

NIALL W. SLATER

PROBLEMS IN THE HYPOTHESES TO ARISTOPHANES' PEACE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 74 (1988) 43–57

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PROBLEMS IN THE HYPOTHESES TO ARISTOPHANES' PEACE

Despite tantalizing glimpses in the hypotheses and scholia to Aristophanes' plays, there are still considerable gaps in our knowledge of the actual play competitions. I here propose to examine some troubled passages in the hypotheses to the Peace, both with respect to the original production or productions of that play and with respect to the didascalical information available to fourth century and later scholars of Athenian drama.

In the third hypothesis¹ to Aristophanes' Peace we find the following didascalical information:

ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἄτει. πρῶτος
 Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορι..
 τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδοτος· ἤνικα ἐρμῆν λοιοκρότης.†

There is an obvious inconsistency between the first and second sentences of this report: first we are told that Aristophanes "won" the competition, then that he "placed" second. The question immediately arises: can νικῶν mean "to place"?

A great deal of didascalical material is preserved in the various hypotheses to Aristophanes' plays. J.Gröbl in a wide-ranging study of the prose hypotheses has concluded that the bulk of this material is sound and goes back to Alexandrian and Aristotelian sources.² While the outline of the hypotheses follows a somewhat standard pattern (resembling that of the hypotheses to tragedies),³ there are differences in phrasing for the reports of places in the competition. The more common pattern is to use ordinal adjectives for the competitors. For example, we learn of Aristophanes in Hyp. 1 Acharnians καὶ πρῶτος ἦν (cf. Hyp. 1 Frogs πρῶτος ἦν) while in Hyp. 1 Wasps δεύτερος ἦν (cf. Hyp. 1 Birds ἦν δεύτερος).

In one or two cases a form of νικῶν seems to be used with an ordinal adjective, though both passages have more than their share of textual difficulties. Hyp. 1 Wasps reports καὶ ἐνικά πρῶτος Φιλονίδης Προάγωνι, Λεύκων Πρέσβεσι τρίτος.⁴ Although there are other problems with the text here, the reading of ἐνικά may be sound. The case of Hyp. 2

¹ I cite the text of Peace and its hypotheses from M.Platnauer's edition with commentary in the Oxford Aristophanes series: Aristophanes: Peace (Oxford 1964) and the other hypothesis texts from the OCT edition of Hall and Geldart. The comic fragments are cited where possible from the edition of Poetae Comici Graeci (= PCG, in progress) of R.Kassel and C.Austin (and designated "K-A."), otherwise from Kock's Comiorum Graecorum Fragmenta [= "K"]. Note that the hypotheses have been variously numbered: e.g., what Platnauer and K-A. designate as Hyp. 3 is for Gröbl (below, n.2) and the OCT of Hall and Geldart the first hypothesis. The editions and commentaries of Peace by B.B.Rogers (London 1913), Platnauer, and A.Sommerstein (Warminster and Chicago 1985) will be cited by name only below.

² J.Gröbl, Die ältesten Hypotheseis zu Aristophanes (Dilligen 1889/90) esp. 8.

³ Gröbl, (above, n.2) 11 ff.

⁴ For the problems of the text, see D.M. MacDowell's edition of Wasps ad loc. He notes also (p. 124) that "πρῶτος may seem superfluous..."

Knights is much more difficult. Coulon in his edition adopts a reading of the didascalical notice found only in manuscript V, which says of Aristophanes: Πρῶτος ἦν· ἐνίκᾳ δεύτερος Κρατῖνος Κατύριος, τρίτος Ἀριστομένης Ὑλοφόροις.⁵ The use of the two verbs thus in succession is unparalleled and has troubled most other editors, who delete one or the other. The OCT gives the text as πρῶτος ἐνίκᾳ, δεύτερος Κρατῖνος Κατύριος, τρίτος Ἀριστομένης Ὑλοφόροις. Rogers in his edition makes out a better case for the deletion of ἐνίκᾳ as an intrusive gloss.⁶ W.Luppe, in the course of a substantial assault on the belief that there were only three comedies in competition during the war years, understandably adopts Coulon's text, as it is for him essential evidence that a second place finish constituted a victory, the position I here challenge.⁷ We may set the problem of the text of Hyp. 2 Knights aside for the moment, for if our examination of the hypothesis of Peace causes us to doubt its reading, the only possible grounds for accepting Coulon's ἐνίκᾳ δεύτερος Κρατῖνος will have vanished. It remains to consider what verb is to be understood in the didascalical notices of Wasps and Knights where none is explicitly given. It is possible that ἐνίκᾳ is to be understood with the subjects that follow, but it seems more likely that the verb to be understood is ἦν. Gröbl in fact argues that in both places the text has been altered through copyists' misunderstandings of the numeral α' and that πρῶτος was not used originally with a form of νικῶν;⁸ whether one accepts this view or not, we are left with no evidence whatsoever that νικῶν, standing by itself, can mean "placed second."

There are two possibilities, then, for explaining the apparent contradiction between the two sentences of the hypothesis of Peace: the first is to postulate a corruption of the text and suggest an emendation, the second to consider the possibility that two didascalical notices have

⁵ V.Coulon, *Aristophane I* (Paris 1958) 77.

⁶ B.B.Rogers, *The Knights of Aristophanes* (London 1910) xlvi and n.6.

⁷ W.Luppe, "Die Zahl der Konkurrenten an den komischen Agonen zur Zeit des peloponnesischen Krieges," *Philologus* 116 (1972): 53-75; 66-68. Luppe's argument that there were five competitors throughout the war has not won universal acceptance; see Dana F.Sutton, "Plato Comicus Demoted: A Reconsideration," *ZPE* 38(1980): 59-63; and Luppe's reply, "ἀπεώθη πάλιν εἰς τοὺς Ληναϊκοὺς," *ZPE* 46 (1982): 147-159. I hope here to demolish Luppe's contention that three poets were all designated as victors in the contest. Though not strictly germane to my purpose here, I wish to add one consideration to the argument between Sutton and Luppe as to whether it is linguistically possible to say in Greek that one has "won" third prize when there are only three competitors. Neither has considered the question diachronically. Let us begin by conceding that to proclaim three victors, we must have more than three competitors; all agree this was the case with comedy before the war. If then the number were reduced to three, might not conservatism of practice lead the state to continue to proclaim three victors? Must we assume the Greeks were such linguistic purists that, having used νικῶν for the first three finishers for many years before the war, they would not then dare to say νικῶν of the third-place finisher once the number was reduced? It seems unlikely. Yet once we acknowledge this, one of Luppe's essential arguments for more than three competitors is gone: even if he can offer an instance of a second or third-place "victory" during the war, that need not imply that there were more than three competitors at that particular point.

⁸ Gröbl (above, n.2) 52-54 (on Hyp. 2 Knights), 58-60 (on Hyp. 1 Wasps). A further objection is the use of another Greek term in the hypotheses for second place: εὐδοκίμησε. Luppe (above, n.7) takes no account of this point. See Gröbl 53-55 and also n.23 below.

for some reason here been conflated. Let us begin by considering the second possibility, which will involve us immediately in the question of the date of the Peace.

The Date of the Peace

The Peace is securely datable to 421 (within the 422/1 term of Alkaios as archon) on internal grounds.⁹ At any time after the summer of 422, a peace settlement was in the air. Internal grounds, however, are not enough for assigning the play to the City Dionysia over the Lenaia. If we believed that a complete and unalterable text of a play had to be presented to the archon in order for the poet to be awarded a chorus, we might then argue that the later festival would be the more likely occasion for a play celebrating peace, but this was not the case. We know from the material which Aristophanes includes in his *Lysistrata* that certain details at least could be altered very near to the time of production.¹⁰ ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ᾧσται is the only explicit testimony that Peace was a City play. If we question whether this sentence belongs with the one that follows, what evidence have we to place Peace and its competitors, Eupolis' Flatterers and Leukon's Phratries, at the City Dionysia?¹¹

Evidence for the career of Eupolis can begin to extract us from these difficulties. Athenaeus (V, 218b [= Κόλακες test. ii K-A.]) in a discussion of the date of Plato's *Protagoras* cites τῆς ἐπ' Ἀλκαίου διδασκαλίας τῶν Κολάκων. Thus we have independent testimony for Flatterers at one of the festivals of 421. We also know of another play of Eupolis which fell in 421 (though the evidence for its date is a trifle more complex): the *Marikas*, an attack on the orator Hyperbolus. Aristophanes alludes to the *Marikas* and its attack on Hyperbolus in lines 551-559 of the *Clouds*. This passage naturally evoked comment from the scholiasts, because the *Marikas* fell after the *Clouds* in the didascalical records available to them. *Clouds* 553 [= Μαρικῶν test. iii K-A.] explains: the reference to *Marikas* must come from the revised version of *Clouds*, because the didascalia report ὑστερον τρίτῳ ἔτει τὸν Μαρικῶν τῶν Νεφέλων.... Since we can date the *Clouds* to 423,

⁹ Platnauer xv-xvi, Sommerstein xv-xvii. The Athenian archon year began in the summer. Both dramatic festivals fell in the latter part of that year, the Lenaia roughly in January, the City Dionysia in March. Productions under a given archon can therefore be dated by Julian year (i.e., the latter year), and I have done so in what follows, except where there is a possibility of confusion.

¹⁰ See J.Henderson, *Aristophanes; Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987) xv-xxv on the dating of that play, especially his discussion (xxi-xxiii) of Peisandros' mission to Athens from the officers on Samos. Peisandros seems to have been in the city from late December 412 to mid-March 411, and Henderson argues persuasively that lines 489-92 of the play reflect this visit. Thus they could have been written no earlier than late December for the Lenaean performance.

¹¹ Maximus of Tyre, *Philosophoumena* XIV,7 (p. 179, 10 Hob. [= Κόλακες test. iv K-A.]) states that Eupolis ridiculed Kallias ἐν Διονυσίοις. This does not necessarily mean the play was a city play. At III,3 (p.33, 15) he uses ἐν Διονυσίοις to refer to Aristophanes' treatment of Socrates in *Clouds*, which was a city play; XVII, 6 (p.226, 9) is the same. At XVIII, 4 (p.221, 12-13), however, ἐν Διονυσίοις refers to the practices of comic poets (plural) ridiculing Socrates; not all can have been city plays. So too XVI, 1 (p. 197, 4-5) and XXXVII, 5 (p.432, 11) seem to refer to Dionysiac rites in general. Therefore Maximus is no proof that Flatterers was a city play.

this places the Maricas in 421. Further corroboration is supplied by c Clouds 549b [= Μαρικῶς test. ii K-A.], where we learn that Εὐπολις ἐπλάττο τὴν Κλέωνος τελευτὴν ἐν τῷ Μαρικῶ.

The only attempt to date any other comedy specifically to 421 with which I am familiar is J.M.Edmonds' placement of Pherecrates' Δουλοδιδασκάλος here on the basis of its fr. 47K: κἀνψηφίσασθ' ἀποδοῦναι πάλιν τὰ χρυσία. The gold here mentioned he connects with the discussion of Hyperbolus taking Egyptian bribes in a fragment of Leukon, Phratries fr. 1 K-A.:

ἄταρ, ὦ Μεγάκλεες, οἶσθ' ἅ ποῦ Παάπιδος
Ἐπέρβολος τὰ κτώμαθ' ἃ κατεδήδοκε.

Mention of gold or silver (neither of which actually occurs in this fragment) is far too common in comedy to put much faith in. The eponymous chorus in Flatterers may be plundering Hyperbolus' house in fr. 162 K-A.:

φοροῦσιν, ἀρπάζουσιν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας
τὸ χρυσίον, τὰργύρια πορθεῖται

While doubtless his gains were ill-gotten, there is no allusion to foreign bribery here. The recent fragmentary papyrus commentary on Maricas shows that silver and gold vessels had something to do with this play, but the words χρυσία τὰ ἀργυρ[ώμ]ατα seem to be not a lemma but part of the commentary (fr. 192 K-A., line 164). At best we can only say that Edmonds' choice of 421 for Pherecrates' Slave-Trainer is not demonstrably wrong (and may be superior to connecting it with Cratinus' Θρηῆται fr. 76 K-A. which refers to Egyptian gold and probably dates near 430; this seems too early for Pherecrates).

Thus we know of two plays of Eupolis which competed in 421, which we must divide between the two festivals. If we accept the grouping given by the second sentence in Hyp. 3 Peace, the Flatterers competed with Aristophanes' Peace and Leucon's Phratries at one festival, while Maricas was entered at the other. The traditional dating places the first group at the City Dionysia; the Maricas would then have fallen at the Lenaia. In light of its content this may be probable: given Aristophanes' experience with Babylonians in 426 and his comments in Achamians (377-382; 497-506) on Cleon's response, it seems somewhat more likely that Eupolis would launch an attack on Hyperbolus such as the Maricas seems to have been at the Lenaia. While Flatterers too seems to have attacked Hyperbolus, its chorus of parasites anticipates the comedy of the next century, with its humor of character types and consequently wider appeal; as such, Flatterers may have been more suitable to the more international audience at the City Dionysia.

I would hesitate to place much weight on this argument: it is one thing for a poet to keep his political attacks "within the family," another to believe that an Athenian poet as yet took any notice of the tastes of the non-Athenian members of his audience or his plays' more than parochial appeal. Yet at some point Athenian poets did just this, else the new international

style in comedy would never have appeared. The argument is further weakened by Leukon's Phratries: this certainly sounds a thoroughly home-grown play.

We are thus left with at most five plays datable to 421: the group of Flatterers, Peace, and Phratries, and the Maricas with perhaps the accompaniment of Pherecrates' Slave-Trainer. Absent from the second occasion at the moment is any entry from the brash new Wunderkind of Attic comedy in the 420's, Aristophanes. Can we plausibly suggest any of his plays for the sixth slot?

My colleague Jeffrey Henderson has suggested to me¹² that the missing play may be the first version of Peace. We noted above that one possible explanation for the confusion in the hypothesis might be conflation of two notices. While it seems unlikely that notices for two different plays, even if both were presented during the archonship of Alkaios, would be accidentally run together, if those two plays were both entitled Peace, Henderson's suggestion seems far more reasonable. In 1897 A.Körte suggested that the didascalic notice of Hyp. 3 Peace might represent a conflation of the first and second Peace.¹³ For reasons to be dealt with below, he proposed that the second Peace was presented at the Lenaia of 420. The further any revised version of Peace is removed from the events of 422/1, however, the less relevant it seems. Henderson postulates a first version of Peace at the Lenaia of 421, a second at the City Dionysia. Before examining this possibility further, we must now consider whether any second version of Peace ever existed.

Evidence for Εἰρήνη β'

Questions of the date and nature of the second Peace have been extensively debated. No clear conclusion has emerged, nor do I propose to advance one. I wish only to lay out certain probabilities and improbabilities about this play--which can in turn help us assess the likelihood of conflation or corruption in the passage of Hyp. 3 with which we began. The starting point for the debate over the second Peace must be Hyp. 2 of Peace, which runs as follows:

Φέρεται ἐν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις δεδιδασχῶς Εἰρήνην (β') ὁμοίως ὁ Ἄριστοφάνης.
ἄδηλον οὖν, φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης, πρότερον τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνεδίδαξεν ἢ ἑτέραν
καθῆκεν, ἥτις οὐ κῶζεται. Κράτης μὲντοι δύο οἶδε δράματα γράφων οὕτως·
ἀλλ' οὖν γε ἐν τοῖς Ἀχαρωεύειν ἢ Βαβυλωνίοις ἢ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ Εἰρήνῃ. καὶ
σποράδην δέ τινα ποιήματα παρατίθεται, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ νῦν φερομένη οὐκ ἔστιν.

Some have questioned whether we possess any evidence beyond this passage for the existence of a lost Peace. Kassel-Austin in PCG attribute five fragments to Εἰρήνη β': fr. 305-309. Platnauer (xvii-xix) and Rogers (xxviii-xxxi) discuss six passages attributed to the second Peace, only four of which are so attributed by Kassel-Austin. Kassel-Austin accept

¹² Private communication, dated 12/22/87.

¹³ A.Körte, "Zu attischen DionysosFesten," RhMus 52 (1897) esp. 172-74.

the attribution of one of the six to the Ὀλκάδεε (296K = 420 K-A.), and another which Platnauer doubted (569K) is now assigned to the Ὠροί (581 K-A.); these re-attributions are doubtless correct.¹⁴ In three remaining cases Platnauer simply blames the source which reports the fragment: thus he claims that Stobaeus has run two fragments together (305 K-A.) or that Pollux (306 K-A.) or an unnamed source (308 K-A.) has simply given a wrong reference. In the case of 307 K-A., he rightly criticizes various attempts to insert it in the existing text of Peace, remarks that the line looks tragic, and leaves it at that. 309 K-A. was apparently unknown to him.

None of these fragments is found in our existing text of Peace; all are attributed to Peace without further specification. While it is true that "had any of [these] citations been made to Εἰρήνη β' our faith would have been strengthened in its existence,"¹⁵ it is nonetheless misleading to claim "Zitate aus einer zweiten Eirene gibt es nicht."¹⁶ One or two fragments may be erroneously cited, but to claim that for all looks like special pleading in light of the statement in Hyp. 2, to which we now return.

Eratosthenes presents us with two possibilities: either that Aristophanes produced Peace twice (ἀνεδίδαξεν), or that he produced another play with the same title. Eratosthenes felt that he did not have the grounds for deciding which of these was the case: do we? Clearly he did not himself possess two texts; what is not clear is whether he had any more information on the point beyond the quotation from Krates which follows.

Widely varying claims have been made about the material to which Eratosthenes had access and the state of his knowledge. Though we cannot answer them with certainty, we must raise a few questions. Did Eratosthenes have access to didascalical records and in such a form that would have allowed him to determine easily whether there were two productions of an Aristophanes play entitled Peace and the dates of those productions? If he did, it seems unlikely that those productions would have been widely separated. That there were two plays called Wealth is quite clear, a lost version of 408 BC and the surviving play of 388: no one will take seriously the suggestion that these were the same play. We might consequently argue that Eratosthenes would not have thought a re-production a possibility if the recorded performances of Peace were separated by more than a few years. On the other hand, if his records showed two productions quite close together, the possibility of a re-production would seem quite likely. Henderson's suggestion (first production at the Lenaia of 421, second at the City Dionysia that year) and Körte's (first production at the City Dionysia of 421, second at the Lenaia of 420) would both meet this criterion. Such didascalical records

¹⁴ See also Sommerstein xix and note 13.

¹⁵ Platnauer xix.

¹⁶ L.Radermacher, "Zum Prolog der Eirene," WS 43 (1922/23): 105-115; 114. Radermacher's solution to the problem of the notice in the hypothesis of a second Peace is an emendation which has found little favor: "nehme ich einen schon von van Leeuwen geäußerten Gedanken in anderer Form wieder auf und schlage vor, ὁμοίως ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης in Ἀραρῶς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνους zu verwandeln" (113).

would also have included information on rank at the festival. On Körte's suggestion, the first Peace placed second, the next version first: would Eratosthenes then have been in doubt that a revision was indeed Aristophanes' method here? If Aristophanes' procedure here was just that which he began in the case of the Clouds but never brought to a second production, we might then wonder why Krates seems to have found the two plays distinct.

On balance it seems more probable that Eratosthenes did not have didascalical records so complete that he could readily determine whether or not a second Peace was ever produced. If he had, he would not have been in such doubt between the two possibilities of revision or separate play. There is no independent proof that Eratosthenes had access to didascalical information in this form. In that case the evidence he was considering for a second Peace may have been no more than the quotation from Krates recorded in the Hypothesis.

Let us then consider the possibilities that Krates leaves open to us. He refers to the existence of something "in Achamians or Babylonians or the other Peace." The first two are early plays; it is then at least possible to conjecture that "the other Peace" is also early.¹⁷ It has, I think, been too little stressed that "the other Peace" does not necessarily mean "the second Peace." What is sufficient to make the play "other"? The term seems to imply some subordination, either in time or quality, of one to the other. It is at least possible that "the other Peace" designates the surviving text, which might be later or simply less successful, in Krates' view.¹⁸

This "other Peace" is either earlier or later than the surviving Peace, and it is also either another version of essentially the same play or another, entirely different play. Four combinations result: the lost Peace was: (1) an earlier but different play; (2) an earlier, first version of the surviving play; (3) a later version of the surviving play; (4) a later and different play. The principal contender for (1) is to suggest that this earlier, different play has come down to us under another title. Henderson is the only one to suggest (2). Körte is the chief representative of view (3). Many alternatives are subsumable under (4). We shall now take these up, though not strictly in turn.

There is not a great deal of room to fit an entirely different play called Peace into the years preceding 421, given our present understanding of Aristophanic chronology. The primary possibility here is a play with two titles: the play known to Krates as the other Peace could have come down to us (and been known to Eratosthenes) under another title. The favored candidate here is one of Aristophanes' early plays, the *Γεωργοί*¹⁹ This is an attractive suggestion for several reasons. It is well-attested in the fragments (101-127 K-A.) and

¹⁷ So Körte (above, n. 13) 174 concluded.

¹⁸ The view of G.Kaibel (quoted in PCG III.2 p. 170) was that Eratosthenes' phrasing implied that he knew "the other Peace" to be a later play, an argument that H.Helmbold, *Aristophanis Pax superstes utrum prior sit an retractata* (Jena 1890) also accepted. Sommerstein (xx n. 18) points out the logical fallacy in this argument, though Sommerstein himself inclines to the view that the second Peace was later.

¹⁹ First suggested by Fritzsche. For the date of *Γεωργοί* see T.Gelzer, *Aristophanes der Komiker* (Stuttgart 1971) [reprinted from Supplement-Band XII der Pauly'schen Realencyclopädie] columns 1408-09.

would presumably have been known to Eratosthenes under this name. As in others of Aristophanes' early plays, the yearning for peace and the desire of farmers to return to the land (109 K-A.) were intertwined. Finally, we know that in the lost Peace the divine figure Γεωργία appeared on stage (305 KA.).

The date of Farmers is uncertain. The play made reference to Nicias' humiliation after Cleon's victory at Sphacteria (fr. 102 K-A.) and so must be after 425. On the other hand another fragment seems to speak of tanning a hide in the context of the city's needs:

ὄτου δοκεῖ σοι δεῖν μάλιττα τῇ πόλει

(B.) ἐμοὶ μὲν ἔπι τὸν μολγὸν εἶναι ἄ· οὐκ ἀκήκοα;

Not all jokes about tanning refer to Cleon, but he is by far the likeliest referent for such a passage as this; that would then imply that at the time of the production of the Farmers, Cleon was still alive: hence, prior to the summer of 422.

If we postulate that Γεωργοί was known to Eratosthenes only under that title but to Krates as Εἰρήνη, we might then account for Eratosthenes' confusion when confronted with a citation ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ Εἰρήνῃ. Let us then consider whether this will explain the confusion in Hyp. 3 to Peace. The writer of the hypothesis might have had a source which referred to Farmers under its other title of Peace and recorded a victory for it. Unlike the case for the tragedians, we do not have reports of numbers of victories won by Aristophanes; he well might have won a first with Farmers. This confusion alone, though, would not account for the statement that: ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητῆς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἄστει. In our discussion of the date of the surviving Peace above, the probability that that play was produced for the City Dionysia in the spring of 421 was very strong indeed. On that assumption, if Farmers won a City victory, it would not have been in the archonship of Alkaios (422/1). If Farmers did win in the archonship of Alkaios, it could only have been at the Lenaia, not the City Dionysia. If, however, fr. 103 K-A. of Farmers refers to Cleon as still living, a production of this play at either festival of 421 (the only two within the archonship specified) is not possible at all.

To summarize briefly: by itself the suggestion that Krates meant by "the other Peace" the play we know as Farmers is possible. This suggestion alone will not account for the confusion in Hyp. 3 of Peace. The likeliest dates for Farmers are the range of 424 to 422. If we disregard 103 K-A., we might place Farmers at the Lenaia of 421, which leaves us to account further for the addition of the phrase ἐν ἄστει to what was (in a presumably non-Alexandrian source which gave its title as Peace) the report of its victory. At most this must be considered a very doubtful possibility.

Similar multi-stage corruptions must be postulated if we are to account for the report of Hyp. 3 as a confusion between a first version of Peace and its newly produced revision. Here we return and examine the suggestions of Körte and Henderson that the first and second versions of Peace were produced at successive festivals. The chief representative of

possibility (3), Körte's suggestion that the lost Peace was a revision for the Lenaia of 420, occurs in the context of a discussion of acting contests at the Lenaia and City Dionysia, the problem to which we will next turn. Because he believes that a comic actors' competition was impossible at the City Dionysia at this period, he suggests that the third sentence of Hyp. 3 must report results of a Lenaean acting contest, i.e., that at the re-performance of Peace at the Lenaia of 420. Körte does not actually address the problem of the conflict between ἐνίκησε and δεύτερος. Let us look again at the three sentences of the hypothesis:

ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἅττει. πρῶτος
 Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορσι.
τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος· ἡνίκα ἐρμῆν λιοκρότης.†

On Körte's hypothesis, the phrases in bold print (including an emendation of the last three words to be discussed shortly) refer to the performance of the revised version of Peace at the Lenaia of 420, while the rest of the notice deals with the original performance at the City Dionysia of 421. In favor of Körte's suggestion, we may note the logic of the order: Aristophanes does what he intended to do in the case of Clouds and takes a play which he believes was unjustly denied the first prize, stages it anew, and is vindicated by victory at the next contest. Against his suggestion, we may note that the Peace would be notably less topical at the Lenaia of 420, when the peace had been in effect for almost a year. Again I must note that Körte does not address the fact that ἐνίκησε cannot mean "placed second;" once we recognize this, however, separating ἐνίκησε from its archon date seems to postulate considerable corruption in the text.

Henderson's suggestion (our possibility [2]) that the lost Peace was performed at the Lenaia of 421 actually presents us with two sub-variants. The first postulates that Aristophanes won the Lenaia with the first version of Peace and then chose to enter a revised version for the Dionysia as well, where it placed second. On this hypothesis, the bold type refers to the Lenaean performance, the rest to the Dionysian one:

ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἅττει. πρῶτος
 Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορσι.
τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος· ἡνίκα ἐρμῆν λιοκρότης.†

This does less violence to the transmitted text than Körte's suggestion and has the advantage of making both performances of Peace topical (i.e., looking forward to the peace settlement). It does leave us, however, to wonder why Aristophanes would try to repeat a successful performance: the Clouds offers no parallel for this, and one wonders what the Athenian audience would have made of such a procedure.

The logically more plausible alternative suggests that the lost Peace placed second at the Lenaia and its revision was successful at the City Dionysia. Thus in the following the bold type would refer to the first performance, the plain text to the second:

ἐνίκησε δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἄτει. πρῶτος
Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος Λεύκων φράτορσι.
τὸ δὲ δράμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος· ἤνικα ἐρμῆν λοιοκράτης.†

Against this suggestion we must weigh the arguments above which suggested that Eupolis' Flatterers was the more likely of his two plays of 421 to place at the City Dionysia. Beyond this, the stages of corruption which would lead to Hyp. 3 in its present form seem dim but quite complex. The reports of the Lenaia and the City Dionysia would then have been reversed in order and combined by someone who saw no inconcinnity between ἐνίκησε and δεύτερος. Finally, though it is an argument from silence, it seems curious that no echo of Aristophanes' most unusual procedure in producing a revised play (with at least one change in its cast of characters) at the very next festival is to be found either in the discussions of Clouds or elsewhere.

We may add one final argument. G.Mastromarco, independently of questions about the date of the Peace, has suggested that Aristophanes produced no play between the Wasps at the Lenaia of 422 and the Peace at the City Dionysia of 421.²⁰ He suggests that lines 781-790 of Peace allude to the disastrous effects of the dancing of Carcinus and his sons on the production of Wasps in 422 and that the allusion to its second place finish over a year later in Peace indicates it is still part of the "theatrical present" of Aristophanes, because the poet had not appeared at any intervening festival.

Certainty is not possible, but the balance of probability inclines toward the view that the lost Peace was an entirely different play of the same title, as is the case with the lost Wealth and lost Thesmophoriazusae. If so, it must be a good bit later than the surviving play. Sommerstein's conclusions on this point are succinct and cogent:

... the lost play. ...cannot have been produced before 412; for it was only in the spring of 413 that war came again to Attica with the Spartan invasion of the country and occupation of Deceleia, and the Attic peasants had again to evacuate their lands. Most probably the lost play belongs to one of the years 410-405. It will have been a completely new play, not a revision of the one we have: our Peace is so closely bound up with the particular circumstances of the year 412²¹

If we must then abandon the notion that a confusion between the two versions of Peace accounts for the confusion in Hyp. 3, what are we to make of ἐνίκησε? I suggest we return to a neglected emendation proposed by Gröbl. He alone has noted the problem with the tense of this verb: "Uebrigens ist auch schon der Aorist auffällig, da sonst überall die stehende Formel ἐνίκησιν ist."²² He proposes that the original reading was ἐνίκησιν τὸ δράμα, with the

²⁰ G.Mastromarco, "Una Norma Agonistica del Teatro di Atene," Rh.Mus. 121 (1978) 19-34, esp. 28. For further discussion, see Luppe 1980 and Sutton 1982 (above, n.7).

²¹ Sommerstein xix-xx.

²² Gröbl (above, n.2) 64.

sense that "es bezeichnet eben auch: 'in den Kampf lassen'."²³ As he himself admits, this is not the standard expression for competing; nonetheless it is clear that both the tense and the sense of ἐνίκησε are wrong. Once it is removed, we can see that both the first and second sentences of the passage in Hyp. 3 refer to the production of the surviving Peace at the City Dionysia of 421.²⁴

Actors' Contests

We must now turn our attention to the final sentence of Hyp. 3 and the attempts to emend its last three words. If we accept the line of reasoning presented above, there is no reason to doubt that the statement that "Apollodoros acted the play" refers to the Peace which was performed at the City Dionysia of 421 and placed second.²⁵ Even if one does not, the most natural reading of the passage is that Apollodorus acted the play which placed second; to assume that he acted in the putative other play which "won" on some other occasion (a City play, unless we amend or edit that sentence) implies once again more disruption in the text than we so far have evidence for.

Nor is the statement unparalleled. Appended to the verse hypothesis in the *Dyskolos* papyrus is the following didascalical notice:²⁶

ἐδίδαξεν εἰς Λήναια ἐπὶ Δημογένουσι ἀρχοντ(ος) καὶ ἐνίκᾳ. ὑπεκρίνατο
Ἄριστόδημος Σκαφεύς. ἀντεπιγράφεται(αι) Μικάνθρωπος.

Thus the anonymous writer of this notice had access not merely to records of the poets' victories but also to information about who played in such plays. We apparently have just such a notice from a century earlier: Apollodorus, of whom we know unfortunately nothing else, was the protagonist in Aristophanes' production of Peace.

This is not all the hypothesis writer wished to convey to us, however; there remain three corrupt words, concealing some bit of information. A number of emendations have been proposed, to which we must now turn. As we do so, we must keep in mind more than just

²³ Gröbl (above, n.2) 65. On the previous page he considers εὐδοκίμησε, which he had earlier established (§ 8) was regularly used to designate second place, but concludes that not only is this "doch zu weit von ἐνίκησε, but also double designation of the second-place finish in the hypothesis is "kaum wahrscheinlich."

²⁴ One last issue may remain. The use of the term ὁ ποιητής to refer to Aristophanes himself is unparalleled in a didascalical notice. As Henderson has pointed out to me (above, n. 12), it does seem curious to refer to Aristophanes first as "the poet," and then by name in the record of placement at the contest. Once we dismiss another didascalical notice as the source, however, this information could have been supplied by the hypothesis compiler from anywhere. ὁ ποιητής may come from an unknown literary source (rather than Aristotle or Callimachus, on whom see below)--but if its source is not didascalical, we have no reason to assume it is correct.

²⁵ If we still wish to consider the possibility of a conflation of notices for two versions of Peace, the only real alternative is one of the variants of Henderson's suggestion. This might be a report of the results of the actors' contest when the Peace placed second at the Lenaia of 421. The objections noted above still incline me against this suggestion.

²⁶ Which I quote from Sandbach's OCT of Menander. Note also the ἐνίκᾳ, which is further corroboration for Gröbl's view that this, and not the aorist, was the customary form in the didascalia (see n.22, above).

the palaeographic possibilities. We must also ask what the possible sources and probable purposes of a didascalical notice such as this might be. The emendations of ἡνίκᾱ ἔρμῆν λιοκρότης known to me are the following:

ἡνίκᾱ ἔτ' ἦν ὑποκριτής - Dindorf
 ἡνίκᾱ Ἐρμῆν Καλλίστρατος - Ranke
 ἔνικᾱ Ἐρμῶν ὑποκριτής - Rose
 ἡνίκᾱ Εἰρήνη β' Λεωκράτης - Richter
 τὸν δὲ Τρυγαῖον ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος, τὸν δὲ Ἐρμῆν Λεωκράτης - Blaydes
 (ἀνεδιδάχθη δὲ ἐπὶ ...), ἡνίκᾱ Ἐρμ(ων) ἦν ὑποκριτής - Mette²⁷

Of this Apollodorus we know nothing; the poet of New Comedy is chronologically out of the question. Therefore, though we do know of poets who began as actors, Dindorf's suggestion merely creates an unknown poet out of an unknown actor. To Ranke's and Blaydes' suggestions the same objection may be posed: as Platnauer succinctly puts it, "from what record could a later scholar discover the name of a deuter- or trit-agonist?"²⁸ To the end of competitions at Athens, only the protagonist was said to "act the play." It is simply inconceivable that a didascalical source available to an Alexandrian scholar would contain information about supporting players. We may therefore safely rule out any emendation which purports to tell us who played Hermes in the Peace, though one can see the temptation, once corruption began, to find his name in our text. The actor Leocrates imagined by both Blaydes and Richter is a phantom nowhere else recorded. Richter's suggestion is palaeographically plausible but presupposes a conflation of notices of the first and second Peace, which we have argued against.²⁹ Rose's emendation (the basis of Mette's), which finds a victory here for a known comic actor, Hermon, is by far the most persuasive.

Rohde was the first to note that, for Rose's emendation to be correct, there must have been a contest among comic actors at the City Dionysia in this period.³⁰ At the time he wrote, this was perfectly plausible. Within the next few years, as the fragmentary inscriptions from Athens known as the "Fasti" and the "Didascaliai" became better known, it no longer seemed even possible. It is to meet the objections presented by this material that

²⁷ Dindorf (ed. 1838), Ranke, *de Ar. vita* (1846), V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig 1863) 554, Blaydes (ed. 1883), H.J. Mette, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland* (Berlin and New York 1977) 157.

²⁸ Platnauer *ad loc.*

²⁹ To anticipate somewhat in the course of our argument, note too that on the usual assumption of the absence of an actors' contest at the Dionysia, Richter's emendation implies that both versions of Peace were Lenaeian plays. The second must have been, and where would information about the actor at the first performance have come from other than contest records? This would rule out both Körte's and Henderson's proposals.

³⁰ E. Rohde, "Scenica," *Rh. Mus.* 38 (1883) 251-292, esp. 285-286.

Körte proposed placing the revised version of Peace at the Lenaia of 420.³¹ To the inscriptional evidence we now must turn.

Two monuments from Athens, one of the fourth century, one of the third, were inscribed with information on the dramatic competitions. The first, IG² ii² 2318 (often referred to as the "Fasti"), was a record of the competitions at the City Dionysia.³² The second was apparently a square building of Ionic style on whose interior were inscribed a series of lists of tragedies and comedies which competed at both the City Dionysia and the Lenaia, including the names of the protagonists who acted these plays (IG ii² 2319-2323),³³ as well as a list of victorious poets and actors in the order of their first victory in each contest and including the number of their victories (IG ii² 2325).³⁴

The heading of IG ii² 2318, though also fragmentary, makes clear its purpose:

]ΤΟΝ ΚΩΜΟΙ ΗCΑΝ Τ[ΩΙ ΔΙΟΝΥC]ΩΙ ΤΡΑΓΩΔΟΙ Δ[

It is a record of the κῶμοι honor of Dionysos. It contains yearly entries (headed by the archon's name) of the victorious tribes and choregoi in dithyramb and of the choregoi and poets in tragedy and comedy in a fixed order. While only small parts of this inscription survive, the number of lines given to each entry is certain. We know that in the year 450/49 a line began to be added to each year's record which gave the name of the actor victorious in the newly instituted tragic actors' competition. This is a somewhat surprising addition. While the victory of all the others recorded here was identical with the victory of the κῶμος with which they were associated, that of the tragic protagonist was not (see further below).

The form and purpose of the other inscriptions is notably different. They seem intended to give a comprehensive record of dramatic competition in Athens. As such, they are assumed to be closely linked with Aristotle's lost work on the dramatic competitions, the *Διδασκαλῖαι*. The name of the protagonist who "acted the play" accompanies each title, and the victor in the actors' contest is given as well.

The similarity in form of these latter inscriptions and the information on actors in the *Dyskolos* papyrus and Hyp. 3 of Peace implies a common source: information on the play and its own success in competition is followed by a statement of who acted the play. This in turn confirms the choice to read ἐνίκᾱ rather than ἠνίκᾱ in Hyp. 3. Not only does this give us sensible didascalical information rather than implausible biographical information, but it does so in a form we would expect from an Aristotelian source.³⁵ Moreover, ἐνίκᾱ is the

³¹ Körte (above, n.13).

³² Mette (above, n.27) 1-42; Sir Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² rev. W. H. D. Lewis (Oxford 1968) 101-107.

³³ Mette (above, n.27) 83-152; Pickard-Cambridge (above, n.32) 107-111.

³⁴ Mette (above, n.27) 159-189; Pickard-Cambridge (above, n.32) 112-120.

³⁵ Aristotle was of course not the only source. Callimachus composed a special chronological pinax entitled Πίναξ καὶ ἀναγραφὴ τῶν κατὰ χρόνον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων. R. Pfeiffer, *A History of Classical Scholarship I* (Oxford 1968) 132 translates this as "Table and register of the dramatic poets...", reflecting his acceptance of Körte's suggestion that the fragments of Athenian comic didaskalia (IG

form used to report Aristophanes' own victories in the play competition; it is what we would expect for the actors' contests as well.

Were it not for the argument from silence posed by IG ii² 2318, we would have not the slightest hesitation in recognizing in †ήνικά έρμην λοιοκρότης† a record of the victory of the well-known actor Hermon in the comic actors' competition. That Apollodorus as protagonist did not win the actors' competition will seem quite in keeping with the second-place finish of *Peace*: just as with theatrical awards today, there was doubtless a close link between the success of the production as a whole and that of the leading actor. This was not always the case, however; in 418 we know of a victorious actor who played in a losing play.³⁶ The latest editor to turn his attention to Hyp. 3, Mette, concurs in finding a reference to Hermon here but continues to accept the silence of IG ii² 2318 as definitive. He therefore conjectures a notice of the re-production of *Peace* at a later date, to which all the objections noted above still apply.

Conclusions

Given the nature of our evidence, the only firm conclusion to the problems of the hypotheses to *Peace* are likely to be negative. While opinions will differ over Gröbl's conjecture of *vilet* in the first sentence under consideration, I hope that I have offered further reasons for regarding *ένίκησε* as impossible.

I hope too that I have offered some grounds for re-opening the question of whether there was an actors' contest at the City Dionysia in the fifth century. It seems very curious that this one contest would have been instituted only a century later, when the other three actors' contests all date within a few years of each other in the 440's and 430's. It has been suggested that the City Dionysia was a more prestigious event for tragedy, the *Lenaia* for comedy. If there were no tragic actors' competition at the *Lenaia*, the lack of a comic competition at the Dionysia would not seem strange—but that is not the case. Nor can we see a logical occasion for beginning a comic actors' contest in the later fourth century; there seems to have been no sudden change in the nature or quality of comic actors at this period.

We know very little about the occasion or motivation for the erection of IG ii² 2318. While Reisch attempted to connect it with the reconstruction of the theatre under Lysurgus, the findspots for most of the fragments were north of the Acropolis.³⁷ I would only point again to the title of the inscription which indicates it is a record of κῶμοι; in this context, the record of the tragic actor's victory is the anomaly. The question must at least be asked: could there have been a victorious comic actor proclaimed at the festival but whose name those who ordered this inscription did not choose to record? There are other surprising omissions

xiv 1097, 1098, and 1098a) found at Rome are "a more or less exact apographon" of Callimachus' work; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (above, n.32) 120-122.

³⁶ This was the well known tragic actor Kallipides at the *Lenaia* for that year: IG ii² 2319.

³⁷ Pickard-Cambridge (above, n.32) 104.

from our point of view: the victorious poets for dithyramb are not recorded, only the tribes and the choregoi. We know far too little about the motivations of those who erected this inscription to pronounce with certainty on what information they would have found worthy of record.

Once we have noted the selectivity of the information this inscription gives us, the way to further speculation is open. Was there a comic actors' contest which was somehow not "official"? or the responsibility of officials unconnected with those who erected IG ii² 2318? It is better to return to more solid facts. In some source available to the hypothesis writer the fact that Apollodorus acted the Peace was recorded. Someone had access to the names of fifth century comic actors who played in losing plays. This resembles much more the so-called "Didascalica" inscriptions than the "Fasti." The former, probably based on an Aristotelian source, recorded victories in the acting contests as well.

I would restore the text of Hyp. 3 of Peace thus:

ἐνίησι δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἄττει.
 πρῶτος Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος
 Λεύκων Φράτορι. τὸ δὲ δράμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος·
 ἐνίκα Ἑρμῶν ὑποκριτῆς.

Until more information comes to light, the possibility of a comic actor's contest at the City Dionysia as early as 421 should remain open.

The Center for Hellenic Studies &
 The University of Southern California

Niall W. Slater

ZPE 77 (1989) 260

CORRIGENDA

S.52, Z.29: Lies "421" statt "412".