

Andreas Willi

Contextualizing Comedy: Assumptions of Intertextuality in the Aristophanic Scholia

Abstract: Right from its beginnings in the Alexandrian period, ancient scholarship on Aristophanes showed a particular interest not only in the linguistic and historical explanation of the comedies, but also in the intertextual connections between them and their many intertexts. By surveying the piecemeal and often elusive evidence provided by the Aristophanic scholia, the present contribution seeks to map out both the achievements and the limitations of this strand of research. While the identification of specific ‘source texts’ was clearly pursued with great — and sometimes even excessive — zeal, much less time and effort was spent on evaluating and interpreting the material from a literary perspective.

Keywords: Intertextuality; allusion; Aristophanes; comedy; scholia; ancient scholarship.

1 Introduction

The scholia on the extant eleven comedies of Aristophanes are our most important window onto ancient scholarship on comedy. Like other scholiastic corpora they have a complex history, many details of which remain controversial. However, it is clear that the core of the scholia goes back to an extensive tradition of commenting on comic texts which started in the early Hellenistic period, not long after Lycophron of Chalcis had been tasked to collect and arrange for the Alexandrian library whatever texts written for the Athenian comic stage were still accessible at the time.¹ In fact, the novel format of writing scholarly commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) may have been tried out first in the context of comic scholarship. In a medieval excerpt from the late antique scholar Orus’ manual on orthography (*Lexicon Mes-sanense*, Rabe 1892, 411), reference is made to a ὑπόμνημα on Aristophanes’ *Plutus* by a shadowy scholar called Euphronius whose activity probably belongs to the second half of the third and/or the very start of the second century BC at the latest; this would make him a contemporary of the great Aristophanes of Byzantium, editor of

¹ For historical overviews of ancient Aristophanic scholarship see White 1914, ix–lxxxv, the classic treatment by Boudreaux 1919, Dunbar 1995, 31–49, and Willi fthc., for up-to-date summaries on the activity of individual figures the relevant entries in *LGGA*.

Homer *and* of Aristophanes of Athens, and hence assign his work to a time *before* Aristarchus wrote his commentaries on Homer.² Euphronius was soon followed by others, including Aristarchus, Aristarchus' contemporary Callistratus,³ someone called Apollonius (perhaps a son of the second-century grammarian Chaeris), an Asclepiades (who may or may not be the famous Asclepiades of Myrlea),⁴ the Rhodian Timachidas, and finally, in the first century BC, Didymus of Alexandria. Didymus' comic commentaries engulfed and superseded all that had come before, and they remained the last word on the matter, until, in the 2nd century CE, a certain Symmachus felt another overhaul was due. Thanks to manuscript *subscriptions* to the scholia on some Aristophanic plays (*Clouds*, *Peace*, *Birds*) we know that Symmachus' work then directly fed into the scholiastic tradition, whereas Didymus' work probably did not: so, just as we “read” Euphronius, Callistratus, Aristarchus, Apollonius etc. only through Didymus, we most likely also “read” Didymus himself mainly through Symmachus — and Symmachus only through the scholia.

One regrettable consequence of this quintessentially indirect transmission of knowledge, with its constant flow of excerpts, expansions, abridgments, and contaminations, is that there was much room for errors and distortions to creep in. When we investigate what the scholia can tell us about the transmission of classical texts in antiquity, and especially of those texts that are otherwise lost, we must always keep in mind at least three major problems that arise time and again. Firstly, texts that are quoted (or also just referred to)⁵ may be ascribed wrongly, be it because of scribal errors in the scholiastic tradition itself or because a mistake was

2 Cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 160f., Novembri 2020; according to Choerob. *in Heph.* 10.6, 241.15–17 Consbruch, Euphronius was one of Aristarchus' teachers, but according to the same source “some” even counted him as a member of the Alexandrian Pleiad, who were active during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 BC) (Choerob. *in Heph.* 9.3, 236.14 Consbruch).

3 Callistratus has traditionally been presented as a rival and opponent of Aristarchus, but the actual evidence for this is limited (beyond what is said in Ath. 1.21c): see Montana 2008.

4 The matter is not made any simpler by the conflicting evidence about the date of Asclepiades of Myrlea; see Pagani 2007, especially 12–16, 121–129, as well as Pagani 2009a; 2009b; 2009c. The identification is doubted more often than accepted (cf., e.g., Wentzel 1896 and Boudreaux 1919, 86f., against the more positive attitude of Roemer 1908, 269, and Adler 1914, 41).

5 Since textual quotations could be removed at any stage of the transmission process, the question whether a text is quoted, or merely referred to, in the scholia is usually not very important. Overall, there is a greater readiness for the verbatim quotation of verse, but even substantial prose passages are not *always* paraphrased (cf., e.g., *schol. Ar. Eq.* 793b quoting Thuc. 5.16.1, *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1364c quoting Dicaearchus fr. 89 Wehrli = fr. 90 Mirhady, *schol. Ar. Plut.* 586c quoting Arist. *Mir.* 834a12–22).

already made by an ancient commentator.⁶ Secondly, both ancient scholars and later scholiasts may be careless readers, work hastily, and therefore misunderstand, misremember, and/or simply misrepresent the sources they refer to.⁷ And thirdly, during the epitomization process which led to the scholia as we have them, relevant information could disappear, so that it is not always clear where any given quotation or reference is coming from and/or what it was meant to illustrate in the first place; thus, it may even happen that one scholion, wishing to abridge, ends up presenting information a fuller parallel scholion drawing on the same source explicitly rejects.⁸

Having said that, it remains true that the comic scholia are an invaluable strand for the indirect transmission of classical literature. This is because ancient scholars, in their attempt to explain what their by no means homogeneous target audiences found (or were expected to find) difficult or noteworthy in reading comedy, relied on what they could gather from other texts no less than modern commentators do. Moreover, Aristophanic comedy is such a profoundly intertextual genre that enabling its readers to decode its intertextual connections has to be one of the principal tasks of any commentator who wants to offer more than just the most elementary linguistic elucidation. Given constraints of space, the following pages will concentrate on this latter domain alone, i.e. focus only on quotations and references in the Aristophanic scholia that tell us something about the ancient critics' interests in and

6 See, for example, *schol. Ar. Eq.* 214a (no pertinent line is to be found in Eur. *Herac.*); n. 37 on *schol. Ar. Ran.* 704ab, *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1292, *schol. Ar. Pax* 741b, and *schol. Ar. Plut.* 690c; n. 26 on *schol. Ar. Ran.* 105; n. 34 on *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1477b.

7 Likely instances of misremembering are seen in *schol. Ar. Ach.* 1086a (quoting Homer as a parallel for the use of the word κίστη for “food-box”, but lumping together *Od.* 3.480 and *Od.* 6.77) and *schol. Ar. Nub.* 602a (similarly making up a Homeric phrase from more than one Homeric line), one of blatant confusion in *schol. Ar. Eq.* 55a, which mixes up Messenian Pylos with the Thermopylae.

8 For a case in point, see the annotation on the adverb ἀπαρτί “just the contrary” in *schol. Ar. Plut.* 388a. This mirrors the Byzantine Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων (α 1637 Cunningham), which distinguishes ἀπαρτί “exactly” (~ ἀπηρτισμένως) and ἀπαρτί (or ἀπαρτι) “just the contrary” (~ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου), the ultimate source probably being Didymus' Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων (cf. *schol. Ar. Plut.* 388b where a third meaning “just now” is added; Montana 2020: 66f.). However, of the five illustrative passages adduced in the Συναγωγή (Hdt. 2.158.4, Pherecrates fr. 98 and fr. 77 K.-A., Pl. Com. fr. 59 K.-A., Teleclides fr. 39 K.-A.), only two also show up in the scholion, in a strongly abbreviated form, and one of these is the Herodotus passage in which, according to the Συναγωγή, ἀπαρτί does *not* have the meaning seen in *Plut.* 388. For a more detailed presentation, and fuller illustration, of the many problems arising by scholiasts working superficially, see Roemer 1902 (who stresses, above all, the lower quality of ms. R in comparison with ms. V).

ideas on comic intertextuality, or allusivity,⁹ while leaving aside the vast quantity of secondary texts adduced by the scholia for the purpose of linguistic¹⁰ and factual explanation.¹¹ As we shall see instantly, even in the area of intertextuality itself different “layers” are to be distinguished, as some pertinent annotations appear to be aimed at less advanced readers of comedy, whereas others undoubtedly respond to, and originate from, more scholarly lines of enquiry. The latter ostensibly hark back to the above-mentioned large body of Alexandrian scholarship on comedy, but it would be unwise to equate the “layering” too readily with changes in the ways Aristophanes was read: Symmachus and his contemporaries in the Roman imperial age could be just as critically sophisticated as Callistratus or Aristarchus had been, and the very fact that the scholia do preserve some of the Alexandrian material, though sifted by Didymus and Symmachus, proves that even in late antiquity, when Aristophanes was part of the school curriculum, there must have been people who continued to see in these texts more than just a quarry to be used for rhetorical instruction.

2 Homeric intertextuality

That the “intertextual subcorpus” is only the tip of the iceberg when we look at the indirect transmission of texts in the comic scholia as a whole is seen very clearly if we start with Homer. With some 230 references in the *scholia vetera* alone, and with

9 This is not the place to discuss the relative merits of the terms “intertextuality” vs. “allusivity”. Most of the following material is concerned with the textual half of how Miner 1993, 38f., defines “allusion”, namely “a poet’s deliberate incorporation of identifiable elements from other sources, preceding or contemporaneous, textual or extratextual”. Given this textual focus, combined with the fact that in common parlance “allusion” would not normally be taken to include, e.g., quotations, imitations, and parodies, while the potential alternative term “reference” has its own shortcomings vis-à-vis “allusion” (cf. Hinds 1998, 21–25, responding to Thomas 1986), “intertextuality” seemed the most intuitive term, even if its practical restriction to phenomena where an element of auctorial intention is (taken to be) present may be criticized as reductive from a more theoretical point of view.

10 For a list of “scholia in γλωττῶν (λέξεων) ἀπόδοσις in which attesting citations are furnished”, see Rutherford 1905, 374–378.

11 The meagre remains of ancient commentaries or annotations on papyrus do not enrich the picture substantially. In addition to P.Oxy. 35.2737 = *CLGP* Ar. 27, col. I.19–27 (cf. n. 37), see only P.Stras. inv. 621 = *CLGP* Ar. 16 (but *schol.* Ar. *Nub.* 1372ab offer more detail) and P.Flor. 2.112 = *CLGP* Ar. 28, fr. C+D+E, col. I.5–9 (on ἀμφὶ μοι αὐτίς; cf. *schol.* Ar. *Nub.* 595c); the references to Aristophanes’ own *Babylonians* and to Euripides in P.Oxy. 6.856 = *CLGP* Ar. 1, fr. B, ll. 2–5 and 8–9 remain very vague. Most of the material treated by Perrone 2010 is of a different (non-intertextual) nature.

most of these involving a literal quotation, however brief it may be, Homer takes pride of place among the secondary sources cited by the Aristophanic commentators; even cross-references to other passages and plays of Aristophanes himself are slightly less frequent. In view of Homer's central place in the educational canon and curriculum throughout antiquity,¹² this is unsurprising. What may be a little more unexpected, is how many of these Homeric references have a purely linguistic focus and belong to the most elementary layer of the scholia. When starting to read Aristophanes, students would already be familiar with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and so any lexical or grammatical phenomenon that called for comment would preferentially be paralleled from (or on occasion contrasted with) Homer, no matter how common it was in other texts too. As a consequence, many Homeric references are of no more relevance to a deeper understanding of the Aristophanic text than references to LSJ or Kühner–Gerth are in a modern commentary. Furthermore, a similar diagnosis holds for many annotations where Homer is not just a *linguistic* comparandum. In *Acharnians*, for example, it is of course possible to compare the chorus of old men's reminiscing about their past prowess with Nestor's similar attitude in the *Iliad* (*schol. Ar. Ach.* 211, quoting *Il.* 7.133 and 7.157f.), but there is no evident link between the two passages; and when Trygaeus in *Peace* speaks to his dung-beetle as if it were a fiery horse, neither is it pertinent to make reference to, and selectively quote, a Homeric passage describing such a fiery horse when there is no lexical or other clue in the Aristophanic text to establish even just a remote connection (*schol. Ar. Pax* 83c, quoting *Il.* 6.506 and 6.509).

Importantly, the scholia in these cases do not in fact suggest that the Homeric passage is anything more than something that might be worth thinking of. Instances where Homer is presented as an actual intertext are much rarer.¹³ Some of them are unproblematic, like ex. (1) where *Av.* 685 (from the parabasis of *Birds*) is said to

¹² Cf., e.g., Criboire 2001, 179, 194–197, 204–213, 225f.

¹³ The dividing line between these two possibilities is often blurred in scholia that adduce textual comparanda: cf. Nünlist 2009, 231, and see, e.g., *schol. Ar. Nub.* 223d and *schol. Ar. Nub.* 299b, whose formulation suggests, but does not affirm, that Aristophanes is to be thought of as imitating Pindar (Pind. fr. 157 and fr. 76 Sn.–M.). To be on the safe side, the following pages concentrate on unambiguous cases, but the exact extent of any intertextual comparison often remains ill-defined even then (cf., e.g., *schol. Ar. Eq.* 498e with Soph. fr. *496 R.; *schol. Ar. Lys.* 706a with Eur. fr. 699 K.; *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 215 (cf. Austin/Olson 2004, 125, “whether [Aristophanes] borrowed [sc. from Cratinus’ *Idaeans*, fr. 90 K.–A.] whole lines or parts of lines or (more likely) simply took over the idea of a scene in which a male character is shaved, depilated, and dressed like a woman is impossible to say”); *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 855/857 and *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 912 hinting at Eur. *Hel.* 1–3, 16–27, 566; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 471a (= ex. (11)).

allude to a Homeric passage.¹⁴ Equally unproblematic, but more interesting is ex. (2), a scholion on *Av.* 575, where the Aristophanic text itself references Homer (Ἴριον δέ γ' Ὀμηρος ἔφασκ' ἰκέλην εἶναι τρήρωνι πελείη “Homer said that Iris is similar to a timid pigeon”). Since a pertinent Homeric description of Iris — as opposed to Athene and Hera — is not found in the Homeric epics, ancient commentators appear to have debated two possibilities: either (a), that the Aristophanic reference might be deliberately misleading, aiming at a humoristic effect,¹⁵ or (b), that “Homer” here did not mean the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* but the author of the Homeric hymns (where there is a relevant mention of Iris, at *h.Hom. Ap.* 114, although the scholion fails to spell this out):¹⁶

(1) *schol. Ar. Av.* 685i: φύλλων γενεᾶ REΓ προσόμοιοι ΕΓ: ὡς θεοὶ ἐσόμενοι προευτελίζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. RVEΓMLh παρὰ τὸ ὀμηρικὸν “οἷη περ φύλλων γενεῆ, RVEΓM τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν” [= *Il.* 6.146]. RVEΓ

“*Similar to a generation of leaves:* About to become gods, they belittle mankind. <The expression is created> after the Homeric ‘as is a generation of leaves, so too is one of men’.”

(2) *schol. Ar. Av.* 575a: Ἴριον δέ γ' RΓ Ὀμηρος RVT: ὅτι ψεύδεται παίζων. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἴριδος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Ἥρας: RVM₉ΓMLh “αἱ δὲ βᾶτην τρήρωσι RVTMLh πελειάσιν ἴθμαθ' ὁμοῖαι” [= *Il.* 5.778]. RVT²MLh οἱ δὲ ἐν ἐτέροις ποιήμασιν Ὀμήρου φασι τοῦτο φέρεσθαι. εἰσὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὕμνοι. VTLh

“*But Homer — Iris:* <To note> that he is jokingly lying; for <the relevant passage> is not about Iris, but about Athene and Hera: ‘And they went off, similar in their movements to timid pigeons’. But others say that this <phrase> is used in other poems of Homer; for there are also hymns composed by him.”

While both (a) and (b) seem legitimate approaches in this case, they illustrate two different attitudes towards intertextuality we also come across elsewhere. In one, which is here exemplified by (b) and which is hugely dominant in the Aristophanic

¹⁴ Surprisingly, there are no scholia listing Homeric (or other epic) parallels for *Pax* 1273 f., 1276, 1281–1284; see only *schol. Ar. Pax* 1270b (referencing *Epigoni*, [Antimachus Teius] fr. 1 Bernabé) and later *scholl. Ar. Pax* 1298ab and 1301 (referencing Archilochus fr. 5 West).

¹⁵ Cf. *schol. Ar. Pax* 1090, where a humorous (ἀστεῖως) Homeric medley (παρέπλεξε) is correctly identified (sc. for *Pax* 1090–1094), even if no *exempli gratia* source passages are quoted. A deliberate (but poor: κακῶς παίζει) humorous “mistake” also seems to be implied in *schol. Ar. Av.* 609 (with Hes. fr. 304.1 M.–W.).

¹⁶ Throughout the text, scholia are numbered and quoted after the authoritative edition by Koster *et al.* 1960–2007; in a few cases, however, the artificially analytic presentation adopted (*inter alios*) by Holwerda 1977 and Chantry 1999 has been reversed (see exx. (16), (22), (23), (26); for decisive criticism of the analytic approach cf. Montana 2017, esp. 195–199).

scholia, the search for the “correct” intertext trumps everything else and the literary dimension of the matter is disregarded. The other, much rarer attitude, here seen with (a), tries harder to understand what is going on when there is intertextuality, however imperfect it may be, and to pin down its place and function in the texture of Aristophanic comedy.

Meanwhile, more problematic, or daring, assumptions of Homeric intertextuality also exist. Were it not for the formulation with *παρὰ τὸ ὀμηρικόν*, where *παρὰ* can hardly mean as little as the modern commentator’s non-committal “cf.”,¹⁷ one would hesitate to assume that any ancient commentator could have thought that Aristophanes had a specific Homeric passage in mind¹⁸ when he composed *Av.* 400–402 where the bird chorus are calming down a little after their initial hostile reaction to the intruders Peisetaerus and Euelpides (ἀναγ’ εἰς τάξιν πάλιν εἰς ταῦτόν / καὶ τὸν θυμὸν κατὰθου κύψας / παρὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ὥσπερ ὀπλίτης “get back into formation together, bend forward and put down your temper by your anger, like a hoplite”) (cf. ex. (3)); or that the conventional phrasing of a *da quia dedi* request by means of a conditional clause (“if I have ever given you X, do now Y”) in the chorus’s prayer-like address to Hermes at *Pax* 385–388 (εἶ τι κεχαρισμένον χοιρίδιον οἶσθα παρ’ ἐμοῦ γε κατεδηδοκῶς “if you are conscious that you ever got from me some pleasant piglet to eat”) should be directly related to an — albeit famous — instance of the same prayer structure in the first book of the *Iliad* (ex. (4)):

(3) *schol. Ar. Av.* 402a: *παρὰ τὴν ὀργὴν RV*: *παρὰ τὸ ὀμηρικόν* “ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι, *RVMLh παρὰ δ’ ἔγχεα RVLh μακρὰ πέπηγεν* [= *Il.* 3.135]. *Lh οἶον* “ὄπλα μὴ ἔχων θυμῷ πολέμει μόνον”. *RVMLh*

“By your anger: After the Homeric ‘leaning against their shields, and next to them the long spears are stuck in the ground’. As if <they were saying>, ‘having no weapons, fight only with your temper.’”

17 Where something like “cf.” is actually meant, *ὡς (τό) or οἶον (τό)* would be a standard way of expression (cf. Nünlist 2009, 11). For two further examples of exaggerated *παρὰ τὸ ὀμηρικόν*, see *schol. Ar. Nub.* 585e (the sun is topically said to threaten not to shine, but the scholion sees a specific allusion to *Od.* 12.383) and *schol. Ar. Ran.* 18 (associating the motif of *Ran.* 17f., where Dionysus says *ὅταν τι τούτων τῶν σοφισμάτων ἴδω, πλεῖν ἢ ἑνιαυτῷ πρεσβύτερος ἀπέρχομαι* “Each time I see one of these tricks, I go home more than a year older”, with verses about premature aging through hardship as well as harsh old age at *Od.* 19.360 and *Od.* 15.357). Without *παρὰ*, it is less clear that a direct dependence must be meant: cf., e.g., *schol. Ar. Pax* 758a *ὀν φώκης ὀσμὴν* “the stench of a seal” ~ *Od.* 4.442. *Ὄν παρὰ* and *ἐκ*, which come to be used interchangeably in the scholia (cf., e.g., *schol. Ar. Av.* 275a with a modified quotation of *Soph. fr.* 654 R. presented with simple *ἐκ* rather than *παρὰ*), see also Roemer 1908, 248–253, Rau 1967, 8f.

18 And one that is moreover rather less comparable than *Il.* 22.111–113, which Dunbar 1995, 290, highlights (without detecting a direct allusion).

(4) *schol. Ar. Pax* 386: εἴ τι κεχαρισμένον: παρὰ τὸ ὁμηρικὸν “εἴ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ’ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρειψα” [= *Il.* 1.39]. Γ

“*If some pleasant*: After the Homeric ‘If I have ever built for you a delightful temple.’”

One may suspect that the point of Homeric references like these is not so much to posit a real intertextual connection as to display the teacher/annotator’s, or enhance the student’s, familiarity with Homer’s works: pointing to Homer has become an instinctive reflex for the ancient instructor.¹⁹

3 Intertextual (over)specificity

At the same time, ex. (4) puts on display another tendency that is observed elsewhere in the scholia too. If we question the Homeric intertextuality here, it is not because we deny the parodistic dimension of the chorus’s words to Hermes. We simply prefer to think of a stylistic parody rather than intertextuality in a narrower sense. The Aristophanic scholia, on the other hand, are often reluctant to content themselves with a mere diagnosis of stylistic parody; they tend to prefer the identification of concrete sources. It is true that there are scholia, like ex. (5),²⁰ where an Aristophanic verse or phrase is said to be taken “from tragedy”, without further specification, and it is likely that this is not just the result of some tragic author’s name having been cut out in the epitomization process. Even then, however, the (perfectly reasonable)²¹ implication seems to be that a parody was recognized but no specific source text could be discovered *even though* there must have been one.

¹⁹ Rutherford 1905, 378, observes that “[q]uotation from Homer is carried to a ridiculous extent by the commentator to the *Acharnians* who quotes him for every kind of purpose”, and it is true that the scholia on *Acharnians* are particularly full of Homeric references. However, numerous equally insubstantial items also occur in the scholia on other plays (esp. *Knights*, *Clouds*, *Wasps*, *Peace*). Annotations such as *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 544b, *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 606a, and *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 696b prove that some Homeric bias already existed in the earliest phases of Aristophanic scholarship.

²⁰ And similarly *schol. Ar. Eccl.* 110, but the *Ecclesiazusae* scholia are generally less substantial than those on *Acharnians*. In *schol. Ar. Eq.* 221a (τοῦτο δὲ παρῶδησεν ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας), it is unclear what is taken to be parodic in *Eq.* 221 (ἀλλὰ στεφανοῦ καὶ σπένδε τῷ Κοαλέμῳ “but take a wreath and libate to Coalemus”).

²¹ Compare the insertion of both *Ar. Ach.* 33 and *Ar. Eccl.* 110 (cf. n. 20 above) among the *fragmenta tragica adespota* (fr. 41 K.–S. for *Ach.* 33, fr. 51 K.–S. for *Eccl.* 110). Modern scholars proceed in a similar way: see, e.g., *trag. adesp.* fr. *45 K.–S. = *Ar. Ach.* 1184f. (with the cautionary note “potius e locis tragicis compositum qu[am] totum e tragoedia quadam sumptum”, referencing Fraenkel 1962, 39f., and Rau 1967, 140f.; the Aristophanic scholia have nothing to say here).

By contrast, at least where (para)tragedy is concerned²² it is exceptional that a scholion, like ex. (6),²³ openly commits itself to something being “just” style parody, not parodic interaction with a precise model:

(5) *schol. Ar. Ach.* 33: ὁ στίχος ἐκ τραγωδίας. ELh

“The line is from tragedy.”

(6) *schol. Ar. Plut.* 639c: ὁ νοῦς πέπαικται εἰς τραγωδίαν· ὁ γὰρ χαρακτήρ τραγικός, ὡς καὶ ἐν “Ορέστη”· “ἀναβοᾶσομαι πατρὶ Ταντάλω” [~ *Eur. Or.* 984f.]. VEΘBarbRs(Ald)

“The sense is a joke on tragedy; for the style is tragic, as in the *Orestes*: ‘I will shout out to my forefather Tantalus’.”

One consequence of this aiming for intertextual specificity is the need sometimes to accept fairly vague similarities as indicative evidence. In ex. (7), which detects something Sophoclean in Strepsiades’ triumphant lyric praise of his son as πρόβoλος ἑμός, σωτήρ δόμοις, ἐχθροῖς βλάβη, / λυσανίας πατρῶων μεγάλων κακῶν “my shield, saviour to the house, harm to the enemy, undoer of sorrows for fatherly great evils” (*Nub.* 1161 f.), the wording is cautious enough to underline that the only

²² For (para)dithyramb the situation may have been slightly different (cf. *schol. Ar. Nub.* 595c, *schol. Ar. Pax* 831abc, Symmachus *ap. schol. Ar. Av.* 1379ab; also *schol. Ar. Eq.* 1323 on the λυρικοί, although a specific allusion to Pindar could be assumed: see *schol. Ar. Eq.* 1329b = Pind. fr. 6 Sn.–M.). This could be because already the ancient commentators had less access to a well-defined dithyrambic corpus. However, we still see the desire to point to specific dithyrambic authors rather than just the genre as such in *schol. Ar. Nub.* 335c(α) (ταῦτα εἰς Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιόν· ENM τὸ γὰρ “στρεπταίγλαν” αὐτὸς εἶπεν. EN ἐπεὶ οὖν συνθέτοις καὶ πολυπλόκοις οἱ διθυραμβοποιοὶ χρῶνται λέξεσιν, κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων ζῆλον καὶ αὐτὸς τοιαύταις χρῆται· χρῆται δ’ οὖν ἀντικρυς τό<πων> ἐξεστραμμέναις. VEN “This is aiming at Philoxenus the dithyrambic poet; for he coined the word “twist-gleaming”. Because the dithyrambic poets use compound and convoluted expressions, he also uses such expressions here, in accordance with their obsession; but he uses them completely changed out of context”) and *schol. Ar. Av.* 930b (ἐμὴν τεῖν EF: χλευάζει τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν τὸν συνεχῆ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δωρισμόν, καὶ μάλιστα τὸν Πίνδαρον συνεχῶς λέγοντα ἐν ταῖς αἰτήσεσι τὸ “ἐμὴν”. RVEFMLh “To me, to you: He is making fun of the dithyrambists’ constant use of Doric in such phrases, and above all of Pindar who constantly says ἐμὴν in his requests”).

²³ Cf. also *schol. Ar. Ach.* 1190b (θρηνῶν παρατραγωδεῖ “in his lament he is paratragic”, about Lamachus), *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1484 (παρατραγουκεῖται, about Philocleon); Roemer 1908, 254 f., Rau 1967, 15, Nünlist 2009, 218. In *schol. Ar. Plut.* 39ab ἔλακεν is identified as a tragic lexeme (cf. *schol. Eur. Or.* 162 Dindorf), but at the same time (unnecessarily) taken to mock Euripides in particular (cf. Roemer 1908, 271 f.). The original point of *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 39, by contrast, may well have been merely that λαός is a tragic form or word, not that εὐφημος πᾶς ἔστω λαός “let the entire people be silent” was borrowed wholesale from tragedy (cf. παρὰ τοῖς τραγικοῖς οὕτω λέγεται “it is said like this among the tragedians”).

actual *tertium comparationis* between Aristophanes' lines and the quotation from Sophocles is the lexical parallelism between λυσανίας and παυσανίας. Yet, a similar reticence is not seen when, for example, a reference to “(the hide of [Argos]) the all-seer (πανόπτης)” in *Eccl.* 80 is turned into a specific allusion to Argus in Sophocles' satyr-play *Inachus*, as if the myth of Argus keeping guard over Io was to be found only there (ex. (8));²⁴ or when something in Philocleon's lament at *Vesp.* 752–754 μή μοι τούτων μηδὲν ὑπισχνού. / κείνων ἔραμαι, κείθι γενοίμαν, / ἴν' ὁ κῆρῦξ φησι· “τίς ἀψήφιστος; ἀνιστάσθω” (“Don't promise me any of these things! I love yonder things, may I be yonder, where the herald says ‘Who has not voted? Stand up!’”) is said to be “from Euripides' *Hippolytus*” (ex. (9)): that a precise comparandum is not then quoted need not mean that none was ever given in the commentary tradition, but its omission is in any case revealing as there is nothing in the *Hippolytus* that would really substantiate the claim.²⁵

(7) *schol.* Ar. *Nub.* 1163d πρὸς τὴν ὀνοματοποιίαν. τὸν Σοφοκλῆν χαρακτηρίζει λέγοντα “ἴζεῦ ἄνοστος ἄγοιτο νικομάχαν καὶ παυσανίαν καὶ ἀτρίδαν†” [= Soph. fr. 887 R., with Ζεὺς νόστον ἄγοι τὸν κτλ.]. E

“About the word coinage: He introduces a note *à la* Sophocles, who says ‘Zeus, may he carry off without return, the battle-winning, sorrow-ending and Atrid†’ [possibly ‘May Zeus bring battle-winning, sorrow-ending, Atrid return’ *vel sim.*].”

24 That a single anchoring point is not necessarily required when the Aristophanic text merely contains such a general reference was however acknowledged by Apollonius in his explanation of the phrase Κρητικὰς μονωδίας at *Ran.* 849. In response to those who held that Aristophanes must here have had in mind a monody of Icarus in Euripides' *Κρήτες*, Apollonius stressed that one may “also” (καὶ) think of the song of Aerope in the *Κρήσσαι* (see *schol.* Ar. *Ran.* 849ab; cf. the discussion in *schol.* Ar. *Ran.* 850ab on the Euripidean referent for the mention of γάμοι ἄνοσοι in the following line).

25 Eur. *Alc.* 866 f. κείνων ἔραμαι, κείν' ἐπιθυμῶ κτλ. may be compared with κείνων ἔραμαι, κείθι γενοίμαν, but the lemma of the scholion is not κείνων ἔραμαι; Eur. *Hipp.* 215–222 (with εἶμι πρὸς ὕλαν [...] ἴνα [...] ἔραμαι) and Eur. *Hipp.* 230 (with εἶθε γενοίμαν) are even less pertinent (*pace* Rau 1967, 153). Given the lemma, Koster 1978, 120, thinks of Eur. *Hipp.* 503, which he reads as μή μοί γε πρὸς θεῶν (instead of καὶ μή γε πρὸς θεῶν, as transmitted); however, even if this were correct, it would only illustrate further how tenuous the connection was. An additional problem, of course, is that there cannot be certainty that the scholiastic note does not ultimately go back to a reference to Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (Ἰππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος). Similar questions arise, *mutatis mutandis*, with *schol.* Ar. *Ran.* 1309f., which names Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* as one source for an Aristophanic passage that bears no similarity to anything in that play (cf. Eur. fr. 856 K. with Kannicht 2004, 2.890); a mix-up with *Iphigenia among the Taurians* is conceivable (thus, e.g., Dindorf 1838a, 142f., pointing to Eur. *IT* 1089 f. since this could pass off as a remote parallel), but wrong attributions are a much wider issue (cf. Section 1 with n. 6).

(8) *schol. Ar. Eccl.* 80a: <τοῦ> Πανόπτου Γ: τοῦ τὴν Ἴω φυλάττοντος, αἰνίττεται δὲ ὡς ὄντος αὐτοῦ δεσμοφύλακος, ἀναφέρει δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν παρὰ ΓΛ τῷ Λ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν “Ἰνάχῳ” Ἄργον. ΓΛ

“Of the all-seer: <i.e.> of the one who guards Io; he alludes to him as a prison guard. He relates this man [sc. Lamius] to Argus in Sophocles’ *Inachus*.”

(9) *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 750: μή μοι τούτων: ἐξ “Ἰππολύτου” Εὐριπίδου. VT³Lh(Ald)

“Don’t etc.: From the *Hippolytus* of Euripides.”

Further instances of the phenomenon are not too difficult to find.²⁶ In the passage elucidated by ex. (10) Strepsiades reports how he asked Socrates to recite something from Aeschylus while holding a myrtle-branch, as was apparently usual during symposiastic recitations — a valuable piece of information offered by Dicaearchus (fr. 89 Wehrli = fr. 90 Mirhady) and quoted in one helpful scholion on the passage (*schol. Ar. Nub.* 1364c); but why another scholion then thinks that “holding a myrtle-branch” must allude to an Aeschylean phrase “since there are meadow flowers there” remains obscure.²⁷ And when we are informed in ex. (11) that the monstrous

²⁶ In addition to the illustrations in the main text, both above and in the discussion of Homer (Section 2, with exx. (3) and (4) as well as n. 17), see also, e.g., *schol. Ar. Eq.* 1290ab (comparing Eur. *Hipp.* 375f.); *schol. Ar. Nub.* 138 (Strepsiades’ τηλοῦ γὰρ οἰκῶ τῶν ἀγρῶν “for I dwell far away in the countryside” may well be parodic in style, but is the phrase sufficient to evoke Eur. fr. 696.13 K. τηλοῦ γὰρ οἰκῶν βίοτον ἐξιδρυσάμην “dwelling far away I built myself a life”?); *schol. Ar. Nub.* 603 (a generic hymnic invocation of Dionysus dancing with the Bacchae on the Parnassus, anachronistically thought to be echoing the prologue of Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* [fr. 752 K.]; on such anachronism see further Section 4 and cf. also *schol. Ar. Nub.* 543b, *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1025b); *schol. Ar. Av.* 1301b (Simonides fr. 597 PMG = 307 Poltera was clearly not the only lyric composition mentioning a swallow; cf. the other references in Dunbar 1995, 644, and contrast *schol. Ar. Av.* 1302a pointing to both Stesichorus and Ibycus); *schol. Ar. Lys.* 963 (hardly a specific reminiscence of Eur. fr. 116 K., *pace* Kannicht 2004, 240; cf. Rau 1967, 200, Henderson 1987, 183); *schol. Ar. Lys.* 1257a (as the other passages mentioned by the scholion itself demonstrate [Soph. fr. 687a R., Aesch. fr. 372 R.], foam at the mouth was a common enough motif, making a specific allusion to Archilochus fr. 44 West doubtful); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1320a (only the word οἰνάνθα “wine-flower” is matched in the quoted verse from Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* [Eur. fr. 765 K.]; cf. Rau 1967, 130); *schol. Ar. Plut.* 203b (as the Aristophanic context suggests, the cowardice of rich people was proverbial, so that no direct reference to Eur. *Phoen.* 597 must be sought; cf. Rau 1967, 207). By contrast, in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 105 the Euripidean line cited (Eur. fr. *144 K.) is a plausible enough parodic model for Dionysus’ words; only its ascription to the *Andromache* is wrong (cf. n. 6) and at best the result of erroneous epitomization of a note that also, somewhat misleadingly, compared Eur. *Andr.* 237 (but a simple mix-up of *Andromeda* and *Andromache* is equally possible; cf. Rau 1967, 119).

²⁷ A bold but utterly speculative attempt to account for the note was made by Holwerda 1968, who postulated that some ancient commentator wanted to explain why Aeschylus’ songs were (allegedly) sung πρὸς μυρρίνην, thought of Aeschylus’ origin from Eleusis with its cult of Demeter, to

punishments the angry doorkeeper of Hades tells Dionysus(-Heracles) to expect in the underworld, including an ἔχιδνα ἑκατογκέφαλος, are shaped after a corresponding passage in Euripides' *Theseus* with Theseus threatening Minos, we would probably pay more heed to this claim than seems to be warranted if we did not at the same time get a notably *dissimilar* quotation of the supposed model lines from the *Theseus* in one of this small series of scholia.²⁸ In other words, for all the reassuring counterexamples where the scholia can still be checked and shown to suggest perfectly reliable connections,²⁹ a certain degree of scepticism always remains appropriate wherever alleged parallels are not, or no longer, spelled out in full in the scholia.

(10) *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1364b μυρρίνην λαβόντα R: παρὰ τὰ Αἰσχύλου “οὐνεκ’ ἐκεῖ ἄνθεα λειμώνια” [= Aesch. fr. 374 R.]. RVEΘN

“*Taking a myrtle-branch:* After the <words> of Aeschylus, ‘Since there are meadow flowers there’.”

(11) *schol. Ar. Ran.* 465aα: ἴτο γὰρ “Στυγὸς” [470] ἐπὶ πλησίον εἶπε τούτοις.† ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα ἐν “Θησεῖ” πεποιημένα Εὐριπίδῃ· ἐκεῖ γὰρ τοιοῦτός ἐστι σπουδάζων ὁ Εὐριπίδης οἷος ἐνταῦθα παίζων <Αριστοφάνη>. VEΘBarb(Ald)

“†He said ‘of the Styx’ near to these <words (?)>.† These <words/lines (?)> are composed by Euripides in the *Theseus*: Euripides is being serious there in the same way in which Aristophanes is here joking.”

schol. Ar. Ran. 465b: τοιαῦτα λέ(γει) <Θησεὺς παρ’ Εὐριπίδῃ?> πρὸς τὸν Μίνωα. V
“Theseus in Euripides says such things to Minos.”

whom the myrtle was sacred, and then dug out a passage in an Aeschylean play where a pertinent reference to Demeter and Eleusis was made.

28 Cf. Roemer 1908, 255f., Rau 1967, 115–118, Dover 1993, 253f. (“470–8 are not a parody of any particular tragic scene [...] but an accumulation of bombastic and not always entirely coherent tragic motifs and phrases”).

29 See, e.g., ex. (1) from Homer; *schol. Ar. Eq.* 16 (only Εὐριπίδου, but cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 345); *schol. Ar. Eq.* 813a with Eur. *Med.* 168; *schol. Ar. Eq.* 1251a with Eur. *Alc.* 181f.; *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1415 and *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 194 with Eur. *Alc.* 691; *schol. Ar. Av.* 711a with Hes. *Op.* 45 and 629; *schol. Ar. Lys.* 155a with Eur. *Andr.* 629f.; *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 275/276 (only ἐν “Ἰππολύτῳ” τοῦτο εἶπεν Εὐριπίδης, but cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 612, as cited in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 102a and *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1471); *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 1130 (only παρὰ τὰ ἐκ Μηδείας, but cf. Eur. *Med.* 298); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 303a with Eur. *Or.* 279; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 931 with Eur. *Hipp.* 375; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1126ab with Aesch. *Cho.* 1; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1185ab with Eur. *Phoen.* 17–20, 1595–1614; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1232 and 1233 with Eur. *IT* 1f.; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1276a with Aesch. *Ag.* 104; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1284–5b (only καὶ τοῦτο ἐξ Ἀγαμέμνονος, but cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 108f.); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1289 with Aesch. *Ag.* 111; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1317 (only ἐξ “Ἡλέκτρας” Εὐριπίδου, but cf. Eur. *El.* 435); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1382 (only τοῦτο ἐκ “Μηδείας”, but cf. Eur. *Med.* 1); *schol. Ar. Plut.* 935 with Soph. *El.* 1416.

schol. Ar. Ran. 471a: Ἀχερόντιός τε...] ἐκ “Θησέως” Εὐριπίδου. VEΘBarbV⁵⁷ καὶ τὰ μὲν ἑαυτῷ πλάττων λέγει, τὰ δὲ ἐξ Εὐριπίδου. VEΘBarbV⁵⁷(Ald)

“*And the Acherontian...*: From Euripides’ *Theseus*. Some of this <Aristophanes> says creating it for himself, some is from Euripides.”

schol. Ar. Ran. 473: ἑχιδνα ἑκατογκέφαλος VE: ὁ τόπος οὗτος παρὰ τὰ ἐν “Θησεῖ” Εὐριπίδου· “κάρα τε γάρ σου συγγέω κομαῖς ὁμοῦ, βανῆται τε δ’ ἔγκεφαλον, ὁμάτων δ’ ἄπο αἰμοσταγεῖς πρηστήρες ἴρέουσονται ἵ κάτω” [= Eur. fr. 386c K.]. VEΘBarb(Ald)

“*The hundred-headed snake*: This passage is <modelled> after the <lines> in Euripides’ *Theseus*: ‘I shall confound your head together with its hair, and scatter (?) your brain; blood-dripping spouts will flow down from your eyes.’”

schol. Ar. Ran. 475a Ταρτησία μύραινα R: παρὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ “Θησεῖ” Εὐριπίδου. RVE

“*A Tartessian murry*: After the <passage> in Euripides’ *Theseus*.”

4 Ancient disagreements

Although it seems legitimate to say that the hunt for intertextual connections was carried too far in cases like these, there will always be grey areas where it is more difficult to state with certainty that an allusion was or was not intended. Different interpreters may be more or less confident when forming pertinent judgments. That such matters were also debated in antiquity, if not in the abstract then at least with regard to individual passages, is revealed by incidental remarks here or there.

Someone, for example, did express misgivings about the validity of the link between *Ar. Ran.* 465ff. and Euripides’ *Theseus* (ex. (12)),³⁰ and even the idea that the bird cosmology which starts in *Av.* 693 should be directly connected with “Hesiod or some other genealogist” was questioned by a sceptical mind (ex. (13)). Moreover, when a scholion notes that “some” assume an intertextual relationship, the implication has to be that “others” — often including the present commentator himself — do not (see ex. (14), on a far-fetched para-Hesiodic theory for Carion’s words

³⁰ Roemer 1908, 255f., underlines the use of *μμεῖται* in this scholion, recognizes in it a “Geist echter und wahrer Wissenschaftlichkeit”, and argues that scholia like those assembled in ex. (11) are the work of “[d]ie Späteren [...], die gar nicht mehr in der Lage waren, die Originale nachzusehen und noch viel weniger den terminus *μίμησις* verstanden”. Although there may be some truth in diagnosing diachronic changes in critical attitude (cf. Section 5), one problem with assuming a neat chronological ordering and continuous decline in scientific standards is that ex. (12) already presupposes the less reticent attitude which allegedly characterizes only later scholarship.

at *Plut.* 253 ὧ πολλὰ δὴ τῷ δεσπότη ταῦτόν θύμον φαγόντες “You who have often eaten the same thyme as my master”):³¹

(12) *schol. Ar. Ran.* 465c (following *schol. Ar. Ran.* 465aβ, which matches *schol. Ar. Ran.* 465aa quoted above in (11)): διστάσαι ἄν τις μὴ ἄρα ταῦτα μιμεῖται Ἀριστοφάνης. V

“One might disagree on whether Aristophanes is imitating this [sc. the passage from Euripides’ *Theseus*].”

(13) *schol. Ar. Av.* 693aa: Χάος ἦν καὶ Νύξ ΕΓ: ταῦτα οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀπευθύνεν πρὸς τὰ Ἡσιόδου ἢ πρὸς τινὰ ἄλλου τινὸς γενεαλόγου. VΕΓΜ

“*Chaos existed and Night*: It is not necessary to relate this to the <poetry> of Hesiod or some <work> of another genealogist.”

(14) *schol. Ar. Plut.* 253b: τινὲς φασιν ὅτι παρῶδῃται ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου· “οὐδ’ ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλω μέγ’ ὄνειαρ” [= Hes. *Op.* 41]. RMEΘBarb(Ald)

“Some say this is a parody on Hesiod’s ‘Nor how much of a great benefit is to be found in mallow and asphodel.’”

Only very exceptionally do we come across a justification for a reservation or rejection of this kind. In ex. (15), for instance, it is likely that Symmachus offered his own explanation of the description of a running messenger in *Birds* as Ἀλφειὸν πνέων because he felt that a far-fetched intertextual hypothesis by Didymus (fr. 242 C.–Pr.) did not hold water, given the formal and semantic distance between the alleged model and the Aristophanic copy; but this is not spelled out in the scholion as we have it, and maybe it never was.³² In ex. (16), by contrast, an explicit case is made, this time perhaps by Didymus himself:³³

³¹ See further *schol. Ar. Av.* 1410b, although at least the first reference, to Alcaeus fr. 345 L.–P., looks quite unassailable there (unlike the second, to Simonides fr. 597 *PMG* = 307 Poltera; cf. Dunbar 1995, 675, and note that examples like this, *schol. Ar. Pax* 1325 with Hes. *Op.* 235, or exx. (13) and (14) in the main text show that epic and lyric echoes were suspected no less readily than tragic ones); *schol. Ar. Pax* 741c (on the question whether Cratinus was here a target of criticism as much as Eupolis); *schol. Ar. Pax* 531b (the idea of “some” that a specific song from Sophocles’ *Inachus* [Soph. fr. 278 R.] was hinted at by the reference to Σοφοκλέους μέλη in *Pax* 531 is qualified as περιέργως “strained”); cf. also *schol. Ar. Av.* 842a (“perhaps” (μήποτε) a parodic reference to Euripides’ *Palamedes* [Eur. fr. 589 K.]).

³² On *schol. Ar. Av.* 1121a = (15), cf. now Benuzzi 2020, 59.

³³ A possible, if notoriously insecure, indicator of this is the use of μήποτε as a qualifier: see Boudreaux 1919, 110f., after Schneider 1838, 112 n. 2, Schmidt 1854, 212, and others (but already Schneider 1838, 111f. also vindicated this for Symmachus).

(15) *schol. Ar. Av.* 1121a: ἀλλ' οὐτοσί VEG τρέχει E: Σύμμαχος· οὔτος οὔτω συντόνως τρέχει ὡσεὶ ὀλυμπιακὸς σταδιοδρόμος. VEGlh ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος· παρὰ τὸ Πινδάρου “ἀμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ” [= Pind. *Nem.* 1.1]. διχῶς δὲ τινες “Ἀλφειον πνέων”. VEGMLh

“*But this one is running*: Symmachus <explains>: This one is running with such intensity as if he were an Olympic runner. Didymus, on the other hand, <says>: <Modelled> after Pindar’s <phrase> ‘revered resting-place of Alpheios’. However, some write differently, ‘breathing Ἀλφειος [sc. with proparoxytone accent]’.”

(16) *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1082a + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1082b (on Aeschylus criticizing Euripides for staging women who claim that living is not living): καὶ φασκούσας οὐ ζῆν RVME τὸ ζῆν M: ἔστι μὲν παρὰ τὰ ἐκ “Φρίξου” Εὐριπίδου· RVEΘBarb(Ald) “τίς δ’ οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἔστι κατθανεῖν, τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν” [= Eur. fr. 638 K.; cf. Eur. fr. 833 K.]. RVMEΘBarb(Ald)

ἀλλ’ ὁ λέγων ἔστι Φρίξος, οὔτος δὲ ὡς παρὰ γυναικὸς εἰρημένον αὐτὸ λέγει. RVEΘBarb(Ald) ἰδεῖν οὖν χρὴ μήποτε τὸν αὐτὸν νοῦν παρ’ Εὐριπίδη γυνὴ λέγει, καὶ μήποτε τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς τροφῆς ἐν “Ἰππολύτῳ” λεγόμενον· “ἀλλ’ ὅ τι τούτου (lege τοῦ ζῆν) φίλτερον ἄλλο VEGBarb(Ald) σκότος ἀμπίσχον κρύπτει νεφέλαις” [= Eur. *Hipp.* 191f.] (Ald) καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. VEGBarb(Ald)

“*And claiming that living is not living*: This refers to the passage from Euripides’ *Phrixus*: ‘But who knows if living is dying, and dying living?’.”

However, the speaker is Phrixus, while this one [sc. Aeschylus] mentions it as something said by a woman. One must therefore see if some woman in Euripides does not perhaps make the same point, and perhaps <think of> the statement of the nurse in the *Hippolytus*: ‘But everything else that is dearer than this [sc. to live], darkness surrounds it and hides it with clouds’, etc.”

While the argument in ex. (16) pays due attention to context but is conceded to be tenuous in view of the good match between the initially proposed intertext from Euripides’ *Phrixus* and the Aristophanic line (cf. the double μήποτε),³⁴ in two other instances more confidence is displayed, and understandably so (exx. (17) and (18)). The core of these two sets of annotations is again likely to go back to Didymus, for

³⁴ The lines quoted by the scholion (and with κάτω νομίζεται added at the end also by S.E. *Pyrrh.* 3.229) are in fact attributed in *schol. Eur. Hipp.* 192 to Euripides’ *Polyidus* [= Eur. fr. 638 K.], and the *Phrixus* passage, though conceptually close, is reproduced somewhat differently in Stob. 4.52b.38 [= Eur. fr. 833 K.]. We do not know who the speaker was in the *Polyidus*. In principle it is imaginable that the original annotation from which *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1082a derives mentioned both the *Polyidus* and the *Phrixus*, with one passage then being cut out and the other misattributed in the process; once that had happened, it would have made sense to change the name Πολύιδος into Φρίξος in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1082b (with the gist of the argument staying the same). This is unprovable, of course, but a similar process of careless epitomization led to the erroneous attribution of the same Euripidean lines to the *Hippolytus* in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1477b (contrasting with *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1477a, which again names *Phrixus*; for a similar issue, see also n. 26 on *schol. Ar. Ran.* 105).

Didymus is known to have had an eye for chronological matters — *and* he never shied back from criticizing his predecessors:³⁵

(17) *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1326b: ἄνεχε, πάρεχε: μετὰ λαμπάδων ἔρχεται καὶ μετὰ αὐλητρίδος ἀποσπάσας αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου. ὁ δὲ νοῦς παρὰ τὴν ἐν “Τρωάσι” Κασάνδραν “ἄνεχε, πάρεχε, φῶς φέρω, σέβω, φλέγω” [= *Eur. Tro.* 308]. τοῦτο πάντες ὁμοίως ὑστερεῖ δὲ ἡ τῶν “Τρωάδων” κάθεισις ἔτεσιν ζ’. VI(Ald)

“*Stop! Make way!*: He [sc. Philocleon] is coming with torches and a flute-girl, whom he has dragged out of the symposium. The sense is after Cassandra in [Euripides’] *Trojan Women*: ‘Stop! Make way! I am bringing a light, worshipping, kindling...’ All <the commentators> write this; but the staging of the *Trojan Women* took place only seven years later.”

(18) *schol. Ar. Av.* 348b (on δοῦναι ῥύγχει φορβάν “to give food to the beak”): παρὰ τὸ Εὐριπίδου ἐξ “Ἀνδρομέδας” “ἐκθεῖναι κήτεϊ φορβάν” [= *Eur. fr.* 115a K.], ὡς Ἀσκληπιάδης τὰ μηδέπω διδαχθείσης VM₉Γ³ τῆς τραγωδίας παρατιθέμενος: ὡς καὶ τὸ “σὰ γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα καὶ τὸ τῆδε καὶ τὸ κείσε” [= *Ar. Av.* 423f.] παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν μηδέπω διδαχθεισῶν “Φοινισσῶν” φησὶν “καὶ ἐκείσε καὶ δεῦρο, μὴ δόλος τις ἦ” [= *Eur. Phoen.* 266]. καὶ ὄλως πολὺ παρὰ πᾶσι τὸ τοιοῦτον. VI³

“<Modelled> after the <phrase> from Euripides’ *Andromeda*, ‘to expose [her] as food for the sea-monster’, according to Asclepiades, who <thus> compares what is in a tragedy that had not been staged yet; just as he claims that ‘all this is yours, both what is here and what is there’ is <modelled> after the <phrase> in the *Phoenician Women* that had not yet been staged, ‘both there and here, lest there be trickery’. In fact, this sort of thing commonly happens in all <the commentators>.”

schol. Ar. Av. 424: τὸ τῆδε καὶ τὸ κείσε VI τε Γ: τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν μηδέπω διδαχθεισῶν “Φοινισσῶν” φησι VM₉ΓM “κάκεισε καὶ τὸ δεῦρο, VM₉Γ μὴ δόλος τις ἦ” [= *Eur. Phoen.* 266]. V καὶ ὄλως παρὰ πᾶσι τὸ τοιοῦτον. VM₉Γ

“*Both what is here and what is there*: He [sc. Asclepiades] says that this is from the *Phoenician Women* that had not yet been staged, ‘both there and here, lest there be trickery’. In fact, this sort of thing happens in all <the commentators>.”

³⁵ Cf. also *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1206abc, which suggests that Aristarchus had cast doubt on an earlier ascription of *Ran.* 1206–1208 to the prologue of Euripides’ *Archelaus*, but qualified this by allowing for the possibility that Euripides himself might have changed the text at some point, while Aristophanes was still quoting the first version here (cf. n. 54 below for a similar theory of Aristarchus; Muzzolon 2005, 102). The more categorical formulation of the rejection in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1206b (ὡς τινες ψευδῶς φασιν: οὐ γὰρ φέρεται νῦν Εὐριπίδου λόγος οὐδεὶς τοιοῦτος “as some say untruthfully, for no such passage of Euripides is transmitted today”) may well be Didymus’ way of putting things since it is usually assumed, in the wake of Schmidt 1854, 291–296, that most or all named references to pre-Didymean scholars of Aristophanes ultimately go back to Didymus (cf. also Boudreaux 1919, 107).

Despite the strength of the objection in these latter two cases, it is indicative of ancient scholarly conservatism or inertia that the intertextual claims nevertheless survived into the scholia: Didymus' (?) point was taken, as it were, but not acted upon.³⁶

However, disagreement about intertextual relationships did not always surface as a yes-or-no issue. Especially, but not only, when the Aristophanic text more or less overtly intimated the existence of some intertext, the search for it could lead to divergent results.³⁷ For example, towards the end of the scene in *Acharnians*

36 For (17) one might perhaps argue that the formulation ὁ δὲ νοῦς παρὰ τὴν ἐν Τρωάσει Κασάνδραν is vague enough to allow a reading which sees in the *Troades* line merely a semantic parallel; but *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1326a, which bluntly states ἐκ “Τρωάδων” Εὐριπίδου, proves that this is not how things were understood. Note that the same reference to Eur. *Tro.* 308 in *schol. Ar. Av.* 1720c is not anachronistic (though again overly specific).

37 Compare already ex. (2) above (*schol. Ar. Av.* 575a), and see further also *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1239 (on the attribution of a quoted scholion line to Alcaeus, Sappho, or Praxilla), *schol. Ar. Pax* 741bce (on Aristophanes' dismissal of “chewing and hungry Heracleses” as carping at Eupolis, Cratinus, or simply a topical motif [ἐπεπόλασε ταῦτα; cf. *schol. Ar. Ran.* 63b]), *schol. Ar. Plut.* 312bc (the chorus' intention to hang up Circe/Carion “by the balls, imitating the son of Laertes” is alternatively related to *Od.* 12.432–437 and *Od.* 22.192f.), as well as P.Oxy. 35.2737 = *CLGP Ar.* 27, col. 1.19–27 (recording a disagreement between Euphronius, Aristarchus, the “author of the παραπλοκή”, and the present commentator [Didymus?]) over the direct or indirect source(s) of a phrase from some parabolic ode; for detail see F. Montana in Esposito/Montana 2012, 169–173). By contrast, the situation may be different with *schol. Ar. Ran.* 704ab, according to which Didymus (fr. 264 C.–Pr.) saw in τὴν πόλιν καὶ ταῦτ' ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις “keeping, moreover, the city in the embrace of the waves” a borrowing from or allusion to Aeschylus (παρὰ τὸ Αἰσχύλου; cf. Aesch. fr. dub. 462 R.), when “in reality” (ὄντως) the line echoes Archilochus (fr. 213 West). Whether or not Didymus himself actually wrote Αἰσχύλου, a slip of the pen is possible here (so that one need not even think of Aesch. *Cho.* 587 πόντια τ' ἀγκάλαις with Fritzsche 1845, 268, and West 1971, 82; cf. also Roemer 1908, 267; Benuzzi 2020, 59). Similar slips occur elsewhere: see *schol. Ar. Ach.* 332a (with κατὰ τὸν τραγωδοποιὸν Αἰσχύλον, where either no personal name or Euripides' name is required); *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1292 (where οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοφάνη almost certainly has to be emended into οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη; Aristotle does speak of animals such as snails and shellfish as ὀστρακόδεσμα “shell-skinned” at *HA* 523b9; cf. also Chantry 1999, 26, on *schol. Ar. Ran.* 141b with ἐπὶ Ἰαριστοφάνουσι for ἐπὶ Ἀριστοτέλους?); *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1064a vs. *schol. Ar. Plut.* 1002c (πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι “once upon a time the Milesians were strong” must belong to either Anacreon [426 *PMG* = Bernsdorff = 53 G.–P.] or, with Didymus [fr. 214 C.–Pr.], Timocreon [fr. 7 *PMG*; cf. Benuzzi 2020, 59]); *schol. Ar. Pax* 741b (with transmitted Εὐριπίδην although *schol. Ar. Pax* 740ba proves that Εὐπολίην must be meant); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 357d (with τὸς περὶ Ἀριστόξενον where τὸς περὶ Ἀρίσταρχον must be meant in view of *Su.* τ 169 A.; cf. Muzzolon 2005, 62, with further slips involving Aristarchus' name); *schol. Ar. Plut.* 690c (with Λυκοῦργος instead of Ὑπερείδης as the author of a speech *Against Demades* in which the term παρείας ὄφις for a type of snake occurred; cf. Harp. π 26 K., *Su.* π 585 A.); perhaps also *schol. Ar. Pax* 528d (if the reference to an otherwise unknown Euripidean *Tlepolemus* in ἔστιν Εὐριπίδου ἐκ “Τηλέφου” ἢ “Τληπολέμου” “<the line> [sc. Eur. fr. 727 K.] is from Euripides' *Telephus*

where Dicaeopolis visits Euripides in order to borrow a rag costume and Euripides gets increasingly annoyed, Dicaeopolis exclaims καὶ γὰρ εἰμ' ἄγαν / ὄχληρός, οὐ δοκῶν με κοιράνους στυγεῖν “For I am too burdensome, not thinking that the lords abhor me” (*Ach.* 471f.). The wider context, the tone, and the metre of this phrase suggest that it is parodic, and because the preceding scene has centred around Euripides’ *Telephus*, a play into which such a lament might fit well, it is natural to suspect that the line was adopted and/or adapted from there. However, a scholion on the line informs us that the parody is actually taken, “obscurely” (ἀσήμως),³⁸ from Euripides’ *Oineus*. To this, Symmachus is said to have added that it was “also”³⁹ from the *Telephus*” (ex. (19)). In our assessment of the situation we are not helped by the fact that the scholion does not quote either of the alleged models. In principle it is conceivable that an identical or at least very similar line occurred in more than one Euripidean play.⁴⁰ However, given the Aristophanic context, any ancient commentator would no doubt have looked at the *Telephus* first. So if something close to *Ach.* 472 had really been discoverable there, to come up with the *Oineus* instead would have been quite pointless. It is therefore more likely that the line *is* from the *Oineus*, but that Symmachus could not see why it should then be inserted into this particular scene, therefore disqualified the parody as ἀσήμως, and suggested that an allusion to something in the *Telephus*, perhaps a similar rejection motif, was intended (or at least intended at the same time). The absence of a quotation from the scholion might not then be due to epitomization, but to the fact that no quotation for the *Oineus* line was needed since it was identical to the one in *Acharnians*, while

or *Tlepolemus*” results from someone at some point inadvertently writing Τληπολέμου instead of Τηλέφου: the existence of a *Tlepolemus* finds no support in *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1264b, which is based on a misunderstanding of the information given in *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1264a).

38 That the meaning of the difficult term ἀσήμως is here likely to be “unverständlich” was plausibly suggested by Roemer 1908, 258; but the “obscurity” may relate more to the unexpected source (cf. below) than to the semantic inapplicability of κοιράνους to Euripides.

39 This is the simplest way of understanding καί in the scholion. Although καί can sometimes also be translated by Engl. “actually”, “in fact”, such “responsive” καί does not normally have the corrective force the English adverbs often have, but rather resembles emphatic δὲ (cf. Denniston 1950, 316f.). However, since “[s]ometimes καί contrasts the objective reality of an idea with its subjective reality or with the unreality of something else”, so that “in translating examples of this class the stressed word is some part of the verb ‘to be’, or an auxiliary (‘do’, ‘might’, etc.)” (Denniston 1950, 321), it is also possible that the scholion rather meant something like “But Symmachus actually does say it is from the *Telephus*”, in response to an implicit “It is odd that Aristophanes is borrowing here from the *Oineus* rather than the *Telephus*”. The essence of Symmachus’ “correction” would remain the same in either case.

40 Cf. Olson 2002, 195f.; but Olson is less ready simply to believe Symmachus than, e.g., Sommerstein 1980, 179, is.

no quotation from the *Telephus* could be given since the resemblance was not close enough to convince on the verbal plane. Such a reconstruction of events, though speculative, is probably not without parallel if we compare a scholion on Trygaeus' line πτηνός πορεύσει πῶλος· οὐ ναυσθλώσομαι "A winged foal will carry me, I will not go by sea" at *Pax* 126; for here again the *context* suggested the adoption of a line from Euripides' *Bellerophon*, which "some" therefore believed in, but the only quotation the scholion is actually able to offer as a source (albeit in a badly corrupted shape)⁴¹ is from the *Stheneboea* (ex. (20)):⁴²

(19) *schol. Ar. Ach. 472*: ὄκληρός, οὐ δοκῶν με κοιράνους <στρυγεῖν>· τοῦτο πεπαρώδηται ἀσίμως ἐξ "Οἰνέως" Εὐριπίδου [= Eur. fr. 568 K.]. ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος καὶ ἐκ "Τηλέφου" φησὶν αὐτό. EFLh

"*Too burdensome, not thinking that the lords abhor me*: This is parodied obscurely from Euripides' *Oineus*. But Symmachus says it is also from the *Telephus*."

(20) *schol. Ar. Pax 126a*: ὁ λόγος ἐκ "Σθενεβοίας" Εὐριπίδου. τινὲς δὲ οἴονται ἐκ "Βελλεροφόντου" παρωδήσθαι. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ "Σθενεβοίᾳ" παρὰ τῷ τραγικῷ οὕτως· "πέλας δὲ ταύτης δεινὸς ἴδρυται κράτος ἐνθηρος ἢ ληστής φρουρεῖται κλυδῶνι δεινῷ καὶ βροτὸς τῶν βρέμει πτηνός πορεύει." [= Eur. fr. 669 K., reading Κράγος, ἧ λησταῖσι, and βροτοστόνῳ] V

"The phrase is from the *Stheneboea* of Euripides; but some believe it is parodied from the *Bellerophon*. However, it goes as follows in the *Stheneboea* of the tragic poet: 'Close to her a terrible power (?) is placed, full of wild animals or a robber is on his guard (?), it roars with a terrible surf that sounds like a human groan; a winged will carry (?)...'"

If they are correctly untangled in such a way, these scholia thus point to disagreement arising from a tension between the expectation that (at least parodic) intertextuality be appropriate or significant in context, i.e. on the level of the *signifié*, and the expectation that it also be formally recognizable, i.e. operative on the level of the

⁴¹ Cf. Rau 1967, 94, who — after others, and no doubt rightly — assumes that the *Stheneboea* passage originally contained the complete line after which *Pax* 126 is modelled; if so, "πτηνός πορεύει" might be understood to stand for something like "πτηνός πορεύσει κτλ.". As Olson 1998, 93, stresses, if πτηνός πορεύει did not belong to the *Stheneboea* passage at all, but was a misplaced scholiastic lemma (cf. Dindorf 1838b, 25), "there would be no real similarities between the two passages and thus no reason to cite E[uripides]".

⁴² Another comparable case is seen in *schol. Ar. Pax 1012*. The context of *Pax* 1013f. suggests that these two lines were quoted/adapted from a *Medea* by the tragic poet Melanthis, but while some (οἱ δέ) did assume this (just as modern scholars still do: see, e.g., Dihle 1976, 146–148, Olson 1998, 263; but contrast Snell 1971, 137, 148, who gives the verses as Morsimus *TrGF* 29 F 1?), they were certainly not able to ascertain it from the text itself because otherwise no-one would seriously have entertained the alternative idea that the Aristophanic verses might echo Eur. *Med.* 96f. instead.

signifiant. Of these two criteria, the latter, formal, one is more basic since less dependent on subjective judgment. Unless a similarity between two passages is only fleeting, or confined to a structural parallelism, hence arguably a product of chance, the two passages *must* form an intertextual relationship of some sort.

5 Variations of intertextual scope

The available scholiastic evidence makes it clear that the earliest Aristophanic scholars very much concentrated on the primary elucidation of the text. In doing so, however, they not only sought to explain unusual expressions or to supply factual background information, but also already to identify overt intertextual allusions. For instance, the commentary of Callistratus is named in ex. (21) as the source citing an intertextual reference to Sophocles, and ex. (22) intimates that such matters were already of some concern to Aristophanes of Byzantium and touched upon in Eratosthenes' investigations on the history of comedy as well. In the latter case, the exact detail of who ascribed what to whom could hardly be more controversial, given the poor state of the transmission, but one thing that seems safe to assert is that Eratosthenes (fr. 101 Strecker) traced the phrase Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν, which is anonymously quoted by the Strong Argument in *Nub.* 967, back to *some* lyric model, be it Stesichorus (fr. 274 *PMG*, cf. fr. 322ab Davies–Finglass) or the early-fifth-century poet Lamprocles (fr. 735 *PMG*), and that Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. 379 Slater) unsuccessfully tried to do the same for the parallel phrase τηλέπορον τι βόαμα:⁴³

43 For a recent discussion of the matter, see now Benuzzi 2019, with earlier literature and a critique of the text given by Holwerda 1977, 185f. This is not the place to engage in this complex debate, but I am not sure that P.Oxy. 13.1611 fr. 5+6+43, however supplemented, is sufficient to conclude that Eratosthenes “in his *interpretamentum* to *Nub.* 967 [...] explicitly quoted and refuted Chamaeleon’s declaration of *aporia*” concerning the actual authorship (Lamprocles or Stesichorus; cf. Stes. fr. 274 *PMG* = fr. 322ab Davies–Finglass) of the lyric song in question, let alone that he settled the matter in favour of Lamprocles (Benuzzi 2019, 136; cf. Chamaeleon fr. 29ab Wehrli = fr. 32–34 Giordano = fr. 31AB Martano). Instead, in view of the available evidence, which is sadly corrupted, it is at least equally plausible (a) that Eratosthenes derived Aristophanes’ Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν from Stesichorus, while acknowledging that Phrynichus ascribed the song to Lamprocles (cf. mss. RV: Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἵσματος μνημονεύει ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος κτλ.), and (b) that Lamprocles had written a different song that began with the same two words Παλλάδα περσέπολιν but continued with κλήζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν. Among other things, this scenario avoids the unlikely hypothesis that the original Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν θεὸν ἐγρεκῦδοιμον

(21) *schol. Ar. Av. 1337c*: γενοίμαν ἀετός VEG: ἐν τοῖς Καλλιστράτου ταῦτα RVEFGM ἐξ “Οἰνομάου” τοῦ Σοφοκλέους. RVEFLh

“*May I become an eagle*: In the <commentary> of Callistratus: This is from the *Oenomaus* of Sophocles.”

(22) *schol. Ar. Nub. 967bβ + schol. Ar. Nub. 967aβ*:⁴⁴ ἡ Παλλάδα R: ἀρχὴ ἄσματος RV Στησιχόρου [coni. Van Leeuwen, Holwerda : Φρυνίχου R, φ(superscr. η) V], ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης RV φησὶν R. Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἄσματος μνημονεῦει ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος “Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κλητίζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν, παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου.” RV ἢ R [τὸ δὲ V] τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα: καὶ τοῦτο μέλους ἀρχή. φασὶ δὲ μὴ εὐρίσκεσθαι, ὅτου ποτέ ἐστίν· ἐν γὰρ ἀποσπάσματι ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ εὐρεῖν Ἀριστοφάνη. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ Κυδίδου τινὸς Ἐρμιονέως “τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα λύρας”. RV

“*Or Pallas*: The beginning of a song of Stesichorus, as Eratosthenes says; but Phrynichus says of this very song that it is by Lamprocles: ‘Of Pallas, the destroyer of cities, I sing, the holy sustainer of war, the child of great Zeus’.

Or the far-reaching shout: This too is the beginning of a song. They say that its author cannot be identified; for Aristophanes [of Byzantium] found it in a fragment in the Library [of Alexandria]. But some say that it is by one Cydidas of Hermione: ‘The far-reaching shout of the lyre.’”

Unsurprisingly, such searches for a contextually presupposed intertext were not always successful. They could on occasion result in a *non liquet* verdict like that of Aristophanes of Byzantium in ex. (22)⁴⁵ or, more problematically, give rise to auto-schediastic emergency solutions.⁴⁶ A prime example for the latter phenomenon is the way several ancient scholars tried to make sense of the stage Dionysus in *Frogs*

sequence, which the scholion in ms. E cites in full, was the random invention of a commentator (as assumed by Benuzzi 2019, 138–140, in the wake of Sgobbi 2006, 294–296).

44 To keep matters simple, I give only the text of mss. RV (recomposed and in the original order, cf. n. 16). In ms. E (= *schol. Ar. Nub. 967aα + schol. Ar. Nub. 967bα*) the basic information is the same, but it is arranged differently, and additional reference is made, without much clarity, to a divergent model reading δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκῦδοιμον as well as an *aporia* of Chamaeleon that is also mentioned in P.Oxy. 13.1611 fr. 5+6+43 (cf. n. 43).

45 Cf. also *schol. Ar. Ran. 13b*, according to which no pertinent intertext could be found in the extant work of the comedian Phrynichus (Φρύνιχος ὁ κωμικὸς οὐδὲν τούτων ἐποίησεν ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις αὐτοῦ. VMEΘBarb(Ald) εἰκὸς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολωλόσιν εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτό τι VEΘBarb(Ald) “Phrynichus the comedian did no such thing in those plays of his that are preserved; but it is likely that something like that was in the lost plays”).

46 Apart from ex. (23), see also, e.g., *schol. Ar. Av. 1376b* and *schol. Ar. Ran. 963*, where the vagueness suggests autoschediasm. Vice versa, no intertext was needed for *Ran. 689*, because the Phrynichus mentioned there is certainly the general (cf. *schol. Ar. Ran. 689bef*; Dover 1993, 73); yet, someone still thought of the tragedian Phrynichus and hence came up with an intertextual proposal (*schol. Ar. Ran. 689c*).

recalling how he rejoiced, while watching Aeschylus' *Persians*, when he "heard about dead Darius, and the chorus immediately clapped their hands together like this and said 'Woe!'" (*Ran.* 1028f., ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἠνίκ' ἤκουσα περί τ' Δαρείου τεθνεώτος, ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν "ἰαυοῖ"). That there is no relevant scene in *Persians* could of course be quickly ascertained by anyone who was spurred on by the Aristophanic wording to check the alleged intertext; and so, while one scholar, Chaeris (fr. 22 Berndt), rather desperately suggested to understand the genitive Δαρείου (τεθνεώτος) as meaning "the son of (dead) Darius" (= Xerxes), another, Herodicus of Babylon, perhaps in the wake of Eratosthenes (fr. 109 Strecker = fr. 6 Bagordo), apparently surmised that since *Persians* was known to have been restaged at Syracuse there might have been a second version of the play which did contain the kind of scene Aristophanes was referring to (plus a presentation of the battle of Plataea):⁴⁷

(23) *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028aa + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028ba + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028c + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028ea + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028f.⁴⁸ ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἠνίκ' ἤκουσα RVE: ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις Αἰσχύλου "Πέρσαις" οὔτε Δαρείου θάνατος ἀπαγγέλλεται οὔτε χορὸς τὰς χεῖρας συγκρούσας λέγει "Ἰαυοῖ". 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 δέ φησι: τὸ "Δαρείου" ἀντὶ τοῦ Ξέρξου: σύνηθες γὰρ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῖς τῶν πατέρων ὀνόμασι χρῆσθαι. πρὸς ὃν ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐν τῷ δράματι λέγεται: "Ξέρξης μὲν αὐτὸς ζῆ τε καὶ βλέπει φάος" [= Aesch. *Pers.* 299].
 Ἡρόδικος δέ φησι διττὰς γεγονέναι <καθέσεις> τῷ θανάτῳ, καὶ τὴν τραγωδίαν ταύτην περιέχειν τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην. δοκοῦσιν δὲ οὗτοι οἱ "Πέρσαι" ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου δεδιδᾶσθαι ἐν Συρακούσαις, σπουδάσαντος Ἰέρωνος, ὡς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' "Περὶ κωμωδιῶν". VEOBarb(Ald)

47 For further discussion of this well-known source, see, e.g., Roemer 1908, 393–396, Totaro 2006, 97–100, Broggiato 2014, Montana 2017, 215–221. A definitive solution of the problem posed by the Aristophanic line is still outstanding: cf. the *crucis* in Dover's text of *Ran.* 1028 f. (printed above), with Dover 1993, 320f., and the doxography of modern emendations given by Totaro 2006, 100–103. Although replacing περί by παρά may be one of the more promising ways forward, and *might* even have been suggested already in antiquity, as argued by Broggiato 2014, 11–13, on the basis of *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028g (οἱ δέ: ὅτι εἰδωλον Δαρείου φθέγγεται, ἐκεῖ<νου> τεθνηκός, δηλονότι VEOBarb(Ald) "Others say that the ghost of — obviously: dead — Darius is speaking"), παρά cannot have been an established textual variant in either Lycophron's or Aristophanes of Byzantium's collection/edition of the Aristophanic plays since otherwise the entire inconclusive discussion would have been futile.
 48 That all this derives from Didymus is clear from the parallel summary in *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028aβ + 1028eβ + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028d + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1028bβ, which omits the doxographic attributions but cites Didymus as the overall source (Didymus fr. 269 C.–Pr.).

“I did rejoice when I heard: In the Persians of Aeschylus as they are transmitted neither the death of Darius is reported nor does the chorus clap their hands and say ‘Woe!’; instead, the plot is set in Susa, the mother of Xerxes is scared because of some dream, and the chorus of the Persian elders is talking to her. Then a messenger <is> announcing the naval battle at Salamis and the flight of Xerxes.

But Chaeris says: ‘of Darius’ stands for ‘Xerxes’; for it is common for the poets to use the names of the fathers for the sons. To this, it has to be objected that in the play it is said:

‘Xerxes himself is alive and sees the light’.

Herodotus, on the other hand, says that there were two productions <...> †of the death, and that this tragedy comprised the battle in Plataea; these *Persians* seem to have been staged in Syracuse, at the invitation of Hieron, as Eratosthenes says in the third <book of his treatise> *On comedies*.”

Meanwhile, a different, though no less interesting, issue is the question when commentators first dared to move beyond the “necessary” minimum and began to postulate intertextual connections that were neither obvious nor directly demanded by the comic text. One scholar whose name repeatedly appears in pertinent situations is Asclepiades, who probably belongs to the late second century BC. In ex. (18) we have already seen how Asclepiades was berated, probably by Didymus, for two anachronistic claims that were based on insufficiently substantial textual similarities. Similar boldness, but no patent anachronism, is on display in ex. (24), according to which he related a passage from Aeschylus’ pastiche of Euripidean monody in *Frogs* (*Ran.* 1331–1333 ὦ Νυκτὸς κελαινοφαῆς ὄρφνα, / τίνα μοι δύστανον ὄνειρον / πέμπεις κτλ. “O black-shining darkness of Night, what wretched dream are you sending to me...”) to a specific passage in Euripides’ *Hecuba*:

(24) *schol.* Ar. *Ran.* 1331b: ὦ νυκτὸς κελαινοφαῆς VE: Ἀσκληπιάδης· VEΘBarb(Ald) παρὰ τὰ ἐξ “Ἐκάβης” Εὐριπίδου, RVEΘBarb(Ald) ἐν μιμήσει δηλονότι. VEΘBarb(Ald) οὕτω γὰρ παραγέγραπται· VEBarb(Ald) “ὦ στεροπὰ Διός, ὦ σκοτία νύξ, τί ποτ’ αἶρωμαι ἔνυχος οὕτω” [= Eur. *Hec.* 68f.] RVEΘBarb(Ald)

“O black-shining ... of Night: Asclepiades: <The phrase is modelled> after the <passage> in Euripides’ *Hecuba*, obviously in imitation; for it is adduced as follows: ‘O lightning-flash of Zeus, o dark Night, why am I stirred up like this in the midst of the night?’”

Given the parallelism consisting of an address to Night followed by a lament about a worrying dream in both *Frogs* and *Hecuba*, Asclepiades’ theory is not implausible here;⁴⁹ but what is more important is the fact that, apart from a few generic words (νύξ, ὄνειρος, ὄψις), there is no conspicuous sharing of lexical elements. In other

49 Cf., e.g., Dover 1993, 358.

words, for Asclepiades at least, intertextuality is something which can operate on a more abstract level of similarity.⁵⁰

In all likelihood, though, Asclepiades was not alone in beginning to read and analyze like this. Regrettably, we are unable to date the origin of ex. (25), which is unusual among the Aristophanic scholia because it posits an intertextual dependency that revolves *entirely* around a humorous structure, without lexical resemblance being of any relevance.⁵¹ When Trygaeus in *Pax* 185–187 answers Hermes' questions about his name, father's name, and family name with nothing but a repeated μιάρωτατος "super-vile", this is said to be inspired by a similar scene in Epicharmus where a basket (φορμός) replied nothing but σηκίς "house-slave, maid" to a series of questions about its mother's, father's, and brother's name. But if we keep in mind that any serious study of Epicharmus' work must have been greatly facilitated by the ten-volume edition and commentary Apollodorus of Athens compiled in the second half of the second century BC, we obtain a plausible *terminus post quem* that is in fact close to Asclepiades.

(25) *schol. Ar. Pax* 185: τοῦτο μάλιστα μὲν πρὸς τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ εἰρημένον “ὦ μιάρῃ καὶ παμμίαρῃ καὶ μιάρωτατῇ” [= *Ar. Pax* 183] δοκεῖ ἡξὲς ἐκείνων ἡλεῆσθαι, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς τὴν ἀφορμὴν ἐκ τοῦ “Σκεῖρωνος” παρ’ Ἐπιχάρμου ἔχει, ἐπεὶ κάκεῖνος πεποίηκε τὸν φορμὸν ἐρωτηθέντα “τίς ἐστί μήτηρ;” ἀποκρινόμενον ὅτι “σηκίς”, καὶ “τίς ἐστί πατήρ;” εἰπόντα “σηκίς”, καὶ “τίς ἀδελφός;” ὁμοίως “σηκίς” [= *Epich. fr.* 123 K.–A.]. ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἔδοξε πρὸς τὸ ἐρωτώμενον τὸ

50 Cf. Roemer 1908, 257. Of course this does not always have to be the case. According to *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1344b, Asclepiades also diagnosed a borrowing from (a specific version of) Aeschylus' *Wool-carders* in the phrase Νύμφαι ὀρεσσίγονοι of the same parodic monody. Since the context would demand a borrowing from a Euripidean original (cf. *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1344c), in some manuscripts ἐκ τῶν “Ξαντριῶν” Αἰσχύλου (mss. RV) was changed into ἐκ τῶν “Ξαντριῶν” Εὐριπίδου (mss. EΘ), but there are no *Wool-carders* of Euripides and the change also underestimates Asclepiades' confidence. If “in *POxy* 2164 [...] the line has not ὀρεσσίγονοι but ναμαρτεῖς” (Dover 1993, 358), this helps to explain why Asclepiades had to specify that his was the reading of a particular manuscript he saw in Athens. Modern doubts about P.Oxy. 18.2164 (= Aesch. fr. **168 R.) really containing a passage from the Ξάντριαι, rather than from Aeschylus' Σεμέλη ἢ Ὑδροφόροι (see especially Latte 1948, 47–54, followed by others), are not strong enough to prove that Asclepiades mixed up the two titles (cf. Radt 1985, 282f.).

51 Cf. further *schol. Ar. Ach.* 398a on the structural similarity between *Ach.* 398 f. and Euripidean lines “such as” (οἷον) *Eur. Hipp.* 612; possibly *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 215 if this implies that Aristophanes borrowed a comic scene from Cratinus (n. 13). There are also a few more scholia where parallel structures of humour are highlighted, but no intertextual relationship is posited: see *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 682 (comparing Alexander fr. 5 K.–A. for the comic separation, in phrasing, of γυναῖκες and βροτοί/ἄνθρωποι), *schol. Ar. Ran.* 308c (Demetrius Ixion, comparing Plato Comicus' Παιδάριον [Pl. Com. fr. 101 K.–A.] for what he takes to be the mocking of (a member of) the audience), *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1159 (comparing Pl. Com. fr. 120 K.–A. for the humorous use of lexical synonymy).

ἐξῆς ἀποκρίνεσθαι· ἔστι γάρ τις τοῖς φορμοῖς συγγένεια πρὸς τὰς σηκίδας· ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐκέτι κατὰ τὸ συγγενὲς οὗτος ἀπεκρίθη. V

“This seems to be said primarily in response to, and drawn from (?), Hermes’ words ‘you vile, totally vile, super-vile person!’. In reality, though, its starting-point is in the *Sciron* of Epicharmus since the latter similarly made his basket answer ‘Maid’ when asked ‘Who is your mother?’, reply ‘Maid’ to ‘Who is your father?’, and again ‘Maid’ to ‘Who is your brother?’. However, <the basket> seemed to give a pertinent answer to what was asked; after all, there is a relationship between baskets and maids. This one here, on the other hand, no longer gave an answer to do with relationships.”

Moreover, another scholion on *Frogs* — a comedy which was of course a particularly rich field for intertextual enquiry — equally points to horizons of intertextuality becoming broader at that time, the trigger no doubt being that scholars who wanted to come up with new insights simply had to cast their nets ever more widely (ex. (26)).⁵² At *Ran.* 1264–1277 Euripides is mocking in his turn the incomprehensibility of Aeschylus’ songs, and in this context a pastiche of Aeschylean phrases is created; this includes the line κύδιστ’ Ἀχαιῶν, Ἄτρεως πολυκοίρανε μάνθανέ μου παῖ “Noblest of Achaeans, wide-ruling child of Atreus, listen to me” (*Ran.* 1269f.). Unlike the earlier verses *Ran.* 1264 and *Ran.* 1266, which were apparently attributed without controversy to Aeschylus’ *Myrmidons* and *Necromancers* (Ψυχαγωγοί) respectively (see *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1264b and *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1266a, with Aesch. fr. 132 and 273 R.), this one proved so challenging that both Aristarchus and Apollonius, a critic who is named together with Aristarchus not just here and may therefore have followed in Aristarchus’ footsteps,⁵³ had to admit defeat, being unable to identify the Aeschylean source. Since there can be little doubt that both of them had tried hard and searched the Alexandrian library thoroughly, it is somewhat suspicious if Asclepiades then pointed to (presumably Aeschylus’) *Iphigenia*, while Timachidas, a rough contemporary of his, thought of Aeschylus’ *Telephus* (Timachidas fr. 26 Matijašić). This can only mean that, once again, Asclepiades and Timachidas found some passage in each of these two plays that was vaguely reminiscent, but not similar enough already to have caught Aristarchus’ attention.⁵⁴

⁵² Recomposed from Chantry 1999, 143; cf. n. 16 and for this item specifically Montana 2017, 200–202.

⁵³ Cf. Boudreaux 1919, 77f., Montana 2002, Muzzolon 2005, 60.

⁵⁴ Cf. Roemer 1908, 262. For a similar situation, which shows that Aristarchus himself was no overly conservative critic of Aristophanes, see *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1400abcde. Even if the matter is not entirely clear, it looks as if Aristarchus had declared that Dionysus’ line βέβληκ’ Ἀχιλλεύς δύο κύβω καὶ τέτταρα “Achilleus has cast two ones and a four” is an adespota fragment, but *might* go back to Euripides who had represented some people throwing dice in a scene of the *Telephus* he subsequently removed (cf. Roemer 1908, 264, Muzzolon 2005, 104f.). This type of argument is not

(26) *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1269c + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1269a + *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1269b: κύδιστ' Ἀχαιῶν VE: Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος· ἐπισκέψασθε πόθεν εἰσὶν. VEΘBarb(Ald) Τιμαχίδας δέ· VMEΘBarb(Ald) ἐκ “Τηλέφου” Αἰσχύλου. RVMEΘBarb(Ald) Ἀσκληπιάδης δέ· ἐξ “Ἰφιγενείας”. VMEΘBarb(Ald)

“*Noblest of Achaeans*: Aristarchus and Apollonius: Try to find out whence <these two lines> are. Timachidas: From Aeschylus’ *Telephus*. Asclepiades: From the *Iphigenia*.”

6 Missed opportunities

If one looks at all the evidence cited so far, which is representative of the entire material, one aspect is striking. For all the effort spent on identifying intertextual relationships, their existence is simply taken for granted and virtually no attempt is made to explore what function they have as a constitutive element of comedy. It would of course be anachronistic to expect the level of interpretative subtlety modern commentators often display when evaluating intertextuality, but since ancient Aristophanic scholars, too, sometimes did express views on how the text works or what the poet wanted to achieve — notably with regard to comedy’s humorous dimension and its aim to ridicule people and make the audience laugh —, this absence is still worth highlighting. Moreover, it is closely connected with another noteworthy feature: the almost complete lack of contextualization of the actual or presumed intertexts. Where dramatic texts are referred to, speakers are *sometimes* named, but even this is fairly rare;⁵⁵ and building any kind of argument on what scene is alluded to or on who is speaking, as happened in ex. (16), is truly exceptional.

untypical for Aristarchus (cf. already n. 35), but someone else (Didymus?) later questioned it, on the grounds that Dionysus rather than Euripides is speaking, while still others — again no doubt *after* Aristarchus — proposed the *Philoctetes*, *Iphigenia in Aulis* or even Aeschylus’ *Myrmidons* as (partial?) intertextual models. To judge by *schol. Ar. Eccl.* 1c, different commentators also came up with different conceivable (ὑποπτεύεται) models for the paratragic first line of *Ecclesiazusae* (hence Agathon *TrGF* 39 F 32 = Dicaeogenes *TrGF* 52 F 6?).

⁵⁵ See *schol. Ar. Ach.* 883 (on Aeschylus’ Ὀπλων κρίσις: no speaker identification, but some contextualization), *schol. Ar. Nub.* 1264–1266 (on Xenocles’ *Licymnius*: comparatively substantial contextualization, going back already to Euphronius [fr. 99 Strecker]), *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 313 and 314a (on Euripides’ *Theseus*), *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1326ab (= ex. (17): speaker identification), *schol. Ar. Av.* 807b (speaker identification), *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 136 (on Aeschylus’ Ἡδωνοῖ), *scholl. Ar. Thesm.* 1018ab, 1022/1023, and 1098 (on Euripides’ *Andromeda*: speaker identification), *schol. Ar. Ran.* 184a (on Achaeus’ satyr-play *Aethon*: speaker identification), *schol. Ar. Ran.* 1425a (on Ion’s Φροῦροι: speaker identification), *schol. Ar. Plut.* 806b (on Sophocles’ *Inachus*: some contextualization), *schol. Ar. Plut.* 935 (on Sophocles’ *Electra*: some contextualization).

The one instance that probably comes closest to an interpretative evaluation of an intertextual connection is ex. (27),⁵⁶ a scholion on the passage in *Frogs* where the Doorkeeper of Hades is whipping both Dionysus and Xanthias in order to find out which one is immune to pain and therefore really a god. At some point, Dionysus exclaims Ἀπολλων —, but immediately seeks to correct the impression that he did feel pain by adding ὅς που Δ ἤλον ἢ Πυθῶν ἔχεις “you who hold Delos and Pytho”, as if he had merely recited an iambic line of (as he says) Hipponax (*Ran.* 659–661). Now, the general thrust of the scholion on this is comparable to what we have already seen in the case of *schol.* *Ar. Av.* 575a (= ex. (2) above), with its idea that Aristophanes might have misattributed the comparison of Iris to a pigeon deliberately, in order to raise a laugh; for it not only states that Dionysus’ line in reality belonged to Ananius rather than Hipponax, but again sees this as a deliberate distortion of facts by Aristophanes. However, in doing so, ex. (27) is even more sophisticated in that it proposes to relate the perceived⁵⁷ misattribution to the state and character of the speaker in whose mouth it is placed (Dionysus), so as to credit the poet with an additional twist:

(27) *schol.* *Ar. Ran.* 661: ἱαμβον Ἰππώνακτος Ε: ὡς ἀλήσας καὶ συγκεχυμένος οὐκ οἶδε τί λέγει, ἐπεὶ οὐχ Ἰππώνακτος ἀλλ’ Ἀνανίου. ἐπιφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἀνανίας αὐτῷ· “ἢ Νάξον ἢ Μίλητον ἢ θεῖον Κλάρον ἴκου καθ’ ἰέρ’, ἢ Σκύθας ἀφίξειαι” [= Ananius fr. 1 West]. VEΘBarb(Ald)

“An iambic line of Hipponax: Having felt pain and being confused he [= Dionysus] does not know what he is saying, since <the verse> is not by Hipponax but by Ananius; Ananius then continues: ‘or who have come to Naxos or Miletus or divine Klaros, for the rites, or who will reach the Scythians.’”

⁵⁶ Apart from this, cf. also *schol.* *Ar. Eq.* 526a, which suggests that Aristophanes’ description of Cratinus as πολλῶν ῥεύσας ἐπαίνῳ “flowing with great praise” might be inspired by a passage in Cratinus’ *Pytine* because the latter was self-referential (Cratinus fr. 198 K.–A.).

⁵⁷ We have no way of ascertaining whether the commentator’s ascription is factually correct or not; “[v]ariant attributions are not uncommon in the history of the text of archaic poets” (Dover 1993, 274). For a further comparandum, see *scholl.* *Ar. Thesm.* 21ab, which talk of a misattribution to Euripides of a verse properly belonging to Sophocles (fr. 14 R.) in *Ar.* fr. 323 K.–A. (from the *Heroes*) and wonder if Aristophanes might have introduced this “on purpose, in order to mislead the others” (ἐπίτηδες, ἵνα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξαπατήσῃ); but a chance coincidence between the Sophoclean line and a lost line of Euripides or an honest error are also considered.

7 Inverse intertextuality

Finally, any survey of assumptions of intertextuality in the Aristophanic scholia would be incomplete if it did not also mention one or two scholia in which Aristophanes himself is identified as the source, or target, of subsequent intertextual referencing. It is at least conceivable that something like this was implied by ex. (28). According to this note, Cratinus retaliated for being described as “babbling nonsense” in *Eq.* 531 by denigrating Aristophanes in his Πυτίνῃ; yet, the idea that any particular Aristophanic line should have triggered the older playwright’s sneering looks anecdotal and need not have had a textual anchoring point in Cratinus’ play (cf. the similar claims in *schol. Ar. Eq.* 400a).⁵⁸ By contrast, a more concrete intertextual relationship is probably suggested by ex. (29). This *could* mean no more than that Eubulus, *in parallel with* Aristophanes (*Thesm.* 136–140), echoed or parodied a passage from Aeschylus’ *Edonians* (fr. 61 R., based on *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 136).⁵⁹ However, the formulation with ἐντεῦθεν mirrors exactly what we read in the unambiguous ex. (30).⁶⁰ So, whether or not there was a factual basis to the claim, Eubulus may also have been thought of as being indebted to Aristophanes’ adaptation of Aeschylus’ scene, although he would have exploited even further the comic potential offered by a series of questions centering around the juxtaposition of seemingly incompatible things. And finally, ex. (30) itself offers the spectacular hypothesis that the proem of Demosthenes’ *Speech on the Crown* may have been inspired by the comic prayer to Athena which the Paphlagonian (Cleon) pronounces at the beginning of the agon in *Knights* (*Eq.* 763–768) — but it has to be said that the (perhaps quite late) commentator who came up with this idea at least felt compelled to hedge it by means of an introductory δοκεῖ μοι:

(28) *schol. Ar. Eq.* 531a: παραληροῦντα: διαποροῦντα καὶ ἀσημιονοῦντα. ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ Κρατῖνος ἔγραψε τὴν “Πυτίνην”, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἐλήρησεν· ἐν ἧ κακῶς λέγει τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ὡς τὰ Εὐπόλιδος λέγοντα [= Cratinus fr. 213 K.–A.]. VEGΘM

⁵⁸ Since they were alluded to also in *Ar. Nub.* 553f. as well as Eupolis fr. 89 K.–A., the allegations of dependency or plagiarism involving Aristophanes and Eupolis were of interest to ancient theatre historians anyway; cf. *schol. Ar. Eq.* 1291 and *scholl. Ar. Nub.* 540a and 554a.

⁵⁹ Cf. Rau 1967, 109, Hunter 1983, 117, Kassel/Austin 1986, 203.

⁶⁰ And again in the Triclinian *schol. Ar. Eq.* 542b, where Gregory of Nazianzus is said to have elegantly transformed (εὐφωρῶς μετερρῦθμισεν) the ship-crew metaphor of *Eq.* 541–544 (ἔφρασκεν ἐρέτην χρῆναι πρῶτα γενέσθαι κτλ. “He said one first needs to become a rower etc.”) in one of his speeches (Greg. Naz. *Or.* 43.26.1).

“*Babbling nonsense*: Being helpless and disgracing himself. When he had heard this, Cratinus wrote his *Wicker flask*, thereby showing that he did not talk nonsense; in it, he speaks badly of Aristophanes, <claiming> that he was plagiarizing Eupolis.”

(29) *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 137a (on the Inlaw’s question to Agathon τί βάρβιτος λαλεῖ κροκωτῶ; ‘How does the lyre converse with the saffron robe?’): ἐντεῦθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν Εὐβουλος ἐποιήσατο τοῦ “Διονυσίου”, τὰ ἀνόμοια τῶν ἐν τῇ Διονυσίου οἰκίᾳ καταλέγων· ἐπὶ πλέον μέντοι [= Eubulus fr. 24 K.–A.]. R

“<Starting> from there, Eubulus composed the beginning of the *Dionysius*, in which he lists all the incongruous things in Dionysius’ house; but he expands things further.”

(30) *schol. Ar. Eq.* 763: τῇ μὲν δεσποίνᾳ Ἀθήνῃ: ἐντεῦθεν δοκεῖ μοι καὶ Δημοσθένης ὠφελῆθεις τὸ προοίμιον εἰληφέναι ἐν τῷ “Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου” λόγῳ. φησὶ γὰρ οὕτως: “πρῶτον μὲν ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις, ὅσῃν εὖνοιαν ἔχων διατελῶ τῇ τε πόλει” [= Dem. 18.1]. VEGΘLH

“*To Lady Athena*: Demosthenes seems to me to have borrowed and taken from there the proem in his speech *On the Crown*. For he says the following: ‘To start with, o Athenians, I pray to all the gods and goddesses, as much goodwill as I constantly have towards the city...’”

Even if there were more substance to any of these few items, their exiguous number would still demonstrate that the *Nachleben* and reception of Aristophanes’ comedies were of little interest to his ancient commentators.⁶¹ As is shown by ex. (28), they did of course try to evaluate whatever might be relevant to theatre history, but beyond that there was simply not enough relevant material to be found in other ancient sources to make a systematic exploration of this aspect of intertextuality feasible or worthwhile.

8 Conclusion

The corpus of the *scholia vetera* to Aristophanes’ comedies comprises more than 1,300 annotations in which some other text is quoted or at least referred to; and

⁶¹ Aristophanes is twice identified as the victim in Clement of Alexandria’s extended discussion of “plagiarism” within the pagan tradition (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6.24.9 on Ar. fr. dub. 976 K.–A. and Epicurus fr. 519 Usener; 6.26.5 on Aristophanes [Δαίδαλος test. ii K.–A.] and Plato Comicus; cf. also Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6.26.6 on the Κώκαλος [test. iv K.–A.] and Philemon’s Ὑποβολιμαῖος); slightly more often he is seen as the “plagiarizer” (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6.14.5f. on Ar. fr. 616 K.–A. and Theognis 457f.; 6.23.1f. on Ar. fr. 711 K.–A. and Hdt. 6.86.γ.2; 6.26.4 on Ar. *Thesm.* 215ff. and Cratinus fr. 90 K.–A. (?); 6.26.5 again on Aristophanes [Δαίδαλος test. ii K.–A.] and Plato Comicus).

since many of these cite more than one text, the overall total of “secondary” passages mentioned is even higher. However, the vast majority of these references relate to grammatical, lexical, or historical (including prosopographical) matters. Discussions of intertextuality in a broad sense are found in some 260 scholia. Unsurprisingly, a majority of these are in turn concerned with the relationship between Aristophanic comedy and tragedy, notably Euripides who on his own accounts for about half of the data; but Aeschylus (c. 30 exx.) and Sophocles (c. 20 exx.) are also more strongly represented than Homer, Hesiod, or Pindar, who ranks first among the lyric poets. Other Attic comedians are constantly consulted when prosopography is discussed, but unless an Aristophanic line overtly suggests a connection their plays do not normally appear among the intertexts mentioned.⁶² To a large extent this uneven distribution reflects the actual nature of intertextuality in Aristophanes’ oeuvre, but we have also seen that the commentators did not always refrain from making unwarranted intertextual claims. As far as Homer is concerned, these must be due to the prominence of the Homeric poems in the educational curriculum (Section 2), but the tendency was also fed by a certain reluctance to allow for merely stylistic parody (Section 3)⁶³ as well as an increasing degree of confidence in diagnosing less obvious intertextual ties with tragedy in particular (Section 5).⁶⁴ Where disagreements arose over such matters, these may be recorded, but a proper evaluation of competing claims is mostly missing, except in one or two cases where chronological issues come into play (Section 4). As always, we do not of course know how much has been weeded out and lost in the genesis of the scholiastic corpus as we have it; yet, given the variety of the material we still possess, coupled with the fact that the abridgment process never seems to have been entirely systematic, it is impossible to believe that a *substantial* body of more in-depth exploration of intertextual matters should have been removed in such a way. Much rather, intertextual scholarship on Aristophanic comedy was regularly practiced as a mechanical art, which managed to highlight a complex web of — sometimes

⁶² Cf. *scholl. Ar. Eq.* 529b and 530a (Cratinus); *schol. Ar. Pax* 741bce (Eupolis, Cratinus; cf. above, nn. 31 and 37); *schol. Ar. Lys.* 158ab (Pherecrates); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 13ab (Phrynichus); *schol. Ar. Ran.* 357f (Cratinus); exceptions occur in *scholl. Ar. Nub.* 540a and 541ab (Eupolis, Hermippus); *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 1025b (Eupolis), *schol. Ar. Thesm.* 215 (Cratinus).

⁶³ Nünlist 2009, 227f., observes a comparable tendency in the Pindaric scholia when they detect allusions to historical events and persons: “Generalising statements, in particular, are at risk of being pinpointed to a specific event or person”.

⁶⁴ Based on these, Roemer 1908 put forward his argument that one should draw a strict line between “sensible” Alexandrian scholarship on the one hand and “misguided” post-Alexandrian criticism. Such a claim is not, however, free from preconceptions (cf. n. 30 above) and hard to substantiate with the available material.

chronologically significant — “dependencies” but which paid little attention to questions of literary interpretation as such (Section 6) and whose perspective was almost entirely retrospective (Section 7). Despite these limitations, however, it remains true that we ourselves would very often tap in the dark when it comes to Aristophanic intertextuality if ancient scholars had not already begun, and indeed completed, much of the cumbersome collection of evidence that is a necessary first step towards an adequate appreciation of Aristophanes’ comic art.

Bibliography

CLGP Ar. = Esposito/Montana 2012.

LGGA = Montanari, F./Montana, F./Pagani, L. (eds.) (2015–), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (Brill online, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278>).

Adler, A. (1914), “Die Commentare des Asklepiades von Myrlea”, in: *Hermes* 49, 39–46.

Bagordo, A. (1998), *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama*, Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Benuzzi, F. (2019), “Eratothenes’ *studia Aristophanica*: The case of schol. Ar. Nub. 967aa–β, ba–β Holwerda”, in: R. Berardi/N. Bruno/L. Fizzarotti (eds.), *On the Tracks of the Books: Scribes, Libraries and Textual Transmission*, Berlin/Boston, 125–141.

Benuzzi, F. (2020), “Didymus and comedy”, in: T.R.P. Coward/E.E. Prodi (eds.), *Didymus and Graeco-Roman Learning* (= *BICS* 63/2), London/Oxford, 51–61.

Boudreaux, P. (1919), *Le Texte d’Aristophane et ses commentateurs*, Paris.

Broggiato, M. (2014), “Aristophanes and Aeschylus’ *Persians*: Hellenistic Discussions on Ar. Ran. 1028f.”, in: *RhM* 157, 1–15.

Chantry, M. (1999), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, pars III: *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum*, fasc. 1^a: *Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Ranas*, Groningen.

Criboire, R. (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton.

Denniston, J.D. (1950), *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed., rev. K.J. Dover), Oxford.

Dihle, A. (1976), “Randbemerkungen zu griechischen Szenikern”, in: *RhM* 119, 134–148.

Dindorf, W. (1838a), *Aristophanis comoediae*, vol. 4/2: *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata* [*Scholia in Ranas, Equites, Acharnenses, Vespas*], Oxford.

Dindorf, W. (1838b), *Aristophanis comoediae*, vol. 4/3: *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata* [*Scholia in Pacem, Aves, Ecclesiazusas, Thesmophoriazusas, Lysistratam*], Oxford.

Dover, K.J. (1993), *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford.

Dunbar, N. (1995), *Aristophanes: Birds*. Edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford.

Esposito, E./Montana, F. (2012), “Aristophanes”, in: G. Bastianini et al. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in papyris reperta* (CLGP), pars I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, vol. 1: *Aeschines–Bacchylides*, fasc. 4: *Aristophanes–Bacchylides* (2nd edn), Berlin/Boston, 3–241.

Fraenkel, E. (1962), *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, Roma.

Fritzsche, F.V. (1845), *Aristophanis Ranae*, Zürich.

Henderson, J. (1987), *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*. Edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford.

Hinds, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.

Holwerda, D. (1968), “Ad Aesch. fr. 727 Mette”, in: *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 21, 71–72.

- Holwerda, D. (1977), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, pars I: *Prolegomena de comoedia; scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes*, fasc. III/1: *Scholia vetera in Nubes*, Groningen.
- Hunter, R.L. (1983), *Eubulus: The Fragments*. Edited with a commentary, Cambridge.
- Kannicht, R. (2004), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF)*, Vol. 5: *Euripides* (2 vols.), Göttingen.
- Kassel, R./Austin, C. (1986), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vol. V: *Damoxenus — Magnes*, Berlin/New York.
- Koster, W.J.W. (1978), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, pars II: *Scholia in Vespas; Pacem; Aves et Lysistratam*, fasc. 1: *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Vespas*, Groningen.
- Latte, K. (1948), “De nonnullis papyris Oxyrhynchiis”, in: *Philologus* 97, 37–57.
- Miner, E. (1993), “Allusion”, in: A. Preminger/T.V.F. Brogan (eds.), *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton, 38–40.
- Montana, F. (2002), “Apollonius [8] Chaeridis filius”, in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/10.1163/2451-9278_Apollonius_8_Chaeridis_filius_it, last consulted online on 4 December 2023.
- Montana, F. (2008), “Il grammatico Callistrato nella ‘diadoche’ alessandrina”, in: *MH* 65, 77–98.
- Montana, F. (2017), “*Zetemata* alessandrini negli scoli alle *Rane* di Aristofane. Riflessioni ecdotiche”, in: G. Mastromarco/P. Totaro/B. Zimmermann (eds.), *La commedia antica. Forme e contenuti*, Bari, 195–229.
- Montana, F. (2020), “Didymus and the Greek historians”, in: T.R.P. Coward/E.E. Prodi (eds.), *Didymus and Graeco-Roman Learning* (= *BICS* 63/2), London/Oxford, 62–78.
- Muzzolon, M.L. (2005), “Aristarco negli scoli ad Aristofane”, in: F. Montana (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche di Aristofane*, Sarzana, 55–109.
- Novembri, V. (2020), “Euphronius”, in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/10.1163/2451-9278_Euphronius_it, last consulted online on 4 December 2023.
- Nünlist, R. (2009), *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge.
- Olson, S.D. (1998), *Aristophanes: Peace*. Edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- Olson, S.D. (2002), *Aristophanes: Acharnians*. Edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- Pagani, L. (2007), *Asclepiade di Mirlea: I frammenti degli scritti omerici*, Roma.
- Pagani, L. (2009a), “Asclepiades [2]”, in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/10.1163/2451-9278_Asclepiades_2, last consulted online on 4 December 2023.
- Pagani, L. (2009b), “Asclepiades [3]”, in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/10.1163/2451-9278_Asclepiades_3_it, last consulted online on 4 December 2023.
- Pagani, L. (2009c), “Asclepiades [5]”, in: *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity*. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/10.1163/2451-9278_Asclepiades_5_it, last consulted online on 4 December 2023.
- Perrone, S. (2010), “Paralleli comici nell’esegesi a commedia su papirio”, in: F. Montana (ed.), *Aner polytropos: Ricerche di filologia greca antica dedicate dagli allievi a Franco Montanari*, Roma, 85–103.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Rabe, H. (1892), “Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto”, in: *RhM* 47, 404–413.
- Radt, S. (1985), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 3: *Aeschylus*, Göttingen.
- Rau, P. (1967), *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, München.

- Roemer, A. (1902), *Studien zu Aristophanes und den alten Erklärern desselben. I. Teil: Das Verhältnis der Scholien des Cod. Rav. und Venet. nebst Beiträgen zur Erklärung der Komödien des Aristophanes auf Grund unserer antiken Quellen*, Leipzig.
- Roemer, A. (1908), "Philologie und Afterphilologie im griechischen Altertum. I: Die Parodien und die Lehren der Alexandriner über dieselben", in: *Philologus* 67, 240–278.
- Rutherford, W.G. (1905), *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica vol. III*, London/New York.
- Schmidt, M. (1854), *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig.
- Schneider, O. (1838), *De veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus*, Stralsund.
- Sgobbi, A. (2006), "Stesich. fr. 274 Davies: Un inno di Stesicoro ad Atena?", in: *Acme* 59.3, 285–299.
- Snell, B. (1971), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 1: *Didascaliae tragicarum, catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*, Göttingen.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1980), *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, Vol. 1: *Acharnians*. Edited with translation and notes, Warminster.
- Thomas, R.F. (1986), "Vergil's *Georgics* and the art of reference", in: *HSCP* 90, 171–198.
- Totaro, P. (2006), "Eschilo in Aristofane (*Rane* 1026–1029, 1431A–1432)", in: *Lexis* 24, 95–125.
- Wentzel, G. (1896), "Asklepiades 30", in: *RE* 2/2, 1631.
- West, M.L. (1971), *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, vol. i: *Archilochus, Hipponax, Theognidea* (2nd ed.), Oxford.
- White, J.W. (1914), *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes with an Introduction on the Origin, Development, Transmission, and Extant Sources of the Old Greek Commentary on his Comedies*, Boston/London.
- Willi, A. (fthc.), "Ancient scholarship on Aristophanes", to appear in: M.C. Farmer/J.B. Lefkowitz (eds.), *A Companion to Aristophanes*, Chichester/Malden, Mass.

