

ARISTOPHANES AND AESCHYLUS’
PERSIANS: HELLENISTIC DISCUSSIONS
 ON AR. RAN. 1028 F.

1. *A problematic reference to Aeschylus’ Persians
 in Aristophanes’ Frogs*

Ar. ran. 1028 f.:¹

Δι. ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ’ ἴηκουσα περὶ† Δαρείου
τεθνεῶτος,
 ὁ χορὸς δ’ εὐθὺς τὰ χεῖρ’ ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν·
“ἰαυοῖ.”

ἡνίκ’ ἴηκουσα περὶ| ἡνίκ’ ἀπηγγέλθη περὶ cod. Venetus Marcianus 475
 (vd. infra) : ἡνίκ’ ἀπηγγέλθη παρὰ Bothe (παρὰ iam Welcker) : τῆ
 νικάκουσας παρὰ Fritzsche : ἡνίκ’ ἐκόκυσας παῖ Tyrrell : ἡνίκα γ’
 ἴηκουσαν παρὰ Richards : ἡνίκ’ ἐπήκοος ἦ τοῦ vel ἡνίκ’ ἐπήκουον τοῦ
 Dover : ἡνίκ’ ἐπήκουσαν Δαρείου τοῦ τεθνεῶτος Sommerstein : alii alia

Lines 1028 f. are one of the most puzzling passages of *Frogs*. During the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides, as soon as Aeschylus mentions *Persians*, a tragedy – he claims – that had inspired the Athenians to fight the enemy, Dionysus observes: “Certainly I rejoiced, when I heard about the death of Darius, and the chorus started immediately to clap their hands, like this, shouting *iauoi*” (vv. 1028 f.). These two lines are riddled with difficulties that concern both the text and its meaning with reference to *Persians*; modern commentaries on *Frogs* discuss all such problems at length, without reaching a generally accepted solution.²

First of all, the problems involving the text. The text of line 1028 (an anapestic tetrameter catalectic), as transmitted in the manuscript tradition, cannot be correct, because it is unmetrical;

1) I reproduce the text of Wilson’s 2007 edition (Wilson 2007a).

2) Useful discussions of the problems raised by our passage are in the recent commentaries by Dover (1993) and Sommerstein (1996); see also Wilson 2007b, 177 f.; Mastromarco / Totaro 2006, 658 f.; Totaro 2006, 95–114.

in place of the words ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα we should read the sequence – ∞ – ∞ –. None of the conjectures proposed to correct the text has found unanimous approval; the problem remains open, and modern editors of *Frogs* generally print the passage between *crucis*.³

Secondly, the line's content is not consistent with the action of Aeschylus' play, because in *Persians* the death of Darius is not announced. In fact, the events described in the play take place in 480, at the time of the battle of Salamis, when Darius had been dead for some years; his ghost, summoned up by the Persian queen and the chorus, appears on the scene and explains that the reason of the defeat of the Persians is Xerxes' hybris; the ghost also announces the Greek victory in the battle at Plataea in the following year (vv. 805–820; this is important for the discussion that will follow). Xerxes himself appears on stage at the end of the play, dressed in rags, lamenting his defeat.

Line 1029 offers two further problems related to the behaviour of the chorus as it is described in l. 1029: as the scholia note, in *Persians* the chorus do not clap their hands, and do not say “iaoui”. These latter issues are the least worrying in modern terms: even if in ancient Greece clapping one's hands was a way to express pleasure, in this passage it evidently signifies pain; alternatively, the gesture could be used as a typical trait of the culture of the Persian chorus. As for the exclamation “iaoui”, it does not appear in *Persians*, where we find, however, ἦέ, οἶ, ὀἶ and ἰωά, that are very similar; they are used almost exclusively in this tragedy and, in all probability, must have sounded foreign and barbarian to a Greek audience.⁴ The visual character of the reference to the behaviour of the chorus in *Persians* has been rightly underlined by modern scholars, in view of the possibility that Aristophanes here is describing an actual performance of the tragedy: we know that Aeschylus' plays continued to be staged in Athens throughout the second half of the fifth century B. C., and Aristophanes and his Athenian audience could certainly have attended one of these performances.⁵

3) An extremely useful and detailed discussion of the text of our passage is in Totaro 2006, 95–114, with a critical survey of the conjectures proposed in the past to correct the text.

4) See the notes on l. 1029 in Dover 1993 and in Sommerstein 1996.

5) See Totaro 2006, 105–107, with a bibliography on the stagings of Aeschylus' plays after his death; Wartelle 1971, 55 ff.; Nervegna 2007, 15–18.

The passage of *Frogs* and the scholia to it have been studied as evidence in the complex and long-standing debate on the possibility that more than one version of Aeschylus' *Persians* circulated in antiquity. According to the Alexandrian scholar Eratosthenes, quoted in the scholia, Aeschylus re-staged the tragedy for a performance in Syracuse, some time after its first production at Athens. Another, lesser-known Hellenistic grammarian, Herodiscus of Babylon, is mentioned in the scholia in relation to the possibility that there existed another version of the tragedy, that apparently included a description of the battle of Plataea (see below). Modern scholars have used this hypothesis to explain a number of difficulties in the text and structure of *Persians* as we have it, which could arise from alterations made by Aeschylus himself for the second performance of the play.⁶

The analysis of the scholia on the passage will show, in my opinion, that they cannot be used to hypothesize the existence of a second version of *Persians*, since they cannot ostensibly offer any clear evidence that Hellenistic scholars could read a different and revised version of the play. In this respect I agree with A. Garvie, who in the introduction to his 2009 edition of the tragedy reaches the conclusion that the supposed existence of a second version of *Persians* finds no clear substantiation in ancient sources: on the contrary, it is likely that Hellenistic scholars, "faced with the discrepancy between the lines of Aristophanes and the text which they had, and knowing of the reproduction in Syracuse, guessed, like their modern successors, that it must have been different from the original."⁷

In this paper, I propose to adopt a different approach to the problem. Rather than using the scholia on our lines as a basis to hypothesize the existence of different versions of *Persians*, we can analyse the same scholia in order to understand which text of *Frogs* 1028 the scholars of the Hellenistic age were working on. I believe that the ancient discussion contains some information which has passed unnoticed so far and could however be useful for the restoration of the text of line 1028.

6) Recent discussions of this problem are in the introductions to the editions of *Persians* by H. D. Broadhead (1960, xlvi–lv), and by A. F. Garvie (2009, liii–lvii), with bibliography and a lucid survey of earlier contributions.

7) Garvie 2009, lvi.

2. *The ancient scholia on ran. 1028–1029*

These scholia preserve an unusually long and minute analysis of the problems related to our passage, and deserve to be read and translated in full.⁸

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *a*: ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἠνίκ' ἤκουσα RVE (περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος): α. ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις Αἰσχύλου “Πέρσαις”, οὔτε Δαρείου θάνατος ἀπαγγέλλεται, οὔτε χορὸς τὰς χεῖρας συγκρούσας λέγει “ἰαυοί”. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πράγματα ὑπόκειται ἐν Σούσοις, καὶ περίφοβός ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ Ξέρξου ἐξ ὄνειρου τινός, χορὸς δὲ Περσῶν γερόντων διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτήν. εἶτα ἄγγελος ἀπαγγέλλων τὴν περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὴν Ξέρξου φυγὴν. RVEΘBarb(Ald) β. Δίδυμος: ὅτι οὐ περιέχουσι θάνατον Δαρείου “οἱ Πέρσαι” τὸ δρᾶμα (p. 250 Schmidt). VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *b*: α. Χαῖρίς φησι (fr. 22 Berndt): τὸ “Δαρείου” ἀντὶ τοῦ Ξέρξου· σύνηθες γὰρ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῖς τῶν πατέρων ὀνόμασι κρήθηται. VEΘBarb(Ald) β. οἱ δέ· ὅτι τοῖς κυρίοις ἀντὶ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν κέχρηται, καὶ (“Δαρείου” ἀντὶ τοῦ Δαρείου υἱοῦ) ἐστὶν, ὁ Ξέρξης. VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *c*: πρὸς ὃν (scil. Χαίριδα) ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐν τῷ δρᾶματι λέγεται “Ξέρξης μὲν αὐτὸς ζῆ τε καὶ βλέπει φάος” (Aesch. Pers. 299). VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *d*: τινὲς γράφουσι (ἀντὶ) (“Δαρείου” “τοῦ Ξέρξου”). VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *e*: α. Ἡρόδικός φησι διττ(ὰς) γεγονέναι (καθέσεις) †...† τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ τὴν τραγωδίαν ταύτην περιέχειν τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην (p. 126 Düring). VEΘBarb(Ald) β. δι' ὅ τινες διττὰς καθέσεις, τουτέστι διδασκαλίας, τῶν “Περσῶν” φασι, καὶ τὴν μίαν μὴ φέρεσθαι. VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *f*: δοκοῦσιν οὗτοι οἱ “Πέρσαι” ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου δεδιδάχθαι ἐν Συρακούσαις, σπουδάσαντος Ἰέρωτος, ὡς φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' “Περὶ κωμωδιῶν” (fr. 109 Strecker = 6 Bagordo). VEΘBarb(Ald)

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *g*: οἱ δέ· ὅτι εἰδῶλον Δαρείου φθέγγεται, ἐκεῖ(νου) τεθνηκότος, δηλονότι. VEΘBarb(Ald)

1028 *a*. α. ἀπαγγέλλεται VEBarb: ἐπ- RΘ 1028 *a*. β cum 1028 *f* conj. (ἄλλως) VE, (δέ) ΘBarb 1028 *b*. α cum 1028 *a*. α conj. (δέ) Barb, (γάρ) Θ 1028 *b*. β cum 1028 *d* conj. VEΘBarb (Δαρείου ἀντὶ τοῦ Δαρείου

8) The text and the apparatus are those printed in Marcel Chantry's 1999 edition of the *scholia vetera*. Chantry also published a very useful annotated French translation of this material (see Chantry 2009, 124–126). Here is a list of the abbreviations used in the apparatus: R = Ravennas 429, s. X; V = Venetus Marcianus gr. 474, s. XI; E = Estensis α.U.5.10, s. XIV ex.; Θ = Laurentianus conv. soppr. 140, s. XIV; Barb. = Vaticanus Barberinianus gr. 126, s. XIV in.; G = Venetus Marcianus gr. 475, s. XV; Ald. = editio Aldina, Venetiis 1498 a M. Musuro composita.

υιοῦ) suppl. Chantry 1028 *d* (ἀντί) suppl. Schuringa 1028 *e. α* cum 1028 *c* conj. (δέ) VEΘBarb διττ(ᾶς) γεγονέναι (καθέσεις) con. Dobree, διττοῦ VEΘBarb, διττήν G ἴ...ἴ τοῦ θανάτου VEΘBarb, om. G, (ὄν μίαν ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαρείου) θανάτου suppl. Fritzsche 1845, 334 καὶ – περιέχειν VEΘBarb: ... ἦτις περιέχει G 1028 *e. β* cum 1028 *a. β* con. VEΘBarb καθέσεις (cf. sch. ad Ar. vesp. 1326, Lys. 1094), καταθέσεις V (G) per compendium, ΘBarb, θέσεις E (Ald) 1028 *f* cum 1028 *e. α* conj. (δέ) VEΘBarb φησιν] φα() Barb 1028 *g* cum 1028 *b. β* conj. VEΘBarb ἐκεί(νου) Dobree: ἐκεί codd.

Translation:

Sch. ad Ar. ran. 1028 *a*: “Certainly I rejoiced, when I heard (about the death of Darius)”:

α: in the *Persians* of Aeschylus as it has come down to us the death of Darius is not announced, nor do the chorus clap their hands and say “*iaoui*”. The action of the play is set in Susa; the mother of Xerxes is terrified because of a dream and the chorus of Persian elders engage in a dialogue with her. Then a messenger arrives, announcing the naval battle at Salamis and the rout of Xerxes.

a. β: Didymus says that the play *Persians* does not cover the death of Darius.

b. α: Chaeris says that the name “Darius” is used in place of “Xerxes”: it is common for poets to call a son by his father’s name.

b. β: according to others, (poets) use the personal name (of the father) instead of the patronymic form, and (Darius) means in fact (the son of Darius), Xerxes.

c: against him (Chaeris) we can say that in the tragedy we read: “Xerxes himself is alive and sees the light” (v. 299).

d: some write Xerxes (instead) of Darius.

e. α: Herodicus says that there were two productions (<...?> of the death, and that this tragedy included the battle of Plataea.

e. β: therefore some say there were two productions, that is stagings, of *Persians* and that one of them has not come down to us.

f: this *Persians* appears to have been produced by Aeschylus in Syracuse, on Hieron’s request, as Eratosthenes says in the third book of his treatise *On Comedy*.

g: others say: “note that it is the ghost of Darius who speaks, he being evidently dead”.

3. Hellenistic scholarship on ran. 1028

The main point of the discussion in the scholia is the inconsistency of Dionysus’ reference to the tragedy of Aeschylus. These annotations are interesting to us not only as a testimony of the work of ancient philologists on the passage, but also because we can try to understand, from their observations, which text of line

1028 they were reading: was it the same that is preserved in the medieval manuscript tradition, or was it different? In general, we can safely work out from the discussion that the line Hellenistic interpreters were working on began with ἐχάρην and ended with Δαρείου τεθνεώτος, just as we read it in medieval manuscripts. What they were reading in the middle of it, where our text is corrupt, is less clear. Unfortunately, our scholia do not mention at all the fact that the line does not scan.

The scholia make reference to the names of several Hellenistic grammarians, who worked in different contexts and at different times; the latest among them is Didymus, the Alexandrian grammarian from the first century B.C., who is generally considered to be the source of the Hellenistic discussion on our lines. The earliest name is that of Eratosthenes of Cyrene, one of the most important scholars of the third century B.C., who worked in the Alexandrian library; Eratosthenes was primarily a scientist, but he was also a poet, philosopher and philologist of some standing. His most voluminous work on literary subjects were the twelve (or more) books *On Old Comedy*, a landmark for studies on comedy throughout antiquity;⁹ our scholia quote a fragment from the third book of this work. Another lesser-known Alexandrian grammarian who is mentioned in our scholia is Chaeris, who belonged to the school of Aristarchus and probably lived around 100 B.C.¹⁰ Finally, the scholia report the opinion of Herodicus of Babylon, who was probably active in the latter half of the second century B.C. in the second most important centre of scholarship of the Hellenistic world, the library of Pergamum; according to our sources, he was a follower of Crates of Mallos, even if we cannot say whether he was his direct pupil or not.¹¹ Herodicus is more difficult to define; his extant fragments have been collected and discussed in 1941 by Ingemar Düring, and show that Herodicus was interested in ancient comedy: he authored a work entitled *Komodoumenoi*, on characters made fun of in comedies (see Düring 1941, 125–127). He

9) On this work see Pfeiffer 1968, 159–162. The fragments of Eratosthenes' treatise have been edited by Strecker in 1884 and more recently by Bagordo in 1998.

10) On Chaeris see Montana 2005, with a bibliography and the text of the extant fragments. Chaeris' fragments were edited by Berndt in 1902.

11) For more detailed information on Herodicus and his philological activity, see my forthcoming edition of his extant fragments.

also wrote one (or more) philosophical works, where he polemicalised against Plato and the Socratic tradition in less than fair terms;¹² as Düring puts it, his work must have consisted of “straining the wording of his sources so as to suit his purpose” (1941, 14). In short, Herodicus was a minor figure compared to Eratosthenes and Didymus, and, generally speaking, the soundness of his philological methods is open to question.

Scholium a, b, c, d

Going back to our scholia, it is clear from Didymus' observation (that *Persians* did not encompass the death of Darius, see sch. *a. β*), that his text of line 1028 must have contained the words *περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος*, “about Darius' death”, probably preceded by a verb of hearing or similar meaning.

At a first reading the opinion of Chaeris, as represented by the scholia (see sch. *b. α* and *b. β*), appears unclear. The scholia apparently state that Chaeris thought the dead Persian king mentioned in Aristophanes' line was Xerxes, not Darius, since it was a common poetic usage to call a son by his father's name.¹³ Xerxes, however, is alive at the time of the action of *Persians* (he would die only several years later, in 465) and actually appears on stage at the end of the play (as another scholium notes, see below)! Chaeris' observation has consequently been generally dismissed as inconsequential by modern scholars.¹⁴ In fact, Chaeris' argument must have been much more subtle than it appears – in his opinion, the line should mean “I rejoiced when I heard about (the son of) the dead Darius”, that is, “I rejoiced when I heard about Xerxes' defeat”.¹⁵

12) See the work *Against the Socrates-lover* (Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην), quoted in Athen. 5.215 f; he possibly wrote a treatise *On symposia* as well (see Düring 1941, 106 ff.). Some abstracts of these works have been preserved in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*: here Herodicus displays the full array of the working methods of ancient philosophical polemic, such as pretending to misunderstand his opponent's words or omitting in his discussion essential pieces of information.

13) Chaeris fr. 22 Berndt.

14) See for example Dover 1993, 320: “what problem did he think he was solving?”.

15) The first to understand Chaeris' note in this way was A. Roemer (1908, 395 and n. 14). For the earlier discussion on this scholium see Zacher 1892, 77 f.

In other words, Chaeris recognized in our line a possessive genitive of the type ὁ Δαρείου “the (son of) Darius”. This can hardly be correct, given that this usage is normally avoided in the genitive (as here) because of its intrinsic ambiguity. Chaeris’ explanation, however untenable and artificial, in any case reached its aim: it removed from the text the bewildering reference to an announcement of the death of Darius in the play. From Chaeris’ observation it is probable that his text of the line must have ended with the words περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτοϛ; what he read in the middle of the line, where our text is corrupt, is not clear.

Scholia *c* and *d* both pick up Chaeris’ remark; sch. *c*, however, misunderstands him (or, possibly, pretends not to understand his point) and leads us to believe that Chaeris thought the line meant “when I heard about the dead son of Darius”: the obvious reply is that Xerxes was, in fact, still alive at the time of the action described in the tragedy. The text of the next scholium, *d*, is garbled: it apparently proposes to emend the text, with the name of Darius in place of that of Xerxes (περὶ τοῦ Ξέρξου τεθνεώτοϛ): this, again, would lead nowhere, since Xerxes is still alive. The author of this note probably misunderstood the explanation of Chaeris (so Roemer 1908, 396).

Scholia e and f

Let us consider now the scholia *e* and *f*, those that have raised the most interest among scholars, because they bring up the possibility that Aeschylus had produced two different versions of *Persians*, and state that the tragedy was staged for a second time in Syracuse by Aeschylus himself. Unfortunately, the text of these scholia is corrupt in some key points, and as a consequence the details of these explanations cannot be defined with certainty.

It is perhaps best to consider sch. *f* first, which observes that this *Persians* (presumably the version mentioned in sch. *e*. β) appears to be the one produced by Aeschylus in Syracuse, at Hieron’s request;¹⁶ the scholium quotes as a source for this information

16) On this sch. see van Leeuwen (1890, 69 f.) and his note on l. 1028 in his edition of *Frogs* (van Leeuwen 1896, 158).

the third book of Eratosthenes' work *On Old Comedy*.¹⁷ From the wording of the scholium it is not clear whether Eratosthenes thought that on this occasion Aeschylus had staged a revised version of the drama or not. There is no reason, at any rate, to doubt the historicity of the information Eratosthenes offers on the Syracusan production;¹⁸ it is well known that Aeschylus had close links with Sicily, which he visited on at least two occasions, and where he died in 456/5; he had close contacts with the tyrant of Syracuse, Hieron, for whom during one of his visits he produced a play, *The Women of Aetna*, probably written in honour of the new city of Aetna, founded by Hieron. Eratosthenes, moreover, is a reliable source, for in other fragments he authoritatively discusses questions relating to the restaging of individual plays and the possibility that the texts had been revised.¹⁹ In particular, his prudent and methodologically sound attitude is evident in his remarks about the second *Peace*: he acknowledges he cannot say whether the second time Aristophanes had staged the same comedy or a different version of it, no longer extant: clearly only one text of *Peace* was available to him.²⁰ It is certainly a pity that in our case the scholia do not preserve his observations in more detail.

Sch. *e* mentions the opinion of Herodicus: the text is badly corrupted, but enough is extant for us to understand that he assumed there had been two productions of the play. Herodicus mentions a tragedy (a lost version of *Persians*?) which included the description of the battle of Plataea; however, we cannot be sure which tragedy exactly he may be referring to, because the preceding sentence is unintelligible – in all probability it contains a lacuna. Sch. *e*. β refers to the two stagings, and adds that one of the two

17) The ancient *Life of Aeschylus* mentions a production of *Persians* in Syracuse as well, see Aesch. T 1, 68 sq., p. 37 Radt: φασίν ὑπὸ Ἱέρωνος ἀξιοθέντα ἀναδιδάξαι τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ λίαν εὐδοκμεῖν. The information is probably derived from Eratosthenes.

18) Contra Jachmann 1909, 34, who thinks the staging in Syracuse is merely the result of speculation on Eratosthenes' part.

19) See fr. 38 Strecker (= 10 Bagordo = argum. Ar. pac. A 2 Holwerda), on a second staging of *Peace*; fr. 97 Strecker (= 14 Bagordo = sch. in Ar. nub. 553 Holwerda), on the two versions of *Clouds*.

20) Argum. Ar. pac. A 2 Holwerda: φέρεται ἐν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις δεδιδαχὸς Εἰρήνην ὁμοίως ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης. ἄδηλον οὖν, φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης, πότερον τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνεδίδαξεν ἢ ἑτέραν καθήκεν, ἥτις οὐ σφάζεται κτλ.

productions was no longer extant. It is certainly tempting to take Herodicus' words at face value and suppose that two versions of *Persians* actually existed, and that Herodicus had somehow come across a copy of the lost version in the library of Pergamum. In my opinion, however, Herodicus' words should be treated with caution, considering what I said above about his partisan approach to philosophical discussions and the fact that he is our only source alleging the existence of a revised text of the tragedy; it is not clear, moreover, how the existence of a further version of *Persians* that mentioned Plataea could solve the problem of the disagreement between the extant *Persians* and the reference in *Frogs*. Everything considered, I agree with Garvie, who thinks that the existence of two different texts of the tragedy could be a hypothesis advanced by Hellenistic scholars, based on Eratosthenes' account of the second production of *Persians* in Syracuse.²¹ It is possible that Herodicus, who worked extensively on ancient comedy, had found the information about the Sicilian staging in Eratosthenes' treatise, and had used it to build a theory to explain the reference to *Persians* in Aristophanes' lines that involved the existence of a second version, revised for the Syracusan performance. In any case, it is difficult to say how the battle of Plataea came into this discussion. Garvie reasonably suggests that the prophecy of Darius in the existing *Persians* about the Greek victory at Plataea may have been the starting-point of the confusion (2009, lvi).

We know that *Persians* was part of a tetralogy that took the prize at the City Dionysia of 472. All the other plays of the tetralogy have mythological subjects (*Phineus*, *Glaucus of Potniae*, and the satyr-play *Prometheus Pyrkaeus* or *Pyrphoros*): Sommerstein (2012) recently suggested with good arguments that the link between them could be the theme of the war against the Persians. Among earlier reconstructions of the contents of the lost plays of the tetralogy, it is relevant here to mention Ahrens' suggestion that *Glaucus of Potniae* might have touched on the battle of Plataea: Potniae, near Thebes, lay close to the site of the battle, and it would have been natural for the plot to cover, or hint at, the Greek victory (Ahrens 1846, 195 f.). The idea that *Glaucus* might have contained references to Plataea has been taken up by a number of scholars even in recent times: see for example Spring 1917, 159; Murray 1940, 114; Harrison 2000, 117 n. 1; Sommerstein 2012, 98 and 100. All things considered, I would not discard the possibility that the subject-matter of this play could have somehow led Herodicus to mention Plataea in his discussion.

21) Garvie 2009, lvi.

Scholium g

Finally, let us look at the last scholium on our line, a very short remark that has escaped the attention of modern scholars, but that, I believe, can shed some light on the text of line 1028, as it circulated in antiquity. Sch. g states that according to some other unnamed interpreters (οἱ δέ), “it is the ghost of Darius who speaks, he being evidently dead”. In other words, the scholium states that the ghost is not the object of the discourse (περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος), but on the contrary it is the agent of the action, that is, it is the one who speaks. The difference is substantial, because this observation can be understood only if these interpreters read a text of l. 1028 that was different from that of our manuscripts. It must have ended, I would suggest, with the words παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, “from Darius, who was (already) dead”, where παρὰ takes the place of περί. What piece of good news had Dionysus heard from Darius’ ghost, that made him rejoice? The only answer can be the Greek victory at Plataea in the following year, 479, which is in fact predicted by the ghost in *Persians* (ll. 805–820).

If my reasoning is correct, this short note is a clue to the existence of an ancient variant (or conjecture) in the text of our line, where παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος alluded to the scene in *Persians* with the appearance of the ghost of king Darius; naturally, the antiquity of this hypothetical reading is not a proof of its correctness. We can only guess at the identity of the οἱ δέ; the scholiast could refer to a grammarian who was active in Alexandria, or, possibly, to someone who worked in a different environment, such as the library in Pergamum, where scholars had access to copies of the play that were different from those available in Alexandria.

It is interesting to note that the conjecture παρὰ has been proposed, independently of our scholium, by a number of modern philologists from the first half of the nineteenth century onwards: F. G. Welcker was the first to advance it in the notes on his German translation of *Frogs* (1812, 215), noting that it is easy to confuse the two prepositions παρὰ and περί. In the following decades, several editors of *Frogs* built on it a number of possible reconstructions of the corrupted words (ἦνίκ’ ἤκουσα) that precede it.²² F. H. Bothe,

22) See Totaro 2006, 100–103, who offers a detailed survey of conjectures on our text from the eighteenth century onwards.

for example (1828, 113, in the note on our line), adopted παρά preceded by a reading found in a Renaissance manuscript, ἡνίκ' ἀπηγγέλθη, and proposed to read ἡνίκ' ἀπηγγέλθη παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, that is, Dionysus says he rejoiced when Darius' ghost foretold the Athenian victory.²³ The reading παρά was actually adopted in several nineteenth century editions of *Frogs*; subsequently discarded, it recently resurfaced in Wilson's apparatus on our line, which mentions H. Richards' proposal to read ἡνικά γ' ἤκουσαν παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος, "when they heard (the prophecy) from Darius, who was dead". The subject of the verb ἤκουσαν would be the Persian queen and the chorus, and what delighted Dionysus was not what Darius predicted, but rather the state of distress and alarm to which the Persians were reduced when they heard him (Richards 1909, 50 f.).

Another possibility that has been explored in the past, in connection with the reading παρά, is that our line originally contained the word νίκη, "victory", where the entire medieval tradition has ἡνίκ'(α). The first to advance this proposal was F. V. Fritzsche in his 1845 edition of *Frogs*: he proposed to read ἐχάρην γούν τῇ νικάκουσας παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος "certainly I rejoiced when I heard about the victory from Darius, when he was already dead".²⁴ This conjecture in Fritzsche's intention would solve the problem of the inconsistency with *Persians*;²⁵ even if it is difficult to accept the crasis Fritzsche's proposal introduces in the text, the idea that the word νίκη could originally have been in the text has enjoyed a marked degree

23) The reading ἀπηγγέλθη is found in the Venetus Marcianus gr. 475 (XV cent.) and in the margins of cod. Laur. 31.16 (s. XV); also in the Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 135, s. XIV (see Totaro 2006, 100 n. 9, who personally collated this ms.). The reading ἡνίκ' ἀπηγγέλθη at least has the advantage of being metrical (see Wilson 2007b, 177 f.), but it is generally dismissed nowadays as an attempt to emend the text in order to make it satisfy the metre (see sch. ad ran. 1028 a. α Chantry, above, which uses the same word: ... οὔτε Δαρείου θάνατος ἀπαγγέλλεται ...). Moreover, Ven. Marc. gr. 475 (G) is commonly considered to be a copy of Ven. Marc. gr. 474 (V), and therefore not an independent testimony. This, however, has been challenged by Ch. N. Eberline, who convincingly argued that this is not true in the case of *Frogs*, where G is not a copy of V, since it often disagrees with it (Eberline 1980, 157 f.; Dover 1993, 93 n. 28 is of the same opinion).

24) The conjecture introduces a harsh crasis in the text, that Fritzsche justified with a similar case of crasis in ran. 509; ἀκούω with a dative, however, means "to listen to, give ear to" someone, not "to hear about" something (see LSJ s.v., II.1). Alternatively, the dative could be construed with ἐχάρην.

25) Fritzsche had in fact proposed this conjecture for the first time in the notes to his edition of the *Women at the Thesmophoria* (1838, 237 f.), in the form ἐχάρην γούν νικήσαι 'κούσας παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος; he quotes it as ἐχάρην γούν νικήσάκουσας παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος in his edition of *Frogs* (1845, 332).

of success.²⁶ In general, however, this solution has been abandoned in recent years and modern editors tend to keep ἠνίκ'(α) in the text, with good reason: the expression ἐχάρην γοῦν ἠνίκ' finds in fact significant parallels in Dicaeopolis' speech in the prologue to the *Acharnians* (see the discussion in Totaro 2006, 108 f.).

Recent editions of the play do not usually mention the reading παρά, but often put forward conjectures that have a similar meaning. Dover makes two tentative suggestions in his apparatus, ἠνίκ' ἐπήκουος ἢ τοῦ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος ("when I hearkened to Darius") or ἠνίκ' ἐπήκουον τοῦ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος ("when I was / they were listening to Darius"). Sommerstein (see his apparatus and notes to the line) takes the latter alternative, substituting the aorist for the imperfect, and proposes ἠνίκ' ἐπήκουσαν Δαρείου τοῦ τεθνεῶτος; in this case the subject of ἐπήκουσαν would be the chorus and the Persian queen, who were on the stage together with Darius' ghost. Sommerstein's solution has been adopted by Jeffrey Henderson, who in his 2002 Loeb edition of the comedy prints ἐχάρην γοῦν, ἠνίκ' ἐπήκουσαν τοῦ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος. Richards' proposal (ἠνίκα γ' ἤκουσαν παρά Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος) has a similar meaning, with the advantage that it is closer to the text we find in the medieval tradition; moreover, if my explanation of what we read in sch. g is correct, the reading παρά goes back at least to the Hellenistic period – hence there is a possibility that it could reflect the original text of the line.

In conclusion, the discussion on our passage in ancient times testifies to the fact that the text of line 1028 was uncertain even in antiquity. From the scholia we can infer two readings of the final part of the line, περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος (Didymus and, probably, Chaeris) and παρά Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος (mentioned in sch. g); the latter, in all probability, refers to the prophecy of the Persian defeat at Plataea made by the ghost of Darius in Aeschylus' tragedy.²⁷

26) Fritzsche's proposal was taken up, with some modifications, by a number of editors of *Frogs*, such as Blaydes (1889), van Leeuwen (1896), and later Radermacher (²1954); Theodor Kock agreed on the fact that ἠνίκ'(α) stands for an original νίκη, even if he did not find any of the proposed emendations satisfying (⁴1898, 167). In 1999 Chantry mentioned again Fritzsche's conjecture in his apparatus to the scholia on our line.

27) I am grateful to my colleagues Maurizio Sonnino and Nadia Cannata, who read an earlier version of this paper; I also wish to thank the external referees for their detailed and useful comments.

Bibliography

- Ahrens, E. A. I., *Aeschylus et Sophoclis tragoediae et fragmenta (Aeschylus tragoediae septem et perditarum fragmenta)*, Paris 1846.
- Bagordo, A., *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama. Mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente*, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1998.
- Berndt, R., *De Charete, Chaeride, Alexione grammaticis eorumque reliquiis*, Pars prior, Diss. Regimonti 1902.
- Blaydes, F. H. M., *Aristophanis Ranae, annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis Graecis instruit F. H. M. B., Halis Saxonum* 1889.
- Bothe, F. H., *Aristophanis comoediae, I*, Lipsiae 1828.
- Broadhead, H. D., *The Persae of Aeschylus*, edited with introduction, critical notes and commentary, Cambridge 1960.
- Chantry, M. C., *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum, 1a, continens Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Ranas*, Groningen 1999.
- Chantry, M. C., *Scholies anciennes aux Grenouilles et au Ploutos d'Aristophane, présentation, traduction et commentaire par M. C.*, Paris 2009.
- Dover, K., *Aristophanes, Frogs*, edited with introduction and commentary, Oxford 1993.
- Düring, I., *Herodicus the Crateteian. A Study in Anti-Platonic Tradition*, Stockholm 1941.
- Eberline, Ch. N., *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Ranae of Aristophanes*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- Fritzsche, F. V., *Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusa*, Lipsiae 1838.
- Fritzsche, F. V., *Aristophanis Ranae*, Turici 1845.
- Garvie, A. F., *Aeschylus, Persae*, with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford 2009.
- Harrison, Th., *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century*, London 2000.
- Henderson, J., *Aristophanes, Frogs, Assemblywomen, Wealth*, Cambridge (Mass.) / London 2002.
- Jachmann, G., *De Aristotelis didascalii*, Gottingae 1909.
- Kock, Th., *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, vol. 3: *Die Frösche*, Berlin⁴ 1898.
- van Leeuwen, J., *Quaestiones ad historiam scenicam pertinentes*, *Mnemosyne* 18, 1890, 68–75.
- van Leeuwen, J., *Aristophanis Ranae cum prolegomenis et commentariis*, Lugduni Batavorum 1896.
- Mastromarco, G. / Totaro, P., *Commedie di Aristofane, II*, Torino 2006.
- Montana, F., *Chaeris*, 2005, in: *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, diretto da F. Montanari / V. Lapini / F. Montana / L. Pagani, <http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/>.
- Murray, G., *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy*, Oxford 1940.
- Nervegna, S., *Staging Scenes or Plays? Theatrical Revivals of "Old" Greek Drama in Antiquity*, *ZPE* 162, 2007, 14–42.
- Pfeiffer, R., *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Radermacher, L., *Aristophanes' 'Frösche'*, Wien² 1954.
- Richards, H., *Aristophanes and Others*, London 1909.

- Roemer, A., Philologie und Afterphilologie im griechischen Altertum. II. Didymus als Erklärer des Aristophanes, *Philologus* 67, 1908, 366–410.
- Schmidt, M., Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia, Lipsiae 1854.
- Sommerstein, A. H., *Aristophanes, Frogs*, Warminster 1996.
- Sommerstein, A. H., The Persian War Tetralogy of Aeschylus, in: D. Rosenbloom / J. Davidson (eds), *Greek Drama IV: Texts, Contexts, Performance*, Oxford 2012, 95–107.
- Spring, E., A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy, *HSPH* 28, 1917, 135–224.
- Strecker, C., *De Lycophrone Euphronio Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus*, Gryphiswaldiae 1884.
- Totaro, P., Eschilo in Aristofane (Rane 1026–1029, 1431a–1432), *Lexis* 24, 2006, 95–125.
- Wartelle, A., *Histoire du texte d'Eschyle dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1971.
- Welcker, F. G., *Des Aristophanes Frösche*, Giessen 1812.
- Wilson, N. G., *Aristophanis fabulae*, Oxonii 2007 (Wilson 2007a).
- Wilson, N. G., *Aristophanea. Studies on the Text of Aristophanes*, Oxford 2007 (Wilson 2007b).
- Zacher, K., Bericht über die auf die griechische Komoedie bezügliche Litteratur von 1881 bis 1891, *JAW* 71, 1892, 1–128h.

Rome

Maria Broggiato