

SCOLIA AND ABUSE-LYRICS IN OLD COMEDY

THE ATTIC SCOLIA AND THE ABUSE-LYRICS
IN OLD COMEDY

By

SHAWN PATRICK MCNAMARA, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

July 1989

MASTER OF ARTS (1989)
(Classics)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Attic Scolia and the Abuse-lyrics in Old
Comedy

AUTHOR: Shawn Patrick McNamara, B.A. (McMaster
University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. W.J. Slater

READERS: Dr. P. Murgatroyd, Dr. P. Kingston

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 94

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to examine two elements of popular Attic culture as they appear in Old Comedy: the so-called Attic scolia, and the ritualized abuse often associated with cult, which takes the form of the abuse-lyrics so prominent in the iambic scenes. This will be done primarily through a re-examination of an old article by Ernst Wüst [*Philologus* 77 (1921)]. This is necessary in that Wüst's arguments seem to have been accepted as valid. It will be shown that, although there are Attic scolia present in Old Comedy (in different forms, e.g. in partial citations and in parody), they are not as pervasive and do not play as formative role in the structure of Old Comedy as Wüst asserted. As for the abuse-lyrics, it will be shown that they derive from several traditions of invective: primarily from the cultic *αἰσχρολογία* and the good-natured abuse frequently associated with religious celebrations, especially those peculiar to women, but also from the Iambographers, whose influence is explicitly attested by the comic poets themselves. In addition, in both parts of this thesis the frequent use of forms of folk-poetry, and the significance of this, will be demonstrated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish first of all to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its financial support in the form of the Special M.A. Scholarship. I wish also to thank the two Readers of this thesis, Dr. Paul Murgatroyd, and Dr. Peter Kingston, for their helpful suggestions. Most of all I wish to thank my Supervisor, Dr. William Slater. It was Dr. Slater who not only suggested the topic of this thesis, but who, with his guidance, encouragement, and with his great generosity, saw this thesis through to its completion.

S.P.M.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
CHAPTER ONE	Introduction:	1
CHAPTER TWO	The Attic Scolia in Old Comedy:	6
CHAPTER THREE	The Abuse-lyrics in Old Comedy:	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY		88

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

More than the other *genres* of ancient Greek literature, Attic comedy drew extensively upon the *Realien* of contemporary Athens. This is true both of Old Comedy and the New, but much more so of Old Comedy, since Old Comedy embraced a far greater range of the life and activity in Classical Athens than the limited and stereotypical plots of the later comedy. This aspect of Old Comedy is true to such an extent that much of what we know of many areas of popular Athenian culture in the fifth century is directly derived from the evidence supplied by the remains of Old Comedy.

This use of popular *Realien* runs the entire gamut of political, religious, and social life of fifth century Athens, so that passages frequently appear which involve the simulation of e.g. the proceedings of the law-courts, the political assemblies, and religious institutions, such as the established cult-rituals, and hymn- and prayer-forms.¹

It is just this popular element in Old Comedy which will be the focus of this thesis. It will deal in particular with two

¹E.g. *Ach.* 263-79 (religious procession), *Vesp.* 891 ff. (court-scene), *Thesm.* 295-371 (political assembly), *Ranae* 316 ff. (religious procession).

elements widespread in the popular culture of fifth-century Athens: the musical-poetical performances at symposia, in particular the Attic scolia; and ritualized abuse, which is found as part of several of the religious festivals.

While there has been little done in the past about the use of Attic scolia in Old Comedy, there has been much work done on the use and origins of the Comic invective; but this has been done in connection with invective in all its forms and in all parts of the comic drama. This thesis will be concerned only with the abuse uttered by the chorus in the form of brief lyrics and located in the iambic parts of Old Comedy.

Only one scholar has attempted to deal with these two elements in a comprehensive manner: Ernst Wüst,² tried to demonstrate 1) that Attic scolia were included in the iambic scenes of Old Comedy in accordance with a tradition of the *genre*, and 2) that the choral abuse-lyrics could in many instances be described as *gephyrismus*, a type of popular, ritualized abuse attested for certain religious festivals. Wüst thought that Aristophanes habitually used this *gephyrismus* in a way which establishes that he (Aristophanes) was closely imitating the popular ritual. This fact Wüst thought could be deduced from the repeated use of certain metrical and stanzaic forms, and from the content of the abuse.

²'Skolion und Γεφυρισμός in der alten Komödie,' *Philologus* 77 (1921): 26-45.

The discussion of the topics raised in this thesis will be divided into two chapters. Chapter Two will deal with the question of the Attic scolia, the third with the question of the *gephyrismus*.

In Chapter Two we shall examine the use of Attic scolia in Old Comedy. As has already been mentioned, Wüst thought that he could distinguish a pattern in the choral lyrics of the iambic scenes which revealed a regular use of Attic scolia which were included through the force of tradition. However, it will become clear that apart from a few actual examples, his theory will not withstand examination. We shall see that Wüst uses the wrong criteria for establishing the existence of scolia in Old Comedy: in order to establish the desired pattern in the lyrics, he creates something called 'Komödienskolien', whose definition is so broad as to be meaningless. What will also become clear (and this will have some bearing for Chapter Three) is that Aristophanes (and the other comic poets, it may reasonably be presumed) frequently made use of the contemporary folk-music in some of the examples which Wüst identifies as scolia. That is, Aristophanes uses lyrics of a simple sort, clearly imitative of popular melodies such as can only be supposed to have had their sources in the folk-music of contemporary Athens.

We shall see too that there are real examples of scolia to be found in Old Comedy. All the real examples, however, are unmistakable: they are either quoted and named as scolia (cf. *Wasps* 1222 ff.), or are parodied in an obvious manner. These

scolia are not used in the programmatic and structural manner described by Wüst.

Chapter Three will deal with the questions which the abuse lyrics raise, in particular with regard to their relation to *gephyrismus*, a relationship which Wüst (in the article cited) suggests exists. Wüst sought to demonstrate that abuse-lyrics were included in a fixed pattern, and we shall examine this assertion as well. It will be necessary to distinguish between the different types of abuse commonly practised by different groups in classical Athens: cultic abuse; *gephyrismus* (if this is to be separated from cultic abuse); iambic abuse, as found in Archilochus and Hipponax (as will be seen this too may have had cultic origins or inspiration). Naturally the dividing lines between these groups, separated for convenience, will not always be distinct. It will therefore be necessary to show how the abuse-lyrics differ from one another, and fall into identifiable groups.

The apparent connection of the abuse in the *parodos* of the *Ranae* with the Eleusinian Mysteries has caused a general supposition of a connection between lyric abuse in Old Comedy and cult. This, in connection with our information about cultic *αἰσχρολογία*, and the possible origin of comedy with popular cultic performances, does make the association of comic abuse with cult possible, and worth examining. Further, the use in Old Comedy of obscene language is frequent, and in this it bears a strong similarity to the practice of the Iambographers. The only

other possible source for this habit is cultic αἰσχρολογία. Both have been seen as the source for obscenity in Old Comedy. In this connection the question of just what γεφυρισμός is becomes important: is it cultic abuse, or simply a form of popular bawdiness which had become loosely associated with the cult, and if the latter, would there be any difference in the *form* that it takes?

The conclusion will be that the non-parabatic choral abuse, inasmuch as it appears in the form of simple folk-lyrics, may be derived from the γεφυρισμός, at least as far as this can be said with any certainty, while the abuse in the parabases shows some of the characteristics of iambographic invective. Of course, because of our imperfect knowledge of the iambographic *genre* and of γεφυρισμός, this conclusion can only be in the form of a suggestion.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE ATTIC SCOLIA IN OLD COMEDY

Those plays of Aristophanes (who wrote as a representative of the final generation in the development of Old Comedy, and so may preserve features which differ from earlier comic poets, and perhaps even from his own contemporaries) which have been preserved more or less intact reveal a structural pattern which is adhered to, with some variation, from play to play: after a prologue, which in Aristophanes is always in trimeters, except for an occasional admixture of lyrics,¹ there follows a series of scenes, usually considered as a whole, the Parados-Agon-Parabasis, which normally features an elaborate pattern of metrically responding passages called, since Zielinski's time, 'epirrhetic syzygies'. In these scenes the conflict of the play is essentially resolved, leaving for the final scenes only the working-out of the consequences of the Agon.² These epirrhetic parts have in the past been the subject of extensive analyses which have revealed the formal structure

¹See Sir A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, Comedy*, 2nd ed. rev. T.B.L. Webster, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 212, for a discussion of this point.

²K.J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), 66ff.

adhered to by Aristophanes.³ Less thoroughly analysed (perhaps because they are less suitable for such analysis) have been the final 'iambic scenes'. By 'iambic scenes' is meant everything which follows the parabasis (although these scenes are often interrupted by other types of scenes, e.g. *Lysistrata* 1014-42, where a sort of second agon has been introduced). The nature of these scenes discourages any attempt to identify structures which are as formally contrived as the epirrhematic syzygies of the Parodos-Agon-Parabasis. Among those who have tried, however, is Ernst Wüst, who attempted to identify certain formal elements in these scenes: his conclusions will form the starting-point and basis for this investigation.

Wüst's Theory

Wüst⁴ tried to show that in the iambic scenes the comic poets followed a convention which dictated the inclusion of scolia (or scolia-like songs) and ritualized abuse-lyrics (typical of certain religious festivals). We shall be concerned in this chapter, however, only with the first part of his argument, that Aristophanes and the other comic poets inserted

³E.g. by Th. Zielinski, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1885); and T. Gelzer, *Der epirrhematiche Agon bei Aristophanes*, *Zetemata* 23 (Munich, 1960).

⁴Ernst Wüst, 'Skolion und Γεφύρισμός in der alten Komödie,' *Philologus* 77 (1921): 26-45. Hereafter cited as "Wüst, *Skolion*."

As Wüst shows, there is a correspondence of contents (and metre) between 1) and 2), and of metre between 1) and 3).⁸ From this correspondence he deduces the widespread popularity of this tune and this subject-matter (hymns to Pan), which he takes as support for the belief (following Reitzenstein⁹) that a book of drinking-songs existed at Athens by the middle of the fifth century, and that this collection provided melodies to which guests at symposia could substitute their own words. He cites as the best evidence for this the four *solia* on the topic of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (10-13P.) which, in Wüst's view, represent the efforts of different symposiasts to compose a song on a traditional topic.¹⁰

Central to his argument is his attempt to use the two short songs from the *Ecclesiastusae* to show that Reitzenstein's definition of *solia* is too narrow. This definition is as follows: Kurze Lieder, welche in einfachster Form den Nachhall berühmter Dichtungen oder beim Gelage beliebter Erzählungen, kurze Ausführungen eines allbekannten Sprichworts oder eine Gnome

⁸Wüst, *Skolion*, 26 f.

⁹Richard Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion* (Gießen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1893; reprint, Hildesheim / New York: Georg Olms, 1970): 13 ff.

¹⁰Wüst, *Skolion*, 27-28, but this is a controversial topic: cf., for example, R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 22 ff., C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956): 393 ff., Victor Ehrenberg, 'Das Harmodioslied,' *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956): 57 ff., and M. van der Valk, 'On the Composition of the Attic *Solia*,' *Hermes* 102 (1974): 6 ff.

bilden; ursprünglich sicher Improvisationen, gehen sie auf keinen Verfasser zurück; es sind 'Volkslieder'.¹¹

Wüst, therefore, wishes to distinguish two types of scolia: the normal sympotic kind as in the collection in Athenaeus, and what he refers to as 'Komödienskolien',¹² of which the two songs pointed out in the *Ecclesiazusae* would be examples. He takes as the 'essential, typifying features' of 'Komödienskolien' that they are closely bound to the plot of the drama and thus do not destroy the dramatic illusion (as *does* happen, for example, with the parabasis), and that each example of 'Komödienskolien' contains within itself a complete 'Gedanke' which is not a generalized statement, but which is a continuation of the plot.¹³ However, on this one must comment that it is clear that by this definition 'Komödienskolien' can never (or almost never) have the same subject-matter as regular scolia, since they must form part of the action of the comedy, which means that the presence of such scolia can be revealed only by the existence of metrical schemes which are paralleled in known scolia. Wüst's definition holds true only for the two songs from the *Ecclesiazusae*: these songs take the metrical form of the Pan-

¹¹R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 21.

¹²Wüst, *Skolion*, 28.

¹³Wüst, *Skolion*, 28: "Diese Skolien sind mit dem umgebenden Komödiendialog aufs engste verflochten, treten nicht etwa wie die Parabase, die Illusion zerreiend, aus dem übrigen Text heraus; sie behandeln zwar in sich abgeschlossen je einen Gedanken, aber nicht einen allgemeinen, überhaupt keinen Gedanken von höherer Bedeutung; sie sind einfach eine Fortführung des Gesprächs, der Komödienhandlung in anderer Form."

scolium, (and are probably, in the first line, εἴθ' ἐξῆν κτλ, a parody of an established scolium-formula¹⁴) while at the same time the subject-matter of the songs continues the plot of the play. (It is more difficult, however, to be sure about Wüst's other example, Cratinus Fr.359 K.-A. It is undoubtedly in its subject-matter and in its metrical form typical of an Attic scolium. That it is a scolium cannot be doubted; to fulfil the other criteria of Wüst's definition it would be necessary to ascertain from which part of the play it comes. Molly Whittaker¹⁵ suggested that it formed part of the parabasis. If this is so, it could not fit into Wüst's scheme; but Whittaker's suggestion is hardly provable one way or the other.) Where, however, undeniable metrical parallels do not exist it becomes impossible to call a lyric passage a scolium.

Important in his argument for 'Komödienskolien' is his belief that there were two parts to the typical symposium, the first featuring the performance of 'Vaterlandsliedern' about the native gods and heroes, the second featuring songs reflecting the more drunken state of the guests. He believes that this

¹⁴Cf. *Scolium* 6 (889 PMG): εἴθ' ἐξῆν ὁποῖός τις ᾄν ἕκαστος κτλ. This example (*Eccl.* 938-45) points to the fact that when Aristophanes imitates the Attic scolia, the parody is clear and unmistakable: both the metre and the first line of the scolium are imitated; compare the examples from the *Wasps* 1226, etc.

¹⁵Molly Whittaker, 'The Comic Fragments in their Relation to the Structure of Old Attic Comedy,' *CQ* 29 (1935): 188.

distinction is evident both in the scolia in Athenaeus, and in the 'Komödiensskolien' of Old Comedy.¹⁶

The final important point in Wüst's argument is that the songs cited from the *Ecclesiazusae* (938-45) occur exactly (*arithmetisch*, p.29) in the middle of the iambic scenes (700-1181). Throughout the article he reiterates his assertion that scolia were regularly placed by Aristophanes in the middle of the iambic scenes. Following this he analyses all the lyrics which he believes support his argument.

This, I think, is a fair summary of Wüst's theory of 'Komödiensskolien'. I intend to show that Wüst was mistaken and that his definition of 'Komödiensskolien' is so broad as to be of little practical use. In addition Wüst's definition is unclear as to what exactly his 'Komödiensskolien' are: are they scolia in the accepted sense? i.e. what relation do they bear to actual scolia? Wüst does not make this clear. It will be seen that few of the lyrics discussed by Wüst can be called scolia (that is if the term *scolia* is to have any real meaning). Upon examination, however, it will become apparent that *some* of the lyrics which Wüst calls scolia are in fact lyrics of the sort which were likely to have been adapted from contemporary folk-songs. This in turn will lead to the examination of the other lyrics of the iambic scenes for further evidence of popular song-forms. Direct evidence for such forms can be derived from a study of those few

¹⁶Wüst, *Skolion*, 28.

genuine folk-songs which survive from the Classical and the Hellenistic periods; these will reveal certain preferred metrical schemes and strophic forms which are found to be imitated by the comic poets.

First, however, a brief analysis of the Attic scolia will be helpful, both in respect to our discussion concerning Wüst's theory, and to illustrate some aspects of folk-songs (among which most of the Attic scolia are to be numbered) in the classical period at Athens.

The Attic Scola

The main, and almost only, source for the Attic scolia is the collection in Athenaeus, XV 694C ff., and although it is of great importance for the definition of the term σκόλιον, it is necessary to pass over a discussion of the manner in which the scolia were performed: for the purposes of this inquiry we will accept the scolia found at the above-mentioned place in Athenaeus as representing the most common types of Attic scolia. Of these we are interested primarily in the subject-matter and in their metrical forms. Their date and authorship is also important, however, for Wüst's argument; this question has been much debated, but R. Reitzenstein has shown that this collection without much doubt already existed as early as the mid-fifth century, and that the arrangement which they take in Athenaeus is

equally ancient.¹⁷ There are twenty-five brief songs in this collection, lacking names of authors and information on their origins. If Reitzenstein's conclusions are correct, their arrangement reflects the order in which they would have been sung at an actual symposium.¹⁸

A) Subject-Matter

The first five *scolia* concern the gods. The first two (to Athena, Demeter and Persephone) contain prayers that these goddesses direct and preserve Athens (ὄρθου τήνδε πόλιν; εὖ δὲ τάνδ' ἀμφέπετον πόλιν). The third is directed to Apollo and Artemis, and the fourth to Pan, asking that god to take pleasure in the singing of the symposiasts. (As Reitzenstein shows, *Scolium* 5 is closely connected with 4 and emphasizes the popular belief at Athens in the importance of Pan in the Greek victory over the Persians.¹⁹) The manner in which these simple, anonymous songs were derived from the songs of well-known poets can be seen from *Scolium* 4:

ὦ Πάν, Ἀρκαδίας μεδῶν κλεεννᾶς,
ὄρχηστᾶ, βρομίαις ὀπαδὲ Νύμφαις,
γελάσειας, ὦ Πάν, ἐπ' ἐμαῖς
εὐφροσι ταῖσδ' αἰοῖσαις κεχαρημένος.,

¹⁷R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 13ff. Wilamowitz came to the same conclusion independently: *Aristoteles und Athen*, vol. I, (Berlin: Weidmann, 1893: reprint, Berlin / Zurich / Dublin, 1966), 316-22.

¹⁸R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 15.

¹⁹R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 14.

which has been adapted from a *Partheneion* of Pindar (Fr.95 Sn.-M.):

ὦ Πάν, Ἀρκαδίας μεδέων
καὶ σεμνῶν ἀδύτων φύλαξ
* * *
Ματρὸς μεγάλας ὀπαδὲ,
σεμνῶν χαρίτων μέλημα
τερπνόν²⁰

It was a habit of popular song-making in ancient Greece to take the longer, more complex songs ('Kunstlieder') of a professional poet like Pindar and, through repeated use and through differing musical needs, to alter them:²¹ the musical needs of symposiasts would of course differ from those of Pindar, so that only that part of the *Partheneion* which could be sung independently of the rest of the song would be used by the symposiasts.

Scolia 10-13, which are in praise of the Tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton, are four songs very similar in their content. There has been a good deal of argument over whether these are four separate songs, or one song with four strophes.²² The answer to this question will be of some importance later, and

²⁰As colometrized by Bruno Snell, *Pindarus, pars altera*, 4th ed., (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1964), 93. Aristophanes also apparently makes use of this at *Thesm.* 977 ff: 'Ερμῆν τε Νόμιον ἄντομαι || καὶ Πᾶνα καὶ Νύμφας φίλας || ἐπιγελάσαι προθύμως ταῖς ἡμετέραισι χαρέντα χορεΐαις.

²¹Another example of this sort of thing among the Attic scolia is *Scolium* 8 P., which is adapted from Alcaeus (Fr.249 V.). For a discussion (and bibliography) of this phenomenon ('zersingen'), and not only in respect to the archaic Greek poets, see Wolfgang Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1980), 99, and footnote 170.

²²E.g., C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., 391 ff.; Wüst, *Skolion*, 27 f.

so must be examined here. Reitzenstein suggests that the division of the four strophes into two songs (10-11; 12-13) is a possibility. Each group would then begin with the lines:

ἐν μύρτου κλαδὶ τὸ ξίφος φορήσω
ὥσπερ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων.

In this way in each set of two the first song sets out the deed, and the second the consequences of the deed. However, he rejects this suggestion and opts instead for one song of four strophes. He agrees with Hesychius in ascribing the original to Callistratus and maintains that the repetition of ἐν μύρτου κλαδὶ κτλ. is the work of conscious artistry on the part of the poet. He finds a parallel for this in the scholium of Hybrias, where there is also found the use of repetition:

...δόρυ καὶ ξίφος	1
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήμενον, πρόβλημα χρωτός·	
* * *	
...δόρυ καὶ ξίφος	6
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήμενον, πρόβλημα χρωτός	

There is also repetition in δεσπότης (v.6) and δεσπότην (v.8).²³ (He argues that the Harmodius-scholium mentioned in the scholium to *Acharnians* 980 must not be interpolated into the collection in Athenaeus. He also rejects Bergk's suggestion that *Wasps* 1226, οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἀνὴρ ἔγεντ' Ἀθήναις, is the beginning of an actual scholium in common use at the time; he believes that it was

²³R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 22 f. There is an inconsistency here: earlier (p.21) he distinguishes the Attic scolia in Athenaeus from longer and more artistically complex scolia, including that of Hybrias.

invented by Aristophanes for comic purposes²⁴). This argument, however, although superficially attractive, ignores the basic characteristic of the Attic scolia, their brevity and anonymity.

Scolia 15 and 16 are about Telamonian Ajax and his father. *Scolium* 15,

Παῖ Τελαμῶνος Αἴαν ἀίχμητά, λέγουσί σε
ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ' Ἀχιλλέα,

is very similar to Alcaeus Fr.48 L.-P.: Κρονίδα βασιλῆος γένος
Αἴαν τὸν ἄριστον πεδ' Ἀχιλλέα, which again shows how popular songs could be adapted from the work of poets who had attained 'classic' status. The scholium to *Lysistrata* 1237 ascribes the origin of this scolium to Pindar,²⁵ but Reitzenstein suggests that both go back to Homer (B768). Reitzenstein supposes that the author of this song had heard the verses of Pindar and Alcaeus in praise of Ajax and has made his own version. This, in Reitzenstein's view, is an excellent example of how scolia came to be written.²⁶

Scolium 14, advice to avoid the δειλός, is called the 'logos' of Admetus, a Thessalian hero. The reason for this ascription is no longer clear.²⁷ The sentiment is common in the

²⁴R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 23, n.1; but this is not provable.

²⁵Nem. 7.26 f.

²⁶R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 15 f.

²⁷R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 17. This was a popular scolium: cf. Aristoph. Fr.444 K.-A.: ὁ μὲν ᾗδεν Ἀδμήτου λόγον πρὸς μυρρίνην, ὁ δ' αὐτόν ἠνάγκαζεν Ἀρμοδίου μέλος. Compare also Cratinus Fr. 254 K.-A.

Theognidea, e.g. 31-32, 105 W., etc.²⁸

The elegiac distich on the subject of Cedon (*Scolium* 23) is also found in Aristotle, (*Athen. Pol.* ch.20.5), where it is explained that Cedon was one of the enemies of the Tyrants. *Scolium* 24 also deals with the period of the overthrow of the tyrants, in this case with the death of the anti-tyrants at Leipsydrium.

The non-political scolia are also grouped together in similar topics. 17 and 18 (εἴθε λύρα καλὴ γενομένην κτλ. and εἴθ' ἄπυρον καλὸν γενομένην κτλ.) exhibit the same scolium formula which we saw used in the *Ecclesiazusae*. *Scolium* 7 (ὕγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον κτλ.) is about the four best things in life.²⁹ Philosophical and moral preoccupations are also found in *Scolium* 6, which expresses a wish to see within the breast of a friend to ascertain if the friend is true. Reitzenstein believes this to be the core of an Aesopian fable. This is possible since *Scolium* 9 (ὁ δὲ καρκίνος ᾧδ' κτλ.) is doubtless adapted from an Aesopian fable,³⁰ such as was often told at symposia (cf. *Wasps* 1182).³¹

²⁸C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., 376 f.

²⁹This scolium also reveals the similarity of many of the motifs found in the scolia in the collection in Athenaeus with motifs found frequently in the Theognidea. Compare 146 W. and 197 W. with *scolium* 7 (146 πλουτεῖν ἀδόκως χρήματα πασάμενος, 197 χρῆμα ... σὺν δίκῃ ἀνδρὶ γένηται, *Scolium* 7.3 τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως. For the possible origins of this scolium, see Bergk's apparatus criticus.

³⁰Fab. 346 Halm, which ends: τοῦ δὲ ὄφεος μετὰ θάνατον ἐκταθέντος ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν· "οὕτως ἔδει καὶ πρόσθεν εὐθὺν καὶ ἀπλοῦν εἶναι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ταύτην τὴν δίκην ἔτεισας." Quoted by C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., 385; R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 19.

³¹R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 19 f. Ezio

Scolium 19 (σύν μοι πῖνε, συνήβα, συνέρα) is an aristocratic call for loyalty, as is 20 (ὕπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ κτλ) whose origin is very likely in proverbial?³² *Scolia* 21 and 22 are jokes. 21 (ἃ ὅς τὰν βάλανον κτλ.) is thought by Wilamowitz to have been made thus: the second verse is a parodic continuation of the first, which was borrowed from an unknown Dorian poet. This is shown by the dialect (ἃ, Τάν); the Athenian parodist is mocking the 'plebejischen geschmack' of the Dorian.³³ The final scolium in the collection, 25, is again about the value placed on truthfulness and loyalty.

Scolium 8: ἐκ γῆς χρῆ κατίδην κτλ is an adaptation of Alcaeus Fr.249 V., and is an example of what W. Rösler calls 'zersingen', that is the popular use of the work of a 'classic' poet.³⁴

B) Metrical Schemes

Pellizer, 'Per una morfologia della poesia giambica arcaica,' [*I canoni letterari di Trieste* (1981): 35-48]: 44, notes that animal fables were used at symposia as exemplary narratives, and compares *Scolium* 9 P. with Xenophanes Fr.1 Gent.-Pr., vv.19-20; *adespota elegiaca* Fr.27 W., vv.1-4.

³²R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 17 f.; C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd ed., 381. This proverb is alluded to at *Thesm.* 328-30; *Soph.* Fr.37 P.; *Hesych.* s.v. ὕπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ (Y717 Schmidt); and *Praxilla* 750 PMG.

³³U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin: Weidmann 1886: reprint, Dublin / Zürich, 1967), 125, n.1.

³⁴W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe*, 99, with footnote 170.

The Attic scolia make use of a few popular metrical schemes, mostly aeolic, although there are a few examples of uniquely occurring metres which may or may not be representative of other scolia which have been lost. Below has been set out a brief survey of the metrical schemes used in the known scolia. They will be discussed in connection with Aristophanic lyrics later in this chapter.

The commonest scolia-form is this (*Scolium* 1):

Παλλὰς Τριτογένει', ἄνασσ' Ἀθάνᾳ,
ὄρθου τήνδε πόλιν τε καὶ πολίτας
ἄτερ ἀλγέων καὶ στάσεων
καὶ θανάτων ἁώρων, σύ τε καὶ πατήρ.

≡ _ ~ ~ ~ _ _ _
≡ _ ~ ~ ~ _ _ _
~ ~ ~ _ ~ ~ ~
_ ~ ~ ~ _ ~ ~ _

This metrical shape is found in *Scolia* 1-7, 10-13, and 24. (5 is corrupt, but it must originally have been the same.) The first and second verses are Phalaeceans, a colon which is rare outside these scolia. (See below for more on this colon.) The Phalaecean is also found at *Wasps* 1226, οὐδεὶς πώποτ' κτλ., the beginning of a scolium, and at *Athen.* XIV 625C (*Scolium* 27) οὐδὲν ἦν ἄρα τᾶλλα πλὴν ὁ χρυσός.

The elegaic distich is found only in 23 P.:

ἔγχει καὶ Κήδωνι, διάκονε, μηδ' ἐπιλήθου,
εἰ χρή τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.

8 P., adapted from Alcaeus Fr.249 V., is in the Alcaic strophe:

<≡-~> ἐκ γῆς χρή κατίδην πλόον ≡ _ ~ ~ ~ _ ~ ~
εἴ τις δύναίτο καὶ παλάμην ἔχοι ≡ _ ~ ~ ~ _ ~ ~
ἐπεὶ δὲ κ' ἐν πόντῳ γένηται ≡ _ ~ ~ ~ _ ~ ~

τῷ παρεόντι τρέχειν ἀνάγκη. - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ -

Scolium 9 is also aeolic:

ὁ καρκίνος ᾧδ' ἔφα ≈ - ~ ~ - ~ -
χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβών. ≈ - ~ ~ - ~ -
"εὐθύνη χρὴ τὸν ἐταῖρον ἔμ- ≈ ≈ - ~ ~ - ~ -
μεν καὶ μὴ σκολιὰ φρονεῖν." ≈ ≈ - ~ ~ - ~ -

It consists of two telesilleans and two 'dove-tailed' glyconics.³⁵

Another aeolic strophe is common in the scolia, and is found in 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23; e.g. 14:

Ἀδμήτου λόγον ᾧ ἑταῖρε μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει,
τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου γνοὺς ὅτι δειλοῖς ὀλίγη χάρις.

≈ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ -

The following is an extended glyconic (Greater Asclepiad).

Scolia 15, 16, 17, and 18 take this form; e.g., 15:

Παῖ Τελαμῶνος Αἴαν ἀίχμητά, λέγουσί σε
ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ' Ἀχιλλέα.

- ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ -
- ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ -

The first verse comprises an anaclastic glyconic + dodrans; the second is the same with dactylic expansion in the dodrans. This is West's analysis.³⁶ Wilamowitz³⁷ calls the first part of each verse a choriambic dimeter.

³⁵Martin West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 59 f. But Page, 855 *PMG*, prints ὁ δὲ καρκίνος κτλ. thus making a glyconic of the first verse.

³⁶West, *Greek Metre*, 60.

³⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1921: reprint, Bad Homburg vor der Höhe: Hermann Gentner Verlag, 1962), 478, n.1.

A scholium in Ameipsias (Fr.22 K.) takes the following metrical form:

οὐ χρὴ πόλλ' ἔχειν θνητὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ' ἐρᾶν
καὶ κατεσθίειν· σὺ δὲ κάρτα φείδῃ.

---~---~---~--
-~-~-~-~-

But this is corrupt: see Page, 913 PMG.

Two final examples are found in Aristophanes, *Vespae* 1240-1 and 1245-47. 1240-41:

οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλωπεκίζειν ---~~---
οὐδ' ἀμφοτέροισι γίγνεσθαι φίλον ---~---~--

1245-7:

χρήματα καὶ βίαν κλειταγόρα τε κάμοι μετὰ θετταλῶν.

1245-47 is as arranged by Page, 912 PMG. J.W. White arranges it as follows:

χρήματα καὶ βίαν
κλειταγόρα τε κάμοι μετὰ θετταλῶν.

-~--~--
-~--~--~--

which gives a final verse that is the same as the final verse in *Scolia* 1-7 etc.³⁸

Note on the Phalaecean Colon

The Phalaecean colon (≡~--~--~--) is found in the first two verses of *Scolia* 1-7, 10-13, 24, and 27 (the *Scholium* of Pythermus). In the classical period (it is found in a number of

³⁸John Williams White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London: Macmillan, 1912), Para.568.

places in the Hellenistic poets; see Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, 137-153, and West, *Greek Metre*, 151.) it appears in very few others places, e.g. at Eurip. *Hipp.* 559, and at Soph. *Ajax* 634 and in the ode at 693 ff.³⁹

Wilamowitz detects the Phalaecean in Simonides' *Scolium* to *Scopas* (542 *PMG*). This is the metrical arrangement of the first strophe (according to Wilamowitz⁴⁰):

```

-  -  - | -  -  -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -  -  - | -  -  -  -  - | -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -  -  - | -  -  -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -
-  -  - | -  -  -

```

He notes that verse 1, an ionic trimeter, is the same as a Phalaecean but for the choriamb in the first foot.⁴¹ He also points out that the first metron of the third verse, an iambic metron with an anapaestic first foot, is the same as the first metron of the third verse of those scolia which begin with a Phalaecean. He concludes that this strophe is an expanded form of the most typical scolium-stanza.⁴²

That the Phalaecean was particularly associated with scolia is shown by the fact that it is often found tied to an

³⁹A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* 2nd ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 141.

⁴⁰U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides* (reprint Berlin/Zürich/Dublin, 1966), 182.

⁴¹*ibid.*

⁴²"... sie erscheint allerdings als eine Steigerung der Skolionstrophe, deren metrische Ingredientien alle vorkommen." *Sappho und Simonides*, 183.

invocation of the god Pan as in *Scolium* 4. This is so at Cratinus 359 K.-A.: these two verses are undoubtedly the beginning of a scolium. It is also used at Soph. *Ajax* 693 ff., a choral ode beginning with an invocation of Pan. Clearly Sophocles had the Pan-scolium in mind when he wrote this ode:

ἔφριξ' ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ' ἀνεπτάμαν.
 ἰὼ ἰὼ Πάν Πάν,
 ὦ Πάν Πάν ἀλίπλαγκτε κυλ-
 λανίας χιονοκτύπου
 πετραίας ἀπὸ δειράδος φάνηθ', ὦ κτλ.

This last verse is a Phalaecean: ≈-~--~--

The Phalaecean is also used at *Vespae* 1226, 1227, where Bdelycleon each time begins a scolium. It is also found at 1248 where Philocleon improperly continues a scolium begun by Bdelycleon. These final two examples are above all evidence for the Phalaecean being the colon normally associated with scolia: Aristophanes could have used any opening verse, but he chose the Phalaecean. There is one final example of the Phalaecean to be mentioned. At *Aves* 1411, it follows a Greater Asclepiadean in a parody of Alcaeus,⁴³ the first verse of which is metrically the same as *Scolium* 14:⁴⁴

ὄρνιθές τινες οἷδ' οὐδὲν ἔχοντες πτεροποικίλοι,
 τανυσίπτερε ποικίλα χελιδοῖ;

--~--~--~--~--
 ~-~--~--~--

⁴³Fr. 345 V., as printed by Voigt:

ὄρνιθες τίνες οἷδ' Ὠκεάνω γὰς (τ') ἀπὸ πειράτων
 ἦλθον πανέλοπες ποικιλόδειροι τανυσίπτεροι;

⁴⁴J.W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, Para. 532, compares this to *Birds* 1415 and *Wasps* 1238.

Some Metrical Schemes of Popular Songs

Popular and primitive songs are alike in that they both naturally prefer simple, repetitive forms. This can be seen in the examples which Martin West gives in his *Greek Metre*.⁴⁵ These show repetition both of metrical form and of content, often with word-for-word repetition. The popular songs of ancient Greece show similar characteristics. A very small number of folk-songs have survived independent of adaptations in the more developed forms of poetry, such as childrens' begging-songs, work-songs, and folk-hymns. (Although these are often dated to the Hellenistic period, they can be assumed, because of the conservative nature of folk-music, to preserve a long-standing tradition.) These show simple cola arranged in straightforward strophes, often with a series of one type of colon ended by a catalectic version of the same colon. An examination of some songs in comedy and tragedy (but less obviously so in tragedy) shows a clear imitation of the popular melodies and strophic forms to be found (or conjectured) in popular songs. Imitation extends even to content in some instances, in particular in cult-hymns and wedding-songs, where there may be little or no change from the songs as actually sung by the people of Attica.

⁴⁵West, 1ff, takes his examples from C.M. Bowra's *Primitive Song*.

A brief description of some of the cola and strophic forms found in surviving folk-songs will be useful before passing on to an examination of the lyrical passages in the iambic scenes of Old Comedy.

The Reizianum colon: Reiziana are used in the Rhodian *Swallow-song* which takes the form of an irregular series of reiziana and other metres:⁴⁶

<i>Carm. Pop. 2 P.:</i>	ἦλθ' ἦλθε χελιδὼν	reiz.
	καλὰς ὥρας ἄγουσα,	"
	καλοὺς ἐνιαυτούς,	"
	ἐπὶ γαστέρα λευκά,	"
	ἐπὶ νῶτα μέλαινα.	"

Synapheia: Also characteristic of popular songs is the use of short cola with synapheia with a catalectic or otherwise differing colon to mark strophe-end. This is seen once again in the *Swallow-song*; also, in comedy, at *Equites* 1111-50 (telesillea + reizianum clausula); *Ecclesiazusae* 290 ff. (irregular pattern of telesillea + reizianum clausula); *Pax* 1329 ff (telesillea in wedding-song 'Υμὴν 'Υμέναι' ὦ κτλ.); *Pax* 856-67 (two telesillea + reizianum); *Aves* 1731 ff. (a wedding-song, as in *Pax* 1329 ff.).⁴⁷ All these instances will be treated in greater detail later.

The Adonean colon: The Adonean, which Wilamowitz also treated as a popular colon (as clausula for the reizianum),⁴⁸ is

⁴⁶U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 400.

⁴⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 253; also, by the same author, *Lysistrata* (reprint Berlin / Zürich: Weidmann, 1964), 28.

⁴⁸U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 399ff.

found in the Rhodian Swallow-song, in the Elean Hymn to Dionysus, and in the Sapphic strophe; e.g., the *Elean Hymn to Dionysus* (871 PMG):

ἐλθεῖν ἥρω Διόνυσε
 Ἀλείων ἐς ναόν
 ἀγναῖσιν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν
 ἐς ναόν τῷ βοέῳ
 ποδὶ θύων ἄξιε ταῦρε,
 ἄξιε ταῦρε.⁴⁹

The same colon is also found in the milling-song from Eresus (Plut. *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 157e: 869 PMG):

ἄλει μύλα ἄλει
 καὶ γάρ βασιλεύων
 μεγάλας Μυτιλήνας
 Πιττακὸς ἄλει.⁵⁰

Iambics: Iambics are also presumed to have been used in folk-songs. There are, however, no independently surviving iambic folk-songs from an early period, but their existence is deduced from the use of iambic lyrics at those places in Old Comedy where a popular origin for a song is thought likely; for example, Dicaeopolis' song of the Rural Dionysia (*Ach.* 263 ff.) would be expected to be modelled on actual folk-songs. Other examples, to be treated more fully later, are: the Komos of the Choes (*Ach.* ad fin.); a song sung at a sacrifice (*Vespae* 868 ff.); *Aves* 851-58=895-902; *Thesm.* 312ff; 352ff; *Ranae* 397 ff. (procession of the

⁴⁹U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 384-5. Wil. reads ἀγναῖσιν for the original ἀγνόν. Page, in his apparatus, comments on his own colometry of this lyric, "lectio plerumque incerta, numeris fides nulla," PMG, ad loc.

⁵⁰U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 400 f.

Mystae); 416ff (λαμβισμοί);⁵¹ *Ach.* 929-51; and *Ach.* 1008-17=1037-46. (That iambs had their origin in folk-songs is also to be deduced from their use in λαμβισμοί, which will be the subject of Chapter Three.)

Glyconics and Pherecrateans: Another colon found often in folk-songs is the glyconic along with its catalectic form, the pherecratean. This is found in Anacreon *Frr.* 1 and 2; and in the dramatic poets where they imitate folk-music, e.g. in Euripides, *Andr.* 501 ff.; *H.F.* 348 ff.; *Ion* 184 ff.; *Phoen.* 202 ff.; *Bacch.* 403 ff.; *I.A.* 164 ff., 543 ff. In Aristophanes it is found at *Equites* 973 ff.; *Vespae* 319 ff.; *Aves* 681 ff.; and *Thesm.* 1136 ff.⁵²

e.g., *Agamemnon* 452-55:

οἱ δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τεῖχος
 Θήκας Ἰλιάδος γᾶς
 εὐμορφοὶ κατέχουσιν· ἐ-
 -χθρὰ δ' ἔχοντας ἔκρυψεν

The first two verses are pherecrateans. The second two form either one priapean or a "dovetailed" glyconic + pherecratean.

Rhythmic Refrains: also adopted from folk-music is the use of rhythmic refrains, which is a habit of nearly all

⁵¹U.von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 242, n.2.

⁵²Carlo Prato, *I canti di Aristofane* (Rome, 1962), 55.

primitive folk-music.⁵³ They occur in Aristophanes, e.g. *Ranae* 399 ff.; and *Pax* 856-62.

Enoplia and prosodiaca: These two cola (En. x-~--~-x [the first anceps is resolvable]; pros. x-~-~-~, according to Wilamowitz) also have a popular origin.⁵⁴ Wilamowitz⁵⁵ quotes the beginning of a paeon to Lysander (Plut. *Lys.* 18) *Carm. Pop.* 21P (867 PMG), for the prosodiac:

τὸν Ἑλλάδος ἀγαθέας
στρατηγὸν ἀπ' εὐρυχόρου
Σπάρτας ὑμνήσομεν, ὦ
ἰὴ Παϊάν.

The first two verses are prosodiaca.

Wilamowitz points out some examples of enoplia-prosodiaca to be found in Old Comedy: in the *Vespae* (1518-22=1523-27); e.g. 518-22:

ἄγ' ὦ μεγαλῶνυμα τέκνα
τοῦ θαλασσίου <θεοῦ>,
πηδᾶτε παρὰ ψάμαθον
καὶ θῖν' ἀλδς ἀτρυγέτου
καρίδων ἀδελφοί.⁵⁶

Cratinus, Fr.151 K.-A. (from the *Odysseus*):

σίγα νυν πᾶς, ἔχε σῖγα,
καὶ πάντα λόγον τάχα πεύση·
ἡμῖν δ' Ἰθάκη πατρίς ἐστὶ,
πλέομεν δ' ἄμ' Ὀδυσσεὶ θείῳ.

⁵³U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 462f.

⁵⁴U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 376-95.

⁵⁵U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 376.

⁵⁶U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 385.

Chariclides (Fr. 1 K.-A.) uses an enoplion in the first verse:

δέσποιν' ἑκάτη τριοδίτι
 τρίμορφε τριπρόσωπε
 τρίγλαις κηλευμένα⁵⁷

Wilamowitz notes that Bergk thought this an actual folk-song, since it is not in the comic style.⁵⁸

Many of the lyrics found in the iambic parts of Old Comedy will now be examined for evidence of the use of Attic scolia, and for the use of forms found in folk-music. For the present we shall ignore the abuse-lyrics.

The *Acharnenses*

836-41=842-46=847-52=853-59: These are four songs in responding iambic metra, each closed with a reizianum. Although metricians arrange these stanzas in different ways, they are undoubtedly iambic, and are believed by Wilamowitz to be derived from popular songs.⁵⁹ Wilamowitz likes to think that these songs

⁵⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 385.

⁵⁸U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 386f.

⁵⁹U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 207. Prato, *I canti di Aristofane*, p.19, where he gives many examples of the use of heterogeneous cola in clausula. Walther Kraus, *Strophengestaltung in der griechischen Tragödie. I. Aischylos und Sophokles* (Vienna, 1957), 36, gives further examples from tragedy.

contain strophe, antistrophe, and epode "in nuce", (In this case two iambic tetrameters; six iambic metra; reizianum), a pattern which is avoided in tragedy.⁶⁰

929-39=940-51: Wüst wishes to call these lyrics scolia, but of course there are no actual scolia using iambs, as these songs do. He observes that they occur exactly ("rechnerisch") in the middle of the "heiteren Szenen" 719-980.⁶¹ These six songs are arranged in the pattern 2x3 (all responding) which is established by the placing of two catalectic iambic metra at 935/6 and 947/8.

ἐνδοσον, ὦ βέλτιστε, τῷ	≈ - √ - ≈ - √ -
ξένῳ καλῶς τὴν ἐμπολὴν	≈ - √ - ≈ - √ -
οὕτως ὅπως	≈ - √ -
ἄν μὴ φέρων κατάξῃ.	≈ - √ - ≈ - √ -

Wüst himself admits that the metre would prevent these verses from being called scolia, but he nevertheless calls them scolia. He then quotes Reitzenstein to the effect that the concept of scolia is not bound to any fixed metres.⁶² This may be true, but without any verbal similarity to any known scolium, we must find some metrical similarity, and none exists.

⁶⁰U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 207.

⁶¹Wüst, *Skolion*, 29.

⁶²Wüst, *Skolion*, 30; R. Reitzenstein, *Skolion und Epigramm*, 13.

1008-17=1037-46: Short iambic lyrics, catalectic alternating with acatalectic. B.B. Rodgers notes the similarity of this metrical system to that of *Pax* 856-67, and 909-21.⁶³

1150-61=1162-73: These lyrics will be discussed in Chapter Three.

The Equites

973-76=977-80=981-84=985-88=989-92=993-96: These lyrics are arranged in six four-line songs, as follows:

ἡδιστον φάος ἡμέρας	-≡-~--
ἔσται τοῖσι παροῦσι καὶ	-≡-~--
τοῖσι δεῦρ' ἀφικνουμένοις,	-≡-~--
ἦν Κλέων ἀπόληται.	-≡-~--

They thus form strophes which repeat AAAAAA, comprising three glyconics + a pherecratean, i.e. a catalectic glyconic. This metrical pattern is not found in the collection of *scolia*, nor is there anything in the content to suggest a connection with actual *scolia*. There is a similarity, but no more, in the metre between these lyrics and the last two verses of *Scolium* 9 P. (ὁ καρκίνος ὦδ' ἔφα κτλ. = 2 tel. + 2 "dovetailed" glyconics) but this metre is by no means peculiar to *scolia*. B.B. Rodgers [in *The Knights of Aristophanes* (London, 1910), ad loc.] remarks on the likelihood of this being a popular melody. R.A. Neil [in *The Knights of Aristophanes* (Cambridge, 1901), ad loc.] also remarks that the metre "is very song-like in effect" and compares it to

⁶³B.B. Rodgers, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1910), ad loc.

the fragments of Anacreon in the same metre, as well as *Equites* 1111-50 and *Ranae* 450 ff. He finds similar stanzas in tragedy, e.g., Soph. *O.T.* 1186-1203; and the Delphian Paeon of Aristonous. More important is the fact that this lyric is a parody of tragic 'Jubellieder',⁶⁴ and that this would be clearly perceived by the Athenian audience.

1111-20=1121-30=1131-40=1141-50: Wüst calls these lyrics γεφυρισμός. However, they will also be discussed here in connection with their metrical form. They form simple, repeating strophes of telesillea + reizianum (the catalectic form of the telesillean colon). West (*Greek Metre*, 116) remarks that aeolic forms were not uncommon in Old Comedy, and that "while tragic parody is intended in some cases, in others the metre is clearly being used as a natural, popular song-form," and points to this passage as an example. He notes that telesillea and reiziana were a feature of popular songs, citing as examples *Pax* 856-62; 1329-59; *Aves* 1731-36; *Ranae* 448-53; *Ecclesiazusae* 289-99.

The *Nubes*

The *Nubes* lacks examples of lyrics which reveal popular song-forms.

⁶⁴p. Rau, *Partragodia* (Munich, 1967), 188; B. Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen zur Form und Dramatischen Technik der Aristophanischen Komödien*, (Meisenheim am Glan, 1985), II: 175.

The *Vespae*

868-74=885-91: These form short iambic lyrics with dochmiac clausula. Not only the metrical scheme suggests a popular origin, but also the surrounding dialogue: the song itself is part of a prayer to Apollo which has been preceded by a call for ritual silence (εὐφημία μὲν πρῶτα νῦν ὑπαρχέτω) and which is ended with the refrain ἦ ἔϊε Παῖάν. In such circumstances it can be expected that the poet would use a traditional song-form. The same remarks apply also to the responding passage. It is this sort of passage which leads to the conclusion that iambs were a traditional feature of folk-songs, though we have no actual examples of folk-songs in this measure.

1224-48: This is an important passage for understanding sympotic singing in fifth-century Athens. In it are found several beginnings to scolia, both those attested elsewhere and those which can be presumed to have been invented by Aristophanes, though this is by no means certain. Examples of scolia are found at 1226 οὐδεὶς πώποτ' ἀνὴρ ἔγεντ' Ἀθήναις and in Philocleon's comic continuation, 'οὐχ οὕτω γε πανοῦργος <οὐδὲ> κλέπτης.' Both of these verses are phalaeceans, which is the colon used in the first two verses of the commonest scolium-form. The same colon is also found at 1248 where again Philocleon continues a scolium begun by Bdelycleon. Verses 1234-5 are a parody of Alcaeus (Fr.141 L.-P.). Line 1238 is the first line of *Scolium* 14 ('Αδμήτου λόγον κτλ). Lines 1240-41 are assigned by the scholiast to a scolium of either Alcaeus or Sappho. The final scolium in

this section is found at lines 1245-47. These verses form three *dodrantes* which are reminiscent of the final verse of the standard *scolium*-form (which is two *dodrantes*).

1265-74: To be discussed in Chapter Three.

1450-53: These verses are mostly *choriambs* mixed with *iambics* and *trochees*. Wilamowitz calls them *choriambic dimeters* (which he calls '*volkstümlicher Vers*').⁶⁵ Prato notes their similarity to tragic metrics, principally Euripides,⁶⁶ although Wilamowitz finds parallels in Pherecrates Frr.95 and 96K.; e.g., 95 K.:

τῶν θεατῶν δ' οἷσινσι δ(ψ'
ῆ, λεπαστὴν λαψαμένοις
μεστὴν ἐκχαρυβδίσαι.

1518-22=1523-28: Two strophes consisting mainly of *enoplia* and *prosodiaca*, which Wilamowitz compares to the Elean cult-song discussed above.⁶⁷

The Pax

856-67=910-21: In each of these two lyric sections there are two three-line stanzas (856-59, 860-62; 910-12, 914-15) which take the following form:

⁶⁵U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lysistrate* (reprint, Zürich / Berlin, Weidmann, 1964), 28.

⁶⁶C. Prato, *I canti di Aristofane*, 123, where there are further references.

⁶⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 385.

ζηλωτὸς ἔσει, γέρον,	≡-~--~--	telesillean
αὐθις νέος ὦν πάλιν,	≡-~--~--	"
μύρῳ κατάλειπτος.	~--~--	reizianum

As Wüst points out, this stanza (in the first two lines) is the same as *Scolium* 9 (ὁ καρκίνος ὦδ' ἔφα | χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβών κτλ.). However, while this can not be taken as proof that it is a scolium, it is evidence for the use of telesillea in popular songs. These stanzas, in the use of telesillea and reiziana, are similar to the lyrics at *Equites* 1111 ff., and *Ranae* 449 ff. The use of such encomiastic lyrics must be considered a natural counterpart to the abuse-lyrics. The form which these encomia take, however, may be influenced by the similar practice of singing praise- and abuse-lyrics at symposia; this topic will be dealt with in the following chapter.

1329-59: The play ends with a wedding-song, which Dale calls "an epithalamium of popular rude form".⁶⁸ These verses are a mixture of telesillea and reiziana (Platnauer arranges them in strophes of two tel. and three reiz.⁶⁹) with the refrain 'Υμῆν 'Υμέναι' ὦ, 'Υμῆν 'Υμέναι' ὦ. Dale notes that "both these forms must be echoes of actual wedding-songs, and there is no doubt that the simpler forms of aeolic were used in ancient popular refrains." Dale also remarks that this same use can also be found

⁶⁸A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 148.

⁶⁹Maurice Platnauer, *Aristophanes, Peace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), ad loc.

in tragedy in the "more seemly and thoughtful refrains", that is, in ἐφύμνια, an example of which was given above.⁷⁰

The Aves

1372-74: Ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον πτερύγεσσι κούφαις·
πέτομαι δ' ὁδὸν ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλαν μελέων.

1376: ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σώματί τε νέαν ἐφέπων

Wüst remarks on the use of the choriamb. The scholium (and Hephaestion, Ch.9) to verse 1372 says it was borrowed from Anacreon 33 P.: Ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον πτερύγεσσι κούφαις || διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ παῖς ἐθέλει συνηβᾶν.

1410: ὄρνιθές τινες οἷδ' οὐδὲν ἔχοντες πτεροποικίλοι,
τανυσίπτερε ποικίλα χελῖδοι

1415 τανυσίπτερε ποικίλα μάλ' αὔθις

Wüst compares these verses to *Scolium* 14 and 19: e.g., 14: Ἀδμήτου λόγον, ὦ ταῖρε, μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει, || τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου, γνοὺς ὅτι δειλοῖς ὀλίγα χάρις. Lines 1411 and 1415 are phalaeceans with a pyrrhic base.⁷¹

1470-81=1482-93=1553-64=1694-1705: See Chapter Three.

1720ff: The Aves concludes with a wedding procession, as in the Pax (1329 ff.). Both in the metres and in the content these verses strongly suggest that actual wedding-songs are being used, or at least closely imitated. This is seen most clearly in verses 1731-36=1737-42, where the two stanzas are made up of

⁷⁰A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 148.

⁷¹C. Prato, *I canti di Aristofane*, 201. 1410 is borrowed from Alcaeus (Fr.345 V.); see above, page 20.

telesillea closed with pherecrateans (although the precise arrangement of these verses is much debated, this does not affect my argument). This is similar to the wedding-song at *Pax* 1329 ff., and to the song at *Equites* 1111-1150.

The *Lysistrata*

1043-58=1059-72=1188-1204=1205-15: Wüst wishes to call these verses *scolia*, though of course they are long lyrics with complex metrical schemes. Having previously cited exact metrical correspondence between known *scolia* and the lyrics of Old Comedy, Wüst now supports his argument with much vaguer evidence, comparing these verses to the *Scolium* of Hybrias the Cretan. But this is certainly wrong: the *Scolium* of Hybrias is a much larger composition than any of the Attic *scolia*; its origin was in a different culture from that of the Attic *scolia*.⁷² The *scolium* of Hybrias consists of two stanzas each in themselves longer than any *scolium* found in the collection in Athenaeus.

1279-94: A cletic hymn, which "reflects in form and context the usages of actual life".⁷³

The *Thesmophoriazusae*

⁷²Wüst, *Skolion*, 32.

⁷³Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes, Lysistrata* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), ad loc.

947-1000: Wüst tries to bring this stasimon into his argument as an example of 'Komödienskolien' on the grounds that it includes many references to the same gods as in *Scolia* 1-4. This, however, is in itself an extremely tenuous connection with actual *scolia*; it is all the more so since there are also references in this stasimon to gods who are not mentioned in *Scolia* 1-4. Nevertheless, verses 969-76=977-84 are of interest, since they contain iambics and reiziana as in the stanzas at *Acharnenses* 836ff.

The *Ranae*

385-88=389-93: These verses form two iambic stanzas closed with a catalectic iambic metron, a strophic form which Dale calls popular and primitive.⁷⁴ She finds similar stanzas at *Acharnenses* 1008 ff., *Nubes* 1447, and *Plutus* 1290.

399-404=405-410=411-416: A cletic hymn in iambic metre, which in the context can be assumed to represent an actual cletic hymn. Each stanza is ended with the refrain, "Ἰαχὲ φιλοχορευτὰ συμπρόπεμπέ με. Radermacher suggests that if this refrain is in imitation of actual cletic hymns, then these stanzas would represent improvised singing.⁷⁵ It is followed by a series of nine simple stanzas, 417-19=420-22=423-25=426-28=429-31=432-

⁷⁴A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 75 f.

⁷⁵Ludwig Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche*, 2nd. ed. W. Kranz, (reprint Graz / Vienna / Cologne, 1967), 201.

34=435-37=438-40=441-44, which Dale calls "old rustic λαμβισμός or γεφυρισμός ... which was probably the most ancient form of the popular metre."⁷⁶ These stanzas will be discussed later in connection with their function as ritual abuse; for the present we shall only take note of their metrical shape, which is 2ia^ˆ 2ia^ˆ 3ia.

e.g., 420-22: βούλεσθε δῆτα κοινῇ
σκώψωμεν Ἀρχέδημον;
ὅς ἐπέτης ὢν οὐκ ἔφυσε φράτερας

449-54=455-59: These stanzas take the form 2ia 2ia^ˆ tel tel tel reiz. The association of iambs with choriambic cola is seen also in the stanzas at *Acharnenses* 836 ff.⁷⁷

814-17=818-21=822-25=826-29:

e.g. 814-17: ἦ που δεινὸν ἐπιβρεμέτας χόλον ἔνδοθεν ἔξει,
ἥνικ' ἄν δξύλαλον παρίδη θήγοντος ὀδόντα
ἀντιτέχνου· τότε δὴ μανίας ὑπὸ δεινῆς
ὄμματα στροβήσεται.

Wüst calls these verses *scolia* and compares them to *Scolium* 23, which is elegiac: the first two verses of the stanzas from the *Ranae* are dactylic hexameters and so is the first verse of 23. But these verses are completely unlike any known *scolium*; Radermacher compares them, in function at least, to the tragic πάροδος,⁷⁸ and Dale thinks that Aristophanes is here imitating

⁷⁶A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 76.

⁷⁷A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 80 f.

⁷⁸L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche*, 259.

Aeschylus, which is not improbable considering the context of the passage.⁷⁹

1251-56: These verses form two brief stanzas of three lines, two glyconics closed with its catalectic form, the pherecratean. As such they follow the pattern of popular songs which we have already seen.

1482-90=1491-99: Although these two stanzas, forming strophe and antistrophe (three lecythia, five trochaic dimeters, and an ithyphallic), are in a high style,⁸⁰ they also show at least one characteristic of popular songs: the repetition of ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ in lines 1487 and 1488 is characteristic of folk-songs. Radermacher cites the Swallow-song for this characteristic: ἦλθ' ἦλθε χελιδὼν || καλὰς ὥρας ἄγουσα, || καλοὺς δ' ἐνιαιτούς, || ἐπὶ νῶτα λευκά, || ἐπὶ γαστέρα μέλαινα (repetition of ἐπ(... ἐπ(...)).

The *Ecclesiazusae*

289-310: These verses form two stanzas comprising an irregular series of telesillea and reiziana each introduced by a longer verse-form (an iambic dimeter + lecythion), which is similar to the songs at *Equites* 1111 ff.

900-923: Apart from the undeniable scolia-imitations at 938-45, Wüst also identifies verses 900-923 as scolia, but with less certainty. These verses are in a variety of metres, causing

⁷⁹A.M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 44.

⁸⁰L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche*, 349.

great disagreement among scholars as to their strophic arrangement: Wilamowitz even suggested that 918-20 are in prose.⁸¹

938-41=942-45: These scolia-imitations have already been discussed.

952-68: These verses form a song-and-response of the Young Man and the Young Woman. The metrical correspondences are inexact, but this could be due to corruption in the text.⁸² The use in these songs of repetition points to a popular model: both begin δεῦρο δῆ, δεῦρο δῆ, and both end μέθες, ἱκνοῦμαί σ' Ἐρως, || καὶ ποίησον τήνδ' ἐς εὐνὴν || τὴν ἐμὴν ἱκέσθαι.⁸³

969-72=973-75: A continuation of the song-and-response between the boy and girl. Again there is verbal repetition: each song ends with the refrain ἄνοιξον ἀσπάζου μέ· || διὰ τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω. These four stanzas are a parody of a typical παρακλαυσίθυρον.⁸⁴

The Fragments

⁸¹U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 479.

⁸²U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst*, 478.

⁸³C.M. Bowra, 'A Love Duet,' *AJP* 79 (1958): 378, calls this a survival of a *genre* of popular poetry, the "love-duet". An opposing opinion is offered by S. Douglas Olson 'The "Love Duet" in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*,' *CQ* 38 (1988): 328-30.

⁸⁴U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristophanes, Lysistrata*, 216.

The following fragments are called scolia by Wüst; whether they actually are scolia is questionable. Each of the fragments given below, however, fits the description which I have used for popular lyrics: simple aeolic and iambic cola used stichically and closed (usually) with its catalectic variant.:

Eupolis 175 K.-A.: οὐ πῦρ οὐδὲ σίδηρος
οὐδὲ χαλκὸς ἀπείγει
μὴ φοιτᾶν ἐπὶ δεῖπνον.

This song is in the pherecratean metre.

Eupolis 176 K.-A.: ὅς χαρίτων μὲν ὄζει,
καλλιβίδας δὲ βαίνει,
σησαμίδας δὲ χέζει,
μῆλα δὲ χρέμπτται.

The metre is -˘˘-˘-˘ (an aristophanean) with the final verse catalectic. The same metre occurs in Aristophanes Fr.9 K.-A. (10 K.):

οὐκ ἐτός, ὦ γυναῖκες,
πᾶσι κακοῖσιν ἡμᾶς
φλῶσιν ἐκάστοθ' ἄνδρες.
δεινὰ γὰρ ἔργα δρῶσαι
λαμβάνόμεσθ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν

and in the first two lines of Aristophanes Fr.715 K.-A.:

ὅστις ἐν ἡδυόμοις
στρώμασι παννυχίζων
τὴν δέσποιναν ἐρείδεις.

The first two fragments are typically comic in that they have the same simple metre used κατὰ στίχον, ended with the colon's catalectic variant. Fr.9 K.-A. of Aristophanes presumably ended with the catalectic as in the fragment of Eupolis.

Eupolis Fr.395 K.-A.:

δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπιδέξει' <ᾄδων>
Στησιχόρου πρὸς τὴν λύραν οἰνοχόην ἔκλεψεν

is metrically similar to *Scolium* 15 (παῖ Τελαμῶνος) in the first verse, and refers to the performance of scolia.

Wüst also cites the last two lines of Ameipsias Fr.22 K.:

οὐ χρὴ πολλὰ ἔχειν θνητὸν ἄνθρωπον,
ἀλλ' ἐρᾶν καὶ κατεσθίειν· σὺ δὲ κάρτα φείδῃ.

which seems either to be from an established scolium or perhaps one invented by Ameipsias.⁸⁵

In this chapter I have drawn together the evidence for the use of Attic scolia in Old Comedy, and I believe that the following conclusions may be drawn from this evidence.

In determining what may be called scolia we must first distinguish the different types of songs which went by that name. We have seen that there are scolia of three sorts: one type includes the larger poems by well-known authors (Alcaeus, Pindar, etc.⁸⁶) who wrote songs specifically called scolia; a second type including the brief anonymous songs collected by Athenaeus, which apparently belong to an oral, improvisational tradition; and third the poems of the 'classic' poets which had become traditional as favourites for performance at symposia, and which, because they had attained traditional status, could be adapted to

⁸⁵Page enters this among the *carmina convivalia* (913 PMG). The colometry of this fragment is in doubt: the text is corrupt. See p.22.

⁸⁶This category may include choral poetry.

suit the needs of performance.⁸⁷ We have also seen that when Aristophanes refers to the performance of scolia it is to either the songs of the second type⁸⁸ or of the third type⁸⁹ that he refers. The Attic scolia included songs representative of many of the types of songs performed at symposia (encomia, abuse-lyrics, advice, and political statements); but only a very limited number seem to have attained the special status of those scolia preserved in Athenaeus. The term *Scolium*, then, should be confined to a restricted group of songs which are alluded to by Aristophanes, that is, they are, for Aristophanes, the scolia.

The evidence does not support the argument for the widespread and customary use of scolia in Old Comedy, as Wüst tried to show. Nor can Wüst get around this by calling his would-be scolia 'Komödienskolien' (which indeed have no relation to

⁸⁷E.g. *Scolium* 8P. (for which see note 34 above). For a discussion of the different types of scolia see, R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, 3-44; Massimo Vetta, 'Un capitolo di storia simposiale (Per l'esegesi di Aristofane, "Vespe" 1222-1248),' [in *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 9-10 (1976-77): 243-66, reprinted in *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica*, ed. M. Vetta (Rome-Bari, 1983): 119-130]: 119f; A.E. Harvey, 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry,' *CQ* 5 (1955): 162-63.

⁸⁸E.g. at *Wasps* 1222-48 each time Bdelycleon begins a scolium for Philocleon to continue, he chooses one from the collection of Attic scolia or at least one which closely fits the pattern of the collection. Cf. also the schol. to verse 1238; *Acharn.* 980 and schol.; *Lysis.* 632, 1237 and schol.; and compare Theopompus Comic. Fr.64 K. and Cratinus Fr.254 K.-A.

⁸⁹E.g. Fr.235 K.-A.: ᾄσον δὲ μοι σκόλιόν τι λαβὼν Ἀλκαίου κἀνακρέοντος. Also *Clouds* 1355 ff., where there is a reference to the poems of Simonides as suitable songs for sympotic singing; and Eupolis 395 K.-A., where the same is said of Stesichorus. Another example is found in the collection in Athenaeus, *Scolium* 8P., which is adapted from Alcaeus (Fr.249 V.): See W. Rösler's discussion of this, *Dichter und Gruppe*, 99.

real scolia): his own definition of 'Komödienskolien' is so broad as to be meaningless, so that to find lyric passages which meet his criteria is a pointless task in that virtually every lyric passage in Old Comedy can be made to fit (as Wüst's own article shows). That none of his 'Komödienskolien' breaks the dramatic illusion is not a significant fact; his other point, that each 'Komödienskolion' contains a 'Gedanke' which is complete in itself, is also unpersuasive. His description of his chosen Aristophanic lyrics is accurate in those two points, but he is wrong in associating them with the Attic scolia, and in finding a fixed and traditional position for them in the structure of the drama. However, the examples with which he began his article, that is, Cratinus Fr.359 K.-A., and *Thesmophoriazusae* 938-45, are undeniably examples of scolia, or are at least clearly imitations of actual scolia: but these are isolated examples which are insufficient to establish a pattern.

As we have seen, when Aristophanes *does* make use of actual scolia this is always done very explicitly: usually with direct ascription (e.g. *Vespae* 1225 f.: ᾄδω δὲ πρῶτος Ἀρμόδου κτλ.). This of course is the clearest proof of the remarkable completeness of that collection in gathering the various representative types of scolia such as were actually sung at symposia.

Other than the Pan-scolium and those like it, that is those which use the phalaecean colon in the first two verses, the Attic scolia found in Athenaeus make use of many cola and

strophic forms which are not peculiar to scolia. Consequently, to draw conclusions from the fact that a lyric passage in Aristophanes has a metrical form similar to a scolium (other than the Pan-scolium), as Wüst does, is unjustifiable. An example of this is Wüst's comparison of a passage in the *Pax* (909-921), where the stanzas consist of two telesillea and one reizianum, to *Scolium* 9, which is in similar metres.⁹⁰ But this is purely coincidental. The metrical pattern of *Scolium* 9 is found in a number of songs in Aristophanes, some of which Wüst does not mention in his article.

As we have seen, the metrical patterns (and hence the tunes) used in folk-music formed a substantial part of the lyrics found in the iambic parts of Old Comedy. In addition many of the *genres* of lyrics performed at symposia (encomia, psogos, paraenesis, etc.) were also introduced into the comic drama: although these *genres* were favoured in scolia, they are *not* used in comedy as scolia, but as the natural expression of the chorus in its role as commentator on the events taking place on the stage. That it (the chorus) uses forms similar to those found in actual scolia is therefore coincidental.

⁹⁰Wüst, *Skolion*, 31.

CHAPTER THREE:

THE ABUSE-LYRICS IN OLD COMEDY

We saw in the last chapter that Aristophanes and the other poets of Old Comedy frequently made use of the simple, popular lyric forms for which they found (one supposes) their models in the folk-songs of contemporary Athens. This practice, common to the comic poets (as far as we can ascertain), will figure prominently in this chapter also, since the comic poets employed such forms in several of the abuse lyrics which have been preserved to us.

In this chapter we shall examine the choral abuse-lyrics found among the iambic scenes of Old Comedy.¹ Our interest will lie in determining the nature and hence the origins of these lyrics, whether it is to be found in cult, in the iambographic tradition, in some other source, or perhaps in a combination of these sources. This will entail a preliminary discussion, albeit a brief one, of the types of abuse found in these sources. We shall take as a *datum* that Old Comedy did not have, in all its aspects, only one simple, uncontaminated tradition: this will be assumed to be true of the abuse in Old Comedy as well. We shall

¹Only the abuse-lyrics: there is of course abusive language throughout the plays of Aristophanes. We are here, however, interested solely in abuse in the form of *lyrics*.

also assume that many strands of Athenian culture and literature went into the development of Old Comedy, some fundamental (that is, aspects of Old Comedy which would have by Aristophanes' time been regarded as essential features, and therefore included as a matter of course), others quite consciously employed by them. We are concerned with merely identifying the different sources, to the extent that this is possible.² It is important to stress that the evidence is meagre, so that conclusions can only be in the form of suggestions. Still, enough evidence can be gathered to make the attempt worth the effort.

Fundamental to Old Comedy is the contest, or *ἀγών*, between the two central characters or ideas brought into conflict. Such a situation naturally, given the comic context, generates abuse between the opponents. Added to this is the chorus, who, for the most part standing aside from the action, comment on the fortunes of the main characters. This commentary takes the form of praise (of the 'hero', whose side they always take following the outcome of the contest) and abuse (of the 'hero's' opponent, and of politicians and other prominent individuals, who, although outside the dramatic situation, are often clearly meant to be associated with the defeated man or idea). This association, however, is to be inferred [for instance, in the *Aves* 1470 etc., where the choral-lyrics tell of characters who mirror the characters introduced upon the stage]

²For the lack of "eine organische Verbindung" in the structure of Old Comedy see G. Giangrande's discussion in 'The Origin of Attic Comedy,' *Eranos* 61 (1963): 1-24, especially 7 ff.

but cannot be proven; it is not an invariable rule, (see for instance, the *Ranae*, where both Aeschylus and Euripides are praised equally.) We shall be concerned in this chapter with these choral comments, in particular with the choral stasima which follow the parabasis.

The satirical and parodic character of Old Comedy naturally causes one to seek for the models used by the comic poets, including those for the invective. Scholars have always sought to identify the sources for the invective and obscenity in Old Comedy, though this is perhaps due more to the unusually great importance attaching to the few bits of information available concerning the origins and early development of Old Comedy, and the desire to identify sources and trace influences from one period to the next. Two sources are usually identified as the inspiration for, and as the models of, the abuse contained in Old Comedy: cult-ritual, and *ῥαβδος*.

Before moving on to consider in detail the abuse-lyrics which have been preserved to us, we shall examine briefly these two possible sources of abuse.

First cultic ritual will be considered. There is a similarity between abuse in cults and some of the abuse-lyrics of Old Comedy, which has caused many scholars to see the influence of the former on the latter. Among them is Jeffrey Henderson,³

³Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), Ch.1, *Obscene Language and the Development of Attic Comedy*, the quotation is from p.14. This work will hereafter cited as *Maculate Muse*.

who, discussing more particularly obscenity rather than abuse in Attic cults, notes that, "the importance of these cults for our examination of Old Comedy resides not simply in the presence of obscenity but in its context: obscenity is almost always cast in the form of ritual strife and abuse."

The principal cults in which good-natured abuse and obscenity were encouraged are those in honour of Demeter and Dionysus. For Demeter, the main festivals in this regard are the Haloa, the Stenia, and the Thesmophoria. At the Haloa the women hurled abuse at one another in a playful manner (παιδιαὶ πολλὰ καὶ σκώμματα).⁴ This was true also at the Stenia and the Thesmophoria.⁵ A possible example of ritual abuse (namely *gephyrismus*) will be considered separately in a moment.

More important, however, in this regard are the festivals of Dionysus, which more clearly involve elements which contributed to the development of comedy. These festivities permitted unusually great freedom of speech, at least in the ability to engage in abuse (τὰ ἐξ ἀμαξῶν σκώμματα; σκώπτειν

⁴Scholium to Lucian, *d.meretr.*, 7.4., ed. H. Rabe, cited by Henderson, *Maculate Muse*, 15; Also Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 61; Hans Fluck, *Skurrile Riten in griechischen Kulte*, (Diss. Freiburg, 1931), 13-15.

⁵Hesychius, Στήνια· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησιν. καὶ διασκώπτουσιν καὶ λοιδοροῦσιν (Σ1825S), and, Στηνιῶσαι· βλασφημῆσαι, λοιδορῆσαι. (Σ27S). See also Photius, Στήνια p.538.9 P.; Collected by Fluck, *Skurrile Riten*, 15 ff. For the Thesmophoria, Apollodorus *Mythogr.*, *Bibliotheca* 1.5.1.; Fluck, *Skurrile Riten*, 18 f.

ἀλλήλους⁶) during the processions (compare the equation of πομπεύειν with λοιδορεῖν⁷).⁸

The second possible source for the use of abusive language in Old Comedy is the precedent of the iambographers. Although there is more evidence for their influence, there is not the space here to go into this question in great detail. Some discussion, however, will be useful to show what influence the iambographers exerted upon the comic poets.⁹ We are interested particularly in the iambographers' use of obscene language (αἰσχρολογί(α) and obscene personal vituperation, etc., which is found nowhere else in Greek literature previous to its reoccurrence in Old Comedy. Important for our purposes is the question of the nature of the poetry of Archilochus, Hipponax, and Semonides: it is much disputed whether their poetry involves the factual revelation of their own experiences, or whether their

⁶Scholium to Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 44; Fluck, *Skurrile Riten*, 34 f.

⁷Scholium to Demosth. *De Cor.* 11. Also, *Men.* 396K; *Suda*, s.v. τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν σκώμματα (T19 Adler); Photius, s.v. τὰ ἐξ ἀμαξῶν (p. 565.11 P.); and Harpocration s.v. πομπείας καὶ πομπεύειν (ed. Dindorf, 1:253).

⁸See G. Giangrande, 'The Origin of Attic Comedy,' *Eranos* 61 (1963): 1-24, for discussion of the Dionysiac κῶμος as the core-element in the evolution of Old Comedy.

⁹Ralph Mark Rosen, in *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, (Diss. Harvard, 1983), has made the most recent attempt to trace in detail the influence of the iambographers upon Old Comedy. A few examples of direct influence are *Lysis*. 360 f. (= Hipp. Fr.120 W.), which is a reference to the poetry of Hipponax; similar is *Ranae* 659 f. (= Ananias Fr.1 W.); and *Ach.* 118 ff. (= Archilochus Fr.187 W.), which is a direct quotation from Archilochus. Further examples are discussed in Rosen (although some are very doubtful).

poetry belongs to a *genre* in which the themes which we see are traditional and the poet's voice impersonal. This question cannot be settled here; a brief summary of the essential points of the question will have to suffice.

Martin West (trying to trace the influence of the iambographers on Old Comedy in general) argues that iambus was not simply personal invective,¹⁰ but that it formed part of a traditional entertainment including the adoption by the poet of a persona not his own.¹¹ This assertion involves us in an ongoing dispute concerning the nature of the iambographic *genre*. West argues for this impersonal, mimetic interpretation, while others maintain that the iambographers wrote personal poetry in which they related their own experiences and feelings.

Briefly, West argues that several of the main fragments and testimonia about the lives of the iambographers show a repeating pattern (e.g., the common deaths-by-hanging of the poets' enemies), which leads him to the conclusion that the iambographers assumed poetic personas and that the subject-matter of their poems followed traditional, fixed plots which were without any relevance to the poets' own lives. This is how he interprets the Lycambes, the Bupalus, and the Orodocoedes fragments and testimonia. One of the main props to this argument is the (supposed) linguistic evidence that many of the names used

¹⁰Martin West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1974), 23 [hereafter cited as *Studies*], citing Dover, *Hardt Entretiens* X, 189.

¹¹West, *Studies*, Ch.2, 'Iambus' passim.

by the iambographers are traditional and carry meanings indicative of the roles which the poetic characters play in the supposedly traditional entertainment.¹²

The story of Lycambes and his daughters (with West's interpretation) thus conforms to a standard, traditional narrative, with Lycambes and his daughters being stock types.¹³ For support West points to a similar story in Aristotle (Fr. 558 R.) of how the tyrant Lygdamis came to power on Naxos.¹⁴ The other examples of the standardized iambographic quarrel are (with this interpretation): Semonides' abuse of Orodocoedes (Luc. *Pseudolog.*2,) and Hipponax's abuse of Bupalus (Frr.13-14 W., 16-17 W., and possibly 84 W., and his curse upon a contract-breaker (Fr.115 W.), if this really ought to be ascribed to Hipponax.¹⁵

¹²West, *Studies*, 26 f.

¹³West, *Studies*, 27. West cites the support of Dover *Hardt Entretiens* X, 206ff, to the effect that in Archilochean iambus the poet is not necessarily speaking in his own voice: "There is room for 'the assumed personality and the imaginary situation'".

¹⁴Another parallel story concerns the beginnings of Comedy. The story goes that some farmers, mistreated by some men from the city, went to the city at night and proclaimed the unjust treatment which they had received at the hands of the city-dwellers. They were then made to repeat their verses in the theatre. When they did so they smeared their faces with wine-lees. This is found in the Scholium to Dion. Thrax, p.18.15 Hilgard. Cited by West *Studies*, 27.

¹⁵It has also been ascribed to Archilochus, for which see the apparatus in Degani's edition of the testimonia and fragments of Hipponax.

Opposed to this interpretation are C. Carey, M. Bonanno and W. Rösler.¹⁶ They assert that the iambographers wrote about their own experiences and expressed their true feelings. Bonanno argues that the use of possibly fictitious names for the targets of iambus is not necessarily indicative of a fictitious situation, but that false names are used either to protect the poet or to increase the satirical effect by the use of allusive names, names which are manifestly to be associated with the intended target of the invective.¹⁷ Carey joins in this disagreement, saying that "the attack on Lycambes is in spirit, manner and language quite inappropriate for the stylized abuse of a stock character;" and that, "This is not entertaining abuse but solemn poetry."¹⁸

Those scholars opposed to West's theory of the Iambographers have some difficulty with the poetry of Hipponax, since it is quite clear that he (Hipponax) assumes a fictitious persona in his poetry. The low character (πτωχός) which appears as the first-person narrator in Hipponax's iambi must be a pose

¹⁶C. Carey, 'Archilochus and Lycambes,' *CQ* 36 (1986): 60-67; Maria Grazia Bonanno, 'Nomi e soprannomi archilochei,' *Museum Helveticum* 37 (1980): 65-88; Wolfgang Rösler, 'Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell' "io" nella lirica greca arcaica,' *QUCC* n.s.48 (1985): 131-144, and, 'Die Dichtung des Archilochos und die neue Kölner Epode,' *Rh.M.* n.s. 119 (1976): 289-310.

¹⁷M.G. Bonanno, *M.H.* 37 (1980), especially 74 ff.

¹⁸C. Carey, *CQ* 36 (1986): 64 f.

on the poet's part since poets were drawn from a higher social class than this character seems to belong.¹⁹

Perhaps the strongest evidence of the iambographers' influence upon Old Comedy is to be found in their use of exaggeratedly virulent curses.²⁰ Such curses are used also by Aristophanes, perhaps in direct imitation of the iambographers. The comic poets were certainly aware of the iambographic tradition and asserted a moral purpose and justification for their own invective.²¹ It is important to note that the targets of the iambographers' invective are people with whom the poets have a personal relationship, whether real or fictitious. In Old Comedy the invective uttered by the chorus tends to fit into two distinct categories: it is either directed at people with whom the chorus has a personal quarrel (again, whether real or imaginary is not important) or with people who have no personal connection with the chorus.

¹⁹C. Carey, *CQ* 36 (1986): 65, n.23.

²⁰G.L. Hendrickson, in a discussion of Archilochean invective ['Archilochus and the Victims of his Iambics,' *AJPh* 46 (1925): 101-127], points to the elaborate curse attributed either to Archilochus (*Fr.* 79a D.) or Hipponax (*Fr.* 115 W.), in which the poet expresses his wish that an oath-breaker suffer a shipwreck and its consequences, as being an example of a survival of the primitive belief in the effectiveness of curses (p.115). This is clearly true and shows once again the pervasiveness of folk-custom in ἱαμβος. Perhaps we must look to the *form* which the curse takes to see the particular influence of the iambographers.

²¹Cf. *Eq.* 1274 ff.: λοιδορῆσαι τοὺς πονηροὺς οὐδέν ἐστ' ἐπίφθονον κτλ.. This expresses an impersonal moral justification; personal justification is found at *Vesp.* 1217; *Nubes* 575 f.; and *Aves* 137 f.

Last, but not least, in importance as a source of influence upon the abuse-lyrics is what may be termed the popular or folk-customs of Athens, which are not to be associated too closely with cult. Of course, there are no actual examples of such abuse: it must be deduced from its imitations in the comic poets. The best-known source for folk-abuse (outside of those which have already been discussed) is that normally associated with the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries, that is, the so-called γεφυρισμός, or abuse-at-the-bridge, which took place on the bridge over the Kephissos during the procession to Eleusis.²² It is disputed whether this abuse is a part of the cult itself, or if the connection is entirely fortuitous. Arguing for the non-fortuitous connection are Wilamowitz,²³ O. Kern,²⁴ Fluck,²⁵ and F. Graf,²⁶ but this has been denied by Deubner,²⁷ Nilsson,²⁸ and

²²Hesych., s.v. γεφυρίς (Γ70S), γεφυριστά (Γ71S); Suda s.v. γεφυρίζων (Γ212 Ad.); Ammonius, περὶ διαφόρων λέξεων, (443 Nickau); collected by Fluck, *Skurrile Riten*, 52ff.

²³*Der Glaube der Hellenen*, (reprint Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955), II:52.

²⁴γεφυρισμοί, *RE* 7.1229.

²⁵*Skurrile Riten*, 52 ff.

²⁶Fritz Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, (Berlin and New York: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1974), 45, where there are further references.

²⁷Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 73: "Daß die γεφυρισμοί an der Brücke über den Athenischen Kephisos einen religiösen Hintergrund hätten, hat Foucart mit vollem recht bezweifelt. Dergleichen Neckereien konnten sich bei enger Passage leicht genug einstellen, und wo kämen wir hin, wenn jeder Scherz als agrarischer Ritus angesprochen würde?"

²⁸Martin Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, Sect.5, Part 2, (Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955), I:658.

Foucart.²⁹ In the opinion of the latter group of scholars this abuse is simply the sort of thing which can be expected to arise among any group of merry-makers during any festive occasion. More important for my purposes is the fact that there is no evidence for the form which the γεφυρισμός took, whether it was in prose or in verse.³⁰ Now, the simple folk-lyrics which appear in the iambic scenes, when examined simply for their metrical form, have been seen to have no literary sources. May we not therefore assume that Aristophanes is using metrical forms which are true to the traditions of folk-music? May we not also assume that he is using forms of abuse which are modelled on popular forms, and should not γεφυρισμός be so described?

The question of the cult-association of γεφυρισμός cannot be answered with certainty, but the evidence for the use of ritualized abuse outside cult causes one to doubt the necessity of the connection. It must be taken into consideration that friendly abuse (in Greece, as elsewhere) was naturally very

²⁹Paul Foucart, *Les mystères d'Eleusis*, (Paris, 1914, reprint New York: Arno Press, 1975), 335.

³⁰On this important point the remarks of Ralph Mark Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, (Diss. Harvard, 1983), 4, are worth quoting: "Although most of the evidence for ritual abuse in festivals such as the Halaoa, the Stenia or the Thesmophoria says nothing about iambic verse *per se* (i.e., terms such as *skommata*, or *paidiai* are used without reference to literary form), the connection between iambs and ritual abuse seems implicit in the name of Demeter's servant *Iambe*, who, as early as the *Hom. Hymn to Demeter*, uses mockery of Demeter to shock her out of her mourning." However, this does not take into account abuse whose metre is simple aeolics.

common. We have other evidence for the (especially sympotic) use of such non-cultic abuse, namely the *Hom. Hymn to Hermes* 54 ff., θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ᾄδειν || ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίνης πειρώμενος, ἥύτε κοῦροι || ἤβηταὶ θαλίῃσι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσιν κτλ.; and in Isocrates, πρὸς Νικοκλέα 47, εὔροι δ' ἄν τις αὐτοῦς ἐν μὲν ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους συνουσίαις ἢ λοιδороῦντας ἢ λοιδορουμένους κτλ.³¹ Such sympotic abuse is only a particular manifestation of folk-custom, one which has left many traces in literature. These descriptions ought to make anyone hesitate to ascribe all abuse found in Old Comedy to a cultic or literary origin.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that little can be stated with any certainty about the origins of the *form* which the abuse took in the hands of the comic dramatists. We can see that there was a tradition of obscenity, bawdiness, and the good-natured abuse of prominent citizens which was part of the celebration of some of the Athenian festivals, and that the dramatic festivals lent themselves especially to this custom.³² But we have no evidence for the *form* which it took. More evidence exists of course for the similarly obscene and abusive poetry of the iambographers, but here too, there is much disagreement on the precise nature of this *genre*. Wüst was on the right track

³¹These and further references to sympotic abuse are collected by Reitzenstein, *Skolion und Epigramm*, 26, n.2.

³²See Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der aristophanischen Komödien, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie*, Heft 166 (Meisenheim/Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1984-85) II:169, for a discussion of this point.

with his theory that there exists a pattern in the abuse-lyrics showing that they were taken from popular custom, although his theory cannot be defended in some of the details. He sought to show that some of the abuse lyrics fit a pattern and that this pattern's origin lay in the γεφυρισμός associated with the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries.³³ The most compelling instance of this is *Ranae* 416 ff., where the identification of the abuse with *gephyrismus* is possible. However, as was discussed above, that *gephyrismus* was part of the cult is itself a matter of dispute. Here, however, we get into problems of definitions, which are impossible to resolve. In order to reach some (perhaps only tentative) conclusions about this problem it will be useful to examine the form and content of each of the abuse-lyrics and to see how they are used in the surviving plays of Aristophanes and the comic fragments.

It is a natural outgrowth of the dramatic situation that choral praise developed alongside of the choral abuse. Because of this, it will also be useful to examine the praise-lyrics, although these will be examined cursorily, and more for their metrical forms than for their contents. Abuse lyrics will be treated first, followed by praise lyrics, and finally by lyrics which combine praise and abuse.

The first example of a lyric consisting purely of abuse which we shall consider is *Ach.* 1150-73. These verses, plus 1143-49, form the second parabasis, with 1143-49 forming the usual

³³Wüst, *Skolion*, 40 ff.

anapaestic commation (ἵτε δὴ χαίροντες κτλ.). The two strophes, 1150-61~1162-73, are, as is usual with the parabatic ode and antode, in a higher style of lyric, similar (in its elevated tone) especially to the tragic style, which is unlike the other lyrics following the parabasis, in which simple, repetitive metrical forms are the norm. Choriambic and iambic metres are used in these verses which are, as Wilamowitz demonstrated,³⁴ in a style which imitates tragic lyric, though with changes suited to comedy.³⁵

The strophe contains abuse of Antimachus, a melic poet, who, as choregus, has failed to provide the chorus with their customary dinners following the Lenaia. This, however, is not necessarily to be taken as relating an actual occurrence. There follows an elaborate curse in the form of a wish that various misfortunes befall Antimachus, including a wish for him to be sitting down to eat a sizzling squid, only to have it snatched away at the last second by a dog.³⁶ In the antistrophe the chorus imagines Antimachus being way-laid by a bandit named Orestes, which results in Antimachus grabbing a turd in the darkness and

³⁴Wilamowitz, *GV*, 206, n.2.

³⁵Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:172.

³⁶This sort of comic curse is repeated elsewhere, cf. *Equites* 929-40; *Pax* 1009 ff. These comic curses are adaptations of a long-standing popular tradition, which poets such as Archilochus made use of. See G.L. Hendrickson, *AJPh* 46 (1925): 101-127, for a discussion of such curses. This curse is quite similar to Hipponax, Fr.115 W. (This is discussed by Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, 87 ff.).

throwing it at Orestes, but hitting Cratinus. The two strophes run in full as follows:³⁷

Ἀντίμαχον τὸν ψακάδος †τὸν ξυγγραφή† τὸν μελέων 1150
 ποιητήν,
 ὥς μὲν ἀπλῶ λόγῳ, κακῶς ἐξολέσειεν ὁ Ζεὺς.
 ὅς γ' ἐμὲ τὸν τλήμονα Λήναια χορηγῶν ἀπέλυσ' ἄδειπνον.
 ὅν ἔτ' ἐπίδοιμι τευθίδος
 δεόμενον, ἡ δ' ὠπτημένη
 σίζουσα πάραλος ἐπὶ τραπέζῃ κειμένη
 ὀκέλλοι· κᾶτα μέλ-
 λοντος λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ κύων
 ἀρπάσασα φεύγοι. 1161

Τοῦτο μὲν αὐτῷ κακὸν ἔν, κᾶθ' ἕτερον νυκτερινὸν γέ-
 νοιτο.
 ἡπιαλῶν γὰρ οἴκαδ' ἐξ ἱππασίας βαδίζων, 1165
 εἴτα κατάξειέ τις αὐτοῦ μεθύων τῆς κεφαλῆς Ὀρέστης
 μαινόμενος· ὁ δὲ λίθον βαλεῖν
 βουλόμενος ἐν σκότῳ λάβοι
 τῇ χειρὶ πέλεθον ἀρτίως κεχεσμένον· 1170
 ἐπάξειεν δ' ἔχων
 τὸν μάρμαρον, κᾶπειθ' ἄμαρ-
 τὼν βάλοι Κρατῖνον.³⁸

The important aspect of this choral lyric is that the abuse is directed at someone, real or imaginary (it is unimportant which), who is in some way connected with the chorus. This is the distinguishing aspect of all those abused by the chorus in the parabatic parts (with one exception). We shall see that it is different in the other choral lyrics.

The next example of choral lyric-abuse occurs at *Equ.* 973-84~985-96. This ode is in simple aeolic metres (stanzas of

³⁷All quotations from Aristophanes, unless otherwise stated, are from the O.C.T. of Geldart and Hall.

³⁸These verses are arranged differently by Wüst (40 f.):
 Ἀντίμαχον τὸν Ψακάδος,
 τὸν μελέων ποιητήν,
 ὥς μὲν ἀπλῶ λόγῳ κακῶς
 ἐξολέσειεν ὁ Ζεὺς· κτλ.

three glyconics with pherecrateans for the clausulae). These simple stanzas (cf. *Equ.* 1111-50) indicate the imitation of popular lyric, but enjambement is also used (982f, 984f, 989f, 993f), which Zimmermann calls an indication of 'verfeinerten Metrik'.³⁹ The ode runs as follows:

ἥδιστον φάος ἡμέρας	973
ἔσται τοῖσι παροῦσι καὶ	
τοῖσι δεῦρ' ἀφικνουμένοις,	
ἦν Κλέων ἀπόληται.	
καίτοι πρεσβυτέρων τινῶν	
οἷων ἀργαλεωτάτων	
ἐν τῷ δείγματι τῶν δικῶν	
ἤκουσ' ἀντιλεγόντων,	980
ὥς εἰ μὴ 'γένεθ' οὗτος ἐν	
τῇ πόλει μέγας, οὐκ ἂν ἦ-	
στην σκεύη δύο χρησίμω,	
δοῖδυσ οὐδὲ τορύνῃ.	

The ode is a parody of tragic 'Jubellieder', (such as Eurip. *El.* 866 f., *Alc.* 244, *I.A.* 1250, *Fr.* 443; and Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1577.⁴⁰), but it continues into ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν. The *Equites* is unique in being entirely abusive of Cleon without mentioning him by name, outside of this stasimon. However, in the parodos the chorus had made it clear that Cleon had attacked Aristophanes. Therefore the chorus (and Aristophanes) has a personal motive in attacking Cleon in this stasimon.

Equites 1264-89~1290-1315 forms the second parabasis (in trochaic tetrameters catalectic), e.g. 1264-75:

τὶ κάλλιον ἀρχομένοισιν	1264
ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν	
ἢ θοᾶν ἵππων ἐλατῆρας αἰεδεῖν, μηδὲν ἐς Λυσίστρατον,	

³⁹Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:175.

⁴⁰P. Rau, *Paratragodia*, (Munich: Beck, 1967), 188; Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:175.

μηδὲ θούμαντιν τὸν ἀνέστιον αὖ λυπεῖν ἐκούσῃ καρδίᾳ;
καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὦ φίλ' Ἀπολλὸν ἀεὶ πεινῇ, θαλεροῖς
δακρύοις
σᾶς ἀπτόμενος φαρέτρας πυθῶνι δίᾳ μὴ κακῶς πένεσθαι.
λοιδορῆσαι τοὺς πονηροὺς οὐδέν' ἐστ' ἐπιφθονον,
ἀλλὰ τιμὴ τοῖσι χρηστοῖς, ὅστις εὖ λογίζεται. 1275

The first three verses (as printed here) are an adaptation of a Pindaric *prosodion* (Fr.89 Sn.-M.).⁴¹ There is, as Zimmermann says, a tension ("Spannung") between the lofty, lyrical beginning, and the colloquial, vulgar conclusion.⁴² Here too, as in *Ach.* 1150ff, the person abused is associated with the chorus, in this instance with the chorus' self-assumed role of abusing bad citizens (λοιδορῆσαι τοὺς πονηρούς 1274).

The next example of lyric abuse is *Vespae* 1265-91. This too forms a second parabasis. (Originally it had four parts, two strophes and two sections of trochaic tetrameters cat., which formed an epirrhetic syzygy. However, lines have been lost between 1283-84.⁴³) The metrical form of the strophe is not modelled on any poem which had attained 'classic' status as is the normal Aristophanic practice in his parabases:

⁴¹τοῦτο ἀρχὴ προσοδίου Πινδάρου ἔχει δὲ οὕτως.
Τί κάλλιον ἀρχομένοισιν
ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν
ἢ βαθύζωνόν τε λατῶ
καὶ θοᾶν ἵππων ἐλάτειραν ἀεῖσαι;

This is discussed by Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, 205, and Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 54 (1919): 54-57 (= *Kl. Schr.* IV [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962], 292-95).

⁴²Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II.176. A scholiast says that it is a parody of the *Phaedra* (ἤδη ποτ' ἄλλως νυκτὸς κτλ.), but Wilamowitz (*ibid.*) discounts this, saying that it is from a Pindaric source.

⁴³See D.M. Macdowell, *Aristophanes' Wasps*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), note ad loc.

πολλάκις δὴ 'δοξ' ἐμαυτῷ δεξιὸς πεφυκέναι
καὶ σκαίος οὐδεπώποτε.
ἀλλ' Ἀμυνίας ὁ Σέλλου μάλλον οὐκ τῶν Κρωβύλων,
οὗτος ὢν γ' ἐγώ ποτ' εἶδον ἀντὶ μήλου καὶ ῥοᾶς
δειπνοῦντα μετὰ Λεωγόρου.
πεινῇ γὰρ ἦπερ Ἀντιφῶν.
ἀλλὰ πρεσβεύων γὰρ ἐς Φάρσαλον ὤχετ', εἴτ' ἐκεῖ
μόνος μόνοις
τοῖς Πενέσταϊσι ξυνῆν τοῖς
Θετταλῶν, αὐτὸς πενέστης ὢν ἔλαττων οὐδενός.

We have seen that it is normal for the abuse contained in the parabatic parts to be inspired by a personal grievance (real or feigned) on the part of the chorus against the targets of the abuse. This lyric is unlike any other parabatic choral abuse-lyric in Aristophanes in that it does not relate the abused person to the activities of the chorus in any way. The abuse is entirely for the sake of abuse: the abused is not brought into any relationship with the chorus.

Pax 775-817. Wüst wishes to call these lyrics *gephyrismus*,⁴⁴ saying that the parabasis, which immediately precedes these lines, ends at 774; however, it is similar in technique and style to the other parabatic lyrics, and so ought to be considered a part of the parabasis. Without the ode and antode the parabasis would be lacking entirely in the typical responding sections. Metrically these verses are a combination of aeolic and dactylo-epitrite; e.g., the first strophe, 775-795:

Μοῦσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένη μετ' ἐμοῦ	775
τοῦ φίλου χόρευσον,	
κλείουσα θεῶν τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε δαΐτας	
καὶ θαλίας μακάρων· σοὶ γὰρ τάδ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέλει.	
ἦν δέ σε Καρκίνος ἐλθὼν	
ἀντιβολῇ μετὰ τῶν παίδων χορεῦσαι,	

⁴⁴Wüst, *Skolion*, 42.

μήθ' ὑπάκουε μήτ' ἔλ-	785
θης συνέριθος αὐτοῖς,	
ἀλλὰ νόμιζε πάντας	
ῥρυγας οἰκογενεῖς γυλιαύχενας ὀρχηστὰς	
ναννοφυεῖς σφυράδων ἀποκνίσματα μηχανοδίφας.	790
καὶ γὰρ ἔφασχ' ὁ πατήρ ὃ παρ' ἐλπίδας	
εἶχε τὸ δρᾶμα γαλῆν τῆς ἐσπέρας ἀπάγξει.	795

This lyric begins with an imitation of the *Oresteia* of Stesichorus (Fr.33P = 210 PMG).⁴⁵ This, like *Ranae* 674 ff., is a comic imitation of a cletic hymn. After the high-poetic style of 775-79, Aristophanes turns to simpler, more colloquial language. The colloquial parts are marked by the use of the Aristophanean metre (-˘-˘-˘-- 785,6,7).⁴⁶ Once again the targets of the chorus' abuse are related to the chorus in their role as chorus; that is, the invective is caused by a wrong suffered by the chorus at the hands of the person at present being abused. They pray to the Muse to join their dance, but not to heed the prayer of Carcinus. This abuse is continued in the antistrophe with abuse of Morsimus and Melanthius, again in connection with the chorus (χορὸν δὲ μὴ ἔχη Μόρσιμος μηδὲ Μελάνθιος 801-2). The Scholiast says that Morsimus and Melanthius (two brothers, the great-nephews of Aeschylus) were very bad tragic poets,⁴⁷ which naturally

⁴⁵Fr.210-12 PMG = *Peace* 775-79, 796-800.

Μοῖσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένα μετ' ἐμοῦ
κλείουσα θεῶν τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε δαίτας
καὶ θαλίας μακάρων

⁴⁶Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:181.

⁴⁷See M. Platnauer, *Aristophanes' Peace*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), note ad loc.

associates them with the chorus.⁴⁸

Aves 1470-81~1482-93~1553-64~1694-1705: The colometry of these lines is disputed.⁴⁹ They are formed from trochees and lecythia, e.g., 1470-81:

πολλὰ δὴ καὶ καινὰ καὶ θαυ-	1470
μάστ' ἐπεπτόμεσθα καὶ	
δεινὰ πράγματ' εἴδομεν.	
ἔστι γὰρ δένδρον πεφυκὸς	
ἔκτοπόν τι Καρδίας ἀ-	
πτέρω Κλεώνυμος,	1475
χρήσιμον μὲν οὐδέν, ἄλ-	
λως δὲ δειλὸν καὶ μέγα.	
τοῦτο τοῦ μὲν ἦρος αἰὲ	
βλαστάνει καὶ συκοφαντεῖ,	
τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος πάλιν τὰς	1480
ἀσπίδας φυλλορροεῖ.	

These lyrics mark off the scenes containing the 'intruders', or *alazones*, and serve the practical purpose of allowing changes of costume to be made;⁵⁰ but they also echo the events taking place on the stage: for example, abuse of Cleonymus (in which he is called a sycophant, 1479) is followed immediately by a scene with a sycophant (1410-79); while verses 1482-93, containing abuse of the foot-pad Orestes, foreshadow the entry of Prometheus (1494), who fears he is being observed and pursued by Zeus. These lyrics are "simple trochaic systems",⁵¹ and are

⁴⁸Melanthius is again abused at Pax 1009 ff.

⁴⁹Compare the editions of *O.C.T.*, *Prato*, and *Schröder*.

⁵⁰Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:184.

⁵¹L.S. Spatz, *Strophic Construction in Aristophanic Lyric* (Diss. Indiana University, 1968), quoted by Zimmermann, II:186 n.16.

linguistically unpoetic.⁵² In these lyrics the chorus stays in character, but the abuse, as in other lyrics of this sort, is not related to the chorus or to the activities of the chorus: though the chorus of birds speaks of itself as flying over the earth and seeing these variously typical κωμωδούμενοι, this is simply a device to introduce the abuse. None of the figures of abuse is brought into a personal connection with the chorus.

Lysistrata 781-96~805-820. These verses form an amoibaion between the two semi-choruses. This, however, can not be considered abuse, at least not of the sort which we are looking at, although Wüst does call this *gephyrismus*.⁵³

Lysistrata 1043-1071~1189-1215. This stasimon is unlike the usual, and expected, stasimon: it contains no abuse. Indeed, at the very beginning, it proclaims that it will not utter the usual abuse (1043-45):

οὐ παρασκευαζόμεθα
τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδέν' ὧνδρες
φλαῦρον εἰπεῖν οὐδὲ ἔν.

In the antistrophe, instead of speaking about some figure not in the play, the chorus addresses the audience, inviting them to a feast at their home, only to announce that the door will be locked when they arrive. The responding stasimon (1189-1215) also invites the poor to come to the chorus' house (the choral "I" is used), but once again there is a catch: the house is guarded by a fierce dog. These two stasima appear where abuse is usually

⁵²Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:186.

⁵³Wüst, *Skolion*, 42.

found. Perhaps the situation of the last half of the play prevents the inclusion of abuse, abuse which the audience has so come to expect that Aristophanes must announce the alteration of his usual practice. The typical pattern (in the earlier plays at least) is to have the triumphant victor of the agon fend off the *alazones* in the iambic scenes. In the *Lysistrata* there are no *alazones*; the final scenes are of reconciliation and rejoicing: the plot produces no losers to be abused.

Ranae 417-34: These little stanzas, in iambics, are uttered by the chorus during the parodos. However, they will be considered with the other choral lyrics, since the later plays of Aristophanes do away with the usual structure established in the earlier plays. In the *Ranae*, since the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides takes up the entire second half of the play, the first half is filled with the sort of episodes which are normally found in the second half of each play, including abuse-lyrics.

These lyrics are uttered by a procession of initiates apparently meant to represent the procession to Eleusis to take part in the Mysteries.⁵⁴ This (apparent) fact has caused the lyrics to be suspected of being examples of the abuse actually associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁵⁵ In addition to Wüst, Dale says that this lyric "represents the old rustic λαμβισμός or γεφυρισμός, the lampooning at the bridge, which was probably the

⁵⁴This is a much disputed point; however, it has little bearing on my argument.

⁵⁵For example, Wüst, *Skolion*, 43; A.M. Dale, *Lyric Metres*, 76.

most primitive form of popular metre."⁵⁶ However, as we have seen, we do not know what form the *gephyrismus* took, and whether it was even in the form of songs at all.

It is the general opinion of scholars that the parodos of the *Ranae* does not represent accurately a cult-scene, but that Aristophanes picks and chooses from any number of popular festivals to suit himself.⁵⁷

The metrical patterns found here are entirely typical of folk-lyrics: the avoidance of enjambement,⁵⁸ in which respect compare *Ach.* 263-79 (phallic song); the use of iambics with aeolics is found elsewhere in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 836 ff., *Nub.* 303 ff.).⁵⁹ Eduard Fraenkel⁶⁰ calls these lyrics true λαμβισμός:

βούλεσθε δῆτα κοινῇ	420
σκώψωμεν Ἀρχέδημον;	
ὅς ἐπ' ἐπ' ἐπ' ὅν οὐκ ἔφυσε φράτερας,	
νυνὶ δὲ δημαγωγεῖ	
ἐν τοῖς ἄνω νεκροῖσι,	
κάστιν τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκεῖ μοχθηρίας.	425
τὸν κλεισθένους δ' ἀκούω	
ἐν ταῖς ταφῶσι πρῶκτόν	
τίλλειν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ σπαράττειν τὰς γυνάθους.	
κάκόπτειτ' ἐγκεκυφῶς,	
κᾶκλαε κᾶκεκράγει	430

⁵⁶A.M. Dale, *ibid.*

⁵⁷Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, I:132. Cf. also Deubner, at the place cited above, n.27.

⁵⁸Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, I:131; cf. Wilamowitz, *GV*, 96.

⁵⁹A.M. Dale, *Lyric Metres*, 80 f.

⁶⁰*Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, 203; cf. Wilamowitz, *GV*, 242, n.2.

Σεβλινον ὅστις ἐστὶν ἀναφλύστιος.

καὶ Καλλίαν γέ φασι
τοῦτον τὸν Ἴπποβίνου
κύσθου λεοντῆν ναυμαχεῖν ἐνημμένον.

As with other such lyrics (e.g., *Equ.* 973 ff.) the targets of abuse are unconnected with the chorus and its usual activities. Throughout these abuse-lyrics the chorus continues in their role as religious initiates: no reference is made to their role as comic chorus.

Ranae 674-85~706-717: The lyrics form the ode and antode of the parabasis, and, like the parabasis of the *Pax*, there is tension between the high-style and the colloquialisms, the hymn-form and the abuse, the tragic rhythm and the content:⁶¹

Μοῦσα χορῶν ἱερῶν ἐπίβηθι καὶ ἔλθ' ἐπὶ τέρψιν ἀοιδᾶς
ἐμᾶς, 675
τὸν πολὺν ὀφρομένη λαῶν ὄχλον, οὗ σοφίαι
μυρίαι κάθηνται
φιλοτιμότεραι Κλεοφῶντος, ἐφ' οὗ δὴ χεῖλεσιν ἀμφι-
λάλοις
δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται 680
Θρηκία χελιδῶν
†ἐπὶ βάρβαρον ἐξομένη πέταλον.†
κελαδεῖ δ' ἐπὶ κλαυτον ἀηδόνιον νόμον, ὥς ἀπολεῖται,
κἄν ἴσαι γένωνται. 685

As in other parabatic abuse-lyrics the abuse is connected with the activities of the chorus as a chorus: here the chorus invite the Muse to join in, and take pleasure in, the choral dance. Immediately after this formal invitation (a parody of a cletic hymn, though we have no evidence that this was taken from some poet, which, as we have seen, is the practice in Aristophanes) Cleophon is abused, and the abuse is in connection

⁶¹Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:288.

with his singing: he is mocked as a foreigner (ἐφ' οὗ δὴ χεῖλεσιν ἀμφιλάλοις δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται θρηκία χελιδὼν † ἐπὶ βάρβαρον ἐξομένη πέταλον·†). In the antode, which the Scholiast says is taken from the tragic poet Ion of Chios (Fr.41 Nauck), a certain bath-house keeper named Cleigenes is abused as a bad citizen. This abuse is part of the general choral address to the audience, which takes the form of a παραίνεσις περὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς κατασκευῆς.⁶²

There are a few non-Aristophanic abuse-lyrics found among the fragments of Old Comedy. The largest (and most interesting) is the fragment of Eupolis' *Demoi*, Fr.99 K.-A. (CGFP 92). These verses are clearly from the parabasis, and are for this reason remarkable: nowhere in the extant work of Aristophanes (although with one partial exception, for which see below) does he use the sort of abuse (short iambic stanzas) found here in the parabolic parts in the *Demoi*. These lyrics are quite similar both in form and in content to those of the *Ranae* 416ff.⁶³ The passage runs as follows (the iambic parts):

καὶ δὴ Πείσανδρ[ο]ν διε-	
στράφθαι χθὲς ἀριστῶντά φα-	
σ' † ἐπιξενοῖν τιν' οντ' αὐτοῦ †	
οὐκ ἔφασκε θρέψειν.	
Πάσων δὲ προστάς Θεογένει	5
δειπνοῦντι πρὸς τὴν καρδίαν	
τῶν ὀλκάδων τιν' αὐτοῦ	
λέσας ἅπαξ διέστρεφεν.	
λ]υτὸς δ' ἔκειθ' ὁ Θεογένης	
τ]ὴν νύχθ' ὅλην πεπορώς.	10

⁶²Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche*, 238.

⁶³See Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen*, 201 f.; and the commentary in PCG.

δια]στρέφειν οὖν πρῶτα μὲν
 χρή Καλλίαν τοὺς ἐν μακροῖν
 τειχοῖν θ' ἄμ', ἀ[ρ]ιστητικῶ-
 τεροι γάρ εἰσιν ἡμῶν,
 Νικήρατόν τ' Ἀχαρνέα 15
].ιν διδόντα χοίνικας
]εον ἐκάστω
].ιη
 τῶν χρημάτων [.....]
 οὐ]δ' ἂν τριχὺς πριαίμην 20
]ν
].ος

These lyrics are followed by twelve verses in trochaic tetrameters catalectic. The series of κωμωδουμένοι in these verses (joined by δέ) are like those found in Aristophanes outside of the parabatic parts, where the abused people are unconnected with the chorus. Here Eupolis combines what Aristophanes keeps separate.⁶⁴

There are a few other abuse-lyrics pointed out by Wüst.⁶⁵ One of which is Cratinus Fr. 62 K.-A. (57, 58 K.):

Λάμπωνα, τὸν οὐ βροτῶν
 ψῆφος δύναται φλεγυρὰ δελίνου φίλων ἀπείργειν
 νῦν δ' αὖτις ἐρυγάνει·

⁶⁴Here is how Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen*, 202, describes the parabasis of the *Demoi* (he is interested in proving that the parabasis originally contained hymns rather than abuse): "Alles was davon erhalten ist, das heisst ein umfangreiches Stück, zwanzig Verse, der Gegenstrophe, ist rein skoptisch: eine Reihe von Athenern, hoch und niedrig, werden verhöhnt. Skoptische Partien fehlen auch in den Parabasenliedern des Aristophanes nicht (*Pax* 871ff., 801ff., *Ran.* 678ff., 707ff.), aber da sind sie in den Zusammenhang von Gebethymnen eingebettet, und diese Hymnen richten sich bezeichnenderweise nicht an irgendwelche grosse Gottheiten, sondern an die Muse. Ob in der verlorenen Strophe der Demenparabase eine hymnische Einleitung vorhergegangen ist, lässt sich nicht wissen. Notwendig scheint mir eine solche Annahme nicht; das ganze Lied mag skoptische gewesen sein."

⁶⁵Wüst, *Skolion*, 44.

βρύχει γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ παρὸν, τρίγλη δὲ κἄν μάχοιτο⁶⁶

For the metres of this lyric see *PCG* ad loc.

Eupolis 386K.-A. is also an abuse-lyric:

μισῶ δὲ καὶ † Σωκράτην
τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέσχην,
ὃς τᾶλλα μὲν πεφρόντικεν,
ὀπόθεν δὲ καταφαγεῖν ἔχοι
τούτου κατημέληκεν

5

For discussion concerning the metres see *PCG*, Cratinus Fr. 62.

Such are the lyrics of abuse in Old Comedy, at least those unmixed with praise. The praise-lyrics alternate with the abuse-lyrics. These will be discussed more briefly. We are more interested in their metrical forms than in their contents.

The first example is *Acharnians* 1008-17~1037-46. These lyrics form an encomiastic amoibaion between the chorus and Dicaeopolis, in simple iambics. The strophe is the second macarismus of Dicaeopolis (the first is at 836ff, which will be discussed later). The chorus sings two brief lyrics of praise. They run as follows:

ζηλῶ σε τῆς εὐβουλίας, 1008
μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς εὐωχίας
ἄνθρωπε τῆς παρούσης.

and,

⁶⁶For the metre of these lines see *PCG*. Wüst arranges and completes them as follows:

<ἀλλ' εἴα, τί φήσομεν>
Λάμπωνα, τὸν οὐ βροτῶν
ψῆφος δύναται φλεγυρὰ δείπνων φίλων ἀπείργειν;
<ἔκαπτε μὲν ἀρτίως,>
νῦν δ' αὖθις ἐρυγγάνει.
βρύκει γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ παρὸν· τρίγλη δὲ κἄν μάχοιτο.

ἤκουσας ὥς μαγειρικῶς 1015
κομπῶς τε καὶ δειπνητικῶς
αὐτῷ διακονεῖται;

Note the use of ζηλῶ σε κτλ. This is a formula which occurs several times in the praise-lyrics.⁶⁷

In the second lyric section (1037-46) the chorus explains what is happening on stage: Dicaeopolis is keeping the benefits of peace for himself:

ἀνὴρ ἀνγύρηκέν τι ταῖς 1037
σπονδαῖσιν ἡδύ, κοῦκ ἔοι-
κεν οὐδενὶ μεταδώσειν.

and,

ἀποκτενεῖς λιμῷ 'μὲ καὶ 1045
τοὺς γείτονας κνίσῃ τε καὶ
φωνῇ τοιαῦτα λάσκων.

Nubes 457-77: These verses form an encomiastic amoibaion between the chorus and Strepsiades, in which, unlike other encomia, Strepsiades is praised for his future blessed state:⁶⁸

Χο. λῆμα μὲν πάρεστι τῷδέ γ'
οὐκ ἄτολμον ἀλλ' ἔτοιμον. ἴσθι δ' ὥς
ταῦτα μαθὼν παρ' ἐμοῦ κλέος οὐρανόμηκες
ἐν βροτοῖσιν ἔξεις.
Στ. τί πείσομαι;
Χο. τὸν πάντα χρόνον μετ' ἐμοῦ
ζηλωτότατον βίον ἀνθρώπων διάξεις. κτλ.

Note the use of ζηλωτότατον. At 1201ff Strepsiades sings his own macarismus. 1205 ff.:

‘μάκαρ ὦ Στρεψιάδες,
αὐτός τ' ἔφυς ὥς σοφὸς
χοῖλον τὸν υἱὸν τρέφεις,
φήσουσι δὴ μ' οἱ φίλοι

⁶⁷As was noted by Colin MacLeod, 'The Comic Encomium and Aristophanes' *Clouds*, *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 142-44.

⁶⁸Pointed out by Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, I:177.

1210

χοὶ δημόται
 ζηλοῦντες ἡνίκ' ἄν σὺ νικᾷς λέγων τὰς δίκας.
 ἀλλ' εἰσάγων σε βούλομαι πρῶτον ἐστιᾶσαι.

This passage is discussed by C. MacLeod in the article cited above, where he argues that Strepsiades sings his own macarismus at the place where the chorus usually sings the macarismus.

Vespae 1450-73. This is a macarismus of Philocleon, who has changed his ways under the tutelage of his son. The metre is iambic without enjambement.⁶⁹ E.g. 1450-61:

ζηλῶ γε τῆς εὐτυχίας τὸν πρέσβυν οἷ μετέστη ξηρῶν τρόπων καὶ βιοτῆς. ἕτερα δὲ νῦν ἀντιμαθῶν ἦ μέγα τι μεταπεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὸ τρυφῶν καὶ μαλακόν.	1450
τάχα δ' ἄν ἴσως οὐκ ἐθέλοι. τὸ γὰρ ἀποστῆναι χαλεπὸν φύσεος, ἣν ἔχοι τις αἰεί. καίτοι πολλοὶ ταῦτ' ἔπαθον. ξυνόντες γνῶμαις ἐτέρων μετεβάλοντο τοὺς τρόπους.	1455
	1460

Note that the vocabulary is entirely colloquial, as befits the metre (e.g., the usual, colloquial *ζηλῶ γε τῆς εὐτυχίας*, which we have seen in the other examples).

Ranae 534-48~590-604: these form encomiastic *amoibaia*. 534 ff. is ironic praise of Xanthias, although Dionysus takes the praise as being directed at himself (542-48). As in the other praise-lyrics, Xanthias is praised for his cleverness and cunning.

⁶⁹The lack of enjambement is characteristic of folk-lyric. Cf. *PMG* 848.

A few lyrics combining praise and abuse appear in the iambic scenes. They are of interest and of importance, since they show Aristophanes experimenting with his material, and since they demonstrate that the lyrics of praise and abuse came to be, at least in Aristophanes, important elements of his dramatic technique.

The first example of a mixed lyric is *Ach.* 836ff. The ode is arranged into four six-line strophes in iambics with reiziana for the clausulae:⁷⁰

εὐδαιμονεῖ γ' ἄνθρωπος. οὐκ ἤκουσας οἷ προβαίνει 836
 τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦ βουλευματος; καρπώσεται γὰρ ἀνὴρ
 ἐν τὰγορᾷ καθήμενος.
 κἂν εἰσὶν τις Κτησίας
 ἢ συκοφάντης ἄλλος, οἷ- 840
 μῶζων καθεδεῖται.

 οὐδ' ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων ὑποφωνῶν σε πημανεῖ τι,
 οὐδ' ἐξομόρξεται Πρέπιδι τὴν εὐρυπρωκτίαν σοι,
 οὐδ' ὥστιεῖ Κλεωνύμῳ.
 χλαῖναν δ' ἔχων φανήν δίει 845
 κοῦ ξυντυχῶν σ' Ὑπέρβολος
 δικῶν ἀναπλήσει· κτλ.

The first strophe begins with praise of Dicaeopolis (εὐδαιμονεῖ γ' ἄνθρωπος) and proceeds to show how Dicaeopolis triumphs over the 'intruders' or *alazones* who in the imagination of the chorus come upon the stage to impose upon Dicaeopolis. These imagined *alazones* are of the same type as appear before Dicaeopolis on the stage, as well as elsewhere in the plays of Aristophanes, being such standard characters as the sycophant, the *euryproktos*, degenerates etc. Zimmermann calls this an

⁷⁰Cf. *Ranae* 416ff; the similarity is noted by Prato, *ad. loc.*; and Wilamowitz, *GV*, 207.

"encomiastische Spottlied".⁷¹ This lyric, like the other non-parabolic abuse-lyrics, is directed against people not in any way associated with the chorus. In this it is similar to *Ranae* 1482-99 (for which see below).

Equites 1111-1150 is also a combination of praise and abuse. It takes the form of an *amoibaion* between the chorus and Demos. The chorus begins by praising Demos, but immediately qualifies the praise by faulting him for his gullibility. This is unique in that the person abused is on stage and conversing with the chorus. But the abuse is not complete: in the second section Demos explains how he only appears to be taken advantage of by unscrupulous politicians:

σκέψασθε δέ μ', εἰ σοφῶς	1141
αὐτοὺς περιέρχομαι	
τοὺς οἰομένους φρονεῖν	
καὶ μ' ἐξαπατῶν.	
τηρῶ γὰρ ἑκάστοτ' αὐ-	1145
τοὺς οὐδὲ δοκῶν ὄραν	
κλέπτοντας· ἔπειτ' ἀναγ-	
κάω πάλιν ἐξεμεῖν	
ἅττ' ἂν κεκλόφωσί μου,	
κημὸν καταμηλῶν.	1150

This lyric is also unique in being the only one in which the person praised is not one of the central characters; but this is just another example of the peculiar nature of the *Equites*.

The final example of this type of lyric is *Ranae* 1482-90~1491-99. It is a macarismus of Aeschylus, the poet who is to be brought back to life by Dionysus. His mental abilities are praised as is the case with other lyrics of praise:

⁷¹Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen*, II:170.

μακάριός γ' ἀνὴρ ἔχων 1482
 ξύνεσιν ἠκριβωμένην.
 πάρα δὲ πολλοῖσιν μαθεῖν.
 ὅδε γὰρ εὖ φρονεῖν δοκήσας
 πάλιν ἀπεισιν οἴκας' αὖ,
 ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ μὲν τοῖς πολίταις,
 ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ
 συγγενέσι τε καὶ φίλοισι,
 διὰ τὸ συνετὸς εἶναι. 1490

χαρίεν οὖν μὴ Σωκράτει
 παρακαθήμενον λαλεῖν,
 ἀποβαλόντα μουσικὴν
 τά τε μέγιστα παραλιπόντα 1495
 τῆς τραγῳδικῆς τέχνης.
 τὸ δ' ἐπὶ σεμνοῖσιν λόγοισι
 καὶ σκαριφημοῖσι λήρων
 διατριβὴν ἀργὸν ποιεῖσθαι,
 παραφρονοῦντος ἀνδρός. 1499

As we noted with Ach. 836 ff., praise of the hero is combined with abuse of extra-dramatic characters, although, unlike that lyric, here "der Chor singt ein Lied, das formal höheren Stil zeigt als die in der Komödie üblichen Intermezzi".⁷²

A brief review of the lyrics treated in this chapter will bring together the important points. First, it can be seen that there is a distinct difference in the nature of the choral lyric-abuse found in the parabatic sections and that found in the choral lyrics outside the parabases: in the parabases the targets of the abuse are almost always associated in some way with the chorus, whereas in the non-parabatic lyrics the abuse is not

⁷²Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche*, 349, where, along with other evidence of the formal nature of this lyric, he compares this (for the use of anaphora) to the Rhodian Swallow-song (PMG 848).

prompted by any personal animosity. Thus the invective in the parabases always originates from a personal grievance (real or feigned) conferring some sort of justification (at least in the chorus' eyes), and often in response to what the chorus perceives to be a wrong which they have suffered as a *comic chorus*, or as representatives of the Athenian people (at the hands of politicians).⁷³ In this way Old Comedy is similar to the invective of the Iambographers: Archilochus abuses Lycambes and his daughters as a result of a broken vow; Hipponax (Fr.115 W.) as we have seen, also composed an elaborate curse against an oath-breaker.⁷⁴

The chorus is often self-conscious and defensive about its use of invective and it will often assert moral justification for it, saying that those who are abused deserve the abuse.⁷⁵ For example, in the second parabasis of the *Acharnenses* the abuse is directed at Antimachus as being a *choregus* who has not treated the chorus in the customary fashion. Here the chorus speak as a *comic chorus* and not in their role as old Acharnian men. In the *Equites* Aristophanes puts *no ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* into the parabasis, possibly because the entire play is made up of abusive exchanges between the sausage-seller and Paphlagon (representing

⁷³E.g. the chorus feels it has been personally wronged at *Ach.* 1150 ff., *Pax* 775-817, and *Ran.* 674-85~706-717. For the similar motives of the Iambographers, see Hendrickson, *AJP* 46 (1925): 144 ff.; and C. Carey, *CQ* 36 (1986): 66.

⁷⁴Cf. *Ach.* 1150-73, where the choregus, Antimachus, has failed in the customary duties towards the chorus.

⁷⁵E.g. *Eq.* 1274 ff.

Cleon). There is, however, abuse in the second parabasis (1264 ff.). As usual the abused (Thumantis and Lysistratus) are abused by the chorus speaking as a chorus of Athenians and not in their dramatic role.

The ode and antode at Pax 775 ff. also fit this pattern. These lyrics (at the end of the parabasis) insert abuse into what was begun as a cletic hymn. As we have seen, the abused people (Carcinus and his sons in the ode, the brothers Morsimus and Melanthius in the antode) are abused for their shortcomings in the realm of tragic poetry (Morsimus and Melanthius) and dancing (Carcinus and his sons), in both of which the chorus, as a chorus, has a personal, or at least artistic, interest. In the *Ranae* Cleophon is abused on the charge of being a Thracian (675 ff.), and in the antode (706 ff.) Cleigenes, a bath-house keeper, is abused: in both ode and antode, the abuse is made by the chorus in connection with their role as comic chorus. In the case of Cleophon, the abuse is introduced in connection with his supposed poor singing abilities, due, it is claimed, to his foreign origins. In the case of Cleigenes, the abuse is introduced in connection with the chorus' non-dramatic role as advisor to the Athenians.⁷⁶

Further examples of this sort of choral invective are found at Aves 1470-81~1482-93~1553-64~1694-1705; and in the

⁷⁶Fraenkel, discussing the abuse in the parabasis of the *Demoi* of Eupolis [*Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, 202] states that the abuse in the parabolic parts of Aristophanes' plays is always connected with "Gebethymnen", but this is not entirely true. There is one exception to this rule, for which see below.

parodos to the *Ranae*. R. Rosen, discussing the parodos to the *Ranae*, says that "the whole parodos is self-consciously invective, i.e., that it re-enacts some sort of invective ritual of a religious procession", but wishes also to see this as evidence that Aristophanes is "making . . . claims about the relation between comedy in general and its iambic heritage."⁷⁷ This, however, is not obvious, and it would perhaps be better to say that, while Aristophanes is depicting the Eleusinian procession, we do not know with what fidelity to the truth he is doing so; after all, we know that he often mixes together material drawn from various sources. Nor is a conscious imitation of the iambographers necessarily clear: as we have seen, iambographic invective sprang from the souring of personal relationships, and was not the impersonal type of abuse found in the parodos to the *Ranae* (to judge from what has survived).

Such is the lyric abuse contained in the parabatic parts. The abuse in the other choral lyrics, on the other hand, is expressed in simple metres and simple strophic arrangements, which, as we have seen, are clearly imitations of folk-lyrics. The abuse in these lyrics is directed at targets who are in no way associated with the chorus either in a general artistic sense, or in the chorus' non-dramatic role as advisor to the state on political matters: the abuse takes the character of abuse for its own sake, without apologies.

⁷⁷Ralph Mark Rosen, *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, 115.

There is one possible exception to these two types of choral abuse in Aristophanes, which must be considered along with the rather similar example from Eupolis (Fr.99 K.-A.). The second parabasis of the *Vespae* (1265 ff.) provides an example of an ode in which the abuse is strikingly similar to that of the non-parabatic choral lyrics; that is, there seems to be no connection between the abused person and the activities of the chorus. Further the metres used in the ode are simple, unsophisticated trochaics,⁷⁸ again unlike the usual parabatic ode, where the typical practice is to adapt or parody a lyric of some poet who had attained 'classical' status. Furthermore, the chorus does not sing a hymn, nor does it talk about its role as advisor to the Athenian *Demos*, but launches straight into the abuse. The fragment from the *Demoi* of Eupolis consists of series of brief iambic stanzas followed by trochaic tetrameters catalectic. It is clear (because of the tetrameters) that this fragment is from the parabasis, and this has caused scholars to speculate on the reasons for this unusual form. (One scholar, A. Körte, suggested that the *Demoi* represents an earlier stage in the development of Old Comedy,⁷⁹ but of course there is no way to prove this.) Körte, however, while demonstrating how this parabasis differs from those of Aristophanes, omits *Vespae* 1265 ff. from his

⁷⁸See Macdowell, *Aristophanes Wasps*, note ad loc. for a metrical analysis.

⁷⁹Alfred Körte, 'Fragmente einer Handschrift der *Demen* des Eupolis,' *Hermes* 47 (1912): 276-313, esp. 293.

comparison.⁸⁰ Still, the parallel is not exact: in the *Demoi* a series of targets is abused (as in the *Ranae* 416 ff.), while in the *Vespae* only one man, Arynias, is attacked.

Some of the praise-lyrics have been included to show that a distinction exists among them similar to that among the abuse-lyrics. The simple songs of praise which use popular metres and colloquial idiom fall between the iambic scenes and alternate with the abuse-lyrics, while the more elaborate praise-lyrics are found in the parabases.

Conclusion

We saw in Chapter Two that, much more than Tragedy, Old Comedy made use of the simple, popular forms of lyric found in contemporary Athens. These folk-lyrics were employed almost exclusively in the choral stasima which occur in the iambic scenes of each drama. Of course, as with all the other material from the popular life of Athens of which Aristophanes made use, he felt free to adapt folk-lyric as he pleased. This is seen clearly in the example of *Eq.* 973 ff.: in these lyrics the simple aeolic cola (glyconics and pherecrateans) are used with enjambement, in what is meant to be an imitation (or parody) of tragic "Jubellieder."⁸¹ This mixing of the colloquial and the literary is also seen in the use of language, for example, at *Eq.*

⁸⁰Körte, *ibid.*

⁸¹See above, p.63.

1264 ff. (the second parabasis), where colloquial and abusive language is set among what is an obvious adaptation of a Pindaric *prosodion*.⁸²

We also saw that true Attic scolia are rare in Aristophanes and what is left of Old Comedy. Where they do occur no pattern in their use can be established. It also became clear in the discussion of Aristophanes' use of scolia that the collection in Athenaeus seems to be representative: Aristophanes uses either the scolia found in the collection, or else those very similar to them.

In the foregoing discussions we have also seen how the lyrics of abuse may be divided *in general* into two groups, the simpler lyrics found outside the parabatic parts, and the lyrics of the parabasis and the second parabasis (this applies also to the praise-lyrics).

We may conclude that, although the comic abuse may well have originated in cult, considering the abundant evidence for ritualized abuse at the Thesmophoria, the Stenia, the Haloa, and the Mysteries, this cannot be accepted entirely without doubt. The influence of the iambographers can be seen in that sort of invective which involves the chorus in a personal quarrel with the target of the abuse. This is found particularly in the use of elaborate curses such as that at *Acharnenses* 1150 ff. The other sort of abuse-lyric can then be seen to represent a popular tradition of non-malicious abuse which surrounded many of the

⁸²See above, p.64.

religious celebrations, of which the γεφυρισμός, associated with the Mysteries, is merely one example. It must be remembered that the γεφυρισμός may not have been part of the cult itself, but merely part of the carnival atmosphere which went along with its celebration.

An important point was made by Rosen,⁸³ namely that there is no direct evidence for the *form* which popular types of abuse took. Rosen assumes that it will have been iambic (and therefore represents the influence of the iambographers), but should not the simple aeolic metres which we have seen in the choral stasima in Aristophanes also be considered for this role? Should we not consider it likely that Aristophanes, when he wishes to recreate the carnival-like atmosphere of the popular religious festivals, uses the most common popular forms, whether it be called *gephyrismos*, *tothasmos*, etc., (though here, too, we have also seen that Aristophanes may not have copied his models precisely)? This category would also include the simple iambic and trochaic stanzas, so that the originators of the form need not be the iambographers, but the folk-tradition, which after all was common to the iambographers as well.

This association of popular lyric-forms with σκώμματα in its simplest forms (by 'simplest' I mean, abuse for the pure fun of it, and with no other purpose asserted, however insincerely) is strong evidence that this was no mere invention of Aristophanes, but that he was acting under the influence of the

⁸³See above, footnote 30.

popular cultural tradition. Where, as in the parabolic parts, he indulges in imitation of the classic poets, he makes it clear that the abuse is uttered not simply for the sake of abuse, but that some point, whether political, moral, or artistic, is being made. This shows perhaps the influence of the iambographers, who do not seem to have uttered invective indiscriminately: their invective sprang from a perceived, or at least alleged, injustice, and it was not frivolous, as is true of much of the comic abuse of Old Comedy. Whether or not this distinction may be applied to Eupolis too, is unanswerable, since, although the parabasis of the *Demoi* shows simple, popular forms in the abuse-lyrics (and so may be reckoned as evidence in support of the answer 'No'), we have seen that such lyrics are not entirely alien to the parabases of Aristophanes. This fact, and the fact that we know so little of the structure of Old Comedy apart from Aristophanes, make it impossible to generalize.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A: EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

- Austin, Colin. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.
- Bergk, Theodorus. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 4th. ed. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1882.
- Cunningham, I.C. *Herodas Mimiambi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Demianczuk, Jan. *Supplementum Comicum*. Cracow, 1912, reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.
- Dover, Kenneth J. *Aristophanes Clouds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Hall, Frederick W., and William M. Geldart. *Aristophanis Comoediae* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. *Aristophanes Lysistrata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Kaibel, Georg. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Vol. 1, 1, Doriensium Comoedia Mimi Phlyaces*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
- Kassel, Rudolf, and Colin Austin. *Poetae Comici Graeci Vol. III Part 2*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- _____. *Poetae Comici Graeci, Vol. IV*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.
- _____. *Poetae Comici Graeci, Vol. V*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Kock, Theodor. *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: 1880-88, reprint, Utrecht: H & S, 1976.
- van Leeuwen, Jan. *Aristophanes*, 11 vols. Leiden: 1893-1906, reprint, Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1968.
- Macdowell, Douglas M. *Aristophanes Wasps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Meineke, August. *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*. reprint, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Neil, Robert Alexander. *The Knights of Aristophanes*.

- Cambridge: 1901, reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966.
- Page, Denys L. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Platnauer, Maurice. *Aristophanes Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Prato, Carlo. *I Canti di Aristofane*. Rome, 1962.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. *Aristophanes' Frösche*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 198. Band, 4. Abhandlung, 1921, 2nd. ed., rev. 1953, W. Kraus, reprint, Graz-Vienna-Cologne: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1967.
- Richardson, Nicholas J. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Schröder, Otto. *Pindari carmina*. Leipzig and Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1923.
- Seaford, Richard. *Euripides Cyclops*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Starkie, William J.M. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London, 1909, reprint, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968.
- _____. *The Wasps of Aristophanes*. London: 1897, reprint Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968.
- Ussher, Robert G. *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- West, Martin L. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. *Aristophanes Lysistrata*. Berlin: 1927, reprint, Zürich / Berlin: Weidmann, 1964.
- B: MONOGRAPHS, ARTICLES, etc.
- Aly, W. 'Skolion.' *RE* IIIA (1929) 558-566.
- Bonanno, Maria Grazia. 'Nomi e soprannomi archilochei.' *Museum Helveticum* 37 (1980): 65-88.

- Bowie, E.L. 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival.' *JHS* 106 (1986): 13-35.
- Bowra, Charles M. *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 2nd. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Carey, C. 'Archilochus and Lycambes.' *CQ* 36 (1986): 60-67.
- Casagrande, Cinzia, et al. 'Sei carmi conviviali attribuiti ai sette sapienti.' *Quaderni di filologia classica* III (1982): 6-23.
- _____. 'Poesia Conviviale in un papiro di Elefantina.' *Quaderni di filologia classica* IV (1983):
- Dale, A.M. *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948, 2nd ed. 1968.
- Deubner, Ludwig. *Attische Feste*. Berlin: 1932, reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966.
- Duchemin, Jacqueline. 'Les origines populaires et paysannes de l'agon tragique.' *Dioniso* 43 (1969): 247-75.
- Ehrenberg, Victor. 'Das Harmodioslied.' *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956): 57-69.
- Fabbro, Elena. 'Considerazioni sul paeana conviviale.' *Quaderni di filologia classica* V (1986): 25-35.
- Fluck, Hanns. *Skurrile Riten in griechischen Kulte*. Diss. Freiburg, 1931.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1962.
- Gelzer, T. *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes*. Munich: 1960.
- Gerhard, Gustav A. 'Iambographen.' *RE* IX (1916): 651-680.
- Giangrande, Giuseppe. 'The Origin of Attic Comedy.' *Eranos* 61 (1963): 1-24.
- Haldane, J.A. 'A Scene in the Thesmophoriazuae (295-371).' *Philologus* 109 (1965): 39-46.
- Halliwel, Stephen. 'Ancient Interpretations of ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν in Aristophanes.' *CQ* 34 (1984): 83-88.
- Harvey, A.E. 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry.' *CQ* 48 (1955): 157-175.

- Heath, Malcolm. *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*,
Hypomnemata 87, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht,
1987.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in
Attic Comedy*. New Haven and London: Yale University
Press, 1975.
- Herter, Hans. *Von dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel*.
Iserlohn: Silva-Verlag, 1947.
- Horn, W. *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des
Aristophanes*. Nuremberg: 1970.
- Immisch, Otto. 'Zur Geschichte der Griechischen Lyrik.' *RhM*
n.f.44 (1889): 553-67.
- Kern, Otto. 'Gephyrismoι.' *RE* VII (1912): 1229.
- Kleinknecht, Herman. *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*.
Stuttgart: Tübinger Beiträge zur
Altertumswissenschaft, XXVIII, 1937, reprint,
Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.
- Koster, W.J.W. *Traité de Métrique Grecque suivi d'un Précis
de Métrique Latine*. 2nd ed. Leyde: A. W. Sijhoff's
Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V., 1953.
- Kranz, Walter. *Stasimon*. Berlin: 1933.
- Maas, Paul. 'Hybrias.' *RE* IX (1916): 32-33.
_____. 'Kleitagora.' *RE* XI (1922): 621.
- MacLeod, Colin. 'The Comib Encomium and Aristophanes'
Clouds.' *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 142-44.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold. 'BOYKOΛΙΑΣΤΑΙ (Der Wettgesang der
Hirten).' *RhM* n.f.99 (1956): 97-133.
- Mittelhaus, Karl. 'Kedon.' *RE* XI (1922): 110-111.
- Moulton, Carroll. *Aristophanic Poetry*, *Hypomnemata* 68.
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Newiger, Hans-Joachim, ed. *Aristophanes und die alte
Komödie, Wege der Forschung* CCLXV. Darmstadt:
Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.
- Page, Denys L. 'The Song of Hybrias the Cretan.' *P.C.Ph.S*
n.s.11 (1965): 62-65.
- Pellizer, Ezio. 'Per una morfologia della poesia giambica

- arcaica.' *I canoni letterari di Trieste* (1981): 35-48.
- Pickard-Cambridge, Sir Arthur. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. 2nd. ed., rev. T.B.L. Webster. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- _____. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd. ed., rev. J. Gould and D.M. Lewis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Podlecki, Anthony J. 'The Political Significance of the "Tyrannicide"-Cult.' *Historia* 15 (1966): 129-141.
- Puppini, Patrizia. 'Espressioni mimiche a simposia.' *Quaderni di filologia classica* V, (1986): 39-52.
- Rau, Peter. *Paratragodia; Untersuchungen einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, Zetemata Heft 45. Munich: Beck, 1967.
- Reitzenstein, Richard. *Epigramm und Skolion*. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1893, reprint, Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms, 1970.
- Rosen, Ralph M. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Diss. Harvard, 1983.
- Wolfgang Rösler. *Dichter und Gruppe*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1980.
- _____. 'Die Dichtung des Archilochos und die neue Kölner Epode.' *Rh. M.* n.s.119 (1976): 289-310.
- _____. 'Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell''io' nella lirica greca arcaica.' *QUCC* n.s.48 (1985): 131-144.
- Rossi, Luigi Enrico. 'Il Ciclope di Euripide come ΚΩΜΟΣ 'mancato'.' *Maia* 23 (1971): 10-38.
- Schmid, Wilhelm. 'Zum Skolion des Hybrias.' *Philologische Wochenschrift* 47 (1927): 989-91.
- Schönberger, Otto. *Griechische Heischelieder, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 105. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1980.
- Siems, Karsten. *Aischrologia, Das Sexuell-Hässliche im Antiken Epigramm*. Diss. Göttingen, 1974.
- Tedeschi, Gennaro. 'Nota a Carm. Conv. 917/34 Page.' *Giornale filologico ferrarese* n.s. VI (1983): 69-71.

- _____. 'L'Elegia parenetica-guerriera e il simposio, a proposito del fr.1W. di Callino.' *Rivista di studi classici* (1978): 203-209.
- _____. 'Solone e lo spazio della comunicazione elegiaca.' *QUCC* n.s.10 (1982): 33-49.
- _____. 'Il canto di Hybrias il cretese: un esempio di poesia conviviale.' *Quaderni di filologia classica* V (1986): 55-74.
- Van der Valk, Marchinus. 'On the Composition of the Attic Skolia.' *Hermes* 102 (1974): 1-20.
- Vetta, Massimo, ed. *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica*. Rome-Bari: Gius. Laterza & Spa, 1983.
- _____. 'Un capitolo di storia di poesia simposiale (per l'esegesi di Aristoph. Vesp. 1222-48).' *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 9-10 (1976-77): 242-266; reprinted in Massimo Vetta, ed. *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica*. Rome-Bari: Gius. Laterza & Spa, 1983.
- West, Martin L. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- _____. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- White, John W. *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. London: MacMillan, 1912.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von. *Aristoteles und Athen*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1893; reprint, 1966.
- _____. *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921, reprint, Bad Homberg von der Höhe: Hermann Gentner Verlag, 1962.
- _____. *Isyllos von Epidauros*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1886, reprint Dublin and Zurich, 1967.
- _____. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913, reprint Berlin-Zürich-Dublin, 1966.
- _____. *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*. Berlin: 1906.
- Wüst, Ernst. 'Skolion und Γεφύρισμα in der alten Komödie.' *Philologus* 77 (1921): 26-45.
- Zielinski, Theodor. *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1885.

Zimmermann, Bernhard. *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der Aristophanischen Komödien*, Vol. 1 1984, Vol. 2, 1985. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1985.