

## Scholars on comedians on lyric poets: Ar. *Nub.* 967 from Stesichorus to Didymus

### Abstract

In a passage from Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Just Argument evokes a golden past when boys still learned to sing traditional songs; the incipits of two of these are cited verbatim (Ar. *Nub.* 967). As the pertinent scholia show, ancient scholars including Eratosthenes of Cyrene then sought to identify the exact sources alluded to. In this connection, they clearly made mention of compositions by Stesichorus, Lamprocles, and/or Phrynichus; but due to the poor state of the transmission of the individual pieces of evidence we have (which also include *P.Oxy.* 1611), the exact connections and interactions between the various players are difficult to disentangle. However, if appropriate attention is paid to the likely role of each of them within the entire web, much less editorial intervention on the scholiastic text may actually be required than has hitherto been assumed. According to the new reconstruction proposed here, one of the 'old' songs referenced by Aristophanes was in fact also mentioned, but parodically transformed and arguably misascribed, in a comedy by Phrynichus.

### 1. Introduction

In the agon of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Just and Unjust Argument confront each other by presenting what each of them considers to be an ideal education. In doing so, Just Argument (Δίκαιος Λόγος) reminisces about the good old times

...ὅτ' ἐγὼ τὰ δίκαια λέγων ἤνθουν καὶ σωφροσύνη 'νενομίστο.  
πρῶτον μὲν ἔδει παιδὸς φωνὴν γρύξαντος μηδέν' ἀκοῦσαι·  
εἶτα βαδίζειν ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς εὐτάκτως εἰς κιθαριστοῦ  
τοὺς κωμήτας γυμνοὺς ἀθρόους, κεῖ κριμνώδη κατανεῖφοι.  
εἶτ' αὖ προμαθεῖν ἄσμ' ἐδίδασκεν τῷ μηρῷ μὴ ξυνέχοντας,  
ἢ "Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν" ἢ "τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα",  
ἐντειναμένους τὴν ἁρμονίαν ἣν οἱ πατέρες παρέδωκαν. (Ar. *Nub.* 962–968)

...when I was flourishing because I said what is just, and when decent behaviour was the norm. First of all, no-one was to hear the voice of a child making just the slightest noise; second, the neighbourhood boys had to walk in the street in proper order when going to the cithara teacher's, without coats, all in a group, even if the snow was coming down like thick meal; third, the teacher would teach them to learn a song by heart (and not with the legs crossed!), either "Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, terrible..." or "Some far-travelling shout...", pitching their voices to the tune our ancestors had handed down.

Identifying and exploring intertextual references has been an important part of Aristophanic scholarship ever since its beginnings in the early Hellenistic period. It is therefore not surprising if the two incipits of—ostensibly 'classical'—songs mentioned by Just Argument in *Nub.* 967 also

already caught the attention of ancient scholars and made them look for their exact sources. As in many such cases, we get a glimpse of this early research activity in the scholia: these tend to preserve precious nuggets of information even when they have come down to us only in garbled form following centuries of (not always careful) copying, editing, abridging, summarizing, and re-arranging. In the present case, however, the scholiastic tradition, though fairly rich, is so confused that no modern attempt of making sense of it has so far been entirely successful. In this contribution we shall therefore take yet another close look at the matter, which involves no less than two Greek lyric poets, two comic playwrights, and two eminent Hellenistic scholars. Given this cast of figures, it seems a fitting tribute to an equally eminent *modern* scholar, to whose wide-ranging work on the history of both Greek comedy and Greek lyric poetry I owe as much as to his friendship, mentorship, and intellectual generosity over many years.

## 2. The scholia on Ar. *Nub.* 967

In order to get a sense of the difficulties we face when we try to illuminate the intertextual allusions in *Nub.* 967, it is best to start from the scholia themselves. Our focus in what follows will be the first quotation (“Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν”). Although the authorship of the second one (“τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα”) was also somewhat contentious, the situation there is simpler in the sense that the information given in the scholia is entirely congruent: ‘they say that one cannot find out who wrote this; for Aristophanes [of Byzantium] found it in a fragment [i.e., in a text without authorship assignment] in the Library [of Alexandria]. Some, however, claim it was by a certain Cydidas of Hermione: “some far-travelling shout of the lyre”’ (schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967aβ Holwerda, φασὶ δὲ μὴ εὕρισκεσθαι, ὅτου ποτέ ἐστιν· ἐν γὰρ ἀποσπάσματι ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ εὕρεῖν Ἀριστοφάνη. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ Κυδίδου τινὸς Ἑρμιονέως “τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα λύρας” RV; cf. similarly schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967aα *sub fine* and (abridged) schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967bα *sub fine* (both in mss. ENp)).

The *scholia vetera* dealing with the first quotation are reproduced below following the edition of Holwerda (1977); a translation of Holwerda’s text is added. For no. [1] the main source is ms. E (= Estensis gr. 127), a fourteenth-century manuscript with very full scholia that reflect the older (pre-Triclinian) scholiastic tradition despite the relatively late date of the copy. Nos. [2] and [3], by contrast, represent the scholia in the earlier mss. R and V, i.e. the mid-tenth-century Ravennas 429 (the oldest and most complete medieval manuscript of Aristophanes, whose scholia however tend to be quite abbreviated) and the eleventh-century Venetus Marcianus 474 (with particularly valuable, since generally less abbreviated, scholiastic annotations). Holwerda’s text naturally includes some unproblematic and uncontroversial minor amendments, the detail of which need not concern us here. In a few places, however, Holwerda either departs from the transmission in more substantial ways or makes assumptions about lacunae that do require further discussion. These points are underlined and Holwerda’s apparatus on them is also given:

[1] schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967α

ἢ ΕΜ Παλλάδα ΕΜΝρ περσέπτολιν ἢ τηλέπορόν τι βόαμα Ε: τὰμφοτέρων†. τὸ μὲν οὖν πρότερον Λαμπροκλέους εἶναί φασι τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ, Μίδωνος υἱοῦ· ἔχει δὲ οὕτως

“Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κλήζω ΕΜ πολεμοδόκον ἀγνάν,  
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον”. [...] ΕΝρ

*Either “Of Pallas, destroyer of cities...” or “Some far-travelling shout...”*: †of both† The former is said to be by Lamprocles the athlete, son of Midon; it goes as follows:

“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, I sing, the august sustainer of war,  
daughter of great Zeus, tamer of horses”.

[2] schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967βα (directly following on from [1], in ms. E preceded by ἄλλως ‘differently’)

<...> οὕτως Ἐρατοσθένης. Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἄσματος μέμνηται ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος τοῦ Μίδωνος υἱοῦ ἢ μαθητοῦ. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως

“Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον”. Ε

Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ, πότερον <...>

“κλήζω πολεμοδόκον ἀγνάν,  
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον” ΕΝρ

ἢ κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα <...> ὑποτίθησι κατὰ λέξιν. Ε

ante οὕτως lacunam statui coll. β | Φρύνιχος δὲ: scripsi coll. β [= no. [3], A.W.], φρυνίχου Ε | post πότερον lacunam statui, quam sic explere possis: <κατὰ Στησίχορον παραπληροῖ>, cf. POx., ubi l. 165 leg. οὕτω παρα[πληροῖ] | ἦ: coniecī, καὶ Ε | post Λαμπροκλέα lacunam latere suspicor

<...> Thus Eratosthenes. But Phrynichus refers to this very song as being by Lamprocles the son or student of Midon. It goes as follows:

“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, terrible goddess, stirring up strife”.

Chamaeleon, however, is unsure if <...>

“...I sing, the august sustainer of war,  
daughter of great Zeus, tamer of horses”

or according to Lamprocles <...> he cites literally.

[3] schol. Ar. *Nub.* 967ββ

ἢ Παλλάδα R: ἀρχὴ ἄσματος Στησιχόρου, ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης RV φησίν. R Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἄσματος μνημονεύει ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος

“Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κληίζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν,  
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου”. RV

Στησιχόρου: VanLeeuwen (recte, cf. POx. et sch. Aristid.), φρυνίχου R, φ(superscr. η) V

*Either “Of Pallas”*: The incipit of a song by Stesichorus, as Eratosthenes says. But Phrynichus mentions this very song as being by Lamprocles,

“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, I sing, the august sustainer of war,  
daughter of great Zeus”.

That all of these scholia go back to a single archetype is immediately clear given the substantial overlaps in wording across the manuscripts. Broadly

speaking, version [2] is fullest since it not only contains a reference to Eratosthenes at the beginning (as [3] equally does), but also a section mentioning some *aporia* discussed by the Peripatetic Chamaeleon towards the end. Version [1] offers nothing of substance that is not also seen elsewhere, and in its wish for concision it leaves away some important qualification of the ascription to Lamprocles of the Aristophanic “Παλλάδα περσέπολιν” phrase; furthermore, it mistakenly changes the musician Lamprocles from a ‘son or student (μαθητής) of Midon’ into an ‘athlete (ἄθλητής), son of Midon’. Version [3], finally, supports Holwerda’s point that something must be left out at the beginning of [2]. The sequence ... ως Ἐρατοσθένης. Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἔσματος... is largely identical in [2] and [3] (if one disregards the inserted, though by no means necessary, φησὶν in R, but not V, and the fact that [2] has a grammatically difficult gen. Φρυνίχου (without following δέ) instead of nom. Φρύνιχος), but the beginning of [2] is odd as it stands. When scholia reference a named source immediately before some text quoted (or paraphrased) from it—as would be the case in [2] if οὕτως Ἐρατοσθένης were the start of the annotation and therefore taken as ‘Eratosthenes [writes] as follows: ...’—they normally give either just the name or put οὕτως between the name and the quotation; more generally, οὕτως thus tends to stand next to quoted (or paraphrased) text, whether that text precedes or follows.<sup>1</sup> Hence, there is every reason to believe that the original behind [2] began very much as [3] still does, with ἀρχὴ ἔσματος Χ<sup>2</sup>-ου, ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης (φησὶν)· Φρύνιχος δὲ κτλ. As we shall see later (§9), it may even be possible to make a guess as to why the compiler responsible for version [2] eventually chose to leave away the initial words.

### 3. The supplementary evidence

First, however, we must turn our attention to two more substantial and closely interrelated issues, namely (a) the divergent text of the (presumed) model of the song incipit adduced by Just Argument and (b) its authorship. Let us start with (b). In Holwerda’s version of [2], things seem to be deceptively clear in this respect: ‘the incipit of a song by Stesichorus, as Eratosthenes says; but Phrynichus makes mention of the very same song as one by Lamprocles’—and then a full eight words of the model are quoted verbatim.

<sup>1</sup> Compare, for example, schol. Ar. Eq. 755a (III) (ἄλλως· Σύμμαχος οὕτως· <text>), schol. Ar. Eq. 963a (III) (ἄλλως· Σύμμαχος· <text>, followed by Ἐρατοσθένης· <text>, and ending with <text>· οὕτω Σωκράτης (*lege* οὕτως ὁ Κράτης?)), schol. Ar. Vesp. 343b (τινὲς δὲ οὕτως· <text>), schol. Ar. Pax 939c (τινὲς οὕτως· <text>), schol. Ar. Av. 768e ((ἄλλως·) Δίδυμος ἐν τῷ περὶ διεφθορίας λέξεως οὕτως· <text>), schol. Ar. Av. 1379b (Σύμμαχος οὕτως· <text>); schol. Ar. Ach. 398a (<text>· οὕτως καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης), schol. Ar. Ach. 1076a (<text>· οὕτως Δίδυμος), schol. Ar. Ach. 1128a (<text>· οὕτως ὁ Σύμμαχος), schol. Ar. Pax 916 (<text>· οὕτως ὁ Σύμμαχος), schol. Ar. Ran. 1413a (<text>· οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος). A case like schol. Ar. Pax 1353 (<lemma>· οὕτως Ἡλιόδωρος) is of course different because the lemma itself there represents the reading/version promoted by the scholar named.

<sup>2</sup> On the question which name (in the o-stem genitive) is to be read here, see §3.

In reality, though, there is no mention whatsoever of Stesichorus in the scholia as we have them, let alone in mss. R and V (= version [2]). What R has instead of Στησιχόρου is Φρυνίχου. To justify the text he prints, which was first conjectured by van Leeuwen (1898, 154), Holwerda refers to two important additional sources we have not yet considered. The first is a third-century AD papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, which apparently deals with various matters of literary scholarship and which, within this general framework, also discusses in one way or another the Pallas hymn mentioned in *Nub.* 967 as well as its Aristophanic reception (= no. [4]). The other is a scholion on a speech by Aelius Aristides in which Just Argument's description of traditional education in *Clouds* is fully excerpted (= no. [5]):

[4] *P.Oxy.* 1611, frs. 5 + 43 + 40 + 6 + ? (col. i 154-177), following Montanari (1989, 414f.)<sup>3</sup>

.. [±15]  
 155 σιν[ ± 15 ]  
 αδεσ[ ± 15 ]  
 αφορο[ ± 13 κα]  
 θάπερ[ φησὶν Ἐραστοσθέ]  
 νης εἰ[ ± 13 ]  
 160 ταις Φρυν[ίχο]υ[ ± 5 ]  
 ἀφηγούμενος τ.[ ± 6 ]  
 “Πα[λ]λά[δ]α περσέπ[ολιν]  
 162a[κλήζ]ω π[ολ]εμ[αδό]  
 [κο]ν ἄγγνᾶν π[αῖ]δα Δι  
 [ὸς μ]εγάλου δ[αμάσιπ]  
 165 πον” οὕτω παρα[φέρει.]  
 διαποροῦσι γὰρ οὐ[κ ὀ]  
 λίγοι π[ε]ρὶ τ[ού]των, κα  
 [θ]άπερ Χαμαιλέων, πό  
 [τ]ερόν ποτε Στη[σι]χόρου  
 170 ἐστὶν ἢ Λαμπροκλέ[ε]  
 [ο]υς, κ[αί]περ τοῦ Φρυν[ί]  
 [χο]υ Λαμ[προ]κλεῖ μά[λα]  
 [ἀκ]ριβῶς] προσνέμον  
 [τος. καὶ Ἀ]ριστοφάνης  
 175 [δὲ παραπ]οιεῖ λέγων·  
 [“Παλλάδα] π[ε]ρσέ[π]ο[λιν δε  
 [ινάν” ...]

...as [Eratosthe]nes [says]...of Phrynichus...explaining/telling (?)...“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, I sing, the august sustainer of war, daughter of great Zeus, tamer of horses” he cites (?) like this. For about this, quite a few people are unsure if it is by Stesichorus or by Lamprocles, although Phrynichus attributes it [very accurately] to Lamprocles. [But] Aristophanes [also] parodies it saying: “Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, terrible”...

<sup>3</sup> Most of the supplements are similar to those already proposed in Grenfell/Hunt 1919, 135, 146f., but see below (§7) on l. 165 (παρα[φέρει]) and note also ll. 172f. where Grenfell/Hunt tentatively propose μα[θη(τῆ) | Μίδωνος] instead of μά[λα | ἀκριβῶς].

[5] schol. Ael. Arist. *Or.* 46, p. 162.8 Jebb (ed. J. J. Reiske; cf. very similarly schol. Ael. Arist. *Or.* 46, p. 162.7 Jebb, whence the variant readings indicated below)

ἀλλὰ ἢ Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν δεινὰν: ταῦτα Ἀριστοφάνους ἐν αὐταῖς κείμενα ταῖς “Νεφέλαις”. εἶδος δὲ τοῦτο ἄσματος καὶ ἀρχή. τὸν δὲ ποιητὴν αὐτοῦ Ῥοῦφος καὶ Διονύσιος ἱστοροῦσιν ἐν τῇ “Μουσικῇ” Φρύνιχόν τινα, ἄλλοι δὲ φασὶ Λαμπροκλέα, ἢ Στησίχορον. τὸ δὲ δεινὸν [i. δεινὰν] γελοίως ἀντίκειται. τὸ γὰρ ἄσμα οὕτως ἔχει, “Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κλεισοπολεμοδόκον, ἀγνὴν [i. ἀγνὰν] παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλα [i. μεγάλου] δαμνηπῶλον [or δαμνοπῶλον] ἄϊστον παρθένον”. BD Oxon.

*But “Either of Pallas, destroyer of cities, terrible”:* This is by Aristophanes and occurs specifically in *Clouds*; it is a type and incipit of a song. Rufus and Dionysius in their *Music* name some Phrynichus as its poet, but others say Lamprocles or Stesichorus. The word “terrible” is a comic replacement; for the song goes as follows: “Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, \*I sing\*, sustainer of war, the august daughter of great Zeus, tamer of foals, unseen virgin”.

Both [4] and [5] attest an ancient debate about authorship. Thanks to [4], which highlights Chamaeleon’s uncertainty whether the song on which Aristophanes drew was written by Stesichorus or by Lamprocles, we also understand better the mention of an *aporia* of Chamaeleon in [2]. There are thus very good reasons to believe with Holwerda that in [2], after πότερον, a lacuna is to be posited. Against Holwerda, however, the most likely text to have fallen out there is something very much in line with the πότερον-clause in [4], i.e. πότερόν (ποτε) Στησίχορου (ἐστὶν) ἢ Λαμπροκλέους. Not only does [4] not allude to a Chamaeleontic *aporia* about *wording*, as Holwerda would have it,<sup>4</sup> but Holwerda also wistfully interferes with the transmission of [2] when he changes καὶ into ἢ simply because he wants to have a regular πότερον-ἢ structure; and in fact he thereby still ends up with a rather strange statement since one might potentially say ‘Chamaeleon is unsure whether *one has to write* A (with Stesichorus) or B (with Lamprocles)’, but not ‘Chamaeleon is unsure whether *he fills in* A or *cites* B’ (as presupposed by Holwerda’s *exempli gratia* supplements). Hence, whatever else may have happened to this part of [2] in the abridgment process, we can already assert with some confidence that Holwerda’s καὶ → ἢ emendation as well as his insertion of a lacuna in the last line are unwarranted.

#### 4. The problem of the source

Nor can we be more generous with Holwerda’s handling of [3], in the wake of van Leeuwen (who knew [5], but not yet [4]). Their reasoning seems to be this: R’s version of [3], with Φρυνίχου, is paradoxical when it states that ‘[This is] the incipit of a song by Phrynichus; but Phrynichus makes mention of the very same song as one by Lamprocles...’; but since [4] and [5] do inform us that both Lamprocles and Stesichorus were potential

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Arrighetti 1968, 87: “per il papiro i dubbi di Cameleonte vertevano sulla paternità dell’ode, per lo scolio *Aldino* sul testo, mentre riguardo alla paternità Cameleonte avrebbe avuto prove sicure per attribuirgli a Lamprocle”; Arrighetti 1987, 216f.

candidate authors, and since Lamprocles's authorship is said to have been promoted by Phrynichus in the *second* clause of [3], apparently in contrast to what preceded (cf. Φρύνιχος δὲ κτλ.), the other option, i.e. Stesichorus, must have featured in the first clause and Φρυνίχου in R will be no more than a simple mistake, perhaps triggered by the immediately following mention of Phrynichus. In fact, if V's version of [3] shrank back from adopting Φρυνίχου (with the scribe instead putting down what is to be interpreted as an abbreviated φ<sup>n</sup> ~ φησίν, inserted *faute de mieux*), and if the editor of [2] even decided to leave away completely the beginning of the scholion, the trigger in both cases might have been a similar feeling that the 'paradoxical' version we find preserved in R simply could not be the right one—only that the medieval copyists then adopted a more cautious attitude than their modern counterparts did and therefore did not go quite as far as conjuring up an entirely different name.

Unfortunately (or luckily), though, the existence of [5] more or less proves that R's Φρυνίχου is *not* just a careless copyist's mistake. This is because [5] tells us in no uncertain terms that already 'Rufus and Dionysius report in their *Music* that the poet [sc. of the Παλλάδα περσέπολιν song] was a certain Phrynichus'.<sup>5</sup> In fact, we may assume that the same source(s) were also where the Aristides commentator had learned that 'others, however, say it was Lamprocles or Stesichorus'. The two scholars mentioned here were both authors of a Μουσική ιστορία, which would be convenient historical reference works for a commentator who was looking for background information on musical history. The later of them, Rufus, may belong to the third century AD and was probably himself drawing on the work of Dionysius Musicus (Διονύσιος ὁ Μουσικός), a Greek scholar of the Hadrianic age.<sup>6</sup> But if we then further ask who Dionysius Musicus might have got *his* information on the song from, and if we consider that the entire matter was evidently of great importance in Aristophanic scholarship, we are naturally led back to the influential Aristophanic ὑπομνήματα of Didymus Chalcenterus in the first century BC.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile, Didymus' hand must be independently suspected behind [2] (and hence also [3]) anyway because it is generally assumed, with good reason, that whenever our Aristophanic scholia refer back to early Alexandrian scholarship and similar sources (as is the case with the references to Eratosthenes and Chamaeleon here), such knowledge has been channeled through Didymus.<sup>8</sup> So, if we see that both [3] and [5] at least *consider* 'Phrynichus' as a potential author of the song under consideration, but

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Scorza 1934, 12 n. 1: "dalle parole dello scolio R [...] è nata, probabilmente, la confusione commessa da Rufo e Dionisio [...], che accanto a Lamprocle e Stesicoro ricordano anche Frinico quale probabile autore dell'ode a Pallade".

<sup>6</sup> On Rufus see Schultz 1914, Bagordo 1998, 72, 162, and Ercoles 2019, on Dionysius Cohn 1903 and Rocconi 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Dionysius may have been too early already to have used the commentaries of Didymus' main successor, Symmachus, whose date is somewhat uncertain (though likely also in the 2nd cent. AD: cf. Montana 2003); but even if not, Symmachus would no doubt have relied on Didymus for such a discussion.

<sup>8</sup> The purpose and scope of *P.Oxy.* 1611 (containing [4]) remain uncertain, but in his full discussion of the matter Arrighetti (1968, 89-98; 1987, 218-228) has suggested that the most likely source of the pieces of information it contains is also an Aristophanic ὑπόμνημα by Didymus.

also acknowledge that there can hardly be a *direct* link between the line of transmission behind [5] (i.e. Dionysius Musicus → Rufus → Aristides scholion) and the later scholiastic tradition of Aristophanes leading to [3], the most likely conclusion is that Didymus' commentary on *Clouds* was the point where things bifurcated and that the possibility of Phrynichan authorship must therefore have been mentioned in Didymus as well—although, to judge by [3] (and less clearly [2]), he in his turn had referenced Eratosthenes for it. Any interference with R's Φρυνίχου in [3] is therefore rash, be it the change into Στησιχόρου promoted by van Leeuwen and Holwerda or an alternative 'correction' into Λαμπροκλέους as advocated more recently by Benuzzi (2019, 135).<sup>9</sup> Instead, we should rather try to establish whether reading Φρυνίχου in [3] is really as paradoxical as has hitherto been thought.

## 5. The problem of the two versions

First, however, we must turn to the other major issue mentioned in §3, namely the divergently quoted continuation of the song named by Just Argument. Most of our sources give this continuation in what I will from now on call the 'κλήζω version', i.e. Παλλάδα περσέπολι<sup>10</sup> κλήζω πολεμαδόκον ἄγνάν, παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον: see [1] and [4] up to and including δαμάσιππον, [2] (second quotation) from κλήζω to δαμάσιππον, [3] up to μεγάλου, and [5] ending with δαμνηπῶλον/δαμνοπῶλον ἄϊστον παρθένον after μεγάλου. (The very end is of no major concern for our purposes, but I suspect that [5] gives the best text after μεγάλου, though it should probably read δαμνᾶπῶλον instead of δαμνηπῶλον/δαμνοπῶλον: as ἄγνήν for ἄγνάν as well as πολεμοδόκον for (metrically necessary) πολεμᾶδόκον show elsewhere in [5] (πολεμᾶδόκον only in [3], ms. R; contrast -μοδ- also in [1], [2], and [3], ms. V), such a δαμνᾶπῶλον could easily give rise to both of the transmitted variants. At the same time, none of them is a likely later invention rather than a true poetic hapax; by contrast, given the relative commonality of δαμασι- compounds, δαμάσιππον could easily take the place of such a δαμνᾶπῶλον when some exegete felt that a word continuing the previous dactylic run was required. In reality, though, after

<sup>9</sup> To support this, Benuzzi argues that "P.Oxy. 13.1611 [= our no. [4], A.W.] constitutes significant evidence in favour of the opposite information preserved by α [= our no. [2], A.W.], i.e. that Eratosthenes ascribed the Παλλάδα περσέπολι (that he found alluded to in the verse of the *Clouds*) to Lamprocles, because the comic poet Phrynichus quoted the very same text in an extended form, explicitly saying that it was by him". Not only is this based on the problematic assumption that οὕτως Ἐρατοσθένης in [2] is cataphoric (cf. §2 on why this is unlikely) and makes unwarranted inferences from [4] (where it is far from clear what exactly Eratosthenes said: cf. §7), but it also disregards how unnatural the wording of [3] would thus become; for Φρύνιχος δὲ κτλ. would no longer entail any contrast, but merely repeat the ascription already made ('the incipit of a song by Lamprocles, as Eratosthenes says; but Phrynichus makes mention of the very same song as one by Lamprocles...').

<sup>10</sup> The metrically impossible περσέπτολι is read in all of [1], [2], [3], and [5], and it must therefore have crept into the tradition (including that of the Aristophanic text itself) early, perhaps already with Didymus' commentary; but in [4] (col. i 176) the correct form still appears (as also in Ael. Arist. *Or.* 46, p. 162 Jebb, as well as Dio Chrys. *Or.* 13.19, who equally draws on *Nub.* 967).

the dactylic hexameter at the beginning (Παλλάδα—ἀγνάν = | hex |), the song may not have continued with another hexameter—it is not a passage from epic, after all—, but with a combination of | D | 4da ||, or | D | D×e ||.<sup>11)</sup>

In [2], meanwhile, an alternative ‘δεινάν version’ is quoted first, and ascribed to Phrynichus, namely Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἔγρεκύδοιμον. Since Aristophanes’ words in *Nub.* 967 include δεινάν, this version is *prima facie* a better model; and so Wilamowitz (1900, 85) concluded that “die beiden Komiker [sc. Aristophanes and Phrynichus, A.W.] haben eine andere Fassung des Liedes gekannt als später umgieng, und wir werden geneigt sein, die ihre für glaubwürdiger zu halten”.<sup>12</sup> Wilamowitz’s idea, however, was based on an inferior transmission of [2] (in the Aldine edition as opposed to ms. E<sup>13</sup>), without the words Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ, πότερον intervening between ἔγρεκύδοιμον and κλήζω. Accordingly, his ‘more credible’ text would effectively have been an extended *combination* of the δεινάν version and the κλήζω version, not an entirely separate one as has now become clear thanks to ms. E. Also to be discarded, for the same reason if nothing else, is the suggestion by Scorza (1934, 11) and Arrighetti (1968, 88f.; 1987, 218), in the wake of Dindorf (*apud* Dübner 1855, 442), according to which δεινὰν θεὸν ἔγρεκύδοιμον would represent an autoschediastic insertion into the κλήζω version made by some commentator who had noticed that Aristophanes’ δεινάν was otherwise missing in the presumed model; and neither is there anything to be said in favour of a more recent revival of this theory by Sgobbi (2006, 294), who similarly believes that “uno scoliasta, accortosi della discrasia tra l’inno nella forma Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κλήζω e quanto riportato nelle *Nuvole*, abbia tentato di reintegrare le parole di Aristofane [...]: sarebbe certo possibile che una mano, a fronte del testo Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν κλήζω, abbia annotato ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἔγρεκύδοιμον (aggiungendo l’ultimo aggettivo per ricordo di Esiodo) e che poi le parole siano state integrate all’interno dello scolio”.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> One may compare what West (1982, 49) says about the Dorian metrical tradition of Alcman and Stesichorus: “Alcman’s dactyls generally come in standard packets: | D |, | ×D |, | ×D- ||, | D<sup>2</sup> |, 4da |, 4da ||, hex ||. He is particularly fond of the acatalectic tetrameter. Hephaestion p. 22. 12 C. (*PMG* 27) says he composed entire strophes in them; the final position must have been anceps, making the last colon in fact not 4da, but D□-□- ||. [...] All of Stesichorus’ poems were extensively dactylic, but we can discern two categories. In one, iambo-trochaic elements were also present, mainly at the ends of periods”.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. similarly Grenfell/Hunt 1919, 146.

<sup>13</sup> See Holwerda 1952, 228f.; but Wilamowitz’s idea—though not attributed to him—is reiterated in Steffen 1964, 49.

<sup>14</sup> By trying to dismiss the Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ phrase in [2] as a secondary intrusion of a different note into the scholion, Sgobbi (2006, 294–296) then even reverts more or less to the position of Wilamowitz and Scorza as far as his views on the text of the ‘original’ annotation are concerned; his scenario of how this is supposed to have been split up is most implausible, and not just because “the compresence of Eratosthenes’ and Chamaeleon’s section in one cohesive exegetical cluster in P.Oxy. 13.1611 makes the hypothesis of a dismemberment of the ancient annotation somewhat unlikely” (Benuzzi 2019, 140; but Benuzzi otherwise accepts the autoschediastic theory of Dindorf/Scorza/Sgobbi and merely offers yet another variation on how the supposedly composite nature of [2] would have arisen).

Yes, commentators and scholiasts may be careless at times, but what is imputed to them here goes far beyond carelessness: the annotator in question would have completely *made up*, without any need, a fake quotation by adding to the words cited in *Nub.* 967 a hexameter end of his own invention (though inspired by δεινὴν ἔγρεκύδοιμον in Hes. *Theog.* 925). That such a ‘solution’ is a rather desperate *ultima ratio* hardly needs stressing. But how else can we make sense of the conundrum?

## 6. Phrynichus’ role in the story

Let us ‘naively’ start from what [2] actually says, nothing more and nothing less: namely that the δεινάν version is what was to be read in Phrynichus. If this were the case, the beginning of [3], in the version of ms. R whose validity has been defended above, would also be perfectly to the point: since *Nub.* 967 includes δεινάν, not κλήζω, its most immediate correspondent should be the δεινάν version, and if the latter is Phrynichus’, it is correct to annotate that Aristophanes’ Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινάν is ‘the incipit of a song by Phrynichus’. At the same time, [5] tells us equally clearly that δεινάν is a ‘comic replacement’ (γελοίως ἀντίκειται). This is a piece of information interpreters have so far paid next to no attention to, although it is rather curious: for if we look at *Nub.* 967, the introduction of δεινάν has not the slightest comic dimension to it—the line is neither more nor less funny than if it read κλήζω instead. Furthermore, interpreters have also been oddly forgetful of the profile of the person we are dealing with here. There is general agreement that the Phrynichus referred to must be the comic poet Phrynichus,<sup>15</sup> a just slightly older contemporary of Aristophanes’ who probably staged his first play in the late 430s or early 420s, but also still competed, with his *Muses*, in 405 when Aristophanes won with the *Frogs* and in that play dismissed Phrynichus’ humour as stale (*Ar. Ran.* 12–15). On the basis of our scholiastic evidence beyond [2], it is generally assumed that Phrynichus quoted a rather lengthy stretch of a song, by Lamprocles or whoever the author was, displaying the conscientiousness and accuracy of a modern academic and even providing a pertinent source reference. But is this at all likely? Would Aristophanes ever have done something like it? The answer is certainly no. So what if the ‘comicity’ (γελοίως) of the δεινάν version was *Phrynichus*’ work? In that case, *he* would have changed the older Pallas hymn by giving it a new, and parodistic, continuation after the initial words Παλλάδα περσέπολιν. Of course, given our complete ignorance of the context, we cannot know what exactly was funny about δεινὰν θεὸν ἔγρεκύδοιμον, which does look like a Homeric-Hesiodic pastiche,<sup>16</sup> but it is certainly not impossible that

<sup>15</sup> Only Holwerda (1977, 186) thinks of the imperial grammarian Phrynichus (against Holwerda 1952, 230 n. 4), but this is impossible to reconcile with [4]; cf. Montanari 1989, 417; Sgobbi 2006, 291; Stama 2014, 351; Benuzzi 2019, 131 n. 23.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. δεινὴν θεόν in the same metrical slot in *Il.* 6.380 and 6.385 and line-initial δεινὴν ἔγρεκύδοιμον in Hes. *Theog.* 925. Note that feminine θεός, though not entirely unsuited to lyric poetry (cf. Alcaeus fr. 129.6 L.-P., Pind. *Isthm.* 8.34), is not otherwise attested in Stesichorus or other melic fragments (contrast θεά in Stes. fr. 193.10 *PMG* = fr. 90.8 D.-F.; the index of *PMG* also lists for θεά Corinna fr. 654.i.13 *PMG*, Timotheus fr. 791.128

speaking of Pallas as a ‘terrible troublemaker’ instead of an ‘august sustainer of war’ could raise a laugh if recited by the right person at the right moment.

## 7. Gaps and uncertainties in *P.Oxy. 1611*

Importantly, *P.Oxy. 1611*, our source [4], does not contain anything to contradict this hypothesis. It is desperately lacunose in the earlier parts and becomes a little clearer only when the Παλλάδα περσέπολιν quotation starts; but, tantalizingly, the words immediately after the quotation are also incomplete, so that we do not know whether οὔτω παρα[φέρει] ‘adduces/quotes like this’ or οὔτω παρα[ποιεῖ] ‘parodistically transforms like this’<sup>17</sup> should be read in l. 165. This decision partly depends on who the subject of the sentence is, the two most obvious candidates being either Eratosthenes (who was almost certainly named in ll. 158f.) or Phrynichus (who is named in l. 160). The fact that the participle ἀφηγούμενος in l. 161 probably agrees with that subject might help a little if it were taken to be more or less synonymous with ἐξηγούμενος and thus to mean ‘explaining’; for in that case Eratosthenes would be a more likely subject and hence παρα[φέρει] a more likely predicate. However, as long as ἀφηγέομαι (lit. ‘lead the way; (also:) tell’) is not well-attested with a meaning of this sort, things remain uncertain—nor do ll. 174f. elucidate them further: there it is virtually certain that reference is made to Aristophanes ‘parodistically transforming’ the Pallas hymn (with καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης [δὲ παρα]ποιεῖ being a most plausible supplement for the size of the lacunae), but that still does not tell us whether Aristophanes was thought to be the only one who created a παραποίησις or whether he did so *as well*. If anything, and *if* the supplemented καὶ ... δέ is correct, the latter might be the case, not because καὶ in καὶ ... δέ *has* to mean ‘also’, but because the Aristophanes clause here does not thematically address the authorship issue raised in the immediately preceding διαποροῦσι γάρ sentence of ll. 166–174 and should therefore rather resume the argumentative line before l. 166.<sup>18</sup>

Be that as it may, there is nothing in [4] which tells us that the κλήζω version as cited in ll. 162–165 was found as such in Phrynichus. If we read οὔτω παρα[ποιεῖ] in l. 165 and therefore take Phrynichus to be the subject, οὔτω cannot possibly refer to the κλήζω version itself since that version is certainly not parodic; οὔτω would therefore have to refer to some other version introduced earlier. If, on the other hand, we read οὔτω παρα[φέρει] with Eratosthenes as the subject, all we learn is that Eratosthenes in a discussion relating to our problem ‘adduced/quoted’ the κλήζω version as a comparandum (cf. παρα- in παραφέρει), making it again likely that it is not what stood in Phrynichus. The only way how the non-parodic κλήζω

---

*PMG*, and fr. adesp. 923.3 and 933 *PMG*, whereas θεός in Timotheus fr. 791.160 *PMG* is different, since accompanied by μέγαν, not μεγάλην).

<sup>17</sup> Not simply ‘took over’, as rendered by Davies/Finglass 2014, 595.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Denniston 1950, 201: “Usually καὶ ... δέ is taken in the writer’s stride, like καὶ ... δὴ and follows a weak stop”; where it “occasionally [...] marks a completely new start after a stronger break”, the καὶ element seems to have more of an additive (‘also’) value (cf. Denniston 1950, 202, “Introducing a new instance”).

version itself could be what Phrynichus had according to the papyrus would be if we read παρα[φέρει and nevertheless took Phrynichus to be the subject;<sup>19</sup> but that would then again raise the problem of what the participle ἀφηγούμενος meant, and it would also jar with the rather technical character of παραφέρειν as a verb of ‘adducing/quoting’ (or ‘providing (further) evidence’). On balance, we may therefore exclude this last option, no matter how we choose to supplement ll. 158–161. By contrast, we cannot exclude, for instance, that our papyrus, perhaps in the context of a wider discussion of the problematic Pallas hymn in question, referred to what Eratosthenes had to say about a δεινάν adaptation of it in Phrynichus—the damaged passage perhaps containing, purely *exempli gratia*, something like ...κα||θάπερ [φησὶν Ἐρατοσθέ]||νης· ἔ[στι δ’ ἐν τοῖς Κωμασ]||ταῖς<sup>20</sup> Φρυν[ίχο]υ. [ταῦτα δ’] ἀφηγούμενος τ[ὸ μὲν οὖν] | “Πα[λ]λά[δ]α περσέπ[ολιν | κλήζ]ω π[ολ]εμ[αδό]κο]ν ἀγνὰν π[αῖ]δα Δι[ὸς μ]εγάλου δ[αμάσιπ]||πον” οὕτω παρα[φέρει.] | διαποροῦσι γὰρ κτλ.

## 8. Chamaeleon’s *aporia*

If [4] thus does not contradict what [2] in conjunction with the beginning of [3] has to tell us, what about the second part of [3] (and with it [1])? This, after all, is the source on the basis of which it is widely assumed that Phrynichus presented the κλήζω version as a *verbatim* quote from Lamprocles; and further that there was “an interpretative controversy that opposed Eratosthenes (fr. 101 Strecker) to the Peripatetic Chamaeleon”, in the course of which Eratosthenes “explicitly quoted and refuted Chamaeleon’s declaration of *aporia*”—whether declaring in favour of Lamprocles *because of* the testimony of Phrynichus or in favour of Stesichorus *despite* the testimony of Phrynichus.<sup>21</sup> Strictly speaking, however, [3] only tells us that Phrynichus ascribed ‘the very same song’ to Lamprocles (just as [4] also does in ll. 171–174), *not* what Eratosthenes thought about that, let alone to what extent or how Eratosthenes engaged with Chamaeleon. Learned as he was, he *may* of course have done so, but we must not forget that whereas his philological interests in comedy are well-attested, there is no strong evidence for a similar activity in the domain of lyric poetry; in that sense, Eratosthenes’ field of literary research did not entirely overlap with that of Chamaeleon, who wrote an

<sup>19</sup> Thus Benuzzi 2019, 141 n. 54.

<sup>20</sup> This attractive supplement is Holwerda’s (1952, 230 n. 4); ἐν] ταῖς Φρυν[ίχο]υ [ῶδαῖς (Montanari 1989, 415; cf. Grenfell/Hunt 1919, 146) is less convincing because there is no fixed corpus of songs by a comic poet from which one would cite with such a generic reference (≠ e.g. ‘in the songs/poems of Sappho’). In l. 165, Holwerda (1952, 230 n. 1), Arrighetti (1968, 86; 1987, 215), and Montanari (1989, 414) opt for παρα[φέρει, Grenfell/Hunt (1919, 135, 146), followed by others, for παρα[ποιεῖ; see the apparatus in Montanari 1989, 415.

<sup>21</sup> For the former view, see Sgobbi 2006, esp. 292, 296f. and Benuzzi 2019, from whom the above quotations are taken (pp. 125 and 136), for the latter, which depends on Holwerda’s conjecture Στησιχόρου at the beginning of [3] (cf. §3), Holwerda 1952, 230f. and Montanari 1989, 418. Wehrli (1969, 81) thinks that Chamaeleon already solved his own *aporia*.

entire treatise *Περὶ Στησιχόρου* (alongside many other things, including several books *Περὶ κωμωδίας*).<sup>22</sup>

In any case, if we now build on what has already been said about Phrynichus not being an academic who faithfully quotes a source and provides a bibliographical reference for it, we must also ask how trustworthy such a comic poet's 'ascription' is. When the begging poet who visits Cloudcuckooland in Aristophanes' *Birds* introduces himself as a Μουσάων θεράπων ὄτρηρός, κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον, 'a nimble servant of the Muses, according to Homer' (Av. 909f., cf. 913f.), it would be misguided to look for the exact phrase Μουσάων θεράπων ὄτρηρός in Homer: it merely consists of Homeric elements freely assembled as a build-up for a pun on ὄτρηρός in Av. 915. And when the same poet subsequently announces a Πίνδαρειον ἔπος (Av. 939), we also know, thanks to the scholia, that the following 'quotation' νομάδεσσι γὰρ ἐν Σκύθαις ἀλλάται στρατῶν | ὃς ὑφαντοδόνητον ἔσθος οὐ πέπαται. | ἀκλεῆς δ' ἔβα | σπολὰς ἄνευ χιτῶνος. | ξύνες ὃ τοι λέγω ('for he roams among the Scythian nomads, adrift from his band, he who does not own a garment swung in the weaving: the jerkin without mantle goes without fame—understand what I tell you!'), though Pindaric in style and containing some original Pindar, is nevertheless nothing but a pastiche (including, for example, the comic ὑφαντοδόνητον ἔσθος instead of Pindar's actual ἀμαξοφόρητον οἶκον 'a home carried on a wagon') (Av. 941–945; cf. schol. Ar. Av. 941b with Pind. fr. 105(b) Sn.-M.). However, in order to confidently exclude the accuracy of such 'quotations', one has to be able to check the original. In the case of Homer and Pindar, that was relatively easy for an ancient scholar who had access to a well-equipped library—but what if the reference was to a lesser poet, such as Lamprocles? Or, even worse, what if the 'referenced' model for what was recognizably a parody or pastiche was known, yet known as the work of a (far major) poet *other* than the one referenced? In a situation like that, there was a real *aporia*, exactly of the type Chamaeleon faced.

It has rightly been asked in the past why Chamaeleon ever expressed uncertainty over the authorship of the Παλλάδα song if Phrynichus ascribed it in no uncertain terms to Lamprocles.<sup>23</sup> Yet, the likeliest answer to this is not that Chamaeleon was simply unaware of Phrynichus' ascription, whose existence would have been discovered only later by Eratosthenes with the latter thereby solving an *aporia* that had *independently* been around before; nor that both Lamprocles and Stesichorus composed a song beginning with the same words Παλλάδα περσέπολι.<sup>24</sup> Much rather, the *aporia* will have arisen because Phrynichus ascribed to Lamprocles a song that was otherwise—i.e., 'normally'—

<sup>22</sup> That Chamaeleon's *aporia* was formulated in the *Περὶ Στησιχόρου* is generally assumed (e.g. Scorza 1934, 10–12; Wehrli 1969, 55f. and 81; Montanari 1989, 418; Giordano 1977, 141), though of course not absolutely certain; Grenfell/Hunt (1919, 147) seem to think of the *Περὶ κωμωδίας*.

<sup>23</sup> See especially Scorza 1934, 11f., who however confidently believes in Lamprocles having been the real author.

<sup>24</sup> For the former idea see Benuzzi 2019, 139 (next to an alternative hypothesis in which Chamaeleon again simply made up things by postulating out of the blue a separate Stesichorean hymn), for the latter tentatively Page 1962, 135, 379 (and cf. Holwerda 1952, 231 n. 1; Dover 1968, 215; Montanari 1989, 418; Cingano 1990, 212).

attributed to Stesichorus and transmitted among Stesichorus' poems. This paradox *could* have suggested to a scholar like Chamaeleon that the 'normal' classification of the composition as Stesichorean was simply wrong. However, to firmly assert that would have been unwise in view of the fact that Phrynichus was, after all, a comedian, whose humorous purpose in quoting (and adjusting) the text will have been clear enough. Suspending judgment was therefore a more intelligent choice.<sup>25</sup>

Once again, a (partial) parallel in Aristophanes can be instructive. At one point in the agon of *Birds*, Peisetaerus states that Ἴριν δέ γ' Ὅμηρος ἔφασκ' ἰκέλην εἶναι τρήρωνι πελείῃ 'after all, Homer said that Iris is similar to a shy dove' (Av. 575). The problem with this claim is that no such description of Iris is found in the Homeric epics; and so, ancient scholars faced a similar *aporia* as to how much faith they could put in the Aristophanic reference. A scholion on the line bears testimony to this (schol. Ar. Av. 575a): one group of exegetes decided that they were dealing with a deliberate (humoristic) mis-attribution to Homer, while another group preferred to take it at face value and hence sought to come up with a different explanation (in the case at hand, the plausible notion that *hymn. Ap.* 114 must be meant since 'there are also hymns composed by him [= Homer]').

## 9. A new reconstruction of the scholiastic archetype

In line with all this, we can now postulate that some character in a play by Phrynichus in one way or another announced that he was going to sing 'according to Lamprocles' (κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα),<sup>26</sup> and then produced the δεινάν version (Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον). That the second half of this was parodistic (γελοῖως ἀντίκειται, as [5] puts it) will have been recognizable both to the original Athenian audience and to later literary scholars reading Phrynichus, especially if they were also familiar with the model of the parody (i.e., the κλήζω version). But, as sketched above, Phrynichus' attribution to Lamprocles did not also *have to be* wrong, or comic, merely because the κλήζω version was *usually* regarded as Stesichorean. Chamaeleon therefore remained undecided—but, for all we know, the same might have been true of Eratosthenes.

With regard to Aristophanes' quotation in *Nub.* 967, meanwhile, it was perfectly appropriate to say that it was 'the incipit of a song by Phrynichus' as it contained the word δεινάν: only without δεινάν could one have said that it was 'the incipit of a song by Lamprocles/Stesichorus'. For the sake of precision, however, it was still sensible to add, as the second half of [3] in fact does, that 'Phrynichus, however, refers to this very song as one by Lamprocles' and then also cite the original κλήζω wording (just as, for example, the original wording of Pind. fr. 105(b) Sn.-M. is quoted in

<sup>25</sup> The song (with κλήζω) is unconditionally attributed to Stesichorus by Tzetzes, *Chil.* 1.685–687, but it is difficult to build much on that as long as we do not know how Tzetzes (who knew of the authorship dispute: see Tzetzes, *schol. in Chil.* 1.686a) came to that conclusion.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. G. Kaibel *apud* Kassel/Austin 1989, 427, on Phrynichus fr. 78 K.-A.: "Phrynichus videtur carminis illius particulam quandam adhibuisse eodem fere quo Aristophanes modo, addito tamen κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα".

schol. Ar. Av. 941b; cf. §8). The double mention of Phrynichus in ms. R's version of [3] is thus not paradoxical, nor does it require emendation (cf. §4).

In [1], the information of [3] has been (misleadingly) condensed by omitting any reference to Phrynichus; the person responsible for that, who was somewhat careless also in other respects (cf. §2), may have done so either because he felt that there was a paradox between a song being 'by Phrynichus', yet said by Phrynichus to be 'by Lamprocles', and/or because he thought that all that mattered was the ultimate origin (hence Lamprocles).

[2] is more interesting. Here, too, there must have been some condensation and some attempt to get to grips with the seeming paradox; but, luckily, both song incipits are nevertheless retained. In its attempt to overcome the apparent problem, [2] left away the beginning of the note as we still have it in R's version of [3] (ἀρχὴ ᾠσματος Φρυνίχου), but kept the actual incipit of Phrynichus' δεινάν text—though transferring it to the place where [1] and [3] quite naturally give the κλήζω text since the sentence at that point has moved on to the Lamprocles question (so that the quotation of the Lamprocles text is appropriate). This transfer in [2] must have seemed legitimate if 'the very same song' was at stake (αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ᾠσματος). Thus, the κλήζω version now only appears in the second half of [2], where mention is made of Chamaeleon's *aporia*—a point that has been cut out altogether as unnecessary additional information in [1] and [3]. However, as we have already seen, things have become garbled in this second half of [2], too. This, we now realize, is nothing but a consequence of the unfortunate intervention in the first half, as the changes there made it difficult to understand how the κλήζω version that is now cited can be a literal (κατὰ λέξιν) rendering of Lamprocles' text (κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα) if Lamprocles' text had just been equated with the δεινάν version.

In order to make these interventions easier to follow, I now offer a (necessarily tentative) reconstruction of what the original 'full' annotation may have looked like before it was adapted in the various ways just outlined:

ἡ Παλλάδα: ἀρχὴ ᾠσματος Φρυνίχου, ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης φησίν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· "Παλλάδα περσέπολι δεινάν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον"	= [3], abridged in [2]
	= [2], but transferred below
Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ᾠσματος μνημονεύει ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος τοῦ Μίδωνος υἱοῦ ἢ μαθητοῦ <τοῦ> "Παλλάδα περσέπολι κλήζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν, παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον".	= [2], shortened in [3] (and [1])
	= [1], [3]; omitted in [2] due to transfer of δεινάν text
Χαμαιλέων δ' ἀπορεῖ, πότερον <Στησιχόρου ἢ Λαμπροκλέους τὸ> "κλήζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν,	= [2] (with garbled omission; but cf. [4], ll. 168-171); omitted in [1] and [3]

παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον” = [2]  
 (καὶ κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα ὑποτίθησι κατὰ λέξιν). (~ [5]; cf. [4], ll. 174–177)  
 <τὸ δὲ “δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον” γελοίως  
 ἀντίκειται.>

“*Or of Pallas*”: The incipit of a song by Phrynichus, as Eratosthenes says. It goes as follows:

“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, terrible goddess, stirring up strife”

But Phrynichus refers to this very song as if Lamprocles the son or student of Midon was the author of

“Of Pallas, destroyer of cities, I sing, the august sustainer of war,  
 daughter of great Zeus, tamer of horses”.

Chamaeleon, however, is unsure if Stesichorus or Lamprocles is the author of

“...I sing, the august sustainer of war,  
 daughter of great Zeus, tamer of horses”

(and he cites it literally in line with Lamprocles).

<The words “terrible goddess, sustainer of strife” are a humorous replacement.>

Although a note like this might seem confusing or redundant at first sight, and hence invite any copyist’s shortening of intervention, its logic is impeccable. It begins with the identification of the source apparently cited by Aristophanes (i.e., Phrynichus) and names the scholar who first discussed the matter (i.e., Eratosthenes). In order to prove the accuracy of the identification, a little more than just the three words echoed by Aristophanes are given. Next, attention is drawn to the fact that Phrynichus introduces this song as if it were one by Lamprocles—although the older song thus referenced in reality goes (i.e., continues) somewhat differently. Moreover, all of this raises yet another issue because the song that Phrynichus indirectly presents as a Lamproclean composition was also (perhaps more commonly?) ascribed to Stesichorus, causing Chamaeleon’s uncertainty which is now mentioned. In this context, it matters that Chamaeleon was really thinking of the same song as Phrynichus, and that is why it is important to stress that Chamaeleon does indeed cite its words in exactly the same way as what has just been presented as the ‘Lamproclean’ version. Finally—but of course this bit is not found in any Aristophanic scholion, only inferred from sources [4] and [5], and hence added merely to show how it could *in principle* have fit in —, it would make sense to conclude by spelling out that the divergence of Phrynichus’ (and Aristophanes’) version from the Stesichorean/Lamproclean one had some humorous dimension to it.

## 10. More on Aristophanes’ text

Even with the above reconstruction, one point remains as unclear as it was under the assumption that Phrynichus had taken over the κλήζω version in its entirety from Lamprocles: namely why Aristophanes wrote δεινὰν, not κλήζω. The wider context in *Clouds* certainly suggests that Just Argument must be adducing the words of a serious poet like Lamprocles or Stesichorus, not those of a contemporary comedian. This problem does not, however, justify the uneconomical hypothesis that two

completely *independent* old songs starting with the same two words Παλλάδα περσέπολις existed. If that had been the case, it would not have made sense for any ancient scholar to discuss the Παλλάδα περσέπολις κλήζω song at all; for only the Παλλάδα περσέπολις δεινάν song could then reasonably have been regarded as Aristophanes' actual reference point.<sup>27</sup> More plausibly, it might instead be hypothesized that the third word of the Lamproclean/Stesichorean song was known in two variants. While Aristophanes (and Phrynichus) would have had in mind the δεινάν variant, later editors of the lyric author in question would have canonized the κλήζω alternative, and the latter would therefore also have been the variant known to Hellenistic scholars working on Aristophanes. In that case, the comic divergence of Phrynichus from his model would effectively have started only *after* δεινάν, with θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον instead of πολεμαδόκον κτλ. Regrettably, we simply do not have any evidence to further strengthen or weaken such a theory—or indeed alternatives to it.<sup>28</sup>

## 11. More on Phrynichus' point

Similarly, not much can be said about the function of the reference to Lamprocles in Phrynichus. Even if the original κλήζω song was (comically) altered by Phrynichus, as has been suggested above, adding κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα to the new version *need* not have entailed a jibe at this early-fifth-century<sup>29</sup> poet. After all, the 'Pindaric' compositions of the begging poet in Aristophanes' *Birds* also do not make fun of Pindar himself as much as of contemporary singers performing (or imitating) Pindar. On the other hand, there is nothing to suggest that Lamprocles played in quite the same league as Pindar or, say, Stesichorus as a poetic reference author; and that is why it is also conceivable that there was some more specific point to Phrynichus' mention of Lamprocles. However, the temporal distance between Phrynichus and Lamprocles might speak against this: Old Comedy tends to make fun of poetic contemporaries, not of comparatively minor figures who lived half a century earlier. Against

<sup>27</sup> Thus, if it had been the case that "Chamaileon knew of a poem among the works of Stesichorus which contained the words Παλλάδα...ἐγρεκύδοιμον" [i.e., the δεινάν version], while "Παλλάδα...δαμάσιππον is what Phrynichos wrote" (Dover 1968, 215; cf. Holwerda 1952, 231 n. 1; Campbell 1991, 187), it would have been odd for any Aristophanic scholar to consider Phrynichus' divergent text (and its ascription to Lamprocles) relevant. By contrast, it is in line with the above argument to assign Παλλάδα περσέπολις κλήζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον (or: δαμναπῶλον, ἄϊστον παρθένον; cf. §5) a place among the fragments of Stesichorus (cf. Davies/Finglass 2014, 202f. with Stes. fr. 322a/322b Davies-Finglass among the "fragmenta fortasse Stesichorea"; contrast Stes. fr. 274 *PMG* with only Παλλάδα περσέπολις). Meanwhile, neither this nor Παλλάδα περσέπολις δεινάν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον can be ascribed to Lamprocles with any confidence (*pace* Page 1962, 379, with Lamprocles fr. 1 (a)/(b) *PMG*).

<sup>28</sup> Such as the idea that Aristophanes made Just Argument borrow δεινάν from Phrynichus on purpose, to raise a laugh about the traditionalist getting things wrong himself. Note that even if something like this seems too contorted to be actually true, it could still be what some ancient scholar might have suggested.

<sup>29</sup> The rough chronological placement of Lamprocles is inferable from schol. Pl. *Alcib.* 118c, according to which he was the teacher of Damon, who in turn taught music to Pericles (c. 495–429 BC).

this background, and also considering the fact that we know for sure that Phrynichus made fun of a less remote—and arguably more prominent (cf. Pl. *Mnx.* 236a, Aristoxenus fr. 76 Wehrli)—musician Lamprus (whom he mocks as a ‘water-drinker, whining super-sophist, mummy of the Muses, shivering fit of nightingales, hymn of Hades’: Phrynichus fr. 74 K.-A.), we may perhaps, rather boldly, wonder if Phrynichus had not actually referred to this Lamprus also in our case, deriding the way in which he performed ‘classic’ songs (like those of Stesichorus). If so, Phrynichus would of course have written κατὰ Λάμπρον, not κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα, but the two names might then have been confused in the transmission either before or with Eratosthenes.<sup>30</sup>

## 12. More on Eratosthenes’ interests

Finally, Eratosthenes’ role in the entire story also deserves further reflection. We have already seen that the common view according to which Eratosthenes responded to Chamaeleon and solved Chamaeleon’s *aporia* about the authorship of the Pallas hymn by reference to Phrynichus is everything but certain: more likely, Chamaeleon’s *aporia* arose because he himself had already become aware of the Phrynichus passage while working on his treatise Περὶ Στησιχόρου (§8). As also already mentioned, no similar scholarly interest in lyric poetry *per se* can be ascertained for Eratosthenes.<sup>31</sup> By contrast, we have a good idea of one important facet of Eratosthenes’ substantial work Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας, which chimes in with his wider interests in critical chronology. According to schol. Ar. *Nub.* 553, Eratosthenes corrected Callimachus who had thought he had found an error in Aristotle’s *Didaskaliai* as they dated Aristophanes’ *Clouds* to 424/3 BC, despite the fact that the parabasis mentions Eupolis’ *Marikas* of 422/1 BC; in response to this, Eratosthenes observed that the transmitted text of *Clouds* must be a partially revised version, so that the *Didaskaliai* were in fact correct. And along similar lines, he also dealt with the question if Aristophanes had restaged his *Peace*, since the *Didaskaliai* seem to have contained two pertinent entries, or if there had been two plays of the same title, only one of which would have survived in the Alexandrian library (cf. argum. A2 in Ar. *Pacem*).

In view of these and further indications<sup>32</sup> that chronological matters were central to Eratosthenes’ occupation with comedy, his concern about the

<sup>30</sup> Such a mix-up does seem to have occurred elsewhere, too, since Athen. 1.20e reports that Sophocles was as a child taught παρὰ Λάμπρω; chronologically, παρὰ Λαμπροκλεῖ would make much better sense here (cf. Abert 1924, 587; Campbell 1991, 315 n. 1).

<sup>31</sup> Apart from the matter discussed in this article, the only hint at some lyric topic comes in schol. Pind. *Ol.* 9.1k mentioning Eratosthenes’ ideas on the hymnic refrain τήνελλα καλλίνικε used by Archilochus (cf. Pfeiffer 1968, 162); but even this may originally have belonged in the context of a discussion of Ar. *Av.* 1764f. (cf. schol. Ar. *Av.* 1764).

<sup>32</sup> See also schol. Ar. *Plut.* 1194 (dealing with the chronology of a comic motif found in *Plutus*, *Ecclesiazusae*, Strattis, and Philyllius), schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1028 (on the implications of an Aristophanic passage for the staging history of Aeschylus’ *Persians*), *P.Oxy.* 2737 (= Aristophanes 27 *CLGP*), col. II.10–17 (on the evolution of the dramatic career of Plato Comicus), Cic. *ad Att.* 6.1.18 (on Eupolis’ chronology); elsewhere, the Aristophanic scholia often cite Eratosthenes on lexical points (cf. in general Pfeiffer 1968, 161f.; Bagordo 1998, 37–40 and 127–136; Geus 2002, 291–301; Montana 2020, 186f.).

source behind Ar. *Nub.* 967 acquires a new dimension. If Aristophanes cited the third word of the Pallas hymn as δεινάν, in line with Phrynichus, but not in line with the traditional (probably Stesichorean) κλήζω text, this fact could be used to establish a useful bit of comic chronology: for at least the relevant passage in Aristophanes' *Clouds* then had to be composed later than the play by Phrynichus which contained the same distinctive δεινάν wording. The demonstrability of a sequence (Stesichorus or Lamprocles →) Phrynichus → Aristophanes could thus potentially be of some help in pinning down the difficult chronology of the *Clouds* script as preserved in Alexandria (cf. above)—and therefore easily catch the attention of a scholar with Eratosthenes' mindset.

### 13. Conclusion

It goes without saying that we have moved well into the realm of speculation with the last three sections (§§10-12); none of them is essential to the central argument proposed above. The principal aim of the preceding pages was to make sense of the various and at first sight contradictory scholia on Ar. *Nub.* 967. Against earlier researchers who either brushed aside the matter as irresolvable or intervened on the scholiastic text in a heavy-handed manner, it has been argued that the transmission is, on the whole, quite sound and that any apparent incompatibilities between the sources we have can be explained by invoking (and rationally accounting for) abridgment and condensation processes that were applied to an internally consistent fuller annotation (§9), perhaps compiled by Didymus (§4). In doing such reconstructive work, we must be careful (i) not to read more into the evidence than it actually tells us—as with the alleged scholarly response by Eratosthenes to Chamaeleon (§8)—, nor (ii) to forget that each of the figures we are dealing with was a rational actor—be it a comic poet like Phrynichus, who must not be assumed to have excerpted long stretches of serious poetry without some intervention of his own (§6), or a scholar like Eratosthenes, who will have had his reasons when he established a link of the Aristophanic line with Phrynichus even though everything in the context of Aristophanes' quotation would have prompted the search for a non-comic source (§9). Even if we do pay attention to these two fundamental principles, we may of course not find *all* the answers we are looking for, but chances are that we at least get a little closer to disentangling the complex web of literary and scholarly interactions of which the scholia give us such a precious glimpse.

### References

- Abert, H. (1924), "Lampros 2", in: *RE* XII/1, 587.  
Arrighetti, G. (1968), "Il POx 13.1611: alcuni problemi di erudizione antica", in: *Studi Classici e Orientali* 17, 76-98.  
Arrighetti, G. (1987), *Poeti, eruditi e biografie: Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*, Pisa.

- Bagordo, A. (1998), *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama*, Stuttgart/Leipzig.
- Benuzzi, F. (2019), "Eratosthenes' *studia Aristophanica*: The case of schol. Ar. Nub. 967a $\alpha$ - $\beta$ , b $\alpha$ - $\beta$  Holwerda", in: R. Berardi, N. Bruno, and L. Fizzarotti (eds), *On the Track of the Books: Scribes, Libraries and Textual Transmission*, Berlin/Boston, 125-141.
- Campbell, D. A. (1991), *Greek Lyric III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides and Others* (Loeb Classical Library 476), Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Cingano, E. (1990), "L'opera di Ibyco e di Stesicoro nella classificazione degli antichi e dei moderni", in: *AION(filol)* 12, 189-224.
- Cohn, L. (1903), "Dionysios 142", in: *RE* V/1, 986f.
- Davies, M./Finglass, P. J. (2014), *Stesichorus: The Poems*, Cambridge.
- Denniston, J. D. (1950), *The Greek Particles* (2nd edn rev. K. J. Dover), Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. (1968), *Aristophanes: Clouds* (ed. with introduction and commentary), Oxford.
- Dübner, F. (1855), *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, Paris.
- Ercoles, M. (2019), "Rufus [3]", in: F. Montanari/F. Montana/L. Pagani (eds), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (online) ([https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278\\_Rufus\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Rufus_3))
- Geus, K. (2002), *Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, München.
- Giordano, D. (1977), *Chamaeleontis Heraclaeotae Fragmenta*, Bologna.
- Grenfell, B. P./Hunt, A. S. (1919), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 13, London.
- Holwerda, D. (1952), "De novo Chamaeleontis studiorum testimonio", in: *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 5, 228-231.
- Holwerda, D. (1977), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, part 1, fasc. 3.1: *Scholia vetera in Nubes*, Groningen.
- Kassel, R./Austin, C. (1989), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vol. 7: *Menecrates - Xenophon*, Berlin/New York.
- van Leeuwen, J. (1898), *Aristophanis Nubes cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Leiden.
- Montana, F. (2003), "Symmachus [1]", in: F. Montanari/F. Montana/L. Pagani (eds), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (online) ([https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278\\_Symmachus\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Symmachus_1))
- Montana, F. (2020), "Hellenistic scholarship", in: F. Montanari (ed.), *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Byzantine Age*, Leiden/Boston, 132-259.
- Montanari, F. (1989), "29 Chamaeleon, 5T: POxy 1611, fr. 5 + 43 + 40 + 6 + ?: De Stesichoro (?)", in: *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF): Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina*, part 1: *Autori noti*, vol. 1, Firenze, 414-418.
- Page, D. L. (1962), *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Rocconi, E. (2010), "Dionysius [12] Musicus", in: F. Montanari/F. Montana/L. Pagani (eds), *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (online) ([https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278\\_Dionysius\\_12\\_Musicus](https://doi.org/10.1163/2451-9278_Dionysius_12_Musicus))

- Schultz, W. (1914), "Rufus 17", in: *RE* ser. 2, I/1, 1207.
- Scorza, G. (1934), "Il peripatetico Cameleonte", in: *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 18, 1-48.
- Sgobbi, A. (2006), "Stesich. fr. 274 Davies: Un inno di Stesicoro ad Atena?", in: *Acme* 59, 285-299.
- Stama, F. (2014), *Frinico: Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento*, Heidelberg.
- Steffen, V. (1964), *Chamaeleontis Fragmenta*, Warszawa.
- Wehrli, F. (1969), *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, vol. 9: *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (2nd edn), Basel/Stuttgart.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1900), *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin.
- West, M. L. (1982), *Greek Metre*, Oxford.

Andreas Willi, University of Oxford  
Worcester College, Oxford OX1 2HB, Great Britain  
andreas.willi@worc.ox.ac.uk