Ian C. Storey
(Peterborough, Ontario)

Notus est omnibus Eupolis?

I begin with Macrobius' rather optimistic appreciation of Eupolis cited above (*Sat.* 7.5.8). The question-mark, however, is the work of the conference organizer, intended (with my concurrence) to show that although ranked by the ancients with Kratinos and Aristophanes, and despite a canon of fourteen (or fifteen) play-titles[1], the discovery of some 120 lines from *Demoi*[2], and substantial portions of commentaries to three other comedies[3], today very few people know Eupolis. As part of an on-going reassessment of the remains of this writer[4], I am proposing to do two things in this paper: (1) to investigate the ancients' knowledge of and attitude toward Eupolis, and (2) to assess the relationship between Eupolis and Aristophanes, the best-known and only surviving exponent of Old Comedy.

I. *Eupolis in antiquity.*

While Aristophanes was the acknowledged master of Old Attic Comedy (e.g. at Arist. *Poet.* 1448a27 the exemplar of comedy, as Homer and Sophokles were for epic and tragedy), Eupolis was known and studied. Two plays in particular, *Poleis* and *Demoi*, were

[1] As genuine Eupolis I accept *Aiges, Astrateutoi, Autolykos, Baptai, Demoi, Heilotes* (there is some doubt here), *Kolakes, Marikas, Noumeniai, Poleis, Prospaltioi, Taxiarchoi, Chrysoun Genos,* and *Philoi*. These make fourteen, not counting the second version of *Autolykos*. The number of seventeen titles given by the Suda (ε 3657) can be explained as these fourteen plus the second *Autolykos* and such 'ghosts' as *Lakones* and *Hybristodikai*.

[2] Fr. 99 Kassel-Austin [hereafter «K-A»]. All comic fragments are referred to in this edition.

[3] Frr. 192 (to *Marikas*), 259 (to *Prospaltioi*), 268 (to *Taxiarchoi*) (= *P.Oxy.* 2741, 2813, 2740).

[4] For the first part of this reassessment see Storey 1990, Storey 1991.

frequently cited, and of the latter Sommerstein observes that apart from the extant plays of Aristophanes, *Demoi* «is the only Old Comedy of which we know that copies continued to be made after A.D. 300»[5]. Allusions to and appreciations of Eupolis can be found in nearly a score of named classical writers, in the scholia to several, and in the various anonymous writers on comedy and comedians[6]. They yield the following observations about antiquity's view of Eupolis.

Eupolis is usually (but not invariably) connected with Kratinos and Aristophanes to form the familiar triad of Old Comedy[7]. Occasionally the triad is expanded to four to include Platon (*Anecdoton Estense* II.5), but Platon is more normally regarded as the exponent of Middle or Second Comedy[8]. On one occasion five poets are given, the usual three plus Platon and Pherekrates (anon. *p.k.* [Koster XIc] 39-40), and the encyclopaedic compiler (anon. *p.k.* [Koster III]) includes Eupolis among eight poets of Old Comedy[9]. Some writers see only a pair, Aristophanes and Eupolis, as the exemplars of Old Comedy (anon. p.k. [Koster IV] 16-7; Lucian *pros ton apaid.* 27, *dis kateg.* 33, *halieus* 25; Libanios fr. 50 β 2). When this occurs, the context is almost always that of personal humour. Aristophanes is usually the leading exponent of Old Comedy — see for instance the assessment of the anonymous writer (Koster III 36-7), μακρῷ λογιώτατος Ἀθηναίων καὶ εὐφυίᾳ πάντας ὑπεραίρων — but one significant exception may be noted, Euanthius on the early history of comedy, *comoediae veteris pater Eupolis cum Cratino Aristophaneque esse credatur* (Koster XXV 1.24-5).

As a 'typical' writer of Old Comedy, Eupolis thus acquires the familiar characteristics of that genre. First, Old Comedy is political. The ancient writers correctly saw an innate link between the vigorous 5th-c. democracy at Athens and Old Comedy which was one of its expressions. In particular see Platonios 1.2-5 ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ Κρατίνου καὶ Εὐπόλιδος χρόνων τὰ τῆς δημοκρατίας ἐκράτει παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν σύμπασαν ὁ δῆμος εἶχεν, αὐτὸς αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων ὑπάρχων and [Dion. Hal.] *techn. rhet.* 8.11 ἡ δέ γε κωμῳδία ὅτι πολιτεύεται. Second, Old Comedy is personally abusive. For so many of the ancient critics of Old Comedy *to onomasti komodein* was the quintessence of the genre, the feature (along with the chorus) most obviously lacking in later comedy, whose presence and disappearance had to be explained in any history of comedy. Personal humour provided for some critics the «redeeming social value» that this otherwise dangerous literary genre required (see Quint. 10.1.65 *in insectandis vitiis*; also Cic. *de Rep.* 4.11, Platonios 1.5-10) or the literary ancestor for their own works of satire (e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.1-7, Pers. 1.123-4). Galen (*peri ton idion bibl.* 17) records a collection in three books of «political names in Eupolis», with two and five books respectively for Kratinos and Aristophanes[10].

Third was the relationship (in some eyes a feud) between Old Comedy and philosophy. From Plato *Apol.* 18 onward the caricature of Sokrates by the comic poets was matter of considerable interest, not to say indignation, with repeated claims that Aristophanes was part of an organized conspiracy against Sokrates (see, for example, Σ

[5] Sommerstein 1980: 53 n.34.

[6] Most, if not all, of the relevant ancient texts can be found in K-A pp. 294-301, the testimonia to Eupolis. I have used here Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.1-7, Pers. 1.123 + Σ, Quint. 10.1.65-6, [Dion. Hal.] *techn. rhet.* 8.11, Vell. Pat. 1.16.3, Lucian *dis kateg.* 33, *halieus* 25, *pros ton apaid.* 27, Libanios fr. 50 β 2, Macr. *Sat.* 7.5.8, Platonios I and II (= Koster I, II), Diomedes (= Koster XXIV) 46-55, Euanthius (= Koster XXV) 24f., Galen *peri ton idion bibl.* 17, Σ Dion. Thr. (= Koster XVIII) 39-46, Σ Thuc. 1.30.1, Σ Lucian *Zeus Trag.* 1, the anonymous writers on comedy (Koster III, IV, V, XIb, XIc), the anonymous *life of Aristophanes* (Koster VIII), and the *Anecdoton Estense* (quoted at Janko 1984: 246). Here and subsequently references to «Koster» are to Koster 1975.

[7] As at Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.1, Pers. 1.123-4, Quint. 10.1.66, Vell. Pat. 1.16.3, Ael. Arist. 3.51, [Dion. Hal.] *techn. rhet.* 8.11, Platonios I.2, II, Rufinus *comm. in metr. Ter.* 564.7, Galen *peri ton idion bibl.* 17, Σ Dion. Thr. 40-1, Diomedes 52, Euanthius 24, Σ Thuc. 1.30.1, anon. *p.k.* (Koster XIb) 36-7.

[8] As at anon. *p.k.* (Koster IV) 17, anon. *p.k.* (Koster XIb) 37, Σ Dion. Thr. 41-2, [Andronikos] (Koster XXIII) 11-17, the first two assigning Platon to «second comedy», the others to «Middle Comedy». At Dio Chrys. 16.9 the triad of Old Comedy is Kratinos, Aristophanes, and Platon. Most strikingly, Platon is absent from the list of poets in Old or Middle Comedy in the anonymous writer on comedy (Koster III).

[9] Epicharmos, Magnes, Kratinos, Krates, Pherekrates, Phrynichos, Eupolis, and Aristophanes. On this writer see Storey 1990: 3-4.

[10] Five books for the forty plays of Aristophanes and three for the 14 (or 17) of Eupolis suggests that there were proportionally more political names in Eupolis.

Cl. 627, Ael. *poik. hist.* 2.13, Max. Tyr. 3.3)[11]. Aristophanes and his *Clouds* clearly take first spot[12], but both Lucian (*dis kateg.* 33, *halieus* 25) and [Dion. Hal.] (*techn. rhet.* 8.11) include Eupolis as well. Finally and much more rarely, some writers recognized the power and elegance of Old Comedy as a form of art, that apart from its didactic or corrective functions it could be admired for its artistic merit. Here we may cite Horace's grudging *non sine multa laude* (*AP* 281-2) and especially Quintilian's perceptive summary: *antiqua comedia cum sinceram illam sermonis Attici gratiam prope sola retinet, tum facundissimae libertatis, et si est <in> insectandis vitiis praecipua, plurimum tamen virium etiam in ceteris partibus habet. Nam et grandis et elegans et venusta ...* (10.1.65). The second treatise of Platonios which attempts to distinguish Eupolis from the other two writers of Old Comedy in terms of style will be discussed below.

Of the fourteen canonical plays of Eupolis, the ancients appear to have known something about the story-line of six (*Autolykos, Baptai, Demoi, Kolakes, Marikas,* and *Taxiarchoi*). Here I am distinguishing between those writers who quote a specific fragment with little or no comment about its context and those who refer more generally to a comedy with some indication of the overall nature of the piece. In almost all these instances of some larger knowledge about a comedy, familiarity was due to the presence in the play of well-known persons or to a connexion with familiar works of literature. *Autolykos,* for instance, had to do with the son of Lykon, boy victor at the Panathenaia and eromenos of Kallias, known from Xenophon's charming portrait in his *Symposium.* Thus the literary association with Xenophon's work and the connexion with Kallias, richest man at Athens and Andokides' opponent in *peri ton Mysterion,* would have interested the ancient critics. Also unusual about the comedy was its production διὰ Δημοστράτου (Ath. 216d) and the fact that there was a second version (Galen *in Hipp. vict. acut.* 1.4). Eupolis' *Kolakes* featured a young and feckless Kallias newly come into his inheritance, associating with Protagoras (a *dramatis persona* — see frr. 157-8; Ath. 218b), indulging in an extravagant and expensive style of entertaining, and victimised by a chorus of professional spongers (the *kolakes* of the title). Kallias himself was well-known to the ancients, but in particular his domestic life in the late 420s furnished the background for three prose works of the fourth century, Plato's *Protagoras,* Xenophon's *Symposium,* and Aischines' lost *Kallias.* Again the literary associations as well as its victory over *Peace* would have assured an interest in *Kolakes.*

Baptai was in part a caricature of Alkibiades, thus a guarantee of notoriety. Certain writers do concentrate on the portrait of Alkibiades and the latter's alleged revenge on the comedian (Σπ Juv. 2.92, Σ Ael. Arist. 3.8, Themist. 8.10, Cic. *ad Att.* 6.1.18; see also Platonios l. 18-9), but apart from that the comedy seems to have had a scandalous reputation in antiquity (Juv. 2.92 + Σ, Lucian *pros ton apaid.* 27). In the last passage Lucian asks whether one has read *Baptai* to the end without blushing. One mourns the loss of a play that made Lucian blush! The evidence of Juvenal and the scholia reveal that the chorus were Athenian men, *molles et effeminati,* dancing *ad imitationem feminarum* as part of the worship of Kotyto, φορτικόν τινα δαίμονα (Hesych. κ 3820). The combination of Alkibiades and an obscene theme would have allowed *Baptai* a good survival.

Marikas seems to have done for Hyperbolos what *Knights* had done for Kleon. As one of Old Comedy's favourite targets[13], Hyperbolos would have kept interest in this comedy alive. But more familiar would have been Aristophanes' complaint of Eupolis' plagiarism at *Cl.* 553-6. The partially revised *Clouds* was one of Aristophanes' best known plays, and thus *Marikas* was guaranteed the interest of antiquity, although the ancient critics seem to have been more concerned with straightening out the relative chronology

[11] Plutarch *Eth.* 10c and Lucian *halieus* 14, 25 take a more reasoned view of the matter.

[12] For a useful collection of passages see K-A III.2 pp. 11-16.

[13] Hyperbolos has rather languished in the shadow of Kleon, perhaps because of Thucydides' summary dismissal of him as μοχθηρὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὠστρακισμένον οὐ διὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀξιώματος φόβον, ἀλλὰ διὰ πονηρίαν καὶ αἰσχύνην τῆς πόλεως (8.73.3) and the universal deprecation of comedy. But he was a popular comic target and was made fun of by at least seven comedians over the period 426-405. Three entire comedies (*Marikas, Artopolides, Hyperbolos*) were devoted to him.

of the two versions of *Clouds* and *Marikas* (Σ *Cl.* 549, 553). On the points in common between the two plays see below. *Taxiarchoi* took as its theme the visit of Dionysos to the Athenian general Phormion to learn «the rules of commanders and wars» (Σ *Peace* 348e). Phormion may not have been as prominent a figure as Kallias and Alkibiades, but he was mentioned often in comedy, and also attractively presented by Thucydides in the second book of his histories.

Finally *Demoi,* Eupolis' best known and most frequently cited comedy, presented the resurrection from the underworld of four eminent leaders (Solon, Miltiades, Aristeides, and Perikles, called variously *prostatai, nomothetai, strategoi*) to put right the state of affairs at Athens. Obviously Perikles' appearance in the play would have assured interest (see the comments of Ael. Arist. 3.365, 3.487; Aphthonios *prog.* 11), but of all the comedies this is the only one that was known in more than incidental details. Platonios, for instance, sums up the creativity of Eupolis by adducing *Demoi* (without naming it), ἀναγαγεῖν ἱκανὸς ὢν ἐξ Ἅιδου νομοθετῶν πρόσωπα καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰσηγούνενος ἢ περὶ θέσεως νόμων ἢ καταλύσεως (II.11-2).

On the whole Eupolis is mentioned along with Aristophanes and the other writers of Old Comedy, and usually they stand together as exemplars of its characteristic features. Four writers, however, attempt to distinguish the poets, to isolate Eupolis and contrast him with the other comedians, especially Aristophanes. We may begin with the anonymous writer on comedy and comedians (Koster III) who presents the following brief entry on Eupolis:

> Εὔπολις Ἀθηναῖος· ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀπολλοδώρου, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ Φρύνιχος, γεγονὼς δυνατὸς τῇ λέξει καὶ ζηλῶν Κρατῖνον· πολὺ γοῦν λοίδορον καὶ σκαιὸν ἐπιφαίνει. γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ δράματα ιδ΄. (33-5).

The connexion with Kratinos is in keeping with this writer's habit of seeking vertical lines of influence for his poets, e.g. Aeschylus upon Kratinos (24), Kratinos upon Krates (26-7), Krates upon Pherekrates (30), Euripides upon Aristophanes (37)[14]. The

[14] For a suggestion that ζήλῳ δὲ Εὐπόλιδος might be the correct reading see below.

verbal power of Eupolis that he adduces is not the elegance and grace of Quintilian's appreciation, but his use of personal abuse. This is the connotation of λοίδορον and such verbal abilities are elsewhere attributed to Kratinos[15]. The last term, σκαιόν, presents problems in that it is not found elsewhere in the appreciations of comedy, although Hesych. σ 800 does give τραχὺς, σκληρὸς, ἐπαχθής as synonyms. Geel's emendation, αἰσχρόν, has much to recommend it, as this word is used elsewhere of the abusive tradition in Old Comedy[16]. In any case, whether we read σκαιόν or αἰσχρόν, this is an unusual negative judgement on the part of the anonymous who is not generally critical of his poets. On this approach, Eupolis is linked with Kratinos in the verbally powerful and abusive side of Old Comedy.

Quite the opposite is Platonios' sketch of Eupolis, one of three overviews of Kratinos, Aristophanes, and Eupolis aimed at demonstrating that Aristophanes is a sort of Aristotelian mean between the other two. After describing Kratinos as αὐστηρὸς ταῖς λοιδορίαις, direct in his approach, and uneven in the constructions of his plays, he continues:

> Εὔπολις δὲ εὐφάνταστος μὲν εἰς ὑπερβολήν ἐστι κατὰ τὰς ὑποθέσεις. τὰς γὰρ εἰσηγήσεις μεγάλας τῶν δραμάτων ποιεῖται, καὶ ἥνπερ ἐν τῇ παραβάσει φαντασίαν κινοῦσιν οἱ λοιποί, ταύτην ἐκεῖνος ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν ... ὥσπερ δέ ἐστιν ὑψηλός, οὕτω καὶ ἐπίχαρις καὶ περὶ τὰ σκώμματα εὔστοχος. ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸν μέσον ἐλήλακε τῶν ἀνδρῶν χαρακτῆρα· οὔτε γὰρ πικρὸς λίαν ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ὁ Κρατῖνος, οὔτε χαρίεις, ὥσπερ ὁ Εὔπολις, ἀλλ' ἔχει καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ Κρατίνου καὶ τὸ ἐπιτρεχούσης χάριτος <τοῦ> Εὐπόλιδος. (II. 8-11, 12-18)[17].

Whereas the previous writer had stressed an essential similarity between Kratinos and Eupolis, one based on abusive language a humour, Platonios contrasts them sharply. Unless περὶ τὰ σκώμματα

[15] See Platonios II.2 (of Kratinos) and anon. *p.k.* (Koster III) 30 for the absence of *loidorein* in Pherekrates. See also Janko 1984: 210-1.

[16] See *life of Aristophanes* 4, Arist. *EN* 1128a23. The word seems to denote the obscenity of Old Comedy rather than its personal humour.

[17] On Platonios II see now the text and commentary of Perusino 1989: 38-41, 64-75.

refers specifically to personal humour, the element of personal abuse in Eupolis is all but eliminated by Platonios. We shall notice that in Aristophanes, the ideal mean, personal humour is not eliminated (πρὸς τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας), but that the power of Kratinos is combined with the grace of Eupolis to provide the desired ideal. On Platonios' scheme Eupolis becomes the polar opposite to Kratinos, and for him Platonios finds characteristics that are not the λοίδορον καὶ σκαιὸν/αἰσχρόν of the Anonymus, but creative imagination (*phantasia*)[18] and grace (*charis*). The latter is often applied to Old Comedy generally (anon. *p.k.* [Koster V] 17; Quint. 10.1.65), but is more especially used of Aristophanes (*vita Thomana* [Koster XXXIII] l.10; Platonios II.3; Ath. 158c, 269e, 276d, 372b, 398c, 569f; Demetr. *p. herm.* 128, [Plato] *epigr.* 14 [West]). What Platonios has done, it appears, is to assign to Eupolis one of the qualities associated with Aristophanes and thus to establish him as one extreme of the comic spectrum. Such a tripartite approach must stem from an Aristotelian school of literary criticism, where excellence is the mean between extremes[19].

Third, the *Life of Aristophanes* (Koster XXVIII) 2-5 sets Aristophanes apart from Kratinos and Eupolis:

> (Aristophanes) ὅς πρῶτος δοκεῖ τὴν κωμῳδίαν ἔτι πλανωμένην τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἀγωγῇ ἐπὶ τὸ χρησιμώτερον καὶ σεμνότερον μεταγαγεῖν, πικρότερόν τε καὶ αἰσχρότερον Κρατίνου κὰι Εὐπόλιδος βλασφημούντων ἢ ἔδει. πρῶτος δὲ καὶ τῆς νέας κωμῳδίας τὸν τρόπον ἐπέδειξεν ἐν τῷ Κωκάλῳ.

This intruiging passage has been used by Janko in his analysis of the ancient tripartite divisions of comedy, one of which would seem to have been Old (Kratinos, Eupolis), Middle (Aristophanes), and New (Menander *et al.*)[20]. What it does show is that at least one source distinguished Aristophanes from the other canonical writers of what we call Old Comedy and that the basis of the distinction was concerned with personal abuse and perhaps 'obscenity'. This coupling of Kratinos and Eupolis and the description πικρότερόν τε καὶ αἰσχρότερον Κρατίνου καὶ Εὐπόλιδος βλασφημούντων ἢ ἔδει is the same as that of the Anonymus. Platonios also in his sketch of Kratinos makes this point that his comedy was verbally powerful and personally abusive; his one-word description of him at II.15 is πικρός.

The last passage is a variant of the preceding, in which only Kratinos is the exemplar of this Old and unrefined comedy and Eupolis follows Aristophanes into something newer and other than Old:

> καὶ ἡ μὲν καλεῖται παλαιά ... καὶ τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, ἐπίσημος δὲ Κρατῖνος, ὁ καὶ πραττόμενος· μετέσχον δέ τινος χρόνου τῆς παλαιᾶς κωμῳδίας Εὔπολίς τε καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης (Σ Dion. Thr. [Koster XVIIIa] 37, 39-41).

As this writer goes on to assign Platon to Middle Comedy and Menander to New Comedy, we cannot be sure where he put Eupolis and Aristophanes. Clearly his structure of comedy is the result of several diverse strands, but it is clear that one such strand associated Eupolis and Aristophanes and distinguished them from Kratinos.

I thus see two different traditions in the ancient world concerning Eupolis and his position in the history of comedy. The first connected him with Kratinos and stressed the bitter and abusive nature of his poetry (anon. *p.k.* [Koster III] 33-5; *Life of Aristophanes* 2-5), while the other associated him with Aristophanes (Σ Dion. Thr. [Koster XVIIIa] 37-46) or assigned him characteristics of Aristophanes in order to set him up as one end of a linear spectrum of Old Comedy (Platonios II).

II. *Eupolis and Aristophanes*

The second part of my paper will deal with the relationship, as we are able to apprehend it, between these two comic poets, whose debuts fall within two years of each other (Eupolis: 429, very probably with *Prospaltioi*; Aristophanes: 427 with *Daitales*) and who were so often connected by the ancient writers. Modern critics usually begin with Aristophanes and thence proceed, usually to

[18] I am understanding this word in the Aristotelian sense of «imagination» (*LSJ* 2.b) rather than in the sense used by [Longinos] «imagery» (*LSJ* 3). See Perusino 1989: 71-2.

[19] A similar approach to tragedy, on which Sophokles becomes the mean between Aeschylus and Euripides, can be found at Dio Chrys. 52.19, Dion. Hal. *Synth. Onom.* 24.

[20] Janko 1984: 244-50.

Eupolis' detriment and unfairly so since we have no complete play to set beside the eleven extant comedies of Aristophanes. A recent entry on Eupolis, for instance, describes his *Taxiarchoi* as «recalling certain themes in *Frogs*», without reminding the reader that *Taxiarchoi* is the earlier play by some ten or twenty years[21]. The author does allow that the two poets did borrow from and influence each other, but the tendency is to approach Eupolis from an Aristophanic starting-point.

Certain mention or allusion between the poets is limited to three instances: (1) *Cl.* 553-6, Aristophanes of Eupolis (see below), (2) Eup. fr. 89 (*Baptai*), Eupolis of Aristophanes (see below), and (3) Eup. fr. 62 (*Autolykos*), Eupolis of Aristophanes' use of the statue of Peace — Σ Plat. *Apol.* 19c ... κωμῳδεῖται δέ καὶ <ὅτι> τὸ τῆς Εἰρήνης κολοσσικὸν ἐξῆρεν ἄγαλμα· Εὔπολις Αὐτολύκῳ. The scholia do add several passages in which they allege that Aristophanes is attacking Eupolis (Σ *Clouds* 296, *Wasps* 1025, *Peace* 740b, 741 b, 763e), but apart from Σ *Wasps* 1025, Σ *Peace* 741b do not furnish any corroborating evidence; these passages I have left as uncertain references at best[22]. It will be seen below that I would add Ar. fr. 58 (*Anagyros*) as a fourth instance of allusion between the poets.

Clouds 553-6 is the natural starting-point to consider the well-known collaboration and 'feud' between the poets:

> Εὔπολις μὲν τὸν Μαρικᾶν πρώτιστος παρείλκυσεν
> ἐκστρέφας τοὺς ἡμετέρους Ἱππέας κακὸς κακῶς
> προσθεὶς αὐτῷ γραῦν μεθύσην τοῦ κόρδακος οὕνεχ', ἣν
> Φρύνιχος πάλαι πεπόηχ', ἣν τὸ κῆτος ἤσθιεν.

Using the distinctive Eupolidean metre[23], Aristophanes complains that Eupolis has turned his *Knights* inside out to do for Hyperbolos in *Marikas* what he had done for Kleon in *Knights*. All this should, of course, be taken with a very large grain of salt. As Heath has shown, this is all part of a ritualised exchange involving competing poets and audience in which claims of originality and plagiarism are standard fare, and self-praise and the denigration of rivals all part of the audience's expectations. The actual situation is likely to be far removed from the picture presented by the comic poet[24]. In this case it can be seen that in the fragments of *Marikas* there are strong echoes of *Knights*, sufficient to establish that Aristophanes' complaint has a certain basic validity but also that *Marikas* was not simply *Knights* reheated. In particular I would cite: (1) that each play was a demagogue-comedy, (2) in each the demagogue was presented under an appropriately disguised name (Kleon/Paphlagon, Hyperbolos/Marikas), (3) the names have connotations of both foreign origin and servile status[25], (4) the demagogue had had a rough education in the streets (fr. 194 - *Kn.* 411-26, 1236-9) and was barely literate (fr. 208 - *Kn.* 188-93), (5) the personal 'smear-tactic' used by each demagogue (fr. 193 - *Kn.* 235-9, also used by the *sykophantai* in *Ach.* (818-28, 908-28), (6) the presence in each play of a character in the role of a *despotes* (fr. 192.118,150 - *Kn.* 40, 47, 53 etc.) and the servile relationship of the demagogue to the *despotes* (fr. 192.149-50 - *Kn. passim*), (7) the threat in each play to punish the demagogue (fr. 203 - *Kn.* 850-1), (8) the calling of a meeting by the *despotes* (fr. 192.148-50 - Kn. 746-55), (9) some business with rings as a symbol of status (fr. 204 - *Kn.* 947), (10) an attack by the demagogue on Nikias in both plays (fr. 193 - *Kn.* 358), (11) the twin choruses of rich and poor men (see below) may have been suggested by the comment at *Kn.* 223-4:

> καὶ γὰρ οἵ τε πλούσιοι
> δεδίασιν αὐτὸν ὅ τε πένης βδύλλει λεώς

(12) two references to *Knights* in the fragments of *Marikas*, at fr. 192.135-6 some mention of the etymology of Paphlagon as applied to

[21] *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature* (2nd ed.) 225 - *s.v.* Eupolis.

[22] Σ *Wasps* 1025 is doubtful in that it alleges that *Wasps* 1024-6 [422-L] is responding to something in Eupolis' *Autolykos* [420]. See also Eupolis fr. 65. Fr. 60 of *Autolykos* has been seen by some (e.g. Starkie 1897: 115) as Eupolis accusing Aristophanes of «licking the lips of many plates», i.e. using all and sundry to create his καινοτέρας ἰδέας.

[23] On this metre and its use in comedy see now the excellent study of L.P.E. Parker 1988.

[24] Heath 1990: 152.

[25] On the significance of the name see Cassio 1985, J.D. Morgan 1986. Morgan has argued persuasively that κίναδος («rascal») should be read in Hesych. μ 283 rather than κίναιδος («catamite»), thus removing the otherwise unattested allegation of sexual perversion.

Kleon (i.e. suggesting the verb παφλάζειν) and fr. 201 πεύσεσθε· νὼ γάρ, ἄνδρες, οὔθ' ἱππεύομεν, sounds rather like the comedian proclaiming (in the prologue - cf. *Wasps* 54-66) to the audience (ἄνδρες) that they will not be getting *Knights* again; (13) certain verbal echoes - fr. 195 (ὡς ἀπόλλυται) and *Kn.* 127, fr. 192.96 (κυκᾷς — the word used of Kleon/Paphlagon at *Kn.* 363, 692, 866, *Peace* 270)[26], fr. 192.124 (ἀπολῶ - cf. *Kn.* 702), and. fr. 194 (κοὐδὲ γιγνώσκειν δοκῶν) with *Kn.* 1146 (οὐδὲ δοκῶν ὁρᾶν).

All this represents a substantial amount in common, especially as we have only fragments of the Eupolidean play, but there are indications that Eupolis was creating his own play and not just representing Aristophanes' demagogue-comedy with the name of the demagogue changed. For instance, he employed a double-chorus of rich men and poor men (fr. 192.29, 98-9, 117-8, 121, 186-7). From fr. 193 it would seem that the chorus of *penetes* supported Marikas and the chorus of *plousioi* opposed him. Thus a whole new dramatic presentation is created from that in *Knights* where both chorus and protagonist are ranged against Paphlagon[27]. The parallels with the combat-scenes in *Acharnians* (557-625) and *Lysistrate* (352-613) are instructive as to how this split chorus could be used dramatically. These other scenes suggest also that Marikas must have had an antagonist in the comedy, perhaps a figure around whom the chorus of *plousioi* could rally.

The other major addition was the character of Hyperbolos' mother whom comedy would present as a bread-seller from the *agora* and Hermippos include in his presentation of Hyperbolos in *Artopolides*[28]. She was clearly involved in some vulgar song-and-dance. Aristophanes does admit that this was a departure from *Knights* but adds that she too was plagiarised, from an early play by Phrynichos[29]. There is no evidence that hers was a major role

[26] On this word see Edmunds 1987b: 1-2.

[27] This point is well made by Heath 1990: 153-4.

[28] On Hyperbolos' mother in comedy see also Hermippos fr. 8 (*Artopolides*), *Thesm.* 839-40, and the comments of Camon 1961: 188-90, Heath 1990: 153.

[29] Perusino 1981 sees in Eupolis' *Marikas* the first instance of what would be called *contaminatio* in Roman Comedy. The πάλαι of *Cl.* 556 might suggest Phrynichos the early tragic poet, but it is hard to see in what context the old tragedian might have crea-

in *Marikas*; indeed the word προσθείς suggests rather a scene added on (at the end - cf. the dancing-scene at the end of *Wasps*), rather than that she was a recurrent character in the play.

The scholia to *Cl.* 554 quote Eupolis' reply to Aristophanes, from his comedy *Baptai*:

† κἀκεῖνος † τοὺς Ἱππέας
ξυνεποίησα τῷ φαλακρῷ < – ⏑ > κἀδωρησάμην.

I have dealt before with the reply to what, but recent studies have kept alive the question of whether the revised *Clouds* was ever produced and thus whether Aristophanes' complaint at 553-6 was ever heard by the audience or by Eupolis[30]. I would re-state my position that *Clouds* as we have it is an incomplete text, surely never performed and unlikely to have been circulated as a private text, and thus not known to the audience generally. I have followed Fritzsche's suggestion that Ar. fr. 58 (*Anagyros*), in the eupolidean metre, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς χλανίδος τρεῖς ἁπληγίδας ποιῶν, refers to Eupolis' using *Knights* to create plays such as *Marikas* and that in the parabasis of *Anagyros* the same or a similar charge was made[31]. We may notice that this line from *Anagyros* carries on the metaphor of clothing contained in ἐκστρέψας[32]. Aristophanes may even have used the same lines as he did in *Clouds*. Anything from *Cl.* 545-62 could have been used elsewhere, and Aristophanes does tend to repeat himself in his

ted what seems so clearly to be a parody of something like the Andromeda-story. Most critics prefer the comic poet whose debut belongs in 429 (anon. *p.k.* [Koster III] 33-4) and consider that for Aristophanes revising *Clouds* c. 418 (*pace* Kopff 1990 whose arguments for the revision of *Clouds* c. 414-3 and the production of *Baptai* c. 413-2 I hope to refute elsewhere) an early play by Phrynichos (429-7, say) would have been sufficiently πάλαι. Aristophanes is trying to score as many points as possible off Eupolis; hence the theme of the old woman would be an *old* joke.

[30] See Storey 1990: 22, Heath 1990: 158 n. 21, Kopff 1990.

[31] Fritzsche 1835: 144. Others who follow this line are Geissler 1969: 50 (who identifies the three «tunics» as *Marikas, Kolakes,* and *Autolykos*), Perusino 1981: 412 n. 3, and Hofmann 1970 who identifies Ar. fr. 590 (= *P. Oxy.* 2737) as part of a commentary on *Anagyros* and finds hints at lines 5 and 63 of the row between Eupolis and Aristophanes.

[32] See Dover 1968: 170.

parabaseis[33]. In any case Eupolis fr. 89 replies not to *Cl.* 553-6 but to a similar charge, very likely in Aristophanes' *Anagyros.*

Σ *Kn.* 1291 picked up Eupolis' claim of collaboration and reported the thesis of some ancients that the second parabasis of *Knights* was the work of Eupolis: ἐκ τοῦ 'ὅστις οὖν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα' φασί τινες Εὐπόλιδος εἶναι τὴν παράβασιν, Sommerstein has shown, following the arguments of Pohlenz and Colonna, that this claim of Eupolidean authorship is based on the superficial resemblance between *Kn.* 1288-9[34]:

> *ὅστις οὖν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα* μὴ σφόδρα βδελύττεται
> οὗ ποθ' ἑκ ταὐτοῦ μεθ' ἡμῶν πίεται ποτηρίου

and fr. 99.33-4 of *Demoi:*

> *ὅστις οὖν ἄρχειν τοιούτους ἄνδρας* α[ἱρεῖταί ποτε
> μήτε πρόβατ' αὐτῷ τεκνοῖτο μήτε γῆ κ[αρπὸν φέροι.

Certain ancient critics, motivated by Eupolis' claim of collaboration (note the explanatory clause in the scholion εἴ γε φησὶν Εὔπολις «ξυνεποίησα τῷ φαλακρῷ»), went through *Knights* looking for resemblances between Aristophanes and Eupolis. All that they could come up with was this 'parallel' between *Kn.* 1288-9 and fr. 99.33-4 (*Demoi*) — both passages are parabatic and in trochaics — and ignored the fact that *Demoi* was produced several years after *Knights.* Sommerstein suggests that *Demoi* as Eupolis' best-known (or only known?) comedy would have been the first (or only?) play to be searched.

Sommerstein further interprets Σ *Kn.* 1226 μιμεῖται δὲ τοὺς Εἵλωτας ὅταν στεφανῶσι τὸν Ποσειδῶνα, to signify that Aristophanes in *Kn.* 1225-6:

> ὦ μιαρὲ κλέπτων δή με ταῦτ' ἐξηπάτας;
> ἐγὼ δέ τυ ἐστεφάνιξα κἀδωρησάμαν

[33] The most striking instance is of course *Wasps* 1030-5 and *Peace* 752-8, but the parabaseis of the first five plays all resemble one another in their praise of the poet and the denigration of his rivals. I think it entirely likely that lines against Eupolis were transferred from the incomplete revision of *Clouds* into *Anagyros* (or *vice versa*).

[34] Sommerstein 1980b.

is borrowing from Eupolis' *Heilotes,* a comedy of doubtful attribution to some extent, but which, if by Eupolis, was very likely early in his career, i.e. before *Knights* (424)[35]. Supporting this interpretation is the verb κἀδωρησάμαν, which is the same word used by Eupolis in fr. 89 to describe his 'gift' of *Knights* to Aristophanes. Eupolis' reply thus would have a sting in the tail by using the same word borrowed by Aristophanes.

A problem lies in the word ξυνεποίησα, which should indicate actual collaboration, not just supplying the odd line or two for Aristophanes to borrow. This is certainly the force it bears at Ar. fr. 596 of Kephisophon collaborating with Euripides on his *melodia* and at *Thesm.* 158 of the *kedestes* helping Agathon with the satyr-plays. Sommerstein explains the verb away as just wild comic exaggeration, typical of the extravagant claims made by the poets about their work, but I wonder about another possibility. Recent studies of Aristophanes' early career, based on close reading of the parabaseis of *Knights, Clouds,* and *Wasps* (esp. 1018-29), have suggested that Aristophanes' early career as a creator of comedy was not composed of the usually accepted two phases, a 'secret' career from 427-424 and his 'open' career commencing with the production of *Knights* at Len. 424. Rather some critics see three phases[36]:

> (1) an 'apprenticeship' in which he suggested comic material to other poets, i.e. *before* 425 (cf. *Wasps* 1018-20 and the stage as ἑρέτην at *Kn.* 542);
> (2) the period of his own plays produced through others (*Daitales, Babylonioi, Acharnians*), 427-427 (cf. *Wasps* 1021-8 and the stage as πρωρατεῦσαι at *Kn.* 543);
> (3) his 'open' period beginning with *Knights* in 424 (cf. *Wasps* 1029ff. and the stage as κυβερνᾶν at *Kn.* 544).

The jury is still out on this matter of Aristophanes' apprenticeship, and MacDowell and Perusino have re-stated the orthodox line for two stages only[37], but a collaboration between the

[35] See Storey 1990: 7, 30. An earlier argument along this line was made by Crusius 1910: 99-101; see also Edmunds 1987b:74.

[36] Halliwell 1980, Mastromarco 1979..

[37] MacDowell 1982b, Perusino 1987b: 37-57. Edmunds 1987b: 70 also sees only two

two young poets is by no means out of the question, especially from 429-7 when Eupolis was just starting his career (and when, incidentally, Eupolis' *Heilotes* probably belongs). At fr. 213 (*Pytine*) ἐν ᾗ (Kratinos) κακῶς λέγει τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ὡς τὰ Εὐπόλιδος λέγοντα (Σ *Kn.* 531 a). Note that this belongs to 423, *before Marikas* and the accusations of plagiarism that arose then, and that this should mean more than just scattered borrowings from Eupolis. Close and known collaboration between the two would certainly explain Kratinos' comment. I wonder also if the description in the anonymous writer on comedy (Koster III) of Aristophanes Ἀριστοφάνης Φιλίππου Ἀθηναίος ... ζήλῳ δὲ Εὐριπίδου, τοῖς δὲ μέλεσι λεπτότερος (36-7) hides an original of Εὐπόλιδος for Εὐριπίδου. The connexion between Aristophanes and Euripides is well-known (see Kratinos fr. 342) and earlier this writer has connected Kratinos to Aeschylus (24), but the rest of the entry on Old Comedy finds vertical relationships within comedy, Kratinos to Krates (26), Krates to Pherekrates (30), the entry on Phrynichos is all but lost, Kratinos on Eupolis (34) with a horizontal connexion to Phrynichos, and then Aristophanes whom one would expect to depend upon Eupolis. If this be accepted, we have further evidence of a close association between the two poets in their early years.

A recent article by E.L. Bowie has important repercussions for the early careers of both poets[38]. He deals with the familiar passages from *Acharnians* where the principal character, Dikaiopolis, twice identifies himself with the comic poet:

> αὐτός τ' ἐμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον
> ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμῳδίαν.
> εἰσελκύσας γάρ μ' ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον κτλ. (377-9)

and

> οὐ γάρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι
> ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω κτλ. (502-3).

Later in the parabasis (626-64) the chorus will pick up this charge against the poet and claim as his defence ὡς κωμῳδήσει τὰ δίκαια (655). Almost all the commentators follow the scholiast's explanation (*ad* v. 377) that the same event lies behind all these passages, i.e. Kleon's reaction to Aristophanes' play *Babylonioi*, produced at Dion. 426. Bowie disagrees and argues that all we may assume from *Ach.* 377ff. is that the main character, as yet unnamed, represents a comic poet who ran afoul of Kleon at the Dionysia of 426. At v. 406 we get the character's name, rather late in the action, argues Bowie, and after this scene which suggests a literary rather than a political context for the name. The important element of the name in Bowie's view is *-polis*; the poet in question was Eupolis, and not Aristophanes. But what about the parabasis where the chorus speaks for the poet? When a chorus speaks for a comedian, it must be referring to its own playwright. In Bowie's view both Eupolis and Aristophanes produced touchy political comedies at Dion. 426 (the latter's was *Babylonioi*; the former's was, Bowie suggests, *Astrateutoi*), and both were attacked by Kleon. Bowie completes his argument by postulating an anti-war theme in Eupolis' early comedies which resembled that of *Acharnians*, in *Prospaltioi* (429), *Taxiarchoi* (429 or 428 - Bowie's date), and *Astrateutoi* (426 - again Bowie's date).

Against Bowie's thesis I would raise the following four points[39]. First, Dikaiopolis is named rather late in the play — in *Clouds*, *Wasps*, *Peace*, and *Ekkl.* the main characters are named in the first 150 lines. But in *Knights* the antagonist of Paphlagon is called *allantopoles* until v. 1257 where his true name is given, Agorakritos, and in *Birds* the audience would consider the main character's name

stages in Aristophanes' early career. The text of this paper was completed before I became aware of Gilula 1989a. Gilula argues that Aristophanes in these lines is describing *four* stages in a naval career, i.e. rower, bowman, *pedaliouchos* (= quartermaster), and captain. Thus an exact tripartite equivalence with *Wasps* 1018-29 is not as likely as it seems. However, this does not negate Halliwell's and Mastromarco's tripartite division of Aristophanes' early careeer at *Wasps* 1018 ff., and *Kn.* 541-4 still shows that Aristophanes thought of his early years as comic poet in more than just two distinct stages.

[38] Bowie 1988.

[39] I am very grateful to Dr L.P.E. Parker for allowing me to see in advance the text of her reply to Bowie (Parker 1991). We agree in our rejection of Bowie's thesis and share certain arguments, e.g. my third point and on the analysis of the parallels between *Prospaltioi* and *Acharnians*.

to be Stilbonides (from the homoerotic fantasy at 139) until the actual name of Peithetairos (or Peisetairos) is given at v. 644. Both instances are considerably later than in *Acharnians.*

Second, the revealing of the name Dikaiopolis is due not to the context of 377ff., but to the comic business of a door-scene. Dikaiopolis has gone to Euripides' house and knocked at the door. If we examine other door-scenes in extant Aristophanes, we see that revealing one's name is part of the expected action. At *Cl.* 134 Strepsiades gives his name at Sokrates' door (name + patronymic + demotic); so too at *Peace* 190 Trygaios gives his at the door of Olympos (name + demotic). On other occasions a false name may be given, e.g. at *Birds* 65, 68 the comic bird-names (Hypodedios, a Libyan bird; Epikechodos, of Phasis) or at *Frogs* 464 Dionysos announces himself as «Herakles the mighty», but the custom remains of giving a name (and ethnic/demotic) at a door-scene. Dikaiopolis gives his name as part of the expected comic business at the door, and not because of the previous scene about the scandal of «last year's comedy».

Third, I find most unlikely Bowie's argument that two comic poets wrote the same sort of play in 426 and then were attacked by Kleon and that the two are referred to in *Acharnians* with no real distinction made between them. If one reads the three passages from the play (366-84, 496-508, 626-64), their similarities are striking and the natural conclusion is that Aristophanes is referring to one play and one incident only. For instance, I would call attention to the stress on the agency of Kleon (377, 502, 659-60), the repeated use of the first person singular (377, 379, 502, 660-1) and of the verb διαβάλλειν (380, 502, 630), the emphasis on the city (372, 503, 631) and on the presence of the *xenoi* (505-6, 634-42), and the insistence that the comedian is on the side of *to dikaion* (373, 500-1 561-2, 655, 661). Bowie is quite correct to assert that our assumptions about what happened at and after the Dionysia of 426 are completely dependent upon the evidence of the scholia, but I feel sure that we are dealing with one poet only and one comedy.

Fourth, I disagree with Bowie's view of Eupolis' early comedies, that they display an anti-war theme of the same sort as *Acharnians. Prospaltioi* may have affinities with *Acharnians* (see below), and the

joke at Aspasia as Helen (fr. 267) does resemble that at *Ach.* 523-37. But *Taxiarchoi,* which treated the theme of Dionysos learning from Phormion the «rules of wars and commanders», in Bowie's view handled Phormion as a *miles gloriosus,* a sort of proto-Lamachos worsted by Dionysos. There is no evidence for such a portrayal in the fragments, and indeed the evidence suggests that Phormion was presented as a gruff military expert and Dionysos as an effeminate and bumbling recruit[40]. A.M. Wilson has found in fr. 268.51-5 the model for the rowing scene in Frogs, where the joke is clearly on Dionysos[41]. If we examine other teaching scenes in Aristophanes (Strepsiades and Sokrates at *Cl.* 627-803, Philokleon and Bdelykleon at *Wasps* 1122-1264, and Dionysos and Charon at *Frogs* 196-208), the joke is always directed at the pupil with the teacher taking what might be regarded as the role of the «straight-man». Thus Dionysos rather than Phormion would be the butt of the humour in *Taxiarchoi,* and the comedy thus not necessarily anti-military at all. The date also of *Taxiarchoi* is by no means secure in the early 420s, although this is where the bulk of critical opinion places it. A minority view puts it c. 415, and on that dating any connexion with the early plays of Aristophanes and with *Babylonioi* in particular is non-existent[42]. On the later dating the comedy could easily be «Dionysos goes to Sicily», hardly an anti-war play.

Astrateutoi is dated by Bowie to Dion. 426, but the evidence for dating the comedy is not firm. There are arguments favouring a date in the late 420s and others for an even later date in the next decade[43]. To fix upon Dion. 426 is not a secure dating. There is also no guarantee that this was an anti-war play. That the play had a chorus of draft-avoiders depicted as women is implied by the alternative title given by the Suda (ε 3657), *Astrateutoi* or *Androgynoi*; the comedy will have taken the same line as the joke directed at Amynias at *Cl.* 687-92. It is quite probable that Eupolis could cast a chorus in a less than favourable light; this certainly appears to be the case in both

[40] In particular see frr. 269-81 and Heath 1990: 156-7.
[41] Wilson 1974.
[42] See Storey 1990: 22-3 nn. 86-7.
[43] See Storey 1990: 15-17.

Kolakes and *Baptai*. The title does not necessarily guarantee an anti-war stance on the part of the poet.

On these grounds then I would reject Bowie's identification of Dikaiopolis with Eupolis and his suggestion of an anti-war play by Eupolis at Dion. 426, and would restate the traditional position that Aristophanes is in *Acharnians* taking the unusual step of identifying himself with the protagonist of his play.

In the final part of my paper I would consider the clear points of contact between Eupolis and Aristophanes and to demonstrate in particular instances where Eupolis seems to be the earlier to handle a theme. The matter of *Knights* and *Marikas* has been considered in detail earlier, where it is clear that Eupolis did take much that was in Aristophanes' play in creating his own demagogue-comedy. Old Comedy was, to be sure, a fluid art-form where common comic ideas were circulated, exchanged, recast for the sake of novelty and variety, and that any one idea or theme was truly new or the sole property of one comedian would be a rare thing indeed. But there are places where Eupolis does appear to have influenced Aristophanes and where he should receive due credit.

I have already argued that *Frogs* recalled themes in *Taxiarchoi*. The use of Dionysos as a principal character is of course the main resemblance, but also the portrayal of him as cowardly, inefficient, and effeminate. At Σ *Peace* 741 b Dionysos is described as *deilos* in Eupolis; this word is used four times of him at *Frogs* 486-500. Dionysos, of course, is a familiar character in Old Comedy. As well as in these two plays, he can be found as an effeminately dressed pleasure-loving god in Kratinos' *Dionysalexandros*, and a wine-loving god in *Babylonioi* (fr. 75) and at Hermippos fr. 77[44]. Wilson's view of the rowing-scene at fr. 268.51-5 as the original of that in *Frogs* has already been noted. Much discussion has surrounded the presence of Phormion in this play. He disappears from the histories of

[44] See the testimony of the fragmentary hypothesis to *Dionysalexandros* (esp. lines 10-12, 16), also frr. 40, 45. Recent discussions of this play are Handley 1982 and Heath 1990: 143-7. Dionysos appears in the titles of plays by Aristophanes (*Dionysos Nauagos* — also attributed to Archippos [*life of Aristophanes* 67]), Aristomenes (*Dionysos asketes*), and Magnes — see Heath 1990: 158 n. 28.

Thucydides in 428, a fact that has led many to a date c.427 for the comedy, but does not disappear from comedy, being a familiar *komodoumenos* until 411[45]. If the later date of c.415 is correct and if Phormion was in fact dead at this time, then either he was resurrected like the *prostatai* in *Demoi*, or perhaps Dionysos went to Hades to consult (or retrieve) him. In that case the resemblance to *Frogs* is even more pronounced.

In *Demoi* the resurrection of the four Athenian *prostatai* for the benefit of the city provides a good parallel for the resurrection of Aeschylus at the end of *Frogs*. It is very probable that the first part of *Demoi* was set in the underworld, although the latter part was clearly set in Athens upon the return of the four[46]. There may be one further connexion between *Demoi* and *Frogs*. Valerius Maximus (7.2.7) states that Aristophanes *in comoedia introduxit remissum ab inferis † Atheniensium Periclen vaticinantem non oportere in urbe nutriri leonem, sin autem sit altus, obsequi ei convenire* — some MSS have *ducem* or *principem* after *Atheniensium*. If we are correct to change Aristophanes to Eupolis — the alternative would be to change Periclen to *Aeschylum*, much less likely in view of the description *ducem* or *principem* and the participle *remissum* which does not suit Aeschylus at *Frogs* 1431 — then the famous reply of Aeschylus at *Frogs* 1431-3 was used by the character of Perikles in Eupolis' earlier play[47]. It is worth noting that Aeschylus' next pronouncement in *Frogs* (1463-5) is a restatement of Perikles' war policy in the early years of the war.

The scene between Aristeides and the sycophant (fr. 99.78-120) does have something in common with the pair of earlier scenes in *Acharnians* (818-35, 910-28), but more closely resembles the later encounter in *Ploutos* (823ff.) between a sycophant and a «just man» (δίκαιος). Aristeides' immortal nickname was ὁ δίκαιος, and Aristeides so describes himself at fr. 99.80 as the adversary of the sycophant.

[45] Phormion is mentioned at Ar. fr. 88 (*Babylonioi*, 426), *Kn.* 562 (424), fr. 397 (*Clouds 1*, 423), *Peace* 347-8 (421), *Lysist.* 804 (411), and Eup. fr. 44 (*Astrateutoi*).

[46] On *Demoi* see Plepelits 1970, Sartori 1975, and Heath 1990: 154-6.

[47] At *Hyp.* II Soph. *O.K.* line 4, the writer makes a similar error in attributing to Aristophanes' *Frogs* the return of generals from the dead.

Eupolis' early comedy *Aiges* belongs in the years 428-422, with the strong probability that it preceded the first production of *Clouds* in 423. The remains of the play show that one character was a teacher (named Prodamos fr. 18); the word used in frr. 17-8, διδάσκαλος, is so used of Sokrates at *Cl.* 871, 1147, 1467. The parallel with *Clouds* is clear. The teacher taught both *grammatike* and *mousike* (fr. 17), the same subjects as in the teaching-scene at *Cl.* 627-99. Another character in the comedy was an *agroikos*. This is implied by the rustic setting and background of frr. 1,3, 13, 15, 19, 22, and 24, and confirmed by fr. 18, part of a commentary that reads σκληρῶς ποιοῦντος *τοῦ ἀγροίκου* τὸ σχῆμα. Fr. 4 καὶ ζῆν μαθόντι μήδε τάγυρι μουσικῆς and fr. 12 ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ αἰπολεῖν σκάπτειν νεᾶν φυτεύειν do seem to fit the character of such a rustic, and we thus have a direct parallel with Strepsiades in *Clouds*. Compare *Cl.* 43-5 and 71-2 where to drive goats is synonymous with rustic life. Fr. 18 makes it plain that the teacher tried to teach the rustic; again the parallel with the teaching-scene in *Clouds* is established. At fr. 11 a character promises ἐγὼ τελῶ τὸν μισθὸν ὄντιν' ἄν χρῇ. One is reminded of *Cl.* 244-6 where Strepsiades promises Sokrates:

> ἀλλά με δίδαξον τὸν ἕτερον τοῖν σοῖν λόγοιν
> τὸν μηδὲν ἀποδιδόντα. μισθὸν δ' ὄντιν' ἄν
> πράττῃ μ' ὀμοῦμαί σοι καταθήσειν τοὺς θεούς.

It is a reasonable conclusion that fr. 11 shows the *agroikos* soliciting the services of the teacher. One small point worth noting is the mention in fr. 21 of a νεόκοπον κάρδοπον recalling the infamous *kardopos* of *Cl.* 669-80. Although Aristophanes may have cast his *Clouds* rather differently from Eupolis' *Aiges*, the points cited above do show that *Clouds* had more than a little in common with Eupolis' earlier play and that Aristophanes was very probably using themes that Eupolis had used before.

I have argued elsewhere that the commonly accepted date for *Chrysoun Genos* (Dion. 424) is not as secure as is assumed[48]. The reference to Kleon and the cities (fr. 316) could be as early as 427/6, and the resemblance between fr. 308 ἀριθμεῖν θεατὰς ψαμμακοσίους

[48] See Storey 1990: 17-18.

and *Ach.* 3 ψαμμακοσιογάργαρα suggests that Aristophanes is improving upon a Eupolidean original and that *Chrysoun Genos* thus belongs before Len. 425. A victory for Eupolis at Len. 427 or 426 can be deduced from *IG* ii² 2325. 124-6; if *Chrysoun Genos* were that play, it would demonstrate a play with a political theme akin to that in *Acharnians* and *Knights* before those plays by Aristophanes[49].

Finally there is *Prospaltioi*, very likely Eupolis' first comedy in 429. This comedy would thus antedate Aristophanes' own debut in 427, and if hints or echoes of Aristophanes can be found in the fragments, it would shed interesting light on our inquiry. Bowie lists six possible parallels between *Prospaltioi* and *Acharnians*. Of these his first is quite convincing, the use of a chorus of Attic demesmen, *Prospaltioi* being to *Acharnians* «the only previous comedy, so far as we know, with a chorus of demesmen»[50]. His other points are less convincing. The mention of Bellerophon at fr. 259.126 is to Euripides' recent play, *Stheneboia*, while that at *Ach.* 427-8 is to the lost *Bellerophon*. The «Thracian lady» of fr. 262 is the mother of someone made fun of for *xenia* (compare the joke at Kleophon at Platon fr. 61), while the Thratta of *Ach.* 273 is a household slave. I have never been convinced that fr. 260, and in particular v. 17 ἵνα μὴ καθῆσθαι φῶσ', is intended to reflect popular disapproval of Perikles' conduct of the war in its early stages[51], and even if it did, it hardly squares with Bowie's thesis of an anti-war theme in Eupolis. *Ach.* 524ff. attacks Perikles for starting the war in the first place, while on this view of *Prospaltioi* Eupolis is criticizing his lukewarm conduct of the war. To Bowie's parallels I would add fr. 267 where Aspasia is called «Helen»; *Ach.* 526ff. shows how the theme of Aspasia as «Bringer of War» could be used. Also in the Suda is the statement (δ 1515) that ἐκωμῳδοῦντο ... Θυμοιτάδαι καὶ Προσπάλτιοι ὡς δικαστικοί.

[49] A political theme for *Chrysoun Genos* is often assumed (e.g. by Whittaker 1935: 189, Schmid 1946: 116), but apart from fr. 316 the fragments are rather non-political, and the play could just be another of the «Golden Age» comedies, well documented in Old Comedy.

[50] Bowie 1988: 185.

[51] For this view of *Prospaltioi* see Goossens 1935, who is followed to varying lengths by Schmid 1946: 114, Schwarze 1971: 115-24, and Luppe 1975: 200-1. For a useful corrective to Goossens see the comments of Page 1941:219.

K-A connect this with the dicastic theme of *Wasps* but there is in *Acharnians* also a strong dicastic theme, principally at 370-6 where the picture of the litigious old men may owe something to the depiction of the Prospaltioi, in the parabasis (esp. 655-718), 845-7 (of Hyperbolos), and the scenes with the sycophant and Nikarchos (818-35, 910-28). It is entirely possible that this theme in *Acharnians* was taken from a similar one in Eupolis' earlier play.

Bowie concludes that «in *Acharnians* Aristophanes had at least half an eye on *Prospaltioi*». I agree, but would not limit Aristophanes' use of Eupolis to just that early play. I have shown that in several instances comic themes in Aristophanes can be found in earlier plays by Eupolis, and I have argued for a close collaboration between the two, especially in the first years of their comic career. The 'feud' and alleged ill-feeling which many earlier critics have assumed as fact I see as part of the fun-and-games of the festival and not evidence of any real hostility, apart from the natural rivalry of the comic theatre[52]. Aristophanes may have done it better and earned the accolades of posterity, but on some occasions I am convinced that Eupolis did it first.

[52] On the 'collaboration' and 'feud' between the poets see Starkie 1897: 115-6, Rogers 1910: xxxix-xlii, Norwood 1931: 200, 210-1, and Murray 1933:56, 66-8. Starkie and Murray in particular, read far more into the implications of the association and its rupture than the evidence would warrant. A good modern parallel might be the Hope-Crosby 'feud' of cinema and comedy of the 1940s and later years.

Niall W. Slater
(Atlanta)

Space, character, and ἀπατη: transformation and transvaluation in the *Acharnians*

In the beginning, as Peter Brook has taught us, there is only an empty space. No matter how many props we pile into that space, it is not a theatre until an actor appears — and even then, until the actor engages the audience, it is still only a space. It is the speaking voice, the moving body of the actor which creates the theatre around him and defines the space, even as he begins the action. That space, once created, becomes the realm of manifold transactions, where representations or symbols from outside the theatrical space can be played with and transvalued. Three interlocking spatial themes demand our attention in the *Acharnians:* first, how theatrical space is created and transformed within the play; second, what equivalencies or areas of exchange Aristophanes sets up between the theatrical space and other public spaces in Athens; and third, how Aristophanes uses the fluidity of both character and space in this play to meditate upon the dangers and the potentials of the process of representation.

The *Acharnians* begins with a voice speaking into an empty, open-air space on a riverbank or a hillside[1] in Athens in the winter of 425 BC. The voice, we will subsequently learn, emerges from a mask and a body which portray an old farmer. When, however, we ask how the actor moves within the theatrical space even as he generates it, we may seem to grasp for ghosts. From texts without melodies, from a few battered stones and a highly dubious wall in the Theatre of Dionysos, we must, as best we can, recover that space.

[1] *Acharnians* was Lenaean. See Slater 1986 on theatre location.

TRAGEDY, COMEDY AND THE POLIS

Papers from the Greek Drama Conference

Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990

edited by
ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN
STEPHEN HALLIWELL
JEFFREY HENDERSON
BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEVANTE EDITORI - BARI

Cover picture:
Paestan bell-crater. Museo Provinciale, Salerno.