament in Greek Tragedy*, «AJPh» CXXXVIII/2 (2017) 243-266.
- Weissenberger 1996 M. W., *Literaturtheorie bei Lukian. Untersuchungen zum Dialog Lexiphanes*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996.
- Welcker 1812 F.G. W., *Komödien von Aristophanes, II, Die Frösche*, Gießen 1812.
- Wellmann 1891 M. W., *Alexander von Myndos*, «Hermes» XXVI/4 (1891) 481-566.
- Wendel 1939 C. W., *Tryphon (25)*, in *RE VII/A1* (1939) 726-744.
- Wentzel 1894 G. W., *Alpheios (2)*, in *RE I/2* (1894) 1631-1636.
- West 1970 S. W., *Chalcenteric Negligence*, «CQ» XX/2 (1970) 288-296.
- West 1974 M.L. W., *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974.
- West 1992 M.L. W., *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
- West 2001 M.L. W., *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München-Leipzig 2001.
- White – Allen 1902 *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑΙ. Facsimile of the Codex Venetus Marcianus 474. With a preface by John Williams White and an introduction by Thomas W. Allen*, London-Boston 1902.
- Wilamowitz 1907 U. v.W., *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie. Unveränderter Abdruck aus der ersten Auflage von Euripides Herakles I Kapitel I–IV*, Berlin 1907.
- Wilcken 1920 U. W., *Die Subskription des Didymus-Papyrus*, «Hermes» LV (1920) 324f.
- Wilkes 1996 J. W., *The Illyrians*, Oxford-Cambridge (MA) 1996.
- Willems 1919 A. W., *Aristophane, III*, Paris-Bruxelles 1919.
- Willi 2003 A. W., *The Language of Aristophanes*, Oxford 2003.
- Wilson 1967 N.G. W., *A Chapter in the History of Scholia*, «CQ» XVII (1967) 244-256.
- Wilson 1984 N.G. W., *Scolia e commentatori*, «SCO» XXXIII (1984) 83-112.

- Wilson 1999 P. W., *The aulos in Athens*, in S. Goldhill – R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 1999, 58-95.
- Wilson 2007c N.G. W., *Aristophanea. Studies on the Text of Aristophanes*, Oxford 2007.
- Wolff 1843 G. W., *De Sophoclis scholiorum Laurentianorum variis lectionibus*, Leipzig 1843.
- Yunis 1997 H. Y., *What kind of commentary is the περὶ Δημοσθένους of Didymus?*, in Bärbel Kramer *et al.* (eds.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses: Berlin, 13.-19. 8. 1995*, Stuttgart 1997, 1049-1055.
- Zacher 1882 K. Z., *Die Schreibung der Aristophanesscholien im Cod. Ven. 474*, «Philologus» XLI (1882) 11-53.
- Zacher 1888 K. Z., *Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien*, Leipzig 1888.
- Zimmermann 1999 B. Z., *Melanthios* (4), in *DNP* VII (1999) 1172.
- Zucker 2012 A. Z., *Qu'est-ce qu'épitomiser ? Étude des pratiques dans la Syllogé zoologique byzantine*, «Rursus» VII (2012) 1-42.
- Zuntz 1938-1939 G. Z., *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri*, «Byzantion» XIII (1938) 631-690, XIV (1939) 545-614.
- Zuntz 1965 G. Z., *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*, Cambridge 1965.

Ringraziamenti

Ho cominciato a occuparmi di Didimo negli scolî ad Aristofane alcuni mesi dopo l'inizio del mio dottorato, nel gennaio 2017, una volta abbandonato l'originario progetto di ricerca con cui avevo vinto la borsa a Cà Foscari. Già a partire da questo periodo di transizione – e per tutto il mio successivo percorso dottorale – non mi sono mai mancati il prezioso supporto e la paziente guida del mio supervisore, il Prof. Ettore Cingano, al quale sono profondamente grata.

Non mi sarei mai dedicata a scoliografia e grammatici antichi se non per la passione trasmessami dal Prof. Renzo Tosi, dal quale ho ricevuto continuo incoraggiamento. La mia gratitudine va inoltre al Prof. Fausto Montana – che mi ha coinvolta nel progetto del *Supplementum Grammaticum Graecum* e mi ha dato importanti indicazioni in momenti centrali del mio lavoro di ricerca – nonché alla Prof.ssa Lara Pagani e al Prof. Giuseppe Ucciardello, valutatori di questa tesi, per tutte le utilissime osservazioni.

Durante questi quattro anni, il Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici è stato per me un luogo non solo stimolante dal punto di vista scientifico, ma anche accogliente dal punto di vista umano: ricorderò sempre con grande piacere il tempo trascorso a Malcanton Marcorà grazie, tra gli altri, alla Prof.ssa Olga Tribulato e alle care colleghe Elena Bonollo, compagna di avventure veneziane e non, Katia Barbaresco e Maria Giovanna Sandri, che mi hanno sempre fatta sentire a casa. Un ringraziamento particolare va a Enrico Emanuele Prodi e Thomas Coward, che ho conosciuto durante i rispettivi periodi di ricerca a Cà Foscari, per avermi offerto la loro amicizia, insieme a tante proficue occasioni di collaborazione.

Fino a primavera 2019 la mia sede ordinaria di ricerca è stata la biblioteca del Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica dell'Università di Bologna, mia *alma mater*. Sono tanti i nomi e i volti che hanno reso e continuano a rendere questo luogo a me familiare. Ringrazio in particolare i colleghi della 'saletta', tutti recentemente addottorati o prossimi al conseguimento del titolo: Eugenio Mattioni, Stella Sacchetti, Giovanna Casali, Francesco Boccasile, Tommaso Interi, Pietro Bertocchini, Luisa Fizzarotti, Alessandro Musino. Porterò sempre nel cuore il ricordo delle belle giornate trascorse insieme. Sono grata anche alla Prof.ssa Giovanna Alvonì, per l'interesse che ha sempre mostrato per il mio lavoro.

L'amicizia – incrollabile, nonostante la distanza geografica – di Sara De Martin è un dono prezioso di cui sono grata ogni giorno: spero di poter presto festeggiare con lei la conclusione dei nostri rispettivi percorsi dottorali.

La maternità prima e la pandemia poi mi hanno portata a concludere la tesi lavorando da casa. Essere madre e dottoranda al contempo non è stato semplice, tantopiù in quest'ultimo periodo: l'aiuto dei miei suoceri e cognati è stato fondamentale. La mia gratitudine va infine a mio marito Filippo e a mio figlio Giovanni, la luce dei miei giorni.

Ai miei genitori, fonte inesauribile di vita, dedico questa tesi.