NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES' *KNIGHTS*

(1) I do not think it is possible to show beyond reasonable doubt that the two slaves who open the play either must have been, or cannot have been, visually identifiable by portrait-masks or otherwise[1] as Demosthenes and Nikias. I wish however to point out a piece of evidence that appears to have gone unnoticed.

In general, Aristophanic slaves share with other characters in the comedies a great liking for wine. It is, in fact, decidedly deviant for anyone to be averse to wine – a mark of such people as the pupils of Socrates (*Clouds* 417) or Philokleon before his conversion is complete (*Wasps* 1253). For slaves' fondness for drink see *Wasps* 9–10; *Lys.* 426–7; *Ekkl.* 1112–24. Of the two suffering slaves in *Knights*, the one who in 54 ff. speaks in the person of Demosthenes[2] has normal tastes in this respect: between 107 and 124, while waiting for and then reading Paphlagon's secret oracle, he drinks at least four cups. Similarly Paphlagon himself, who at 104 is reported to have drunk himself to sleep. The other slave – the one traditionally labelled Nikias – is quite different. Not once but twice (87–8, 97) he warns darkly of the dangers of heavy drinking; and, though it is he who runs the risks of stealing the wine of which his companion partakes so freely, he himself apparently does not drink at all. The first slave tauntingly calls him *κρουνοχυτρολῃραῖον* (89): whatever its precise meaning, in context this certainly implies that he is a water-drinker. It is hard to see what the point of all this is – it does not advance the plot, it is not particularly funny, and the first slave's praise of wine as a sharpener of the intellect is hardly consistent with its effect upon Paphlagon – unless it is intended to help the audience identify the second slave with some public figure who had the reputation of a water-drinker and/or, if they have already made the identification, to poke fun at this public figure.

Now there may have been any number of political rivals of Kleon who it was said did not drink wine (cf. *Knights* 349); but only for one person have we information that enables us to see how such a reputation could have arisen. Nikias was a markedly unsociable man (Plut. *Nik.* 5). He neither dined out nor entertained friends, and took pains to project the image of an ascetic devoted to public duties. His avoidance of symposia makes it likely in any case that he did

[1] Cf. K. J. Dover, 'Portrait-masks in Aristophanes', in H. J. Newiger, ed., *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie* (Darmstadt, 1975), pp. 155–69 (originally published in *Κωμῳδοτραγήματα, Studia Aristophanea . . . W. J. W. Koster in honorem*, Amsterdam, 1967). In addition to the possibilities there mentioned, it might sometimes be possible to use a man's carriage and gait as aids to his identification (Nikias' walk, it seems, was thought to betray a lack of self-confidence: Phrynichos fr. 59 – contrast Socrates, *Clouds* 362 and Pl. *Symp.* 221 b); cf. John Woodcock, *The Times*, 23 June 1978, on helmets in cricket: 'Twice yesterday it was necessary to know a batsman by his walk, or some other mannerism, to distinguish him from an equally faceless partner.' See further L. M. Stone, *Costume in Aristophanic Comedy* (Diss. N. Carolina: Ann Arbor, 1977), pp. 40–1.

[2] This assumes that the speaker of 85–6 is the same as the speaker of 47–72 and 74–9, as is probable. I think it certain that 80^a and 80^b–81 belong to different speakers (otherwise there is no justification for ἀλλά); if so, the speaker of 80^b–81 must be the speaker of 74–9. Lines 82–4 can and probably should all be given to one speaker ('Nikias'): he racks his brains for an answer and eventually comes up with one, like Strepsiades in *Clouds* 79–80 and Philokleon in *Wasps* 166–7 (both with repeated πῶς as here).

not drink much, and besides was so abnormal for an Athenian of his class that it may well have given him the reputation of being a total or almost total abstainer, just as the poet Agathon's habit of shaving (*Thesm.* 218) led to suspicions of sexual abnormality.

I suggest that *Knights* 85 ff. provides definite evidence that the non-drinking slave is meant, and was understood by the audience, to represent Nikias.

(2) ὁ δ' Ἱπποδάμου λείβεται θεώμενος. 327

Ἀρχεπτολέμου δὲ φέροντος 794
τὴν εἰρήνην ἐξεσκέδασας.

It has generally been supposed that these two passages refer to one and the same person, Archeptolemos of Agryle, son of Hippodamos the Milesian town-planner who became one of the leaders of the Four Hundred and was executed after they fell from power ([Plut.] *Lives of the Ten Orators* 834a). The identification has been doubted,[3] but is confirmed by the following considerations:

(i) The scholion on *Knights* 327 takes it for granted that the Hippodamos in question is the Milesian and that his son's name is Archeptolemos. Since he does not think it necessary to give any information about Archeptolemos except his name, he must be meaning to refer to the only well-known Archeptolemos of this period.

(ii) More important is the fact that while Archeptolemos is an attested Athenian name,[4] Hippodamos is not. It follows that if the father of Archeptolemos the oligarch was not Hippodamos the Milesian, he must have been another foreigner of the same name, who, or whose son, also performed such signal services for Athens that he was made a citizen. This may be thought unlikely; but if it is rejected, the inference is inescapable that the son of Hippodamos in *Knights* 327 – a man well known to the Athenian public, since his own name does not need to be given – must be either Archeptolemos the future oligarch or an otherwise unknown brother of his, probably the former since if there were two sons of Hippodamos in public life the bare patronymic would be ambiguous. And then we must take 794 also to refer to the same man, unless we are prepared to suppose that there was someone else with the same rather rare name who was also in the public eye and an opponent of Kleon.

It is true that schol. *Knights* 794 (whose author seems never to have heard of Archeptolemos of Agryle) treats the use of the name there as purely symbolic – 'even Mr Makewar was offering peace, but you wouldn't accept it'; but his reason for resorting to this hypothesis is that, misled by ἔτος ὄγδοον (793), he has confused the Spartan peace-offer of 425 with the one-year truce of 423,[5] with which there is no reason to believe that Archeptolemos had anything to do. No doubt Archeptolemos' name was partly responsible for Aristophanes' choosing to mention him here rather than some other advocate of peace, just as

[3] A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* iii. 732. He refers to Diels, but the only pronouncement by Diels that I can find (*Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* 39 A 4), while rejecting (without giving any reason) the identification of the Hippodamos of *Knights* 327 with the Milesian town-planner, says nothing about Archeptolemos.

[4] *IG* ii². 1700. 203; *AE* 1914, 10 = *REG* 32 (1919), 190; *Athenian Agora* XV. 61. 94 (= *SEG* xxiii 86. 220) and 72. 194. The name was also restored by Lewis (*ABSA* 49 (1954), 38 in the prescript of *IG* ii². 190.

[5] Probably fixing on the words ὄγδοον ἔτος in Thuc. 4. 116. 2, and not remembering that the truce, recorded in the next sentence, must therefore belong to the *ninth* year of the war.

Lamachos' name condemned him to be singled out with monotonous regularity as the arch-warmonger; but there is no reason to reject the plain statement that at some time, probably in 425, Archeptolemos had commended Spartan proposals for peace to the Athenian people.[6]

Knights 327 and 794 are the only references to Archeptolemos in comedy of which we know; in one the tone is of compassion, in the other of approbation. Archeptolemos the pro-Spartan and future oligarch is thus to be added to that select list of living politicians whom, far from satirizing, Aristophanes sympathizes with, and whose setbacks, far from predicting or gloating over, he regrets – a list, as De ste. Croix has pointed out,[7] composed almost entirely of opponents of those leaders who relied mainly on the support of the poor. To this generalization there are two possible exceptions, one from near the beginning of Aristophanes' career, one from near the end. The first is Demosthenes, who in *Knights* is repeatedly given the credit for the victory of Pylos. Demosthenes' political views are not directly known, but his connections with the Messenians and with revolutionary elements in Boiotia[8] suggest that he was a strong democrat; nor does Thucydides, who knew and evidently admired him, give any hint that he was ever jealous of or hostile to Kleon. Probably he had little interest in internal Athenian politics, and his exact political sympathies will have been of less interest to Aristophanes than his usefulness as a stick with which to beat Kleon.[9] In the other case, that of Thrasyboulos, it is not clear that Aristophanes ever refers favourably to him in his lifetime: the references in *Ekklesiazousai* (202 f., 356) are hard to understand but at least one of them seems to be critical,[10] while by the time *Wealth* was produced Thrasyboulos was probably dead.[11]

[6] I do not know why Gomme (on Thuc. 4. 41.4) thinks φέροντος τὴν εἰρήνην must mean Archeptolemos had been to Sparta; it need mean no more than that he came before the people with peace metaphorically in his hands, perhaps after private discussions with Spartan ambassadors. Both here and in the afterthought cited in n. 3 Gomme seems unduly under the influence of his notion that 'Aristophanes was not particularly pacific when he wrote *The Knights*' – a claim hard to square with 792–809 and above all 1388–95 where Demos is given a peace-treaty (very attractively personified) as the supreme blessing.

[7] *Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1972), pp. 361–2, 367. It does not appear that the same could be said of the other Old Comedians, though two of them make friendly references to Nikias (Telekleides fr. 41, Eupolis fr. 181); for we also find Hermippos (fr. 46) calling Kleon 'a blazing spirit' (αἰθωνι) in contrast with the allegedly cowardly Perikles, and later Eupolis (fr. 98 Kock = 114 Edmonds) giving his hero a complimentary remark about Perikles the younger. I can find no other favourable reference to a living politician in the Old Comic fragments, unless we count Phormion in Eupolis' *Taxiarchs* (if he was alive when it was produced).

[8] See Thuc. 3. 94.3; 95.1; 107–8; 4. 3.3; 76; 7. 31.2.

[9] It has not been unknown since for political groups to exploit the popularity of celebrated generals without much regard for the political views, if any, of those generals themselves.

[10] *Ekkl.* 202 f. is correctly interpreted by R. Seager, *JHS* 87 (1967), 107: 'there had been a glimpse of safety, but . . . Thrasybulus had in some way opposed it or brought it to nothing.' Discussing the corrupt text of the passage in a footnote, Seager, rightly seeking 'some explanation of why σωτηρία was not achieved', rejects Hermann's easy conjecture ὀργίζεται (ορειζεται R, ὀρίζεται cett.) as not providing this; but surely it does. Peace had been in prospect, but Thrasyboulos was annoyed at being in political eclipse; therefore, seeing 'the chance to recover the ascendancy, . . . he intervened decisively in favour of continuing the war' (Seager, loc. cit)

[11] His death is now generally placed in 389; G. L. Cawkwell, *CQ* N.S. 26 (1976), 271–5, has argued for a date a year earlier. At any rate to place his death in 388, and hence his last expedition in 389 (G. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* iii^2. 2. 224), leaves far too long a period of Athenian inactivity after the failure of the attempts at peace in

(3) Αλ. ὁτιὴ λέγειν οἷός τε κἀγὼ καὶ καρυκκοποιεῖν. 343

The verb *καρυκκοποιεῖν*, which means 'to make blood-sauce', is taken here by some commentators in its literal sense, which is improbable since though the Sausage-seller was a literal *καρυκκοποιός*, Paphlagon–Kleon was not; by others, with the scholia,[12] it is taken to mean 'to garnish a speech'. An alternative rendering, more in keeping with the imagery of the play, is suggested by two entries in Hesychios:[13] *καρυκάζειν · ταράττειν* and *καρυκείαις · μαγειρεύμασιν, ἀρτύμασι, ταραχαῖς*. What the Sausage-seller is as good at doing as Paphlagon is 'stirring things up', 'agitation', a notion found repeatedly in *Knights* in connection with the art of the demagogue (214, 247, 307 ff., 358, 363, 431, 692, 840, 864 ff., 984).

(4) *τὸν Οὐλιών τ' ἂν οἶομαι, γέροντα πυροπίπην,* 407
ἠσθέντ' ἰηπαιωνίσαι καὶ Βακχέβακχον ᾄσαι.

Οὐλιών Raubitschek: Οὐλίου Bothe, Coulon: Ἰουλίου codd. (ἰου- in ras.Θ), Suda.

πυρο- RAΓ[1] recc. Suda: πυρρο- VEΓ[3]ΘM: πυρο- and παιδο- scholia.

It may perhaps now be considered settled[14] that the subject of these lines is Oulios son of Kimon (for a son of Oulios would not have been *γέρων* in 425/4); and the passage proves that at this time he was under some kind of threat from Kleon. With the help of the scholion which says that *πυροπίπην* 'wheat-snooper' means *τὸν φύλακα τοῦ σίτου*, we can make a reasonable guess at the nature of that threat.

It is well known what importance the Athenians attached to the corn trade. Corn was the only commodity for which there was a special board of supervisors, the sitophylakes,[15] and on more than one occasion members of this board were sentenced to death[16] for failing in their duty, which was, in the public's view, to keep the price of corn low. During the Archidamian war, Kleon and other politicians concerned themselves much with the corn supply, several times promising, and at least once actually providing, a free distribution (*Knights* 1100–3, *Wasps* 715–18). It would thus not be surprising to find Kleon threatening to prosecute the sitophylakes for allegedly letting prices rise, or remain, too high. It is not clear whether the attack was directed against Oulios alone or against the whole board; in the latter case the fact that Oulios alone is mentioned would presumably be due to his being its best known member.

There is nothing to be said in favour of the variant reading *πυρροπίπην*. No other example is to be found before Eustathios of a *-πίπης* compound whose first

392/1. On *Wealth* 550 see Seager, op. cit. 109 n. 127: the line implies that in 388 some Athenians still believed that Dionysios of Syracuse could be detached from the Spartan side (as Konon had tried to do a few years before: Lys. 19. 19–20) and equated him in some way with Thrasyboulos (perhaps by calling both 'liberators', Dionysios having freed the Sicilian Greeks from Carthage).

[12] *κοσμεῖν ποικιλίᾳ τινὶ ῥημάτων τὸν λόγον· πλαγίως δὲ τῇ λέξει ὡς μάγειρος ἐχρήσατο.*

[13] κ 912 and 917 Latte.

[14] See A. E. Raubitschek, *RE* 18 (1942), col. 1999; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 BC.* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 306–7. But it remains theoretically possible that Οὐλίου is right, referring to the son of an unknown Οὐλίας, for which name cf. *IG* ii[2]. 1602. 17 and *Athenian Agora* XV. 49. 7.

[15] Lys. 22. 16, confirmed by Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 51.

[16] Lys. 22. 16.

element is an adjective; and there is very little sign[17] that Greek pederasts, or any of them, were especially attracted to boys with red hair (who in the fifth century would normally be slaves[18]). One version of the scholia on the line derives from a commentator who had *παιδοπίπην* in his text;[19] this is therefore an ancient reading, but *πυροπίπην* is to be preferred because it gives the reason why Oulios is in danger.[20]

(5) On being given a cushion by the Sausage-seller, Demos praises his public spirit and asks whether he is 'a descendant of that house of Harmodios' (786). It is interesting that Kleon appears[21] to have been connected by marriage with this family; did he perhaps exploit to his own greater glory this rather tenuous connection with the tyrannicide,[22] so that Demos now expects that anyone else aspiring to be his benefactor will lay claim to a similar connection?

(6) σὺ Θεμιστοκλεῖ ἀντιφερίζεις;
ὃς ἐποίησεν τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν μεστήν, εὑρὼν ἐπιχειλῆ. 814

The scholia are certain that 814 alludes to the rebuilding of the city's fortifications after the Persian War, but they do not succeed in explaining how the language of the line can bear this interpretation. One version renders *ἐπιχειλῆ* – correctly, it would seem – as *τὸ μὴ πλῆρες ἀλλ' ἀπομεσούμενον*, but does not then explain how surrounding a city with a wall can be called 'finding it half full and filling it to the brim'; the other unblushingly claims that *ἐπιχειλής* means 'without a rim'. Subsequent scholarship, when it has not altered the text under a misapprehension of the meaning of *ἐπιχειλῆ*, has been content[23] to take the line as referring to the material prosperity which later generations supposed Athens to have had in Themistokles' time (comparing Telekleides fr. 22). This prosperity does indeed seem to be (along with the creation of the Peiraeus port) the subject of lines 815–16; but those lines are not an explanation of what went before, but an additional point (*πρὸς τούτοις* 815), and one may suspect 814 of bearing some more specific meaning.

There is, in fact, an event we know of in Themistokles' career that would fit the allusion. At one time he held the office of controller of water-supplies (*ὑδάτων ἐπιστάτης*) (Plut. *Them.* 31. 1); and in that capacity he had certain persons prosecuted and heavily fined for diverting public watercourses. With the proceeds of the fines he dedicated a statue of a maiden carrying water, which the

[17] There does not seem to have been any single 'ideal' hair-colour for *ἐρώμενοι*: see K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London, 1978), p. 79.

[18] Cf. *Frogs* 730 and the New Comedy slave-name Pyrrhias.

[19] So rightly Casaubon (cf. D. M. Jones's note in his edition of the scholia, ad loc.).

[20] *πυροπίπης* and *παιδοπίπης* are both very rare words. The former is cited by the scholia on our passage as used by Kratinos (fr. 340) in reference to the same man – presumably therefore in the same year, and probably at the same festival in his *Satyrs*; this suggests that the word was not a new coinage by either poet but a current popular name for a sitophylax. The only attestation of *παιδοπίπης* is at Ath. 13. 563 e, where it directly follows a quotation from the choliambic poet Hermeias and may itself be derived from the unquoted part of his poem against the Stoics.

[21] See Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, pp. 320, 472 ff.

[22] Cf. perhaps *Wasps* 1224–6.

[23] This is the view of Van Leeuwen in his edition (but, following Willems, he gives *ἐπιχειλῆ* a wrong meaning) and of B. Keil (*Hermes* 50 (1916), 314 f.) who regards lines 814–16 as essentially three ways of saying the same thing – that Athens was already prosperous and Themistokles made her even more so.

Persians afterwards carried away. The dedication of the statue indicates that Themistokles at any rate thought he had performed an important public service which deserved to be remembered; and remembered it evidently was, down to the date of Plutarch's source. Until Themistokles acted, the city was being deprived of water which rightfully belonged to it; its cup, one might well say, was only half full. He saw to it that the city received full measure.

If it is to this that the Sausage-seller is alluding, the reference is highly appropriate because of the strong contrast between what Themistokles did and what Kleon does (or is alleged to do). The restoration of the watercourses was a genuine public service, which benefited the whole people and harmed only the guilty; Kleon, it is constantly reiterated, while loudly proclaiming his devotion to the people's interests, has given them no real benefit, and makes a practice of persecuting the innocent (63–70, 259–65, 774–6). Nor would Kleon have used the money from the prosecutions to dedicate a statue: he and his cronies would have pocketed it. Aristophanes does not choose to make the Sausage-seller bring out these points explicitly here; he contented himself with reminding the audience of the story of Themistokles and the watercourses, from which they could draw their own conclusions.

(7)
ἔπειτ' ἀναγ-
κάζω πάλιν ἐξεμεῖν
ἅττ' ἂν κεκλόφωσί μου,
κημὸν καταμηλῶν. 1150

The last phrase has generally been understood to mean 'using the funnel <of the voting-urn> as a probe <to induce vomiting>'; but while this fits excellently into the metaphorical context, it does not give good literal sense. The doctor wishing to make his patient vomit thrusts a probe into the patient's throat. But the juror when he votes does not thrust the funnel of the urn into anything; rather he thrusts his hand into the funnel. Furthermore, as Neil pointed out, μηλόω and its compounds take an accusative, not of the probing instrument, but of the cavity probed (cf. Ar. fr. 614 *τὴν φάρυγα μηλῶν*). I take it therefore that the passage is to be explained by regarding *κημὸν* as a surprise substitute for some such word as *λαιμόν*.[24] The politician is made to 'cough up' his ill-gotten gains, not by the doctor's probe in the depths of his throat, but by the juror's hand in the depths of the voting-funnel, with the pebble of condemnation in it.

(8)
ἐγὼ δέ τ' ἐστεφάνιξα κἀδωρησάμαν. 1225

τ' Elmsley: τυ vel τοι codd.

It is certain that this line is a quotation of some kind; but the only direct evidence for its source is a scholion which says 'he imitates the Helots, when they crown Poseidon'. It has sometimes been suggested that the words are taken from an actual Helot ritual; but it is hard to see what kind of real-life ritual can have included these words, which evidently reproach the god, as Demos is reproaching Paphlagon, for his ingratitude. Nor is there any need to assume anything so far-fetched. The words surely came, and the scholiast surely means that they came, from a play called *Helots*.[25] He does not give the author's name, as he normally

[24] It is of interest that when the scholiast is describing medical throat-probing in his note on this line, λαιμός is the word that he uses for 'throat'.

[25] This was seen by K. O. Müller (*RhM* 3 (1829), 488–90), who however took the

would, because in the view of the scholar on whose commentary he is here drawing, *Helots* was an anonymous play. There were two schools of thought about this comedy[26] in later antiquity. Some held that it was by Eupolis, some that the author was unknown; Athenaios, no doubt following different authorities in different places, cites it in both ways.[27]

It follows that, since editors of the comic fragments customarily include *Helots* among the plays of Eupolis, *Knights* 1225 deserves recognition as a Eupolidean fragment. But that is by no means the whole of the information we can derive from this unassuming little line; for it also both furnishes virtual proof that the comedy *Helots* was in fact the work of Eupolis, and enables us to trace the origin of the myth that Eupolis had a share in the composition of *Knights*.

Pohlenz and Colonna[28] have shown that the ancient statements[29] claiming to see the hand of Eupolis in the second parabasis of *Knights* (1264–1315) are no more than conjectures based on a coincidence of phrase between *Knights* 1288 and a similarly placed line in the parabasis of Eupolis' *Demes* (*CGF* 92. 33 Austin). Nor were these conjectures particularly intelligent, since even if the coincidence were more striking than it is, the more obvious way to account for it would be by the assumption that Eupolis, writing twelve years later, was imitating *Knights*. Why then were such far-fetched conjectures made at all? Evidently in an attempt to explain Eupolis fr. 78.

Aristophanes, in the revised parabasis of *Clouds* (553–4), had accused Eupolis of plagiarizing *Knights* in his comedy *Marikas*, produced in 421. To this charge Eupolis in *Baptai* retorted as follows:

κἀκείνους[30] τοὺς Ἱππέας
συνεποίησα τῷ φαλακρῷ < >[31] κἀδωρησάμην.

Here the last word tells the whole story: for it is the same as the last word of *Knights* 1225 and of the line of *Helots*.[32] Eupolis is not claiming to have collaborated in the composition of *Knights*: he is answering Aristophanes' charge of plagiarism with a *tu quoque*.[33] Nor was this the first time Aristophanes had been

play in question to be the satyr-play *The Helots on Tainaron* supposed to be vouched for by Herodian (1. 244. 21 Lentz); he does mention the *Helots* ascribed to Eupolis, but does not pretend to understand how, if at all, it was related to the satyr-play. Actually there never was any such satyr-play; Herodian is simply making a statement about the chorus of Sophocles' play *Satyrs at Tainaron*. On this see S. L. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* iv. 186–7, 231.

[26] I take it as certain that there was only one comedy called *Helots* that survived into Hellenistic times; nowhere is there any sign that anyone knew of two, and fragments (e.g. Eupolis fr. 139) are cited simply as by 'the author of *Helots*', which would be ambiguous if there were two plays.

[27] Athen. 4. 138 e; 9. 400 c; 14. 638 e.

[28] M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* 47 (1912), 314–17 and *NGG* 1952, 5. 120–1; A. Colonna, *Dioniso* 15 (1952), 32–7.

[29] Σ^{E} *Clouds* 554 (which is also our source for Eupolis fr. 78) and τινες ap. $\Sigma^{VE\Gamma^{3}}$ *Knights* 1291.

[30] Hermann: κἀκεῖνος E: κἀκείνῳ Koster.

[31] τούτῳ suppl. Hermann, προῖκα Koster.

[32] Eupolis in *Baptai* quite possibly wrote the semi-Doric form κἀδωρησάμαν as in the other two places: note that this form nearly vanished from the manuscript tradition of *Knights*, being preserved (or more probably restored) only in M.

[33] Professor G. Mastromarco very kindly communicated to me before publication his paper 'L'esordio "segreto" di Aristofane' (*Quaderni di Storia* 10 (1979), 153–196) in which he points out that Eupolis' verb συνεποίησα ought strictly to mean more than this. One must expect, however, that the accusations made by comic poets (especially against each other) will be wildly exaggerated.

so accused: in 423, the year following the production of *Knights*, Aristophanes had been criticized by Kratinos (fr. 200, from *Pytine*) for 'using the words of Eupolis'. It may well seem odd that Aristophanes' two rivals should make such a fuss over a single line; but Aristophanes himself (*Clouds* 558–9) can wax indignant over the borrowing of one simile (and inflate the alleged offence by using the plural τὰς εἰκούς).

We have, then, the evidence both of Kratinos and of Eupolis himself for the authenticity of Eupolis' *Helots*; and the storm over Eupolis' 'collaboration' in *Knights* turns out to have been in a very small teacup indeed, but to have been genuine for all that. It was centuries later that a scholar who had lost sight of the connection between the *Baptai* fragment and *Knights* 1225 (and who perhaps believed *Helots* was not by Eupolis) cast about through *Knights* for a portion of the play in which the hand of Eupolis might be discerned, was reminded by *Knights* 1288 of a similar passage in what was probably Eupolis' best-known work,[34] and stated as a fact that Eupolis had written the second parabasis of Aristophanes' play.

(9) κυλίνδετ' εἴσω τόνδε τὸν δυσδαίμονα. 1249

It is widely believed that there is here a reference to the use of the *ekkyklema*; but those who take this view seem generally to hold[35] that the allusion is purely jocular: the *ekkyklema*, it is supposed, was used in the scene of Euripides' *Bellerophontes* which is here parodied, and so where the speaker in the tragedy had said κομίζετ' εἴσω Aristophanes substitutes κυλίνδετ', the word which to the comic mind the speaker ought to have used.

C. W. Dearden, however,[36] has made out a strong case for the view that Paphlagon is actually in this scene removed from the acting area by means of the *ekkyklema*. It would certainly be odd for him to cry 'roll me in' and then to find his orders to the stage personnel ignored and be left to walk off. It is far simpler to suppose that his instructions, like other similar instructions,[37] are obeyed. Probably he collapses on the wheeled platform which is then withdrawn, just as the Euripidean Alkestis fell on her bed after addressing to it the words which are parodied in Paphlagon's last utterance (*Alk.* 177–82 ~ *Knights* 1250–2).[38]

If, though, this is the occasion for the withdrawal of the *ekkyklema*, when was it originally brought out? Dearden, reviving an old proposal of Ribbeck, suggests that it was brought out after 751 and represented the Pnyx. To this though there are several objections.

(i) It becomes necessary to discount the instruction εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν in 751; Dearden calls this 'a ritual cry with no reference to the staging', but its plain meaning is that in order to go to the Pnyx the characters have to advance

[34] It is significant that except for the eleven Aristophanic comedies that survived into the Middle Ages, *Demes* is the only Old Comedy of which we know that copies continued to be made after A.D. 300.

[35] Cf. Van Leeuwen's note: 'Verbo κυλίνδειν iocose nobis in mentem revocatur tragicorum recens inventum ἐκκύκλημα.' Much less plausible is the view that κυλίνδετ' was what Euripides wrote (Merry, Rogers) or that the use of the word has no special point at all (Neil).

[36] *The Stage of Aristophanes* (London, 1976), pp. 70–1.

[37] *Ach.* 479, *Thesm.* 265; I would add *Ach.* 1096 (see *CQ* N.S. 28 (1978), 385–90). Later, Men. *Dysk.* 758.

[38] A difference, of course, is that in *Alkestis* the event is merely reported, while in *Knights* it takes place on stage.

towards the audience, i.e. into the orchestra. Dearden's objection that 'a seat for Demus is required by 785 and 1153' is not valid, for it is evident from 783–5 that Demos is sitting very uncomfortably on the ground until the Sausage-seller provides him with a cushion.

(ii) If the action in 756–1249 takes place on the *ekkyklema*, i.e. directly adjacent to the *skene* door, there will be great difficulties in production. The limited space available on the platform will become hopelessly cluttered with the numerous properties brought out of the *skene* by Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller; and their race for the door (1158–61) will be absurd, since the distance can hardly be more than a yard or so.

(iii) To stage the contest on the *ekkyklema*, which emerges from the *skene*, which as recently as 729 has represented Demos' house, will tend to confuse rather than enlighten the audience as to the place where they are to imagine the debate as occurring – more particularly since the *ekkyklema* was especially associated with the revelation of *interior* scenes. We are better advised to take our cue from the contrast drawn in 752–5 between Demos' mentality *οἶκοι* and *ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς πέτρας*, and to place the debate well away from the house – that is, once again, in the orchestra.

But if the *ekkyklema* is not rolled out at 751, the only other plausible moment for rolling it out is precisely the moment at which Paphlagon calls for it. In that case, it must come out empty. It would seem that the process of rolling it out takes about half a minute; it is covered by lines 1250–2, after which Paphlagon collapses on the platform. For the rolling out of the *ekkyklema* with no actor on it, cf. *Thesm.* 277.[39]

(10)

Αλ. *τὸν Δῆμον ἀφεψήσας ὑμῖν καλὸν ἐξ αἰσχροῦ πεποίηκα.* 1321
Χο. *καὶ ποῦ 'στιν νῦν, ὦ θαυμαστὰς ἐξευρίσκων ἐπινοίας;*
Αλ. *ἐν ταῖσιν ἰοστεφάνοις οἰκεῖ ταῖς ἀρχαίαισιν Ἀθήναις.*
Χο. *πῶς ἂν ἴδοιμεν; ποίαν τιν' ἔχει σκευήν; ποῖος γεγένηται;*
Αλ. *οἷός περ Ἀριστείδη πρότερον καὶ Μιλτιάδη ξυνεσίτει.* 1325
ὄψεσθε δέ· καὶ γὰρ ἀνοιγνυμένων ψόφος ἤδη τῶν προπυλαίων.
ἀλλ' ὀλολύξατε φαινομέναισιν ταῖς ἀρχαίαισιν Ἀθήναις
ταῖς θαυμασταῖς καὶ πολυύμνοις, ἵν' ὁ κλεινὸς Δῆμος ἐνοικεῖ.
Χο. *ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀριζήλωτοι Ἀθῆναι,* 1329
δείξατε τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡμῖν καὶ τῆς γῆς τῆσδε μόναρχον.
Αλ. *ὅδ' ἐκεῖνος ὁρᾶν τεττιγοφόρας, ἀρχαίῳ σχήματι λαμπρός,*
οὐ χοιρινῶν ὄζων ἀλλὰ σπονδῶν, σμύρνῃ κατάλειπτος.
Χο. *χαῖρ', ὦ βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων· καί σοι ξυγχαίρομεν ἡμεῖς.*
τῆς γὰρ πόλεως ἄξια πράττεις καὶ τοῦ 'ν Μαραθῶνι τροπαίου. 1334

1324 *ἴδοιμεν* Brunck: *ἴδωμεν* codd. *τίν'* add. Porson: om. codd. *ποῖος* Reisig: *καὶ ποῖος* codd.
1328 *ταῖς* Blaydes: *καὶ* codd.
1331 *-φόρας* Hesych.: *-φόρος* codd. et ut vid. Procopius Gazaeus

What are the scenic arrangements in this passage? The text tells us that the epiphany of the rejuvenated Demos takes place in two stages: (1) a door opens

[39] If – as I think likely – the ekkyklema was already in use in Aeschylus' last years, we should add *Eum.* 235 where its appearance bearing the *ἀρχαῖον βρέτας* of Athena would be a useful visual signal of the change of scene.

(1326) and the chorus are then able to see 'the Athens of Old' (1327) which is the dwelling of Demos (1328), but Demos himself they cannot yet see, for they ask for him to be 'shown' to them (1330); (2) Demos himself appears (1331) in the costume of the early fifth century. Clearly the crucial questions are: what is the visible representation of 'the Athens of Old'? and how is it brought into view?

A widespread opinion, in several variants,[40] has been that the 'Athens of Old' is made visible by the unrolling of a new façade for the *scaenae frons*, or the removal of the old one. One objection to this hypothesis is that it has to ignore or explain away the opening of the door at 1326; another is that from 1393 onwards the *scaenae frons* can no longer represent 'the Athens of Old', the abode of Aristeides and Miltiades, but once again the house of Demos, the abode of Paphlagon (who is led out in disgrace at the end), so that for consistency we should have to assume the anticlimax of a transformation-scene in reverse; a third is that the proponents of this view have yet to adduce a parallel in the fifth-century theatre for a transformation of this kind – taking place, too, in the space of a line or so in the middle of a scene.

It is not as if the phraseology of 1326–7 were unique. On the contrary, it is of common occurrence in relation to *the use of the ekkylema*, which is frequently introduced by this combination of the notions 'opening of a door' and 'revelation of a scene':

Clouds 181–2[41]
ἄνοιγ' ἄνοιγ' ἀνύσας τὸ φροντιστήριον,
καὶ δαῖξον ὡς τάχιστά μοι τὸν Σωκράτη.
Soph. *Aj.* 346–7
ἰδού, διοίγω· προσβλέπειν δ' ἔξεστί σοι
τὰ τοῦδε πράγη, καὐτὸς ὡς ἔχων κυρεῖ.
Soph. *El.* 1458–9
σιγᾶν ἄνωγα κἀναδεικνύναι πύλας
πᾶσιν Μυκηναίοισιν Ἀργείοις θ' ὁρᾶν.
Eur. *Hipp.* 809–10
ἐκλύεθ' ἁρμούς, ὡς ἴδω πικρὰν θέαν
γυναικός, ἥ με κατθανοῦσ' ἀπώλεσεν.
Eur. *Herakles* 1029–33
ἴδεσθε, διάνδιχα κλῆθρα
κλίνεται ὑψιπύλων δόμων . . .
ἴδεσθε δὲ τέκνα πρὸ πατρὸς
ἄθλια κείμενα δυστάνου.
Men. *Dyskolos* 689–90 (cf. Sandbach ad loc.)
τὴν θύραν
ψοφοῦσιν. ὦ Ζεῦ σῶτερ, ἐκτόπου θέας.

Compare also Eur. *Med.* 1314–15, where the expected appearance of the

[40] Rogers pictures the unrolling of 'a representation of the Athenian Acropolis' by means of revolving pillars at the sides of the stage; Pohlenz (*NGG* 1952. 5. 122 n. 56) thinks of an 'Aufrollung der Fassade'. Most other commentators do not even discuss the problem, though the scene is perhaps the most impressive in a play relatively poor in spectacle and variety.

[41] Cf. Dearden, *The Stage of Aristophanes*, pp. 65–7. This and the following examples were used to make a different point at *CQ* N.S. 28 (1978) 386.

ekkyklema is forestalled by a theatrical effect of a different kind – the appearance of Medea in her flying chariot:

> χαλᾶτε κλῆδας ὡς τάχιστα, πρόσπολοι·
> ἐκλύεθ' ἁρμούς, ὡς ἴδω διπλοῦν κακόν.

This evidence, much of it earlier in date than *Knights*, indicates that we should assume the use of the *ekkyklema* at *Knights* 1327 unless this involves insuperable difficulties. The difficulties that present themselves are two: the nature of the visible representation of 'the Athens of Old', and the problem of when the *ekkyklema* was withdrawn.

The answer to the first question seems to be given by the text, which describes 'the Athens of Old' (1328) as the place 'wherein the glorious Demos dwells'. This points to its being represented by some kind of symbolic building standing on the platform, big enough to hold Demos concealed within it until he appears at 1331; presumably the building would be in the style of the Persian War period – or rather, in what the public of the 420s imagined that style to have been; and the reiterated ἰοστέφανοι (1323, 1329) suggests that the walls may have been painted with floral decorations. For symbolic buildings on the *ekkyklema* cf. *Thesm.* 277 ff. (the Thesmophorion).

The rejuvenated Demos steps out of this building at 1331, and 'the Athens of Old' is not mentioned again. Since, as we have seen, it must have disappeared by 1393, we must suppose that at some point between 1335 and 1392 the *ekkyklema* was unobtrusively withdrawn, just as we found it was unobtrusively rolled out at 1250–2. The withdrawal of the *ekkyklema* in the middle of a scene probably finds a parallel at *Clouds* 81–91,[42] where much less time is available than is the case here. More commonly, if it is not desired to draw special attention to the withdrawal of the *ekkyklema*, it is done during a choral ode or parabasis.[43]

The use of the *ekkyklema* in *Knights* 1326–34 thus seems to be the only possible staging of that scene consistent with the general practice of comedy and tragedy and with the indications of the text.

University of Nottingham A. H. SOMMERSTEIN

[42] Cf. Dearden, *The Stage of Aristophanes*, p. 65.

[43] Probable instances of this in comedy occur after *Clouds* 509 and *Peace* 728 (see Dearden, *The Stage of Aristophanes*, pp. 62–4, 66, though I would disagree with him on some details); in tragedy, after Eur. *Hipp.* 1101 (Phaidra's body and the accompanying message, certainly visible at 1057 and probably at 1077, are never spoken of as visible thereafter).