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The final paragraph of Aristophanes, Peace, Hyp. 3, lines 37-39 Holwerda¹, runs as follows:

ένικησεν δε τῷ δράματί ὁ ποιητής ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἀστει. πρῶτος Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνης, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορσι. τὸ δὲ δράμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος ἢνικα Ἄρμην λοικροτής.

Writing on the Peace hypotheses some years ago², N.W.Slater ended by proposing the following emended text:

ένίησι δὲ τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἀστει. πρῶτος Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνης, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορσι. τὸ δὲ δράμα ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀπολλόδωρος ἢνικα Ἐρμων υποκριτής.

This involves a modified form of Gröbl’s ἐνίησι τὸ δράμα³ at the beginning of the didascalic notice and Rose’s ἢνικα Ἐρμων ὑποκριτής⁴ at the end.

The object of this paper is to query the first proposed emendation, on the grounds inter alia that I do not believe that it is possible as Greek, and to sound a note of caution about the second. Slater’s proposed change has a wider significance in that he sought to use it as evidence for the existence of a competition at the City Dionysia for the comic protagonist at the time that Aristophanes was writing. Such a contest is otherwise unattested for the 5th century BC. Olson, on the other hand, commenting on Peace Hyp. 3 in his recent edition of the play⁵, has used that same lack of evidence for comic actor contests in the 5th century BC to argue against Slater that this material, however corrupt, cannot derive from the didascaliae. I believe that there are other more compelling reasons than this argumentum ex silentio to reject both of Slater’s proposed emendations.

As Slater acknowledged⁶, the major objection to ἐνίκησεν has to be the obvious inconsistency thereby created between this first sentence in the didascalic

¹ I quote the text of the hypotheses from D. HOLWERDA et al., Scholia in Aristophanem, Groningen, 1960-.
³ J. GRÖBL, Die ältesten Hypotheseis zu Aristophanes, Dillingen, 1889-90, p. 65.
⁴ V. ROSE, Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, Leipzig, 1863, p. 554. The last sentence of Peace Hyp. 3 is given, with discussion, in PCG III.2 as Aristophanes, Test. 22.
⁶ SLATER (supra n. 2), p. 43.
section of Hyp. 3 and the following words, which tell us that Peace won second prize.

*Knights* Hyp. 5, lines 11-12 Holwerda:

πρώτος ἦν ἔνικα δεύτερος Κρατίνος Σατύροις, τρίτος Ἀριστομένης Ὡλοφόροις.

*Wasps* Hyp. 2, lines 38-39 Holwerda:

καὶ ἔνικα πρώτος Φιλωνίδης Προόγωνι, Λεύκων Πρέσβεσι,

and *Clouds* Hyp. 6, line 13 Holwerda (not cited by Slater):

ὅτε Κρατίνος μὲν ἔνικα Πυτίνη, Ἀμειψίας δὲ Κόννω

all suggest that under certain circumstances νικάν can perhaps mean ‘to win a prize, any prize’. But as Slater rightly argued, when the verb stands alone as it does in Peace Hyp. 3, it ought to mean ‘to win the prize’, i.e. the first prize. Leaving aside any questions about a second production of Peace, the poet cannot therefore have won both the first prize and the second prize for the same performance.

Yet to replace ἐνίκησεν with Gröbl’s ἐνίησι is not a viable solution. To read ἐνίησι for ἐνίκησεν may seem persuasive from a palaeographical viewpoint. But it involves replacing a verb which is regularly found in these hypotheses with one which is never found there. The verb which we would expect to find in this context is not ἐνίημι but the compound καθίημι, cf. *Birds* Hyp. 5, line 29 Holwerda, ἐπὶ Χαβρίου τὸ δράμα καθήκεν, *Knights* Hyp. 2, lines 15-16 Holwerda, Ἀριστοφάνης καθίησι τὸ τῶν Ἰππέων δράμα δι’ αὐτοῦ. There is, too, the question of the tense of ἐνίησι for the historic present is never used elsewhere in the didascalic section of the hypotheses. More importantly, ἐνίησι may have the meaning ‘in den Kampf lassen’, which Gröbl argued for it, if it were used transitively in his proposed ἐνίησι τὸ δράμα. But it seems very doubtful whether the active could be used intransitively in this sense with the dative as Slater has proposed in ἐνίησι δὲ τῷ δράματι.

The initial words of this didascalic notice cannot therefore be salvaged simply by replacing a single word. Furthermore there are other difficulties to make one suspect that the whole phrase up to ἐν ἄστει should be regarded as intrusive and that never at any time did it form part of the information about the play’s presentation. Firstly, as Gröbl himself noted, ἐνίκησεν is not in the tense which we would expect here. While an aorist would be quite acceptable in the descriptive section of the hypothesis summarising the play’s plot, the imperfect ἐνίκα is the form of the verb which we always get in the didascalic sections. Then there is the use of ὁ ποιητὴς which, as Slater notes, is unparalleled in the didascalic notices. In addition it is superfluous here since both the poet and the play are named in the following line.

---

7 SLATER (supra n. 2), p. 43-44.
8 The same points about the tense and sense of the word are also noted by Olson (supra n. 5), p. 65. The absolute usages of XEN., *HG* 2.4.32, and Cyr. 7.1.29, quoted by LSJ from Stephanus, do not seem to provide an adequate parallel.
9 GRÖBL (supra n. 3), p. 64.
What Slater might also have mentioned is that the use of ὁ ποιητής to refer to the dramatist is nevertheless quite characteristic of the descriptive sections of the Aristophanic hypotheses. It occurs in Acharnians Hyp. 1, line 15 Holwerda, Knights Hyp. 1, line 10 Holwerda, and Clouds Hyp. 2, line 6, and Hyp. 7, line 19 Holwerda, as well as earlier in Peace Hyp. 3 itself in lines 21 and 34 Holwerda (the latter of poets in general). So too is the use of τὸ δρᾶμα. While it is found in the didascalic sections of the hypotheses only in Knights Hyp. 5, line 10 Holwerda, and Birds Hyp. 5, line 29 Holwerda, it is nevertheless extremely common in the other, descriptive sections of the hypotheses.

The conclusion from all of this must be that while this initial phrase shows a number of linguistic features typical of the general sections of the Aristophanic hypotheses, it never formed part of the material drawn from the didascaliae. That material begins for certain only with ἐν ἀστεί. The words up to that point are an intrusion of some kind. Nevertheless the fact that some of those words occur with some regularity throughout the non-didascalic parts of the hypotheses suggests that they may have originated as part of that amorphous and rather disorganised mass of information (plot summaries, literary-critical judgements, snippets of historical background) which makes up the bulk of the material found in these hypotheses. Or the words may simply have originated as a marginal gloss, based perhaps on a scribal misunderstanding, which subsequently made its way into the text, in the process displacing some more appropriate word, e.g. ἔδιδάχθη, or words, e.g. τὸ δρᾶμα ἔδιδάχθη. Either way they contain nothing which can be recovered, or is worth recovering, about either of the 5th century BC productions of Peace.

Slater's second proposed change, following Rose, is to read the final three words of Peace Hyp. 3 as ἐνίκα Ἅρμων ὑποκριτής. This would create a reference to the success of Hermon, a comic actor of the time who is otherwise known to us from Clouds Schol. 541b Holwerda. Slater's argument is that while Apollodoros was the lead actor in Peace, it was Hermon who was the winner of the prize for the comic protagonist, presumably for his role in the winning play, Eupolis' Kolax.

Such a restoration poses major problems, all of them raised earlier with unusual succinctness by Russo. Those problems, in increasing order of difficulty, are as follows. Firstly, the specification ὑποκριτής would be superfluous after ὑπεκρίνατο and must therefore be suspect (cf. Slater's own argument, noted above, against ὁ ποιητής). Secondly, the actor Hermon is not known in connection with Peace. Thirdly, although there are examples of didascalic notices such as those attached to Menander's Dyskolos (in the Bodmer papyrus) and Imbrioi (P.Oxy. X 1235), which name the play's protagonist, there exists no didascalic notice which gives us information about an actor in another play produced at the same festival. Fourthly, the Venetus ms is the only witness to the second part of Peace Hyp. 3 and its last two words are in the hand of the reviser, who was also responsible for copying

---


12 Slater (supra n. 2), p. 56-57.

the very corrupt Hyp. 4\textsuperscript{14}. Finally, a competition for comic actors at the Dionysia is otherwise unattested at this period. Indeed it seems to be ruled out by the dramatic ‘Fasti’, \textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 2318.

As is well known, the ‘Fasti’ give the names of the winning tragic protagonists at the Dionysia in such a way that it can be calculated that the competition for tragic actors must have begun in 450/49 BC. Yet the same inscription maintains a stony silence about comic protagonists all the way down to 329/8 BC, the date at which \textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 2318 \textit{xiii} ends. It is not until we come to the so called ‘Didascaliae,’ \textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 2323a, that we get the names of winning comic actors at the Dionysia, beginning in 312 BC, suggesting that the prize for the winning comic actor at the Dionysia was not established until sometime between these two dates.

It may seem totally anomalous, inexplicable, and an insult to the god Dionysus himself as well as to comic actors that, while there was a prize for the best comic actor at the Lenaea from the late 440’s BC (\textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 2325) and a parallel contest for tragic actors had certainly been established there by 421/0 BC (\textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 2319 \textit{ii}), no reciprocal arrangement was ever made at that time to reward those acting in comedies at the more important City Dionysia. Even more amazing is the notion that the city authorities were able to persist in this slight to the comic acting profession for well over another century. And this during a period when the acting profession was growing in power and influence.

Nonetheless in view of all the other objections to Rose’s \textit{ένικα \v{E}ρμων ύποκριτής} outlined above we cannot use these final corrupt words in \textit{Peace} Hyp. 3 as an argument for the existence of a contest for comic actors at the Dionysia in the 5th century BC\textsuperscript{15}. Slater ended his 1988 article with the words ‘\textit{Until more information comes to light} (my italics), the possibility of a comic actor’s contest at the City Dionysia as early as 421 should remain open’. I believe that he is entirely right. Sooner or later that information will come to light, either in contemporary insessional form or in the form of later papyrological evidence which draws upon the didascaliae\textsuperscript{16}. But until that happens, the end of \textit{Peace} Hyp. 3 cannot be made to form part of that information, however much we may hope otherwise. It is simply too corrupt to tell us anything.

\textit{University of Queensland} \hfill \textit{John WHITEHORNE}

\textsuperscript{14} Russo (supra n. 13) quoting the edition of \textit{Peace} by K. Zacher, Leipzig, 1909. It is only the Venetus ms which preserves the full text of \textit{Peace} Hyp. 3 and the corruption there extends well beyond the last paragraph of Hyp. 3 into Hyp. 4, for which V is again the sole witness.

\textsuperscript{15} Nor can they be manipulated, as Olson (supra n. 5), p. 66, who suggests emending to \textit{ένικα \v{E}ρμων ύποκριτής} \textit{ην} \textit{ό} \textit{Ιοκρότης} \textit{τ} (sic), to reveal an original scholarly source which recorded ‘a chronological coordination between two important actors.’

\textsuperscript{16} That such evidence may still come to light is demonstrated by the recent (1999) publication by N. Gonis of \textit{P.Oxy. LXVI} 4508, the unfortunately fragmentary remains of a prose commentary on Aristophanes, perhaps the lost \textit{Seasons}, containing different types of material such as we find in the hypotheses; fr.2 in particular seems to draw upon didascalic material.