

FOR R. A. PACK

## Objective Evidence for Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy

*Richard Hamilton*

CONSIDERING ITS IMPORTANCE for textual criticism the question of the type and quantity of actors' interpolations in Greek tragedy has received little attention.<sup>1</sup> The few who have studied the evidence in any detail disagree substantially about its value. The disagreement continues today, but no attempt has yet been made to summarize, evaluate and harmonize the views.<sup>2</sup> The evidence is of two kinds—a very few 'documents', scattered in all sorts of unlikely places, and fourteen or so scholia to the plays of Euripides, primarily *Medea* and *Orestes*. The mere distribution of the scholia might make one suspicious, and careful examination reveals that

<sup>1</sup> By 'actor' I mean anyone connected with the stage production; by 'interpolation' any interference with the text, not just an insertion. The most important studies of the question are found in: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* [= *Hera-kles I*] (repr. Darmstadt 1959, from the 3rd ed. 1895); W. Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica III: A Chapter in the History of Annotation* (London 1905); W. Malzan, *De scholiis euripideis quae ad res scaenicas et ad histriones spectant* (Darmstadt 1908); J. Vürtheim, *Aischylos' Schutz flehende* (Amsterdam 1928); R. Cantarella, "Il testo di Sofocle" (*RivIGI* 9.1-2 [1925] 3-15) and "L'influsso degli attori sulla tradizione dei testi tragici" (*RivIGI* 14.3-4 [1930] 39-73), both conveniently found in his *Scritti minori sul greco* (Brescia 1970), from which I cite them; D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1934); G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965); A. Tuilier, *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide* (Paris 1968); and J. Baumert, *ENIOI AΘETΟΥΣΙΝ* (diss. Tübingen 1968). Hereafter these works will be cited by author alone. Euripidean scholia will be cited from the edition of E. Schwartz (Berlin 1887).

<sup>2</sup> Doubts about actors' interpolations can be found in W. Biehl, "Die Interpolationen in Euripides' Hekabe," *Philologus* 101 (1957) 66 and 68 n.2; A. M. Dale, *Euripides, Helen* (Oxford 1967) xxxii; and C. W. Willink, "A Problem in Aeschylus's *Septem*," *CQ* 18 (1968) 8 nn.3 and 5. Generally, however, endorsement of the idea is wholehearted: W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge 1964) 39; *OCD*<sup>2</sup> (1970) s.v. SCHOLARSHIP, GREEK, IN ANTIQUITY; J. M. Bremer, "Euripides' *Hecuba* 59-215: A Reconsideration," *Mnemosyne* 24 (1971) 243; M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 16; M. D. Reeve, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, III," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 171; and, most positively, W. S. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 46. In all of these Page's is the only study mentioned.

quite a few of them are speculative, guesses by scholars rather than verifiable fact. Those that are factual, as we shall see, have no effect on the text but rather record actors' gestures and phrasing. In any case both speculative and factual scholia attest at most only minor changes. The documents, on the other hand, attest wholesale revision of plays. The fact that we have no clear examples of such suggests that the acting texts, in which they must have been recorded, had little or no effect on the manuscript tradition as compared with the booksellers' texts. This interpretation is implicit in the work of earlier critics and can, I think, be clearly demonstrated from the material itself as well.

## I

Wilamowitz's *Einleitung* (1889) contains only a few paragraphs devoted to the question of actors' interpolations, but they are crucial. He balances trust in the literary tradition with the realization that actors' interpolations did exist. Book form protected the tragedies from corruption (p.130). Actors, however, inevitably made changes and the Lycurgan law restricting them was ineffectual, so that when our texts depend on actors' copies their reliability is small. Nonetheless, the condition of our extant plays is quite good (pp.132-33).

In regard to the actual scholia, Wilamowitz (p.162) is critical, in particular, of Didymus, the great compiler of scholia in the first century B.C., who is mentioned in several scholia concerning actors' interpolations (schol. *ad Med.* 169, 356): "er hat von ihrer Tätigkeit weder eine klare Vorstellung, noch gibt er sich die Mühe die Vorwürfe, die er gegen sie richtet, zu beweisen. Er braucht die Schauspieler vielmehr. . . als *Deus ex machina* um kritische Knoten zu durchhauen." Wilamowitz is critical, in general, when the wording of the scholium is vague or a scholarly question can be seen to lurk in the background.<sup>3</sup> Yet this scepticism does not extend to the hypothesis of *Rhesus* (p.131) or to the scholium at *Orestes* 1366 (p.154 n.63) even though, as we shall see, the language in both places is circumspect about the possibility of actors' interpolation. Nor does he question the statement by Aristophanes of Byzantium about the use of an *ekky-*

<sup>3</sup> That is "wo der Grammatiker durch ein *ἔγωγε* selbst eingesteht, dass für ihn das Drama nicht mehr auf der Bühne existiert. . . Auch wenn über das Umkostümieren geredet wird, ist die Verkehrtheit der Bemerkung Beweis genug, dass das am Schreibtisch ausgedacht ist" (p.154 n.64).

*klema* at *Hippolytus* 171, even though the play itself seemed to contradict this (p.154 n.64).

Wilamowitz's trust in Aristophanes stems from his belief that Aristophanes, living in the third century B.C., unlike Didymus in the first, saw plays performed and that all the factual (as opposed to speculative) scholia concerning actors go back to him. The evidence for this belief is the scholium to *Orestes* 1287, where Aristophanes defends a reading by quoting Stesichorus, and so, Wilamowitz argues, when Stesichorus is quoted at *Orestes* 269 it is likely that Aristophanes is responsible for this scholium also and, since this scholium is concerned with actors, Aristophanes must have been concerned with actors. The reasoning is ingenious but not totally satisfying. None of the five other citations of Stesichorus mentions either Aristophanes or actors,<sup>4</sup> nor is it certain that Aristophanes and Stesichorus are to be joined in the scholium to *Orestes* 1287: in the first place a quotation from Homer intervenes and, secondly, Aristophanes was concerned with the grammatical subject (and consequently the number) of the verb, whereas Stesichorus is cited for the idea that Helen's beauty overpowered her attackers, an idea which is in the play regardless of the verb's number and subject.<sup>5</sup> Finally, Aristophanes never mentions actors and those who do are Didymus and his contemporaries, Apollodorus of Tarsus (schol. *ad Med.* 148=169) and Philoxenus (schol. *ad Phoen.* 264).<sup>6</sup>

Rutherford in his four-page treatment (1905) is more thoroughly sceptical; the language of the scholia gives them away as guesses (p.59): "At *Med* 169, the note reveals that nobody had thought of solving a notorious ζήτημα by supposing that it was the creation of the actors until a scholar in the first century B.C. suggested that the difficulty might be got over by this assumption." Yet, in the end, Rutherford concedes that the stage tradition may have been responsible after all for the obvious corruptions in our texts.

<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere Stesichorus is one of a series of authors attesting a point of mythology. A fact that Wilamowitz might have used to advantage is that of the seven citations of Stesichorus in the scholia, four are to this play.

<sup>5</sup> A stronger argument for connecting Aristophanes and actors is the high density in *Orestes* scholia of references to him (schol. *ad* 488, 713, 1038, 1287) or his pupil Kallistratos (*ad* 314, 434, 1038) and to stage business (*ad* 57, 176, 643, 1366, *cf.* also the hypothesis).

<sup>6</sup> Philoxenus and Didymus were contemporaries (R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* [Oxford 1968] 274-75), Apollodorus presumably a bit earlier (Rutherford p.59; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* II [Leipzig 1891-92] 178).

Malzan in his dissertation on scenic scholia (1908) is only tangentially concerned with actors' interpolations as such. His main purpose is to carry on the work of Trendelenburg and Weissmann by showing that not only the scholia criticizing Euripidean dramatic technique but also those dealing with stage business depend on Peripatetic rhetoricians (p.32).<sup>7</sup> He finds a close connection between criticism of actors, precepts for actors and, ultimately, the use of actors to solve textual problems (p.34). The scholia involve all three.

Vürtheim's purpose in his appendix (1928) is simply to justify speaking of the possibility of actors' interpolations in *Supplices*. He first catalogues the evidence for actors' interpolations and then argues for their existence in Aeschylus. Although he is uncritical of all but one of the scholia (*Med.* 169), he carefully points out when the text actually remains unaffected or only slightly altered.

Cantarella at first (1925) thought that the manuscript tradition was based on stage texts rather than book texts (p.306), but he became more doubtful when, in 1930, he examined the actual evidence (p.149): "Stando così le cose, una critica troppo sottile potrebbe, se non negare del tutto, ridurre abbastanza l'attendibilità di tali testimonianze." His discussion of the scholia themselves is generally perfunctory but he does point out two problems that others have ignored: the usual explanation of why Euripides alone attracts such scholia, that he alone was frequently revived (see e.g. Rutherford p.57, Tuilier p.26 n.2), is insufficient.<sup>8</sup> The second problem is that the scholia invariably speak of 'the actors' rather than 'the actor' (or even a proper name),

<sup>7</sup> K. Weissmann, *Die szenischen Anweisungen in den Scholien zu Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides und Aristophanes und ihre Bedeutung für die Bühnenkunde* (Bamberg 1899), collects quite a few passages "im Anschluss an spätere Aufführungen" where "Vortrag oder Spiel getadelt wird" and suggests they go back to Apollodorus of Tarsus, but he discusses only five, very briefly (pp.33-34). His general intent, following A. Trendelenburg, *Grammaticorum graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum reliquiae* (Bonn 1867), is to show the theoretical, philosophical nature of the scholia, in particular their dependence on Aristotle's *Poetics*.

<sup>8</sup> Cantarella argues that Euripides had lost the dramatic sense the other two tragedians retained by being actors themselves (p.152) and that Euripides was much more popular in the schools and therefore attracted more scholia (p.148). The relative popularity of Euripides is a commonplace (see e.g. Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.2.60 n.3, I.2.507, I.3.824 n.3). Sophocles, however, was quite popular as well (F. G. Welcker, *Die griechische Tragödie* [RhM suppl. 2, 1841] 912; A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup> [Oxford 1968] 100; B. E. Donovan, *Euripides Papyri* [Toronto 1969] 6). P. Orsini (*REA* 38 [1936] 110) asks pertinently why the popular *Ion* and *Alcestis* were not also victimized (of course we have no scholia to *Ion*).

and this might lead one to suspect the scholia were not first hand (p.149).

Page's book (1934), by far the longest treatment of the subject, is disappointingly uncritical in its approach. His general thesis is that the manuscripts depend on actors' copies and are therefore terribly corrupt. The bulk of his book is taken up divining where the corruption lies. Defense of his position is confined to a short and rather late chapter (pp.106–12) and is preceded by only the most dogmatic statements of his view. His acceptance of the scholia is total.

After a brief reply to Rutherford,<sup>9</sup> Page outlines his argument: (1) actors' interpolations exist as we know from explicit (schol. *ad Phoen.* 264) and implicit evidence (interpolations in *Heraclidae*, *Iphigenia at Aulis*, *Orestes* and *Phoenissae*, p.107). Page does not raise the possibility that some of these presumed interpolations could be caused by men other than actors. (2) Our manuscripts derive directly from Aristophanes and Aristophanes visited the theatre, and so our manuscripts are from the theatrical tradition (p.107). Page here depends on Wilamowitz for his evidence (which we have shown cause to doubt) but ignores his conclusion, that book texts rather than stage texts were the main carrier of our manuscript tradition. (3) "The publisher who made a book wrote what the actors said at the time, and so perpetuated the actors' alterations in the written texts which were soon to lie open before Aristophanes" (pp.108–09). This compromise between his second argument and Wilamowitz's position ignores several problems: (a) there is no reason to assume that it was the actors' copies rather than the autograph that provided the exemplar for the booksellers; (b) even if the first book was dependent on actors' copies, both book and performance were presumably controlled by the poet (Wilamowitz p.128, Vürtheim p.231, Cantarella p.138);<sup>10</sup> (c) subsequent texts, then, could come from two sources and it is likely that they came from the book tradition rather than the

<sup>9</sup> Page makes one general criticism: "we need not take the Scholiasts seriously, in the sense that we may write them off as murmuring pedants; but we are bound to take their charge seriously, in the sense that we must earnestly scrutinize its relationship to our manuscript text" (p.106). Yet this is precisely what Rutherford (in a rather abbreviated fashion) has done and what Page leaves undone. His particular criticism is also peculiar: the scholium to *Med.* 169 "only proves that its compiler derived his information from a note by Apollodoros; it does not say whether Apollodoros merely gave his own view or based his comment on older material" (p.107).

<sup>10</sup> Strictly speaking, interpolation requires a preexistent text, which would be the text of the first production.

acting tradition for (d) the book trade would reflect a more continuous and probably greater demand for the texts than would stage production, which in terms of the whole tragic corpus was intermittent and highly variable;<sup>11</sup> and (e) the actual form of actors' texts may well have been unsuited to reading.

A reconstruction such as Page's requires that actors' interpolations not post-date Aristophanes.<sup>12</sup> But there are two problems with this thesis. First, as noted above, the only names we find in the scholia are much later: Didymus, Philoxenus, Apollodorus of Tarsus. To meet this difficulty Page is content with Wilamowitz's pronouncement on Didymus (p.110), not recognizing that this course requires elimination of much of his evidence. There is also the problem of the phrasing in the scholia, "the actors now." Page argues that 'now' does not show that the scholium was late but simply that it was a *verbatim* quotation from an earlier source (p.110). Still, this argument does not eliminate the problem, raised by Cantarella, of the generalizing 'actors'.

Page has some positive arguments as well: (1) "notes about actors' interpolations are not strictly relevant to any commentary save that which explains a textual recension; and the only great textual recension was that of Aristophanes" (p.109). Yet (a) most of the notes are not relevant to any commentary at all, as we shall see; (b) it is unlikely that Aristophanes wrote a commentary to accompany his text;<sup>13</sup> (c) it is not certain that Aristophanes' was "the only great

<sup>11</sup> Page's view requires, as Orsini has pointed out (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.8] 111), "que la transmission des textes tragiques au moins pour les pièces à succès, fut, jusqu'aux Alexandrins, surtout orale." This is unlikely in view of the common use of books as early as the fifth century (see Pfeiffer, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.6] 27ff; F. D. Harvey, "Literacy in the Athenian Democracy," *REG* 79 [1966] 585–635). So G. Jachmann ("Binneninterpolation II," *GöttNach* 1 [1936] 193 n.1): "alles in allem überwiegt in unserer παράδοσις doch bei weitem die rein literarische Interpolation, etwa im gleichen Verhältnis wie die Tragödie, auf die Gesamtzeit gesehen, stärker, länger und kontinuierlicher als Lesebuch denn als Bühnenwerk fortgelebt hat."

<sup>12</sup> That they should date from 400–200 B.C. is accepted by all: Cantarella 142ff, 172f; A. Lesky, *DLZ* 57 (1936) 2205; F. Solmsen, *CR* 49 (1935) 131; Tuilier 26; Barrett 46; Ritchie 34; West 16 (the last three cited *supra* n.2).

<sup>13</sup> Pfeiffer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6), is firm on this point (pp.173, 190, 212), but Page's assumption finds some support in schol. *ad Tr.* 47: "the line is marked [since it sounds] as if Troy were no longer inhabited, for Aristophanes suspected [this line] on the basis of *Il.* 20.307," which suggests that the mark was geared to a commentary. Likewise a scholium to Pindar, *Ol.* 2.48c Drachmann: "Aristophanes athetizes this colon for *he says* it is metrically superfluous in regard to the antistrophe" (see also the scholia to *Od.* 23.296 and *Hipp.* 171). E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1968) 116–17, notes that the mere presence of signs suggests a commentary, but unfortunately the examples he offers are all much later than Aristophanes.

textual recension”<sup>14</sup> and, even if were, this does not preclude other editions or other commentaries to his edition. (2) “The existence of the substitute [for the unpronounceable ἐκφρῶς’ at *Phoen.* 264] and its universal acceptance can only be explained by the assumption that it is very old indeed” (p.110). This scholium will be discussed in detail shortly, but one should note here that the opposite argument is just as easy: the scholiast maintains that the actors said οὐ μεθῶς’ because they could not pronounce οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν; since it is unlikely that Euripides would write what his actors could not pronounce, the actors in question must be performing some time later, when pronunciation has changed. (3) The actors’ interpolations are too good to be late (p.110). This might suggest to the sceptical that they are not interpolations at all. (4) Histrionic accidents exist in the texts, and the only way to explain this is to assume that a prompter’s copy was used as a source for our manuscripts (p.111). Yet the existence of prompters at this date is unlikely.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, most of the examples of histrionic accidents that are clearly such, *i.e.* mispronunciation, do not affect our manuscripts. The exception, *Phoenissae* 264, could hardly be called ‘accidental’.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The evidence of Aristophanes’ impact is the uniformity of the colometry all the way back to its introduction (by Aristophanes) and the uniformity of the texts after Aristophanes as opposed to their wild fluctuation before. The evidence for the former, however, is exiguous (see Pfeiffer, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.6] 185ff), and the evidence for the latter has recently been questioned (see Barrett, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.2] 56 n.1, and Donovan, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.8] 24, versus Turner, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.13] 107 and n.14). Page’s statement that “the wide publication of annotated texts ensured a high degree of stability” (p.7) ignores the fact that hypomnemata were published separately from the texts they discussed until the codex form allowed space for their inclusion (Pfeiffer 218; for some exceptions see N. G. Wilson, “A Chapter in the History of Scholia,” *CQ* 17 [1967] 244–56). On the whole question of actors’ interpolations, Page is much more restrained in “Some Emendations in Aristophanes’ *Acharnians*,” *WS* 69 (1956) 127.

<sup>15</sup> The possibility of a prompter is discussed in some detail by P. D. Arnott, “The Dissociated Actor,” in *Greek Drama*, ed. G. L. Beede (Vermillion, S.D. 1967) 40–51. The actual mechanics to get us from improvisation to textual interpolation is Page’s greatest weakness (so Lesky, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.12] 2206).

<sup>16</sup> One would expect Page to start with attested actors’ interpolations (*i.e.* mispronunciation), but a few pages earlier (100ff) we find that the “accidental interpolations” he discusses are not only unattested but also quite different from the attested accidents of mispronunciation: substitution of a word or line for another from a similar context; repetition of a line from a different context. The scholium to *Med.* 84 should have been a sobering reminder how hard it is for an actor’s version to infiltrate the ms tradition: the reading preserved in this scholium shows no transferral of either τοῦτο or αὐφῶς from actor to text, and the actor’s version of the disputed form γινώσκει(ς) is found only in one ms and in corrections of two others. The actors’ reading preserved in the scholium to *Med.* 910 had

Zuntz (1965) clearly believes in actors' interpolations but only as one of many sources of textual corruption (p.252). He finds many of the scholia speculative and actors used as "mere whipping boys" in scholarly arguments (p.254 note).

Tuilier (1968) exhibits the same paradoxical attitude found in Wilamowitz, Rutherford, Cantarella and Zuntz. The idea of actors' interpolations is attractive (p.26); the evidence, however, is weak (p.222).

Baumert's aim in his extended discussion of the scholia concerning actors' interpolations (1968) is to show that they, like all other external evidence beside manuscripts, are of no value. His method is to argue either that the text in question is perfectly satisfactory and therefore the scholium must be wrong or that, since there is no distinction between reading and acting texts, actors are invoked only to explain variations in the manuscript tradition. Such circularity, unfortunately, mars his thorough, well-documented and often penetrating analysis.<sup>17</sup>

## II

Everyone believes that actors changed their texts in performance (it would be impossible not to), but there is little agreement about how many of these changes can be discerned in *our* texts. A chart will make this immediately apparent (x indicates that the scholar heading the column was sceptical of the scholium's factual basis, o that he was not):<sup>18</sup>

---

no effect whatsoever on the text. One can argue the same for the scholium to *Med.* 228: all the mss read *γινώσκειν*, but the scholium suggests that this was a misreading by the actors ("the actors not understanding the turn of phrase say *γινώσκειν καλῶς*"). The result has been, as J. Kaiser notes ("Bemerkungen zu Euripides' *Medea*," *Gymnasium* 66 [1959] 503), that the ms reading has been emended "mit jeder der drei Personen von *γινώσκειν*." Yet, Kaiser argues, *γινώσκειν* makes perfectly good sense, so why change it: "warum soll der Fehler nicht vielmehr im Scholion stecken und hier zu ändern sein?" See also O. Regenbogen, "Randbemerkungen zum *Medea* des Euripides," *Eranos* 48 (1950) 26: "seine Meinung durchaus unklar ist;" and Baumert, who concludes that interpolation by actors is possible but not compelling (p.95).

<sup>17</sup> For Baumert's faults of logic see M. D. Reeve's lengthy critique, "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy, I," *GRBS* 13 (1972) 247-65, and *infra* n.30.

<sup>18</sup> The question marks and parentheses should be explained: Wilamowitz's condemnation of Didymus would presumably include *Med.* 169 and 356. Malzan says on *Med.* 148/169, "quod sane factum esse putandum est non nisi post saeculum quintum chori partibus neglectis" (p.26); on *Med.* 228, "quid de histrionum culpa iudicandum sit equidem ignoro" (p.27); on *Or.* 643, "si vere rettulit ille [criticus]" (p.17); and on *Phoen.* 264, "si re vera ab histrionibus orta est" (p.24). Vürtheim thinks that at *Med.* 910 "fanden die Schau-



REFERENCE	WILA- MOWITZ	RUTH- ERFORD	MAL- ZAN	VÜRT- HEIM	CANTA- RELLA	PAGE	ZUNTZ	TUI- LIER	BAU- MERT
<i>Andr.</i> 7		x	x	o	o	o	x		x
<i>Hipp.</i> 171	o		x		o	(o)	o	o	
<i>Med.</i> 84		x	o	o	o	o	x	o	x
<i>Med.</i> 148/169	(x)	x	x?	x	o	o	x	x	x?
<i>Med.</i> 228		x	?	o	o	o	x		x
<i>Med.</i> 356/380	(x)	x	x	o	o	o	x	x	?
<i>Med.</i> 910		o	o	o?	o	o	x		x
<i>Or.</i> 57	o	o	o	o		o	o		o
<i>Or.</i> 268	o	o	o	o	o	o	o		o
<i>Or.</i> 279					o				o
<i>Or.</i> 643	o	o	o?	o	o	o	o		o
<i>Or.</i> 1336	o	x	x	o	o	o	x	x	x
<i>Rhes.</i> hypoth.	o	x	o	o?	o	o		o	
<i>Phoen.</i> 264		o	o?	o?	o	o	x	x	?

No scholium is doubted by all and only three are accepted by all. If we separate the scholia into two categories, however, those dealing with stage business or mispronunciation and those dealing with a text problem, a clear pattern is discernible:

## STAGE BUSINESS OR MISPRONUNCIATION

REFERENCE	x	o
<i>Hipp.</i> 171	1	5
<i>Med.</i> 84	3	5
<i>Med.</i> 910	2	5
<i>Or.</i> 57	—	7
<i>Or.</i> 268	—	8
<i>Or.</i> 279	—	2
<i>Or.</i> 643	—	8
Total	6	40

## TEXT PROBLEM

REFERENCE	x	o
<i>Andr.</i> 7	4	3
<i>Med.</i> 148/169	7	1
<i>Med.</i> 228	3	3
<i>Med.</i> 356/380	5	3
<i>Or.</i> 1336	4	4
<i>Rhes.</i> hypoth.	1	6
<i>Phoen.</i> 264	2	5
Total	26	25

spieler einen korrupten Satz" (p.234), that concerning *Phoen.* 264 "die Aenderung war jedenfalls keine Besserung" (p.239), and that the second prologue given in the hypothesis to *Rhesus* is prosaic "aber Euripides hat mehr solche geschrieben" (p.233), although the existence of another variant prologue suggests that this is "Schauspielermachwerk." Page does not discuss *Hipp.* 171, but his citation of Wilamowitz implies his acceptance of it. Tuilier (59 n.4) follows the older reading (B) in *Hipp.* 171 *ἐγκλημα*: "Il s'agit ici d'un reproche précis qu'Aristophane de Byzance adressait à la mise en scène, et non de la machine scénique." Aristophanes, he says, is correct: Phaedra should be inside. Baumert thinks that Apollodoros had a *paragraphos* in his text which led him to his false conclusion about *Med.* 148/169 (p.75), that *Med.* 356/380 records a transposition, not an interpolation, but actors' interference cannot be ruled out (p.88), and that *Phoen.* 264 is not a certain example of actors' interference (pp. 93, 269). Here as elsewhere I am not considering speculative stage business, i.e. the frequent stage directions deduced from the text (schol. *ad Or.* 225, 1567, 1573, *Med.* 96, 97, 1317, *Hipp.* 215, *Tro.* 98). It has long been recognized that these are the work of 'armchair' critics (see *supra* n.7). To the list in my table might be added the arrivals *via mechane* described in the scholia to *PV* 397 and *Med.* 1320 and the placement of Electra at the foot, not the head of Orestes' bed in the *Orestes* hypothesis (see now V. Longo, "L'Hypothese di Aristofane di Bisanzio e le posizioni di Elettra nella parados dell' *Oreste* euripideo," *Dioniso* 41 [1967] 390-97). Scholia such as these sometimes clearly refer to revivals (*Or.* 57, 268) and perhaps they always do.

Scholia concerned with stage business or mispronunciation are questioned only 15 % of the time, while those concerned with text problems are questioned 50 % of the time. The logic of this distinction is simple and was expressed in some form by Wilamowitz, Rutherford, Malzan, Vürtheim, Zuntz and Baumert: stage business and mispronunciation do not reside in the text alone and so a scholar looking only at the text would not be apt to invent them, whereas text problems might lead him to invent a solution involving actors.<sup>19</sup> The criteria for deciding when we are dealing with a scholar's invention are (1) presence in the scholium of language which makes it clear that it is an hypothesis, or (2) discussion of a problem (*ἀπορία, ζήτημα*) to which an appeal to the actors is one solution.<sup>20</sup>

By these criteria, all but two of the scholia dealing with text problems can be seen to be inventions, and even these two are arguably so.<sup>21</sup>

Four notes guess that actors were responsible for a problem in the text. This is clearest in the hypothesis to *Rhesus*, where the problem is that there is evidence of two versions of the prologue not found in the manuscripts; the speculative solution is advanced that "*perhaps* some of the actors *might have* reworked it."<sup>22</sup> Similarly in the scholium to *Orestes* 1366, although the problem is not explicitly stated, it is clear that a contradiction was felt between the Phrygian's described leap from the roof and his (described and visible) exit from the door. The

<sup>19</sup> One must then discount the few critics of such scholia: Zuntz gives no reasons for doubting *Med.* 84 and 910 nor does Rutherford for doubting the former. Baumert thinks that the rejection of a variant reading in both cases led to the false assumption of actors' interference, not noticing that the actors' versions in either case could not be derived from our ms tradition (see *supra* n.16). Malzan's distrust of *Hipp.* 171 is certainly understandable, but it is hard to imagine what would induce Aristophanes to read an *ekkyklema* into those lines other than something like a stage direction that later dropped out of the text (so Weissmann, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.7] 26). "It is unwise to reject Aristophanes of Byzantium's testimony," said T. B. L. Webster, *CR* 13 (1963) 33.

<sup>20</sup> For a similar phenomenon in Pindaric scholia see H. Fraenkel, "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 385-97.

<sup>21</sup> For *Med.* 228 see *supra* n.16.

<sup>22</sup> The scholiast may be correct: faced with a defective text an actor would have to invent while a scholar would not. The ancient evidence is inconclusive: we know from the hypothesis that the play, without any prologue, was read by Aristophanes and that the first prologue was read by Dicaearchus, a pupil of Aristotle; but there is no assurance that Dicaearchus did not know of the other prologue or that Aristophanes was ignorant of both. To use this as an example of an actor's interpolation means agreeing (1) that the play had a prologue to begin with; (2) that this original prologue was removed by an actor and not simply lost; and (3) that it was replaced by a prologue written by an actor.

solution is again speculative: “one would readily agree that these lines [about the door exit] were not from Euripides but rather from actors who come out of the door so that they will not be hurt leaping from the palace.”<sup>23</sup> The language is less hesitant in the scholium to *Medea* 169 (= 148), but the situation is clearly the same: “this too is one of the celebrated ζητήματα: how Medea calls on Themis and Artemis, but the nurse says that she called on Zeus, not Artemis, as witness. Now Apollodorus of Tarsus says that the actors are the cause of the ambiguity by running together the choral part and Medea’s words.” Didymus disagreed, rightly as the meter assures us. In the notes on *Medea* 356 and 380 we find that Didymus thought that v.380 should be placed after v.356, not v.379. It is not clear what bothered him, but once again the solution is criticism of the actors: “he blames the actors for their poor arrangement.”<sup>24</sup>

To these four clearly speculative references to actors’ interference may be added the scholium to *Andromache* 7: οἱ ὑποκριταὶ τὸν ἱαμβὸν προσέθηκαν ὑπονοήσαντες εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν δὴ τίς ἢ οὕτως: “νῦν δὴ τίς ἄλλη” καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ συγκριτικοῦ τὸ “δυστυχεστάτη” [δὴ τίς Kirchoff, ἦτις O A om. M, νῦν δὴτις A, νῦν δ’ ἦτις M, νῦν δ’ εἶτις O]. The implication is that the actors were wrong, that the text should not read δὴ τίς (or ἦτις); indeed most of the manuscripts read δ’ εἶτις. Yet two read οὕτις, and so there is clearly a textual problem distinct from anything the actors may have suggested. At least as far as v.6 is concerned, then, it looks as if the actors were simply reacting to a corrupt text. One should note also that the actors’ δὴ τίς (or ἦτις) is not reflected in the manuscripts. The last part of the scholium only adds to the confusion: it could mean that the actors substituted the superlative for the comparative or that they took the superlative as a comparative. If the former, there would be no reason to add v.7;<sup>25</sup> if the latter, then we must assume the actors both added a line and changed the existing

<sup>23</sup> It is now generally recognized that there is no contradiction; see Baumert 76ff for the literature, to which may be added Dale, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) xxxii, and J. Roux, “À propos du décor dans les tragédies d’Euripide,” *REG* 74 (1961) 28ff.

<sup>24</sup> The usual assumption that 356a is a conjecture by Didymus (see Baumert 86–88) is attacked by Baumert on the grounds that when the scholiast says “it is well placed here. Didymus marks it because the actors arrange it poorly,” the scholiast is not opposing Didymus since there is no δέ separating them. Moreover, Didymus’ mark would not reflect a textual variant but “eine Besonderheit”; but see Turner, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.13) 116f.

<sup>25</sup> And so the latter interpretation is always accepted, even though the elimination of a textual basis for the scholiast’s inference about the actor’s interpretation considerably weakens his objectivity.

context to fit it in.<sup>26</sup> Further doubt of actors' interference is raised, as Baumert notes (pp.81–83), by the scholium to v.6, in which v.7 is attacked without reference to actors. It looks, then, as if v.7 was in the text to begin with and that textual corruption led to questioning of it. To accept *Andromache* 7 as an example of actors' interpolation means agreeing (1) that the actors inserted a line into “un contexte en soi très clair”;<sup>27</sup> (2) that to accomplish this they altered the surrounding context with not one but two grammatical peculiarities ( $\delta\eta$ , superlative for comparative); (3) that only one of the three changes, the insertion of v.7, had any effect on the manuscript tradition even though this renders the context incomprehensible; and (4) that the actors' rôle in this was ignored by all but the scholiast to v.7.

We are left, then, with one note, *Phoenissae* 264, that clearly attests an actual change in the text by actors, and it is on this note that Page most depends. But here too there is cause for doubt. First there is the variation in the scholium itself. The accepted version is, “the text is οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν; the actors changed the phrase on account of difficulty in pronunciation. Philoxenus in his ‘About Monosyllables’ in talking about φρῶ cites this use.” One of the two manuscripts (A), however, reads οἱ μὲν γὰρ, “some say οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν . . .,” and if this is closer to the original form of the scholium (no other explanation for its presence forthcoming) we might reconstruct the earlier form in this way: “some say οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν but others say οὐ μεθῶσιν; the solution is that the actors introduced the latter to replace the former which they could not pronounce.”<sup>28</sup> A more substantial cause for doubt concerns what Philoxenus would have been likely to say; if he explicitly quoted this line as from *Phoenissae* and actually said that the actors had changed it, one would be bold to doubt his word. But Philoxenus may merely have cited among his examples of φρῶ a line identical to *Phoenissae* 264 except for having ἐκφρῶσιν instead of μεθῶσιν; someone noted the resemblance and resolved the discrepancy by reference to

<sup>26</sup> Baumert notes (p.82) that  $\delta\eta$  does not fit with v.5. Reeve, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.17) 261 n.41, eases the difficulty here considerably by positing the insertion and later disappearance of the comparative.

<sup>27</sup> So A. Garzya, “Quelques notes sur l’Andromaque d’Euripide,” *RBPhil* 29 (1951) 1143, who argues that therefore v.7 is clearly interpolated; but this is precisely what should make us suspicious of such a solution. See P. T. Stevens, *Andromache* (Oxford 1971) *ad loc.*, and Reeve, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.17) 261, “there is no clearer case in Euripides of an interpolation designed to obviate an elliptical construction.”

<sup>28</sup> The γὰρ that introduces the variant reading suggests that even more must be supplied.

actors.<sup>29</sup> If so, we have no text changed by actors but yet another example of speculative actors' interpolation.<sup>30</sup> The arguments in favor of the latter are: (1) This is consonant with all other actors' interpolation scholia involving textual changes. (2) It is not likely that, in fact, the word was difficult to pronounce (*cf.* ἐκφρέω, ἔκφρων LSJ).<sup>31</sup> (3) Philoxenus was interested in usage, not pronunciation; it is therefore doubtful that he did more than quote the line without attribution.<sup>32</sup> The scholium itself suggests no more. Thus we find in Photius' lexicon οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν· οὐκ ἐξαφῶσι· Σοφοκλῆς: that is, οὐκ ἐκφρῶσιν, found in Sophocles, means οὐκ ἐξαφῶσι. This may well have come from the same spot in Philoxenus but with a different attribution eventually attached. There are parallels for the insertion of material from Philoxenus' very popular book into scholia *via* lexica (see C. Wendel, *RE* 20 [1941] 197–98 *s.v.* PHILOXENOS). (4) Philoxenus was contemporary with Didymus; both lived during the height of the mania for speculative actors' interpolations. This increases the likelihood that a false ascription on the basis of his reference would be explained by reference to actors' interpolations.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Page collects (and tries to eliminate) a number of such 'echoes', twenty-five in Euripides alone (pp.104–05; he adds four more in a note on p.220), most of which involve the change of only a word.

<sup>30</sup> Baumert's reconstruction (pp.91–93) is similar, but it rests, as usual, on ill-defined and circular arguments: ἐκφρῶς must be a rejected variant since "it is hardly possible that an expressly rejected variant could replace the vulgate reading." Therefore there is no division into reading texts and acting texts. Neither of the two possible sources for the variant, a *Kollationsexemplar* or Philoxenus, suggests actors, and so there is no sure proof of actors' influence.

<sup>31</sup> "Le témoignage de Philoxène d'Alexandrie repose certainement sur une conjecture de philologue, puisque le verbe ἐκφρέω est un mot tardif qui est inusité dans le vocabulaire d'Euripide . . . Il est donc évident que l'auteur de l'archétype conserve une grande indépendance à l'égard des notes de philologues qu'il joint au texte d'Euripide" (Tuilier p.223). Baumert, on the other hand, says (p.92) "sprachlich sind beide Wörter in dem hier von Euripides angewandten Jagbild möglich." For a thorough study of the verb see Barrett, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) *ad Hipp.* 866–67.

<sup>32</sup> In a scholium to Dionysius Thrax (*Gramm. Graec.* I.3 p.247. 21–22 Hilgard) Philoxenus is cited as saying that φρῶ is the 'vivid' word for προίεμαι.

<sup>33</sup> The limited influence of the theory of actors' interpolations is suggested by the paucity of places in which such types of errors are so explained. Thus at *Med.* 169 it is a question of misattributed lines, but the same problem arises without mention of actors at *Med.* 520f, *Hipp.* 58, 776, and *Or.* 140. In *Andr.* 7 and the *Rhesus* prologue actors are accused of having added their own lines, but there are many places where lines are added (or removed) and the actors are not accused: *Alc.* 820, *Andr.* 1254, *Hipp.* 871, 1050, *Med.* 87, *Or.* 957, 1394, *Phoen.* 973, 1075. See Baumert 269ff for a variety of explanations of interpolations not attributed to actors.

The general conclusion is clearly negative. Careful examination of the scholia inevitably leads one to doubt almost all of them. An appeal to actors' interpolations seems grounded even less than before on valid external evidence.

### III

What then of the evidence other than the scholia? The non-scholastic evidence is small in quantity and of uneven quality. In a sense Cantarella (p.143) was right in saying that Plutarch's statement (841F) about Lycurgus' law was the only surviving document. Rutherford refers also to a gloss by Phrynichus ("restoring the old: a metaphor from putting other soles and heels on old sandals; they are speaking of those who rework, restitch the old dramas," *Anecd.Bekk.* 39.19), but this probably refers to comic practice (the gloss was of a comic line) of unknown date and may simply reflect the common Roman practice of *contaminatio*, the blending of two Greek originals, to make one new play.<sup>34</sup> Wilamowitz (p.132 n.18) refers to a passage in Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* [XIX] 69.487 R) to witness the disappearance of the chorus: "the strong parts, that is the iambic (*τὰ ἰαμβεῖα*), of the (old) tragedies remain; parts of these (*τούτων μέρη*) they go through completely (*διεξίαισι*) in the theatre while the softer parts, the choral (*τὰ περὶ τὰ μέλη*), have wasted away." This remark might be taken to refer to alterations of the tragedies for revival.<sup>35</sup> Vürtheim refers to Quintilian's confusing statement (10.1.66) that "the Athenians allowed later poets to enter corrected versions of Aeschylus' plays (*correctas eius fabulas*) in contests, and many won the crown that way." As Cantarella notes (p.154): "Le parole stesse di Quintiliano ci

<sup>34</sup> One should note that Phrynichus speaks of *restitching* shoes and that it is *other* soles, not new soles, that are used.

<sup>35</sup> A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford 1946) 196, counters that "this only shows that 'parts of the iambic portions,' i.e. select scenes, were acted, and does not refer to reproductions of the whole tragedies at all." He was probably thinking of the analogical treatment of the choral parts, which were commonly performed separately and in isolation; see *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 648, and E. G. Turner, "Dramatic Representations in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *AntCl* 32 (1963) 128 and n.16. Yet this is not what Dio Chrysostom means: the iambic parts are clearly being contrasted to the lyric *in toto*, dialogue to chorus (so E. Bethe, "Die griechische Tragödie und die Musik," *NJbb* 19 [1907] 84 n.1), and the verb *διεξίαισι* suggests a thorough rendition. For further evidence of a decline in the choral part see the passages assembled by Pickard-Cambridge pp.160f and 240ff, the scholium to *Ajax* 693, and *P.Oxy.* 2458, which Turner thinks is "an excerpt made for acting purposes" (p.126).

dimostrano oramai che già al tempo suo non si sapeva più esattamente come le cose fossero andate.”

Page adds a number of documents, only one of which is really relevant. The opening of the third book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* simply states that actors are now more important than poets. The anecdote in Aelian (*VH* 14.13) merely indicates that some of Agathon's friends thought he should clean up his language. The reference to Theodorus in Aristotle's *Politics* (1336b28ff), however, is more to the point: Theodorus “allowed no one ever to appear on the stage before he did, not even the bad actors, on the grounds that the audience is influenced by what they have heard first.” Aristotle's phrase “what they have heard first” suggests that Theodorus' alterations went beyond scenic effects such as the alteration recorded in the scholium to *Orestes* 57, where Helen and her baggage were paraded in the prologue—“incorrectly, since he [the poet] says explicitly that she slipped in during the night and the drama takes place during the day”; if the protagonist is to speak the first words in every play, this would often mean considerable relocation and adaptation of the original.

We come finally to the law of Lycurgus: “that the tragedies of them [Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides] were to be copied and preserved in the public archives and that they were to be read to the actors [who were planning a revival] by the city recorder.” Scholars debate the law's effectiveness,<sup>36</sup> but in any case it assumes the existence of a ‘clean’ copy of the plays and gives no reason to suppose that such a copy would be obtained only with difficulty.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, in light of the two relevant documents (Dio Chrysostom and *Politics*), which both refer to major alterations, one could argue that it was changes such as these that were the object of the law and that it was the performance rather than the text that was being protected.

If we are to give any weight to the documents, then, it is major alterations that we should look for as the result of actors' interference. Whether we have any in our extant tragedies is an issue that is and always will be debated (*e.g.*, the end of *Septem*). The prologue to *Rhesus* seems the likeliest candidate, and Page has added the prologues

<sup>36</sup> Wilamowitz (p.132) is negative, followed by Page (p.2) versus Cantarella (p.143), Tuilier (pp.28ff) and A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* I (Cambridge 1917) xxxiv: “it may be presumed that the net was cast as wide as possible, and that the most authoritative sources were consulted.”

<sup>37</sup> Whether it was an acting copy (Page, Cantarella p.305, *OCD*<sup>2</sup> *supra* n.2) or not (Wilamowitz, Cantarella p.143).

402 OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE FOR ACTORS' INTERPOLATIONS

of three lost plays (*Archelaos*, *Meleager* and *Melanippe Sophe*) with more or less validity.<sup>38</sup>

In any case, we can say that although there was clearly reworking of plays for dramatic production, there is no objective external evidence that the dramatic texts had any influence on our texts. The apparent evidence turns out to be a few notes on two plays, concerned with stage business and actors' slips. Probably in the first century B.C. the theory of actors' interpolations was applied to some textual problems, and it is this that has been wrongly backdated by several centuries and elevated to the status of fact.<sup>39</sup>

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
*June, 1974*

<sup>38</sup> The only source of the alternate beginning of *Melanippe* is Plut. 756c, who tells us explicitly that the poet changed the first line for a second production. With *Meleager* Page again contradicts the only explicit testimony: the scholiast to *Frogs* 1238 tells us that the line is from *Meleager* but that it is not the first line. With *Archelaos* the external evidence partially supports Page: the scholiast to *Frogs* 1206 says "this is the beginning of *Archelaos* some say, wrongly, for no such *λόγος* is now in Euripides; for it is not, Aristarchus says, from *Archelaos* unless the poet himself changed it later, but Aristophanes said this was the beginning." We know from other sources that this is not the beginning of *Archelaos* (see Nauck, *TGF*<sup>2</sup> fr.228) but, whether we then accept Aristarchus' tentative explanation (Page) or not (F. Stoessl, *RE* 23 [1957] 2340 s.v. PROLOGOS II), the possibility of revision by actors has not even been raised.

<sup>39</sup> I wish to thank Professors G. W. Dickerson, J. M. Hunt, M. L. Lang and Miss Lisa Montagno for reading and criticizing this paper, which was measurably improved by the journal's referees as well.