

Nikolaos Athanassiou

**Marginalia and Commentaries in the Papyri of Euripides,
Sophocles and Aristophanes**

**PhD thesis / Dept. of Greek and Latin
University College London**

London 1999



Name of candidate: Nikolaos Athanassiou
Title of Thesis: Marginalia and commentaries in the papyri of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes.

The purpose of the thesis is to examine a selection of papyri from the large corpus of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes. The study of the texts has been divided into three major chapters where each one of the selected papyri is first reproduced and then discussed. The transcription follows the original publication whereas any possible textual improvement is included in the commentary. The commentary also contains a general description of the papyrus (date, layout and content) as well reference to special characteristics. The structure of the commentary is not identical for marginalia and hypomnemata: the former are examined in relation to their position round the main text and are treated both as individual notes and as a group conveying the annotator's aims. The latter are examined lemma by lemma with more emphasis upon their origins and later appearances in scholia and lexica.

After the study of the papyri follows an essay which summarizes the results and tries to incorporate them into the wider context of the history of the text of each author and the scholarly attention that this received by the Alexandrian scholars or later grammarians. The main effort is to place each papyrus into one of the various stages that scholarly exegesis passed especially in late antiquity. Special treatment has been given to P.Würzburg 1, the importance of which made it necessary that it occupies a chapter by itself. The last chapter of the thesis deals with the issue of glosses, namely their origin and use in the margins of papyri. The focus is again on the history of early collections of tragic and comic vocabulary and their appearance in the margins or hypomnemata. The parallel circulation of hypomnemata and glossaries often compiled by the same people and some special features of the glosses in our material led to the conclusion that most glosses at least in the earlier periods were copied from hypomnemata. The thesis ends with a presentation of all conclusions from the previous chapters in relation to the history of scholarship and book production in late antiquity.

Table of Contents

	Pages
Preface	4
Chapters	
1. The papyri of Euripides	8
P. Oxy.3716: <i>Orestes</i>	9
P. Mich. Inv.3735: <i>Orestes</i>	11
P. Harris 38: <i>Medea</i>	13
P. Merton 2.54: <i>Phoenissae</i>	15
P. Oxy.3712: <i>Phoenissae</i>	16
P. Oxy.2543: <i>Andromache</i>	18
PSI 1302: <i>Alcmeon</i>	19
P. Oxy.3215: <i>Alcmeon</i>	21
P. Oxy.852: <i>Hypsipyle</i>	22
P. Oxy.3719: <i>Iphigenia in Aulis</i>	24
P. Oxy.1370: <i>Orestes and Medea</i>	26
P. Oxy.3718: <i>Orestes and Bacchae</i>	28
P. Ant. 1.23: <i>Medea</i>	33
Louaniensis deperditus: <i>Andromache</i>	34
P. Gr. Vindob.29769: <i>Phoenissae</i>	35
Conclusions	38
Appendix to Chapter 1	
P. Würzburg 1: A Commentary on Euripides' <i>Phoenissae</i>	44
2. The papyri of Sophocles	59
P. Oxy.1805: <i>Trachiniae</i>	60
PSI 1192: <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>	63

P. Oxy.2180: <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>	69
P. Oxy.3151: <i>Ajax Locrus</i>	71
P. Oxy.1175: <i>Eurypylus</i>	74
P. Oxy.2452: <i>Theseus</i> (?)	77
P. Oxy.1083 + 2453: <i>Polyidos</i> or <i>Manteis</i> and other plays	80
P. Oxy.1174: <i>Ichneutae</i>	82
Conclusions	86
3. The papyri of Aristophanes	92
P. Oxy.856: Commentary on <i>Acharnians</i>	93
P. Mich.3690: <i>Heroes</i> (?)	106
P. Grenf.12: <i>Gerytades</i> or <i>Thesmophoriazousae II</i> (?)	108
P. Amh.13: ?	111
P. Rain.3.20: Commentary on <i>Clouds</i>	114
P. Rain.1.34: Commentary on <i>Peace</i>	117
Conclusions	122
4. Didymus, Glossaries and Lexica, Marginalia	127
5. Conclusions	148
Bibliography	178
Appendix with the texts of papyrus commentaries	189

Preface

The first time I heard about marginalia and commentaries in papyri was in the autumn term of 1993 in a paper delivered by Prof. H. Maehler in the Department of Greek and Latin at UCL. Since then the initial awe in front of such a specialized and unknown to me subject was gradually replaced by curiosity and interest to work further into this field and to explore some of its “secrets”. The decision that this would be the subject of my PhD research was made the following year.

The papyrological evidence about hypomnemata and annotation on classical Greek authors covers a substantial amount of texts and literary genres from Homer and Hipponax to Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. Some of it has already been thoroughly studied in the first editions of the papyri, or in monographs and articles by various scholars under different perspectives. There have been, however, very few attempts to reconsider as a whole all this evidence which is scattered in papyrological publications and to draw conclusions about the nature and methods of the ancient exegesis as illustrated in papyri.

The main idea behind the present study was to reexamine a selection of annotated papyri or hypomnemata on papyrus from the corpus of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes. The focus is not on the purely papyrological aspect since most of the material has already been adequately published. A general description of the papyri, however, is always given insofar as this is necessary for the better understanding of the marginalia and of the circumstances under which they were written. The principal objective of our work is to compare the material provided by the papyri to the scholia of the byzantine manuscripts (usually to the so-called scholia vetera but occasionally to the scholia recentiora too). The scholia recentiora reflect the studies of the famous Byzantine scholars such as Tzetzes, Triclinius and Moschopoulos but they contain also elements of much earlier exegesis which has not been preserved in the scholia vetera.

A study of ancient exegesis on classical literature would not be complete without a constant consideration of all the relevant material in lexicography of late antiquity and Byzantine times. Entries in Hesychius, Suda, the Etymologica and other lexica were used in order to help us reconstruct the origins and various channels through which Alexandrian and Graeco-Roman scholarship has been transmitted up to the present times. The study of the lexica confirmed the known fact that in antiquity a systematic exchange of material between commentaries, glossaries

and possibly monographs took place; unfortunately the evidence from monographs is still too limited to be of any use in this study. Given the complexities surrounding the sources of lexicographical material, it was inevitable that occasionally some questions remained unanswered and some links were based upon a certain amount of speculation. Hopefully, however, we managed to throw some more light upon the development of scholarship on drama and the radical changes that this kind of exegetical material underwent during the first seven centuries of our era.

In dealing with marginalia and hypomnemata in papyrus one needs to be consistent with a very precise terminology which would help to avoid confusion as far as different and successive forms of the scholarly material are concerned. First of all, the very familiar term “scholium / a” refers exclusively to the bulk of exegesis transmitted in the margins of the byzantine manuscripts and not to any earlier form of marginal annotation as has been the practice of many earlier editors of papyri. Within “scholia” we distinguish between “scholia vetera” and “scholia recentiora” or preferably “scholia byzantina”, which in old editions used to be edited together. “Marginal note / marginalia” refers to the annotation of papyri in general, although it was necessary to specify as “interlinear” a note or a gloss inserted between the lines of the main text. The terms “commentary” and “hypomnema” are usually interchangeable, namely they are both used to define the same kind of literary work introduced by the Alexandrian scholars. Accordingly, the terms for the people responsible for marginal annotation and commentaries are “annotator” and “commentator”. “Lemma” denotes the excerpt from the main text which had been cited in a commentary or a lexicon and “explanation” is whatever sort of exegetical material followed.

Chapters 1, 2 and 3 are devoted to the papyri of each poet separately, and always conclude with some very specific considerations drawn from each group, with regard to the history of annotation of the dramatic texts in the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman world. The Appendix to Chapter 1 is a papyrus commentary which, though on Euripides, needed to be discussed separately and not in Chapter 1. Chapter 4 deals with the issue of marginal glosses and their links to the scholiographical and lexicographical tradition. The method of presenting the papyri examined in these chapters is as uniform as possible: main texts and marginalia are accurately reproduced but not always according to their first edition. Subsequent publications are taken into account, provided, of course, that they offer an improved version of the papyrus.

For reasons of economy of space, the papyrus text which is offered includes only the part of the papyrus that contains the marginalia; all the rest is omitted unless it is absolutely indispensable. Because our interest was not in the readings of the main text, there is no critical apparatus. However, important disagreements in the readings of the marginalia are always mentioned and judged in the discussion that follows.

All texts of papyrus commentaries are appended in full at the very end of this study in the form of photocopies from the first editions. Their lemmata, however, are discussed selectively and only if there is something new and important to be added to the first edition.

During this study I tried to check from the original as many papyri as possible but this was not achieved for texts belonging to collections abroad. The only exception was P. Würzburg 1 (appendix to Ch.1) which I had the opportunity to examine carefully during my five month stay in Würzburg as an Erasmus student in the winter of 1995-6. For the rest I had to rely on photographs which unfortunately were not all of the same quality, as far as cursive and faded marginalia are concerned. At this point I take the opportunity to apologize for not having indicated uncertain letters with the appropriate dots underneath as it is the practice in editions of papyri; this is exclusively due to the lack of the appropriate Greek fonts while typing the thesis. As already stated, however, all uncertain readings affecting the interpretation of the marginalia are cited and discussed as appropriate.

An earlier version of the P. Würzburg 1 has been presented in Würzburg and London, P. Oxy.1805 and PSI 1192 from Chapter 2 at the Classical Association Conference in Lampeter, Wales. I would like to thank all these audiences for their useful criticism and suggestions.

Finally, I wish to thank a few people who stood by me and helped me at all stages of this research: first of all, my supervisor, Prof. H. Maehler, for his inspiring ideas, constant encouragement and all the valuable time he spent correcting earlier drafts of my thesis. Secondly, Prof. K. Alpers from Hamburg University for advising me on the chapter of my work on glossaries, lexica and marginalia. His expertise saved me from many mistakes and his meticulous writings on lexica have always been a very safe guide when I was looking for links between marginalia, scholia and lexica. Thirdly, the staff at the manuscripts Department of the Würzburg University Library for allowing and facilitating my personal inspection of P. Würzburg 1.

I also deeply thank my very good friend Dr Pantelis Michelakis for his continuous

Preface

support and useful exchange of ideas all these years as well as for his help with the final proofreading of the present thesis. I should not forget to mention also Mr and Mrs Sparsi for their warm hospitality in London for the past four years.

Above all, however, my greatest thanks go to my parents, Panagiotis and Stella Athanassiou, who believed in me and supported me throughout both emotionally and financially.

Chapter 1

The Papyri of Euripides

Col. I]	
].	
	τις] αν	941
]	
] []	
].. []	
].. []	945
	μ θ]ανείν ^{ζη}	
	σφ]αγηι	
].	
	εκκλητω]ν απο	
	ομαρτου]σιν φιλοι	950
]σοι	
]	
]	

P.Oxy.3716 is fragment of a papyrus roll which contained *Orestes*. What remains is part of two consecutive columns (ll. 941-51, 973-83) with intercolumnar space. If, as the editor (M. Haslam in 1986) has assumed, vv. 957-9 were not included, the papyrus had about 31 lines to the column. The hand can be dated to the later second century B.C. There are no accents, breathings or any lectional aids apart from a stichometric K (=v.1000) which was probably used by professional scribes in order to calculate and receive their payment, and a diplo obelismene indicating the transition from the antistrophe to the epode (l. 981).

We should start from what looks like a marginal note next to and above v. 946. Although the papyrus is damaged, one can see clearly the siglum ζη attached to v. 946 and an interlinear variant from which only the letter ν is preserved. The cursive script in which the ζη has been written has led the editor to the conclusion that it should be attributed to a date “no earlier than

the first century A.D.” Apparently, then, the papyrus roll continued to be in use for nearly two centuries after it was written, in the hands of someone interested in matters of textual criticism or someone who checked the readings of his old copy against a more recent one. It was very common indeed for scribes or owners of papyri to correct their texts by comparing them to one or more other copies.¹ On the other hand, there has been some disagreement over the meaning of the siglum ζη, often found in literary papyri.² The most plausible theory is that it was an abbreviation of the verb ζή(τει) or ζη(τεῖται) whose general meaning was ‘ the expression or the word or the passage is under question ’. In some cases, like the famous P. Oxy. 5.841 (Pindar, *Paeans*), ζη introduces variants. This led Grenfell and Hunt (p.15) as well as the successive editors, Turyn, Snell and Maehler to claim that behind the abbreviated ζη hides the name of the famous Alexandrian scholar Zenodotus. Lobel, however, in his commentary on P. Oxy. 26.2442 expressed doubts as far as the explanation Ζη(νόδοτος) is concerned: “ I am doubtful of its interpretation as Zenodotus. I should say it always means ζήτει, ζητεῖται or some other part of this verb ”.The theory is still debatable but it does not seem to apply to this papyrus anyway, since Zenodotus, as far as we know, did not deal with tragedy.³

It seems clear that the marginal ζη is related to the interlinear note. As the critical apparatus shows, a textual problem exists in v. 946. The manuscript tradition is divided between two variants: πετρούμενος and πετρουμένους. The papyrus seems to confirm the existence of the problem already in antiquity. The interlinear traces, of course, may belong to either of the two variants, the one being in the text, the other being inserted above it. This assumption made by the editor looks to me quite plausible and indeed within the old common practice of correcting the texts or taking notice of discrepancies in the manuscript tradition by using copies

¹ See for example P. Oxy. 1174 (Soph., *Ichneutae*) and P. Oxy. 2452 (Soph. *Theseus* ?), both examined in Chapter 2.

² Pfeiffer (1968) 118 (n.4) defended the traditional view: “ ζη can certainly mean ζήτει, etc., but as far as my knowledge goes, it is never set in front of a simple variant reading. It usually introduces a question about the subject-matter...Therefore, I am pretty sure that Grenfell and Hunt gave the correct interpretation ”. For another example of ζη not introducing a variant see Turner (1987) 66: (on the papyrus of Soph.*Ichneutae*, col. ix, 12) “... but ζη probably means not Ζη(νόδοτος) but ζήτει ”.

³ List of all the papyri with this abbreviation is in McNamee (1981a) 35, where ζη is explained in all cases as ζή(τει).

of recognized authority.

The editor has also noticed the presence of “ a long sinuous descender, lighter, thinner and more flowing than the main text ” next to v. 940 which extends into the φ of φθ[όνος (v. 974) in the next column. He suggests that a second marginal note should be recognized, although nothing similar to ζή(ται) can be seen here. In my opinion, it looks more like a shapeless line of ink, a slip of the pen. Not even a change of metrical pattern can be found in the main text, which would make the use of the appropriate symbol necessary.

P. Mich. Inv. 3735 (412.01 Pack³)

First century B.C.

Euripides, *Orestes*

[βεβακχευ]τ[αι] μανιας,	...[835
[Ευμ]ενισι θηραμα φοβωι	...[
[δρομασι]`δι`[νευ]ων βλεφαροις,		
[Αγαμεμνον]ιος παις		
[ω μελεος μ]ατρος οτε		
[χρυσεοπηνητ]ων φαρων	χρυ[σ	840
[μαστον υπε]ρτελλοντ εσιδ[ων	εισ[

P. Mich. Inv. 3735⁴ is fragment of a column which contained *Orestes* 835-46. The scrap preserves also part of the right margin including two very damaged marginal notes. Its two editors, Koenen and Sijpesteijn, have dated the papyrus to the first century B.C. on palaeographical grounds. As for the text, it was written on the recto of the roll with the verso left

⁴ It has been published by Koenen and Sijpesteijn (1989), unfortunately without a plate.

blank and was supplied with a few accents and a high stop. The general impression, according to the editors, is that this was a carefully produced edition.

Since the marginal notes occupy the right margin, following the practice of the annotators it is certain that they refer to the extant column. The size of the letters as well as the space between the lines is considerably smaller with the effect that the marginalia are not on the level of the lines of the main text.

The first note is almost completely illegible. Only traces can be seen and the letter ι is the only one that has been considered worth printing by the editors. Though there are some known textual problems in the corresponding main text (835-6) ⁵, no one can be identified here, until perhaps some further progress is made towards the decipherment of the marginal note.

The second note refers to vv.840-1. As the editors have stated, for the first few letters χρυ[“erscheint eine Erklärung von χρυσεοπηνήτων wahrscheinlich”. The scholia of the byzantine manuscripts have the following explanation: ἐκ χρυσοῦ ὑφανθέντων. ἴσως παρὰ τὸ πηνίον. It seems that they cannot be of any significant help. One further explanation of the same word is given by Hesychius s.v. χρυσεοπήνητος· ἡ διὰ χρυσοῦ εἰργασμένη and it is likely that its origins can be found in the lexica of much earlier periods, even collections of tragic vocabulary such as the one by Didymus.

The second line of the note offers a doubtful reading: εἰσ[or θε[. According to the editors, it is natural to see in εἰσ[an explanation of the form ἐσιδών. The inevitable conclusion would then be that the two lines represent probably two different remarks and not a single explanation in two lines as expected.

Two solutions are possible: either the note is a paraphrase of 840-1 (cf. P. Oxy.31.2536, Theon’s hypomnema on Pindar which offers among others some paraphrase); alternatively, one might read θε[which could be part of a participle ὑφανθέντα and so take the note as a full explanation of the adjective χρυσεοπηνήτων: χρυ[σοῦ ὑφαν] / θε[ντων. I believe that in the case of notes on quite early papyri such as this, one should be very reluctant to infer relations with the scholia vetera: the explanation looks ordinary and rather elementary; moreover, the main stream of the scholia on Euripides was formed after the contribution of Didymus.

The papyrus offers an example of annotated papyri of the late Ptolemaic period. It is

⁵ See the critical apparatus in Diggle’s edition of Euripides (vol. 3).

unfortunate that the badly damaged notes do not allow us see whether there was more annotation and of what kind.

P. Harris 38 (405 Pack³)

Second century
Euripides, *Medea*

Fr. 4	Col. i		
	μιαν δηι κλυω μίαν τών πάρος	μονανδι	1282
	γυναϊκ' εν φ[ιλοις] χείρα βάλειν τέκνοις		
	Ινώ μανείσαν' εκ θεων οθ η Δι]δς		
	δάμαρ νιν' εξέπ[εμψε δωματων] άλαις	ηι	1285
	πίτνει δ' ά ταλαι[ν ες αλμαν φο]νω		
	τέκνων δυσσεβ[ει		
	άκτης ύπερτείνασα ποντία[ς π]οδα	ου	1288
	δυοϊν τε παίδοιν ξυνθανουσ' απόλλυται		
	τί δήτ' ου γένοιτ' αν έτι δεινον		
	ώ γυναικών λέχος		
	πολύπον όσα δη β[ρ]οτοις	ον	1292
	Ιασων τι δ' εστιν ου που καμ' α[ποκτειναι θελει	η	1308

P. Harris 38 consists of four fragments from a roll containing *Medea*. Fragment 4 offers vv. 1279-1312 in one complete column, which means that the whole play must have been written

in forty-two columns. Our fragments come from columns 22, 32, 39 and 40. The hand, a medium-sized ornamented uncial, is dated to the second century A.D. The text is full of punctuation and accentuation marks, some by the first hand, others by a second. Since the edition of the papyri Harris, a few more fragments of the same roll have been identified, one in the Fitzwilliam Museum⁶ and another in the Oxyrhynchus collection at Oxford (still unpublished). These fragments do not contain any annotation but confirm the provenance of the papyrus.

What is important for our research is the great number of supralinear additions as well as a marginal note. All of them are of text-critical nature, namely variants which a second hand introduced above the words in question. Usually one syllable from the variant was enough for the corrector. It is interesting that some of the readings are very important, such as ἄλαις which was previously accepted by the editors as a conjecture by Blaydes. On the other hand, οὐ που in v.1308 confirms a conjecture by Barthold but has not been adopted in modern editions.

The marginal note is also a text-critical remark. At first sight, it is not clear what exactly it refers to. Apparently, μόναν stands as a variant for μίαν. δι on the other hand, is either an abbreviated form of δίς, διπλή or an etacistic mistake for δη. In the first case, μοναν δι means that μίαν has to be replaced in both places; in the second case μοναν δη has to replace μίαν δη at the beginning of the verse 1282. The examination of the variants has shown that the corrector twice supplied the papyrus text with readings reappearing elsewhere in the manuscript tradition and at least once offered a variant which is otherwise unattested. It becomes inevitable to conclude that with so much collation and interchange of variants in antiquity attempts to group papyri into families would be fruitless.

⁶ This was published by Page (1938).

26	[ασπιδοφέρμονα θιασον ε]νοπλον	διε	796
27	[αντιπαλον κατα λαινα] τειχρα [χαλκωι κοσμησας]		
28	[η δεινα τις Ερις θεος α ταδ]ε		
29	[μησατο πηματα γας βασι]λευσιν		
30	[ω ζαθεων πεταλων πο]λυθηρατα [τον ναπος Αρτεμιδος] χιονοτροφον [ομμα Κιθαιρων]		
32	[μηποτε τον θανατωι] προτεθεντα	λο [χευ]	803
33	[Ιοκαστας]	μα	

P. Merton 2.54⁷, possibly from the Arsinoite nome, comes from the second half of second century A.D, since the hand of the recto has been dated to the middle of the century. It preserves ll.768-89 and 792-806 from Euripides' *Phoenissae* written on the verso of a papyrus roll with the recto used for a list of names. Each column would have approximately forty-eight lines, so the whole play would cover nearly thirty six columns. The left margin is lost but the right one is wholly preserved.

On the level of l.26 (v.796) three cursive and very doubtful letters διε can be seen. Their meaning is obscure and possibly unrelated to the text on the left. No variant or gloss given by the scholia has a beginning similar to these three letters. One explanation suggested by the first editor is that their closeness to the corresponding lines of the next column makes it possible to link them to the opening lines of Teiresias' speech (vv.834-44). I was not able, however, to find any variant or gloss suitable to that context either, so even the reading διε itself remains questionable.

A few lines below and on the same side the word λό[χευ]μα is written. This is not a

⁷ Also examined by Bremer and Worp (1986) 250. They offered some new readings.

variant nor a gloss, although γέννημα is attested in some manuscripts and the scholia as a gloss on λόχευμα. It has rather been inserted by the first hand, in order to correct an accidental omission by the scribe. The word has been squeezed ⁱⁿ at this place together with Ἴοκάστας, instead of being put at the beginning of 1.33 (v.803).

The papyrus with its two marginal notes does not offer anything of striking importance for the purpose of our study. The first editor noted after Lobel's suggestion that it looks like the work of a "schoolboy learning to write for literary purposes" ⁸. The hand is indeed heavy with thick strokes which are not linked to each other and verticals which are often ornamented with serifs. The fact, however, that the text was written on the back of a used roll is not a decisive factor for the attribution to a schoolboy, as the first editor thought. On the other hand, no link to the scholarly tradition of its time can be seen in this papyrus. It is, therefore, only another example of the use of the margins either for variants and glosses or for corrections.

P.Oxy. 3712 (415.01 Pack³)

Second century
Euripides, *Phoenissae*

ετεοκλεα κλεινην τε] πολυνεικου / [
]ο´ θ....ρι
 κορας τε δισσα]ς την μεν εισμηνη[ν πατηρ 57

P. Oxy. 53.3712 is fragment of a single column containing Euripides' *Phoenissae* 50-69. The hand is "crude and heavy", according to the editor (M. Haslam in 1986), datable to the second century A.D. The style of the hand as well as the marking of some line-endings with

⁸ Criore (1996) listed the papyrus as item 282 in the catalogue of writing exercises.

oblique strokes also led him to suggest that this could be part of a school-exercise ⁹. The meaning and function of the oblique strokes at the end of ll. 56 and 68 in particular is not clear. The editor thought that they could indicate line division in a text either dictated or copied from an exemplar written out as prose. Among other various functions, slash is often used as a sign of division within a text or in annotation ¹⁰. The mistake of verse division at l. 56 seems to be in favour of this theory. On the other hand, it is not clear that there were such strokes in ll. 54, 55 and 60, 69, given that the papyrus breaks before the end of the lines. There is also a possibility that the text finished with the prologue, as prologues were often used for school exercises.

In v. 57 there are two supralinear notes, unfortunately both badly damaged. The hand that inserted them probably marked them off at both sides with dots, a technique widely spread in the case of corrections and variants.¹¹

The first note is placed above δισσα]ς. Only ο can be seen with some certainty and this led the first editor to assume that it must have been δύο as a gloss to the adjective δισσός.

Above εισμηνη[ν, the traces and the two letters θ ρ point towards θυγατέρα. This explanation looks very elementary unless we assume that the note like the text below it breaks off here and continues with θυγατέρ[α νεωτέραν referring to Ismene. It is interesting to note in this respect that the scholia on the next verse gloss “τὴν δὲ πρόσθεν Ἀντιγόνην” as “τὴν προγεγεστέρα, τὴν μείζονα”.

The papyrus offers an example of trivial glossing even of words that would not normally need an explanation, at least for one who can understand the rest of the text. This strengthens the theory of a schoolboy's exercise.

If this text was indeed an exercise for verse division and possibly for the understanding of iambic trimeter, it constitutes another example of the use of classical Greek authors such as

⁹ Cribiore (1996) included P.Oxy.3712 in her catalogue of writing exercises (long passages) as item 270. She also provided a photograph absent from the first edition.

¹⁰ For examples of the use of the slash as a siglum in papyri see McNamee (1992 a) 17 and Table 2, D.

¹¹ E.g. P. Oxy.5.841 (P. *Pae.* 2.61), P. Oxy. 9.1175 fr.84.2. For more examples see McNamee (1992b) 19 n.56.

Euripides for educational purposes in Graeco-Roman Egypt. The choice of *Phoenissae* is indicative of the popularity of the play¹² as well as of the tendency to read, teach and comment on a limited number of plays, some of which later constituted the so-called “Selection”.¹³

P. Oxy. 2543 (379.2 Pack³)

Second century
Euripides, *Andromache*

Margin:]κτελει δ[

P.Oxy. 2543 consists of numerous fragments from one column of a papyrus roll that contained Euripides' *Andromache*. Remains of ll. 346-68 can be identified in the surviving part but the column had probably more text. The papyrus, according to the editor (J. W. B. Barns in 1966), is of good quality and is dated to the second century A.D. No traces of annotation can be seen on the fragments since very little of the original margin survives. One small piece, however, written by the same hand in smaller size, offers a note. The editor assumed that it belonged to the bottom margin, but from the photograph it seems that it could come from any of the margins around the column of the main text.

It is indeed impossible to relate the fragment to any specific part of the surviving text and it is also possible that it comes from another column. Furthermore, the meaning of the legible letters]κτελει δ[is very obscure and the scholia of the manuscripts do not provide any plausible supplement. If located at the lower margin, the note can refer to any line of the column above it.

¹² On the subject see Bremer (1984).

¹³ For more details on the “Selection” see the Chapter ‘Conclusions’, pp. 162-3.

One could, however, try to find a supplement for the first part of the note and this points clearly to the third person singular of the verb ἐκτελεῖν. If the decipherment is accurate, no other verb could fit the gap. Furthermore, one could think of the noun δόλος as one of the possible supplements for the second part. The whole phrase, then, would refer to someone plotting against someone else. In our context, the first person could be Menelaus, the second Andromache. More specifically, it is in vv. 380-3 that Menelaus offers a false deal to the suppliant Andromache in order to remove her from the altar of Thetis. These lines would be contained either in the surviving column or at least in the following one. The word δόλος occurs twice in the text (*Andr.* 435, 446) and once in the scholium on 428 ᾧ σ' ὑπήγαγον: ᾧ λογισμῶ σε ἔπεισα καὶ ἐδέλεασα.... as part of a paraphrase.

The above reconstruction obviously relies heavily on speculation and uncertain supplements. If the supplements are correct, however, it seems that the owner and user of the papyrus added in the margin an explanatory note on Menelaus' speech. This would be neither profound nor scholarly. It simply facilitated reading or even teaching as we have often seen with marginalia. On the other hand, the expression ἐκτελῶ δόλον sounds odd, not proper Greek.¹⁴ The problem of the marginal note will remain unsolved, as long as its relation to the main text remains unclear.

PSI 1302 (431 Pack³)

Second century
Euripides, *Alcmeon*

ληι αυτη	αλλ ερπ ες οικ[ους
	μη του[τ] εμη[
].να`υ`δαι	υμιν τ απαυδ[ω
	ει τις λακουσα τ[
	μη μ αιτια{ι}σθη[ε

5

¹⁴ According to LSJ⁹ ἐκτελῶ means "accomplish, bring to an end".

οστις δε δουλωι φωτι πιστευει βροτων,
πολλην παρ ημιν μωριαν οφλισκανει

PSI 1302 is the left-hand side of a column containing tragic verses. Lines 6-7 were already known from a quotation in Stobaeus' *Anthology* (fr. 86 Nauck²) and this identifies the text as a fragment from Euripides' *Alcmeon* either the first or the second.¹⁵ The first seven lines which are reproduced above come from the end of a tragic ῥῆσις and are succeeded by a lyric part marked off by a coronis. Top, left and bottom margins are all preserved. There are twenty lines in a column and the papyrus appears to be of very good quality. It comes from the second century Oxyrhynchus.

On the left margin the remains of two incomplete notes can be seen. Their position to the left of the text as well as their distance from it make it more likely that they belong to the preceding column¹⁶. The second note, however, could perhaps refer to the surviving column, as the verbal similarity between α`υ`δαι and ἀπαυδ[ῶ indicates, thus making it a very unusual case. It is quite clear, however, that both notes are variants, alternative readings to those already in the text. The second one, as already mentioned, looks like a non-composite form of the verb ἀπαυδῶ in l.3 but this idea could be misleading, since the assumption that the annotation belongs to the lost column carries more weight. Given that the text comes from a play which is not transmitted through the manuscript tradition, any further attempt to investigate the notes is impossible. These provisional conclusions are going to be reconfirmed after the examination of the following papyrus.

¹⁵ See also Schadewaldt (1952).

¹⁶ This is more or less the unanimous view of all subsequent editors. Schadewaldt (1952) 48 remarks: "Bei Vers 1 und 3 stehen am linken Rand die Glossen .ι αυτηι und .ναυδαι, die aber, wie Vitelli gesehen hat und der Abstand deutlich erkennen läßt, zu der nicht erhaltenen linken Kolumne gehören". Van Looy (1964) 25 quoted the slightly different readings by B. Snell as]HΛAYTHI and]TONA`Y`ΔAI. See more recently F. Jouan and H. van Looy, *Euripide: tome VIII: Fragments: Aegeus-Autolykos*, Les Belles Lettres (Paris 1998) 111.

P. Oxy.3215 (431.1 Pack³)

Second century

Euripides, *Alcmeon* (?)

Fr. 1

- 1].ν ελευ[θ]ερω [.] []
]μα του νεανιου ^{χη}·[]
]αντα συν κεινωι πονους
- 15 ευ λε]γων ου παυομαι ευλογων[]
- 19]. α[λ]λαξειε τις
 ελε]υθερον]ημ[]

P. Oxy.3215 is a column from a papyrus roll carrying twenty fragmentary iambic trimeters. It is a second century piece and its right margin has remains of annotation. The editor pointed out the close similarities between this papyrus and PSI 1302. This appears quite obvious when one compares the two plates in the original publications. The hand looks the same, so does the number of lines (20) and the entire layout of the two fragments.

The same scribe seems to have written more than one published text from Oxyrhynchus, including tragedy (P. Oxy. 2077 (Soph. *Scyrians*), P. Oxy. 2452 (Soph. or Eur. *Theseus*)) and presumably prose. The additional element, however, of the same number of lines makes it certain that P. Oxy. 3215 and PSI 1302 were not only written by the same hand but were also parts of the same roll. Some similarities in content made the editor assume that the former preceded the latter in a complete roll of Euripides' *Alcmeon*. The hand of the marginalia, however, does not look exactly the same and there is no physical link between them to offer a definitive argument. Eventually, the fact that the two papyri are fragments of the same roll must be considered as a fact whereas their exact position in the text is still an open question.

The role of the marginalia in P.Oxy. 3215 cannot be studied in detail, since two out of three consist of one syllable only. The note in l. 15, though, is the complete word εὐλογῶν. By providing the main text with the plausible supplement εὐ λε]γων the editor considered the marginal as variant and at the same time expressed his preference for it by claiming that

“εὐλογεῖν is much oftener employed than εὖ λέγειν when a word for ‘praise’ is wanted”.

As a conclusion, one may maintain that P. Oxy. 3215 is another example of a papyrus roll of good quality, in the intercolumnar space of which the first or a subsequent hand inserted variants. Being related to PSI 1302, our fragment was not the only one carefully annotated with variants. Moreover, a general view of the texts seemingly written by the same hand proved that annotation with variants probably taken from other copies was a common feature of the entire group according to the practice of the scribe and the demands of his clients.¹⁷

P. Oxy.852 (438 Pack³)

Second-third century

Euripides, *Hypsipyle*

Col. 4	8	ἴδου κτύπος ὄδε κροτάλων	αν(ω)
Col. 6	6	τις αν η γόος η μελος η κιθαρὰς	κιθαρι
		επιδακρυσει μοῦσ' ανοδυρομενα	επιδακρυσιμί
		μετα Καλλιοπας	
	9	επι πονους αν ελθοι	
	38]αρομ[....ε]υτυχως, γυναι	.ει δη[

¹⁷ The photograph of P. Oxy. 3215 fr.2 shows traces of annotation in the top margin of the scrap. The main text is from Euripides' *Hecuba* probably from another roll but from the same hand.

Col. 19]φεστηκ' ουδ[
	5	^{ως·ιδ[}]·ιδ'·ουτ[
Col. 27	48]· Ηδωνίσι θραι-
		< 'Ηδωνίσι >] κιαις
		Πάγγαιον ορος
	50	< Πάγγαιον >] της θρακης
]ας
		3 lines lost
]σην
	56]ν [[κατ]] κάτ(ω)

P. Oxy. 852¹⁸ was found by Grenfell and Hunt together with other very important literary papyri, such as Pindar's *Paeans* (P. Oxy. 841) and *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (P. Oxy. 842). It contains a part of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* large enough for the reconstruction of the whole play. Written on the verso of a document (P. Oxy. 985), the roll consisted of thirty columns of text, approximately 1742 lines in total.

The papyrus has been dated to the last decades of the second or the first decades of the third century AD and the editors regarded as very likely that it once belonged to a scholar's library. Apart from the first hand, responsible also for the paragraphi, the names of characters and some corrections, a second hand has checked the whole text and added variants as well as a couple of explanatory glosses.

Most of the variants stand in the margins, some were inserted above the relevant line and probably some additions were placed in the top or bottom margin. Due to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus, however, it is often impossible to specify the improvement that a variant could bring to the reading of the main text. Two of the clearest cases are κίθαρ[and

¹⁸ Published also by Italie (1923), Bond (1963) and Cockle (1987).

ἐπιδακρυσίμ[in col. 6. The first one has been restored as either κίθαρι[σµα by Wilamowitz and Diggle or κίθαρι[ς by Grenfell and Hunt in opposition to the preferred κίθαρας in the text. The second one, ἐπι δάκρυσι μ[is a variant to the inferior ἐπιδακρύσει in l. 7 of the text. The rest of the variants (εἰ δη[in Col. 6,38 and ὡς ἰδ[in Col. 19 between ll. 4 and 5) are either too fragmentary themselves or the relevant text is missing.

... In col. 27 there are two marginal notes introduced by a lemma, one of which is in the dative case, apparently following the inflection of the words of the main text. The first one in l. 48 (Ἴδωνίσι Θραικίαις) refers to the Thracian tribe of Edonians, whose king, Lycurgus, was killed on Mount Pangaeum after his attack on Dionysus. The second note, two lines below, Πάγγαιον ὄρος Θράκης, is obviously related to the previous one and indicates a reference in the text to the same event from Dionysus' adventures. On the other hand, a suggestion has been made by Cockle that the person in question could be Orpheus, given that he, too, was killed on the same mountain.¹⁹ As regards scholia and lexica, a gloss on E. *Rhesus* 408 from codex Vaticanus gr. 909 explains Πάγγαιον as ὄρος Θράκης, whereas Suda Π6 has rather vaguely Πάγγαιον ὄνομα ὄρους. Ἴδωνοὶ is glossed in Suda H 104 as ὄνομα ἔθνους but Steph. Byz. 298, 17 has the more specific definition Ἴδωνοὶ ἔθνος Θράκης similarly to Sch. Lyc. 418²⁰ The scholium on Eur. *Hec.* 1153 is also very clear: Ἴδωνοὶ γὰρ οἱ Θράκες.

A few lines below (l. 56), there is the abbreviation κάτ(ω) which points to a note (alteration or addition) in the lost bottom margin. It is an interesting indication of the annotator's methods which reappeared in Col. 4, 8 with the abbreviated ἄν(ω). It is likely that it refers to a longer note or an omitted verse which could not be accommodated in the right margin.²¹

¹⁹ Cockle (1987) 175.

²⁰ In Steph. Byz. 97, 16 s.v. Ἄνταδρος there is a reference to Aristotle (fr. 478 Rose): ... Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ ταύτην ὠνομάσθαι Ἴδωνίδα διὰ τὸ Θράκας Ἴδωνοὺς ὄντας οἰκῆσαι.

²¹ Full list of parallels is given by McNamee (1981) 48-9, e.g. P.Oxy.11.1358, 22.2313 and P.Princ.3.113.

P. Oxy.3719 (399.21 Pack³)

Third century

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*

	εισο]ρας γυ[νη		
	κα]κοις θρασυ[
]σου μου		
	σεσωσ]μεθα		
917	φιλτρο]ν μεγα	[
	τ]εκνων	[
]ολειτο . [.] πε	[
]	[
]	[
]	[
]	κλυ ^τ [977 ?

P.Oxy. 3719 offers the ends of six verses (913-8) from *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Most of the papyrus is blank, coming obviously from the space between two columns of text. From the right column only the name of the speaking character is preserved (Κλυτ(αιμνήστρα)), thus allowing for an approximate calculation of the missing part. According to the editor (M. W. Haslam in 1986), provided that the papyrus had the entire text as transmitted in the manuscripts each column must have contained over fifty lines. It has been assigned to the third century.

Immediately after the end of v. 919, there is a marginal note which is so damaged that it does not make any sense. This is the point where Achilles' long speech begins (919-74) and one would expect to find a reference to it. Moreover, given the uncertainty about the authenticity of a large part of this tragedy, including this speech of Achilles, there is a possibility that the note could possibly make a relevant remark but there is no indication whatsoever to prove or disprove such a conclusion. The text of the manuscripts is likely to be fully represented in the papyrus, although the name of Clytemnestra in the next column is not enough proof, as long as we do not know the exact length of the columns.

As an alternative, one could suppose that the note refers to the right column. Approximately and if the assumption about the length of the column is correct, on the same level stood vv. 970-2: τάχ' εἴσεται σίδηρος, ὄν πρὶν ἐς Φρύγας/ ἐλθεῖν φόνου κηλίσιν αἵματι

χρανῶ/εἶ τίς με τὴν σὴν θυγατέρ' ἐξαιρήσεται.]ολει το ... looks like a future form of ἀπόλλυμι / μαι and could possibly belong to a short paraphrase of the passage. The verb ἀπόλλυμι is found in l. 941: εἰ δι' ἔμ' ὀλεῖται διὰ τε τοὺς ἐμοὺς γάμους as well as in 978: μηδ' ἐνδεῆς τοῦδ' ἀπολέσαιμι τὴν χάριν; but no link to the marginal note can be seen.

In all likelihood, the marginal note which probably extended in two lines was a comment of some sort on the beginning of Achilles' speech. It could be paraphrase or a comment of general character referring to the entire speech. The fact that there is no annotation with glosses or variants in the rest of the surviving margin makes this assumption more likely.

P. Oxy. 1370 (402 Pack³)

Fifth century

Euripides, *Orestes* and *Medea*

Fr. 9 *Orestes*

Fol. 2 verso

[πεφευγα βαρβαροις ευμα]ρισιν

ειδος υποδηματο[ς] 1370

[κεδρωτα πασταδων υπερ] τερεμνα

η παστας

π[ε]πο[ι]κιλμενο[ς]

[οι]κος

P.Oxy.1370²² consists of nine fragments from a fifth century papyrus codex of *Orestes* and *Medea*. Each page contained thirty seven or thirty eight lines of text, so if the editors' calculations (B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in 1915) are correct, this codex was of at least 84 pages. The sequence of the plays cannot be determined. Interestingly enough, these fragments

²² See McNamee (1977) 169-70.

belong to the same find as P. Oxy.1369 (Soph. *OT*) and 1371- 4 (Aristophanes), all from the fifth century and annotated.

In the margin of fr. 9, fol. 2 verso two brief notes have survived next to verses 1370 and 1371. The hand does not look like that of the main scribe and the editors have called it “ late fifth or sixth century cursive ”. The same hand seems to have inserted the speaker’s name at l. 1260. The editors identified all together four different hands at work in this text.

Both notes are obviously glosses. The first one comes without a lemma, the second one is preceded by a lemma in a grammatical case different from that of the main text.

The gloss εἶδος ὑποδήματος which explains the word εὐμάρισιν, has been explained by the scholia of the manuscripts as follows: ἐν εὐμάρισιν: εἶδος ὑποδήματος σανδαλώδους· πεποιήται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐμαρῶς ὑποδεῖσθαι. προπαροξύνεται ἐν τῇ καθόλου. It is interesting that Hesychius under the lemma εὐμαρίδες (δ 6977) has the explanation εἶδος ὑποδήματος which derives from Diogenianus. Other lexica offer similar explanations: Photius s.v. εὐμαρίδες: ὑποδημάτων γένος and Et. M. 393,16 s.v. εὐμαρίς εὐμαρίδος, εἶδος ὑποδήματος, διὰ τὸ εὐμαρῶς βαδίζειν τοὺς ὑποδεδεμένους. Εὐριπίδης, βαρβάρους ἐν εὐμαρίσιν. These may also have originated in Diogenianus’ influential lexicon. Moreover, in the scholium on Aeschylus’ *Persians* 660 we find εὐμαριν] εἶδος ὑποδήματος.

Although the explanation of the papyrus is very short, the existence of so many identical occurrences in other texts indicates that behind all these sources there is a common origin. This could most likely be a commentary on *Orestes* or a glossary on drama from earlier centuries. We know that the scholia in their present form emerged after a long process of epitomizing, rephrasing and conflating older commentaries. Similarities between scholia and annotation in papyri usually are an indication of this common origin. On the other hand, the same process was the rule for ancient lexicographers, such as Hesychius and his main source Diogenianus who in his turn relied upon Didymus’ comic and tragic glossaries. The appearance of εὐμαρίς in the scholia on Aeschylus strengthens our assumption for an older scholarly origin.²³

The second gloss ἡ παστάς· πεποικιλμένος οἶκος refers to the word παστάδων in

²³ The problem of the origin of glosses in the margins of literary papyri is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

verse 1371. Unlike the first one, this gloss is accompanied by a lemma in the nominative and not in the genitive plural of the main text.

The scholia give a long explanation which is not particularly close to the papyrus note: κεδρωτὰ παστάδων: τὰ ἐκ κέδρου ξύλα. παστάδων δὲ τῶν κοιτώνων... The lexica, on the other hand, seem to stand much closer: Hesychius s.v. παστάδες... ἴσως δὲ καὶ οἱ διαγεγραμμένοι οἴκοι· πάσαι γὰρ τὸ ποικίλαι, and s.v. πάσσε... ἔνθεν καὶ παστὸς τὸ γαμικὸν ποίκιλμα. Also Orion 125,7 s.v. παστός: ποικίλος οἶκος νυμφικός, παρὰ τὸ πάσσειν, ὃ ἐστὶ ποικίλλειν and after it Et. M. 655,37 s.v. παστός: ἢ ἐκ παραπετασμάτων ποικίλων κατεσκευασμένη σκηνή, ἣτις ἐστὶ πεποικιλμένη· καὶ νυμφικός οἶκος, παρὰ τὸ πάσσειν.

As has been stated above, the similarities between papyrus annotation and entries in lexica confirm the theory that common origins are to be found in earlier commentaries or lexica. The possibility, however, that the annotator of this papyrus used this or the other source cannot be proved. Given that both notes are glosses it is equally likely that it has been picked up from a lexicon or from a hypomnema which contained such information.

Finally, one could argue that the later the date of the papyri, the closer the similarities of marginal annotation to the scholia of the manuscripts. This is also true for the commentaries, as will be shown later on by more explicit examples (e.g. P. Rain. 1. 34 and P. Rain. 3. 20 in Chapter 3).

P. Oxy.3718 (414.02 Pack³)

Fifth century

Euripides, *Orestes* and *Bacchae*

Orestes

- | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|------|
|] | εμπειρος | [ξυνετος πολεμου φονιος τε δρακων | |
|] | | ερροι τὰς η[συχου | 1407 |
| |]·τ·οσ | προνοίας [κακουργος ων | |

Απο^λ Μεν[ελαε παυσα]ι ^{φρον[η]μα} λήμ[εχων τεθηγμενον] 1625

πα]γοισιν [εν Αρειοισιν ευσεβεστά]την 1651
^{πά...}
 ψη]φον διοίσ[ο]υ[σ'] εν[θα νικησαι σε χρή]

Bacchae

επει]σὺ φεγ[γος] 210
^{] . εε...[}
 εγω π]ροφ[ητης]

εκδημ]ος ων[215
^{νεα[}
 κλύω δε νεο[χμα
 γυναίκα[ς

] φε . γωσι πτώσσου[σαν
 πρόφασιν[
^{] κ[}
 τ[ην δ Αφροδιτην 225

]λέγω 230
^{] λημασι}
 ε]ν αρκουσιν

^{] φαρμακ[}
] [γοης ε]πωδο[ς Λυδιας απο χθο]νός 234

γ]άνος πομα 261
ο]ργίων[

P. Oxy. 3718 consists of many fragments of a papyrus codex of the fifth century. The codex contained four or five tragedies of Euripides in unknown order. Our fragments are from *Orestes* and *Bacchae* which, according to the editor (M. W. Haslam in 1986), were preceded by two or even three other plays since the page-number 198 appears above *Bacchae* 195. The editor regards the sequence *Phoenissae*, *Medea*, *Orestes* and *Bacchae* as a likely option but this is only an assumption based upon other analogous examples. In his own words “ there is no assurance even that the codex contained none other than "select" plays ”.²⁴

The page had about twenty-nine lines with an interlinear space large enough to accommodate corrections and glosses. These glosses were added by a different hand either in the margins or between the lines. The editor distinguished three hands which have worked on this papyrus codex.

The first marginal gloss is ἔμπειρος and refers to *Or.* 1406 as an explanation of the word ξυνετὸς. Although the reading is doubtful, the scholia at this point confirm it by offering: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔμπειρος τοῦ πολέμου. The scholia recentiora offer similar glossing. The editor considered any transmissional connection between them unlikely. The study of the other glosses of the codex, however, tends to confirm the connection.

The second gloss next to l. 1407 has been seriously damaged with only three letters visible. The scholia do not offer any help towards its restoration: “... πρόνοιαν δὲ τὴν εἰμαρμένην ” derives from an erroneous interpretation of the passage. As for the lexica, Suda and Photius gloss πρόνοια as πρόγνωσις with clear reference to Soph. *OT* 978 (Sch. ad. loc. πρόνοια· πρόγνωσις) whereas Orion 133,27 and from him Et. M. gloss πρόνοια as: ...ἡ ὑπέρ τινων νοοῦσα. Hesychius has προενθύμησις, ἐπιμέλεια, φροντίς which are close to the *Orestes* passage. The last gloss in genitive, φροντίδος, could possibly match the letters deciphered by the editor and would be in the same case as the word explained.

²⁴ Cf. Irigoin (1994) who gives a systematic account of the editions of Euripidean plays before and after the “Selection”.

A marginal note, possibly a *nota personae*, has been erased in the left margin of v.1621 and then replaced by a new one, no longer visible either. A few lines below, though, in v.1625, the gloss φρόνημα is placed above the word λῆμα. The scholia once again offer something similar to this gloss: τοῦ φρονήματος. There are many other cases in scholia, however, where λῆμα is glossed as φρόνημα (e.g. Sch. Eur. Med.119 and 348, Sch. Ar. Nu.457 and Th.459). The lexica make also a considerable contribution with Hesychius λ 860 λῆμα: βουλή, ἀξίωμα, ἀνδρεία καὶ φρόνημα from Cyrillus, Photius s.v. λῆμμα (confusion with λῆμα)· φρόνημα, κέρδος and Suda s.v. λῆμα: ἀξία καὶ ἀνδρεία (from Herodotean glosses). φρόνημα, κέρδος (from Synagoge). Photius and Suda through Synagoge refer back to Cyrillus' glossary. From the same glossary derives the lemma in Hesychius. The origins of the gloss before Cyrillus cannot be identified but it must have existed in one of the widely known collections.

In l. 1652 over the verb διοίσουσι, there is also a note of obscure meaning, since only two letters survive π'α... The scholia on l. 1651 offer ... ἐδίκασαν δὲ Ἰαθηνᾶ καὶ ἸΑρης. The editor tried to establish a link between the two by supposing an abbreviated π(αρά) ἸΑρει but it is not possible to investigate further.

In the fragments of *Bacchae* there are many marginal and supralinear notes too. First of all, over l. 211 a gloss which has not been deciphered by the editor]εε..[seems to refer to the noun προφήτης. Another gloss νεα[explains the adjective νεο[χμα in l. 216. The glossing of νεοχμῶς as νέος appears frequently in lexica. Suda, Photius and in this case Hesychius as well, derived it from Cyrillus.

Next to l.223 in the left margin, there is the gloss or variant]φε.γωσι which is difficult to explain. If it were φεύγουσαν, then it could refer to πτώσουσαν either as gloss or variant, although I have not found in any lexicon φεύγω as gloss for πτώσω. As a variant it would require some changes in the text, but still the subjunctive cannot be justified.

Above ἸΑφροδίτην in v. 225 there was a gloss, from which only the first letter κ[survived. The editor assumed a gloss κ[οίτην or something similar. Similarly destroyed and without any hope for restoration is a marginal note next to l. 227.

A gloss over ἐν ἄρκουσιν in l. 231 has been partly preserved:]λημασι. The editor objected to the idea of a gloss and treated it more like a variant because it seems to scan. Two possibilities, περιβ]λήμασι and με]λήμασι, were both rejected, the first for metrical reasons, the second as inappropriate. Lexica offer numerous definitions of ἄρκος, some from Cyrillus

(Suda and Photius), others from Diogenianus (Hesychius α 7394 and Photius α 2833) and others from Harpocration (Suda and Paus. Att.). A scholium on *Orestes* 1421 gives an interesting and useful parallel: τοῖς δ' ἐς ἄρκυστάτων μηχανὰν ἐμπλέκειν : ... καὶ περιβλήματι λίνου ἐμπλέκειν καὶ ἐμβάλλειν τὴν Ἑλένην. οἶον εἰς ἄρκυστάτην μηχανὴν καὶ [ὡς] περίβλημα λίνων. Moreover, the scholia on Ar. *Lys.* 790 explain ἄρκυς as εἶδος δικτύου or λίνα κυνηγετικὰ. I believe that in all likelihood the papyrus explained the word ἄρκυσι by using the gloss and not variant, περιβλήμασι or λίνου περιβλήμασι.

Another gloss is found above l. 234 and more specifically over the words γόης ἐπωδός. The scholia on *Hipp.* 1038 offer an important parallel: (ἐπωδός καὶ) γόης· ἀπατεῶν, φαρμάκων ἔμπειρος. This parallel led the editor to suggest the possible supplement ἔμπειρος] φαρμάκ[ων perhaps also under the influence of the marginal gloss on *Orestes* 1406: ἔμπειρος τοῦ πολέμου. The evidence from lexica helps also to trace the use of φαρμακός in relation to γόης. So in Hesychius s.v. γοητεύει· ἀπατᾶ μαγεύει. πείθει. φαρμακεύει. ἐξάδει. Also in Et. Gud. 319,16 s.v. γόης· κόλαξ, πλάνος, περίεργος, ἄ[π]ατεῶν, φαρμακός. Apart from φαρμακός, the rest of the explanation together with Suda Γ 364, Photius s.v. and Hesychius γ 774 are derived from Synagoge and Cyrillus.

In the right margin of l. 261 πόμα stands as a gloss or variant to γάνος of the main text. Grammatically, it does not belong to classical Attic and this led the editor to discuss it as variant and in the context of the authenticity of the verse. I think that the problem which arises with πόμα as variant, can be solved if πόμα is treated as a gloss. Indeed, we saw that almost all the annotation of the papyrus was glosses and not variants.

Generally speaking, this papyrus codex seems to have been annotated with glosses from commentaries or less likely glossaries on Euripides from the main stream of scholarship that gave us the scholia of the manuscripts (although the scholia on *Bacchae* have not survived) and most of the ancient and byzantine lexica. More attention to its special characteristics will be given below.²⁵

²⁵ See pages 40-1 in the conclusions of this Chapter and 147 in Chapter 4.

P. Ant. 1.23 (406 Pack³)

Fifth/sixth century

Euripides, *Medea*

Verso

[χο]ρο[ς]	ἱερ[ας χωρας απορθητου]	825
αποτρε[π(ων)]	τ' αποφ[ερβομενοι]	
[Μη]δειαν της	κλεινο[ταταν σοφιαν]	
[παιδ(ων)] αναηρεσε(ως)	αει δια λα[μπροτατου]	
[ως μια]ιφονον	βαίνοντες [α]βρ[ως αιθερος]	
[ουχ]υποδεξον(ται)	ένθα ποθ' αγνας	830

Recto

] φ[ο]νω χε[ρα]

μολυν(αι)

] 865

[ηκω κελευσθεις και γαρ ουσα δ]υ[σ]μενης

P. Ant. 1.23 is fragment of a papyrus codex from the fifth or sixth century. It contained *Medea* written in pages of approximately forty lines. Another fragment of the same codex containing lines from *Bacchae* was published later as P. Ant. 2.73 but it does not offer annotation of any kind. In the margins of two pages from *Medea* the hand of a diorthotes added two short notes.

The first note is next to *Medea* vv. 825ff. and briefly summarizes the content of the lyric passage that follows. The scholia ad loc. offer two quite similar versions of paraphrase, but the second is shorter than the first one: **a.** ... βούλεται αὐτὴν ἀποτρέψαι τοῦ κατὰ τῶν παίδων φόνου. οὕτως γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἐπάγει ὅτι οὐκ εἰκὸς τοὺς οὕτως ἱεροὺς καὶ σοφοὺς ἄνδρας (sc. the Athenians) σὲ μαιφόνον γενομένην ὑποδέξεσθαι **b.** ... ἀποτρέπων τῆς πράξεως τὴν Μήδειαν, ὡς οὐκ ἂν οἱ τοιοῦτοι τὴν τοιαῦτα δράσασαν δέξαιτο.

The marginal note of the papyrus presents similarities to both versions of the scholia

cited above but its final appearance is rather clumsy. The syntax is not correct and one gets the impression that something was deliberately omitted possibly for reasons of space. Strikingly even the main verb is missing.

The second marginal note refers obviously to v. 864, the last line of the stasimon, which is not preserved on the papyrus. Its counterpart in the scholia of the manuscripts is more extensive but partly very similar to the marginal note: ... εὐ οἶδα, φησί, ὅτι οὐ καρτερήσεις τὴν ἐργάτιν τοῦ φόνου χεῖρα μολῦναι τῷ αἵματι τῶν παίδων γονυπετούντων σε.

The comparison of the marginalia of the papyrus to the corresponding scholia of the manuscripts shows that behind them all there was a common ancestor, a commentary from which later annotators and scholars derived the material they needed.²⁶ What we already know about the rephrasing, summarization and abridgement that ancient exegesis underwent in the course of time is here - especially at v.824 - illustrated by the three different versions of the same text. The late dating of the papyrus is another important element, if one thinks that for many scholars it is during these centuries that the archetype of the scholia was formed. This coincides with the standardization of exegetical material and the creation of new mixed commentaries based upon the few old ones that survived into late antiquity.²⁷

Louaniensis deperditus (382.2 Pack³)

Sixth-seventh century
Euripides, *Andromache*

φασί [] . λαός οἱ . . τῶν θεῶν
οἶα με τὸν δυστήνον ἀμφίβασ εἶχες
πῶς οἰχεται μοι παῖς μόνου παιδὸς μόνος;

1082

²⁶ See Maehler (1994) 113-4.

²⁷ More about this issue will be said in Chapter 5, pp. 172-5.

This fragment belongs to a parchment codex of the sixth or seventh century.²⁸ It does not come from Egypt but from Palestine and according to the editor's information it was irrecoverably damaged and subsequently disposed of due to bad conditions of preservation. All that survives is one old photograph on which one can read fragments of Euripides' *Andromache*.

The only interesting point for our purposes is a note placed at the top margin of page one. Written in a cursive hand different from that of the main text, the note is introduced by the verb $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$. This word is a common feature in scholia of various content and it is often used to summarize the opinions and theories of previous commentators and scholars thus avoiding the trouble of quoting them by name. In this case, after $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$ follows l. 1089, which was on the same page: $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \tau' \acute{\epsilon}\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\epsilon\iota \lambda\alpha\delta\omicron\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\eta}\tau\omega\rho \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (sc. the Delphians).

Unfortunately after $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$ there is a gap, that deprives us of essential information about the nature of the note. The editor assumed that the meaning of v.1089 aroused the religious feelings of the reader and made him point it out by rewriting the verse in the top margin. The scholia of the manuscripts do not offer anything on l.1089 but $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$ was probably followed by $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ or $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ or even $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$. In my opinion a sort of explanation or a brief comment on the phrase $\lambda\alpha\delta\omicron\varsigma \omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\eta}\tau\omega\rho \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is likely to have existed but the missing bit of the note does not permit to assume anything more specific. Finally, according to E.G.Turner, as reported in Wouter's article, the hand of the note looks very close to the handwriting of Dioscorus of Aphrodito (6th cent.) thus offering some help with the dating of the papyrus as a whole.

P. Gr. Vindob. 29769 (418 Pack³)

Sixth-seventh century

Euripides, *Phoenissae*

Verso

] . . . νδηκλ [337
] νάδονῆν [

²⁸ Published by Mossay (1972). More information about the dating of the text in Wouters (1973).

] εινέχειν [
] μφέπειν [340
] λαίωι [[.]] τῶ παλαιγεν[
]
] . εχω του ιδειν τα τεκνα [
]ος

P. Gr. Vindob. 29769²⁹ is part of a papyrus codex of the sixth or seventh century which contained *Phoenissae* and possibly other plays of the “Selection”. There were about forty lines per page.

The verso of the fragment which has been reproduced above preserves parts of the right and bottom margins. In the right margin, one can see traces of a cursive hand, probably remains of some sort of annotation which cannot be deciphered. Also in the lower margin, there are two lines of annotation written in a cursive hand, not necessarily that of the main text. Bremer and Worp, the second editors of the papyrus, disagreed with the first editor (H.Oellacher) who had described the marginalia as coming “von derselben Hand”.

The note was printed in the first edition as ἀ]πέχω τοῦ ιδεῖν τὰ τέκνα [. . .] ος, which Bremer and Worp after their own examination of the papyrus changed into πόθο]ν ἔχω τοῦ ιδεῖν τὰ τέκνα or something similar. They also tried to associate this note with the main text which is a long lyric passage by Iocasta. Their conclusion was that “it is not clear to which of Iocasta's utterances in the preceding lines this would refer”.

In my opinion, since the note is in the bottom margin of the verso, it is very likely that it refers to one of the lines between 300 and 341 which were contained in this page. It looks more like a paraphrase or explanation of a complicated poetic phrase rather than a piece of scholarly exegesis. The first person singular ἔχω points to Iocasta who is the speaker from v. 300 to 354. It is difficult to understand, however, why Iocasta could miss both her sons given that Eteocles was never away from Thebes. Furthermore, I was not able to find any verse matching exactly the meaning of the marginal note, namely that someone was looking forward

²⁹ First published in *Mitt. P.- Samml. Wien*, NS 3 (1939) 30-1 and reexamined by Bremer and Worp (1986) 246-8.

to seeing both his children.

As an alternative, it can be suggested that the note refers to Iocasta's description of Oedipus living in misery and depression: ὁ δ' ἐν δόμοισι πρέσβυς ὀμματοστερῆς / ἀπήνας ὀμοπτέρου τᾶς ἀποζυγείσας δόμων πόθον ἀμφιδάκρυτον ἀεὶ κατέχων (vv. 326 - 30). The scholia of the manuscripts offer the following on v. 330: πόθον ἀμφιδάκρυτον: καίπερ πόθον ἔχων ὁμως ἀποθανεῖν ἐζήτει. The similarities to the marginal note of the papyrus are very clear and it is perhaps because of them that Bremer and Worp proposed the supplement πόθο]ν ἔχω etc. One major difficulty, however, is the use of the first person ἔχω instead of the third ἔχει or the participle ἔχων. This is the reason that made both editors think of Iocasta speaking of herself. Only with the supply of a final ν (i.e. ἔχω<ν>) would the problem be partially solved.

A very plausible supplement for the end of the first line could be ἰδεῖν τὰ τέκνα[διαλλαγέντα but there is nothing in the text corresponding to such a paraphrase. Finally and as far as the second line is concerned, I find it very difficult to provide a supplement. Οἰδίποδος is only one of the many options.

Conclusions

Euripides is well known to be the one dramatist of the fifth century BC, whose popularity increased fast after his death and soon exceeded that of the other two dramatists, Aeschylus and Sophocles. In the context of Euripides' postclassical popularity Aeschylus' words in the *Frogs* 868-9 sound indeed ironic: “ ὅτι ἡ πόησις οὐχὶ συντέθνηκέ μοι, τούτῳ δὲ (sc. τῷ Εὐριπίδῃ) συντέθνηκεν ”. The evidence comes from many sources including papyri as well as quotations in other authors, anthologies, treatises etc.³⁰

The great interest and extensive research undertaken by Alexandrian scholars (e.g. Aristophanes of Byzantium, Callistratus, Didymus) and by some later minor scholars who edited and commented on the plays of Euripides is well attested. The scholia that have come to us squeezed in the margins of the byzantine manuscripts are what remains from this admirably detailed study of tragedies from the Hellenistic until the early Byzantine period. We are going to discuss the issue of the transmission of ancient scholarship more thoroughly at the very end of this study.

Apart from the commentaries which represent the main product of Alexandrian scholarship in written form, one would expect to find in the margins of the papyrus rolls or codices small samples of ancient exegesis, enough to demonstrate the nature and continuity of this scholarly tradition. Out of 129 papyri of Euripides checked for this particular study, however, only fifteen were found to contain some sort of marginal or supralinear annotation. In addition to that, three of them (PSI 1302, P. Oxy. 45.3215 and P. Oxy. 6.852) are fragments of plays which have not survived, with the effect that the study of the marginalia in these cases has to be done without the help of scholia or even without the text itself. Similarly, no scholia have been transmitted for the so-called alphabetical plays and the *Bacchae*. Therefore, every marginal note has to be examined in itself and without the possibility of comparison to the corresponding scholium in the manuscripts. Another feature of the annotation is that very often it is limited to variants. In this case it is interesting to see that some of them are still to be found in the various medieval manuscripts inside or outside the text. It should also be pointed out that

³⁰ Aspects of Euripides' reception are treated under different perspectives in Easterling (1997) 211-27 and Elsperger (1907-10).

it is usually glosses and exegetical notes which are the most useful for the purposes of our research.

One important element that helps in classifying the papyri we have examined so far is their attribution either to a scholar or to someone with access to scholarly works, or their use as schooltexts by a schoolboy or a teacher. In the case of many papyri it is difficult to make a decision only on the basis of the marginalia since such scholia are usually fragmentary and sometimes obscure. I would suggest, though, that P. Merton 2.54 (*Phoenissae*), P. Oxy. 53.3712 (*Phoenissae*), P. Oxy. 2543 (*Andromache*), P. Oxy. 3719 (*Iphigenia in Aulis*) and Louaniensis deperditus (*Andromache*) are all texts once used by or for schoolchildren, by ordinary readers and people with no advanced knowledge of style and language. More specifically, I would consider P. Merton 2.54 as an example of a school text with corrections of mistakes or additions of omitted words in the margin. The fact that it was written on the verso of a roll is not a factor sufficient enough to determine its quality (for examples of literary texts written on the verso of documents see P. Oxy. 6.852). Its general appearance as well as the nature of its annotation, however, suggest that it was not destined for a person from the scholarly circles and that it could not have been influenced by one. P. Oxy. 53.3712 is another example of a school text with elementary glosses and absence of any deeper thought or analysis. The two glosses do not seem to offer anything original and, as the editor assumed, the whole text could be only an exercise for practice in verse division. The two texts of *Andromache* (P. Oxy. 2543 and Louaniensis) cannot be regarded as scholarly texts either. Even if the text itself is of good quality, the marginalia belong to that category of remarks that could easily spring in the reader's mind while reading the play. They could be a short paraphrase of a striking or simply difficult passage or a note for further attention. If the assumption of the editor is correct, the note on the top margin of the Louaniensis, is an example of a passage that may have struck the religious feeling of the reader. With a short remark at the beginning of a speech, P. Oxy. 3719 seems to paraphrase or just comment on the passage that follows. In such cases, it is interesting and perhaps not surprising that the annotation is limited to only one note.

In order to put together all those texts that contain variants one further category should be introduced. In this category I would include P. Oxy. 3716 (*Orestes*), P. Harris 38 (*Medea*), PSI 1302 (*Alcmeon*), P. Oxy. 45.3215 (*Alcmeon* ?) and possibly P. Mich. 3735 (*Orestes*). Despite the fact that their marginalia are very fragmentary, the two papyri of *Orestes* are still

important especially because they come from the Ptolemaic period. The first one, P. Oxy. 3716, contains the remains of a variant and a ζή (τει) both written nearly two centuries after the main text. Obviously this is an indication either of the continuous use of the roll for a long period or of its rediscovery by the same person who thought it necessary to collate it with another, perhaps more recent copy of *Orestes*. P. Mich. 3735, on the other hand, seems to have received a slightly different sort of annotation; one of the two marginal notes is a gloss on χρυσεοπηνήτων which is found as lemma in the much later scholia and lexica. Given that there is no relevant indication none of these papyri can be regarded as a schooltext. One should not attempt, however, to see them as scholarly copies either, since the evidence is fragmentary and most of the conclusions are based on reconstruction and speculation.

P. Oxy. 1370 (*Orestes* and *Medea*), P. Oxy. 3718 (*Orestes* and *Bacchae*), P. Antin. 1.23 (*Medea*), P. Vindob. 29769 (*Phoenissae*) and P. Oxy. 6.852 (*Hypsipyle*) are all texts, the marginal and supralinear notes of which occasionally reveal elements of the more learned or even scholarly studies on Euripidean tragedies. These elements are mainly glosses and only very few are notes of interpretation or paraphrases of longer bits of text.

P. Oxy. 1370, which comes from a papyrus codex, has in its margin two glosses which, as has been shown, were drawn from a commentary on *Orestes*. It is interesting to note that the corresponding scholia offer more elaborate and extensive explanations of the same words combined with etymology and synonyms. The main reason is that the scholia have brought together material from various sources, heavily or slightly rephrased in order perhaps to accommodate it more easily in the limited space provided by the margins of the manuscripts. The glosses in the papyrus, on the other hand, are limited to the essentials and are very close to the definitions given by lexicographers most notably Hesychius but also Suda, the *Etymologica* etc.

The papyrus codex of *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* (P. Oxy. 3718) is richly annotated with glosses. They are all one-word explanations, and in this respect they are different from lexica and scholia which, as stated above, usually give elaborate definitions and plenty of different usages and synonyms. It has been shown, however, that these short explanations occur unaltered or slightly rephrased either in lexica or even more interestingly in the corresponding scholia. At first sight this could be considered as a coincidence but given the number of the cases and also the difficulties of the words picked up for glossing, I believe that the codex was owned by

somebody with direct access to a commentary or a glossary on the plays of Euripides. Whether or not he was a scholar himself does not affect the overall impression one gets from the text.

The two marginal notes of P. Antin. 1.23 are the only ones among all the marginalia in the papyri of Euripides which stand so close to the scholia of the byzantine manuscripts. As has already been demonstrated, these marginal notes look like shortened versions of their extensive counterparts in the manuscripts. Given that the scholia have two quite similar versions of paraphrase of the same passage, it is more likely that they should all be attributed to a common source, an old commentary on *Medea*, which must have contained all this material. The papyrus offers a clumsily abridged form of this commentary, adapted to the annotator's preferences, while the scholia bring together two versions of the same material from two different commentaries of common origin. This is another example of the difficulties involved in tracing the successive stages of the compilation of scholia.

If the reconstruction of its marginal note is correct, P. Vindob. 29769 is another papyrus which could be linked to the scholia. Its late date is another argument in favour of this theory. It seems much more likely, however, that what the annotator wrote was a piece of paraphrase, one of the commonest elements in late commentaries and the scholia. Given the difficulties posed by lyric passages this assumption looks probable. However, the continuous adjustments and modifications of the exegetical material make any attempts to establish links with the scholia very unsafe.

The papyrus of *Hypsipyle*, dated to an earlier period (second / third cent. AD), as the editors have noticed, belonged to a scholar's library. It is very likely that he himself supplied the text with the variants and the two surviving glosses by copying from other editions available to him or possibly from a commentary. The fact that the glosses are introduced by lemmata indicates that their origin is scholarly but the fact that *Hypsipyle* is a lost play, therefore without scholia, makes further research impossible.

Apart from some conclusions about the nature and transmission of the ancient exegesis, the examination of the marginalia from the papyrus fragments of Euripides leads also to a few further points related to chronology, format and problems of attribution to specific sources. None of the late Ptolemaic and Graeco-Roman papyri with marginal notes seems to have offered substantially more than variants and a few glosses. Some of the variants are transmitted through the manuscript tradition, a fact which suggests that the textual problems which preoccupy the

modern editors were faced by the ancient editors too. The practice of using margin and interlinear space for text - critical annotation is very old and very widespread among literary papyri. Common is also the practice of using the space around the columns in order to make corrections or to add omitted words or lines.

The annotated papyri of Euripides, though not being numerous enough, are not exceptional as far as insertion of variants and glosses is concerned. The same practice is a common feature of most annotated papyri of the first six centuries of scholarship, namely down to the third century AD. After this period, the marginalia, in addition to gradually becoming more extensive, show a tendency towards a text - exegetical character, such as remarks about the action and the characters or about material that needs clarification (geographical or historical names, idiomatic words etc.). Furthermore, the increasing lack of acquaintance with the Attic dialect makes more and more necessary the addition of shorter or longer glosses in the margins or between the lines. Two more examples are P. Oxy. 3718 and P. Oxy. 1370 which we examined above. It is well known that in earlier periods all this material was written down in commentaries which were the indispensable tool for the study of classical texts. The increasing use of margins for similar sort of information may indicate a tendency towards more limited use of commentaries, which, however, continued to be in circulation for another couple of centuries.

Another fact which emerges from the study of the annotated papyri of Euripides and which is closely related to the observations made above is that the use of a roll or a codex affected considerably the attitude of the scribes and readers. It looks quite certain that papyrus rolls were originally not made to accommodate marginalia. Usually the intercolumnar space was narrow, suitable only for variants or sigla that made reference to independent commentaries. Glosses or brief remarks can always be found, as e.g. in P. Mich. 3735 or P. Oxy. 852 but this is not what one would call systematic annotation. It was the transition from roll to codex that urged the scribes to make extensive use of the margins. Unfortunately, the papyri of Euripides do not offer examples of papyrus codices heavily annotated, as is often the case with other authors like Aristophanes and Callimachus. We can suppose, of course, that if larger fragments of papyri such as P. Ant. 1.23 and P. Oxy. 1370 had survived, they would exhibit much more annotation similar to the existing one.

Apart from the frequency and the nature of the marginalia, it is also their relation to the scholia and lexica that changes in the later centuries. It is true, of course, that one could possibly

find similarities between the marginalia in the early rolls and the lexica or sometimes scholia. Most of them if not all, however, are superficial and perhaps coincidental. This is the case especially with some quite elementary glosses. On the other hand, as regards the notes in the late papyrus codices of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries AD, most of them reappear either in scholia or in lexica if they are glosses.

A few concluding remarks can be added here: first of all, it seems that the later annotators used to consult and excerpt from commentaries which were based upon various earlier scholarly works (hypomnemata and monographs) and had at some point acquired a standard form. The general question of the development of scholarship in late antiquity will be discussed together with the final conclusions at the end of this study. It seems likely, however, that similarities between marginalia and scholia are explained through the increasing uniformity of exegetical material after the fourth century. Discrepancies, on the other hand, are due to the freedom with which scholars and students of literature dealt with works of secondary rank such as hypomnemata, glossaries and monographs. Secondly, ancient lexicography (Diogenianus, Hesychius, Orion, Etymologica, Suda etc) very often discusses lemmata and glosses that have already been found in the margins of the papyri (e.g. P. Oxy. 3718). It is very difficult indeed to say whether the lexicographer and the annotator used the same commentary as source or the annotator took his glosses from a glossary or a lexicon related to the surviving one. For some reasons, which are going to be discussed in the relevant chapter (chapter 4), the first theory looks much more likely than the second one. Finally, it should be once again emphasized that in the case of Euripides where we do not have sufficient evidence most of the aforesaid conclusions are uncertain. It would be sufficient to say, however, that they certainly add arguments and strengthen existing theories based upon marginalia on other authors.

Appendix to Chapter 1

P. Würzburg 1: A Commentary on Euripides' *Phoenissae*

P. Würzburg 1 (419 Pack³): Commentary on Euripides' *Phoenissae*

Hermupolis 6th century Codex leaf, 31 x 17cm

ll. 13-22 vv. 638-40

The papyrus offers a version of the story of Cadmus from the moment he went to the oracle at Delphi until he founded Thebes. It includes Cadmus' question to Apollo, Apollo's answer, the foundation of Thebes and an etymology of the new city's name. As far as the succession of events and the derivation of the name "Boeotia" are concerned, the papyrus shows similarities with the scholia vetera edited by Schwartz: ... καὶ ἡ Βοιωτία δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς βοῦς ἐκλήθη in the scholia (638) corresponds to Βοιωτία δ' ἐκλήθη ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ π[εσεῖν ..].τῆν βοῦν in the papyrus (ll. 21-2). On the other hand, it looks as if the commentator took liberties with his exemplar; for example he turned the verse narrative of the oracle which is transmitted in the scholia into a prose summary.

The first editor of the papyrus, U. Wilcken, regarded this particular lemma and its explanation as very decisive for the evaluation of the quality of the whole text. By using the Schwartz scholia as his only source, he considered every omission or discrepancy in the papyrus as a clear indication of the copyist's confusion or incompetence. A closer inspection of the sources, however, is going to refute this approach and show that the mythographical tradition is very diverse, insofar as Cadmus is concerned.

A comparison of the versions provided by the Euripides scholia and the papyrus with Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 3,4,1 shows their close vicinity to this very influential mythographical compendium that relied upon earlier individual writings. As regards the story of Cadmus, in particular, the narrative of Apollodorus is found also in the scholia D on *Iliad* B 494, included in Dindorf's edition of the Homeric scholia (Vol.1). The scholium states that the source of the story are the *Boeotica* of Hellanicus (*FGrH* 4 F51) and the third book of Apollodorus.¹ It is

¹ On the relation of the Homeric scholia with Apollodorus see Van Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 103-11(esp.109): "The story on 2,494 closely agrees with Apd. 3,4,1 except for the beginning and the end. This seems to tally with the subscription where both Apd. and Hellanicus' *Boeotiaca* are mentioned". Furthermore, Van Rossum-Steenbeek points to the tendency of the

highly likely, according to J. G. Fraser, the editor of Apollodorus, that in this particular story Apollodorus followed Hellanicus. In the index of Euripides scholia, one can see that Hellanicus is quoted eight times, Apollodorus not once. It is known, however, that quoting sources by name is not a practice followed consistently by the scholiasts.

The first objection to the accuracy of the narrative raised by Wilcken refers to the question that Cadmus poses to the oracle. Most sources, including the scholia, agree that Cadmus asked the oracle about his sister Europa, and that the god gave him instructions as to where to found a city instead. Wilcken in a clear cut statement says: “ Das verstößt gegen die gesamte mythographische Tradition und kann wohl nur auf eine Verwirrung des Excerptors zurückgeführt werden ...”. A close examination of other early accounts of the story, however, suggests that this is not accurate. In the scholia on Aeschylus *Septem* 486 we read: “... ὁ οὖν Κάδμος ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἑλλάδα καὶ μὴ εὐρῶν [τὴν Εὐρώπην] εἰς Δελφοὺς ἦλθεν ἐρωτήσων ποῦ κατασταίη”. Similar versions are found in Latin literature: Ovid *Met.* III 8-9: “... Phoebique oracula supplex / consulit et, quae sit tellus habitanda, requirit”; Myth. Vat. I 146 (149 Mai): “ Cadmus desperata spe visendi parentis Apollinis oraculum ingreditur sciscitans in quibus partibus orbis consisteret ”. It is reasonable to infer that the papyrus follows a version that was found in its exemplar, and that the scribe did not invent it himself, as Wilcken supposed. Another argument against Wilcken’s judgement is that, in contrast to the scholia which transmit the narrative of the oracle in its poetical form, the texts quoted above provide simplified prose forms of the oracle.

Wilcken’s prejudice against the papyrus become evident in another case, namely when we examine the narrative which follows the oracle. The text reads: (19-21) “... εἶτα λαβὼν τὸν χ[ρησμὸν] ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς Θήβας τῆς Βοιωτίας καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔπεσεν ἡ βοῦς καὶ ἔκτισεν ἐκ[εῖ] τὰς Θήβας”. According to Wilcken, “ liederlich ist seine Erzählung, daß Kadmos nach "Theben" gekommen sei und dort "Theben" gegründet habe ” and also “ der Höhepunkt seiner Gedankenlosigkeit ”. Despite the severeness of Wilcken’s expressions, there is indeed another parallel in the already mentioned Sch. A. *Sept.* 486: “...ἦλθεν εἰς Θήβας, ὤλισθεν ἡ βοῦς, καὶ ὁ μὲν Κάδμος ἐκεῖ ᾤκησεν ”. An additional and very interesting example will be given

scholia to modify their sources: “On the one hand, the scholia omit several times additional information or variant versions regarding offspring or parentage found in Apd. ... on the other hand, many explanations have been added to the stories found in the scholia” (l.c.).

in the next paragraph, when we move to texts of much later periods. I hope, however, that it has become clear by now, that so far as the details of the story are concerned, the papyrus text is closely related to earlier texts. The claim that the copyist changed his exemplar because he did not understand it or because he tried to be brief to the detriment of important elements of the myth is not convincing.

... In addition to the parallels discussed above, the narrative of the papyrus bears similarities with a later version of the story of Cadmus in the scholia. This version provides a short narrative about the foundation of Thebes that comes from the prefatory material in codex Monacensis Gr. 560 (C in Dindorf [Vol 3,179], Mn in later editors). Its similarities with our papyrus concern both content and wording. First of all, this late hypothesis agrees with the papyrus on the issue of Cadmus' question.² Furthermore, it includes the formulation that Wilcken found unacceptable: "... καὶ εἰς Θήβας ἔθηκε καὶ ἐκεῖ ὠκοδόμησε τὰς Θήβας ". Other similarities concerning the wording give one the impression that what we have here two versions of the same text; compare: "... ὅπου ἂν πέση ἡ γ[ησαμένη σοι] ἡ βοῦς ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς, ἀπανι[σ]τὰς ἐκεῖ κτίσον πόλιν", with "... ὅπου καθίσει ἡ βοῦς αὐτή, ἐκεῖ κτίσον πόλιν". Note also the similarities between "καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔπεσεν ἡ βοῦς καὶ ἔκτι[σεν ἐκ]εῖ τὰς Θήβας" and "... καὶ εἰς Θήβας ἔθηκε, καὶ ἐκεῖ ὠκοδόμησε τὰς Θήβας ".

The only striking disagreement between the papyrus and the narrative in Monacensis concerns etymology. Whereas the papyrus follows the scholia vetera in deriving "Boeotia" from "βοῦς", Monacensis etymologises the word "Thebes" from the Syrian equivalent for "βοῦς": Θήβα γὰρ Συριστὶ λέγεται ἡ βοῦς. The Syrian etymology provided by Monacensis is an argument in favour of the Phoenician origin of Cadmus as opposed to the theory favoured by the scholia vetera (codd. MTAB) and others, namely that Cadmus was an Egyptian.³

As regards the authority and the sources of the narrative in Monacensis, it is especially interesting that the same etymology of the name "Θῆβαι" is found also in Et. M. 450, 41ff. and Sch. Lyc. 1206:...ὄθεν ὁ Κάδμος ὑπάρχων ἐλθὼν ἐν Ἑλλάδι τὰς ἑπταπύλους ἔκτισε καὶ

² On this issue see Vian (1963) 31-5: (p.34) "...Il faut raccorder la scholie C aux *Phén.* 638, à la scholie A aux *Sept* 486. Toutes deux, en effet, introduisent deux variantes notables dans l'histoire de Cadmos: le héros demande à l'oracle, non comment il parviendra à retrouver sa soeur, mais où il doit s'installer..."

³ For more details on the question of Cadmus' origin see Vian (1963) 32-4.

Ἔγγυγίας πύλας ἐκάλεσε πάντα ποιήσας εἰς ὄνομα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Θεβῶν. Ἴλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς σφαγιασθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ Κάδμου βοός φασι Θήβην τὴν ἐπτάπυλον κληθῆναι. Θήβη γὰρ ἡ βοὺς κατὰ Σύρους. According to Mastronarde and Bremer, both the use of Et.M. or of one of his sources and the general character of the text indicate a learned source. The two scholars conclude their analysis of the narrative in Monacensis with the assumption that what we have here is “ two consecutive notes from an ancient hypomnema on *Phoenissae* ”.⁴ The papyrus seems to confirm this assumption.

II. 22-3 v. 640

The explanation of this lemma is almost illegible. Even ἄδραστον in l.22 seems to me doubtful, so it is pointless to comment on Wilcken’s hypothesis that there could be a comparison between ἄδραστον - ἄδρατον and ἀδάμαστον - ἀδάματον.

A search in the lexica does not offer anything useful either. A reference to this word can be found only in Hesychius α 995: ἀδάμαστον ἀνυπότακτον and 996: ἀδάματος· ἀδάμαστος, ἀνυπότακτος. There is nothing similar to the papyrus, though.

On the other hand, the scholia explain ἀδάμαστον as αὐτόματον. Furthermore, at the beginning of l. 23,]τομ can be seen with some certainty and the rest of the traces seem to agree. It is not unlikely that a form of αὐτόματον was written here.

II. 23-6 v. 651

In these lines the commentator deals with the story of the birth of Dionysus and his subsequent rescue by Zeus. This was a popular and well known story in Greek literature and mythology. Euripides, however, gives a rather different version of the myth. In order to save the baby from fire, Zeus made ivy grow and surround Dionysus. This was what the Thebans believed and according to the scholia, this is why they called the god περικιόνιος.

⁴ Mastronarde and Bremer (1982) 83-4.

A search in the mythographical sources (Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 3,4,3, Diod. Sic. 4.2.2, Hyginus *Fab.* 179 and Ovid. *Met.* III 259ff.) offers no reference to this particular detail of the myth. It is only in Philostr. *Imag.* I 14 that we find an analogous representation of Dionysus. In addition, Pausanias 9,12,4 and E. *Antiope* fr.203 Nauck² mention the cult of Dionysus Perikionios in Thebes as related to the honours given by the locals to a piece of wood supposed to have fallen from the sky.⁵ Of some interest is the reference to this myth in Sch. E.Or.1492 (from Thomas Magister): κισσὸς περιέλιξεν αὐτὸν (sc. Διόνυσον) εἰς φυλακὴν δῆθεν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ δράματι (sc. *Phoen.*) οὗτός φησιν ἐν τῷ χορῷ τῷ Κάδμος ἔμολε.

The scholia vetera inform us that they have drawn their narrative from the work of Mnaseas of Patara (fr.18), an Alexandrian scholar, pupil of Eratosthenes.⁶ It looks quite certain that the papyrus contained a similar narrative, which was covering at least the most important elements of the myth in the same order.

As regards the use of σκεπάσαι as an explanation for ἐνώτισε, it is worth quoting from Hesychius ε 3483: ἐνώτισε· τὰ νῶτα περιεσκέπασεν, the lemma being obviously from Euripides. The same verb is used in the paraphrase of the passage in the byzantine scholia: κισσὸς φύσιν ἔχων ἐλίσεσθαι κύκλῳ ἐσκέπασε.

This short narrative is one of the many we find in the papyrus and shows the practice of the commentator to confine his explanations to brief but informative summaries of the myths involved.

II. 26-28 v.656

This lemma and its explanation were not deciphered by Wilcken. They coincide with the sch. E. *Ph.* 656 in the scholia vetera: καὶ γυναῖξιν εὐίοις: ταῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον χορευούσαις καὶ τὸ εὐοῖ εὐὰν ἐπιφθεγγόμεναις. It seems that the papyrus contains more or less the same information with the exception that it specifies these women as Bacchae and that

⁵ See Nilsson (1967) 207 and 572. Also Kern (1903) cols.1015-6.

⁶ For the fragments of Mnaseas see Müller *FHG* III, pp.149-58 and Mette (1978) 39-40.

it explains their εὐοῖ εὐὰν as a hymn to Dionysus.

It is noteworthy that the papyrus bears similarities here with the byzantine scholia. The latter identify the women as Bacchae and provide an explanation of εὐοῖ εὐὰν. Sch.E.Ph.656 Dindorf, for instance reads: γυναιξὶν εὐίοις: ἤγουν ταῖς Βάκχαις ταῖς βοώσαις εὐ οἶ, ἤγουν εὐ καὶ καλῶς ἔστω οἶ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Διονύσῳ. In another passage (Sch.638 Dindorf), the phrase γυναικῶν τῶν εὐίων, ἤγουν τῶν βακχικῶν is further explained by (note on 23) τῶν τῷ εὐοῖ - ἔστι δὲ ὕμνος εἰς Διόνυσον -ἀδουσῶν.

Two more points are worth drawing attention to: one is the obvious iotacism in the lemma (εὐοίοις) and the other is the very likely supplement ἀκολουθοῦ[σι τῷ Διονύσῳ or Βάκχῳ in 1.27.

The lexica do not offer any explanation that would help to decipher the rest or discover the sources of the already deciphered part.

II. 28-34 v. 657

The new lemma begins in 1.28 and continues until the bottom of the verso. It is now clear that Wilcken's suggestion for a lemma in 1.29 should be ignored; the same applies to his conclusion that the scribe inserted in the text the word υἱὸς, a word which is not transmitted by the manuscripts. It is much more likely that what we have here is a lemma similar to that of the scholia on v.658: * Ἄρεος ὠμόφρων φύλαξ.

Once again the explanation contains a mythological narrative of the sort we have seen before in this papyrus. This time it has to do with the story of Cadmus after he arrived in Thebes, namely his encounter with the dragon, Athena's intervention, the sowing of the dragon's teeth and the eventual foundation of the city.

The sources for the fight with the dragon are numerous and extend to all the ancient mythographical sources. Apollodorus is once again the source closer to the papyrus, in the sense that it gives almost the same information but with different phrasing. Quite surprisingly, though, the papyrus exhibits many verbal similarities to a narrative in codex Guelferbytanus, manuscript of a later date, the scholia of which have been edited in Dindorf's edition. It is true that the deciphered text in the papyrus is not sufficient to give us a full idea of the events narrated. To

a certain extent, however, the content of the two seems to be identical and to follow the same sequence of events. In my opinion there are enough verbal similarities to make the idea of mere coincidence unlikely. These links of the papyrus with a manuscript of late date are very striking indeed, especially because there is nothing like that when we come to compare the papyrus with earlier versions of the story -except perhaps perhaps the one by Apollodorus. The whole issue is going to be discussed further at the end of the chapter when the examination of the lemmata and their explanations is finished.

II. 36-38 v. 683

As usual the lemma is longer than the one in the scholia. On the other hand, the explanation is shorter. Whereas the scholia offer two interpretations of διώνυμοι, the papyrus has only the first of the two, namely that each goddess had one alternative name. Moreover, it explains the name Κόρη by saying that Demeter was the mother of Persephone. This is missing from the scholia, apparently as self-evident, while the commentator finds it necessary to mention even trivial details.

A look at the byzantine scholia offers once again useful parallels. The lemma of the papyrus reads: διώνυμοι θεαί: ἢ ὀνομασταὶ καὶ ἐξάκουστοι ἢ αἱ δύο ὀνόματα ἔχουσαι, ἢ γὰρ Γῆ καὶ Δημήτηρ ἢ αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ Περσεφόνη καὶ Κόρη ἢ αὐτὴ. Compare the byzantine scholia: διωνύμους λέγει τὰς θεάς ἢ διὰ τὸ ἐκάστη δύο ὀνόματα εἶναι· τὴν τε γὰρ Δήμητρα καὶ Γῆν καλοῦσι, τὴν τε Περσεφόνην καὶ Κόρη· ἢ ἐπειδὴ δύο ἦσαν καὶ δύο ὀνόματα εἶχον.

It is of some interest for the study of the scholia recentiora to quote two entries from the lexica. The first is from Hesychius δ 2051 διώνυμος· περιβόητος, ὀνομαστός, the other one from Photius δ 687 διώνυμον διαβόητον, ὀνομαστόν, περίφημον. This alternative definition of διώνυμος has not been accepted by modern commentators but illustrates that some material in the later scholia had roots in much earlier sources such as lexicography.

II. 38-9 v. 683

In the middle of l.38 the traces of ink that Wilcken read as -νται (after our new reading Περσεφόνης) seem to be remains of the strokes indicating the end of an explanation and the beginning of a new lemma. The reading is not certain but it looks as if the scribe had initially written αὶ δ which he later corrected into the oblique and vertical strokes.

If a new lemma is accepted, it must have been part of the previous one which was longer, this time with a new explanation. We have seen this practice again in the case of ἀδάμαστον πέσημα cited for the first time in l.14.

As far as the explanation is concerned, this must have contained another interpretation of διώνυμοι, somehow associated with the cult of the goddesses in Thebes. The papyrus may have followed the pattern of the scholia, which offer usually two interpretations.

II. 40-3 v.687

In his edition, Wilcken had assumed the existence of this new lemma, which he inferred by the few words of the explanation he deciphered. In addition, he thought he could read πυροφόρους before θεᾶς, now confirmed with the new examination of the papyrus. In any case, this is a lemma already existing in the corpus of the scholia. It is interesting that the papyrus offers the reading πυροφόρους, not πυρφόρους which is universally adopted by the modern editors. As the relevant scholium shows, these two variants existed already in antiquity: “γράφεται καὶ πυροφόρους”.

A comparison of the explanation with its counterpart in the scholia vetera shows a certain degree of similarity, at least so far as the content is concerned. Both stress the double meaning of πυροφόρος partly on the basis of etymology. We also notice similarities on the level of phrasing: πυροφόρους δὲ εἶπε Δήμητρα καὶ Κόρη in the scholia, τὴν Περσεφόνην καὶ Δήμητρα πυρφόρους in the papyrus. The rest of the papyrus text, however, is very different from the scholium, so provision of supplements is quite difficult.

What is striking in l. 41 is the appearance of the grammatical term συνεκδοχῆ. It is really surprising, given that the commentator does not seem to be particularly interested or even familiar with such a terminology. Furthermore, this grammatical observation is not to be found in the scholia, or at least not expressed in such a technical manner. Consequently, it would be

useful to endeavour to specify the meaning and the function of *συνεκδοχή* in this passage and look for other texts that could facilitate its understanding.

The definition of *συνεκδοχή* in LSJ⁹ is as follows: “ understanding one thing with another... an indirect mode of expression, when the whole is put for a part or vice versa ”. In the passage under discussion one can find two cases of this schema, both attested by ancient sources. At first, *πυροφόρος* means the one who brings *πυρὸς*, wheat. It is very often found in Homer in the form *πυροφόρος ἄρουρα*. Eustathius (907,43-4) comments on one of these instances (M 314): ...ἡ δὲ πυροφόρος ἄρουρα τὴν ἀπλῶς σπερματοφόρον ὡς ἐκ μέρους δηλοῖ. The implication is that with the same word one understands simultaneously wheat and all sorts of cereals. The expression *ἐκ μέρους* is an equivalent for *συνεκδοχή*, as other examples in Eustathius show (Θ 239, A 529). In Hesychius s.v. *συνεκδοχή* we find the same explanation: ὅταν τις ἀπὸ μέρους παραλάβῃ.

The second case of *συνεκδοχή* in the expression *πυροφόρους θεᾶς* is associated with the roles the ancient Greeks attributed to Demeter and Persephone. It was only Demeter whose main function was to provide people with wheat. Persephone was the wife of Hades and not the patron of agriculture. In a broader context, however, she could also be considered as taking part in her mother’s activities. Whereas the scholia vetera do not mention that at all, the byzantine scholia have a clear statement (Sch. E. Ph.687 Dindorf): ἡ πυροφόρους τὰς παρεχούσας τὸν σῖτον. εἰ γὰρ καὶ μόνη Δημήτηρ παρέσχευ, ἀλλὰ μετ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ταύτην συνέλαβεν (Gu.Bar.). In order to make the phrase in the papyrus clearer, we should turn to Eustathius once again. In his comment on A529 (145,4) where we find another analysis of a *συνεκδοχή*, he writes: “ ἐν δὲ τῷ “κυανέαις ἐπ’ ὄφρυσιν ” ἡ ὅλη νοεῖται κεφαλὴ ἀπὸ μέρους συνεκδοχικῶς καὶ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ὡς οἱ Τεχνικοί φασὶ διὰ τὸ συνεκδέχεσθαι καὶ συλλαμβάνεσθαι ταῖς ὄφρυσιν τὴν ὅλην κεφαλὴν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἴδιον συνεκδοχῆς ἢ τοῦ συλλήψεως ”. It is worth mentioning also Hesychius s.v. *συνεκδοχικῶς· συλληπτικῶς*. The use of *συλλαμβάνειν* in both these sources demonstrates that the byzantine scholium on *πυροφόρους θεᾶς* refers to a *συνεκδοχή* and accordingly that our papyrus made a similar remark first in a much earlier period. When compared to the first possibility of a *συνεκδοχή* mentioned in the previous paragraph, this second one seems to me more likely.

As regards l.42, the papyrus is offering the double etymology of the adjective *πυροφόρος* in agreement with the scholia. Though it is difficult to restore the whole line, a

definition of συνεκδοχή in Choeroboscus' *Περὶ Τρόπων* (*Rhet. Gr.* III, 248, 11-2), however, presents an analogous structure by using exactly the same pronoun, ἕτερος: Συνεκδοχή ἐστὶ λέξις δι' ἑτέρου καὶ ἕτερον συνεκδηλοῦσα νόημα.

The last line of the explanation (43) is very difficult to decipher; the impression one gets is that of letters squeezed next to each other, in order to make room for as much text as possible. I think that I can read πυροφόρους ἐκάλουν θεὰς ἐπ[ειδὴ] but this is far from certain. It would agree, however, with the versions of the scholia referring to the torches lit in honour of Demeter: “πυροφόρους δὲ εἶπε Δήμητρα καὶ Κόρη, ἐπεὶ δαδουχίαι αὐταῖς γίνονται...” (MTAB) or “πυροφόρους δὲ καλεῖ, ἐπειδὴ ἐν νυκτὶ γιγνομένων τῶν μυστηρίων οἱ μυσούμενοι πῦρ ἔφερον...”.

Conclusions

Since it was first edited in 1933, the papyrus Würzburg 1 has been regarded as a text of low quality compiled for educational purposes by a person without scholarly abilities or even common sense. To quote from the preface of the first edition by Wilcken (p.9): “Ich hatte aus diesen und anderen Beobachtungen den Schluß gezogen, daß wir eine Epitome vor uns hätten, und zwar, wie ich meinte, aus einem Kommentar. Schwartz dagegen folgerte... daß wir vielmehr eine Privatarbeit eines mittelmäßigen Schulmeisters vor uns haben, der sich « aus einem mit Scholien versehenen Exemplar der *Phoenissen* das ausgeschrieben hat, was ihm gefiel, ohne sich an den Wortlaut zu halten »”. This negative attitude is due mainly to the absence from the papyrus of quotations from earlier scholars, its rather arbitrary selection of lemmata and its insistence on mythological narratives in a simple, not very elegant language.

Although the criticism is to a certain extent justified, a closer examination of the papyrus in relation to the ancient and the byzantine scholia shows a few positive elements and allows for a more balanced evaluation of the text.

First of all, despite the limited number of lemmata and the short explanations that seem

to paraphrase and abridge those transmitted by the scholia, in some cases the papyrus offers more. As examples I could mention the narrative about the oracle at Dodone (ll.53-7) and the story of the Calydonian boar (ll.77-86). At the same points, the scholia vetera make very brief remarks. It is obvious that the commentator had a fuller and richer version of the scholia (or rather their sources) in his hands. Furthermore, it is indicative of his method that he tried to include more than one version in his accounts of the myths. He introduced them with the expressions: *τινὲς λέγουσιν* (l.84), *ἄλλοι* (l.61) or *οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν* (l.55). On the other hand, one cannot maintain that the commentator was not interested in grammatical problems at all, since in a couple of cases the point is purely lexicographical (l.58: *ἐς διήρηες ἔσχατον*, l.52: *ὄθεν τί τᾰκτός* and ll.41-2 about *συνεκδοχῆ*). It is striking, however, that a large part of his commentary is occupied by short mythological narratives of nearly the same size which summarize the stories mentioned in the play, a fact which confirms the view that the commentator's main interest is mythology⁷.

A second very important point in the study of the papyrus is its links to the so-called byzantine scholia or scholia recentiora. As Wilcken informs us in the preface of his edition, it was with E. Schwartz's help that he managed to decipher many almost illegible bits of the text. It was also Schwartz who provided the papyrus with the most important supplements. No doubt all this study was completed by consulting the corpus of the scholia vetera which had been edited by the famous scholar in the last decades of the nineteenth century. A look at the commentary after the main text demonstrates clearly that this was the only source for Wilcken's edition. On the other hand, in two instances Wilcken found similarities to the later scholia. In the first case (ll.69-75), he made use of the Wolfenbüttler hypothesis which he found in Nauck's edition of Euripides, while in the second one (l.65) he refers to an explanation which "stimmt wörtlich überein mit dem Schluß eines jüngeren Scholions" also edited by Schwartz. In neither of these

⁷ G. Arrighetti in *Entretiens* (1994) 134 suggested that "il fatto è che questo testo veniva utilizzato come raccolta di narrazioni mitologiche (ἱστορίαι) tratte da un hypomnema e poco interessava la sua connessione con le *Fenicie* di Euripide". See H. Maehler's reply *ibid.* 135: "Ich möchte in P. Würzb. 1 nicht eine Sammlung von ἱστορίαι sehen, sondern einen Kommentar, oder zumindest Teile eines Hypomnema aus folgenden Gründen: 1) Neben Mythologischem enthält er auch Worterklärungen... 2) Die Reihenfolge der Lemmata des P. Würzb. 1 folgt im allgemeinen dem Euripidestext, bis auf die Lemmata 606, 24, 43, 90; die beiden letztgenannten Erklärungen sind gerade keine ἱστορίαι".

cases nor anywhere else in his commentary did he refer to Dindorf's edition of the scholia, which included scholia both vetera and recentiora.

As has been seen in our comments on individual lemmata, very often the papyrus exhibits surprising similarities to the byzantine scholia. These similarities extend beyond the content to the level of individual words and expressions. One interesting example is the Oedipus story in ll.69-76. Whereas the scholia have a short and very different version, the papyrus agrees considerably with the hypothesis in the codex Guelferbytanus. This was a long mythological narrative written by Thomas Magister in the fourteenth century and for that reason it has not been edited in modern editions.⁸ Another example one can mention is the story of the Calydonian boar (ll.77-86). Here the scholia vetera say nothing about the events which precede and follow the hunt. On the other hand, the long narrative in the papyrus is very close to the ones by Apollodorus 1,8,2 and Zenobius (*Cent.V* 33). The byzantine scholia offer a shorter version; it is striking, though, that there are once again strong similarities, mainly on the level of grammar and syntax. Moreover, unlike the earlier Greek sources, these later scholia offer an etymology of the name of the boar which seems to have existed also in the exemplar of the papyrus (l.80). The scribe left a blank space, possibly because his exemplar was illegible at this point.⁹

When it comes to the question of the manuscripts from which most of the so-called byzantine scholia have been drawn, the most important appears to be codex Guelferbytanus (Wolfenbüttel, Gud.Gr.15/14th cent.). Before Schwartz the editors of the Euripidean scholia relied very much on this manuscript which they considered to be of great authority.¹⁰ According to Mastronarde and Bremer (p.15), it is especially interesting for its scholia "which are a compilation of Moschopoulean elements and Thoman with some admixture of old scholia and material of uncertain origin". This description is confirmed to a certain extent by all the above mentioned similarities to the Würzburg papyrus and accordingly to ancient exegesis. It is only natural that the discussion comes to the role of these byzantine scholars such as Thomas

⁸ See Mastronarde and Bremer (1982) 84. This hypothesis can be seen in Dindorf's edition of the scholia on *Phoenissae* (vol.3, pp.5-10).

⁹ On the possible causes for the disorder of the lemmata cf. Maehler (1994) 109-11.

¹⁰ See Turyn (1957) 20-2.

Magister, Triclinius and Moschopoulos, whose work is represented in such late manuscripts. It is very common among modern scholars to consider their work mainly as product of their own thought only, somehow not connected to the earlier philological sources. So, one cannot but be surprised when one discovers that part of the material in their scholia came from earlier centuries, even directly and without the intervention of *codices veteres*. A very indicative example of this has been studied by W. S. Barrett and deals with Moschopoulos and his epitome of Euripides' *Phoenissae* in comparison to P. Oxy. 2544 and 2455.¹¹ Two of his conclusions are worth mentioning. The first refers to the byzantine recensions: (p.68) "no recension produces its text out of thin air: it uses manuscript sources. A reading found first in a recension may have originated in that recension, but may equally have been inherited by it from its manuscript sources". The second deals with the epitome: (p.58) "We now have, therefore, papyrus fragments of the epitome ranging over the whole of the ancient text; and it is evident that the Moschopouleian version is far closer to that text than is the version found in the principal medieval manuscripts" and later on (p.68): "Moschopoulos' source was not only independent of the source used by earlier manuscripts but was far superior".

It would be appropriate at this stage to go back to the Cadmus story and remember the supposition made by Mastronarde and Bremer that the version transmitted by the byzantine scholia was originally excerpted from an ancient hypomnema on *Phoenissae*. The same can be more or less maintained for the Thoman hypothesis on the same play. The part of this hypothesis which refers to Oedipus has been shown to be close to the Oedipus narrative in the papyrus (ll.69-75). As regards other similar cases concerning hypotheses, the one on *Alcestis* entitled *Δικαιάρχου* by Triclinius has been found by Turner to have ancient origins on the basis of similarities of phrasing to the fragmentary hypothesis of *Alcestis* in P.Oxy. 27.2457 from the early second century¹². Zuntz in his discussion of the various types of hypotheses speaks in favour of the continuity of such material at least for "three or four if not seven or eight centuries before Thomas".¹³ The Würzburg papyrus agrees roughly with this chronological pattern.

¹¹ Barrett (1965) 58-71.

¹² See also in Haslam (1975), esp.152-3.

¹³ Zuntz (1955) 129-52, esp.134 with n.2 and 140-2.

To conclude with a general remark, the severe judgements of Wilcken and Schwartz seem to be unfair and not entirely correct. The weak points of the papyrus commentary are counterbalanced by an amount of clearly scholarly material drawn probably from a trustworthy exemplar in the mainstream Euripidean exegesis of late antiquity. This is confirmed by many links to earlier sources but also by the surprising reappearance of some material in the much later byzantine scholia. Furthermore, the “peculiarities” of the papyrus (simple language, lack of learned citations and insistence on mythological topics) may be due to the purposes for which it was compiled, very likely those of education.

Chapter 2

The Papyri of Sophocles

P. Oxy. 1805 (1471 Pack²)

Late second century

Sophocles, *Trachiniae*

Frs. 6-10

ἀγορᾶ συνεξήκουον

λειμῶνι ταυτ[α

αγορᾶι νοησαι [δει το επι λειμῶνος [αθροισμα?

[τη]ν παιδα [δουναι] κρυφιον ως εχο[ι λεχος

360

[εγ]κλημα [μικρον] αιτιαν θ' ετο[ιμασας

[επι]στρατε[υει πατριδ]α την ταυ[της εν η

[το]ν Ευρυτο[ν τονδ ειπε] δεσποζ[ειν θρονων

Fr. 15 Col. i

]

]

[πως ειπας ω παι του παρ ανθρωπων]

μ θ

[[παρωνανθρωπου]]

744

[[Αρ(ιστοφανης?)]]

]

]

P. Oxy.1805 consists of several fragments from *Trachiniae*. On the basis of the hand and especially that of the cursive marginalia, the first editors, Grenfell and Hunt, dated the papyrus to the late second century AD . Accentuation and punctuation are frequent and it seems that, apart from the first hand, a corrector is responsible for some of them. Two more scraps published later as P. Oxy.3687 belong to the same roll but they do not offer any marginal notes.

The first cursive note is placed in the upper margin of the column which contains ll.360-87 (fr.6-10). Unfortunately its largest part is missing. What is left, however, allows us to identify a quotation from l.372 of the play: καὶ ταῦτα πολλοὶ πρὸς μέση Τραχινίων / ἀγορᾶ συνεξήκουον ὡσαύτως ἐμοὶ as well as a reference to l.188: ἐν βουθερεῖ λειμῶνι πρὸς

πολλοὺς θροεῖ / Λίχας ὁ κήρυξ ταῦτα. If the supplements are correct, the meaning of the third line is the following: “with ἀγορᾶ one should understand a gathering in the meadow”. The scholia vetera on I.372 offer an explanation of the word ἀγορᾶ as ἄθροίσματι which at first sight seems insignificant and unrelated to the marginal note. It will be shown later on that they both refer to the same problem, a problem which arises from a careful reading of the text.

Line 372 is part of the messenger’s speech explaining to Deianeira Lichas’ announcements to a crowd of Trachinians. The event took place “ πρὸς μέση Τραχινίων ἀγορᾶ ”, in the middle of the market place of Trachis if one follows the most common translation¹. In his first appearance on stage, however, and during his first account of the events the messenger referred to the location of Lichas’ speech as follows: ἐν βουθερεῖ λειμῶνι πρὸς πολλοὺς θροεῖ Λίχας ὁ κήρυξ ταῦτα, “in the meadow where the cows graze in the summer”. Obviously here there is a self-contradiction which did not escape the careful eye of the ancient reader and annotator.

The exact meaning of the word βουθερῆς is not clear and several suggestions have been made both by ancient as well as modern commentators.² In ancient lexicography Hesychius explained in δ890: βουθερεῖ· ἐν ᾧ βόες θέρους ὥρα νέμονται and the lemma has been attributed to Diogenianus and possibly back to the latter’s source, Didymus (Did., p.106 Schmidt). Despite the vagueness of the adjective, however, it remains certain that the poet referred definitely to a place outside the city of Trachis, somewhere in the fields.

On the other hand the problem is solved when we examine carefully the meaning of the word ἀγορᾶ. The ancient lexicographers give extensive definitions of it and indicate the double meaning it could have in different contexts. Interestingly enough, most offer very similar explanations: Hesychius α 724: ἀγορῆ· ἐκκλησία. αὐτὸ τὸ ἄθροισμα. καὶ ὁ τόπος. καὶ ὁ λόγος; EM auctum 160 ἀγορά· καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄθροισμα καὶ ὁ τόπος καὶ ὁ λόγος, probably both from Apollonius Soph. 4,15 Bekker s.v. ἀγορά: ἡ ἐκκλησία τὸ πλῆθος καὶ ὁ τόπος καὶ τὸ συνάθροισμα. Apollonius’ source could possibly be Arion s.v. ἀγορῆ ε´· τὸν τόπον τῆς

¹ H.Lloyd-Jones in his Loeb edition, vol.1 (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1994) translated the passage as “in the centre of the market place”.

² See Jebb (1892) 60, Kamerbeek (1959) 67, Rougemont (1983) 285-89, Easterling (1982) 101 and Davies (1991) 97.

ἐκκλησίας. καὶ τὸ πλῆθος. καὶ τὴν βουλὴν... Finally Orion 27,5: ἄγυρις: τὸ ἄθροισμα καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία... After all this evidence it becomes clear that there is no contradiction between the two passages from *Trachiniae*, provided that with ἄγορᾶ in l.372 we understand “gathering of citizens”. In fact, this is exactly what the scholia vetera implied by glossing ἄγορᾶ as ἄθροισμα. The annotator of the papyrus seems to have given the same interpretation, although there can be no certainty about the exact wording of the marginal note in l.3.

Modern commentators have dealt with the problem but they have not reached a unanimous interpretation. They seem to balance between the two meanings; public place, market place on one hand, gathering of citizens on the other.³ As Easterling briefly says: “πρὸς μέσῃ ἄγορᾷ need not conflict with ἐν βουθερεῖ λειμῶνι of 188: the details are in any case left vague, and ἄγορᾶ can mean both a place where people meet and the assembled people themselves.”⁴

Considering the general character of the marginal note in question, it is interesting to see that the use of the verb *voeîn* in all its grammatical forms is quite common in the corpus of the scholia. A look at the index of the scholia on Sophocles as well as on Euripides shows that *δεδί voeîn* belongs to the terminology used in ancient exegesis.⁵ This, of course, is not an indication of scholarly origin; it would be equally possible to attribute it to the vocabulary of the classroom. *Δεδί voeîn* was often used to explain or point out to the readers the movement and behaviour of the actors on stage or other details that the poet had left out as superfluous. Such scholia can sometimes be simplistic and naive, possibly proper to a school environment.⁶ Its case, therefore, should be examined separately and on its own merits. One should also pay attention to the common practice of annotators to point out inconsistencies within a text and to their attempts to explain them. As a close parallel from our material, I could mention the marginal note in PSI 1192 that follows, where the annotator stresses the similarity of two passages from the same

³ Kamerbeek (1959) 99.

⁴ Easterling (1982) 123.

⁵ E.g. Sch. Soph. *Ajax* 860, *OC* 115 and 163 and sch. Eur.*Or.*156.1, 218 and Eur.*Ph.*10 and 690.

⁶ See Meijering (1987) 129: “.. but there are also some (sc. scholia) which take the viewpoint of the reader, making explicit what he must (*δεδί*) imagine as happening”.

play, one from the prologue, the other from a lyric part, this time illustrating not an inconsistency but the consistency of the poet's descriptions.

In the margin of fr.15 col.1, the second hand has written a variant to the word ἀνθρώπων that stood in the text (l.744). The variant was ἀνθρώπου and is not attested in any other of our known sources. It attracts more of our attention, however, since it is attributed to a certain Αρ (). This abbreviation seems more likely to stand for Aristophanes of Byzantium than Aristarchus or Aristonicus.⁷ The variant has not been adopted by any of the modern editions and was also crossed out in the papyrus. The last word of the line was also deleted probably by mistake too. This had been written by the first hand as παρων under the influence of παρ' ἀνθρώπων that preceded. It was the corrector's hand that changed it into the correct form μαθων.⁸

It is unfortunate that the remains of the papyrus have not preserved more of the marginal annotation it probably had in its complete form. The marginal note and the varia lectio that survive indicate a good level of scholarship, especially an acquaintance with the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium or one of his successors.

PSI 1192 (1467 Pack²)

Second century

Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*

Col. I

θη [.]ιον αποξενον ορμον ειωθεσαν γαρ τα καθα...α βαλλειν
 εις την θαλασσαν κ(αι) ομη(ρος) λε(γει) και εις αλα λυματ εβαλλον . . η . . ν . φω
 κρητας επ αριστερα

177 χ ακταν προ[.]θεου εσ[. . . .] θεου του αιδου
 ων πολις α[.]ολλυται

⁷ Cf. Soph. *Ich.* 143 (col.6,5) : ' Αρ(ιστοφάνης?) and McNamee (1981a) 10 and n.16 with examples of similar abbreviations in the other papyri of Sophocles.

⁸ See Jackson (1955) 224.

νηλεα[.]εγ[. . .]α προς πεδωι	
θανατα[. . .]ακειται ανοικτως	
[.]ν δα[. . . .]πολιαι	ομοιον το...προ[.].....
τ επι μα[. . . .]α[.]τα[...λλο[.....]εξεστεμμεν[.]i....
παρα βω[]θακ[

PSI 1192 is a fragment of two columns from a papyrus roll of *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The editor of P. Oxy.2180 suggested that they both come from the same roll on the basis of the handwriting, the number of lines to the column and other features. PSI 1192, however, has the advantage of preserving more of the original margin so that we can actually see that the text was also annotated with plenty of marginalia. The presence of a χ next to l.177 shows that the scribe made reference to a commentary for a more detailed discussion of a problematic or interesting element in the verse, probably similar to the note in the right margin. A more careful study of the marginalia will prove that their origin and sources are to be found in commentaries of a remarkable level of scholarship.

In the top margin of the fragment, just above col. 1, there is an extensive marginal note written in three lines. It starts with the lemma “θρήικιον ἀπόξενον ὄρμον” from ll.196-7: εἴτ’ ἐς τὸν ἀπόξενον ὄρμων (ὄρμον codd.) / Θρήικιον κλύδωνα. These verses have not survived in the papyrus which breaks after l.190. The first observation one can make about the lemma refers to its slightly modified word order, so that the syntax comes closer to that of prose. It seems unlikely that this was the wording of the main text. After some space left blank to indicate the transition from lemma to explanation, the explanation starts with a general statement about the ancient custom to which the Chorus hints at: “εἰώθεσαν γὰρ τὰ καθαρτα(?) βάλλειν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν”. It goes on with a quotation from Homer A 314: καὶ εἰς ἄλλα λύματ’ ἔβαλλον. The explanation finishes with a series of undeciphered letters as well as two words in the middle of l.3 unrelated to one another : κρητας and επαριστερα.

The scholia on l.196 do not offer anything similar to the remarks made in the papyrus. There is only an attempt to give the exact location of the Thracian coast mentioned by the Chorus: εἴτ’ ἐς τὸν ἀπόξενον: ἴσως τὸν Σαλμυδησσόν φησι περὶ ὃν ἱστορεῖται πολλὰ

ναυάγια γίνεσθαι. Moreover the adjective ἀπόξενος is glossed as δυσχείμερος⁹. It seems that the note of the papyrus is more profound and more relevant to what the poet intended to show.

A look at the scholia on Homer, however, and more specifically on the line quoted in the marginal note (A 314) presents two slightly different versions of the same scholium, which in turn are very near to that of the papyrus: i. τὰ περιττώματα εἰς τὴν ἀπέριττον θάλασσαν βάλλουσι. καὶ Εὐριπίδης (IT 1193). ii. ἀπεκαθαίροντο καὶ εἰς τὴν θάλατταν τὰ περιττώματα καὶ καθάρματα ἔβαλλον. The editor of the scholia attributes the first version to the category of scholia exegetica and the second one to the so-called scholia D and with a question mark to Didymus himself.

A whole series of later sources, both scholia and lexica, seems to reproduce the homeric scholium either in full or partly. From a chronological point of view, of course, it is obvious that the papyrological evidence is closer to the Hellenistic scholarship, whereas we know that later texts such as the byzantine lexica were copied from one another and augmented with lots of new material from late antiquity. On the other hand, some of the sources of later lexica and monographs date back to the Alexandrian and early Roman scholarly activities, and in this respect their information can be invaluable. We find for example in Et.Gen. 1065 s.v. ἀπολυμαίνεσθαι: ... καὶ τὰ περιττώματα εἰς τὴν ἀπέριττον θάλασσαν βάλλεται ὡς Εὐριπίδης (IT 1193)... and Eustathius 108,29: εἰς τὴν ἀπέριττον οὖν φασὶ τὰ περιττώματα ἔβαλλον. Also in sch. Ar. Pl.656: εἴθιστο γὰρ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐκεῖ καθαίρειν τοὺς ἀφωσιωμένους· ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος· “εἰς ἄλα λύματ’ ἔβαλλον”.

It is worth noting that there are some possible links between two homeric glossaries preserved on papyrus which give glosses on the Homeric lines in question and the scholiastic and lexicographical tradition. The glossaries are P. Strass. inv.33 (Pack² 1163) and P. Palau Rib. inv.147. Both explain the verb ἀπολυμαίνεσθαι as ἀποκαθαίρεσθαι, the same gloss appearing both in the Homeric scholia as cited above, Et. Gen. loc. cit., Hesychius α 6469 and Ar. Soph. 38,11. Moreover, λύματα is once again explained as καθάρματα or ἀποκαθ[ά]ρματα, similarly to the Homeric scholia. It would be useful at this point to quote

⁹ Cf. Strabo 7.298 (7.3.6): “...καὶ καλεῖσθαι (sc. τὴν θάλατταν ταύτην) Ἰσχυρὸν διὰ τὸ δυσχείμερον καὶ τὴν ἀγριότητα τῶν περιρρικούντων ἔθνων”.

Hesychius λ 1406: λύμα· κάθαρμα and sch. S.OC 805: λύμα· κάθαρμα which, V. de Marco, the editor of the scholia vetera on *Oedipus at Colonus*, regards as coming from Didymus' Τραγικὴ Λέξις (Praef. p. XVIII). Also Hesychius λ 1412: Λύματ' ἔβαλλον· τὰς ἀκαθαρσίας ἔβαλλον from the scholia on A 314.

From the examination of the first marginal note, one can draw two important conclusions: the first relates to the origin of the note, which must have been a commentary on *Oedipus Tyrannus*, probably scholarly. The fact that it is introduced by a lemma from the text is an important factor in favour of this assumption. Moreover, the quotation from Homer which aims at enriching the discussion of the passage shows that the explanation does not belong to the trivial ones often to be found in the margins of papyri. Although it does not mention the geographical location of the Thracian coast under discussion, as the scholia do, it treats another aspect of the problem which is equally, if not more, important for the interpretation of the passage.

The second point that the marginal note raises is its association with the Homeric scholia. It is difficult to establish the exact nature of the relationship between the source of the note (a commentary on Sophocles, as stated in the previous paragraph) and the various layers of the scholia on the *Iliad*. Erbse, the editor of the scholia, attributed the first version of the scholium on A 314 to the scholia exegetica¹⁰ and the second one to the scholia D or Didymus. The scholia exegetica are considered products of post-Hellenistic scholarship, whereas the history of scholia D goes back to pre-Hellenistic times. Despite the fact that the relation to Didymus cannot be proved, there are, however, indications in favour of his involvement in the creation of the specific scholium. Given Didymus' strong presence in the scholia on Sophocles, especially those on *Oedipus at Colonus*,¹¹ as well as his influence and contribution to the later lexica, it is very likely that he is behind all the evidence and parallels mentioned already above, including the marginal note in question. Moreover, the existence of a similar scholium on Aristophanes' *Plutus* 656, where the contribution of Didymus is beyond doubt too, adds another strong argument to our hypothesis about the origin of the note.

¹⁰ For the scholia exegetica see H. Erbse (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I (Berlin 1969) XII-XIII.

¹¹ See V. de Marco's remark about sch. OC 806 as mentioned above.

Next to l.1 of col.I stands a short note referring to l.177 of the text: ἀκτὰν πρὸς ἑσπέρου θεοῦ. We have already mentioned the presence of χ in the left margin as probably indicating the discussion of this verse in a separate commentary on the play. The note starts with the lemma “ἑσπέρου θεοῦ” and then follows a very brief explanation, “τοῦ ἁΐδου”. This particular use of the adjective ἑσπερος which identifies the god from the West with Hades is not attested elsewhere. LSJ s.v. ἑσπερος quotes this passage and explains as “the god of darkness, i.e. Hades or death”. A look at the ancient lexica shows no reference at all to this specific explanation, for example: Suda E 3184 ἑσπέριος· ὁ δυσικός, Hesychius ε 6301 ἑσπέρια· δυτικὰ μέρη and ε 6308 ἑσπερος· ὁ ἀστήρ. In his commentary on the play Dawe found this use of the word strange: “The “western god” must be Hades, though this is not a normal description of him”¹². Sophocles seems to have used a very unusual expression indeed, since there are no parallels for it in extant literature. The only explanation one can think of is some Egyptian influence. For the Egyptians the god of death was placed in the West by the Ocean, where the Sun finishes and starts his day-journey. The scholia vetera, on the other hand, explain very briefly: ἑσπέρου θεοῦ· τοῦ ἁΐδου φησί. It is very interesting that this interpretation of a unique and obscure phrase occurs only in the scholia and the papyrus. One may argue that for the Alexandrian scholars it would not be so difficult to identify in Sophocles an element of Egyptian religion with which they must have been quite familiar.

A few lines further down column I and again in the right-hand margin, there is another marginal note referring to ll.183- 4 of the play: “ἐν δ’ ἄλοχοι πολιαί τ’ ἔπι ματέρες / ἀκτὰν πάρα βώμιον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι”. Here the Chorus describes the situation of desperate mothers and wives assembled round the altars of the gods mourning and asking for protection. The scholia vetera offer only two linguistic remarks on this passage. The marginal note of the papyrus, however, contains a reference to the prologue of the play and compares the situation described there with the one here. The editor failed to identify the reference but it is clear that this was in ll.19-20 of the Priest’ s speech: “ὅμοιον τοῖς προλ[ε]γομένοις / τὸ δ’ ἄλλο [φύλον] ἐξεστεμμέν[ον] / ἀγοραῖσι]θακ[εῖ, πρὸς τε Παλλάδος διπλοῖς / ναοῖς, ἐπ’ Ἰσμηνοῦ τε μαντεῖα σποδῶ”. It is interesting but perhaps without any further significance that this note is not accompanied by a lemma from the text.

¹² Dawe (1982) 110.

As regards now the nature and value of the marginal note, one can find out easily that it belongs to a category of scholia which are not uncommon at all. In fact, there are several examples both in papyri and the scholia where the annotator or scholiast discovers references to similar passages from the same text in order to point out discrepancies or continuity of ideas. As a case of discrepancy, I have already mentioned P.Oxy.1805 and the problem of the location of Lichas' speech in pp. 2-3; much more strikingly, in the scholia on *OT* 187, that is just a few lines below the passage our papyrus deals with, we find a reference to a case of similarity. The Chorus says: παιῶν δὲ λάμπει στονόεσσά τε γῆρυς ὄμαυλος. The scholiast makes the following remark: "...τοῦτο δὲ ὁμοίον ἐστὶ <τῷ> "ὁμοῦ δὲ παιάνων τε καὶ στεναγμάτων"(1.5)". He compares the situation described by the Chorus in the parodos with what Oedipus says in his opening speech. Once again, what is illustrated here is a continuity in some elements of ancient exegesis throughout the centuries.

After this presentation and study of the three marginal notes, it has become clear, I believe, that PSI 1192 is a papyrus of considerable importance for the history and stages of transmission of Sophoclean exegesis. Together with P. Oxy.2180, which we will examine next, they constitute a papyrus roll of high quality with reliable text and a series of marginalia very close to the Alexandrian scholarship. It is unfortunate that very little of the margins survives, especially in P. Oxy.2180. From what we have it is clear that the text transmits several good readings and that the marginal notes were excerpted from a scholarly commentary much richer than the scholia of the byzantine manuscripts.¹³

¹³ On the textual value of P.Oxy.2180 and therefore PSI 1192 see also H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (eds.), *Sophoclis fabulae*, OCT (Oxford 1990) vi: "Though we cite their (scil.of the papyri) readings from time to time they do not require special mention here. The exception is P. Oxy.2180, which thanks to a recent re-examination by W. S. Barrett, has been found to contain several valuable readings".

P. Oxy. 2180 (1466 Pack²)

Second century

Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*

Frr. 10-11

[και σ αμφιπλ]ηξ [μητρος τε] και απο σ ^τ ου πατρος	417
[ελαι ποτ εκ γ]ης τ[ησδε δεινο]πους αρα	χαλε) επο[
[βλεποντα ν]υν μ[εν ορθ επ]ειτα δε σκοτον	
[ου γαρ τι σ ηδη μωρα φωνησο]ντ' επει	ηδη 433
[σχοληι σ αν οικους τους εμους εσ]τειλαμην	

P. Oxy.2180 consists of numerous fragments from a papyrus roll containing *Oedipus Tyrannus*¹⁴. On the basis of the hand it has been dated by its editor to the second century AD. There were twenty lines to the column with ample margins. Its main features are unsystematic accentuation and punctuation but also a careful bookhand which give the impression of an edition of high quality. This impression will be strengthened after the study of the marginalia and the evaluation of the readings of the main text. As has already been stated (pp.64 and 68), it probably belonged to the same roll as PSI 1192. They both have many features in common, including hand and layout.

Since very little of the original margin has been preserved, there are only two marginal notes, both of them very short. They appear in frr.10-11 of the papyrus. The first one, χαλε() επο[refers to l.418 of the play: ἐλᾶ ποτ' ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε δεινόπους ἀρά. Although the decipherment is not certain, as the editor also admitted, there can hardly be any doubt that this was a gloss, a short explanation of the word δεινόπους from the text and that it should be read as χαλεπῶς ἐπομένη.

The scholia on l.417 give a rather different explanation: ἀμφιπλήξ] ἡ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων

¹⁴ Fragments 39,46 and 48 were identified and placed ("misplaced", according to Barrett as quoted in Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1997)49) by Brunner (1986) 295, most of the rest by W.S.Barrett, as Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) 82-3 inform us again.

ἐλαύνουσα, ἢ ἐκατέρωθεν πλήττουσα, ἔκ τε πατρὸς καὶ μητρός· δεινόπους δὲ ἢ διὰ τῶν ποδῶν δέος ἐμποιοῦσα. We find this definition repeated in the ancient lexicography: Suda Δ 342 δεινόπους ἀρά: ἢ διὰ τῶν ποδῶν δέος ἐμποιοῦσα (see also A 1753 s.v. ἀμφιπλήξ). Also Hesychius α 4083 s.v. ἀμφιπλήξ· ἐκατέρωθεν πλήσσουσα. Σοφοκλῆς Οἰδίποδι Τυράννω, from Diogenianus according to Latte.¹⁵ Thomas Magister on Il.417-21: ... δεινόπους δὲ διὰ τὸ κακῶς ἐπέρχεσθαι πρὸς οὓς ἂν πεμφθῆ. LSJ translates likewise, “with terrible foot”. It seems that Thomas’ interpretation is much closer to the real meaning of the adjective than the other sources and the scholia vetera. Did he have access to a better source or was it his own idea? Modern commentators do not offer anything significantly different.¹⁶

Another careful look at the ancient lexica, however, shows that other compounds with the adjective δεινός are explained in a way quite similar to that of the papyrus. Suda Δ 341 explained the verb δεινοπαθεῖ as δεινῶς ἔχει, χαλεπὰ πάσχει. The same explanation appears in Hesychius δ 507 and Photius δ 127. The original source of all these is Synagoge and Cyrillus. Although the gloss of the papyrus is still unparalleled, it seems now that it was not completely unusual to gloss the adjective δεινός as χαλεπός. The compound δεινόπους would then acquire its appropriate meaning, namely ‘the one who follows or attacks angrily and cruelly’. Finally, one could think of a different supplement for the gap, perhaps χαλε(πῶς) ἐπο[ιχο]μένη which has roughly the same meaning as ἐπομένη. In any case, the marginal gloss explains the adjective δεινόπους more satisfactorily than the scholia and most ancient sources.

The second note is a variant referring to a word from l.433. Given that in the papyrus the relevant part of the verse is missing, one cannot be sure about which form of the verb stood in the text. The editor printed ηἰδη in the margin and suggested the form ηδη for the main text. On the other hand, it becomes clear from the critical apparatus of recent editions that ἦδη is only attested by the papyrus and Par.Gr.2884 (once associated with Thomas Magister) and that the rest of the tradition has the reading ἦδει or ἦδειν. Therefore, it is natural to assume that this latter form stood in the text. The interesting thing is that the annotator provided the text with a

¹⁵ This was included by M. Schmidt among the fragments of Didymus p.98. Similarly τανύπους from *Ajax* 837 and Hesychius s.v. τανύποδας Ἐρινῶς as Did. p.101.

¹⁶ Dawe (1982) 135: “The -πους compound suggests to the mind an identity between the Ἄρα and the Ἐρινῶς, for καμψίπους... are all epithets of the latter”.

varia lectio apparently drawn from a very good edition. There are three more instances where the papyrus gives readings preferable to those of the manuscript tradition (l.417, 461 and 531 where the omission of the line in the papyrus has been adopted by modern editors).¹⁷ In the first case it was the corrector who introduced the reading adopted by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in their edition.

To sum up, as has been stated at the beginning of the examination of P.Oxy.2180, it seems that this was a text of very good quality not only because of its layout but also because of the value of the few marginalia and the readings of the text.

P. Oxy. 3151

Second / third century
Sophocles, *Ajax Locrus*

Fr. I

Col. i

Col. ii

]....το[
]	. []αλ[
]	πο[
] αιας	σηκ[
]αφορα απο	λα.[
]νικωμε	ουκει.[
] . []ων αλεκτρυ	πολλη[[.]]
]υμ[.]νι[]ονων	αλλουχο[

P. Oxy.3151 is a group of seventy three big and small fragments from a papyrus roll of the late second or early third century. The presence of Ajax as well as a speech of Athena about a sacrilege committed in her temple led the first editor (M. W. Haslam) to the identification of the papyrus with *Ajax Locrus* by Sophocles (Soph. fr.10a-g Radt). The text was supplied with

¹⁷ On the omission of v. 531 see Rose (1943) 5.

accents, breathings and punctuation marks as well as various other lectional aids. The hand of another corrector can also be seen in the text adding names of characters, correcting the text, adjusting the layout and also supplying short marginalia.

The fragmentary state of the text, especially the lack of the right hand margin does not allow a study of the marginal notes that would possibly exist there. Unfortunately the surviving ones refer to preceding lost columns and they are themselves fragmentary too. The presence of χ and χ^p next to some lines shows that points of interest were indicated either for further discussion in a commentary or for the aims of an anthologist.

The only marginal note that can be studied thoroughly is in Fr.1 in the margin between col.1 and col.2. It is almost complete and probably refers to col.1. It explains a lost passage as a metaphor from cocks defeated in a cock-fight. The fact that there was such a technical term in cock-fighting is attested in the scholia on Aristophanes' *Birds* 71a: ἡττήθης τινὸς ἀλεκτρούνοϋ: φυσικὸν τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς συμβολαῖς τῶν ἀλεκτρούνων τοὺς ἡττηθέντας ἔπεσθαι τοῖς νενικηκόσιν. The scholium explains Peisetaerus' reply to Tereus' servant saying: ὄρνις ἔγωγε δοῦλος. Suda repeats in a slight paraphrase the same scholium (H 620), whereas in the *Corpus Paroemiogr.Graec.* II,450 (Apostolii Centuria VIII 70) we find the same idea too: ἡττήθης τινὸς ἀλεκτρούνοϋ: ἐπὶ δούλων ἢ θεραπόντων ἐπομένων τοῖς δεσπόταις. A similar proverbial saying, also about defeated cocks, is transmitted by various sources and has its origin in the tragic poet Phrynichus who was expelled from the theatre after the performance of *The Sack of Miletus*: “πτήσσει Φρύνιχος ὡς τις ἀλέκτωρ” (Phryn. 3F 17 and fr. adesp. 408a, Sch. Ar. *Vespae* 1490a and Aelian, *Var.Hist.* 13.17). The explanation given by the scholia and Aelian, “παροιμία ἐστὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς τι πασχόντων”, could be appropriate also to a tragic context.

Some more information about the behaviour of defeated cocks is given by Aelian, *De natura animalium* IV 29: ... καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἄλλον ἡττηθεὶς ἀγωνία οὐκ ἂν ἄσειε. See also Cicero, *De divinatione* I 34,74 and Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* X 24,47. Both these characteristics of cocks defeated in cock-fight seem to apply to the context of the story of *Ajax Locrus*. The first editor assumed that the metaphor of the defeated would apply to Cassandra who stood in silence but he then rejected this view as inappropriate. Perhaps he thought that an expression used in comedy could not have a place in tragedy. In order to justify the metaphor, however, one has to assume that there was at least one person in captivity or in silence. Otherwise there would be no

point for the marginal note, especially if one takes into account the absence from the surviving collections of any other proverb related to cock-fight. Even if the metaphor was used in a derogatory manner, it would still apply very well to the image of Cassandra or even Ajax sitting by the altar as suppliants¹⁸. In fr.10 we find another striking image, the description of the netting of a boar or deer.¹⁹ Whether metaphorical or not, such an image would add to the atmosphere created by the imagery of cock-fight.

As regards now the evaluation of the marginal note in question, one should not assume automatically that it indicates a scholarly source. The explanation of metaphors is a very common element in the scholia in general. The normal structure is “ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ...” and the indexes of the scholia have plenty of examples to offer. Zuntz has developed some criteria to distinguish between elementary or rather simplistic explanations and cases where a more scholarly approach can be detected.²⁰ The example found in P. Oxy.3151 is not easy to classify but one wonders whether the terminology of cock-fight really presupposes previous research, especially when the topic was a matter of discussion in several ancient authors as well as scholiasts or lexicographers. I think, however, that the note should not be rejected so easily as a note from a simple reader since the papyrus was quite carefully annotated. Yet the present condition of the papyrus is such that does not allow any further speculation.

¹⁸ In one of the possible reconstructions of the play Ajax fled to the altar of Athena and was not punished by the other Greeks.

¹⁹ See Cockle (1976) 35-6.

²⁰ Zuntz (1975) 10- 15: “Schülerklärungen, die zu einem übertragenen Ausdruck anmerken “ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ...” u.ä., sind bekanntlich in den Scholien zahlreich wie Sand am Meer”.

P. Oxy. 1175 (1472 Pack²)

Late second century

Sophocles, *Eurypylus*

Fr. 5

Col. i

<* Αγγελος>

Τη]λεφο()

]ς

]]

]]

π]τηναι

5

θη]ρασιμο ()

]·σα[]

]ην μεταιχ[μι]

δ]ιαβεβλημ[εν]

9 ερρηξατην ες κυκλα χαλκεων οπλων

20 εγχος]μεσον έγχος ου(τως) ην μο(νον) εν ετ(ερφ)

]·ιται πρόσω

Col. ii

<' Ασ.> τριτην δ επ εμ[ε] <Χο> κ[α]ι γαρ ουν 6

προσαγ[α]γ' ωδι[.]ιγ[...]υ διάινεις ...[δ]ακρυε[ις

επει κτησιων φρενων εξεδυς· ου γαρ αυτ[

<' Ασ.> ω δαιμον ω δυσδαιμον ω κείρας [ε]με

< Χο.> αγχου προσειπας· ου γαρ εκτος εστως 10

σύρει δη φύρ·δ·αν· -ταν ου(τως) ην εν [β'

<' Ασ.> επισπασει δικα με.

< Χο.> δικαι ναι·

<’ Ασ.> ἀλλ ὡς ταχιστ’ ἀριστα. ^{η ταχιστη ἀριστη}

P. Oxy.1175 consists of a group of fragments which were found together with those of Sophocles’ *Ichneutae* (P. Oxy.1174) ²¹. The editors identified parts as coming from the now lost tragedy *Eurypylus* by Sophocles on the basis of a known verse quoted by Plutarch (*De cohibenda ira* 10, p.458D). Apart from the pieces of considerable length, which can be identified more easily, some of the smaller fragments may belong to either *Ichneutae* or *Eurypylus*. The papyrus roll, which probably contained only *Eurypylus*, dates to the late second century.

Despite the very fragmentary condition of the papyrus and the loss of most of its margin, from what survives and especially from the bigger fragments it is clear that the text was corrected and annotated. It is quite common, of course, as in the case of P.Oxy.3151, that some marginalia cannot be discussed because the text they refer to is missing. On the other hand, one can draw some conclusions concerning the general nature of the annotator’s work.

First of all, the text was collated by a corrector with another copy. The appearance of a couple of variants together with the abbreviated οὐ(τως) ἦν μόνον ἐν ἐτ(έρῳ) or ἐν β’ indicates the use of a text of some authority in order to give to the new copy the greatest accuracy possible. Two points deserve to be mentioned separately here: in col. 2,11 the main text has the reading φύρδαν (already corrected from φύρταν), “in utter confusion”, whereas just above the letter δ as well as in the margin the corrector added the variant φύρταν which he probably found in the other copy. The interchange of δ and τ in the papyri is a common mistake due to pronunciation changes in the late Hellenistic period.²² The corrector either could not recognize the classical form or it was not part of his job to evaluate the variants he brought into the text. The second point one can make with reference to the work of the corrector stems from fr.84 (220a Radt) and the marginal note Νι() -λειν σε ὀδῶ. Here the variant is introduced by the abbreviated name Νι(), probably indicating a scholar who commented on the plays of

²¹ Eighteen additional fragments were published by A. S. Hunt in vol.17 as P. Oxy.2081(b). All fragments were republished by Carden (1974) 1-51 and S. Radt, *TrGF* 4 (1977). Selections by H. Lloyd-Jones (ed.), *Sophocles: The fragments*, Loeb Class. Lib. (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1996) 82-95 and J. Diggle (ed.), *TrGFS* (Oxford 1998) 37-9.

²² Mayser (1970²) 147.

Sophocles. Nicander or Nicanor are both possible explanations but neither is known to have worked on Sophocles. Interestingly enough, the same abbreviated name occurs in two variants in the margins of *Ichneutae* (Col.IV, 23 and VI, 18)²³. It seems that the edition or hypomnema of this unknown scholar was used by the corrector or correctors of both texts and that it was considered a reliable source.

A number of sigla were used in the papyrus in order to help the reader. ‘Chi’ refers the reader to a commentary, whereas the use of diplex obelismene at several points indicates the beginning of a lyric part. Paragraphi are also found in the main text marking the changes of speaker. The ancora in fr.3,7 (208 Radt) was probably used to mark an omission and a corresponding insertion by the corrector in the top or bottom margin. In 2081(b) fr.8 (222 b Radt) there is a trace which looks like a coronis or a stichometric figure (B=200) which would indicate, as it is generally accepted, that the scribe counted the number of lines in order to calculate his payment.

At the top right-hand margin of fr.5 (210 Radt), col.1 the remains of two marginal notes cannot be examined thoroughly because the corresponding text is lost. However, the first one, Τη]λεφο() obviously gives some information about Eurypylus’ father, Telephus. The second one π]τηναί / θ]ηρασιμο () could be either an element of the myth, paraphrase or possibly a quotation.

In fr.5, col.2 two more notes are quite clear. The first one ... [δ]ακρύε[ις / σὺ γὰρ αὐτ[looks like a prose paraphrase of the Chorus’ words to Eurypylus’ mother Astyoche: “... διαίνεις / ἐπεὶ κτησίων φρενῶν ἐξέδυσ”. Its most important element is the explanation of the verb διαίνεις as δακρύεις. The lexica offer similar interpretations e.g. Suda Δ 880 διαίνεσθαι: βρέχεσθαι. Διαίνω γὰρ τὸ ὑγραίνω; Et. M 266,56 διαίνω: τὸ βρέχω, τὸ ὑγραίνω and Hesychius δ 1025 διαίνεται· βρέχεται· δακρύνει, all drawn possibly from Cyrillus and the Synagoge. Hesychius has another one in δ 1040 διαίνεται· βρέχεται, ὑγραίνεται, this time from Diogenianus. A similar explanation is given in the scholia on A. *Persae* 1038 δίαινε πῆμα· δάκρυε τὸ ἀτύχημα. The second marginal note is a very simple paraphrase of a proverbial expression. The annotator turned into Attic what he possibly thought to be Doric; perhaps also he was already familiar with the proverb in its Attic version. Nothing

²³ For more examples see McNamee (1981a) 63 s.v. Νι(κάνωρ?) and n.51.

comparable can be found in the existing corpus of ancient proverbs. In *Antigone* 1327, however, we meet the same idea: βράχιστα γὰρ κράτιστα τὰν ποσὶν κακά. Kamerbeek assumed a reminiscence of *Eurypylus* which is thought to have been one of the early plays of Sophocles but the line in *Antigone* can simply be resonance of a proverb known from everyday life.²⁴

As a general brief remark after the examination of P.Oxy.1175, one could say that this text was supplied with plenty of lectional aids and was collated with another copy. It was probably a scholar's text, like the papyrus of the *Ichneutae* together with which it was found. Furthermore, as has been shown above, it contained some marginalia about the content of the play but it is not easy to form a clear idea about their extent and quality since what survives is too little and very fragmentary.

P. Oxy. 2452(1479 Pack²)²⁵

Later second century
Sophocles, *Theseus*(?)

Fr.1= fr. 730 d

δικαία πρασσει[ν.] κε . [5
ειην οθι[
]λε ο ^υ εν β· μ ^ο καρα .. [
καιτο ..[

Fr.2= fr. 730 e

[]κωμου ωι παν
]
]πικ[.]πινυκτ()	αγε· αξιο[
]αιεπ[.]...	τοιουτος[

²⁴ Kamerbeek (1978) 209-10.

²⁵ Republished by R. Kannicht in S. Radt, *TrGF* 4, 730 a-g.

Ἰοφειλες	φρουρα[...]. . [...]. . [
Ἰν γαρ σκο	τηρο[υντ]ες ηδη μι	4
Ἰντι		

Ἰνο ^ω εν ε ^τ αρι	χ ^χ χω μεν καλωσ[16
Ἰοσφραινομαι	χ ^χ νεον τι πραξι[
	λευκην γαλη[νην	
Ἰυνομαι ου() εν ετ()	χ ^χ αει δ' α[ν]ω θηλ[εια	
1.		
1.		

P. Oxy.2452 offers fragments from a lost and unknown tragedy. The only certain fact is that it dealt with the adventures of Theseus and his companions in Crete. Various stylistic and linguistic observations led the first editor (E. G. Turner) to the conclusion that it can be attributed to Sophocles and indeed to his play *Theseus*. There has been a series of objections to the attribution of the fragments to *Theseus* but at least there seems to be unanimity about the authorship.²⁶ For the purposes of this study it is enough to accept the title which the first editor suggested, only with a question mark.

The papyrus has been dated to the later second century on the basis of the hand. Accents, breathings, quantity marks and punctuation have been supplied by the first hand. A second hand has corrected the text, added the names of characters and what is more important, has written in the margins notes about textual criticism and interpretation. As it is the case with several texts from this period (e.g. P. Oxy.1174 and 75), this one has also been collated with one or possibly two other copies. Often we come across the formulaic abbreviated expression οὐ(τωρ) ἐν ἐτ(έρω) μό (νον) preceded by a variant. Unfortunately the loss of the corresponding main text prevents us from a full study and evaluation of these alternative readings. In the left margin of fr. 2,16, however, a reading is ascribed to a certain Ἀρι or Ἀρι^χ, that is Aristophanes of Byzantium

²⁶ See e.g. Lloyd-Jones (1963) 434-36: "...Prima facie Sophocles is the likeliest author; but he should not be named as author without a question mark (436)". In his edition of the fragments of Sophocles (344-5) he included P.Oxy.2452 among the "fragments not assignable to any play". Similarly R. Kannicht in *TrGF* vol. IV, 497-518.

or Aristarchus respectively.²⁷ The interpretation depends on whether χ is part of the abbreviation or simply the common siglum for a notable passage. It should be noted here that χ has been used many times in this papyrus together with χ^p , the sign that indicates a passage useful to an anthologist. Since a similar χ can be seen at the same position a couple of lines below, it seems to me that $\alpha\rho\iota$ was what the annotator wrote and simply squeezed it ⁱⁿ below the siglum that was already there.

There are also a few examples of marginal notes of interpretative character but without the main text only speculative and uncertain suppositions can be made. The note in fr.2 seems to have been quite extensive if it was a continuous one. We have the end of five lines in the left margin with a reference to night ($\nu\kappa\tau(\delta\varsigma)$) and possibly to darkness ($\sigma\kappa\omicron / [\tau \]\nu\tau\iota$). Given that in the main text there is a description of a nocturnal event possibly associated with a late night guard, the marginal note must have contained a comment on this. In line 17, immediately under a variant, there is the verb $\delta\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in the margin. One cannot tell whether it is a gloss or part of a quotation but the first editor has already stated that it does not belong to the vocabulary of tragedy. He suggested that a citation from Aristophanes' *Frogs* 654: $\kappa\rho\mu\mu\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$ $\delta\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, could give a solution. The commentator needed an example to distinguish between $\kappa\rho\mu\mu\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$ and Κρομμυῶν , the place where one of Theseus' adventures took place. Because marginalia normally refer to preceding columns and in order that this theory functions, fr.3 in which Κρομμυῶν is mentioned should therefore precede fr.2. In my opinion, although we have here a very plausible suggestion, the problem of the note has not found a fully satisfactory answer. In the margin two lines below, Kannicht reads]αζομαι instead of]υνομαι of the first edition but the latter looks to me more likely.

Generally speaking, P.Oxy.2452 is another example of a category of texts the fragmentary condition of which does not allow us a detailed study of their marginalia. Most of the annotation is lost or unclear and our study helps only to specify its nature, the methods used and possible parallels. Naturally there is plenty of speculation involved especially as far as sources are concerned. Despite all this, however, P. Oxy.2452 must have been a copy prepared for and used by a person interested in the correctness and accuracy of the text. This is the reason it was in all likelihood collated carefully with editions of recognized authority and also annotated

²⁷ See McNamee (1981a) 9-10 and n.15 about the uncertainty of the abbreviation.

with notes of some value for the interpretation of the text.

P.Oxy. 1083+2453 (1739 Pack²)

Second century

Sophocles, *Polyidos* or *Manteis* and other plays

Fr.19= Fr. 1132 Radt

Fr.46= Fr. 1133 Radt

] . . [.]·χ[

]ρέσσειται[

]

] . . σουτοσώ . [4

]

π]αππαπαππαπ[αι

]

]μεν ειπειν ο Φοι[νιξ 8
]σοδουειν εμφυ[

.] . . [. .]ε.[

.] . . δρ . ειν[

]·κλυεινκ.[

..]οιδακα[4

]·υτος ην[

]φρεσιτατο[

]τωι φρεν[

Right from the first publication of P. Oxy.1083 by Hunt in 1911 it was obvious from the presence of a chorus of Satyri in fr.1 that the roll offered fragments from a lost satyr play. Its authorship is uncertain but since one of the characters involved was king Oeneus or Schoeneus and it is known from other sources that Sophocles wrote a satyr play with the title *Oeneus*, editors usually include it in the editions of the fragments of Sophocles, although among the *dubia*. The publication by Turner of 27 additional fragments as P. Oxy.2453 in 1962, however, showed the presence of another character, Polyidus. Given also that Phoenix is mentioned in fr.

4.6, 14.3 and 19 i.m. it is impossible to imagine a single play with so incompatible characters. It was, therefore, clear that this series of fragments comes from one or more rolls containing more than one play or parts of several plays. There was definitely one satyr play, the tragedy *Polyidus* or *Manteis* and possibly other plays as well.

What matters more for our study is not the attribution of the fragments to individual plays but the fact that this papyrus was occasionally corrected, supplied with accents and breathings, punctuation and some marginalia. There are also names of characters (Χο (ρὸς) σατύρων) and Ἰοίνευς in fr.1) as well as paragraphi indicating the changes of speaker. It is mainly the first hand which is responsible for all these and from what survives there is no sign of collation with other copies as in the texts examined earlier on. The corrections may have come from the first scribe in the process of copying or in a later stage of collation with the exemplar used.

A few marginalia appear in some of the fragments, such as 19 and 46 which are reproduced above. Unfortunately, once again it is not possible to find out their exact meaning or function because the main text is missing. Interestingly, however, some of them were quite extensive with the one in fr.46 occupying three lines in the bottom margin.²⁸ Apart from that, it is also clear that they addressed various issues and not exclusively textual problems as it happens very often elsewhere. The note in fr.19 talks about Phoenix whose role was more likely in the satyr play *Oeneus*. In 1.9 where the first editor, Hunt, had read Ἰσοδοῦς ἰν' ἐμφυ, Carden (1974) 151 reads Ἰσοδοῦειν ἐμφυ which is preferable.

²⁸ Carden (1974) 156 offered a slightly different reading of the note () . υτοσηπ[/]. ισπτατο [/] ωφρεν[) but I find Turner's transcription, which has been printed above, more accurate.

P. Oxy. 1174 (1473 Pack²)Sophocles, *Ichneutae*

Second century

Col. 3

Σιληνο(ς) θεος Τυχη [κ]αι δαιμον ιθυντηριε ει(υθ)ιυντηριε· Αρ(ιστοφα)ν(ης) 20 (79)
 τυχε]ιν με πραγδύς ού δραμημ' επειγεται

Col. 6

<Χο> ἄκουσον αυτος νυ[ν πα]τερ χρονον τινα 4 (142)
 ο,ιω π,λ,αγεντες εν,θαδ, εξ[ω]ργισμεθα διω κπλαγ(εντες) Αρ(ιστοφα)ν(ης)
 ψοφω τον ουδε[ι]ς π[ωπο]τ ηκουσεν βροτων ενθαδ' εξε
 <Σι> τι μοι ψ[ο]φον· φοβ[. . .] . κα[.] δειμαίνετε νισμεθα ου(τως) ην μο(νον)
εν τ(ω) Θε(ωνος)

Col. 8

<Σι> εα. <Χο> τι εστιν <Σι> ου μενω <Χο> μεν' ε[ι] θελεις. 17 (205)
 <Χο> ουκ εστιν· αλλ αυτος συ ταυθ οπη θελεις, ταυθ οπη δυναι βελ(τιον)
 ζήτει τε καξιχνευε και πλού[του ταυθ]' οπη θελεις

The papyrus of the *Ichneutae* (P. Oxy.1174) is one of the most important of all the papyrological finds of the lost plays of Sophocles. Since its first publication by Grenfell and Hunt in 1912 it has been examined from various perspectives including textual criticism as well its important contribution towards the understanding of satyr play as a poetic genre.

As one would expect, in all the editions of the papyrus apart from the main text the ample marginalia have also attracted the attention of the editors. It is to be expected, therefore, that the marginal notes have been more or less fully deciphered and nearly all mistakes of the first edition corrected. What has not been done yet is a detailed research of the meaning of each note separately for the interpretation of the text as well as a general assessment of the philological

principles behind the scattered and often fragmentary variants. It is not in the aims of this particular study to attempt such an extensive task in full, so it will be limited to a brief description of the facts and presentation of some examples chosen at random.

P. Oxy.1174 has been dated to the late second century. As has been stated earlier, it was found together with 1175 (Sophocles, *Eurypylus*) and both share common features in layout and annotation, possibly written by the same hand. Similarities are to be seen also when the papyrus is compared to other texts from the same period, such as P. Oxy.2452 and others. The fact that 1174 is a very well preserved and quite long text allows us to observe the work of the scribe and the diorthotes to a large scale and to base our conclusions on a firm and reliable amount of material.

First of all, the text has been collated with other copies. The presence and repetition of the expression: οὕτως ἦν ἐν τῷ Θεώνοϋς makes sure that one of the copies belonged to Theon regardless of whether Theon was the owner, the editor or both. The identification with Theon, son of Artemidorus, seems doubtless and is confirmed by the appearance of his name in the margins of other papyri as well.²⁹ Apart from Theon, the names of other scholars are also mentioned, very interestingly that of the famous Aristophanes of Byzantium and of a certain Νι (), possibly Nicander or Nicanor. I find it unlikely, however, that the text has been collated with all these editions. It seems likely that some of these variants were quoted by Theon in his own copy, probably as marginalia, perhaps in the discussion of the passages in a separate commentary.

A look at the variants attributed to Theon and the other scholars shows that they can be regarded as products of the scholarship that developed in the Hellenistic and early Roman Alexandria either in the circle of the Museum or in provincial centres of Egypt such as Oxyrhynchus.

In col. 3,20 of the main text stands the expression δαίμον ἰθυστήριε. The variant in the margin attributed to Aristophanes lacks the second and third letters and was supplemented by the first editors as ε[ἰθ]υστήριε, thus denoting a poetic form or less likely an etacistic error. Later editors, though, gave the preferable supplement εὐθυστήριε, the classical equivalent of

²⁹ P. Oxy.841 (P., *Paeans*), P. Oxy.2427 (Commentary on Epicharmus), P. Oxy.2536 (Commentary on P., *Pythians*) etc.

ἰθυντήριε.³⁰ It seems that it was not an unusual phenomenon in the textual tradition that some scribes would write the epic form ἰθύνω instead of the classical εὐθύνω and vice versa and that we would find the manuscripts divided between the two.³¹ Although it is unlikely that Aristophanes suggested the rarer εἰθυντήριε, it is indicative of his scholarly abilities that he thought that an epic form like ἰθυντήριε might not be appropriate in a tragic dialogue especially in a metrically indifferent place.

Two variants referring to the same verse appear in col. 6,5. The first one, οἴω 'κπλαγέντες, comes from Aristophanes, if the abbreviation Ap is so understood. The second variant, ἐνθάδ' ἐξεπίσμεθα, is attributed to Theon (fr. 28 Guhl). The reading of the main text is not clear but it was definitely some form of a different verb, possibly ἐξ[ω]ργίσαμεθα (Hunt, Radt et al.) or ἐξ[η]γίσαμεθα (Siegmann). Theon suggested the verb ξενίζομαι not with its classical meaning 'receive or entertain as guest' but in the sense of 'be astonished' which is mainly post-classical and would not seem appropriate in a text of the fifth century. Of course, one cannot be certain whether this was a reading Theon found in an earlier copy or his own conjecture and in any case modern editors print ἐξεπίσμεθα despite the objections.³²

Another point concerning the variants in the margins is that some of them stand on their own, that is without any reference to a particular scholar. There is still the possibility that they were found in the copies which this papyrus was collated with but it is equally likely that they come from the anonymous person who annotated the text either for his own use or on behalf of his client. There is an example where we can see clearly more than a mere presentation of variants. In col. 8,18 the marginal note says: ταῦθ' ὄπη δύνᾳ βέλ(τιον) / [τοῦ ταῦθ' ὄπη θέλεις, according to Siegmann's correction of Hunt's supplement which was: ταῦθ' ὄπη δύνᾳ· βέλ(τιον) / ταῦθ' ὄπη θέλεις. Two variants, one of which is probably the reading of the main text, are compared and the annotator expresses his preference. No reasons are given for

³⁰ See e.g. Blomfield (1830⁴) 72 (note on A. *Persians* 779), Diehl (1912) 209 and (1913) 6, Pearson (1917) 239 who provides a few relevant examples.

³¹ Barrett (1964) 387-8 (note on Eur. *Hipp.* 1223 and 1226-7).

³² Carden (1971) 42-3: "...The source for the corruption is not explained, but it seems possible that ἐξεπίσμεθα, not recorded otherwise for the classical period, was also liable to be misunderstood".

this preference but we can infer them from the context of the lines involved. The repetition of the verb θέλεις in two consecutive lines seemed objectionable to the annotator who thought that by replacing the second θέλεις with δύνᾱ, he would improve the text.³³ This suggestion cannot be accepted for two reasons: first of all, a repetition may be intended by the poet in order to achieve a particular effect. Secondly, as Pearson noticed, forms of the verb δύνασθαι tend to gloss very often equivalent forms of the verb θέλειν.³⁴ Although in this case there is no need for an explanation of θέλειν, both arguments justify the rejection of the variant and all modern editors apart from Grenfell and Hunt seem to agree in printing ταῦθ' ὅπη θέλεις in both positions. It is interesting, however, that this marginal note is not attributed to the edition of an eminent scholar but probably comes from the annotator himself who for the first time expresses his personal opinion.

Apart from preserving large parts of a lost satyr play, P. Oxy.1174 is also a very good example of a scholar's copy. The careful corrections, the stichometric figures in the margins and most importantly the marginal annotation indicate that this text was copied for a person whose knowledge and acquaintance with classical literature was considerably above that of an ordinary reader. The quality of the variants, as has already been said, is very good and this is of course due to the copies used for collation. The names of known scholars such as Theon and Aristophanes clearly confirm the above statement. It is rather unfortunate that no interpretative marginalia exist and we can only assume that the scholar in question had at his disposal a separate roll containing a detailed commentary.

³³ See Siegmann (1941) 72.

³⁴ Pearson (1917) 251 with several examples from scholia and lexica.

Conclusions

The popularity of Sophocles was at its highest point in the fifth century BC but was eclipsed in the centuries that followed by that of Euripides. Revivals in the festivals, citations in other authors (Aristotle in the *Poetics* regards *Oedipus Tyrannus* as the highest point of Greek tragedy) and Sophocles' inclusion among the three dramatists whose text was chosen to be put under state protection, however, show that his work continued to be in circulation, to be performed, read and studied by later generations. The creation of new centres of philological activity in the East, especially in Alexandria of the Ptolemies marked a new era for the fate of Sophoclean drama, as it is of course the case with the whole of classical literature. A great deal has been written about the contribution of the Alexandrian scholarship to the preservation and study of classical texts. Although no complete work has survived, plenty of material has come down to us in the corpus of the scholia in the margins of the byzantine manuscripts, through the lexica which usually abridge or paraphrase material from lexica and glossaries of the Alexandrians and last but not least in the papyri, whose proximity to the period in question guarantees their preservation of reliable information.

The papyri of Sophocles as discussed above give us the opportunity to examine the history of the text during the Ptolemaic, Roman and early Byzantine times in Egypt. Though always bearing in mind that this sort of evidence comes only from a limited geographical area leaving aside other important centres of scholarship, papyri can offer new information to confirm, refute or expand our knowledge of the philological interest in Sophocles. At first, one should mention the much repeated observation that the Alexandrians possessed the biggest part if not the whole corpus of Sophoclean drama. The discovery of lost plays which still circulated in the first centuries of our era shows that these plays were not only read but also studied and annotated, probably with the help of independent commentaries. The examination of plays such as the *Ichneutae* or *Theseus* illustrates not only that the texts of the "Selection" were subject to scholarly attention but also that critical editions and commentaries for the rest were still available and there was demand for them.

It is unfortunate for the study of Sophoclean scholarship that the material which survives

comes in its entirety from the first centuries AD.³⁵ Papyri of the early or late Ptolemaic period would perhaps enable us to learn more about the Hellenistic scholars, although similar examples from the papyri of Euripides have shown that this is rarely the case. On the other hand, fragments from late antiquity which are usually more heavily annotated are few and without any marginalia. We should, therefore, limit our research to the papyri examined above and try to see if there are any conclusions to be drawn from them.

In order to organize the presentation and assessment of the information provided by the papyri, we can attempt to classify them in two categories: on the one hand we have P. Oxy.2180 + PSI 1192 (from the same roll) and P. Oxy.1805; on the other hand, the fragments of the lost plays, namely *Ichneutae*, *Eurypylos*, *Theseus*, *Ajax Locrus*, and the roll with the various plays. The first group gives fragments from *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Trachiniae*, both plays from the "Selection", and therefore, with scholia we can compare to the marginalia. It has been shown already that papyri were supplied with notes from scholarly sources. The amount of the material is admittedly limited but the main reason is that very little of the margins has survived. From what we have, however, it seems that the marginal notes dealt with obscure passages, inconsistencies and difficult words as well as with problems of textual criticism. The scholia of the manuscripts on these specific passages do not contain anything like this, a fact which simply confirms, however, the well established assumption that the scholia are the result of a long process of amplification, abridgement and conflation of different ancient sources. It has also been suggested that commentators of the late antiquity used to replace large parts of ancient exegesis with trivial explanations and long paraphrases which are very common in the scholia.

If we now return to the three papyri in question, we see that their marginalia seem to have been drawn from commentaries, possibly scholarly ones. More specifically, in the case of P. Oxy.2180 and PSI 1192 which belong to the same roll, two of the notes are introduced by a lemma. The use of lemmata is a feature of commentaries and their appearance in the margins of a roll indicates an immediate relation between them. There are also other features of the marginalia which illustrate their scholarly origin such as the quotation from Homer in PSI 1192, the two notes on *OT* 177 and 184 in the same papyrus which show a careful reading and

³⁵ For the history of the text of Sophocles see Pearson (1917) xxxii-xlvi, Dawe (1982) 23-6 and Easterling (1982) 240-7 (Appendix 2). Also *Testimonia W* in *TrGF* IV 83-6.

interpretation of the text and finally the presence of the very important variant ἦιδη in P. Oxy.2180. P. Oxy.1805 (*Trachiniae*) offers a couple of scholarly marginalia too. In the note about the exact meaning of ἀγορᾶ, in particular, there are two elements which point to a scholarly commentary: first of all, the note seems to have been introduced by a lemma from l.372 of the play and a quotation from l.188. Secondly, if the explanation has been correctly supplemented by the editor, it seems to have dealt with an inconsistency concerning the exact place where Lichas' speech took place. This indicates on the one hand a very careful reading of the text and on the other a quite literary way of approach. The commentator was aware of the double meaning of the word ἀγορᾶ and his interpretation coincides with that given by the lexicographers as well. We have also seen in our discussion of this particular point that the scholia offer only a one word explanation which reflects, though, the explanation given by the papyrus and the lexica. Once again the scholia illustrate clearly that they preserve only a very small amount of material in comparison to what was written in antiquity. Another indication of the sources used for the annotation is the marginal variant ἀνθρώπων in P. Oxy. 1805. If it definitely comes from the edition of Aristophanes, we should assume that the annotator had this edition at his disposal or otherwise that he found the variant quoted under Aristophanes' name in the commentary he was using for the rest of the marginalia.

When it comes to the identification of the marginalia discussed above with the names of scholars who worked on Sophocles, one has to be very speculative. We know from various sources that Aristophanes of Byzantium classified and edited the plays but also that he did not probably write commentaries on them. Aristarchus must have been the first to write systematic commentaries on Sophocles, although there is no absolute certainty about him either. The other two persons who engaged themselves in the study of these plays were Didymus and Theon, both from the late first century BC to the first decades of the first century AD. References to the former in the corpus of the scholia confirm his compilation of commentaries and we should expect that he made extensive use of the work of earlier scholars, possibly of Aristarchus. As regards Theon, there is evidence that he worked on Sophocles; the evidence consists of variants attested to have been copied from his edition. It is probable that the marginalia which, as noted above, were copied from scholarly sources, must be related at least to the work of Didymus and Theon. Furthermore, given the fact that there was close communication, even exchange of books between Oxyrhynchite scholars and people from the Alexandrian Museum, it is very likely that

Theon's and Didymus' commentaries or treatises were accessible for consultation. Some of the surviving marginalia can indeed be excerpts from such works. On the other hand, it is only in one case that one can find traces of Didymeian scholarship. The marginal note at the top of PSI 1192 has plenty of parallels in the scholia and lexica as has been illustrated in the detailed discussion of the papyrus above (pp.5-7). One of the two parallels in the Homeric scholia has been cautiously attributed to Didymus but it is mainly the rest of the evidence which points towards him. The lexicon of Hesychius, for example, and the scholia on *Oedipus at Colonus*³⁶ and Aristophanes contain a lot of Didymeian interpretative and lexicographical research, so the appearance of versions similar to the note in PSI 1192 cannot but increase the possibility of a common scholarly source. By common source one should understand a hypomnema either by Didymus or based upon him.

The second group of papyri of Sophocles with marginalia includes the fragments from some lost plays, namely *Ichneutae*, *Ajax Locrus*, *Theseus* (?), *Polyidus* (?) and a few other unidentified plays. Although in all these papyri we find marginal notes which refer not only to different readings but also to points of interpretation, as has been repeatedly stated, these cannot be studied further either because the main text is missing or the notes themselves are very fragmentary. From what survives at various points, however, we can draw the conclusion that they were of uneven quality, most of them trivial but some showing a more scholarly approach, such as the metaphor from the defeated cocks in *Ajax Locrus*. Equally important, of course, for the study of the various forms of ancient scholarship are the conclusions one can draw from these papyri about the method in which they were corrected and annotated. A thorough discussion about their owners and the overall atmosphere in the second and third century Oxyrhynchus has been made mainly by Turner and other scholars in various books and articles.³⁷ What is certain from this discussion is the conclusion that we have in our hands copies written for and used by scholars. The texts were not only corrected by the first diorthotes with the help of the exemplar but also collated with one or two copies of authority. To give an example, the papyrus of *Ichneutae* because of its length and relatively good condition makes clear that its

³⁶ See Richter (1911) 37-70 and V.de Marco (ed.), *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Rome 1952) xvi ff.

³⁷ Turner (1952), (1956) and Krüger (1990).

margins were supplied with variants of good quality drawn, as stated above, from the copy of Theon. Some other variants are attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium and some to a certain Nicander or Nicanor. The fact that these latter variants are not said to have come from a copy of Aristophanes or Nicander may mean that they were found elsewhere, for instance in the margins of Theon's copy, or in the first exemplar or in a commentary on the play. Furthermore, from what we have seen and discussed in this second group of papyri, it becomes clear that in the second and third century Oxyrhynchus there was a circle of scholars interested among others in the plays of Sophocles. These so far unknown people were not satisfied with an ordinary commercial copy but were keen on acquiring a reliable text collated with other editions which were either in circulation or more likely stored in a private or public library. The exact meaning of the expression οὕτως ἦν ἐν τῷ ... has been debated by many scholars as to whether it denoted the copy belonging to an individual, the critical edition made by the person mentioned or even a commentary. The last possibility seems more likely if one interprets the word ἀντίγραφον as commentary.³⁸ On the other hand, it is not easy to imagine the diorthotes or the scholar himself going through a lengthy commentary picking up variants to copy them into the margins of his text. The absence of interpretative notes, especially in the case of the *Ichneutae*, is a serious indication that the owner of the text used to work with a commentary which was written in a separate roll. The frequent occurrence of the sign χ is proof of the discussion of specific passages in available commentaries.

As has been stated above, the fact that the Sophocles papyri with marginalia come all from the second and third century limits our research to a very short period. The effect is that we cannot follow the process of supplying the margins with notes of textual and interpretative character throughout the post-Hellenistic times. The surviving material, however, shows that the margins of the texts were often used for brief notes of all sorts. This annotation was usually unsystematic and rather elementary but one should bear in mind that there was always a widespread use of commentaries alongside the circulation of texts. These commentaries must have been those of Didymus, Aristarchus, possibly Theon and other minor grammarians. Traces of this intense philological activity can be seen sometimes in the margins where the scholar

³⁸ Pfeiffer (1968) 277: "These ἀντίγραφα (sc. those cited in the subscription of the scholia on *Medea*) were, of course, ὑπομνήματα", Treu (1974) 64 and Erbse (1959) 295ff.

copied short bits from the commentary he was using, often together with the lemmata as in PSI 1192. When these marginalia offer more information and indeed of better quality than the corresponding scholia, we can once again confirm the process of epitomization which our scholia have been subjected to. As regards the variants, which, together with the glosses, are the commonest element of annotation, their appearance simply illustrates the reservations with which one should treat the readings of ancient texts, especially when their tradition goes back to only one exemplar from the late antiquity.³⁹ Finally, references to scholars such as Aristophanes, Aristarchus, Didymus or Theon demonstrate both the extensive use of their works and their deep influence upon annotators or later scholars. This influence lasted until the time of the formation of the scholia in which already selected parts of the writings of the Alexandrians or works falsely attributed to them were included.

³⁹ Cf. "Die Spürhunde des Sophokles" in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1935)348: "...Beherzigen wir nur, daß der Text (sc. *Ichneutae*) ziemlich stark geschwankt hat und einheitlich aussehen würde, wenn der Korrektor nicht eingegriffen hätte".

Chapter 3

The Papyri of Aristophanes

I.3. The editors have suggested the supplement τ]αις κω | [μωιδιαις without reference to any particular verse. It is likely, however, that what remains is part of an explanation of v.97: ἄσκωμ' ἔχεις που περὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν κάτω, and more specifically of the word ἄσκωμα. The scholium on this verse is as follows: ...ἄσκωμα δὲ, ὃ ἰμάς ὁ συνέχων τὴν κόπην πρὸς τῷ σκαλμῷ. A comparison with explanations of the same word elsewhere gives useful parallels: Sch. Ar.*Ran* 364D: ἄσκωμα, δερμάτιόν τι, ᾧ ἐν ταῖς τριήρεσι χρῶνται, καθ' ὃ ἡ κόπη βάλλεται. A fuller version of the scholium appears in Suda A 4183 s.v.ἀσκώματα: τὰ ἐν ταῖς κόπαις σκεπαστήρια ἐκ δέρματος, οἷς χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς τριήρεσι, καθ' ὃ τρήμα ἢ κόπη βάλλεται. Other lexicographers such as Hesychius α 7724, Et. Gen. α 1284 and Pollux A 88 give similar explanations, the ultimate source being Diogenianus and possibly Didymus. Line 3 could be thus supplemented as τ]αις κω | [παις. Moreover, the supplement δερμα]τινων is likely for I.2, although it is far from certain, given the length of the line and the huge range of possibilities for]τινων.

I.5. χρυ]σιου could be either an explanation of χρῦσο from v.104 within a paraphrase or part of a lemma from v.108: οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἀχάνας ὅδε γε χρυσοῦ λέγει which is found shorter in the scholia.

I.6. ἐν]ιοι or ἄλλ]ιοι δ(ε) φα(σι) refers possibly to v.108. The scholia offer two explanations of the word ἀχάνη: it is either a Persian weight, according to Aristotle (fr.566), or a basket to put food in: ἀχάνη μέτρον ἐστὶ Περσικόν... ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ὅτι κίστη ἐστίν... Lexicography too dealt with the exact meaning of the word and presented both alternatives by quoting the authority of Aristotle for the first (Pollux X164 and others) and the attidographer Phanodemus (*FGrH* 325.19) for the second (Hesychius α 8818). Ael. D.α 202 and Paus.Att. α

¹ The papyrus was first published in the sixth volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri by Grenfell and Hunt and was later reprinted unchanged in the preface of N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Scholia on the Acharnians* (Groningen 1975) vii-ix. Plates and description can be found in Wittek (1967) 21 and plate 11, as well as in Turner (1987²) 122.

179 have very similar explanations to those of the lexica. It is almost certain that all this, together with the evidence from the scholia, goes back to Diogenianus and Didymus (See *Did.frr.*, p.299). If the papyrus really had a note on this word, it is very likely that this note had similarities to the rest of the tradition.

II.7-9. The dicolon at the end of l.8 indicates that two different lemmata were explained in these three lines but it is not clear which specific verses of the text were examined. If we accept something like εὐνούχῳ παρ]αβάλλων in l.8, then an explanation emerges similar to the one in the scholium on v.118: ...οὗτος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης ἀεὶ τὸ γένειον ἐξυρᾶτο πρὸς τὸ ἀεὶ φαίνεσθαι νέος. διὰ τοῦτο εὐνούχῳ αὐτὸν εἰκάζει. The presence of the participle ἔχο(ντ) in the accusative case in l.9 indicates a paraphrase or a brief note (e.g. εἰσάγει τὸν Κλεισθένη ψευδῆ πώ]γωνα ἔχο(ντα) on v.120.² The scholia on the same verse point out the parody of a verse of Archilochus, but it seems rather unlikely that such a remark was included in the papyrus: the length of one line is not enough to accommodate both a lemma and a long explanation even if the latter occupied a part of l.10 as well.

I.10. The papyrus seems to have the same explanation as the scholia on v.127, although slight variation can never be excluded. It mentions that v.127 was a proverb about the habit of the Athenians to entertain too many state guests. The same appears also in *Suda* I 717 s.v. ἴσχειν.

I.12. Similarly to the scholia on *Ach.* 11 and 140a but much more briefly the commentator explains who Theognis was.

I.13. A likely supplement is πλῆ]ν τῶν | [παρνόπων either as lemma or as part of the explanation on v.152. The fact that so much is missing on the left of the column, however, makes any further assumptions too speculative.

II.14-5. In these two lines, the papyrus has a lemma from v.160. κ]αταπελ] [τάσσονται is quite certain but we do not know how long the whole lemma was. It is impossible, however, to reconstruct the content of the explanation. The corresponding scholia offer two possible interpretations: καταπελτάσσονται: κατακοντίσουςι, καταπολεμήσουςι. πέλτη γὰρ εἶδος μηχανῆς ἀφ' ἧς ἀκόντια καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἀφιάσιν, ἢ καταδραμοῦνται. πέλτη γὰρ ἀσπίς μικρὰ μὴ ἔχουσα ἱμάντα. The first definition of πέλτη as catapult arises from a confusion of

² Modern commentators find it more likely that Cleisthenes was wearing a beardless mask suitable for a real eunuch. See Rennie (1909) 108 and Sommerstein (1980) 163.

πέλτη with καταπέλτης while the second one provides the correct meaning of the verb καταπελτάζομαι. A possible supplement of l.15 could be πέλτη γὰρ εἶδος μηχανή]ματος. Hesychius κ 1320 repeats the right interpretation, probably from Diogenianus, and associates καταπελτάζεσθαι with the troop of peltast's who used to carry the pelte, a small and light shield. One should not be surprised, though, if the papyrus had only the wrong explanation based on a misleading etymology.

l.16. Here we have the end of an explanation, as the dicolon indicates. Perhaps it referred to the word σωσίπολις in v.163, which is hapax in Aristophanes and occurs also in Strabo (14,1,41) as an epithet of Zeus and in Pausanias 6.20.2.4 where it is attributed to a tutelary hero. Since there are no traces of any relevant explanation in ancient lexicography, this could only be a simplistic interpretation analyzing the two parts of the compound noun, e.g. ὁ σώζων φ]ησι πόλιν. On the other hand, the whole line could apply to ὁ θρανίτης λεῶς in v.162 with the comment being something like: “the upper-oarfolk saves the city as the poet says”.

ll.19-20. One of the numerous possibilities for supplementing]ενοις in l.19 is ἐσκοροδισμ]ένοις with reference to v.166: οὐ μὴ πρόσσει τούτοισιν ἐσκοροδισμένοις. The absence of a high stop to indicate the end of a lemma is seen a few more times e.g. in l.36 and 44. In such case the note as whole was about the use of garlic in cock-fight. On the basis of the scholium on v.166 α and the connection with the ἀλεκτρυόνες a supplement like οξυτερο]ι (εισι) in l.20 is very likely.

ll.25-7. After a lemma from v.378 the papyrus discusses in three lines the *Babylonians*, the comedy that caused Aristophanes much trouble for having offended the Athenian authorities. The scholia on v.378 have a quite long account of the issue with details of the circumstances of the alleged offence. They also stress the presence of the allies at the theatre as one of the main reasons Aristophanes should not have criticised so explicitly the political system of Athens. The commentator of the papyrus seems to have concentrated more on the action of the play and to have given some more specific information about it. Given that key elements of the explanation are missing, however, there is inevitably a great deal of speculation involved. In 1911, just three years after the first publication of the papyrus, Alfred Körte suggested the following

supplement:³ εἰσήγαγε γὰρ τοὺς συμμάχους ὡς δούλους στικ]τοὺς τῶν Ἰθναίων καὶ πεδή[τας . . . εἰσαχθεῖς ὑπὸ Κλέωνος δίκην ἔφυ[γε. One of the main arguments in favour of this supplement is the evidence provided by Eustathius 1542,47: ... στίγων (sic) καὶ πέδων δούλος ὁ στιγματίας καὶ πεδήτης παρὰ Ἰριστοφάνει (*PCG* III 2 fr.90, 99 and 871) and also slightly rephrased in Suetonius *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* p.62 XII. The word στίγων is also explained as στιγματίας with reference to the *Babylonians* in Ael. D. σ 34 and Hesychius. Both lexicographers' source was probably Diogenianus. On the other hand, there has been a debate about the truthfulness of the assumption that Aristophanes presented on stage the allies as chained and branded slaves. It is worth quoting from G.Norwood:⁴ "... There is no shadow of reason to suppose that they [certain slaves] were, or in any case represented, members of the subject-states... (note 3)... but that [restoration], of course, is the result of his [Körte's] preconception." In my opinion, regardless of the identification of the branded slaves with the allies or not, the supplements στικ]τοὺς and πεδή[τας look plausible. As regards now the issue of them being the allies or not, there was probably no need for them to be named as such. Only the presence of a group of chained and branded "Babylonian" slaves on stage would be enough to make the audience associate them with their heavily exploited allied cities. As for the papyrus, it would not be surprising if its information about the play was not completely accurate in referring to allies presented on stage, as Körte also assumed.

1.29. Although the scholia on v.392 (ὡς σκῆψιν ἀγῶν οὗτος οὐχὶ δέξεται) have only the later gloss σκῆψιν: ἤγουν πρόφασιν, the papyrus apparently contained more. The main if not the only point was that the Aristophanean verse was a known proverb, παροιμία. A search in the ancient proverb collections shows that this was the case: *Zenobii Centuria* II 45 Ἰγῶν πρόφασιν οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται, οὔτε φιλία: ὁ Μύλων ὁ παροιμογράφος Ἰβύκειον τὴν παροιμίαν ταύτην φησίν, ὡς πρώτου χρησαμένου τοῦ Ἰβύκου. Also Greg. *Cypr.* I,19 and *Cod. Leid. Cent. I*, 10 and 11. Mylon the paroemiographer seems to be nothing more than a name but we know that Zenobius in the age of Hadrian had made an epitome of Didymus' and

³ Körte (1911) 268-9. This short presentation is the only study of the papyrus after its publication.

⁴ Norwood (1930) 1-10 (esp.4) (= *Gr.Com.* p.282-7).

Lucillus' collections of proverbs.⁵ The same proverb was often explained in lexica such as Suda A 328, Photius α 317 and Paus.Att. α 23. The source of Suda and Photius is indeed Pausanias and he got some of his paroemiographical material from Didymus and the Paroemiographers. Moreover, the scholarly treatment of numerous proverbs within the scholia on Aristophanes also goes back to the work of Didymus, as frequent agreements with Zenobius indicate. We can suppose that in a fuller version of the extant scholia there existed a reference to the proverbial origin of v.392 which was later left out. I should also mention that variations of the proverb are found in many classical authors, including Pindar, Aeschylus and Plato.⁶ As a final remark one should note the alternation of πρόφασις and σκῆψις in the various sources. Usually the first glosses the second and eventually replaces it as is the case in the corpus of proverbs cited above.

II.30-1. The lemma and the explanation which are contained in these two lines refer to vv.418-9: τὰ ποῖα τρύχη; μῶν ἐν οἷς Οἶνεὺς ὀδὶ | ὁ δύσποτμος γεραιὸς ἠγωνίζετο; The corresponding lemma in the scholia is τὰ ποῖα τρύχη, whereas the papyrus had probably Οἶνεὺς ὀδὶ ὁ δύσποτμος. The explanations agree in identifying Euripides' *Oeneus* but are not entirely similar. The scholia offer an account of the story of Oeneus drawn possibly from a mythological work or a collection of tragic hypotheses. The events and the names of the heroes involved are given in a very precise and concise manner. On the other hand, the papyrus omits all details of the plot and probably names, thus concentrating on the figure of Oeneus and the way he was presented by Euripides. For the commentator what matters is not the general framework of the play but what was absolutely necessary for the understanding of the Aristophanean reference and comic exploitation of the Euripides' play. It is interesting to note that the explanation is introduced by the formulaic expression: εἰσάγεται γὰρ παρὰ + Dative, which is found very often and in many varied forms in the corpus of the scholia, e.g. Sch. Ar.Ach. 416: καὶ τοὺς προλόγους μακρηγοροῦντας εἰσάγει Εὐριπίδης and in v.424: εἰσήγαγε τὸν Φιλοκτήτην ἐν τῇ Λήμνῳ πενόμενον.

II.31-2. In these lines the papyrus has an explanation of v.421: τὰ τοῦ τυφλοῦ Φοίνικος. The scholia have only a very short note by Triclinius: Φοίνικα λέγει τὸν Ἀμύντορος. It was

⁵ For more details see Rupprecht (1949) esp. 1754ff.

⁶ P.O 1,81, Aesch. *Glaucus Potnieus* fr.37 Radt, Pl.*Cratylus* 421d. A brief discussion of the proverb with parallels is found in Gerber (1982) 124-5.

Körte (1911) 269 who identified the reference in l.32 and suggested the following supplement: τυφλωθεῖς γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, εἰσάγε]ται παρ' αὐτῷ, ὑπὸ δὲ Χείρων[ος θεραπευθεῖς τὰς ὄψεις ... His reconstruction of the line is based on Apollodorus' account of the story.⁷ Although one is never certain about the relation between Euripides' handling of myths and the narratives in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, it is very important that the papyrus confirms that in the play too, it was Cheiron who cured the blindness of Phoenix. From a structural point of view, it should be again pointed out that the explanation starts with the common expression εἰσάγε]ται παρ' αὐτῷ, just as the previous explanation did, and indeed others, where the plot of a play or a specific character is discussed. As regards the rest of Körte's supplement, it should be considered as one among many other possibilities, since there is no indication that our text is dependent upon Apollodorus.

I.33. As the dicolon indicates, the two glosses ῥάκη and σχίσματα are at the end of an explanation. Without the corresponding lemma, however, it is not certain which word of the text they refer to. They gloss either λακίδας in v.423 or σπάργανα in v.431. Λακίδες is glossed in the scholia as διερρωγῶτα ἱμάτια. Lexicography, on the other hand, explains the word λακίδες by using σχίσματα, e.g. Orion 96,27 Λακίδες. ἐπὶ σχίσματος ἱματίου... , Hesychius λ 200 λακίδες· τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν ἀρμένων σχίσματα from Cyrillus' glossary and λ 204 λακίς· ...σχίσμα. On the other hand, the glosses on σπάργανα include ῥάκη just as the papyrus does, if the supplement is correct: Sch. Ar.Ach.431 τὰ σπάργανα] τὰ ἱμάτια. κυρίως δὲ τὰ ῥάκη ..., Hesychius σ s.v. σπάργανα· δεσμά, ῥάκη. The first editor's assumption that it could all "go back to τρύχη in 418" is not valid any more, after a new lemma (v.421) has been established in l.32. The two other options, however, are both equally possible.

II.33-4. The lemma σκιμα[λίω comes from v.444: ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὺς ῥηματίοις σκιμαλίω. The scholia offer a detailed discussion of the word, investigating both the literal and the metaphorical meaning of the verb (ἐξουθενίσω ἢ χλευάσω) as well as quoting a parallel from *Peace* 549. Ancient lexicographers have dealt with σκιμαλίω too: Phrynichus 83, 13-5 De Borries: καταδακτυλίζειν: ...τοῦτο καὶ σκιμαλίζειν οἱ Ἀττικοὶ λέγουσιν and from him Moeris:

⁷ Frr. 804-18 Nauck² and pp.621-6 about the fragments of the play and Apollod. 3,13,8: ...Πηλεὺς δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς Χείρωνα κομίσας ὑπ' ἐκείνου θεραπευθέντα τὰς ὄψεις βασιλέα κατέστησε Δολόπων.

σκιμαλίσαι Ἀττικοὶ, καταδακτυλίσαι Ἑλληνας, Hesychius σκιμαλίσαι· καταδακτυλίσαι from Cyrillus, and Photius σκιμαλίσαι· καταδακτυλίσαι ἀσχημόνως. The gap in the papyrus does not allow us to compare the explanation provided by our text with the rest of the ancient evidence. What remains seems to point towards a sort of paraphrase combined perhaps with some glossing of σκιμαλίζω in its metaphorical sense.

ll.35-6. There is no high stop in l.36 to indicate the end of the lemma that probably began in l.35. We can assume that it should be either supplemented after δὸς or that the lemma stopped immediately before the gap in the papyrus. The scholia have ἰσχνά μοι φυλλεῖα as lemma, but as we have often seen, the lemmata between papyri and scholia are not normally entirely identical. As regards the explanation, the scholia on v.469 are as follows: τὰ ἀπολεπίσματα τῶν λαχάνων. “ἰσχνὰ” δὲ οἶον μεμαραμμένα καὶ εὐτελῆ τῶν λαχάνων φύλλα... Hesychius s.v. φυλλεῖα· τὰ τῶν λαχάνων ἃ προστιθέασι τοῖς ὠνούμενοις ἔωλα καὶ φαῦλα. Interestingly, PSI 892, probably a fragment from Diogenianus’ lexicon, has the same explanation: ἃ προστιθέασι τοῖς ὠνούμενοις ἔωλα καὶ φαῦλα λάχανα.⁸ The papyrus explains as δὸς τὰ σαπρὰ φύλλα ἃ ἐκ τ[which could be either τ[ῶν λαχάνων or τ[ῆς μητρὸς, for which one can compare v.478: μητρόθεν δεδεγμένος.

ll.38-9. The comment refers to v.483, on which the scholia run as follows: γραμμὴ δ’ αὐτῆ: ἀρχή, ἀφετηρία, ἢ λεγομένη βαλβίς. ἐκ μεταφορᾶς οὖν τῶν δρομέων. The lexica offer various explanations too (Pollux 3,147, Hesychius γ 894), but it seems more likely that the papyrus had simply something like ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν δρομέων which is a quite common form of interpreting similar passages in ancient scholiography.

l.40. This line is a real puzzle. The first editors called it obscure and they could not think of any other satisfactory solution but corruption. The problem starts first with the lemma, for which we suppose that it was σίκυον ἴδο]ιεν but the scribe forgot to mark its end with a high stop. What constitutes the explanation does not really make any sense. The scholia on v.520 have the following: σίκυον] ἀπὸ εὐθείας τῆς ὀ σίκυος. Other instances in the scholia (Sch. *Ar.Pax* 1001) as well as in lexicography (Suda, Hesychius, Pollux) deal with various aspects of this noun, including different kinds of cucumber and proverbial uses. Moreover, there was a question of grammatical interest, namely whether the nominative case was ὀ σίκυος or σικυός. It seems

⁸ This supplement was suggested by Körte (1932) 231-2.

that the scholium on v.520 cited above, implied the same point. The only thing that one can make out of the explanation in the papyrus with some certainty is some kind of parallelism between σίκυος and Τιθωνός. If this was on a grammatical level, the choice of Tithonus looks inexplicable. Tithonus' name, however, obtained a proverbial use, especially as regards Τιθωνοῦ γῆρας, namely from the fact that when he reached a very old age he was transformed into a cicada. On the other hand, there was a distinction between σικυὸς πρῶς and σικυὸς σπερματίας (unripe and ripe cucumber) with the former being of the best quality. Even the fact that both nouns are in the dative case is strange, despite the presence of a form of ἔοικα which asks for a complement in dative. Perhaps there was a note indicating that σικυωι is also accentuated on the last syllable, just as Τιθωνωι does but this seems to me very unlikely. The line remains obscure and the theory of corruption is still the only reasonable one.

II.40-1. The first editors have suggested ἐκκεκαυ]μένοι as gloss on πεφυσιγγωμένοι. This is only one of the many possibilities offered by the scholia on v.526 as well as by the ancient lexica. It could also be: πεφυσημένοι, πεπλησμένοι or ἐσκοροδισμένοι which would equally fit the gap.

I.41. From what remains of the explanation of πόρνα δύο in v.527, the papyrus does not seem to have contained anything like the discussion in the scholia. On the contrary, it must have had a very elementary remark, for example ὡς πορν[ηι τηι Ασπασιαι χρηται without any historical or other information of anecdotal character.

II.41-2. Although the scholia on v.532 do not offer any specific definition of the term σκόλιον, in many other instances both in scholia and in lexicography we find versions similar to that given in the papyrus, e.g. Sch. Ar. *Vesp* 1238c σκόλια δὲ λέγεται τὰ παροΐνια μέλη from Triclinius and sch. Ar. *Ran* 1302: σκολίων· σκολιὰ λέγονται τὰ παροΐνια ἄσματα. Also in Paus. Att. σ 16 from Pamphilus and subsequently Synagoge and its derivatives. The original source must have been Didymus' Συμποσιακὰ as attested in Et.M. 718,35 (Did. frg., p.371). Finally see Hesychius s.v. σκόλια.

I.42. Once again and unlike the scholia, the papyrus has a very short explanation of Σεριφίων from v.542. The scholia offer an interpretation of the whole context in v.541 together with a note about Seriphus itself: ... τῆς Σερίφου, τῆς εὐτελεστάτης νήσου τῶν Ἀθηναίων. As a supplement for I.42 one could think of something like τῶν Αθ[ηναίων συμμαχοὶ οἱ Σεριφιοὶ or τῶν Αθ[ηναίων νήσος ἡ Σερίφος.

I.44. The scholia have nothing on δικτύοις in v.550. The explanation offered by the papyrus is a gloss which is in turn explained by lexicographers such as Hesychius γ 1023, Pollux 10,158 and Suda Γ 508. They all refer to Aristophanes' *Daitaleis* fr.226 K.-A. The use of the verb λέγει is common in the scholia in cases of explanations of glosses. Its subject can either be the author or the gloss itself. In the second case λέγει gets the additional meaning of σημαίνει or δηλοῖ.⁹ What seems interesting in this comment is the fact that the commentator felt the need to gloss a rather easy word which even the scholia omit. It is another example of an approach which serves the needs of the school.

II.46-9. In these four lines there must have been a summarizing account of verses 557-65. The scholia on v.557, as the editors of the papyrus also noticed, have a sort of similar comment. Furthermore, an indication of the content of these lines is given by α]γωνιζο(μενων) in I.48 which can be compared with τὸ ἡμιχόριον τὸ συναγωνιζόμενον αὐτῷ in scholium on v.564 and also by]ουτος δειχ[θ which can refer either to Dicaeopolis or Lamachus. Not much can be said with certainty, however, given that very little of the text survives and that we do not know how many lemmata were discussed.

I.50. The scholia have no comment on v.568. The papyrus, on the other hand, comments on ὦ φυλέτα, one of the characterizations given by the Chorus to Lamachus, and the explanation it provides is ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς φυλῆς. A search in the scholia and lexicography shows that the term was discussed in many places. In Sch. *Ag.Aves* 368 we find καὶ φυλέτα· συμπατριώτα... Suda in Φ 832 s.v. φυλέτης: συγγενής, ὁμόφυλος. It is very interesting that the formulation is often identical: Hesychius s.v. φυλέτης: ἐκ τῆς (αὐτῆς) φυλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁμόφυλος, Erotianus p.116 fr.60 ... καὶ †'Ρίνθος† ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς συνηθείας φησὶν· "οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς φυλῆς ὄντες φυλέται λέγονται ..." and Orus A27 (Alpers) ... δημότην δὲ τὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ δήμου, ὡς φυλέτην τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς φυλῆς ... Also Pollux 3,51:...οἰκεῖος, φυλέτης, δημότης, φράτηρ and Eustathius 901,8. From all the sources quoted and especially Erotianus and Orus who offer an elaborate discussion, it is clear that grammarians dealt with the problem of a group of nouns which denoted people belonging to the same social group such as δημότης,

⁹ Similar cases together with passages from the scholia can be found in W. G. Rutherford (ed.), *A Chapter in the history of annotation being Scholia Aristophanica* Vol. III (London 1905) 341.

λοχίτης and φράττηρ. The ultimate source must have been Aristophanes of Byzantium: Περὶ πολιτικῶν ὀνομάτων.¹⁰ In classical Attic one did not need the preposition σὺν to imply membership to the same group as somebody else, and terms such as δημοτικός were used to imply simple belonging to the group. It is not surprising that the Atticism and its representatives in scholia and lexicography (e.g. Ael. D. δ 12) would pay special attention to such subtle usages of the Attic dialect. I also assume that similar points would be of particular interest in the course of school lectures or in the writing of exegetical works addressed to students. It is a bit strange that this note occurs in the papyrus but not in the scholia on the same verse.

l.52. It is not easy to make sense of the remains of letters in l.52. There is a possibility, however, that this was a note on v.571: ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔχομαι μέσος. The scholia explain as ἀντὶ τοῦ ἥττημαι, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἀθλητῶν τῶν τὰ μέσα ληφθέντων. In Sch. Ar.*Nubes* 1047c for the same expression we find: ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιόντων, whereas in Sch. Ar.*Ran.*469 we read: τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἀθλητῶν. It is likely that in l.52 the text was ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ] τ(ῶν) ἀ[θλ]ητῶν, although other possibilities cannot be excluded.

ll.58-9. The explanation, the final part of which can be seen in l.59, started in l.58 and refers to v.598: Λάμαχος: ἐχειροτόνησαν γὰρ με -Δι: κόκκυγες γε τρεῖς. The interpretation offered by the scholia, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄτακτοι καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόκκυξ ἄμουσόν τι φθέγγεται is unsatisfactory and furthermore unrelated to the interpretation in the papyrus. In Hesychius κ 3294, however, there is a note which is more appropriate to the context in the play and also very close to the meaning of ἐ]ρημία in the papyrus comment: κόκκυγες <γε γ'> ἐπὶ ὑπονοηθέντων πλειόνων εἶναι καὶ ὀλίγων ὄντων. Alfred Körte has already suggested for the papyrus the supplement διότι ζῶσι κατὰ τὴν ἐ]ρημίαν οἱ ὄρνεις and stated that this version should be preferred to that of the scholia.¹¹ Although Hesychius seems to point to the right direction, his note does not offer a straightforward explanation either. In other ancient sources, however, we find more about the behaviour of the cuckoo which gave rise to proverbial expressions: In Arist. *H.A.*563b18: ὁ δὲ κόκκυξ φαίνεται ἐπ' ὀλίγον χρόνον τοῦ θέρους,

¹⁰ See Ar. Byz. fr. 298A-305 Slater and p. 97 (introduction to the relevant fragments).

¹¹ Körte (1911) 269: "In letzterem Verse ist die Auslegung der τρεῖς κόκκυγες, die den Lamachos wählten, etwa διότι ζῶσι κατὰ τὴν ἐ]ρημίαν οἱ ὄρνεις der unserer Scholien ὁ κόκκυξ τὸ ζῶον ἄμουσόν τι φθέγγεται wohl vorzuziehen".

τὸν δὲ χειμῶνα ἀφανίζεται. In Et. M. 524,50 s.v. it is its cowardice that is stressed: ...ἢ δειλότατον, ὡς φησι Ἴ�νακρέων. This characteristic of its behaviour appears also in Sch. Lyc. 395: ...διὰ δειλίαν οὐ συναυλίζεται τοῖς λοιποῖς ὄρνέοις.¹² The fact that the cuckoos live in isolation is stated also in the note of the papyrus and apparently explains in a much better way the phrase of Dicaeopolis “By three cuckoos (you have been elected)”.¹³ This case is one of the few where the papyrus has to offer something much better than the scholia.

II.61-5. In these lines the commentator abandons the explanation of very specific passages or individual words and provides a paraphrase or rather a prose summary of a longer part of the text, possibly from v.603 to 615. The unity of the explanation is illustrated by the absence of any paragraphus in the left margin after l.60. The only objection one can bring is that the lemma in l.61 is from v.614. It seems, however, that the commentator deals with it in ll.64-5 after he has made a brief presentation of what the poet said in the previous lines. First of all (ll.61-2) various names that Aristophanes enumerates are referred to. Some of them are characterized as προδότες and a distinction is made between them and those who served the army by means of the construction οἱ μὲν and οἱ δὲ. The adverb ἐκεῖσε at the beginning of l.63 probably refers to some of the names of places mentioned in the text such as Ecbatana or the land of the Chaones. Again in l.63 the phrase εἶτα πυνθάνεται summarizes the questions that Dicaeopolis addresses to the Chorus in vv.607-13. The final part of the passage (l.64) apparently deals with the four names that the poet invented for some of the members of the Chorus. The commentator points out that the names denoted the social and professional status of their bearers. The noun τάξις used in l.64 clearly speaks of the social class to which the addressees of Dicaeopolis belong. In l.65 the reference to Megacles and Lamachus must have been part of the same discussion and not of a new lemma. The paragraphus in the left margin indicates a lemma probably at the end of the line.

¹² All relevant material has been collected by Thompson (1936) 151-3. For the passage from the *Acharnians* 598 see p.153: “Of the “three cuckoos” who voted for Lamachus in *Ar. Ach.* 598 no satisfactory explanation has been given, unless we accept that of Hesychius”.

¹³ A different interpretation is suggested by A.Sommerstein (1980) 186: “i.e. by an ill-attended Assembly acting stupidly. For “cuckoo” meaning “imbecile”, cf. Plato com. fr.64 [65K.-A.]”. This is supported also by Phryn. *PS*, p.48,11: ... κόκκυγα λέγουσι τὸν κενὸν καὶ κούφον.

II.65-7. The paragraphus above the beginning of l.65 is the only indication of a new lemma which must start and finish in the same line, despite the high stop in l.66, normally signifying the end of lemmata. “ἔλεγον ἐξίστω” is not in the text, so it must be part of the explanation. The scholia on v.617 have a quite similar version to that of the papyrus: εἰώθεσαν, εἴ ποτε ἐκχέοιτο ἀπόνιπτρα ἀπὸ τῶν θυρίδων, ἵνα μὴ τις βραχῆ τῶν παριόντων, “ἐξίστω” λέγειν. With some reservation we could suggest the following supplement: τὸ δ(ὲ) ἀπό[νιπτρον ἐκχέοντες (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι or οἱ φίλοι) ...]προφωνοῦσιν ἐξίστω ἵν[α μὴ τις βραχῆ τῶν παριόντων.

l.68. As the first editors suggested, *Λάμαχος* in l.68 was part of a new lemma, or perhaps a complete one, since there was no paragraphus above the previous line (67). This lemma refers to v.619: οὐ δῆτ’ ἐὰν μὴ μισθοφορῆ γε *Λάμαχος* on which the scholia have no comment at all. The explanation given by the papyrus is again a sort of paraphrase of the words of Dicaeopolis. More specifically, the theory of a paraphrase is strengthened by the supplement εἶθ’ ὁ Δικαιοπόλις· οὐ δ[ῆ]τα... which is very close to the original verse. On the other hand, it is tempting to see in this line a short note about the staging of this scene. Six lines below, the action stops and the actors leave the stage in order that the Chorus perform the parabasis. Given that after this note the commentator proceeds with the interpretation of lemmata from the parabasis, it would not be surprising to find here a reference to the end of the scene. A form of the noun οὐδὸς which means “threshold” together with the appropriate verb would indicate the fact that Dicaeopolis approaches the entrance of his house and thereby is about to quit the stage. It seems that both ways of supplementing the text are plausible, with that of paraphrase being more likely as οὐ δ[ῆ]τα is part of the verse in question.

II. 69-72. In these lines the commentator deals with vv.647-49 or even 650. He gives a paraphrase which is very close to the text and repeats entire bits of it such as “πρῶτον μ(ὲν) πότερον ταῖς ναυ[σὶ] κρατούσιν” from v.648. The scholia have notes on the same passage but there does not seem to be any similarity between them and the papyrus. Moreover, the papyrus interprets the attitude of the poet as one of pride or arrogance - depending on the translation of μεγαλοφροσύνη in l.72. From the same point of view, it is likely that ὑπερ εαυτου should be supplemented at the beginning of l.70, as the editors suggested. The presence of a paragraphus above περ in l.70 indicates a new lemma somewhere in the line but this would interrupt the paraphrase which appears to continue naturally into the next line.

II.73-4. These two lines refer to vv.652-4 and continue to give a prosaic version of the text. Line 74, however, explains the relationship between Aegina and the poet, as also do the scholia on v.654 in a more detailed and scholarly way. The absence of the second half of l.74 does not allow us to see which explanation the commentator adopted if he adopted one. Another point that is worth mentioning, however, is the role of the paragraphus above the beginning of l.73. As the first editor noticed “[this line] seems to have been tacked on to the previous note without a new lemma”. If this remark is correct then the paragraphus is sometimes used to indicate only the transition to a new section without the presence of a lemma being necessary, as it was for most part of the commentary. It is very likely that the paragraphus in l.70 served the same purpose, although the survival of only the left hand side of the lines does not permit definite conclusions for what is missing on the other side.

II.75-7. This comment refers to vv.657-8 and seems to continue the paraphrase that started in l.69. The scholia on v.657 run as follows: οὐ θωπεύων· οὐ κολακεύων, οὐκ ἀπατῶν, οὐδέ τισι μισθὸν διδοὺς ἵνα αὐτὸν ἐπαινέσωσιν. The commentator is more precise and talks about τὸ δικαστικὸν. According to the ancient sources (Arist. *Ath.Pol.*27,3 and Plut. *Per.*9) μισθὸς δικαστικὸς was introduced by Pericles and Cleon raised it in order to gain the favour of the people. Contrary to the vagueness of the scholia, the papyrus must have given a much more precise explanation based on historical facts. The scholia and lexicographers have more details too drawn from Diogenianus (= Hesychius δ1813) or from Aristotle (Sch. Ar. *Vesp* 684). As regards l.76, the comment probably refers to οὐδὲ κατάρδων in v.658, for which the scholia offer analogous interpretations, the closest being οὐ καταβρέχων ὑμᾶς τοῖς ἐπαίνοις ὡς φυτὰ. Finally, εἰθ οὕτω κατεπραττον[in l.77 has no equivalent in the scholia. It probably concludes the long paraphrase by adding a short remark about the content of the six verses, the so-called pignos, that follow. It is also likely, however, that it refers to the same people who unlike Aristophanes, were flattering and playing tricks against the citizens.

τουτοις μεν νοσους διδομεν		7
σπληνιάν βηττειν ύδερân	υ[δρω]πιάν	
κορυζαν ψωραν ποδαγρân		
μαινεσθαι λειχηνας εχειν		10
βουβωνας ρίγος πυρετον	ρίγος ουκ ηπιαλον	
[. . .]. . . (.) . κλεπτα[ις] διδομεν		

P. Mich.3690 (PCG III2, fr.322) is fragment of a papyrus roll from the second or third century AD.¹⁴ It contains part of a speech by a Chorus of heroes which led the editors to attribute it to the lost comedy of Aristophanes, *Heroes*. What is important for our study is the two glosses in the right margin. Both refer to a long list of diseases which the Chorus enumerates in the form of present infinitives. The first gloss is υ[δρω]πιάν and explains ύδερân from l.8 of the text. Although the first editors have not commented further on this, a look at the ancient lexicography shows that the same glossing occurs quite frequently: Hesychius s.v. ύδερών· ύδρωπιών and s.v. ύδαριᾶ· ύδρωπιᾶ. Photius s.v. ύδερών· ύδρωπιών; similarly Suda Y45. Both Photius and Suda derived the gloss from Synagoge and it is very likely that in Hesychius we have a gloss from Cyrillus' glossary, which is among the prime sources of the Synagoge. The fact that Cyrillus is the source of the Hesychian gloss is confirmed by its reappearance in the atticistic lexicon of Moeris (Y7 Hansen): ύδερος και ύδρân 'Αττικοι· ύδρωψ και ύδρωπιân *Ελληνες.¹⁵ With the term *Ελληνες one should understand the lexicographer's

¹⁴ The first publication was made by Merkelbach (1967). The articles by Th.Gelzer in *ZPE* 4 (1969) 123-33 and B.Gentili in *QUCC* 13 (1972) 141-3 do not contain anything relevant to the marginalia.

¹⁵ See K.Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Copenhagen 1953) XIV: "...Haec Byzantina e Cyrillo maxime ad Hesychium venerunt, et eiusdem originis sunt quae totidem verbis in Moeride recurrunt, ita ut quae ille Atticorum dicat, lemmatis vice fungantur, quae

contemporaries in contrast to the Athenians of the fifth century whose dialect served as model for imitation. In this context, the person who supplied the papyrus with this gloss on ὕδερᾶν, provided as explanation for himself or another reader a word current in the everyday vocabulary since the classical term was no longer intelligible.

The second marginal is not exactly a gloss. It is a longer note that refers to v.11: βουβῶνας ῥίγος πυρετὸν. This makes clear that ῥίγος and πυρετὸς are two separate diseases and not one, the so-called ῥιγοπύρετον for which there was the special word ἠπίαλος. The meaning of ἠπίαλος is discussed in many instances both by lexicographers and scholiasts.¹⁶ It seems that some identified it with that kind of fever which is accompanied by shivering and others took it as the shivering that actually precedes fever. More specifically, in Sch. Ar. Ach.1164a we find: ...ἠπίαλος γὰρ κυρίως ὁ μετὰ ῥίγους πυρετὸς... In Sch. Luc. Gall.9 p.90,1R: ... ἢ ῥίγος συνημμένον πυρετῶ (from ms. Δ in which the *Erweiterte Synagoge* was used). Also Ael. D. η 13: ἠπίαλος: ὁ ῥιγοπύρετος from which Phryn. PS. p.73,7: <ἠπίαλος> ...ἕτερόν τι σημαίνει, τὸ καλούμενον ῥιγοπύρετον and Timaeus *Lex. Platon.* ἠπίαλος: ὁ ῥιγοπύρετος. Suda H 433 s.v. ἠπίαλος: ὁ ῥιγοπύρετος (from Synagoge like Phot. 72,15, both from Phrynichus) ... ἠπίαλος γὰρ ὁ μετὰ ῥίγους πυρετὸς(from sch. Ar. Ach.1164 a). Very interesting for the ancient distinctions between different kinds of fever is a passage from Galen, *De diff. febr.* Π 6: ...Τούτου τοῦ γένους ἐστὶ καὶ ἠπίαλος πυρετὸς ἰδίως ὀνομαζόμενος, ὅταν ἅμα πυρέττουσί τε καὶ ῥιγοῦσι... φαίνονται δὲ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔνιοι καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ ῥίγος οὕτως ὀνομάζοντες. The second alternative definition is found also in many sources such as Sch. Ar. *Vesp.*1038a:...προεῖρηται γὰρ, ὅτι ἠπίαλος λέγεται τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ κρύος. Ἀριστοφάνης *Νεφέλαις* (fr.399 K.-A.) καὶ *Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις* (fr.346 K.-A.)... *Δίδυμος* δὲ φησι (Did. frg., p.51, n.1). Also in Hesychius η 687 s.v.ἠπίαλος· ῥίγος πρὸ πυρετοῦ, Sch. Luc. *Gall.*9 p.90,1 R:ἠπίαλον]ῥίγος πρὸ πυρετοῦ and Moeris H23 Hansen s.v. ἠπίαλον· τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ ψῦχος. ἅμα δ'ἠπίαλος πυρετοῦ πρόδρομος. It seems that this was the definition adopted by Aristophanes in the second *Thesmophoriazousae* (fr.346 K.-A.), according to the scholium on *Wasps* 1038, and possibly Galen included the comic poet in his group of Attic men who regarded ἠπίαλος

Ἑλλήνων, explicationis”.

¹⁶ A detailed discussion of ἠπίαλος is found in Deichgräber (1956) 23ff.

as the shivering that occurs before fever.

Returning to the note in the margin of the papyrus, we notice that the annotator follows the first interpretation, namely that ήπίαλος is the simultaneous occurrence of shivering and fever, the ρίγοπύρετον. It seems likely that ρίγοπύρετον could be a variant in the text but the existence of two separate words makes it clear that the poet intended them to be two separate diseases. As regards now the quality of the annotation and the scholarly abilities of the annotator, the two notes are not enough to allow firm conclusions. It is enough to say that he must have consulted good sources (possibly including atticistic lexica) or that his education was adequate in order to explain difficult medical terms by using also technical vocabulary of his times.

P. Grenf. 12 (1625 Pack²)

Third century

Aristophanes, *Gerytades* or *Thesmophoriazousae II* (?)

αυτον ληρωι τρυχ]ουσιν και ν<ο>υ-	αυται λαλουσαι τον[
θετουσι	τρυχουσι πολλοις τ[
επ]ιβουλευουσι	κακουμεναις γαρ ν[
οικτον εχει	υπο μητρυων τε κα[ι
καλου]σι πεντα-	ουκ ηλθ αρηξων αλ[λ
σφιγγον	νυν ουν αποινα τ[
οι καταδικοι κο]λαζονται	κατα την Μελανιπ[πην
οντων κ-	αλλα ξεστων ετ[

5

P.Grenfell 12 (*PCG* VIII fr.1005) was first published as a fragment belonging to a lost tragedy. O.Crusius, however, in a detailed article showed that it was rather a comic fragment than a tragic one.¹⁷ He also argued for the assumption that it belonged to Aristophanes' *Gerytades*, a play whose action takes place in the underworld, a sort of "comic Nekyia" in which the dead Euripides was presented being tortured by the women he had criticized in his tragedies. The problem has been discussed by many scholars since then but their opinions differ.¹⁸

What is more important for the purposes of the present study is the annotation that the papyrus offers in its left margin. Given that the text has been dated to the third century AD, the presence of so ample marginalia is quite surprising, although a considerable number of papyri with scattered marginalia or systematic annotation come from around this period. Naturally the smaller the fragment, the less certain any conclusions about the entire roll can be. There is always the possibility that the annotation did not spread evenly throughout the roll. One of the problems that the first editors faced is the location of the marginalia on the left of the column to which they are supposed to refer. In papyrus rolls the notes are usually related to the text on the left and not on the right. In this papyrus, however, a closer look at the annotation shows clearly the opposite: the notes match exactly bits of the column on the right. As Crusius admitted: "Toutefois, si l'on compare de plus près les restes subsistants avec les débris du texte placés en regard, on découvre bientôt certaines analogies et certaines relations qu'il est impossible de mettre sur le compte d' un pur hasard".

The supplements that various scholars have suggested for the better understanding of the marginalia look more or less acceptable, although different supplements cannot be ruled out. The first note in ll.2-3 and the second in l.5 belong to the category of paraphrase, which is a very common form of exegesis especially for poetic texts. The annotator rephrases the text in a prosaic form and replaces obsolete and unintelligible words or expressions by others he draws from the contemporary vocabulary. Two small points are worth mentioning: first, the insertion of an ypsilon in l.2 in order to make the supplement $\nu\langle\omicron\rangle\upsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ possible does not seem

¹⁷ Crusius (1898).

¹⁸ For example Kuiper (1913) 237-8 who thinks of *Thesm.b* and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1935) 446 who makes also useful suggestions for the restoration of the text. Full bibliography in *PCG* VIII, p.296.

absolutely necessary. The interchange of ου and υ in the papyri is a phenomenon that occurs frequently and is due to phonological changes.¹⁹ This is, however, something concerning mostly documentary papyri and any attempt to apply it also to literary texts is risky. Of course, the verb *νουθετεῖν* seems to apply well to the present context in the sense of ‘chastise’ or ‘rebuke’ but there is also another possibility, *νύκτωρ*, according to the suggestion by Wilamowitz (1935) 446. My second point is about 1.5 *λοῖκτον ἔχει*, which probably refers to οὐκ ἦλθ’ ἀρήξων ἀλλ[λ and takes as subject a person, possibly Euripides, who did not show any compassion to the maltreated women and is therefore punished by them. Οὐδένα, once again a suggestion by Wilamowitz, seems to me a very likely supplement.

The second marginal note covers lines 6-8 and apparently explains the way of punishment the person on stage was subjected to. The instrument of torture was called *πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον* and its use is attested in many ancient sources including Aristophanes’ *Knights* 1049: *τουτονὶ / δῆσαί σ’ ἐκέλευ’ ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ ξύλῳ*. Both in scholia and in ancient lexica we find descriptions of this instrument such as in Hesychius s.v. *πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον· πέντε ὀπὰς ἔχον κατὰ τὸ δεσμωτήριον...*, Photius s.v. *πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον· πέντε ὀπὰς καὶ τρήματα ἔχον, τραχήλῳ, χερσίν, ποσίν· Ἀριστοφάνης* and s.v. *σανίς· καὶ ἐν ἧ τοὺς κακούργους ἔδουν...* The last one is first attested in Ael. D. σ7 s.v. *σανίς*, possibly from Diogenianus and in P. Oxy.3329 fr.11 1-2 (Diogenianus ?) as well as in Eustathius 1923,46. Given the Aristophanean origin of the word it is likely that the explanation ultimately goes back to Didymus’ *Κωμικὴ Λέξις*. Interesting is its frequent identification with *ποδοκάκη*, e.g. in Sch. Ar. *Eq.*1049 *πεντεσυρίγγῳ ξύλῳ] τῆ ποδοκάκη φησίν...* and Hesychius s.v. *ποδοκάκη· ὁ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ δεσμός, ἐν ᾧ οἱ κακούργοι δεσμεύονται, οἷον ποδοκατοχή*. See also Harpocration s.v. *ποδοκάκη*. The explanation of the papyrus is quite elementary, probably without any specific description or function of the instrument. For this reason one should not assume that the annotator had consulted an independent source. The text itself would be enough to allow him to formulate this short note. There is always, of course, the possibility that the next line had more on the same topic but this cannot be confirmed because of the big gap. Finally, the form *πεντασύριγγον*, which the note contains, is a later development of the classical *πεντεσύριγγον*. Ael. D. π35 discussed this morphological development. Similarly other

¹⁹ See Mayser (1970²) 79 and Gignac (1976) 214.

Atticists such as Phyn. *Ecl.* 386 Fischer and Moeris II 63 Hansen. Et. M 346,18 has also a remark on this issue: ...φυλάττουσι γὰρ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει, πεντέμηνον λέγοντες καὶ ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ ξύλῳ ἡμεῖς δέ, πεντάμηνον.

Although the fragmentary state of the papyrus prevents us from drawing important and definite conclusions about this particular text, the density of the marginalia is still a factor that makes it worth studying. As has been shown above, the notes combine paraphrase with explanation of difficult words and are not concerned only with variants and glosses as is normally the case. On the other hand, the problem of the identification of the play has not been solved and its authorship cannot be taken for granted as its classification among the adespota in the latest edition of comic fragments (*PCG VIII*) illustrates.

P. Amh. 13 (1626 Pack²)

**Third century
Aristophanes, ?**

Col. i

] .σ' ἢ μὴ 'μβαλω·	ει(ρη)τ(αι) παρα το φορτικ(ον) εκπρασων	
] εξ υπτιας·	η μη μπρασ.. [.]αιρου)	
] . . ινω .	εις Μαγνητα	
]τι δη μαθων		
]λεγειν	αν(τι) συλλεγειν	5
]οτι		
]		
]οτας		
]. τατων		
τοσο]υτουι χρονου		10
]χρονος	το τελος την δα[
]Βυζαντιου	ποτερον απολ[

Για πολις	θεωι τω[
Γτος ηρξ' εγω	μαδ[
Γλλ. .ιου·	κιμ[15
Γουντα σε·	παιζει παρα[
Γι μαρτυρας		
Γνιει		
εφη]μερωι.	αν(τι) σημερινωι	
] . [.] . σθαι μ' αυτικα		20

P. Amherst 13 (*PCG* III 2, fr.593) is a fragment of a papyrus roll from the third century. It contains remains of two columns of text and intercolumnar space of considerable length which has been filled in with marginalia. The identification of col. i,2 with a known citation from Aristophanes (*Pollux* vii 138) shows that our fragment belongs to a lost comedy by Aristophanes, the title of which is unknown.

The marginal notes refer to col. i, from which only the endings of twenty lines survive. What makes the situation more difficult, is that most of the notes themselves are incomplete as well. The examination of what remains shows that the annotator's interests went beyond problems of textual criticism or glossing of words and expressions. Some of the notes are, of course, glosses introduced by the technical *άν(τι) (του)* or possibly lemmata, such as the note next to l.11 τὸ τέλος τὴν δα[πάνην. This note explains a word from the text but it is not absolutely clear whether τέλος was a lemma or the first of the two glosses. The presence of lemmata from the main text is usually an indication that the scribe has transferred into the margins explanations that he found in a commentary. In this case, however, the nature of the comments as well as the vocabulary used seem to point towards a quite learned source. Τέλος is explained by *Ael. D. τ7: τέλος οἱ Ἄττικοὶ τάττουσι καὶ άντι τάξεως καὶ δαπάνης, ἔνθεν ὁ πολυτελῆς καὶ εὐτελῆς καὶ συντελῆς...* Similarly in *Sch. Plat. Symp 205a*. Also in *Sch. Hom. II K 56b: σημαίνει δὲ πλείονα ἢ λέξεις ποτὲ μὲν δαπάνημα... ὡς Εὐριπίδης... καὶ Δημοσθένης*. Expressions like *εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ φορτικὸν, εἰς Μάγνητα* and *παίζει παρὰ...* are found elsewhere in the scholia on Aristophanes and one can claim that they are part of a technical terminology. At least they indicate an acquaintance of the annotator with the

scholarly exegesis. Apart from the indications arising from the above mentioned expressions, the content itself shows a good level of erudition. The first note in l.1 explains the meaning of an expression that stood in the text as deriving from a vulgar equivalent which is also quoted. With no traces of it attested anywhere else, it is impossible to reconstruct its exact meaning and how it applied to the comic text. It is also uncertain whether εἰς Μάγνητα in l.3 is the concluding part of the note or it stands on its own. In any case, it illustrates the ability of the annotator or his source to understand the allusion to a comic poet whose work may not have survived until such a late date. In one of his articles, Allen has suggested that Μάγνης relates with the expression]·σ' ἢ μὴ 'μβάλω in l.1 of the main text and with the reference to his person in *Knights* 525: ἐξεβλήθη πρεσβύτης ὦν but it is difficult to confirm it on the basis of so insufficient and unstable ground.²⁰

Another interesting point is the presence of an additional verse in the top margin of column 2 preceded by an antisigma.²¹ The same symbol appears in l.4 of the second column and shows that the omitted line should be inserted here. It is likely that the annotator corrected a mistake by the scribe or that the scribe himself collated his text with the exemplar he used. Generally speaking, P.Amherst 13 is a carefully annotated text with notes drawn from some kind of scholarly source, possibly a hypomnema. It is also important, as also the first editors have noted, that plenty of free space was left perhaps for convenience of the annotator.

²⁰ Allen (1901) 425 col. 1: "...The text may presumably be restored ἐκβαλῶν σ' ἢ μὴ 'μβάλω, and if the reference to Magnes extends to this line we are reminded of ἐξεβλήθη πρεσβύτης ὦν *Knights* 425".

²¹ For the function of antisigma see McNamee (1992a) 14-5 and notes 26-34.

ll.1-4. The explanation refers to v.186 of the *Clouds*: τοῖς ἐκ Πύλου ληφθεῖσι, τοῖς Λακωνικοῖς. The scholia on this line concentrate primarily on the point that Aristophanes makes about the state of the Spartan prisoners during their imprisonment in Athens and explain the reasons for their bad physical appearance (εἰκὸς οὖν τούτους... ὠχροὺς καὶ δυσειδεῖς γεγενέναι). On the other hand, the papyrus focused on the events that came before their captivity, namely the siege of the island of Sphacteria and Cleon's role in the whole expedition. Since the battle at Sphacteria and the fate of the Lacedaemonian prisoners are mentioned frequently in other comedies as well, the scholia on those passages with their various accounts of the events give us the opportunity to compare and look for similarities with the version of the papyrus. The most striking parallel is found in the scholium on *Knights* 393a: ... ἀντὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων οὐδὲ ζῶντας ἄξιον κατεπαγγεῖλάμενος ὁ Κλέων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐμπροθέσμως ἤγαγεν. As in our papyrus, the emphasis is on Cleon's promise to bring the Lacedaemonians to Athens as captives within a limited period of time. From other parts of the scholia on the *Knights* we hear further details of the story, as well as a reference to Thucydides as source of 1054a: ...καὶ Θουκυδίδης δὲ φησιν... In fact, Thucydides was the single most reliable ancient source about events of this period and it seems that the scholia made extensive use of his work on many occasions.²³ As the second editor of the papyrus has also noted, in this passage the papyrus presents some verbal similarities with the text of Thucydides which cannot be accidental or negligible: *Thuc.* IV 28,4: ...ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν εἴκοσιν ἢ ἄξιον Λακεδαιμονίουσ ζῶντας ἢ αὐτοῦ ἀποκτενεῖν and IV 39,3: ... ἐντὸς γὰρ εἴκοσιν ἡμερῶν ἤγαγεν τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὥσπερ ὑπέσθη. There can be no doubt that the accounts of the story in the scholia and probably the one in the papyrus are all related to the narrative of Thucydides. The fact that the papyrus is only partly preserved does not allow us to trace closely the extent and accuracy with

²² The identification and second edition of the papyrus have been made by Gronewald (1982) 61-9.

²³ See the Index Scriptorum in F. Dübner (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* (Paris 1842) 706 s.v. Θουκυδίδης.

which the unknown commentator was reconstructing the events. It seems, however, that the papyrus offered a summary of the story in a version shorter than the ones surviving in the scholia on *Knights* 55. The issue of the use of Thucydides in the compilation of the scholia on Aristophanes in late antiquity has been briefly discussed by Zuntz in his study of the Aristophanes scholia on papyri and more specifically in the section about the historical accounts of the death of Themistocles.²⁴ One of his conclusions that seems to apply also to our case is the existence of a rhetorical tradition (chronicles, historical handbooks etc.) that derived some of its material from Thucydides. It is not easy to reconstruct the various stages in the formation of this tradition but the mixing of selected parts from the original narrative of Thucydides together with other historians and later compilations seems the most likely pattern. It is in this context that one should put the short narrative in the first four surviving lines of the papyrus.

ll.5-6. These two lines refer to v.192: οὗτοι δ' ἐρεβοδιφῶσιν ὑπὸ τὸν Τάρταρον. The second editor compared this with the scholia vetera (RV) and thus suggested the following supplement: τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν[ζητοῦσι καὶ καταμανθάνουσιν. This supplement would indicate an immediate relationship of the papyrus commentary with the sources of the scholia and would indeed confirm the editor's assertion that "Da man nicht unbedingt an Phaeinos und erst recht nicht an Symmachos denken will, dürfte man unseren Kommentar am sichersten denen der ἄλλων τινῶν zurechnen" (with reference to the subscription to the scholia on the *Clouds*).²⁵ There are, however, some other options which should also be taken into account: in the scholia recentiora on the same verse we find explanations of the word Tartarus as ὁ ὑπὸ γῆν κατώτατος τόπος. The same is found also in Hesychius s.v. τάρταρος and similarly in the scholia on *Iliad* Θ13b. It is therefore equally likely that the papyrus offered an explanation such as these. In addition, the following line can be said to continue somehow the discussion of the

²⁴ Zuntz (1975) 29-47. See e.g. in p.35: "Allen drei Fassungen des Scholions ist gemeinsam mit Aristodem die Anknüpfung der "rhetorischen Vulgata" an eine im Wesentlichen an Thukydides orientierte Vorgeschichte" and p.47 n.1: "Ein Beispiel: das Scholion (sc. sch. *Eq.* 814) ist eine rhetorische Bearbeitung des Thukydides (wörtliche Berührung...) wie es, unabhängig, auch Diodor-Ephorus und Aristodem sind ". Also F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 2C, (Berlin 1926) 319-20: "daß für das erhaltene Herodot und Thukydides die letzten Quellen sind, ist sicher; ebenso sicher aber, daß für die eigentliche Darstellung nicht sie, sondern eine jüngere, bereits fortgebildete Tradition benutzt ist, die ganz auf athenischem Stadtpunkt steht".

²⁵ Gronewald (1982) 62.

same point by adding a remark concerning the connection between Tartarus and Hades.²⁶ Already in classical times but also in the later literature Tartarus stopped being a separate part of the world and became identical with Hades. In the scholia on *Iliad* Θ 13b we find for example: Τάρταρος τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐσκοτισμένον μέρος κατώτατον τοῦ Ἄιδου and in Et.M 747,14 s.v. Τάρταρος: ὁ κατώτερος τοῦ ἄδου τόπος. Likewise in Suda T 135 and Photius, obviously from the Synagoge. In this context one could think of the following supplement for l.6: λέ]γει ἄδην ἢ τ[άρταρον, although some of the letters are very uncertain. l.7-8. Nothing important emerges from these two lines. It is an explanatory remark on v.195: ἀλλ' εἴσιθ', ἵνα μὴ ' κείνος ὑμῖν ἐπιτύχη, giving the reason for the student's advice to the others. The scholia offer a similar comment only in different words and they accompanied it by paraphrase. Apparently the poet implied that more than one student. have come out of the phrontisterion, contrary to Socrates' instructions. The commentator finds it necessary to state clearly what happens on stage and what the reason is for the student's sudden reaction. Similar notes are often found in the scholia. Gronewald's supplement ἔξω φ]ανέντων ἀν[θρώπων τινῶν λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰσελθεῖν ἵνα μὴ δ]αρῶσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ[Σωκράτους seems plausible and appropriate.

l.9-11. It is not absolutely clear to which specific verses these lines refer because no lemma has survived. Nor do the scholia offer anything particularly profound for vv.196-206. The first supplement that Gronewald suggested is γε[ωμετρίαν in l.9, probably referring to v.202 and Strepsiades' question about geometry. The second one is πε]ρίμετρος which glosses περίοδος from v.206: αὕτη δέ σοι γῆς περίοδος πάσης. The scholia vetera do not comment on this term of geography as used in this context. In the scholia anonyma recentiora, though, περίοδος is explained as τὸ διάγραμμα, γεωγραφία, διέλευσις τῆς περιμέτρου, ἢ περίμετρος. Although the spectators of the comedy in the fifth century would understand with περίοδος something like 'map', 'chart', in a later period it was necessary to give a more technical and precise explanation by using the term περίμετρος.

l.11-2. The lemma, the beginning of which is visible in l.11, comes from v.209 of the text: ὡς

²⁶ See for more s.v.Τάρταρος in *RE* 4.A2 (1932) col.2442: "... Diese Erweiterung des Tartarus wird der Grund dafür sein, daß er seine selbstständige Stellung als Teil der Welt verlor und mit dem Hades vereinigt wurde".

τ[οῦτ' ἀληθῶς Ἀττικὸν τὸ χωρίον. The scholia offer a paraphrase with the remark that this verse can be read also as a question: ἐν ἐρωτήσει· “ὡς τοῦτό σοι δοκεῖ ἄττικὸν χωρίον, ἐν ᾧ καθήμενοι δικάζουσιν;”. Part of the paraphrase can be seen in l.12 of the papyrus and we assume that to some extent the commentator had made a similar remark. The ambiguity and briefness of the scholia vetera is overcome with the help of a scholium from the Aldine edition: τινὲς ἔνθεν ἕως τοῦ “οἱ ἡμοὶ δημόται” τοῦ γέροντός φασιν, ἔνιοι δὲ διαιροῦσιν. καὶ κατ' ἐρώτησιν δὲ εἶναι τὸ τοῦ φιλοσόφου καὶ ἐν ἀποφάσει δύναται. The implication of giving v.209 to Strepsiades and not to the Student is that the verse should be read as a question. If spoken by the Student, v.209 should remain in affirmative.

ll.13-7. Gronewald saw correctly the lemma from v.211 (ἡ δὲ γ' Εὐβοία ὡς ὀρέῃς) in l.13. Its explanation could go on up to l.14, although without a visible lemma it could extend even up to the end of the present fragment. Possibly, however, there was a new lemma from v.213 starting between ll.14-5. The issue is the conquest of Euboea by the Athenians under the leadership of Pericles and l.15 fits this context. The scholium on v.213 runs as follows: ἐπολιόρησαν αὐτήν Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ Περικλέους, καὶ μάλιστα Χαλκιδέας καὶ Ἐρετριέας. A possible supplement in l.14 is: κρατήσαντες καθάπερ, as part of a longer historical narrative similar to that on Sphacteria and Pylos in ll.1-4.

P. Rain. 1.34 (2865 Pack²)²⁷

Fifth century

Commentary on Aristophanes' *Peace*

Recto ll.1-2. There is no introductory lemma for the explanation in ll.1-2 of the papyrus but from the content we see that it refers to vv.410-1 from the *Peace* of Aristophanes: ἡμεῖς (sc.οἱ Ἕλληνες) μὲν ὑμῖν θύομεν, τούτοισι (sc. the Sun and the Moon) δὲ οἱ βάρβαροι θύουσι. The scholia on these verses confirm the cult of the Sun and the Moon by the barbarians and point

²⁷ Published together with P.Rain.3.20 by Gronewald (1982) 64-9. See n.22.

out their identification with Apollo and Artemis respectively: ...ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἥλιος Ἰ Απόλλων ἐνενόμιστο, ἡ δὲ Ἄρτεμις σελήνη. The papyrus commentary seems to have contained also this remark as it can be seen from what survives in ll.1-2. It is, of course, equally likely that there was more information in the part of the text that is now lost. Another scholium on the same passage quotes Herodotus as a source for the cult of the Sun and the Moon by the barbarians and Sch. Ar. *Nubes* 595 inform us: ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ Ἡλιος καὶ Ἰ Απόλλων. In Herodotus' account of the Persian culture we read: (I 131,2) ... θύουσι δὲ (sc. οἱ Πέρσαι) ἡλίῳ τε καὶ σελήνῃ. Also in Book IV188: ... θύουσι δὲ (sc. Λίβυες) Ἡλίῳ καὶ Σελήνῃ μούνοισι. Another element that strengthens the theory of the identification of the two Greek deities with the two Persian is given again by the scholia on *Pax* 410-1: ... διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὴν Δῆλον καὶ τὴν Ἐφεσον οὐ διελυμήναντο (sc. οἱ βάρβαροι). This piece of historical information is not attested in the same straightforward manner in any other of our sources. Herodotus in Book VI 97 has Datis saying to the Delians: ...καὶ μοι ἐκ βασιλέος ὧδε ἐπέσταλται, ἐν ἧ χώρῃ οἱ δύο θεοὶ ἐγένοντο, ταύτην μηδὲν σίνεσθαι... Modern commentators have seen in this speech an example of the Persian policy of religious tolerance towards conquered peoples or a premeditated and deliberate political gesture prompted by Datis' advisors.²⁸ In any case, it has been suggested that the identification of the Greek with the Persian gods was easy and could serve well the political purposes of the time. Insofar as the Persian religion is concerned, the evidence shows that gods like Mithra were related to the Greek Apollo and also goddesses like Anahita to Aphrodite or more frequently Artemis.²⁹ It is very likely that this religious proximity gave good argument to the Ephesians whose Artemision survived when all other sanctuaries were destroyed by Xerxes during his campaign against the Ionian cities (Strabo 14.5(c.634,25) and Solinus *Mem.* 166,7 (40,2)).

ll.3-6. The lemma in l.3 comes from v.413 of the poetic text: ἵνα τὰς τελετὰς αὐτοὶ λάβοιεν τῶν θεῶν. It is uncertain, however, how many lines the explanation covered since nothing intelligible appears in l.6. From what survives it seems that the main point was about the

²⁸ See Macan (1895) 352, who talks about a policy of religious tolerance and How and Wells (1964⁷) 103: "...The Persians may well have seen in them their own gods of Sun and Moon, Mithra and Mah (cf. i 131.2)".

²⁹ For more about Persian gods see Cook (1983) esp.148 and Briant (1996) esp.171, 566 and 724.

meaning and the usage of the word τελετή in this passage. Gronewald suggests the supplement θυσία]ς λεγειν τ[ελετας for l.5 on the basis of the scholium on v.413b: παρατηρητέον, ὅτι ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ “τὰς θυσίας” κείται τὸ “τελετάς”. Lexicographers show that the two words are indeed related to each another: Ael. D. τὸ τελετή θυσία· μυστηριώδης and from him Tim. Lex. 251R and probably the Synagoge and its derivatives such as Suda T267. Also Hesychius s.v. τελεταί· ἑορταί. θυσίαι. μυστήρια and Et. M 751,11 s.v. τελετή: θυσία μυστηριώδης. As regards now the nature of this scholium, it is very interesting to quote the scholium on v.419 πάσας τε τὰς <ἄλλας> τελετάς: καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας τελετάς (in v.413). σαφέστερον δὲ ἐν τούτοις ποιεῖ, ὅτι οὐ περιγεγραμμένως ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν τὰς τελετάς εἶρηκεν. The continuity in interpretation seen in the response of sch.419 to sch.413 is certainly an element of importance. Firstly, it shows clearly the existence of separate constituent parts in the compilation of the existing scholia which were all mixed up at various stages. Secondly, and by taking the point that the scholiast makes into consideration, we can say that it is one of these remarks that are products of the classroom. According to Rutherford who studied carefully and also classified a large part of the Aristophanic scholia into categories, this scholium belongs to “others [which] are merely scholiasts’ prattle in which they use the day’s lesson to Aristophanes to remind the boys of some trifling piece of information that they have often been given before”.³⁰ Although this analysis refers only to the scholium, the fact that in the papyrus we assume the existence of a similar explanation allows us to draw conclusions about the general character and origins of this commentary as well as about the educational purposes of the commentator. Another point that is worth mentioning is the use of παρατηρητέον ὅτι in the above cited Sch. Ar. Pax 413b as a technical expression that crops up in several places in the scholia, e.g. Sch.Ar. Pax 32β, 380, 578 and 865.

ll.6-9. The abbreviated]αρϵ^ϵ has not been commented upon by Gronewald whereas the first editor suggested tentatively ἀρετή. It is likely, however, that it stood for π]αρέτ(ρωγον) from v.415: καὶ τοῦ κύκλου παρέτρωγον ὑφ’ ἁμαρτωλίας. It is known that lemmata were often abbreviated in commentaries. In this case one should transfer τὸ l.6 the lemma from v.415 which Gronewald suggested for l.9 and consider ll.7-9 as part of the relevant explanation. The

³⁰ W.G.Rutherford (ed.), *A Chapter in the History of Annotation being scholia Aristophanica* Vol.III (London 1905) 373 and n.53.

reappearance of π]αρέτ[ρωγον in 1.9 could simply imply the existence of a paraphrase of vv.414-5.

Verso ll.1-5. These five lines contain the explanation of v.457: Τρ. ᾗ Ἀρει δὲ μῆ. Ἐρ. μῆ. Τρ. μηδ' Ἐνυαλίῳ γε. Ἐρ. μῆ. The problem that both the ancient and modern commentators discuss is about the god Enyalios whom some identify with Ares and others regard as a separate deity.³¹ In this passage Aristophanes seems to adopt the second option, a fact acknowledged also by the scholia: πρὸς τοὺς οἰομένους τῶν νεωτέρων τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ᾗ Ἀρεα καὶ Ἐνυάλιον. They also inform^{us} that the poet Alcman was balancing between the two alternatives. The fragmentary state of the papyrus does not allow us to tell which was the ancient commentator's view, if he had one. The existence of ποτὲ δ[ε, however, in 1.2 makes likely the presentation of both views. Gronewald, the second editor of the text, suggested a bold but also uncertain reconstruction based upon the information we have about Alcman: Ἐνυάλιον] δὲ π[οτὲ μὲν τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ᾗ Ἀρεα Ἐνυαλ]ίῳ, ποτὲ δ[ε οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τῷ] ᾗ Ἀρει τὸν Ἐν[υάλιον. The reference to Sophocles in 1.4 has been considered by Gronewald to be to *Ajax* 179 where, according to the reading of the manuscripts and the scholia, the poet clearly distinguished between Ares and Enyalios: ἢ χαλκοθώραξ ἢ τιν' Ἐνυάλιος.³² Although a satisfactory solution has been given to the mentioning of Sophocles, the presence of Hecate in 1.5 is puzzling. Gronewald thought correctly of the identification of Artemis with Hecate as a parallel given by the commentator to the existence of the two names for Ares. What urged him towards this assumption is the reference to Artemis in the same strophe in *Ajax* as Ares and Enyalios (v.172: ἢ ῥά σε Ταυροπόλα Διὸς ᾗ Ἀρτεμις). The issue of identifying Artemis with Hecate is often discussed in the scholia, e.g. *Lys.* 443: νῆ τὴν Φωσφόρον: τὴν ᾗ Ἀρτεμιν οὕτως ἐκάλουν, ἐπεὶ δαδούχος. ἢ αὐτὴ γὰρ τῆ Ἐκάτη. ἢ ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆ σελήνη ἢ αὐτῆ. Also sch. *Pl.* 594 and *Ran.* 1356. According to Rutherford's classification, these scholia belong to a category which deals with ἐπώνυμα and διώνυμα.³³ Among other examples he includes the

³¹ See Sommerstein (1985) 154.

³² Modern editors adopt Reiske's emendation ἢ χαλκοθώραξ σοί τιν' Ἐνυάλιος or Elmsley's εἶ τιν' (Dawe and others), thus making Enyalios an epithet of Ares. For more see Garvie (1998) 143 and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) 13.

³³ W.G. Rutherford, *History of annotation*, p.372 and n.51.

scholia about Hecate and the scholium on *Pax* 457 with which our papyrus deals. It seems that here we get another argument in favour of the theory mentioned above. The commentator used the case of another διώνυμον which was possibly fresh in his mind after the reference to *Ajax*, in order to offer a fuller presentation of the schema.

ll.6-8. The siglum that introduces the lemma in l.6 is called dotted obelus and is usually associated with commentaries or marginal notes excerpted from commentaries.³⁴ This particular lemma comes from vv.465-6: οὐ ξυλλήψεσθ'; οἶ' ὀγκύλλεσθ' / οἰμῶξεσθ' οἱ Βοιωτοί. Unfortunately nothing important survives from the explanation but on the basis of the scholia the second editor suggested the following supplement: ὅτι μηδὲν αὐτοῖς μέλει τῆς εἰρήνης· ἐ[πὶ γὰρ Ἄλκαίου etc. A newly published papyrus (P.Duke inv.643 recto) provides some marginalia referring also to this passage of the *Peace*³⁵. The note on v.465 is]περιβάλλεσ[θ]ε [τὸν ὄγκον] /]οὔτοι οὐχ ἔλ[κουσιν, ὅτι μηδὲν] /]αὐτοῖς μέ[λει τῆς εἰρήνης] / σπ]ονδαὶ ἐπ[εποίηντο τοῖς Ἄθη-] / ναί]οις εἰς Λα[κεδαίμονα ἄνευ Βοι-] / ωτ]ῶν.

³⁴ See McNamee (1992a) 18.

³⁵ Smith (1996) 155-60 and Luppe (1997) 7-10 with important corrections and new readings of the marginalia.

Conclusions

The papyri of Aristophanes with scholia have been fortunate in having been discussed thoroughly by Günther Zuntz in a long article of his in the late thirties. Zuntz reexamined the extensive marginalia in some papyri of late antiquity and thereupon based an influential theory about the development of scholarship on Aristophanes and its various stages that ended up with the formation of codices fully supplied with scholia sometime in the ninth century. His theory has implications for most texts of classical authors, so it gave rise to a long discussion which is still vivid among scholars today.

No attempt has been made in the present study towards reexamining papyri already discussed by Zuntz since there is indeed very little left to add insofar as decipherment and interpretation are concerned. Our purpose was to study some texts which were left aside or were published thereafter. Any results that have emerged from the present study will be tested against Zuntz's schema of the transmission of the scholia on Aristophanes with a view to whether they strengthen or weaken his argumentation. It should be stated in advance, though, that his main points will not be disputed and, of course, are not going to be repeated here.

P. Oxy.856 is a commentary on the *Acharnians* dated to the third century. Its format is indeed very interesting: very long columns combined with brief comments on very selected lemmata would make it possible to cover the whole play in very few columns (for the 1233 verses of the *Acharnians* the space of three columns was enough). It is highly likely that the original roll contained commentaries of a similar kind on more than one play, a sort of epitome useful to a basic study of the comedies of Aristophanes. Are we justified in assuming that the roll dealt with those plays which from approximately this period onwards formed the so-called "Selection"? This papyrus commentary has been regarded as being of very low quality since its first publication and for this reason has remained outside the interests of scholars studying the Aristophanic scholia. Indicative of this attitude is Zuntz's brief judgement: "...es zeigt knapp so viel Berührung mit den Scholien unserer Handschriften, wie sich bei zwei Kommentaren zum gleichen Gegenstand selbstverständlich ergibt; stellt aber ein ganz ärmliches Schul-Hilfsbuch dar, viel kürzer als unsere Scholien, und ohne Verwandtschaft mit diesen".³⁶ After our detailed

³⁶ Zuntz (1975) 28 repeated by Maehler (1994) 124.

discussion of the text, however, it seems that this papyrus contained plenty of information about points of major interest, so that it should be regarded as anything but useless. References to people from the Athenian society to which Aristophanes alludes, such as Cleisthenes, the tragic poet Theognis and the politician Megacles, indicate a familiarity with sources useful to Aristophanean exegesis. The summaries of lost plays given in two instances (*Babylonians* in ll.25-7 and *Oeneus* ll.30-2) show again access to good sources which the scholia seem to ignore. Although the explanations of the papyrus are usually shorter than their counterparts in the scholia, they often offer more or completely new elements of interpretation, the validity of which is confirmed by their reappearance in the scholia on other authors or in lexicography (e.g. ll.29, 44, 50 and 58-9). On the other hand, much of the material offered by the commentator is elementary. It is often derived from the text itself and not from an appropriate source. Interestingly enough, however, none of this is nonsensical or excessively inaccurate as it is the case with plenty of material in the scholia. The commentator has been careful to avoid any misinterpretations and his scholarly level is quite satisfactory. Another element that characterizes this commentary is the quite long sections of paraphrase which summarize the main points of the text and which are often combined with elements of interpretation, such as in ll.62ff. and 70ff. From what has been said very briefly until now, it seems to me that Zuntz's view that the commentary is a schoolbook is very likely to be correct. His judgement that it was "a very poor schoolbook", however, can be seriously disputed. Its comparison with the scholia shows that there are hardly any similarities which would indicate a considerable relationship between the two. Given the temporal distance between them this is only reasonable but on the other hand this commentary can be regarded as one of the school by-products of the scholarly ancestors of the scholia vetera.

The second group of papyri which we examined in this chapter comprises three papyri from around the third century AD. They are all fragments of lost plays of Aristophanes carefully annotated by their scribes or by another hand. The first one is P. Mich.3690 which is believed to come from Aristophanes' *Heroes*. Its two notes are short glosses on the medical vocabulary of the extant passage. The glossing of difficult words had been a common feature in the margins or the interlinear space of the papyri already since the last centuries BC. What makes the glosses in question worth including in this study is the fact that they seem to reflect some discussion possibly made in a commentary on this play. The first gloss (ὕδρωπιᾶν) is simply the term

which substituted in later periods the classical one (ὕδερᾶν), as the atticist lexicographers inform us. At a first glance the second note looks quite ordinary, but as has been demonstrated in the discussion earlier on, the problem behind it was very complicated and had divided the ancient commentators and lexicographers into two groups. It is not clear whether the annotator was aware of the problem he was touching on but it looks probable that he was, since, as has been shown, he adopted one of the two views in a rather indirect way.

The other two papyri of the group (P.Grenf.12 and P.Amherst 13) have been studied here because of the extent of their marginalia. Although the notes are once again fragmentary, what remains gave us the opportunity to reconstruct their function and meaning in a quite satisfactory manner. From many papyri of this period, it is known that annotation used to be about variant readings and other points of interest in the text that in one way or another affected the interpretation. The quality of the notes varies a lot depending on the abilities and needs of the owner or user of the papyrus. In this particular case, the study showed that at least some of them were of learned origin. As regards the papyrus Grenfell 12, its notes seem to be on a relatively elementary level. If the reconstructions are correct, the first two of them are paraphrases which seem to have become more and more frequent in the later centuries of antiquity. The third note, the one about πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον, does not go further than giving a very general description of this instrument of torture unlike the more specific and accurate ones in the scholia and lexica. P. Amherst 13, on the other hand, has not preserved enough of the text in order to enable us to understand the full meaning of its annotation. From what survives, though, one may conclude that they come from a scholarly source, most likely from a commentary. The references to Magnes and the ability to understand the poet's allusions to everyday expressions or other jokes (εἴρηται παρὰ, παίζει παρὰ) indicate an acquaintance with Aristophanean exegesis. In both papyri, apart from the value and quality of the notes themselves, their frequency and density next to the column is striking, especially if one accepts that the same happened throughout the rest of the roll. Of course, there has been published a substantial number of heavily annotated papyri on other authors as well, such as Pindar's *Paeans* (P. Oxy. 5.841) or Alcman's *Partheneion* (P. Par.71). These two texts of Aristophanes, however, have the additional advantage of showing an interest in Aristophanes in a period earlier than the fifth and sixth centuries from which there is much more evidence.

In the third group of the papyri examined in this chapter we include the two

commentaries from the fifth century, namely P. Rain.3.20 on the *Clouds* and P. Rain.1.34 on the *Peace*. These two have been identified as commentaries on comedies by their second editor M. Gronewald in 1982. Zuntz in his study of the transmission of ancient exegesis on Aristophanes has stated: "... und zwar haben die Benutzer offenbar, mit Hilfe der alten, neue Hypomnemata hergestellt. Uns ist zu Aristophanes kein solches erhalten - kein Wunder, da von ihnen natürlich nicht viele Abschriften genommen wurden ... Die Existenz später Hypomnemata auch zu Aristophanes erschien wahrscheinlich wegen der Lemmata in dem oben besprochenen "Wolken" papyrus".³⁷ After the publication of these two commentaries from late antiquity, this view should be modified, although the overall theory is still valid. As far as the material offered in the hypomnemata is concerned, the second editor tried to prove that this was in close connection with the scholia vetera on the basis of some occasional similarities. In my opinion, the similarities indicated are rather accidental or even not sufficient especially when compared to the marginalia of the papyri examined by Zuntz. It should be admitted, however, that the content is by and large the same. If the supplements suggested are correct, the commentators discussed the same points as the scholiasts do but only formulated them differently. Considering now the origins and the quality of these two texts, it emerges quite clearly that they are products of a school environment or at least that they reflect a school-centred attitude towards classical literature. The brief summary of the events at Pylus and Sphacteria, the discussion of the use of τελευτὰ instead of θυσίαι or the glossing of περίοδος and Τάρταρος are a few characteristic examples of this tendency. It is rather unlikely that the papyrus contained any references to scholars of earlier periods or parallels from other texts as the scholia often do. Paraphrase must have occupied a great deal and I assume that some of the very fragmentary notes are remains of this sort of comments. When we return to Zuntz's study and his reconstruction of the archetype of the scholia we find reference to school commentaries of late date which have been incorporated into the main stream of tradition.³⁸ It is highly likely that our commentaries should be also included in this category.

A papyrus which was published recently (P. Duk. inv. 643) offers remains of the *Peace* together with marginal notes. The papyrus was rather mistakenly assigned to the third century

³⁷ Zuntz (1975) 114.

³⁸ Zuntz (1975) 27 and also his stemma of the transmission of the scholia.

AD: palaeographical reasons as well as features of the format point towards the fifth century.³⁹ Being a leaf from a papyrus codex, it was supplied with plenty of marginalia, especially in the recto. The examination of the notes by the first editor and subsequently by W.Luppe shortly afterwards showed their very close relations with their counterparts in the scholia of the manuscripts and only some minor differences as far as wording is concerned. What matters most for the purposes of the present study is that here we have another example of a late papyrus with marginalia, probably copied from a commentary of this period and which was among the ancestors of the scholia. It is unfortunate that there is hardly any margin preserved in the verso; from some traces it seems that there was annotation there too.

Finally and after this summary of the most conclusions which have emerged from this chapter, it should be pointed out that none of the papyri studied above managed to overturn any of Zuntz's main arguments. It was only made possible to look again at some of the main stages in the transmission of Aristophanean exegesis. We started from the papyrus rolls of the second and third centuries which were sometimes supplied with marginalia of scholarly origins and we concluded with later codices also annotated but this time with notes very close to the corresponding ones in the scholia of the manuscripts. The existence and circulation of commentaries in the fifth century that Zuntz had already assumed and which has been seen in the case of other authors, such as Euripides, has been finally confirmed by the new evidence also for Aristophanes. The fact that some of these texts seem to have been compiled for use in schools confirms once again the theory about the role of "school books" in the compilation of a homogeneous corpus of scholia on Aristophanes, which were subsequently transferred partly or wholly into the margins of parchment codices.

³⁹ See n.35. I owe this suggestion about later dating to Prof.Maehler.

Chapter 4

Didymus, Glossaries and Lexica, Marginalia

Rudolf Pfeiffer named the final chapter of his *History of Classical Scholarship* “The Epigoni: from Aristarchus’ Pupils to Didymus” and dedicated the last pages of this very influential book to Didymus. In his own words the scholar who lived during the passage from the Hellenistic to the Imperial period “... was enabled to become the most efficient servant of an ancient intellectual community”.¹ This description as well as a look at the catalogue of his works shows clearly that Didymus was, in fact, one of the main figures which dominated nearly all fields of ancient exegesis on classical Greek literature.² The quality of his contribution has been debated already since antiquity and continues to be a matter of interest even today. What impressed the ancients and still impresses today anyone dealing with Greek literature is the amount of his work. It is well known that in antiquity one used to talk about 3,500 or 4,000 books which even if fictitious is still indicative of the number and the varied range of Didymus’ interests.³

When it comes to the area of dramatic poetry which is the central point of the present study, it is not surprising to find that Didymus was the author of commentaries on Sophocles and Euripides as well as on Aristophanes and other comic poets. According to Pfeiffer, these commentaries were not accompanied by an edition but relied upon the texts of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus. Apart from hypomnemata, however, Didymus compiled collections of tragic and comic vocabulary under the titles of Λέξεις τραγικῆ, or Λέξεις τραγωδομένη, and Λέξεις κωμικῆ respectively. These were part of a large section of his work on lexicography, in which the main focus was probably on the vocabulary of rhetoric since it is well known, and attested in papyri, that Didymus wrote on orators as well, especially on Demosthenes.⁴ Furthermore, there can be no doubt that he devoted many of his monographs to the study of

¹ Pfeiffer (1968) 279.

² A list of titles attested for Didymus can be found in M. Schmidt (ed.), *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (Leipzig 1854) 11-4.

³ See Suda Δ 872 s.v. Δίδυμος: φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν συγγεγραφέναι ὑπὲρ τὰ τρισχίλια πεντακόσια βιβλία.

⁴ H. Diels and W. Schubart (eds.), *Didymos, Kommentar zu Demosthenes (Pap. 9780)* in (Berlin 1904) [BKT1]. The latest edition is by L. Pearson and S. Stephens (eds.), *Didymi in Demosthenem commenta*, BT (Stuttgart 1983).

particular problems arising from tragedies and comedies but this is beyond our purpose at this present stage.

The personality and the works and methods of Didymus have been studied by various scholars under many different perspectives throughout this century, his fragments, however, were collected and published by Schmidt in 1854 and this edition has not been replaced since then despite later discoveries and new approaches.⁵ Like most collections of fragments, the general principle behind this particular one was that it should comprise all items, however small, that bear the name of Didymus as well as those which look probable in the editor's judgement to originate from some defined or undefined work of his. The criteria which Schmidt used in order to classify a fragment as Didymean or not were not always reliable. This is especially true for the fragments derived from lexica given that by the middle of the nineteenth century some lexica had not been properly edited or had not been edited at all. It is not always enough to claim that an entry in Hesychius' lexicon with an equivalent in the scholia indicates its provenance from Didymus. The same can be said about Schmidt's argumentation in some other cases, for example on p.299 where the nature of the scholium on *Ar. Equ.*546 is claimed to apply well to a scholar who had travelled around, like Didymus to Rome.⁶ Despite the deficiencies or reservations one could express about specific passages or even groups of passages, however, it remains undisputed that Didymus' writings constitute the nucleus of the scholia on tragic and comic poets as well as most of the lexicographical material derived from or simply commenting on these poets.

As regards the survival and influence of Didymus' work during late antiquity, it is more useful to examine the fate of hypomnemata separately from that of glossaries, although their existence was parallel and there was a constant and intense exchange of material between them. The brief outline of the transmission of hypomnemata and glossaries is crucial to the present study, since it was always our purpose to compare the small remains of scholarship preserved in the margins of the papyri with what is known from later sources (corpora of scholia and

⁵ See e.g. Cohn (1903), Wilamowitz (1907) 157-68, Pfeiffer (1968) 274-9, West (1970), Harris (1989) and Gibson (1997).

⁶ Zuntz (1975) 15 and note 1 argued about the origin of the same scholium but on a purely scholarly basis contrasting himself with Schmidt.

lexica) and thereby to make clearer the ways into which Hellenistic scholarship developed and survived for many centuries to come.

The name of Didymus is the last one in a series of renowned scholars who worked on Euripides.⁷ After him the situation becomes vague and it seems that nothing comparable to the scholarly achievements of earlier generations was added to the corpus of scholia as this was acquiring a standardised form by the end of antiquity. The question of the successive stages towards the formation of the scholia, of course, is not going to be discussed here. What matters and should be mentioned, however, is the evidence provided by the subscription at the end of the scholia on Euripides' *Medea*: πρὸς διάφορα ἀντίγραφα Διονυσίου ὀλοσχερὲς καὶ τινα τῶν Διδύμου. Despite the internal obscurity of the phrase as well as its uncertain date, it is obvious that during later centuries commentaries bearing the name of Didymus were still in circulation. It is highly likely that these were adaptations of the original (or even pseudepigrapha) augmented or epitomized according to the taste and the needs of a new era in classical studies.

It is interesting to explore for how long Didymus' glossaries were still in circulation and were used by scholars directly and not through the work of others. It is quite certain that these glossaries survived at least until the fifth century: we know that Orus used *Λέξις κωμικὴ* and that he lived sometime around the beginning of the fifth century.⁸ In the following century Hesychius was able to quote in his prefatory letter to Eulogius the glossaries of Didymus and Theon but material from them reached him mostly through the lexicon of Diogenianus.⁹

The history of early lexicography, namely of the period before the great byzantine lexica, is quite complicated because in most cases we have to deal with fragments or very severe abridgements of the originals and also because the people responsible for them are usually obscure figures of uncertain date. Some of the fragments were incorporated into later lexica

⁷ Among others Aristophanes of Byzantium who edited and possibly commented on some of the plays and Callistratus, his pupil. See Barrett (1964) 45-50.

⁸ See Orus 117-20.

⁹ Hesychius 1 (Latte): ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς μόνας ὡς Ἀπίων καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀρχιβίου· οἱ δὲ τὰς κωμικὰς ἰδίᾳ καὶ τὰς τραγικὰς ὡς Θεῶν καὶ Δίδυμος καὶ ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι.

either with a name reference to a source which is now lost or even without description.

One would have expected that papyri would throw some new light upon problems relating to Didymus and other scholars who compiled lexica and glossaries. Indeed they have often provided some missing links, as in the case of the lexicon of Apollonius Sophista (P.Oxy.2517)¹⁰ or the papyri of Diogenianus (PSI 892 and P.Oxy.3329). In general, however, most of the published material cannot be identified with any of the known lexica and remains scattered in papyrological publications, unfortunately not yet collected and brought together into a special corpus.¹¹ An attempt to categorize these glossaries is in itself a very demanding task, given that the boundaries between different kinds are not clear. Roughly speaking, one could distinguish between Homeric glossaries which are the commonest group, rhetorical glossaries, tragic, comic and mixed ones. There are also cases of specialized lexica, namely devoted to a specific author or even a particular work, such as a speech by Demosthenes or a hymn by Callimachus (P.Oxy.3328). Ancient readers must have made frequent use of such glossaries and the existence of many glossaries on Homer is a good example of this widespread practice.

What is really striking about the glossaries on tragic and comic vocabulary is that very few of them have survived. A comparison with similar compilations on other genres such as oratory and epic poetry shows the predominance of such glossaries over the tragic and comic ones.¹² This can be partly explained by the practical use of rhetorical vocabulary in the writing of exercises by students or even by professionals of rhetoric which flourished during late antiquity. Another reason could be the influence of Atticism which used some of the Attic orators as models for linguistic and stylistic purposes. As regards Homer, it is very well known that his use in schools and the intrinsic difficulties of his language gave rise to the compilation of various glossaries already from an early stage, and quite a great deal of them has survived on papyri.¹³ Drama was treated differently, it seems. The fact, however, that famous scholars such as Didymus and Theon whose activities included commentaries on plays dealt with lexicography

¹⁰ See Alpers (1966).

¹¹ A brief presentation of his unpublished dissertation on Greek lexicography has been made by Naoumides (1969).

¹² A look at the section of glossaries in Pack² pp. 115-6 confirms this view.

¹³ See Henrichs (1971).

as well (this is certain for Didymus, less certain for Theon¹⁴) made their work indispensable to all subsequent general lexica. The gradual limitation of the number of plays in the so-called “Selection” would also prevent any fresh attempt to create new glossaries from achieving its goal. The effect was that one had to rely on the two glossaries which existed already.¹⁵ The limited interest in classical literature would necessarily result into a limited demand for new works especially if such works were to be large and of such specialized interest.

Among the group of papyri published as glossaries and lexica, there are two which deal most clearly with drama and they are both on comedy. The first one is P. Oxy.1801, published in P. Oxy.vol.15 together with a few other papyri all belonging to the same category, that of glossography.¹⁶ Grenfell and Hunt did not link the text to any of the known authors from antiquity but only noticed the reappearance of all the lemmata in Hesychius. They also pointed out the fact that it was a glossary with lengthy explanations and plenty of citations which are missing from Hesychius. The papyrus is dated to the first century AD and its lemmata treat words starting with B, the first one being βαμβακεύτριαι and the last before the papyrus breaks off, βήρηκες. The arrangement was alphabetic according to the first two letters. This had been the practice in the earlier periods and it seems that it remained in use for small glossaries of later centuries. According to Hesychius in his prefatory letter, it was Diogenianus who invented the fully alphabetical arrangement, although Galen’s Hippocratic lexicon, also fully alphabetized, is nearly contemporary.¹⁷ The evidence from the two papyri which presumably represent his lexicon confirms this theory.

The lemmata of P.Oxy.1801 have been taken from comedy and there are many known names listed as sources, together with citations from surviving or missing plays. It seems that

¹⁴ On Theon’s life and works see Guhl (1969).

¹⁵ There is evidence that Artemidorus, Theon’s father, compiled a Λέξεων Συναγωγή which contained also comic vocabulary (Sch.Ar. *Vesp* 1144, 1169 etc.).

¹⁶ Republished and discussed by Luppe (1967). Also in *CGFP* 343 and *PCG* 8 fr.1037-44 and Naoumides (1964) who claims that the papyrus preserves Theon’s comic glossary intact.

¹⁷ Hesychius’ own words are: προέθηκε δὲ κατ’ ἀρχὴν ἐκάστης λέξεως τριῶν ἢ τεσσάρων στοιχείων τάξιν... About Galen’s lexicon and for a detailed discussion of the general topic see Daly (1967) 34ff. and review by K. Alpers in *Gnomon* 47 (1975) 113-7.

there were references also to satyr plays, such as Sophocles' *Salmones* in l.10. The scope of the lexicon must have been very ambitious and it was justified that the subsequent editors looked for one of the big names in lexicography to ascribe it to. On the basis of its clear correspondences with Hesychius, the papyrus most likely offers one of his sources. Diogenianus himself should be excluded on the grounds that he lived in the age of Hadrian and also because his lexicon was of a general character. Among his sources for the vocabulary of drama, however, were the lexica both of Didymus and Theon. For reasons having to do with Theon's presence in Oxyrhynchus' literary circles and the improbability that we possess a fragment of Didymus, it has been convenient to assign the papyrus (always hypothetically) to the former. Indicative of the uncertainties surrounding such attributions is Latte's judgement: "...in hac compilatorum provincia diiudicari nec potest nec attinet".¹⁸ Since the focus of this chapter is on the description of the origin of the marginal glosses on the papyri of dramatists and given that Didymus, not Theon, was the person whose work has exercised the most influence in this field, P. Oxy.1801 should not be discussed in detail. However, it is still of some use as it provides us with a model of what the comic glossaries of the time looked like and what their structure and content basically were.

The second papyrus in question is P. Sorbonne 1.7 dated by its editor to about 200 AD.¹⁹ This has also been identified as a comic glossary though of a different nature from the previous one. What remains is fragments of three consecutive columns from the end of the work with lemmata from the letters X, Ψ, and Ω. The lemmata are separated from their explanations by some space left blank and are in ecthesis as is common in most similar texts. The explanations are not very long and interestingly there are no citations. Twice the explanation extends to the next line. The arrangement of the lemmata follows the order of the first two letters, as we have already seen in P. Oxy. 1801.

When it comes to the examination of the explanations and their recurrence in later lexica, there are some interesting remarks to be made: first it is clear that the material explained is from various comic poets, not only from one among them; for example the word χρυσῆς

¹⁸ Hesychius XLII (Latte).

¹⁹ Published by Cadell (1966) no.7 as "Fragment d' un vocabulaire des poètes comiques". Also *CGFP* 342.

appeared in Aristophanes, Cratinus and Hermippus, ψύρα in Cratinus, ψώθια in Pherecrates and ὄμιλλα in Eupolis. We have, therefore, a comic glossary of the same kind as the previous one but it is not possible to determine its size because, as the first editor remarked, the beginning and end of the columns are missing and in general the amount of words beginning with the last letters of the alphabet is limited. There is no reason, of course, to assume that the papyrus roll contained only a small glossary.

A second point we should make is that all the lemmata with their explanations are also found in the later large lexica. Most interestingly, all of them but one appear in the Suda and Photius. The similarities are very close, although these late works have collected more material including the citations which the papyrus omitted. In the case of χρίειν, its glossing as τύπτειν, is found out of all lexica only in Suda X 466 s.v. χρεΐειν and Photius in the complete version of codex Zavordensis. The word χρεμψιθέατρον is followed by an explanation in two parts in the papyrus and strikingly enough it is only Suda which offers an exactly identical one: ὅτι εἰσιόντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον χρέμπτονται ἢ ὅτι χρεμπτόμενοι ἐκβάλλονται (X 456). Also in Hesychius (Schmidt's edition) under the same lemma there is the beginning of the same explanation with the rest marked as missing.

Photius and Suda both relied upon an earlier lexicon, the so-called *Erweiterte Synagoge*, a short version of which is offered by the manuscripts Coislinianus 345 and 347.²⁰ The original source of the Synagoge was the glossary ascribed to Cyrillus of Alexandria in which various important sources were incorporated, such as atticistic lexica (e.g. Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias from the second century AD), Diogenianus and Λέξεις ῥητορικαί. As for Hesychius, it is very well known that his main source was Diogenianus. The fact that the glosses of the papyrus appear almost identical in Suda, Photius and Hesychius indicates that they all go back to Diogenianus. It is rather unlikely, however, that P. Sorb.7 preserves a portion of that very popular lexicon which was probably arranged in strict alphabetical order, was not confined to comic vocabulary and was compiled at roughly the same period as the papyrus. It is more likely that as in the case of P. Oxy.1801, what we have here is one of Diogenianus' sources. To be more accurate, the papyrus must have drawn on one of Diogenianus' sources,

²⁰ For the discussion of the Synagoge I have drawn heavily on the relevant discussion in the edition of Orus, especially the chapter B2 of the Introduction "Zur Überlieferung der *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων*" (69-79).

namely Theon's or Didymus' comic glossaries. The original must have contained the citations and presumably more lemmata but it is quite difficult to identify the criteria for such a selection.

So far we have seen two pieces of evidence from the period shortly after Didymus. They are both examples of the kind of glossaries which were in circulation at this time for use by readers of classical comedy and reflect in one way or another the influential compilations by Didymus and Theon. It would not be accurate, however, to consider either of the two scholars as responsible for these papyri. It is well attested that subliterate works such as commentaries, lexica and all sorts of treatises were subjected to constant modifications, epitomizations or amplifications. It is much more plausible, therefore, to regard both texts as being very close to the original glossaries, perhaps derived directly from them with alterations ranging from omission of citations to selection of lemmata. It is worth recalling again Latte's description of Oxyrhynchus as a "compilatorum provincia". On the basis of the two papyri, however, one can also get an idea of what Didymus' lexicographical works looked like and how they were organized. For this task the fragments transmitted by indirect tradition can also be of significant help. Like probably most of his works, the glossaries seem to have been of substantial length. There is evidence from Harpocration that the lemma ξηραλοιφεῖν appeared in the twenty-eighth book of *Λέξεις τραγική*²¹, therefore, that the glossary as a whole was much longer. This is, of course, not surprising given that by the end of the Hellenistic age most of the corpus of Attic drama was still available, especially to someone working in Alexandria, for centuries the centre of scholarship. The lemmata were arranged in alphabetical order, probably according to their first two letters. The explanation must have contained the reference to the play from which the lemma came as well as the citation itself, as P.Oxy.1801 has indicated. It is very likely that next to his own preferred explanation, Didymus quoted briefly previous scholars' opinions, as is well known to be the case in his commentaries. In the lemma "Achelous" (*Λέξεις τραγική* fr.2) transmitted by Macrobius, *Sat.*5,18,9-12, he offered a citation from Agesilaus' *Histories* in order to find another argument for his case. In the lemma *ὀρείχαλκος* (*Λέξεις κωμική* fr.34a), after the favoured definition follows a series of sources and authorities such as Stesichorus and Bacchylides, Aristotle and Aristophanes of Byzantium. It is interesting also that

²¹ Harpocratio s.v. Ξηραλοιφεῖν Dindorf... ἔλεγον τὸ χωρὶς λουτρῶν ἀλείφεισθαι, ὡς Δίδυμος ἐν κῆ' Τραγικῆς λέξεως.

the evidence that has been collected seems to cover the whole of classical life with precise details about aspects of social and private life, politics, mythology, geography and natural history. There are also some elements of grammar and etymology, such as different forms of the same word or analysis of compounds. Apart from cases where more than one explanation is possible (e.g. Λέξεις κωμική fr.36: μίνθον οἱ μὲν τὸν ἠδύοσμον, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἰυγγα), Didymus often attacked other lexicographers' views such as Eratosthenes' for ἰουλος (Λέξεις κωμική fr.32) or Lycophron's and Eratosthenes' for βάρρακες (fr.25). What is not clear is whether there were also points of textual criticism involved in cases of doubtful readings and also whether the methods of presentation were the same in the tragic and the comic collection.

Didymus must have relied a lot upon his own earlier works, above all on his commentaries on tragedies and comedies. It is not certain, however, whether he had written on Aeschylus or on each one of the plays included in Aristophanes' editions of drama. Although the relevant material may have been available to him through the works of others as well as from personal research in the Library, there may have been an unevenness in the treatment of some plays or poets. It is natural, however, that in order to cover any gaps or deficiencies in his own glossaries he drew upon earlier lexicographical works. In Hellenistic Alexandria lexicography began with Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι by Philitas²² and grew up gradually to a more systematic and scholarly level with Zenodotus' Γλῶσσαι, Eratosthenes and Callimachus as well as with Λέξεις compiled by Aristophanes of Byzantium.²³ This last work was of great significance and the evidence in later lexica such as the Antiatticist, and Orus shows that it had been one of their sources. Moreover, in the case of the atticistic lexicon of Orus it has been clearly demonstrated that it was through Didymus that Λέξεις and their own sources were made known to him.²⁴ This is another proof that Didymus exploited the products of earlier scholarship. In any case, this is

²² P. Hibeh 172 = *Suppl. Hell.* 991, a poetic onomasticon, illustrates an early stage in the development of the compilation of 'glosses'. The fact that one of its glosses is attested for Philitas' glossary made it tempting to ascribe the entire papyrus to Philitas. However, the fact that unlike the papyrus, Philitas' glossary contained explanations of the glosses makes the ascription rather unlikely.

²³ For more information about the early stages of lexicography see Cohn (1913⁴) 681-6 and Tosi (1994).

²⁴ See Orus, 109-11.

exactly what Didymus is always credited with or criticized for by modern scholars. His commentaries made use of all the earlier works stored in the Museum, to which he was able to add plenty of historical and antiquarian material of all sorts.

The usefulness of Didymus' work was undoubtedly felt and recognized by his contemporaries and above all his successors in the study of ancient drama. The use of his glossaries has already been indicated in the case of the so-called Antiatticist, Orus, and writers such as Macrobius of the fifth century. Didymus' work serves also as a basis for an Attic "Onomastikon" compiled in the middle of the second century which has been shown to be among the prime sources of Harpocration, the *Λέξεις ῥητορικαὶ* (Bk^v) and Pollux' *Onomasticon*. The richness in information about private and public life in classical Athens made *Λέξεις κωμικῆ* useful to the study of other texts with similar problems such as rhetorical speeches and history. Finally, as far as the transmission of Didymus' texts is concerned, it was common in this period and for the rest of antiquity that huge compilations such as those of Didymus were subjected to epitomization in order to be more practical and more convenient to use. The needs of education were very different from those of scholars and there was much freedom in adapting the philological writings according to educational needs without much hesitation. The two glossographical papyri we examined above could be two characteristic examples of this tendency.

Another aspect of the transmission of Didymus' glossaries is their use as a prime source by later lexicographers. We know for certain that Pamphilus who lived in the first century AD used Didymus as a source for his 95 volume onomasticon, *Περὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ὀνομάτων*. From his lexicon very few fragments have survived and as has been already quite rightly assumed its size made it very unpractical and difficult to use. It is not surprising, therefore, that this lexicon was very soon epitomized. The name of Julius Vestinus is the first to be mentioned in this process. Diogenianus in the age of Hadrian probably used the epitome of Vestinus and perhaps Didymus' and Theon's glossaries themselves which were still in circulation. Since ^{it} was more or less the same material from tragedy and comedy which was to be found in most of these lexica, the routes of its transmission during the first two centuries AD are not clear. Diogenianus' lexicon was also epitomized at a later stage with the effect that citations and references were omitted for reasons of economy of space or perhaps lack of interest. We have already mentioned the two papyri which seem to preserve fragments of this epitomized

Diogenianus: PSI 892 of the fourth century with lemmata starting with $\phi\upsilon$ - and P. Oxy.47.3329 of the third or early fourth century with lemmata in $\sigma\alpha$ -. The comic provenance of most words treated in the second papyrus is obvious but given the small size of the fragment and the fact that some lemmata are not exclusively comic, it is unlikely that what we have here is the remains of a comic glossary such as P. Oxy.1801. Citations are completely absent from both texts. The epitomization must have already taken place. The two fragments of Diogenianus give us an idea of what the copy that Hesychius possessed may have looked like. He lived probably in the sixth century and one of his main sources was the lexicon of Diogenianus. In the prefatory letter to Eulogius he criticized Diogenianus for “[τεθεικέναι] τὰς ἐζητημένας τῶν λέξεων οὐκ ἔχούσας τὰ τε τῶν κεχρημένων ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς τῶν βιβλίων ἐπιγραφὰς ἔνθα φέρονται” and claimed to have carried out this task himself. Since the epitome of Diogenianus perished at some point during the Byzantine period, what we are basically left with from this material, enormous in quantity and importance, is to be found in Hesychius. Material from Didymus and Diogenianus can be found, of course, in other lexica of earlier or later date as well, such as those of the Atticists Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias and those derived from the *Erweiterte Synagoge* (Photius and Suda) but none offers so much as Hesychius. It has also been shown by Latte that scholia such as those on Aeschines, Plato and Hermogenes claim Diogenianus among their sources.²⁵

It has already been stated that Didymus compiled his glossaries on tragedy and comedy partly by drawing upon the commentaries and perhaps also monographs he himself had written on most of these plays. Furthermore, for some authors such as Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes one could maintain with a considerable degree of certainty that their corpus of scholia is largely based upon Didymus' commentaries, although in the case of Aristophanes there are also the names of some rather obscure people who seem to have contributed at a later stage, namely Symmachus and Phaeinus. The appearance of a gloss, longer or shorter, on its own or within a scholium on one of these poets and at the same time in one of the above mentioned lexica, especially Hesychius, makes it inevitable in most cases to see Didymus' hand behind all this. This must have been one of the main criteria of Latte's edition when identifying entries as

²⁵ The most detailed discussion of Diogenianus is in the *Prolegomena* to Hesychius by Latte, Ch.8 (XLII-XLIV).

coming from Diogenianus. What is a tricky question, however, is the attribution of the glosses either to Didymus' commentaries or to his glossaries. In antiquity the boundaries between such works, especially when they came from the same scholar, were not very strict. We know that in the case of Didymus both commentaries and glossaries survived, probably after many modifications, up to the fourth or fifth century. Pamphilus, Diogenianus and the Atticists could have easily gone through some of these commentaries in order to enrich their lexica and find passages to justify their definitions of rare and difficult words. It is not, therefore, guaranteed that all glosses of Didymean origin go back to his glossaries. Another aspect of the problem of the attribution of glosses to a specific source is our ignorance of the impact of Theon's *Τραγικὴ* and *Κωμικὴ Λέξις* upon other lexicographers, let alone scholiasts. His influence and esteem in the literary circles of Oxyrhynchus has been illustrated by papyri which provide examples of his activities: to give two examples, P. Oxy.2536 (on Pindar's *Pythians*), references to his antigraphs in the margins of texts and P. Oxy.1801 if it represents his glossary). It is interesting that Hesychius in his prefatory letter mentions Theon's glossaries on the same level as those of Didymus and probably as another of Diogenianus' sources. It is possible, therefore, that some of the glosses which have been credited to Diogenianus may in fact come from Theon and not from Didymus. The scholia can be of great help in clarifying the situation, especially when they give a name reference. Finally, one should bear in mind that Byzantine lexica such as Suda have used the scholia on Aristophanes as a source and have copied entire portions of them, therefore no links to earlier lexica can be inferred. Usually, of course, the extracts are not short glosses but quite substantial notes proper to the encyclopaedic character of the Suda.

The above discussion brings us eventually to the main point of this chapter, namely the origins of the shorter or longer glosses of the papyri we have examined in relation to their reappearance within the surviving corpus of scholia and lexica. The relevant material which has arisen from the limited number of papyri we selected for this research is in no case adequate to provide us with a general pattern for the whole of literature and scholia. Other poets and authors might have led us towards different directions depending on the history of the texts in question. The great number of Homeric texts or the papyri of Hellenistic poets are possible candidates for a research of similar nature. As far as dramatic poetry is concerned, namely Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes, the situation is more or less clear. As often stated above, it was above all Didymus with his scholiographical and lexicographical work who dominated the field of ancient

exegesis on these poets. The originality and accuracy of his statements has often been disputed, especially after the discovery of a commentary, or for others of a treatise, on Demosthenes bearing his name.²⁶ His position, however, as a scholar of great influence cannot be challenged.

In general, most of the papyri examined have in their margins a mixture of notes. Others offer variants or explanatory remarks on obscure and problematic passages. Others simply paraphrase the text or point out grammatical and syntactical schemata such as metaphors.²⁷ Finally, quite often we find short glosses explaining rare or obsolete words. The length of the glosses can vary according to the occasion but in their vast majority they are quite short, extending to only a couple of words. What is also interesting is that they are very rarely introduced by the appropriate lemma. Like the rest of the marginalia they usually stand next to the word they refer to or even above it, so the link is sufficiently clear. It is generally assumed that all sorts of notes introduced by a lemma have been copied from a commentary. This is going to be an important criterion when it comes to the discussion of the origins of the marginalia.

After the special examination of each one of the glosses in the previous chapters it remains to be examined in a more general context what their scholarly value is and whether there are some conclusions to be drawn about their origin and function. In their majority, the glosses in papyri are not negligible trivialities. On the contrary, they tend to reappear in the lexica of later periods, primarily in the most important ones, Hesychius, Suda and the Etymologica. Since there were no specialized ancient lexica for tragedy and comedy, such as Harpocration and the Bekker Lexica for rhetoric, Timaeus for Plato and Erotianus for Hippocrates, one should confine one's research to the general lexica like the ones just mentioned. Occasionally, however, like in the case of πεντεσύριγγον ζύλον in P.Grenfell 12 (Ar.*Gerytades* or *Th.* II) or the two glosses in P.Mich. 3690 (Ar.*Heroes*), important references can be found also in the atticistic lexica, namely those of Moeris and Phrynichus as well as those of Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias. These are very useful examples of how varied and interrelated the roots and resonances of a

²⁶ See note 4 and West (1970) who on the basis of *Περὶ Δημοσθένους* criticizes strongly the methods and achievements of Didymus: "What we have here is potted scholarship, hurried compilation rather than intelligent re-interpretation, and that is no proper activity for a learned man. I think we should be cautious in estimating his achievement".

²⁷ See e.g. P.Oxy.44.3151 (Soph. *Ajax Loc.*) and P.Berol.13929 (Ar. *Equ.*, note on v.546) with the relevant discussion by Zuntz (1975) 10-4.

gloss can be and how the same material was dispersed in different lexica of different periods.

Research in Hesychius confirms what has already been illustrated in theory: most glosses from the papyri reappear in this lexicon in the same form or slightly modified. Compared to other sources, it seems that Hesychius is by far the richest as far as dramatic material is concerned. The situation is less clear, however, when in the lexicon the gloss is referred to a play different from the one the gloss of our papyrus comes from. For example, the explanation of ἐπωδὸς in P.Oxy.3718 (Eur.*Or.* and *Ba.*) is found in Hesychius under the lemmata γόης/γοητεύει together with a reference to Euripides' *Hippolytus* 1038. Elsewhere, however, the gloss of the papyrus agrees with the scholia, but the lexica, Hesychius included, offer something different. This is the case with ἔσπερος θεὸς in PSI 1192 (Soph.*OT*): the papyrus glosses it correctly as "Hades" similarly to the scholia, whereas the lexicographers prefer the vague explanation "the one from the west". It seems that this last example can be very helpful in the investigation of the sources of the papyrus glosses. Concerning the grammatical case in which glosses in papyri are given in comparison to their counterparts in lexica, we note that normally the former follow the case that the text has (e.g. ἄρκυσι: περι]βλήμασι in P.Oxy.3718 (Eur.*Or.* and *Ba.*) and Ἡδωνίσι· Θρακίαις in P.Oxy.6.852 (Eur.*Hyps.*)). To this rule there are exceptions which probably have to do with the source, more likely a commentary, from which they were excerpted. It has been shown, however, that even when the papyrus follows the case of the text, the lexica, here Hesychius, have a tendency to turn their lemmata into nominative. This could naturally have happened also in one of their sources like Diogenianus. The prominent position that Hesychius' lexicon has in the reappearance of most of the papyrus glosses in it is easily explained by the fact that one of his main sources, namely Diogenianus, has incorporated in his lexicon the glossaries of Didymus. The papyri then simply confirm what has already been stated on a theoretical level.²⁸

The presence of glosses from the papyri within the rest of lexicography is not quite as regular and systematic as in Hesychius. As far as Photius' lexicon and Suda are concerned, there are correspondences but often these do not go further than the lemmata. The explanations are usually different if not completely opposed. The common ground between Photius and Suda has

²⁸ As Latte noted in his Praefatio (pp. XIV-XV), some sort of interpolation from a paraphrase of Euripides compiled for school use can be found in Hesychius but this is not relevant to the problem of the glosses under discussion in this chapter.

already been explained as due to their common source, the so-called *Synagoge* (7-8th cent.). This was a lexicon based upon the glossary ascribed to Cyrillus of Alexandria²⁹ but expanded by incorporating plenty of material from other lexica, such as the Atticists Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias, Phrynichus, Orus, Apollonius Sophista, rhetorical lexica and also Diogenianus whose epitome survived for many centuries after its use by Hesychius. It is natural that through the channel of these expansions, some of the glossographical material of earlier centuries on drama found its way into Suda and Photius. Some of the similarities between these lexica and Hesychius, however, are due to Cyrillus' glossary with which Hesychius was also heavily interpolated. Yet these similarities can be important and indicative of ancient origin only when the lemma in Hesychius is with certainty ascribed to Diogenianus, therefore only when Cyrillus is excluded. In all other cases, the gloss derived from the Cyrillus' glossary (around the fifth century), which is why the explanations of the same words can be very different, with some lexica transmitting material from the Roman period while others from the early Byzantine period.³⁰ The comic glossary in P.Sorbonne 7, which we examined in pp.133-5, represents strikingly the early stages of lexicography with some of its material reappearing in almost identical form in lexica such as Photius and Suda compiled many centuries later.

The fact that what remains from the various lexica of the Imperial period is fragments scattered in other lexica or grammatical treatises of later centuries, does not allow us to trace the glosses of the papyri to a full extent. It is only by coincidence that a gloss appearing in the margin of a papyrus would reappear among these fragments. It is known, however, that some of these lexicographers such as Aelius Dionysius, Pausanias and Orus had access to Didymus' works, the first two probably through Pamphilus, the third directly.³¹ As examples one could mention the glossing of τελετη in Aelius and the similar notes in P. Rain.1.34 (comm. on Ar. *Pax* republ. in Gronewald (1982) 64ff.) as well as in Timaeus and in the derivatives of the *Synagoge*. Also interesting is the presence of a note on φυλέτης in P.Oxy. 856 (comm. on Ar. *Ach.*) as resonance of a discussion in most lexica such as Orus A27, Aelius D. and Pollux 3,51.

²⁹ For the Cyrillus' glossary see Drachmann (1936) esp. 37-43

³⁰ Such seems to be the case in P.Oxy.1805 (*Soph.Trach.*) with the exact meaning of ἀγορά.

³¹ For Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias see Erbse (1950) 67-9 with the corresponding footnotes.

One can make analogous remarks about the rest of the lexica of this period, namely Orion's *Etymologicon*, Phrynichus, Moeris and Harpocration. Scattered evidence in all these lexica, however, does not really contribute much to our research and does not above all indicate anything similar to what we have noticed for Hesychius, Photius and Suda.

The tracing of glosses from the margins of papyri in the corpus of lexicography is of great importance: first, it indicates the parallel run of two separate branches of scholarship already from the late Hellenistic period up to the Byzantine times. The process is quite well known both for the scholia and lexicography. What is highly interesting is the relation between the two and the ways in which one drew on and took advantage of the other. More about this will be said later on (pp.145-7). Secondly, for texts which are fragmentary or without scholia, the presence of glosses attested also in lexica illustrates the scholarly attention they had received in an earlier period and provides specific examples of it. The presence of glosses is all the more important when together with them the papyri have notes on interpretation. There is a fair chance, then, that they were all excerpted from a commentary on the play which survived without scholia or did not survive at all. In this study, we have tried to apply these methods and theories also to the glosses that were included in papyrus commentaries. The reappearance of papyrus glosses in lexica would be a good argument in favour of the scholarly origin and value of the commentary. An ^{not}isolated gloss, however, can be evaluated with safety. It is not easy to tell a scholarly gloss from an ordinary one when what remains is a single word. One needs more than one gloss or something of more striking value in order to avoid judging as scholarly the product of a simple coincidence. On the other hand, papyri such as P. Oxy.1370 and P. Oxy.3718, both of a late date, can be regarded as cases where the value of the glosses appears certain.

The question which arises after this discussion of the compilation of the first glossaries on tragedy and comedy, of their development as attested in the papyri and of their eventual incorporation into the general lexica, concerns the origins of the marginal glosses which are frequently found in papyri with annotation. From where did the annotator copy the glosses with which he supplied his text? Supposing that they were not products of his personal background, did he copy them from a commentary he consulted or from a glossary at his disposal? Both options seem possible but the problem needs to be discussed further so that the respective arguments are fully presented.

The problem has not been discussed anywhere by Zuntz whose work on the Aristophanes

scholia on papyri is by far the most detailed and reliable study of the subject until today. This is mainly due to the fact that the papyri of Aristophanes that Zuntz chose for his research have obviously drawn their material for marginal annotation from commentaries where one could easily find exegetical and glossographical material brought together by earlier scholars. There are moments during the discussion, however, where his general views about the marginalia become evident: “Herkunft und Wert dieser Notizen sind ganz verschieden: ein Schüler mochte sie nach dem Vortrag seines Lehrers beifügen; sie können Exzerpte aus einem grossen Hypomnema sein etc.”³² And a bit below: “sie sind es (diese Unbekannten), die, nach dem Vortrag eines Grammatikers, auf Grund eines geborgten Hypomnemas, eines Lexikons, oder gar proprio Marte ihre Noten an den Rand der Texte setzten.” So, according to Zuntz, for most part of the marginalia, glosses and exegetical notes, it is from commentaries, lectures and personal ideas that the annotators drew their material. Lexica remain an option but obviously of limited use. At other stages of his discussion, Zuntz emphasizes the role of lexicography by using it very often as a tool in order to clarify the origins of a marginal note or a scholium. Sometimes his results go back to lexica and glossaries, such as those of the Atticists or Didymus. A good example of this is provided by his conclusions regarding the notes on οἰκέτης (1.5) and ἀδελφιδῆ (1.47) in P. Oxy.1371 (Ar. *Nub*). For the first one he says: “... es ist unwahrscheinlich, daß hier überhaupt Didymus vorliegt; und wahrscheinlich, daß unser Scholion aus Aelius Dionysius stammt” and for the second “wenn dort ein attizistisches Lexikon dem Scholiasten die Lehre des Aristophanes von Byzanz vermittelte, wird man das auch hier annehmen”.³³ The role of lexicography, therefore, emerges once again as crucial in the process of the compilation of the scholia. What is not shown, however, in Zuntz’s remarks is the direct transfer of the glosses from the glossaries and lexica into the margins of rolls and codices. Zuntz implies clearly that the lexica were incorporated into the independent commentaries at the various stages of amplification and transformation which the latter underwent. This must have happened gradually from the first century AD to the fifth, the period during which the original Alexandrian commentaries were provided with new material, more often of trivial character suitable for use in schools and at the expense of valuable information about the text that earlier scholars had

³² Zuntz (1975) 79.

³³ Zuntz (1975) 52-3.

accumulated and which finally perished. Again Zuntz in the examination of P. Berol.13929 and the etymology of ῥόθιον in *Equ.*546 notes: “das stumpfe Nebeneinander einer grammatisch-technischen und einer "philosophisch"-stoischen Etymologie älterer Art ist nicht für die Zeit des Didymus, wohl aber seit dem 2.Jahrhundert möglich ... wird also diese Etymologiensammlung in die Aristophanes-erklärung aus einem Lexikon aufgenommen worden sein”. Once again the point made by Zuntz refers to lexicographical material infiltrating commentaries and scholia and not to individual glosses transferred into margins.

The same question is discussed by K. McNamee in an article appended to her monograph on sigla and marginalia.³⁴ This article stems from her study of marginal glosses which do not follow the inflection of the words they are set to explain. Her discussion concentrates on the question of the origins of the glosses. McNamee begins with the widely accepted view that in commentaries lemmata and, therefore, glosses, follow the inflection of the corresponding words of the main text. The natural explanation for that is that any “problematic” glosses are of different origin, namely that they have been copied from lexica in which the lemmata had already been turned into the nominative case. We have earlier presented the two comic glossaries on papyrus (P. Oxy.1801 and P. Sorb.7) and discussed the fact that such lexica were in circulation already from the first century AD. Although it is highly likely that the cases in the original texts were different, the predominant case of the lemmata is nominative. Two objections to this assumption, however, make McNamee’s argumentation turn into the opposite direction: first, the anomalous glosses in question are usually mixed with others inflected correctly. Secondly, the tendency of glossaries not to follow the inflection of the text is not always to be taken for granted. Furthermore, the distinction between glossaries and commentaries is not as strict as one would imagine by using standards of modern scholarship. After that, McNamee states that what appeared as anomalous actually reflects “the question-and-answer method of the *grammatikos* which, as a matter of course, transforms lemmata into the subjects or objects of explanatory sentences”. She comes to the right conclusion, then, that all these glosses and notes have been copied from commentaries: “the information they provide may have found its way into lexica too, but the immediate source of the notes on papyri was commentaries, not lexica”. Her discussion closes with an overall view of the lexica in which glosses in the nominative case seem

³⁴ McNamee (1992a) 65-81.

to be very frequent regardless of the case of the original text.

The balance seems to be very much in favour of glosses being copied together with the rest of the notes from commentaries and not from lexica. A couple of arguments can be added here to strengthen this view: at first, commentaries on tragedy and probably comedy were circulating at least until the sixth century AD. These are represented by two papyri: P. Oslo inv.no.1662, a commentary on Euripides' *Troades* from the fifth and P. Würzburg 1, a commentary on *Phoenissae* from the sixth century (see Appendix to Ch.1). There is no reason why similar texts could not be used by annotators even at this late period when the tendency towards supplying the margins with extensive notes became more and more common. The nature of later commentaries especially of those on drama is not very clear because the evidence from papyri is quite limited. It seems that the scholars of late antiquity compiled new commentaries on the basis of earlier scholarly works by adding plenty of new material serving the needs of the new era. This new material would be similar to the paraphrase which is predominant in the scholia of the manuscripts, in glosses and etymologies from glossaries, ^{reading} notes from lexica and grammars of the new grammarians as well as mythographical material very useful to school purposes. There can be no doubt that the marginalia in the Aristophanes papyri studied by Zuntz come from such commentaries. As far as glosses themselves are concerned, it is very likely that annotators could easily have used either commentaries or glossaries depending on which one was available at the time. This is based on the assumption that the commentaries had already been infiltrated with glosses from lexica and glossaries which had been compiled after the first-second century AD. Another factor in favour of the wider use of commentaries over lexica is the complete absence of tragic glossaries from the corpus of papyri published so far. Comic glossaries have indeed been found and two of them were discussed above but they are still something of a rarity. Moreover, no glossary on a specific play has been found either. Arguments ex silentio are not very safe, of course, but they are indicative of the situation. One should also be reminded of the general lexica into which material from tragedy and comedy was incorporated. Furthermore, one should compare the situation in drama to that in oratory (see e.g. P. Berol.5008, an alphabetical lexicon on Demosthenes' *In Aristocratem*) and that in Homer with the numerous glossaries and lexica. Once again, we see that it was more likely that the glosses we find among the rest of the marginalia were copied from the new commentaries and less often from lexica.

Another aspect of the same problem deals with the fact that in many papyri one finds a mixture of glossographical and exegetical notes, as one does in the scholia of the manuscripts. As examples one could mention P. Oxy.1371 (*Clouds* with marginalia), P. Amh.13 (Ar., unknown) and P. Grenf.12 (Ar. *Gerytades* or *Th II*). It has already been demonstrated that these marginalia were copied from some sort of commentaries. It is impossible, however, to maintain that the annotator used a commentary for the exegetical notes and a glossary for the rest. Rather it all came from one and the same source. The task of bringing together all this material had already been carried out by the people who compiled the mixed commentaries which apart from some other secondary sources constitute the main element of the corpus of the scholia.

Although the balance of the arguments leans more towards the view that glosses were copied from commentaries than from glossaries, there are still cases where the opposite remains an option. P. Oxy.1370 (Eur. *Medea*) for example, has two glosses which McNamee considered as coming from commentaries. Παστάδων and εὐμάρισιν could indeed have originated in a commentary and been copied from it, but, since there is no other note in the fragments of the papyrus, copying from a lexicon cannot be absolutely ruled out. In addition to that, P.Oxy.3718 (Eur. *Or* and *Ba*) offers a series of glosses in one word which in their shortness and accuracy may have come from a glossary. Interestingly, both these papyri are of a quite late date, namely from the fifth century. We know that during this period exegesis of classical authors was acquiring a standard form (pp. 172-5), and in this respect it is common for the marginalia to be similar to the scholia. The increasing need for explanation of classical vocabulary which became more and more difficult to understand probably led to greater use of lexica, such as those of Diogenianus or Cyrillus which were quite rich in material as well as easy to consult. The possibility that annotators had direct access to them at this stage is much bigger than in earlier centuries.

At the end of this discussion of the origin of marginal glosses in the papyri, the conclusion seems clear: in most cases, glosses were copied from commentaries in much the same way as the exegetical notes. The same problem, however, that applies to the latter applies also to the former: marginalia are often school products, notes from lectures or improvisation on the basis of the information provided by the text itself. It is not always easy to name their origins unless the supporting evidence is quite strong. The fact that glosses are normally very short makes classification even more hazardous.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

—

In this study we have dealt primarily with a series of papyri chronologically ranging from the late Ptolemaic to the early Byzantine period, namely shortly before the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs. It was a thematic selection which consisted of papyri from the quite extensive corpus of Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes. As has been set out in the Preface, we have focused our attention on annotated texts from these authors as well as on a few hypomnemata which deserve more attention than they had received in their original publications. Our main purpose was to examine the meaning and value of individual marginalia or explanations of lemmata in commentaries from two perspectives: firstly, from the point of view of the annotator or commentator as an individual with his own personal motives and aims (often very modest) and secondly within the wider framework of classical tradition and scholarship, one end of which goes back to the glorious Hellenistic Alexandria whereas the other one reaches the medieval ages and the famous Byzantine scholars. It was necessary to follow at the same time the development of scholarship in its various stages and its close links with education and book production mainly during late antiquity. Although it is through the corpus of the scholia that we normally approach the immense amount of ancient exegesis on classical literature, the marginalia and hypomnemata on papyrus constitute the direct evidence at least as far as the Graeco-Roman and early Byzantine periods are concerned.

Before we enter the discussion of the conclusions which have arisen from the study of the material in the previous chapters, it is necessary to point out the difficulties and therefore limitations which we faced in the course of our research: first of all, the focus on material from the corpus of the three dramatists and the inevitable exclusion of other authors such as Pindar, Callimachus or Theocritus does not allow a general view of the whole spectrum of literature as one would wish in order to follow the transmission and change of ancient exegesis in its entirety. For all that has been left aside, it is necessary to rely on other studies. Some of them were monographs (e.g. G. Zuntz's study of the Aristophanes papyri)¹, whereas some others were the conclusions which accompany the publication of individual texts (e.g. P. Oxy. 2536, Theon's commentary on *Pythian* 12, P. Berol. 5865 on Aratus *Phen.* [APF 27(1980) 19-32]).

The second problem was that the relevant material for dramatists is not extensive if compared to that of other authors such as Homer, Callimachus or the lyric poets. In the case of

¹ Zuntz (1975).

Aristophanes the most heavily annotated papyri from late antiquity have been studied by Zuntz, whereas the rest belong to lost plays, therefore without scholia to compare. The limited material is even more striking when we come to Euripides who is definitely the most popular of all tragedians according to the statistics based on papyri published so far.² Most of his papyri carry no annotation at all and when they do so it is usually variants and glosses. With the notable exception of two late commentaries³, this is the case throughout the period in question, even during the flourishing period of the Antonines. For Sophocles the situation is more or less the same, with the addition, however, of the so-called scholars' copies from the second and third century Oxyrhynchus, about which more will be said below. It is very common to find a couple of learned notes dispersed among glosses, variants and paraphrase. It is very rare, however, to find more of them put together in the margins and even rarer to find them copied from a scholarly source, namely a hypomnema. For this reason we have made as much as possible out of the material available to us and although some of it may look like isolated instances, as a whole it has helped us to create an overall picture of the nature of annotation and of its relations to classical scholarship of the period in question.

Despite the above difficulties there are still interesting conclusions to be drawn from the study of marginalia and hypomnemata on drama. Most of these conclusions have already been reached or simply touched upon by various scholars in the past. For some like Günther Zuntz and K. McNamee⁴ research started with the study of a selection of papyri small for the former, much larger for the latter. On the basis of this material they developed theories about the early stages of annotation and tried to reconstruct the process of the formation of scholia. Others such as N. G. Wilson⁵ or E. G. Turner⁶ treated the same issue in the much wider context of the history of scholarship, transmission of texts and book production mainly relying on evidence from select

² For the most recent statistical survey see Bouquiaux-Simon and Mertens (1992) 95-107.

³ These are P. Würzburg 1 on *Phoenissae* and P. Oslo inv.no.1662 on *Troades*.

⁴ McNamee (1995). Her main argument is about the need for annotation of legal texts already from the fourth century and the subsequent manufacture of codices of very large format suitable for heavy annotation.

⁵ His two most detailed contributions are Wilson (1967) and (1982).

⁶ Turner (1968) 118-24 (esp.122-4).

papyri, early manuscripts and the indirect tradition. J. Irigoin, H. Maehler and occasionally others have also studied annotated papyri and scholia but each of these studies should be considered separately in the light of the evidence and in the special context in which it was studied. Even so, there is still plenty of primary evidence, namely papyri and manuscripts, to be assessed. In our research the inspection and study of a substantial number of papyri as well as a close look at some other texts outside this limited selection has led to conclusions which are going to offer arguments in favour or against the existing theories and so to contribute to the ongoing debate on the formation of scholia.

It is well known that from the Hellenistic period onwards scholarly exegesis was transmitted in separate rolls in the form of hypomnemata which were in parallel and simultaneous use with the text editions. As often repeated, commentaries, editions, lexica and monographs were the main products of Alexandrian scholarship which enabled the transmission of the vast amount of Hellenistic scholarship during late antiquity. The form and layout of hypomnemata is quite well known since the papyri from Egypt have supplied us with many examples from almost all periods. It is also certain that those people who needed to study carefully the works of classical literature would have to consult two rolls at the same time, admittedly not the most convenient thing to do. Readers in antiquity did not enjoy any of the advantages that we nowadays take for granted, such as word division, full punctuation, accentuation, line numbering and a meticulous system of lectional signs. It is not surprising, therefore, that with some outstanding exceptions (Alcman's *Partheneion* or P. Oxy. 841/ Pindar, *Paeans*) annotation in papyri is on a very limited scale. With a large number of hypomnemata in circulation and probably easy access to them, especially where big libraries existed, there was no need to fully annotate the texts given the limited space between columns. The availability of commentaries has been confirmed by the papyrological discoveries at least of the period until the third century AD after which fundamental changes in society and book production promoted new practices, among which the gradual disappearance of the book roll and hypomnemata. More about this will be said later on but I should stress at this point the wide range covered by commentaries as for example lost plays or works of lyric poetry not surviving in the manuscript tradition. With such a variety of exegesis available in hypomnemata within relatively easy access it is to be expected that annotation was normally kept at a low and not particularly scholarly level, since its role was purely supplementary.

The study of the annotated papyri of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes allows us to distinguish between different kinds of annotation and trace their frequency within this group.⁷ The picture does not change considerably in the case of other authors, although use of dialectal and obsolete words by an author (lyric poetry) or the occurrence of technical vocabulary (Aratus) in the text affect the kind of annotation needed. What is very clear is that the commonest form of marginalia is glosses and variants. These can be found either round the column of the text and close to the words they refer to or even between the lines and above the problematic word or expression. Normally they are not introduced by a lemma, a practice proper to commentaries, but they stand on their own. The question that usually arises and which we tried to answer in the previous chapter (pp.143-7) concerns the origins of the glosses and perhaps the variants, although for the latter there is more to be said. It seems more likely and is often clear that glosses were copied from commentaries. For reasons which have been mentioned in the previous chapter (pp.146-7), glossaries and lexica were not used as sources of annotation, or at least they were used scarcely. Moreover the fact that at the basis of the collections of tragic and comic vocabulary there is Didymus, whose commentaries are one of the most important elements of the scholia as well, does not allow us to tell clearly in which of the two works of Didymus did a gloss originate. What is also very common in the papyri is that elementary annotation of this kind is a mixture of glosses and variants or sometimes exegetical notes. This shows in my opinion that the annotator, whoever each time this person was, would consult a commentary and select from it whatever he found useful, always feeling free to abbreviate, reformulate or expand. There is also the possibility of notes taken down from a lecture but this is difficult to prove. What is really important is that annotation of such sort is a private procedure carried out by the owner of the text according to his preferences and needs.

When it comes to variants the situation is slightly different. On the one hand it is certain that in most cases variants, like glosses, were also copied from commentaries. Ancient scholars would be expected to have included their preferred readings or conjectures in the hypomnemata and not insert them in the text. We find plenty of such material both in hypomnemata on papyri and in the corpus of the scholia usually introduced by *γράφεται* or *ἐν τισιν* etc. Annotators

⁷ A lengthy study of annotated papyri combined with lists and statistical data was made by McNamee (1977).

often found it useful to quote a variant in their text, especially when this entailed noteworthy changes to the meaning. On the other hand, in a number of papyri, some of which have been examined in this study, the biggest part of the annotation consists of variant readings introduced by the standard expressions: οὕτως ἦν ἐν τῷ α´ or β´ or ἐν ἑτέρῳ. Moreover, some of them are attributed to specific scholars such as Aristophanes of Byzantium, Theon and possibly Aristarchus and Nicanor. The exact meaning of these notes is not always clear, as has been pointed out in the chapter on the papyri of Sophocles (pp.89-90). What exactly was meant by the expression “so it was in Theon’s copy” or simply “in the second one” ? Was this a commentary by the scholar in question, an edition he produced or perhaps just a copy found among his books? More questions may be asked concerning the circumstances and the procedure in which these variants were so systematically copied into the margins of the rolls. What seems to be agreed by the modern scholars who have dealt with this problem is that these papyri are the product of collation against one and often more copies of the same text. It is of great interest to our research that this task was carried out by the scribe himself or by some other professional. He would compare the new copy at least to its exemplar. Further collations could be made by the scholar who had ordered the copy. He may have had access to the copies of other famous scholars (borrowing copies from friends or consulting them in a public library are likely options⁸) or even to commentaries by them. One small problem, of course, is the availability of all these works. In my opinion it is very likely that some of these variants, especially the ones from famous people such as Aristophanes of Byzantium were copied directly from annotated private copies or from commentaries and not from Aristophanes’ original editions themselves. For all these reasons, we believe that these papyri were scholars’ copies and we know that in Oxyrhynchus there was a wide circle of highly educated people and scholars with links to Alexandria.⁹ It is really unfortunate that such variants are often in the margins of texts now completely lost or so fragmentary that no clear conclusion can be drawn from them about the basic principles of textual criticism in antiquity.

⁸ We could mention here two papyri exemplifying the private exchange of books: P. Oxy.2192 from the second century shows the interests of scholars in Oxyrhynchus in acquiring books and exchanging them with friends, P. Berol.21849 from the fifth illustrates the loan of books between orators, one of them living in Hermopolis (published in Maehler (1974)).

⁹ Turner (1952) and (1956) and Krüger (1990).

The second category of texts we examined in our study were commentaries from different centuries and on different authors. There was P. Oxy. 856 on Aristophanes' *Acharnians* from the third century AD, P. Rain. 3.20 on the *Clouds* and P. Rain. 1.34 on the *Peace* from the fifth century as well as P. Würzburg 1 on Euripides' *Phoenissae* from the sixth century. A number of other commentaries on Aristophanes has been deliberately left out because they deal with lost plays and any conclusions about their position in the history of scholia would involve a lot of speculation. The first immediate conclusion we could draw is that there are no striking similarities between our commentaries and the existing corpus of scholia. This is especially the case with the earlier commentaries. Obviously none of them brings to light any of the hypomnemata that were later transferred into the margins of parchment manuscripts either. Nevertheless, one should not necessarily condemn them as useless examples of scholarship in decline. In the past, it was common among editors to ascribe such texts to mediocre schoolmasters of late antiquity or clumsy epitomators. A closer look at individual points, however, showed that in them there is plenty of useful information either linguistic or related to interpretation. Occasionally these commentators come up with much more accurate explanations than and use sources absent from the scholia which although they collect all sorts of information often miss the main point. The value and scholarly origin of such elements is clearly confirmed by their reappearance in other parts of the tradition such as mythological compendia like Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* or lexica such as Hesychius and Suda. This is one of the main reasons why each comment must be examined on its own merits and on what it has to offer and not be rejected in advance on grounds of the overall inferiority of the hypomnema. On the other hand, of course, it is also very common to find comments simply paraphrasing the poet's text and seeking solutions to problems only with the help of the context, that is without any further investigation in other works of the same author and works of reference by earlier scholars. One possible way to assess the value of papyrus commentaries is to regard them as by-products of the mainstream scholarly works. By this I mean compilations based upon famous hypomnemata by authorities such as Aristarchus or more likely Didymus which were subsequently abbreviated and augmented according to the personal preferences and needs of the compiler. Normally they were closer to the standards of school environment which would ask for more of elementary paraphrase and explanation of difficult words, at the expense of long citations from other literary works and references to the views of earlier scholars.

The discussion comes inevitably to one of the main aspects of the ancient exegesis, namely the way it was perceived and transmitted by copyists and users. To start from the users, their attitude was characterized by lack of respect towards the actual words and arguments of earlier scholars and commentators. This had the effect that when copying scribes felt free to omit entire sections or more often to paraphrase in order to shorten or emphasize specific points. Moreover it would be very common to add material drawn from other sources. Even commentaries bearing the names of famous scholars such as Aristarchus, Didymus and Theon did not escape this process. There are two characteristic examples of this practice: the first one is P. Amh.12 from the third century AD, a commentary by Aristarchus on the first book of Herodotus which seems to have been abbreviated because it covers a large amount of text in a rather brief manner. The second is P. Oxy. 2536, a fragment of Theon's commentary on Pindar's *Pythian* 12 from the second century; this one illustrates clearly the process we have described above. Not one but two people thought it necessary to add more material to Theon's original text. For this they used every available space such as the bottom margin and the space between the columns. It would not be surprising if a subsequent copyist inserted all additional notes into the main text without any indication whatsoever about different authorship.

The flexibility and relaxed attitude of the copyists and users towards commentaries led the transmission of ancient exegesis to a direction very different from that of the classical texts themselves. As far as the classical texts are concerned, a very deep sense of respect and faithfulness was reserved to the readings of tradition.¹⁰ Very few of the textual alterations suggested by the Alexandrians entered the manuscript tradition. Their views were expressed in hypomnemata and monographs. In the case of glossaries and lexica, on the other hand, a situation to that of commentaries must have occurred; their ^{similar} abbreviation and conflation must have started at a very early stage, even within the same generation as the original.¹¹ As a conclusion, one can regard ancient exegesis as circulating in a form far from standard. This notion looks definitely very strange to the modern reader who is used to books being reproduced mechanically and with care for the slightest detail. It should always be borne in mind that in

¹⁰ See Turner (1968) 100-12, Fraser (1972) 475-9 and Pfeiffer (1968) 173-4.

¹¹ One can mention as a striking example Pamphilus' lexicon which was epitomized by Diogenianus and possibly J. Vestinus soon after it was written because of its large size.

antiquity the publisher's system was very different and works like hypomnemata were not intended for a very wide public in libraries outside Alexandria.

Although a hypomnema usually occupied one roll and was used together with the corresponding text, which was also in one roll, other possibilities cannot be excluded. As P. Oxy. 856, the commentary on Aristophanes' *Acharnians* indicates, a very selective commentary could cover a whole play in a limited number of columns, thus allowing the accommodation of more than one hypomnema in a roll or a codex at a later period. Reasons of convenience must have favoured such practical innovations especially after the so-called "Selection" established itself by limiting the number of texts in circulation and study to a very small one. Schools and private libraries are very likely candidates for the ownership and usage of such compilations.

It is unfortunate that for the purposes of our research the number of surviving hypomnemata on tragedy and comedy is small, contrary to what one may have expected. Commentaries on lost plays, especially from the first to the third century AD, can offer clues as to what earlier hypomnemata looked like and what sort of exegesis they contained. It is impossible, however, to draw from them any conclusions relevant to our research without relying on speculation. The absence of scholia and more importantly of the text itself deprives us of one of the main methods, which is comparison between material offered in hypomnemata and material in the margins of manuscripts. Commentaries on lost plays, therefore, can be of limited use, despite the fact that they illustrate the interests and wide range of ancient exegesis as well as how much has been lost during late antiquity.

Before we enter into a different period in the development of ancient scholarship, we should mention a couple of general points concerning the relations between commentaries and marginalia. First of all, it has been often pointed out that the origin of marginal notes is not easily determined. Some of them may be the work of the annotator himself, products of his wider readings, lectures he gave or attended, personal thoughts and interpretations. Some other notes have been copied from hypomnemata, available to the scribe or more likely to later users of the papyrus. The quality of the notes taken from hypomnemata is generally higher. The way to identify notes which have been taken from hypomnemata is usually by the presence of lemmata used to introduce the explanations in commentaries. When copying from commentaries, annotators would often copy the relevant lemmata as well, although these were no longer absolutely necessary in the margins. Secondly, the main limitation imposed on the marginal

notes was that of space. As a result of this, the material derived from hypomnemata underwent considerable changes: as a rule, names of scholars were omitted, hence, the marginalia are anonymous. Moreover, the process of abbreviation entails omission of citations from other scholarly or literary sources, shortening or complete omission of lemmata and slight or more serious changes in wording. The above mentioned freedom in adapting and abbreviating commentaries is conspicuously present in the procedure of transferring hypomnemata into the margins. Finally, it is clear that after so many modifications it is a difficult task to assess the real value hidden behind brief and obscure marginalia. It is usually with the help of reappearances of the same material in other texts, namely scholia and lexica, that we are able to identify scholarly elements and distinguish between important and trivial pieces of information. Even this method, however, has its own risks since scholia and lexica are themselves a mixture of material derived from sources of unequal value.

Up to this point, all the major and minor conclusions discussed concern scholarly and scholastic exegesis and their main features during the Ptolemaic and the biggest part of the Greco-Roman Egypt. Hitherto, for reasons relating to the dates of most papyri in this study, the emphasis has been upon the first three centuries AD. The situation, however, changes immensely after the third century. New developments occur in the whole of the Empire and therefore in Egypt as well, where the evidence of papyri makes them more visible and better documented. The first radical change is the gradual Christianization of the Roman Empire, a process culminating in the fourth century when Christianity acquired finally the status of the official religion. The second development concerns the slow decline of classical letters during a period of great social and political changes when classical studies had to compete with the ever increasing Christian literature and education. The first two changes coincided with, and perhaps caused, important changes in book production: the traditional papyrus roll was replaced by the codex and the number of classical texts in circulation shrank considerably. What took place was the so-called "Selection", a process of picking out a small group of texts from each author suitable for and dictated by the demands of the school curriculum. All these radical changes happened in a period when many new centres of studies developed outside Egypt. To what extent each new centre influenced scholarship and more specifically book production is not always clear, given that papyrological evidence from Egypt continues to be far richer and often more reliable than the indirect information on scholarly activities in the rest of the Eastern

empire. The effects of these changes on the nature and transmission of scholarship are great and at the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century nothing seems to be as it was in the Greco-Roman period we examined earlier.

After a period of strong persecution by the Romans, the Christian religion managed eventually to overcome all obstacles and become the most powerful force both in the higher and the lower classes of society. Constantine became the first Christian emperor and with the exception of Julian, the fourth century saw an immense advance of Christians in administration, education and literature.¹² This is the period of Christian fathers and strong bishops such as Athanasius were ready to fight even against the Emperor's will. In the following centuries paganism retreated to very limited circles of people whereas Christianity as the predominant religion embraced and promoted by the Imperial household managed to close down pagan Schools such as the one in Athens in 529, destroy pagan temples and gradually isolate the last remaining pagan intellectuals and teachers by not allowing them to practise their profession in 546.¹³ After the reign of Justinian paganism is almost extinct.

During this period of change, conflict and fanaticism, classical literature and education found themselves under threat and in a defending position. Rhetorical and philosophical speech did not seem appropriate in addressing the wide public and communicating Christian preaching to ordinary people. Christian morality was not to be very happy with the models and examples provided by pagan literature either. It is not surprising then that some Christian writers attacked severely pagan authors, even tried to exclude them from the school curriculum. Despite the official anti-pagan policy, however, classical literature did not disappear from education, let alone circulation in general.¹⁴ On the contrary, educated classes continued to study classics and scholars to write commentaries, lexica and monographs as the earlier generations did, only on a more limited scale. Christian fathers did not reject classical education but instead favoured a selective use of pagan authors since they themselves had studied in pagan Schools like Athens under famous pagan teachers like Libanius. The result was that gradually Christian and pagan

¹² For more details and extensive bibliography see CAH (1998).

¹³ There is a detailed description of the period and events in Cavallo (1978).

¹⁴ On education and culture see Cameron (1998).

elements mixed and began to coexist in the educational system of late antiquity. Classical education escaped the danger of becoming completely extinct but its adaptation into a system very different from the old one and also in a socially and culturally shifting environment brought about many changes.¹⁵

The problem of education in late antiquity does not belong to the field covered by this study and has been discussed from many different perspectives elsewhere. It is apparent, however, that scholarly activities and book circulation in late antiquity are very closely linked to the standards and limitations imposed by educational practices. It should be briefly mentioned here that the older system of education was based on rhetorical studies and the ability to understand and possibly imitate classical style and language. Still in the fourth century famous orators like Themistius and Libanius continued this tradition, being both powerful and influential personalities themselves. At the same time, however, the need for new members in the imperial administration equipped with knowledge of Latin and notarial skills made more traditional qualifications irrelevant and unpractical. Professional and vocational training led fast to the decline of rhetorical studies and the formation of a uniform and more focused curriculum.¹⁶ This affected considerably classical studies and increased the demand for technical works such as grammatical treatises, glossaries like the one attributed to Cyrillus of Alexandria, and legal and medical studies. The level of literacy gradually decreased and the situation became very serious after the period of Justinian until the beginning of the so-called “Dark Ages”. The reasons for the decline are, of course, more complicated and coincide with a period of wars, natural disasters and disappearance or heavy destruction of cities of the Eastern Empire.¹⁷ In the West the situation is not very different from that of the East. Because of social and political changes circulation of books in the fourth and fifth centuries tends to diminish and stays in the hands of

¹⁵ See Mango (1980) 125-37 and Marrou (1956) 314-29.

¹⁶ See Cameron (1978) 673-9 and Cavallo (1986).

¹⁷ For more see Mango (1980) 60-79. He writes for example: (p.66) “the period in question witnessed a remarkable succession of droughts, plagues of locusts, earthquakes and other calamities (...) It would have taken many years, indeed several generations, to recover fully from such a combination of calamities. This respite was not granted to many eastern provinces”.

the aristocratic élite of Rome and other cities like Ravenna.¹⁸ We hear also about grammarians equally famous to their colleagues in the East and also very attached to the authorities who occasionally grant them public offices and honours.¹⁹ The decline in classical studies and circulation of books is rapid and more visible after the reconquest of Italy by the forces of Justinian.

The new cultural, social and political conditions which the classical heritage faced after the fourth century affected seriously the production and circulation of pagan literature. It is known that book production, at least according to the evidence from Egypt, reached a peak in the second century AD due mainly to the revival of classical studies in the age of the Antonines. Immediately after this period a gradual and steady fall begins in the number of texts, some of which will never appear again in the manuscript tradition. A recovery in the case of authors such as Aristophanes in the fifth century is exceptional and does not change the overall picture as stated above. Despite the absence of a complete up-to-date list of published papyri, the conclusions from some provisional lists do not seem to alter the data derived from Pack² and it is likely that further publications will only add a few more exceptions to the general rule.²⁰ From a historical point of view, as has been already indicated for the field of education, the age of Justinian was marked by a much faster decline after which any prospects of complete recovery were no longer realistic.

Historical sources and modern research by and large agree that during the reigns of Theodosius (379-395) and Justinian (527-565) the policy against paganism and classical studies was strengthened and that it employed every method of suppression including the burning of pagan books in 562.²¹ On the other hand, however, efforts were made to preserve at least part of the classical heritage, namely books under risk of destruction. Two instances from the fourth

¹⁸ In Cavallo (1978) 201-11 one finds a brief account of the period. Also in Reynolds and Wilson (1991³) 36-9 and 79-86.

¹⁹ Kaster (1988) discusses all aspects of a grammarian's role and personality and gives a prosopographical list from 250 to 565 AD.

²⁰ A detailed study Cavallo (1986). For lists of texts from late antiquity see Maehler (1997) 125-8 and Treu (1986). It should be stressed, of course, that Christian texts are not included in such statistics for obvious reasons.

²¹ I. Malalas, *Chronographia* 18, p.491 di Bonn.

century are worth mentioning: first, in a speech by Themistius addressed to the emperor Constantius in AD 357 the orator praises him for having organized the rescue of old decaying books containing the wisdom of the ancients. This did not aim so much at the preservation of standard authors such as Homer whose survival was guaranteed by their authority, but primarily of works of secondary rank which were threatened by lack of demand and increasing indifference.²² Themistius specified the provision of resources for this task and one can assume that it was all part of the reorganization of the public library in the newly founded capital of Constantinople. A second example of a similar imperial initiative can be seen in the Theodosian codex. The entry of May the 8th, 372 orders the appointment of four Greek and three Latin copyists “selected for copying the manuscripts of the library and for repairing them on account of their age” (*Cod.Theod.* XIV 9,2). The job must have included also the transfer of some texts from rolls into codices but this was not necessarily the main objective.²³ Fifty years later, in 425, Theodosius II founded the University of Constantinople, which though not a university in the modern sense, was an institution providing state supported education by grammarians, orators and sophists as well as professors of philosophy and law both in Greek and Latin. This act together with the arrival of many scholars such as Orus, Pamprepius and Horapollo from the provinces to Constantinople illustrates the attempts of the Emperor to elevate educational standards and general cultural life by taking advantage of the traditionally pagan system. It would be surprising if this did not mean some sort of encouragement for the production and circulation of classical texts at least within the capital.

The period we have been discussing is marked not only by changes in the attitude towards classical literature but also by more specific modifications in the form and number of texts in circulation. During the first centuries AD a new kind of book, the codex, started to compete with the traditional papyrus roll. Various reasons made the codex much more suitable

²² Themistius, *Or.* 4.59 d - 60 c: ... ὅσοι δὲ ὀπαδοί τε ἐκείνων καὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐξαρκεῖ ἑαυτοῖς πρὸς διαμονήν ... πολλοὺς μὲν Ὅμηρου ὑποφήτας καὶ νεωκόρους, πολλοὺς δὲ Ἡσιόδου θεραπευτάς, Χρῦσιππὸν τε αὐτὸν ἤδη καὶ Ζήνωνα καὶ Κλεάνθηνα ... On this speech see Vanderspoel (1995) 96-100.

²³ Irigoin (1952) 99 n.2: “Je comprendrais volontiers que Thémistios fait allusion à des éditions commentées d' Homère e d' Hésiode, c'est-à-dire des poètes en général ”. His interpretation agrees with his theory about an early archetype of the scholia.

for the reading public and therefore destined to become the only type of book after the fourth century. These reasons have been discussed thoroughly elsewhere,²⁴ so it is enough to repeat them here very briefly: the codex was much more convenient in use compared to the roll since it created for the first time the unity of a page, still today the main element of books and of electronic communication (e.g. 'web pages'). In a codex one can accommodate more text than in a roll. This gave the opportunity to form groups of texts by the same author and bring them together in one easily consulted book. Furthermore, codex facilitated reference, very difficult in the long papyrus roll of the past. Apart from practical reasons, however, it seems that Christians favoured the new book form and adopted it to a certain extent in order to dissociate themselves from the roll which had been the exclusive means of transmission of pagan literature for centuries. The abandonment of the roll is in itself a revolution in book production; although it did not happen suddenly but progressively, it was due to affect seriously other aspects of book circulation too.

Until the second century AD the amount of classical literature in circulation was more or less the same as that possessed and edited by the Alexandrians. This is confirmed by papyrological evidence as well as by quotations in authors of the time. A look at the number of tragedies and comedies as well as of lyric poetry from Oxyrhynchus of the first two centuries AD illustrates clearly how much did not survive for long after. From the third century onwards the number of texts shrinks and we end up with a so-called "Selection", pretty close to the corpus which through Byzantium reached modern times. Another earlier process of selection had happened in Alexandria probably in the time of Callimachus and Aristophanes of Byzantium and had led to the formation of the canon of classical authors. In both cases what was left outside the selection fell into oblivion and perished with the exception of occasional appearances in anthologies and quotations.

The selection of classical texts has been much discussed since Wilamowitz who argued for a systematic and quick process carried out by a schoolmaster possibly in the early third century AD. Arguments against this theory have not disproved it completely but only modified

²⁴ Roberts and Skeat (1983). For more specific effects on literary texts see Canfora (1974) and Irigoin (1994) esp.67ff.

it and added further dimensions prompted by the evidence of papyri published in this century.²⁵ It seems more likely now that the selection of the third century was the end of a process which started much earlier and related to readers' preferences, availability of commentaries and certainly educational usefulness. Moreover, this theory applies better to dramatic texts to which it referred in the first place and should not necessarily be applied to all authors. Despite the various considerations about the earlier origins of the selection, however, it remains a fact that from the third century the selection gets its final and standard form. The beginning of a decline in classical studies as described earlier on is definitely the main historical factor which in a way created and pushed forward the conditions for the diminishing of the number of texts people read and studied. School cannot be disregarded, of course, as its environment, needs and purposes were best served by the selection. Literature was adapted to the school curriculum, which as we have seen, tended towards a more uniform and practical character for the purposes of a more vocational and less idealistic education appropriate to bureaucrats and administrators. Of course, what was thought suitable to education must not have been far from common and popular choices, as it is the case with tragedy and comedy.

The invention of the codex and the gradual disappearance of the roll facilitated the process of selection. For the first time, it was made possible to put together a substantial number of texts which would otherwise need the space of several rolls. The new book form encouraged the creation of corpora, groups of texts from one author or genre. The seven plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles and the book of Pindar's *Epinicia* are well known examples of this. Although individual texts outside the selection have appeared on papyri after the third century, these are so exceptional that they cannot change the overall picture. Finally and as far as commentaries are concerned, the ones on plays outside the selection became immediately useless and therefore perished. Even the commentaries that survived underwent severe changes in the period that followed the selection but these will be discussed later on.

Up to now it has become obvious that revolutionary changes in the most crucial areas of book production created entirely different conditions for the survival and continuation of classical studies. On top of them, however, the scholarship shifted from the traditional urban

²⁵ Wilamowitz (1907) 173-219. See also Zuntz (1965) 254-61 and Barrett (1964) 50-3.

centres to the new ones which flourished in late antiquity.²⁶ In the past Alexandria, Athens and Rome were the places where famous scholars lived, taught and wrote. At the time when the situation in the West was changing dramatically, cities such as Antioch, Berytus and Gaza set up schools of rhetoric, philosophy and law. Personalities such as Libanius and Procopius of Gaza taught in these places and their schools were attended by many pupils. From this list of cities one cannot omit Constantinople, the new capital, which did not manage, however, to eclipse the glory of Athens or Antioch at least until the sixth and seventh centuries when a series of natural disasters and enemy invasions brought the loss of the provinces of Syria, Palestine and Egypt.²⁷ The biggest part of scholarly activities continued to take place in big provincial cities with long literary traditions. As regards Egypt in particular, the school of Alexandria, which took up the activities of the Museum, existed until the Arab conquest, although it is likely that the Library was destroyed in the late fourth century, a period of strong fanaticism and conflicts between Christians and pagans.²⁸ Like elsewhere, however, the focus had already shifted mainly to the interpretation of Platonic philosophy and science such as medicine and astronomy. There is also evidence about literary and possibly scholarly activities in the rest of Egypt. Early Byzantine Oxyrhynchus provides us with a number of classical texts written in codices, often heavily annotated. Panopolis was probably an equally important city with a school where Greek was taught and a library with books of classical authors such as Homer and Menander.²⁹ Nonnos, the poet of *Dionysiaca* also came from there. Papyri seem to indicate that in Hermopolis too one could have access to plenty of classical books. A group of papyrus codices from the excavations in Hermopolis includes authors such as Homer, Aristophanes, Sophocles, Euripides, Theocritus, Apollonius and Menander. It would be useful to know in whose hands all these texts were and whose literary interests they reflect but this is not an easy task given the problematic fate of the

²⁶ For a thorough discussion see Wilson (1996²) 28-60.

²⁷ Cavallo (1995).

²⁸ The temple and the library of the Sarapeum were attacked and destroyed in 391. There is still controversy as to whether this was the end of the library; it is possible that some volumes continued to exist until the Arab conquest. See El-Abbadi (1990) 145-78 and Canfora (1989) 81-99.

²⁹ The question of a library belonging either to a private school or a monastery has divided papyrologists. See Fournet (1992) 253-66, Blanchard (1991) 211-20 and Bagnall (1993) 102-4.

papyrus findings from Hermopolis since their discovery at the beginning of this century. It has been suggested that most of these papyri belonged to the élite of the city, big and powerful families of land owners prominent in the late fourth and fifth centuries.³⁰ This must have been a private library going from one generation to the other. There is, of course, also the possibility of a number of books being part of a library of a school or even of a Christian institution together with books of Christian literature. As regards the general literary atmosphere in Egypt in this period, the literary movement of pagan poets in the fourth and fifth centuries included people such as Claudian, Horapollon and Olympiodorus, some of whom were well educated by famous scholars or were scholars themselves.³¹ It has been suggested that these people came from rich families of landowners in Upper Egypt, like the ones we saw in Hermopolis with interest in Homer and the dramatists and in possession of large codices of these works.

Libraries continued to exist also outside Egypt and it is likely that discoveries in the eastern provinces such as Syria or Palestine will bring to light fragments of literary texts from codices of late antiquity. Indirect evidence gives plenty of information on possession of books but the nature of works of late antiquity and their strong rhetorical features do not always allow modern scholars to conclude whether the author had the classical text in his hands, was quoting from memory or from an anthology. Libanius is a characteristic example of a library owner of the fourth century.³² His library included among others the three tragedians and Aristophanes. Euripides seems to have been his favourite but it is also quite certain that his collection of drama did not exceed the number of plays that have come down to our era. More interestingly, Libanius had in his collection some commentaries, for instance one on Aristophanes - not necessarily on all the selected plays - and one on Demosthenes. The authorship of the commentaries cannot be proved but there is some evidence for a Dionysius and Didymus. Especially in the provinces that suffered from earthquakes and invasions until their conquest by the Arabs, the fate of these libraries must have been that of destruction, although isolated examples of survival cannot be excluded given the interest of the Arabs in scientific, philosophical and medical texts.

³⁰ See Maehler (1997) 119-25 and by the same author *BGU* 12 (Berlin 1974) xvi-xxviii. For a more cautious interpretation of the evidence, van Minnen and Worp (1993) 151-86.

³¹ Cameron (1965).

³² More in Norman (1964) and Wolf (1952).

From what has been said above, it is absolutely clear that the period of late antiquity and early Byzantium was not simply a troubled period lacking completely in scholarly achievements. As far as book production and general scholarship are concerned, slow decline at the beginning and rapid decline towards the end is a rather indisputable fact. The changes that occurred in these times, however, and in particular the innovations in books, determined to a great extent the subsequent appearance of books as well as the survival or disappearance of a large part of classical literature. Moreover, the choices and compilations of this period are more or less what the scholars of the ninth and tenth century used in compiling the archetypes of texts and scholia. The importance of these changes can be practically seen when one compares the appearance of books from the second and third centuries with their equivalents of the ninth and tenth centuries. On the one hand you have papyrus rolls written in majuscule and usually accompanied by hypomnemata written separately and containing all the relevant scholarly exegesis. On the other hand, in the tenth century there are large parchment manuscripts written in minuscule with large amounts of scholia surrounding the main text on each page.

Our attention will now focus on the process of the formation of scholia, as this emerged during our study of the selected papyri of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes as well as of some other important texts already examined by others in monographs and articles. It is a known fact that the history of scholia has been the object of a long debate among modern scholars which started earlier this century and continues to divide scholarship even today, although the existing gap is no longer as big as it used to be at the beginning. A brief historical presentation of the most influential contributions will enable us to understand the extent of different views and follow the development of the debate together with some new aspects that research has added to the traditional argumentation on the problem.

The first pole in the controversy over the creation of scholia was established by Wilamowitz who spoke in his *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* of the edition of the select plays as having scholia in its margins.³³ His view was universally adopted as valid and remained influential for the first four decades of this century. Other scholars elaborated the theory further by extending it also to authors such as Aristophanes. J. W. White in his edition of the scholia on *Aves* spoke of a parchment codex of the fourth or fifth century that contained the select comedies

³³ Wilamowitz (1907) 196: "...Daß die Schulausgabe Scholien hatte, liegt in ihrer Natur".

with a full scale commentary in the margins.³⁴ No doubt this was thought to be the archetype of the manuscripts of the tenth century, especially as far as scholia are concerned. J. Irigoin is another scholar who followed Wilamowitz's steps in his detailed account of the history of the text of Pindar. According to him, "il est donc très vraisemblable que, vers la fin du 2e siècle, le choix des *Épinicies* avec son commentaire, a été transcrit sur un codex de papyrus".³⁵ This theory seems to have had impact on most classical authors, Homer and Hesiod included.

The ever increasing papyrological evidence during the first half of this century, however, was not in support of Wilamowitz and his followers. It should not be much of a surprise, therefore, that the theory that still represents the other pole of the debate started with a research relying basically on the papyri of Aristophanes. With two long articles published in 1938 and 1939 G. Zuntz maintained that it was no longer possible to argue for an archetype of the scholia dated as early as the third or fourth century.³⁶ On the contrary, his conclusions led to a much later date, namely the ninth or tenth century. The material he used consisted of late papyri of Aristophanes with plenty of marginalia. A very thorough and exhausting analysis of the notes in relation to all available sources such as lexica and scholia on other authors revealed a very complex system of links between the notes on papyri and the scholia of the manuscripts. Zuntz achieved an exemplary presentation of the history of Aristophanic scholia in late antiquity by focusing especially on the multiple strata of exegesis which were eventually brought together in the margins of the byzantine manuscripts. He was also the first to point out the importance of the *catenae*, running commentaries on ecclesiastical texts compiled from different sources, as a model for the scholiasts on secular literature. In order to support his theory for such a late date, Zuntz accepted the survival of commentaries and monographs through the Dark Ages (seventh and eighth centuries) and claimed that it was only after the invention of minuscule that scribes were able to transfer into the margins such a big amount of ancient exegesis.

Zuntz's theory was not universally accepted and in the following years there were still scholars arguing for the old view of an early annotated edition of the select plays and of lyric

³⁴ White (1914) lxiii-lxv.

³⁵ Irigoin (1952) 97-100.

³⁶ Zuntz (1975).

poems. We have already mentioned Irigoin who rejected the idea of a late archetype of scholia in his study on Pindar but there were also other scholars who were not not convinced by Zuntz. Irigoin continues to support the model of an early annotated codex until today although there are not many who would share his view as a whole. Zuntz, on the other hand, reconsidered his original conclusions twice on the basis of new evidence. In a brief discussion of the problem in 1965 he conceded that it was possible for some commentaries to have passed into the margins already in late antiquity and that in some cases the compiler of the scholia had to use both commentaries and annotated codices.³⁷ Given also the nature of late antique hypomnemata as a combination of extracts from various older sources, it becomes likely that at least for some authors the process of compiling a corpus of scholia had begun definitely earlier than the tenth century.

The third major contribution to the debate was made by N. G. Wilson in 1967.³⁸ From the point of the evidence used it was again papyri that necessitated a review of the existing theories. The publication in 1952 of P. Oxy.2258, a codex of Callimachus from a very late period, brought to light a type of book especially designed for and indeed supplied with plenty of marginalia. It is an exceptional text since it is of very large size and offers more than one comment on each lemma.³⁹ For the first time scholars came across an example of a compilation from different sources coming from late antiquity, a unique piece of evidence to base the new theories on safer ground. Wilson attempted to bridge the gap between Wilamowitz's and Zuntz's theories by examining each aspect of the problem separately and not only from a technical side. On the one hand he saw as likely the survival of some commentaries into the ninth century, which together with the annotated codices of earlier times were used by the scholars of this period to create the corpus of scholia. On the other hand, however, he searched in late antiquity for known technical features of the scholia such as ἄλλωζ, manuscripts of large format and early examples of amalgamation. His results showed that all of them can be found in late antiquity, although not always in the fully developed form of the tenth century. In addition, the

³⁷ Zuntz (1965) 272-5.

³⁸ See Wilson (1967).

³⁹ For a description see the first edition and Turner (1977) 49 and 84 as well as Turner (1987) 67 with plate.

examination of the catenae took him to the problem of their relation to scholia, one of Zuntz's main points. Procopius of Gaza who is considered the inventor of the catena lived at the turn of the fifth century. Some of the features, however, that catenae and scholia have in common have already been found in even earlier periods. According to Wilson, direct imitation of the catenae by the scholia cannot be proved. It would be surprising if scribes did not imitate one of the main features of the catena, that of citing sources by name.⁴⁰ Wilson's influential contribution finishes with an attempt to link the compilation of scholia to the Gaza School, definitely at an age three or four centuries earlier than Zuntz had originally assumed.

Since 1967 when Wilson offered a well founded alternative to the two existing theories, no study on a similar large scale has appeared. Instead, scholars have focused their efforts upon very specific aspects of the problem such as the format and nature of exegesis in late antiquity. Interestingly enough, Zuntz in the second edition of his articles (1975) offered some more thoughts on the subject. Basically he did not move from his original view about a late date for the archetypes of codices with full scholia. He simply conceded to the view that there were some earlier stages, one of them represented by the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus. In his own words: "eine solche [die neue, aesthetisch und materiell befriedigende Form] war gegeben mit der hochbyzantinischen "Ersten Renaissance". This updated version of the old theory of 1938 was supported also by H. Maehler in 1993 with the argument that the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus is not enough proof for an early compilation of scholia and that there is no example of a manuscript from late antiquity with the full corpus of scholia written even in a very small majuscule script.⁴¹ On the other hand, K. Dover in his lengthy introduction to Aristophanes' *Frogs* argued for late antique manuscripts of Aristophanes with scholia. It is worth quoting two passages illustrating his views: "When the first medieval codices of Aristophanes were made in the tenth century, the texts surviving from late antiquity were already furnished with a variety of scholia, which had only to be transcribed". And later on: "... but there is one consideration which strongly supports the hypothesis that ancient scholia, not an ancient commentary, were the immediate source of the scholia in medieval manuscripts of Aristophanes. An alternative explanation of a passage is sometimes introduced by ἄλλως (...). On the assumption that no

⁴⁰ A very recent brief discussion of the issue is in Wilson (1997).

⁴¹ Maehler (1994) 137.

commentator repeated himself so grossly, this type of scholion cannot be taken as a whole from a commentary, but must be the product of combining two scholia, from different exemplars, which were originally both excerpted from one and the same item in a commentary”.⁴²

The most recent discussion of the problem has been offered by K. McNamee in three articles expanding the same idea, namely that it was in the law schools of the East that the practice of heavy and systematic annotation developed. They even combined elements from different sources similarly to the scholia of the manuscripts and the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus.⁴³ McNamee gathered examples of heavily annotated papyri from late antiquity and came to the conclusion that this is the first time there seems to be a relation between format and annotation, since codices were specially manufactured in order to accommodate large portions of exegesis. The task of annotating these texts was possibly carried out by the scribes themselves even before the codices were assembled. Moreover, the evidence shows that from the fifth century there was also a relation between the predominance of Greek over Latin and the need to use extra space in margins for relevant annotation of Latin legal texts. More students without good knowledge of Latin meant greater need for translations, notes and glosses for the study of the Latin originals. On the basis of three specific examples, P. Ryl. III 477 (Cicero), P. Ant. 3.153 (Law) and the Scholia Sinaitica (on Ulpian’s *Libri ad Sabinum*) which McNamee thinks illustrate a deliberate transfer of scholarly material, and indeed from multiple sources in the second and third case, she concludes that (McNamee (1995) 414) “the process [of the compilation of scholia] may have begun even earlier, possibly as early as 400.” The only reservation that she expressed refers to the majority of annotations in these codices of large format being scholastic and not scholarly. Strikingly enough, one of the two papyri with purely scholarly annotation on a literary text is the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus.

After this brief presentation of the debate over the stages and date of formation of the scholia, we will attempt to reconsider the major aspects of the problem and by taking into account the results of our study we will also express our personal opinion, to the extent that this is possible.

At first, it should be said clearly that both Wilamowitz’s and Zuntz’s theories about an

⁴² Dover (1993) 94-102.

⁴³ McNamee (1995), (1997) and (1998).

early or late compilation of scholia are no longer tenable. The former was contradicted by the huge amount of evidence from papyri published during this century, the latter by papyri such as the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus and further research into the sources from late antiquity. Zuntz was even compelled to adapt his theory to the new discoveries and to start talking of “Vorstufe”, namely earlier stages of manuscripts with scholia such as the much discussed Callimachus. In order to form a clear image of the development and various stages of the transmission of ancient exegesis in late antiquity we have to examine separately each one of the factors which led to the abandonment of commentaries and the eventual creation of scholia.

The first important factor involved is that of the format. It is understandable that there could be no “scholia” in the limited space provided by rolls. Annotation in rolls has been discussed many times in this study but the conclusion even in the most prominent cases has been that rolls by definition and manufacture were not made to receive huge amount of exegesis. There can be no question of transcribing entire commentaries in rolls nor of conflating from two different sources. It was only after the establishment of the codex as a medium of transmission of texts that scribes allowed more and more space to be left blank for the accommodation of notes. The advantages and capacity of the codex have already been described above. It is interesting to quote here E. G. Turner’s remark on the topic since it conveys in the best possible way the meaning and function of the codex: “One portion of Justinian’s work is entitled *Codex Justinianus*, that is comprehensiveness is the final aim of the codex. That a work should be all-inclusive is now its *raison d’être*. Such a work must be in large format, and the large format offers the opportunity to include alongside the sacred text the annotation the reader will need. Space for such annotation has been deliberately provided in the papyrus codex of Callimachus.”⁴⁴ Apart from Turner’s lists and categorizations of papyri according to dimensions, McNamee too has published a list of codices with heavy annotation and big format. In all lists the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus has a prominent position. Its dimensions are extremely big (37x28cm), the margins are full of notes probably from different sources. It is indeed a very exceptional papyrus but one should always bear in mind the limitations set by a unique piece of evidence. The format of codex, however, seems to have developed to the direction of the well known manuscripts of the byzantine period, that of large margins suitable for plenty of scholia.

⁴⁴ Turner (1977) 84.

The second factor involved in the formation of the corpus of scholia is the script. The invention of minuscule in the eighth and ninth centuries facilitated decisively the squeeze of exegetical material in the margins and even between the lines of the main text. On the other hand, majuscule has been considered as the main obstacle for scribes in late antiquity since there was no way of transferring in the margins the amount of scholia offered for example by Venetus A of the *Iliad*. Further research and evidence from papyri, however, has shown that there are cases of majuscule script adapted to the needs of the circumstances. The Oxyrhynchus Callimachus is again the first example of text and annotation written in the same coptic uncial script but with the notes in a much smaller size. It seems that uncial could be written in a very small form, as in the cases of PSI 1182 (legal text) and the Mani codex.⁴⁵ Furthermore, we can see in manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries that although the main text was written in minuscule, scholia were still in majuscule of a very small size. In my opinion this illustrates that majuscule script was not by definition an unsurpassable obstacle in compiling scholia. From a different point of view, however, it was the adoption of minuscule that gave the final solution to the problem of space in the margins. As regards the amount of scholia offered by famous codices such as Venetus A, one should bear in mind that Homeric scholia are huge in quantity whereas the ones on authors such as Sophocles and Plato are limited. It is very likely that for some texts it was much easier to combine text and scholia in the same manuscript at an early stage. For other texts the process continued even after the creation of the archetype, every time the scribe or reader could find a source providing extra material.

Very important for the transfer of hypomnemata from separate rolls into the margins of manuscripts are the developments and changes that affected ancient exegesis itself during late antiquity. It is well known that the Hellenistic and Roman periods were most productive as far as scholarly works are concerned and that there were several hypomnemata, monographs and lexica for the biggest part of Classical and Hellenistic literature. This diversity of material indicates the flourishing of classical studies ranging from the school environment to the literary circles of scholars in big cities such as Alexandria, Rome or Oxyrhynchus. Many papyri have preserved examples of hypomnemata on known or unknown works, especially on lyric poetry, oratory and epic. From a chronological point of view, however, what is most striking is the rapid

⁴⁵ Wilson (1982) 107-8.

change in the nature of exegesis after the fourth century AD. Whereas commentaries from previous centuries only rarely have similarities to scholia, similarities become very common in late antiquity. In our research this has been illustrated by the commentary on the *Acharnians* on the one hand and the two late commentaries on Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Peace* on the other. The commentary on the *Acharnians*, although it contains some material of real value, does not seem to be among the immediate predecessors of the scholia. The commentaries on *Clouds* and *Peace*, however, dated to the fifth century, discuss more or less the same points as their counterparts in the scholia. It should be pointed out that the differences which sometimes occur are only in wording not in content.

In the case of marginalia, notes in early papyri such as in PSI 1192 (Soph. *OT*), no matter how scholarly they are, usually discuss different points or from a different point of view. On the other hand, notes in papyri from later centuries such as P. Ant.1.23 (Eur. *Medea*) and the ones studied by Zuntz are very close to scholia both in wording and content. The obvious conclusion from all this is that after the fourth and fifth centuries AD there is a sort of standardization of exegesis on classical texts. In a way this reflects the gradual decline of scholarship and the need to adapt classical studies to the general tendency for uniformity in the new educational system. The selection of texts mainly for the school curriculum must have been followed by a selection of hypomnemata suitable to the same environment. Demand for high quality commentaries full of textual criticism and quotations must have been very low, as one needed new compilations focusing predominantly on language and myth. The evidence of papyri confirms this assumption and it is indeed rare to find in late antiquity hypomnemata or marginal notes of high scholarly value. It is much more common to come across a mixture of different elements of interpretation where paraphrase and glosses are occasionally interrupted by bits of scholarly exegesis. This process has been studied thoroughly by Zuntz in his articles on the Aristophanes papyri. The situation with other poets and authors is not very different, although one has to adjust the theory to each case separately. Apart from minor objections it is generally agreed and verified by the evidence of papyri that exegesis on classical literature becomes less original and much less important in the last centuries of antiquity. We hear about people who wrote commentaries on Euripides, Aristophanes, Sophocles and others and we can assume with all probability that it was they who combined ancient exegesis with paraphrase, glosses and mythological information, so common in scholia. Because they are to us nothing more than names, their exact contribution

cannot be evaluated. Their names appear in the subscriptions to the scholia and sometimes in the scholia themselves. We do not know, for example, who Dionysius was, although his commentary on Euripides is mentioned in a subscription alongside that of Didymus. Pius, Sallustius and Horapollon wrote hypomnemata and perhaps other works on Sophocles but apart from the last one, the other two have not been identified nor dated. On the other hand, things are easier with Symmachus and Phaeinus, two late commentators on Aristophanes.⁴⁶ The former lived in the second century AD, the latter very close to the Byzantine period. The general opinion about these obscure people who played a crucial role in the transmission of scholarship during late antiquity is very low. We hear about ignorants, low level schoolmasters and unoriginal compilers.⁴⁷ It is very likely, however, that it was only through their commentaries that some valuable exegesis from the Alexandrian times managed to survive and find its way into scholia. No matter how free these scholars felt to epitomize, adapt and expand earlier works on literature, it is very unlikely that they did not feel respect for great names of the past and the necessity to safeguard what was still available for the present and future generations. At this point, we should recall the fact that in periods of transition and decline works of secondary rank, such as hypomnemata, are the first to be threatened. Galen who lived in the second-third century AD wrote that “Ζεύξιδος ὑπομνήματα μηκέτι σπουδαζόμενα σπανίζει”,⁴⁸ and following this remark one can assume that in the more turbulent centuries that followed, access to old hypomnemata must have been difficult. Commentaries on plays outside the “Selection” must have disappeared soon after the “Selection” took place. It is natural, of course, that a period with different priorities and objectives in the study of classics would create its own commentaries. We have seen or mentioned such examples in this study (P. Würzburg on *Phoenissae*, P. Oslo on *Troades*, P. Rain. on Aristophanes) but none can be attributed to any of the known names. Apart from the Würzburg commentary, however, the others exhibit clearly the fact that by this time exegesis had acquired a standard form and there was very little new material that late commentaries have to offer compared to the scholia. Finally, the mention of hypomnemata under

⁴⁶ See e.g. Koster (1973).

⁴⁷ Wilamowitz (1907)181 (about Phaeinos): “...ein jämmerlicher Ignorant, der sich nur in der gewöhnlichsten Exegese versucht”.

⁴⁸ Galen in *Hipp.Epid.III, Comm. II* 4,605 / *CMG* 10.2.1, 78-9 Wenkebach.

the name of Didymus in the subscriptions to the scholia is very unlikely to refer to genuine works of the Alexandrian scholar. It would make better sense for this period to be considered as a pseudepigraphon or a compilation containing a few parts of Didymeian exegesis.

The brief presentation of the changes in exegesis during late antiquity helped to show that the conditions for its transfer into the margins of the manuscripts were already there. Instead of a big variety of commentaries we find a much smaller amount of material in a standard form with only slight differences in wording when compared to scholia. Moreover, amalgamation of earlier works has brought together information from many different sources, often of a very uneven quality as in scholia. Scholia, of course, are characterized by the use of ἄλλως which has not been found yet on any of the published papyri.⁴⁹ N. G. Wilson showed, however, that there are examples of the Latin equivalent “aliter” even as early as the fifth century in the Latin scholia and of the Greek ἄλλως in various other contexts. The Oxyrhynchus Callimachus is also considered as illustrating the practice of putting together material from more than one source.

After this discussion of the separate factors that contributed towards the formation of scholia, what one needs in order to provide a complete picture of the situation in late antiquity is concrete evidence coming from manuscripts and papyri of this period. Although we have already mentioned some of this evidence, a brief listing of this testimony will help to fully understand the extent and limits of the relevant material: first of all, there is a series of legal texts from the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries indicating a change in format very convenient for the accommodation of scholia. Then we find some papyrus codices, such as those of Aristophanes, full of marginalia which are in turn very close to the corresponding scholia. Catenae is also a very important piece of evidence, although their uncertain history does not allow any specification of their relation to scholia. As regards individual texts, the Vienna Dioscorides with its large margins and the attempt to copy there parts of writings of more than one author can be placed next to the much discussed Oxyrhynchus Callimachus, a much more developed form of annotation, the one closest to the scholia from the ninth century onwards.

The presentation of the different theories together with the discussion of most factors related to the formation of scholia showed clearly the complexities and uncertainties surrounding

⁴⁹ In the Oslo commentary on the *Troades* the editors supplemented ἄλλως similarly to the corresponding scholia. It seems very unlikely to be correct.

the problem. Of course, the uncompromising character of the earlier theories has been replaced today by more flexible considerations and efforts to study the problem from new perspectives and with a deeper understanding of the existing evidence. On the other hand, however, many questions remain open and the date of the compilation of scholia keeps moving from one century to the other. In my opinion, compilation of scholia cannot be seen otherwise except as a process, a long procedure which started as early as the fourth century and did not reach its final stage before the ninth. The two theories which support either a very early or very late date have proved false by the evidence of papyri which seems to be in favour of different stages, of “Vorstufe” according to Zuntz. In a broader sense, the process had started much earlier, from the period of papyrus rolls when scribes or readers felt that they could use the limited space provided for adding their own remarks or for copying from available hypomnemata. Such a procedure, of course, despite outstanding examples such as Alcman’s *Partheneion* and Pindar’s *Paeans*, was not due to last given the unfavourable circumstances and the lack of those factors which in later times led to the creation of scholia.

It is only during late antiquity, a period of revolutionary changes that all factors needed for scholia started functioning together: new format, limited and uniform material as well as flexibility in the size of script. On top of that, we saw already the new social conditions, the selection of texts and predominance of codex. In fact, nearly all elements characterizing the scholia of byzantine manuscripts are found in late antiquity as well. What is missing is conclusive evidence, namely more manuscripts from this period with clearer examples of amalgamated scholia in their margins. McNamee’s list of papyri is certainly helpful but it would be too hazardous to claim that it points to something more than a new larger format suitable for annotation on a bigger scale. Her conclusion that “the process may have begun even earlier, possibly as early as 400” possibly holds true but the real evidence for the compilation of scholia from multiple sources is once again provided only by the Oxyrhynchus Callimachus. On the other hand, if our objective is to find the archetype of scholia, in my opinion this cannot be found earlier than the ninth century. Manuscripts such as Venetus A of the *Iliad* presuppose the invention of minuscule in order to accommodate the amount of scholia to be preserved. Besides, this achievement of scribal and scholarly activities needed the intervention of strong and influential scholars such as Arethas and Photius, absent as far as we know from the so called Dark Ages that preceded the “Byzantine Renaissance”. In conclusion, one can visualize the

process of compilation of scholia as located between two great inventions in book production: the invention of the codex and the “Selection”, on the one hand, and the transliteration that was prompted by the invention of minuscule in the ninth century on the other. The first marks the starting point of the process, the second its completion, although the practice of adding some extra material to the existing corpus continued occasionally into later Byzantine times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions of texts and scholia

Euripides

Diggle, J. (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae*, vols. 1-3, OCT (Oxford 1981-94)

Dindorf, G. (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis tragoedias*, vols. 1-4 (Oxford 1863) [for the scholia recentiora]

Schwartz, E. (ed.), *Scholia in Euripidem*, vols. 1-2 (Berlin 1887-91)

Sophocles

Dawe, R. D. (ed.), *Sophoclis tragoediae*, vols. 1-7, BT (Leipzig 1996³)

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N. G. (eds.), *Sophoclis fabulae*, OCT (Oxford 1990)

Christodoulou, G. (ed.), *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους* (Athens 1977)

De Marco, V. (ed.), *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* (Rome 1952)

Longo, O. (ed.), *Scholia byzantina in Sophoclis Oedipum Tyrannum* (Padua 1971)

Papageorgious, P. N. (ed.), *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera*, BT (Leipzig 1888)

Aristophanes

Hall, F. W. and Geldart, W. M. (eds.), *Aristophanis comoediae*, vols. 1-2, OCT (Oxford 1906-7)

Dübner, F. (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* (Paris 1842) [only for the scholia not yet edited in the Groningen series]

Koster, W. J. W., Holwerda, D. et al. (eds.), *Scholia in Aristophanem* (Groningen 1960-)

Rutherford, W. G. (ed.), *Scholia Aristophanica*, vols. 1-3 (London 1896-1905) [scholia from codex Ravennas]

Fragments

- Austin, C. F. (ed.), *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (Berlin 1968)
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. J. and Lee, K. H. (eds.), *Euripides: Selected fragmentary plays*, Vol. 1 (Warminster 1995)
- Jouan, F. and van Looy, H., *Euripide tome VIII: Fragments: 1^{re} partie: Aegus-Autolykos*, Les Belles Lettres (Paris 1998)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.), *Sophocles: The fragments*, Loeb Class. Lib. (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1996)
- Nauck² A. Nauck (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 2nd edition (Leipzig 1889) with *Supplementum* by B. Snell (Hildesheim 1964)
- TrGF* B. Snell et al. (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1971-) [for Sophocles see S. Radt (ed.), *TrGF* vol. IV: *Sophocles* (Göttingen 1977) and for Euripides R.Kannicht (ed.), *TrGF* vol. V: *Euripides* (forthcoming)]
- TrGFS* J. Diggle (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta*, OCT (Oxford 1998)
-
- CAF* T. Kock (ed.), *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1880-8)
- CGFP* C. F. Austin, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris reperta* (Berlin and N.Y. 1973)
- Demiańczuk, I. (ed.), *Supplementum Comicum* (Cracow 1912)
- PCG* R. Kassel and C. F. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin and N.Y. 1983-)

Editions of ancient lexica

- Ael.D* H. Erbse (ed.), *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin 1950)
- Erotianus* E. Nachmannson (ed.), *Erotiani Vocum Hippocraticarum Collectio cum fragmentis* (Uppsala 1918)
- Et.Gen* †F. Lasserre and N. Livadaras (eds.), *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica*, vol. 1: α-ἄμωσγέπως

- (Rome 1976), vol. 2: ἀνα-βώτορες (Athens 1993)
- Et. M. T. Gaisford (ed.), *Etymologicum Magnum* (Oxford 1848)
- Harpocratio G. Dindorf (ed.), *Harpocratonis Lexicon in decem Oratores Atticos*, vols. 1-2 (Oxford 1853)
- Hesychius K. Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. 1: A -Δ (Copenhagen 1953), vol. 2: E -O (Copenhagen 1966)
- M. Schmidt (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vols. 1-5 (Jena 1857-68)
- Moeris D. U. Hansen (ed.), *Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris* (Berlin and N. Y. 1998) (SGLG: Band 9)
- Orio F. G. Sturz (ed.), *Orionis Thebani Etymologicon* (Leipzig 1820)
- Orus K. Alpers (ed.), *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros* (Berlin and N.Y. 1981)
- Paus. Att. H. Erbse (ed.), *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin 1950)
- Photius R. Porson (ed.), *Photii lexicon e codice Galeano* (London 1822)
- R. Reitzenstein (ed.), *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios* (Leipzig and Berlin 1907)
- C. Theodoridis (ed.), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*, vol. 1: A-Δ (Berlin and N.Y. 1982)
- Phryn. E. Fischer (ed.), *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Berlin and N.Y. 1974)
- Phryn. PS I. de Borries (ed.), *Phrynichi Sophistae Praeparatio Sophistica*, BT (Leipzig 1911)
- Pollux E. Bethe (ed.), *Pollucis Onomasticon*, vols. 1-3 (Leipzig 1900-37)
- Suda A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon*, vols. 1-5 (Leipzig 1928-38)

Books and articles

- Allen, T. W. (1901) "Grenfell and Hunt's *Amherst Papyri II*", *CR* 15: 425-6
- Alpers, K. (1966) "Ein neues Fragment eines Homer-Lexikons auf Papyrus", *Hermes* 94: 430-4
- (1969) *Bericht über Stand und Methode der Ausgabe des Etymologicum Genuinum*.
Copenhagen

- (1990) "Griechische Lexikographie in Antike und Mittelalter", in H. Albrecht- Koch (ed.), *Welt der Information: Wissen und Wissensvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 14-38. Stuttgart
- Arrighetti, G. (1977) "Hypomnemata e scholia: alcuni problemi", *MPhL* 2: 49-67
- (1987) *Poeti, eruditi e biografi: Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura*. Pisa
- Bagnall, R. (1993) *Egypt in late antiquity*. Princeton
- Barrett, W. S. (1964) *Euripides: Hippolytos*. Oxford
- (1965) "The epitome of Euripides' *Phoinissai*: ancient and medieval versions", *CQ* 15: 58-71
- Blanchard, A. (1991) "Sur le milieu d' origine du papyrus Bodmer de Ménandre", *CE* 66: 211-20
- Blomfield, C. J. (1830⁴) *Aeschyli: Persae*. London
- Bond, G. W. (1963) *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford
- Bouquiaux-Simon, O. and Mertens, P. (1992) "Les témoignages papyrologiques d' Euripide: liste sommaire arrêtée au 1/6/1990", in M.Capasso (ed.), *Papiri letterari greci e latini*, 95-107. Lecce
- Bremer, J. M. (1983) "Papyri containing fragments of Eur. *Phoenissae*: Some corrections to the first editions", *Mnemosyne* 36: 293-305
- (1984) "The popularity of Euripides' *Phoenissae* in late antiquity" in *Proc. of VII Cong. FIEC*, 281-8. Budapest
- Bremer, J. M. and Worp, K. A. (1986) "Papyri containing fragments of Eur.*Phoenissae* (2)", *Mnemosyne* 39: 240-60
- Briant, P. (1996) *Histoire de l' empire Perse*. Paris
- Brunner, T. F. (1986) " Computer - Früchte ", *ZPE* 66: 293-6
- Cadell, H. (1966) *Papyrus de la Sorbonne*. Paris (P. Sorb. 1)
- CAH (1998) A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. XIII: *The Late Empire, A.D. 337-425*. Cambridge
- Cameron, A. (1965) "Wandering poets: A literary movement in Byzantine Egypt", *Historia* 14: 470-509

- Cameron, A. (1998) "Education and culture" in CAH (1998) 665-707
- Canfora, L. (1974) *Conservazione e perdita dei classici*. Padova
- (1989) *The vanished library* (trs. by M. Ryle). London
- Carden, R. (1971) "Notes on Soph. *Ichneutae*", *BICS* 18: 39-45
- (1974) *The papyrus fragments of Sophocles*. Berlin and N.Y.
- Cavallo, G. (1978) "La circolazione libraria nell' età di Giustiniano" in G. G. Archi (ed.), *L' imperatore Giustiniano: Storia e mito*, 211-20. Milan
- (1986) "Conservazione e perdita dei testi greci: Fattori materiali, sociali, culturali" in A. Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico: Tradizione dei classici, Trasformazioni della cultura IV*, 83- 172 and 246-71. Bari
- (1995) "Qualche riflessione sulla continuità della cultura greca in oriente tra i secoli VII e VIII", *BZ* 88: 13-22
- Cockle, W. E. H. (1976) "Hunting in the *Locrian Ajax* of Sophocles", *ZPE* 22: 35-6
- (1987) *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Rome
- Cohn, L. (1903) s. v. "Didymos" in *RE* 5. 1: cols. 445-72
- (1913⁴); "Griechische Lexikographie" in K.Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, 681-730. München (Handb.d.klass.Altertumswissenschaft 2.1)
- Cook, J. M. (1983) *The Persian Empire*. London
- Cribiore, R. (1986) *Writing, teachers, and students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Columbia
- Crusius, O. (1898) "Fragment poétique dans les papyrus Grenfell" in *Mélanges H. Weil*, 81-90. Paris
- Daly, L. W. (1967) *Contributions to a history of alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Brussels
- Davies, M. (1991) *Sophocles: Trachiniae*. Oxford
- Dawe, R. D. (1982) *Sophocles: Oedipus Rex*. Cambridge
- Deichgräber, K. (1956) *Parabasenverse aus Thesmophoriazusen II des Aristophanes bei Galen* in Sitz. Ber. Berlin, Nr. 2
- Diehl, E. (1912) "Notes on Sophocles, *Ichneutae*, and *Eurypylus*", *CR* 26: 209-12
- (1913) *Supplementum Sophocleum*. Bonn
- Donovan, B. E. (1969) *Euripides Papyri: Texts from Oxyrhynchus*. New Haven and Toronto

- Dover, K. (1993) *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford
- Drachmann, A. B. (1936) *Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars*. Copenhagen
- Easterling, P. E. (1982) *Sophocles Trachiniae*. Cambridge
- (1985) "Books and readers in the Greek world / The Hellenistic and Imperial periods" in P.E.Easterling and B.M.W.Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (vol.1): *Greek literature*, 16-41. Cambridge
- (1997) "From repertoire to canon" in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek tragedy*, 211-27. Cambridge
- El- Abbadi, M. (1990) *The life and the fate of the ancient library of Alexandria*. Paris
- Elsperger, W. (1907-10) "Reste und Spuren antiker Kritik gegen Euripides", *Philologus Supp.* 11: 1-176
- Entretiens (1994) O. Beverdin and B. Grange (eds.), *La Philologie Grecque à l' époque Hellénistique et Romaine*. Geneva (Fondation Hardt / Entretiens sur l' antiquité classique XL)
- Erbse, H. (1950) *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin
- (1959) "Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben", *Hermes* 87: 275-303
- Fraser, P. M. (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford
- Fournet, J. L. (1992) "Une éthopée de Caïn dans le Codex des Visions de la Fondation Bodmer", *ZPE* 92: 253-66
- Garvie, A. F. (1998) *Sophocles: Ajax*. Warminster
- Gerber, D. E. (1982) *Pindar's Olympian One: A commentary*. Toronto
- Gibson, C. A. (1997) "P. Berol. Inv. 5008, Didymus, and Harpocraton reconsidered ", *CP* 92: 375-81
- Gignac, F. (1976) *A grammar of the Greek papyri*, vol. 1: *Phonology*. Milan
- Gronewald, M. (1982) "Zwei Hypomnemata zu Aristophanes", *ZPE* 45: 61-9
- Guhl, K. (1969) *Die Fragmente des Alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon*. Hamburg
- Harris, E. M. (1989) "More Chalcenteric negligence ", *CP* 84: 36-44
- Haslam, M. W. (1975) "Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1", *GRBS* 16: 149-74
- Henrichs, A. (1971) "Scholia minora zu Homer I, II and III", *ZPE* 7: 97-149, 229-60 and 8: 1-12
- How, W. and Wells, J. (1964⁷) *A commentary on Herodotus*, vol. 2. Oxford

- Irigoin, J. (1952) *L'histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris
- (1982) "Livre et texte dans les manuscrits byzantins de poètes" in C. Questa e R. Raffaelli (eds.), *Atti del convegno internazionale: Il libro e il testo*, 87-102. Urbino
- (1994) "Les éditions des textes" in *Entretiens* (1994) 39-82
- Italie, G. (1923) *Euripidis: Hypsipyla*. Berlin
- Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia scaenica*. Oxford
- Jebb, R. C. (1892) *Sophocles: The plays and fragments*, Part 5. Cambridge
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1959) *The plays of Sophocles: Commentaries*, Part II: *The Trachiniae*. Leiden
- (1978) *The plays of Sophocles: Commentaries*, Part III: *The Antigone*. Leiden
- Kaster, R. A. (1988) *Guardians of language: The grammarian and society in late antiquity*. Berkeley. Los Angeles. London
- Kern, O. (1903) s.v. "Dionysos" in *RE* 5. 1: cols. 1010-46
- Koenen, L. and Sijpesteijn, P. J. (1989) "Euripides, *Orestes* 835-846 (P. Mich. Inv. 3735)", *ZPE* 77: 261-6
- Körte, A. (1911) "Bericht über die Literatur zur griechischen Komödie", *Jahresbericht Bursian* 152: 268-9
- (1932) "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen", *APF* 10: 217-37
- Koster, W. J. W. (1973) "De Phaeino et Symmacho commentatoribus Aristophanis", *Mnem.* 26: 225-9
- Krüger, J. (1990) *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit*. Frankfurt
- Kuiper, W. (1913) "Ad Satyri fragmentum de vita Euripidis adnotationes duae", *Mnem.* n.s. 41: 233-42
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1963) "The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part 27", *Gnomon* 35:
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N. G. (1990) *Sophoclea: Studies on the text of Sophocles*. Oxford
- (1997) *Sophocles: Second thoughts*. Göttingen
- Luppe, W. (1967) "Das Komikerglossar P.Oxy. 1801", *Philologus* 111: 86-109
- (1997) "Aristophanes' *Pax* 459-69 mit Scholien: Zu P. Duk. Inv. 643 recto", *APF* 43: 7-10
- Macan, R. W. (1895) *Herodotus: The fourth, fifth and sixth books*. London
- Maehler, H. G. T. (1974) "Menander Rhetor and Alexander Claudius in a Papyrus Letter",

GRBS 15: 305-11

- (1994) "Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften" in *Entretiens* (1994) 95-127
- (1997) "Byzantine Egypt: urban élites and book production", *Dialogos* 4: 118-36
- Mango, C. (1980) *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. London
- Marrou, H.I. (1956) *A history of education in antiquity* (trs. by G.Lamb). London
- Mastrorade, D.J. and Bremer, J.M. (1982) *The textual tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai*. Berkeley. Los Angeles. London
- Mayser, E. (1970²) *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. I, I 2 bearbeitet von H. Schmoll. Berlin
- McNamee, K. (1977) *Marginalia and commentaries in Greek literary papyri*. PhD thesis [unpubl.]. Duke University
- (1981a) "Abbreviations in Greek literary papyri and ostraca", *BASP* Supp.3
- (1981b) "Greek literary papyri revised by two or more hands" in R.S.Bagnall et al. (eds.), *Proc. 16 Intern. Con. Pap.*, 79-91. Ann Arbor
- (1992a) *Sigla and select marginalia in Greek literary papyri*. Brussels (Pap. Brux. 26)
- (1992b) "Annotated papyri of Homer" in M.Capasso (ed.), *Papiri letterari greci e latini*, 13-51. Lecce
- (1995) "Missing links in the development of scholia", *GRBS* 36: 399-414
- (1997) "An innovation in annotated codices on papyrus" in B.Kramer et al. (eds.), *Akten 21 Intern. Pap. Kongr.*, vols. 1-2, 669-78. Berlin
- (1998) "Another chapter in the history of scholia", *CQ* n.s. 48: 269-88
- Maltese, E.V. (1982) *Sofocle Ichneutae*. Florence (Pap. Flor. 10)
- Meijering, R. (1987) *Literary and rhetorical theories in Greek scholia*. Groningen
- Merkelbach, R. (1967) "Die Heroen als Geber des Guten und Bösen", *ZPE* 1: 97-9
- Mette, H. J. (1978) "Die "kleinen" griechischen Historiker heute", *Lustrum* 21: 5-43
- Mossay, J. (1972) "Les fragments d' Euripide", *AC* 41: 500-18
- Naoumides, M. (1964) "' Ο P.Oxy.1801 καὶ ὁ Θεών" in *Χάρις Κ. Βουρβέρη*, 327-35. Athens
- (1969) "The fragments of Greek lexicography in the papyri" in *Classical Studies presented to B.E.Perry*, 181-202. Urbana

- Nilsson, M. (1967³) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I*. München
- Norman, A. F. (1964) "The library of Libanius", *RM* 107: 158-75
- Norwood, G. (1930) "The *Babylonians* of Aristophanes", *CP* 25: 1-10
- Page, D. L. (1938) "A new papyrus fragment of Euripides' *Medea*", *CQ* 32: 45-6
- Pearson, A.C. (1917) *The fragments of Sophocles: vol.I*. Cambridge
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of classical scholarship from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford
- Pöhlmann, E. (1994) *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur* (Band I): *Altertum*. Darmstadt [reviewed by M. L. West in *Gnomon* 69 (1997) 1-5]
- RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart 1895-1978
- Reeve, M. D. (1996) s.v. "Scholia" in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. Oxford
- Reitzenstein, R. (1897) *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologica*. Leipzig
- Rennie, W. (1909) *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London
- Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G. (1991³) *Scribes and scholars*. Oxford
- Richter, J. (1911) "Die Scholien zu *Ödipus Koloneus* und ihr Verhältnis zum *ὑπόμνημα* des Didymus", *Wiener Studien* 33: 37-70
- Roberts, C. H. (1953) "Literature and society in the Papyri", *MH* 10: 264-79
- Roberts, C. H. and Skeat, T. C. (1983) *The birth of the codex*. London
- Rose, H. J. (1943) "Sophokles *OT* 530-1", *CR* 57: 5
- Rougemont, G. (1983) "Le pâturage d' été de Trachis", *Rev. Phil.* 57: 285-9
- Rupprecht, K. (1949) s.v. "Papoimiographoi" in *RE* 18. 4: cols. 1735-78
- Schadewaldt, W. (1952) "Zu einem Florentiner Papyrusbruchstück aus dem *Alkmeon in Psophis*", *Hermes* 80: 42-66
- Siegmann, E. (1941) *Untersuchungen zu Sophocles' Ichneutae*. Hamburg
- Slater, W. J. (1989) "Problems in interpreting scholia on Greek texts" in J.N.Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin texts: Papers given at the twenty-third annual conference on editorial problems/ University of Toronto 6-7 November 1987*, 37-61. New York
- Smith, L. P. (1996) "Aristophanes' *Peace* with scholia on a Duke papyrus", *APF* 42: 155-60

- Sommerstein, A. H. (1980) *The comedies of Aristophanes*, vol.1: *Acharnians*. Warminster
- (1985) *The comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 5: *Peace*. Warminster
- Thompson, D. W. (1936) *A glossary of greek birds*. Oxford
- Tolkiehn, J. (1925) s.v. "Lexikographie" in *RE* 12. 2: cols. 2432-82
- Tosi, R. (1994) "La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo" in *Entretiens* (1994) 143-97
- Treu, K. (1986) "Antike Literatur im Lichte der Papyri", *Byzantinoslavica* 47: 1-7
- Treu, M. (1974) "Theon's Pindarkommentar (P.Oxy. 2536)" in J. L. Heller and J. K. Newman (eds.), *Serta Turyniana*, 62-85. Urbana
- Tuillier, A. (1968) *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d' Euripide*. Paris [reviewed by J. Diggle in *CR* 21(1971)19-21]
- (1972) *Étude comparée du texte et des scholies d' Euripide*. Paris [reviewed by J. Diggle in *Gnomon* 46(1974) 746-9]
- Turner, E. G. (1952) "Scribes and scholars of Oxyrhynchus", *JEA* 38: 78-93
- (1956) "Scribes and scholars of Oxyrhynchus", *MPER* 5: 141-6
- (1968) *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Oxford
- (1975) "Oxyrhynchus and Rome", *HSPH* 79:1-24
- (1977) *The typology of the early codex*. Pennsylvania
- (1987) "Greek manuscripts of the ancient world" (2nd ed. by P. J. Parsons), *BICS* Supp.46
- Turyn, A. (1957) *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides*. Urbana
- Vanderspoel, J. (1995) *Themistius and the Imperial court*. Ann Arbor
- Van Looy, H. (1964) *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides*. Brussels
- Van Minnen, P. and Worp, K. A. (1993) "The Greek and Latin literary texts from Hermopolis", *GRBS* 34: 151-86
- Van Rossum- Steenbeek, M. (1998) *Greek readers' digests? Studies on a selection of subliterate papyri*. Leiden. N.York. Köln
- Vian, F. (1963) *Les origines de Thèbes: Cadmos et les Spartes*. Paris
- West, S. (1970) "Chalcenteric negligence", *CQ* n.s. 20: 288-96
- White, J. W. (1914) *The scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes*. Boston. London

- Wilamowitz- Moellendorff, U. von (1907) *Einleitung in die griechischen Tragödie*. Berlin
- (1935) *Kleine Schriften I*. Berlin and Göttingen
- Wilson, N. G. (1967) "A chapter in the history of scholia", *CQ* n.s. 17:244-56
- (1971) "Two notes on Byzantine scholarship", *GRBS* 12:557-60
- (1982) "The relation of text and commentary in Greek books" in C. Questa e R. Raffaelli (eds.), *Atti del convegno internazionale: Il libro e il testo*, 105-10. Urbino
- (1983) "Scoliasi e commentatori", *SCO* 33: 83-112
- (1996²) *Scholars of Byzantium*. London
- (1997) "Scholien und Katenen" in H.G.Nesselrath (ed.), *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*, 102-3. Stuttgart and Leipzig
- Wittek, M. (1967) *Album de paléographie grecque*. Gand
- Wolf, P. (1952) *Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike*. Baden-Baden
- Wouters, A. (1973) "The hand and the date of R. De Langhe Parchment ", *AC* 42: 516-8
- Zuntz, G. (1955) *The political plays of Euripides*. Manchester
- (1965) *An inquiry into the transmission of the plays of Euripides*. Cambridge
- (1975) *Die Aristophanes-scholien der Papyri*. Berlin (reprinted from *Byzantion* 13(1938) 631-90 and 14(1939) 545-614 with *Nachwort* and reviewed by N. G.Wilson in *CR* 27(1977) 271)

P. Würzburg 1: Commentary on Euripides' *Phoenissae* (Verso ↓)

- 1 // >> οὐδέ σοι πυρός ἀνῆψα φῶς // λα[μπα... ..] v. 344
 2 [. εἰσ]άχαι καὶ εἰ...ισε...ου νυμφί[ο]υ[... ..] v. 347
 3 [... ..]..υ...// >> ἀνυμέναια δ' ἐκ[κ]δεύθη Ἴσμηνός [λουτροφόρου]
 4 [χλιδαῖς//] εἰώθα[σ]ιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι εἰσβαλεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιχ[ω]ρίων ποταμῶν
 5 [Ἄ ἀπὸ πη]γῆς ὕδατα καὶ λουσαι τὸ[ν] νυμφίον καὶ παιδοποιῶν εὐχεσ-
 6 [θαι ἀπὸ τῶν] γάμων // >> κᾶτα δ' ἐπ[ι]λθεν αὐτῷ φυγᾶς // >> [... ..] v. 417
 7 [...τι παρ]άνομον· τῆ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ κ[α]ί τούτου χάριν φυγᾶς γι[ν]όμενος
 8 [... ..// >>] καὶ σκυλα [γρ]άψεις // εἰώθασιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι δτ' ἐποί[ου]ν σκύλευσιν v. 574
 9 [καταγράψ]αι ἐ[ν] ἱματίοις ὅτι ὁ δεῖνα ἱποίη[σ]εν, τὴν νεκ[κ]ν ἀπολα-
 10 [βῶν, καὶ τὰ ἱμ]άτια τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνατιθεῖναι // >>] καὶ σὺ φοῖβε εὐ[σ]αξ' ἀγυιεύ v. 631
 11 [// στήλην ὅ]ξε[ί]αν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι βαλόντες ἐν τοῖς προθύρο[ι]ς αὐτῶν... ..
 12 [... ..]του ἀπόλλ[ω]νος ἐκάλουν αὐτὸν φοῖβον ἀγυ[ί]α ἀγυιά δι
 13 [ὄνομα ἀρχαῖο]ν τῆς ὁδοῦ· >>] Κάδμος ἔμολε τάνδ[ε] γ[α]ν Ἰ[ύ]ριος ὦι τε- v. 638 ff.
 14 [τρασκελῆ]ς μὲσ[χ]ο[ς] ἔδ[ε] μ[α]στ[ρον] π[έ]σμα· Κάδμος βουλόμενος κτίσαι πόλιν τὸν
 15 [θεὸν ἠρώτη]σεν κ[α]ί εἰ[λ]αβεν χρησμὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀπόλλωνος, ποῦ ἢ πρό[λι]ς κτ[ι]-
 16 [ζητα]ι καὶ ἔχρησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἀπόλλων χρησμὸν τοιοῦτον· „ἀ[π]ι[θ]ι... ἐν-
 17 [θίνδε π]ρὸς β[ου]κό[λ]ον Πελάγοντα καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ βουῖν ἀ[γ]όρασον σῆμα
 18 [ἐχ]ου[σαν] ἐπὶ τῶν (ν)ώτω[ν] (?) σ[τ]ρογγύλου καὶ, ὅπου ἐν π[ί]σι ἡ[γ]ισμαίν σοι
 19 ἢ βουῖς ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς, ἀπαν[ι]στὰς ἐκεῖ κτίσον πόλιν.“ Εἶτα λαβὼν τὸν χρ[η]σμὸν
 20 ἦλθεν ἐ[ί]ς τὰς θήβας τῆς Βοιωτίας καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔπεσεν ἢ βουῖς καὶ ἔκτισεν
 21 [ἐκ]εῖ τὰς θήβας. Βοιωτία δ' ἐκλήθη ὁ τόπος ἐκείνος διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ π[ι]σιῖν
 22 [... ..] τὴν βουῖν // >>] ἀδάμαστον π[έ]σμα // οἷον [ἄ]δραστον [... ..] v. 640
 23 [...]τομ... ..[.]ου >>] κισσὸς ἔν περιστεφ[ή]ς // κ...[.....] v. 651
 24 [...]μν... ..υ.ον... ..ὁ μ[ι]ν Ἐρμῆς(?) [... ..]
 25 [...]ιο... ..τα. κίρατα τοῦ δ[ε]... ..
 26-28 nicht entziffert.
 29 [... ..]υ... .. τῶν κ... ..β...λ... .. // >>] φόνιος ἦν δρᾶ- v. 657
 30 [κων ἄρ]ε[ος] υἱός // ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ δράκων, ὅς εἰ... .. [.....]
 31 nicht entziffert.
 32 [... ..]ωδε... ..υτ[.]...λ... .. τῷ Κάδ(μ)ω τῶν ὀδόντω[ν]... ..
 33 nicht entziffert.
 34 [...]... .. // [.]
 35 (in der Mitte) Δράκων(?)

Recto

θ

- 36 (>>>) ἐν διώνυμοι θεαί Περ]σέφασσα καὶ φίλα Λαμήτηρ θεά// v. 683
 37 [- - - - -] ἐκλήθη Γῆ καὶ Λαμήτηρ καὶ ἡ Π[ι]ερ[-]
 38 [σεφόν]η καὶ Κόρη... ..νται αἱ διώνυμοι ἢ κ[α]ί
 39 [- - -]ς ἐπι[.]... ..[...]
 40 [- - -] θεᾶςφ...κ... ..[...]
 41 [- - -] α συνεκδοχικὸν δὲ τὸ σχῆμα θε... ..[...]
 42 [- - -] ἑτέρου α... ..ιο. ἢ Λαμήτηρ [.]... ..[...]
 43 [- - -] α λαμπαδηφορ... ..[...]
 44 (>>) Βαθύς γέ τοι Δι]ρκαῖος ἀναχωρεῖ[ν] πόρος // Δίρκη κρ[ῆ]νη ἐσ[τ]ίν, v. 730
[λαμπαδηφοροῦσι]

P. Würzburg 1: Commentary on Euripides' *Phoenissae* (Verso ↓)

22. [...] ΤΗΝ ΒΟΥΝ̄ // >> ΑΔΑΜΑΣΤΟΝ ΠΕΣΗΜΑ // ΟΙΟΝ ΑΔΡΑΣΤΟΣ [
23.] ΤΟΜ..... ΟΥ // ΚΙΣΣΟΣ ὄΝ ΠΕΡΙΣΤΕΦΗ [Σ //] Κ
24.] . Ω . ΚΕΙ..... Π . ΡΙΣΤ .. ΟΜΕ .. Σ Ὁ ΖΕΥΣ
25.] ΚΙΣΣΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΚΕΠΑΣΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΔΙ [ΟΝΥΣΟΝ
26.] Ν Ν // >>> ΚΑΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΞΙΝ ΕΥΟΙΟ [ΙΣ
27.] . ΕΚΑΛΟΥΝΤΟ ΕΤΙ ΒΑΚΧΑΙ ΕΠΕΙΔΗ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΟΥ [
28.] ΕΥΑΝ.... Ὁ ΥΜΝΟΣ ΑΣΜΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ // >>> ΑΡΕΟΣ [
29.] ΚΑ [] ... ΕΙ . ΤΟΝ ΚΤΙΣΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΘΗΒΑΣ . Σ ΛΕ
30.] . ΕΥ . Ο . Δ [] .. ΗΝ ΔΕ ΕΚΕΙ ΔΡΑΚΩΝ ὄΝ ΕΙΑΣΕΝ
31.] ... ΣΕ ΑΥΤ . [ΠΑ] Ρ [ΑΙ] ΝΕΣΣΕΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΣ Ὁ ΚΑΔΜΟΣ ΑΠΕΚ [
32.] ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΣ ΤΩΙ ΚΑΔΜΩΙ ΙΝΑ ΟΙΚΩΣΙΝ Ο
33.] ΚΑΔΜΟΣ ΕΔ .. Η ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΚΟΝΤΟΣ Τ .. Ο . Ο .
34.] ΠΟΛΑΒ ΚΑΙ Α

P. Würzburg 1: Commentary on Euripides' *Phoenissae* (Recto ↗)

36.] ΡΣΕΦΑΣΣΑ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΑ ΔΑΜΑΤΗΡ ΘΕΑ//
37.] ΕΚΛΗΘΗ ΓΗ ΚΑΙ ΔΗΜΗΤΗΡ ΚΑΙ Η ΠΙ [
38.] ΤΗΡ ΠΕΡΣΕΦΟΝΗΣ // >> ΑΙ ΔΙΩΝΥΜΟΙ ΘΕ [ΑΙ
39.] ΤΑΙΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΣ ΕΤΙΜΩΝΤΟ Η [Δ] ΗΜΗΤΗΡ ΚΑΙ . Σ Φ (?) [
40.] ΠΥΡΟΦΟΡΟΥΣ ΘΕΑΣ // ΤΗΝ ΠΕΡΣΕΦΟΝΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ ΠΥ [
41.] Α . ΔΟΚ ΙΝΑ ΣΥΝΕΚΔΟΧΙΚΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΧΗΜΑ ΣΥΝΕΚΔ . Χ [
42.] ΔΟΚΟΥ .. ΕΤΕΡΩΣ . Υ . ΕΤΕΡΟΥ ΤΑΣ ΑΡΤΟΝ Η ΔΗΜΗΤΗΡ
43.] ΦΟ ΘΕΑΣ ΕΠ [] ΛΑΜΠΑΔΗΦ

P. Oxy. 6. 856: Commentary on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*

Fr. (a)	Col. i.	
	μιν	
	τινων	
	ταις κω	
μωιδιαις	ι περι	
5	σιου	
	οι δε φα(σι)	108?
	ς Κλεισθ(ενης)	118
	αβαλλων :	
	πωγωνα εχο(ντ)	120
10	... επι των πολλους ξενου]ς δεχομ(ενων) :	127
	Θε]ωρος :	134
	Θεογνις' τραγωιδιας' ψυχρος πο(ιητης) :	140
	των	
	αταπελ	160
15	τασονται	
	ματος []	
	φη(σι) πολιν :	
	η α	
	τις εχων	
	νοις	
20	οι (εισι) :	
	αν μυτ	174
τωτ	ς σκληροι	180

Fr. (b)

	[.....]ινοι: ουκ ενασπιδ[ω(σομαι)] οιον [ψηφηδακειν 368. 376
	[επει ψηφ]οις δικαζοντες χρωνται . [την περυ 378
25	[σι κωμω]ιδιαν· εις τους Βαβυλωνιο[υς	
	[.....]τους τ(ων) Αθηναιων (και) πεδι[
	[..... υ]πο Κλεωνος δικην εφυ[γε	Ιερωννου· πο(ιητης) 386
	[τις ην κο]μητης: του Σισυφου· οιον [391
	[... παρ]οιμιαν σκηψιν αγων ουτος· [392
30	[..... δ]υσποτμος· εισαγεται γ(αρ) παρ[α τωι Ευριπιδηι ως εκπεπωκως	419
	[εκ της βα]σιλειας κ(αι) πτωχος περιν[οστων	
	[.....]ται παρ αυτωι υπο δε(ε) χειρων [
	[... τα ρα]χη κ(αι) τα σχισματα: σκιμα]λιω·	444
	[..... τ]οις ρημασι: Τηλεφωι δ αγ[ω φρονω·	χρεος 446. 455
35	[μεν ουδ]εν· προ(ος) το χρεος λεγει: ωσπε[ρ η μητηρ·	ισχνα μοι 457. 469

	φυλλεία] δος τα σατρα φυλλα ἄ εκ τ]	σκαν	478
	[δικα· λ'αχανιον τι: εμπορευτε]α·		480
	[.....] υπερ Λακεδ(αιμονιων) ανδρων λεγ(ειν) ο .] γραμμη·		482, 483
	[.....] δρ]ομεων: παρακεκομμενα [517
40	[σικ(υον)ιδο ιεν ου(τ) σικνωι τιθωνωι εοικ()] πεφουσιγγωμενοι·		520, 526
	[εκκεκαυ]μενοι: πορνᾶ δυο· ως πορν]	σκολια·	527, 532
	[μελη πα]ροιγια: Σεριφιων των Αθ[ηναι	παλλαδιων·	542, 547
	[... τα] π(ερι) τας τριηρεις οντα Παλλαδ[ος αγαλματα		
	[εν δικτυο]ις λε(γει) εν γυρογαθοις: τριχ]ιδων·		550, 551
45	[.....]αι: τον δ[ε] Τηλεφον [555
	[.....]..... ι . [.....]υκαν επ]		
	[.....] 20 letters] . αυτων [
	[.....] " "] αγωνιζο(μενων) τω]ν		
	[.....] 21 "] ουτος δειχ[θ		
50	[.....] φυλετα·] απο της α(υτης) φυ[λης		568

Fr.(a) Col. ii.

	[.....]κησι]		
	[...] τ (ων) α[.]. τω[
	[.]καλ() οι ετεροι του[ς		
	δειν ως φα(σι) κ(αι) οι ηθ[πτερον αιτει	584
55	ινα καθεις εις την φαρυγα ε]ξεμεση κομπολακ(υθου)· ουτω λε(γει)		589
	τον Λαμαχον οτ(ι) κομπαστης [ην σπουδαρχ(ιδης)·	στρα	595, 596
	τωνιδης π(αρα) το στρατευεσθα]ι μισθαρχιδης δε οτι	μισθον	597
	λαμβανων εφ ο[ις αν π[κοκκυγες·	ε 598
	ρημιαν οι ορν(εις): Τισαμεν[οφαιν(ιππους)· Πανουργιπ(παρχιδας)· πα		603
60	νουργιαι: Γερητοθεοδ(ωρους) Γερ[ης		605
	αλλ ὃ Κοισυρας· ο Μεγακλης· τ[614
	δ[ε] κα(ι) οσοι προδοται (εισι) οι μ(εν) α[
	εκεισε ειτα πυνθανετ αι λ[
	την ταξιν αυτων η εμ]		
65	τοι φη(σι) ο Κοισυρας κ(αι) :λαμαχ]ος		616-7
	ελεγον εξιστω το δ(ε) απο]νιπτρον		
	προφωνουσιν εξιστω ιν[α		
	Λαμαχος· ειθ ο Δικαιοπ(ολις) ουδ]		619?
	χανυνοπολ(ιτας) οιον χανυνος: ο[τε και βασιλευς·	υ	635, 647
	και		
70	περ εαυτου λεγων οτ(ε) βασιλε]νς		
	πρωτον μ(εν) ποτερον ταις ναυ]σι κρατουσιν		
	μεγαλοφροσυνην εαυτου [
	δια δ(ε) ταυτα φη(σι) Λακεδαιμο(νιους) [652
	πο(ιητην) φα(σι) ·(αρ) οι μ(εν) αυτον εκει .]		651
75	οιον εξ ὧν το δικαστικον [656-8
	κ(αι) προς χαριν λεγοντ . [
	ειθ ουτω κατεπραττον [
	φλεγυρα· ενθρομος: φ]ειφαλος· σπινηθηρ: επανθρακιδες· ιχθ]υες		665, 668, 670
	η κ]ρεα: οι δ(ε) Θασιαν τω]		671

P. Rain. 3. 20: Commentary on Aristophanes' *Clouds*

μ]άχηι τε ἐνίκη[σεν
2 ζῶ]ντας ἤγαγεν [
] ἡμέραις το[
4] ἐκ Πόλου [
 ὑ]πὸ τὴν γῆν [
6]·ε· ἄδην η[
]ανεντων ἀν[
8]αρωσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ [
]·ς ἑώρα χε[
10 πε]ρίμετρος (·)[
]·ης ὡς τ[
12 το]ῦτό σοι δοκεῖ [
] ἢ δέ γ' Εὐβοία ᾤ[ς
14]ησαντε(·) καθα[
 εἰ]πεν τὸ περι[
16]αλλ[
 Εὐ]βοία[

