I believe this to be mistaken. What we have by 257 is a use of 'X is not' which may be replaced by 'X is (other than)'. This must now be applied to the definition of falsehood to show it is not self-contradictory. Falsehood is taken to be 'saying what is not' and how this is possible has not yet been established. The only way in which 'saying' can partake of 'not-being' which we are given by 257 is that found in such cases as 'Saying is not sneezing' or 'Saying is other than snoring', and such are hardly sufficient for the purpose at hand. After the distinction between nouns and verbs (the names of entities about which things are said and the things said about these entities – 262a–263a), Plato (263b–d) returns to the definition of falsehood as 'saying, about a subject, things that are not, i.e., are other than, what is the case'.

Finally, Jordan tries (p. 124) to introduce a contrast between F and G by suggesting that in the puzzle about images (239c–240c) what has to be resolved is how something can be F (a cat) and not be G (an image). But such an interpretation misses the basic point at issue, which is not the unproblematic question as to whether something can be a cat without being an image, but how there can be images. *This* is what the sophist denies (239d, 240c) on the grounds that an image both is not (F), yet is, in a way, (F).

I conclude that both Jordan's objections and his positive thesis are inconclusive.

University of California, Davis   JOHN MALCOLM

CECROPIDS IN EUBULUS (FR. 10) AND SATYRUS (*A.P.* 10.6)

Ζῆθον μὲν ἐλθόνθ' ἁγνὸν ἐς Θήβης πέδον
οἰκεῖν κελεύει· καὶ γὰρ ἀξιωτέρους
πωλοῦσιν, ὡς ἔοικε, τοὺς ἄρτους ἐκεῖ,
ὁ δ' ὀξύπεινος. τὸν δὲ μουσικώτατον
κλεινὰς Ἀθήνας ἐκπερᾶν Ἀμφίονα,
οὗ ῥᾷστ' ἀεὶ πεινῶσι Κεκροπιδῶν κόροι
κάπτοντες αὔρας, ἐλπίδας σιτούμενοι.

Eubulus, fr. 10

ἤδη μὲν Ζεφύροιο ποητόκου ὑγρὸν ἄημα
  ἠρέμα λειμῶνος πίτνει ἐπ' ἀνθοκόμους,
Κεκροπίδες δ' ἠχεῦσι, γαληναίη δὲ θάλασσα
  μειδιάει κρυερῶν ἄτρομος ἐξ ἀνέμων.
ἀλλ' ἴτε θαρσαλέοι, πρυμνήσια λύετε, ναῦται,
  πίτνατε δ' εὖ πτερύγων λεπταλέας στολίδας.
ὦ ἴτ' ἐπ' ἐμπορίην πίσυνοι χαρίεντι Πριήπῳ,
  ὦ ἴτε δὴ λιμένων δαίμονι πειθόμενοι.

Satyrus (*A.P.* 10.6)

Cecropids, grammatically masculine in one case and feminine in the other, occur in each of these pieces of poetry. I believe that the second passage can shed some light on the meaning of the term as it is used in the fragment from the *Antiope* of Eubulus. The question of the significance of the Cecropids in Eubulus has previously been discussed by E. K. Borthwick.[1] A. B. Cook, noting the similarity of κερκώπη (a term designating a type of cicada) to the name of Cecrops and seeing their associations with dew as a link between the insects and the names (Herse, Pandrosus) of Cecrops' daughters, had posited a connection between the autochthonous Athenian family of Cecrops and the earth-born cicadas, those symbols of Athenian autochthony.[2] Borthwick applied Cook's theory to the passage from Eubulus and concluded that

[1] 'A Grasshopper's Diet – Notes on an Epigram of Meleager and a Fragment of Eubulus', *CQ* 60 (1966), 107–12.
[2] A. B. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1940), iii. 246–61.

when the poet mentions the Cecropids that feed on the breezes he is alluding to the musical cicadas, who were believed to subsist on dew and/or air. It was this latter feature of their diet, Borthwick proposed, that inspired the last line of the fragment. Thus the musical and impractical Amphion would be likened to the musical but improvident cicadas of Athens. While admiring the thoroughness of the case that Borthwick makes for the cicadas, I must suggest, in the light of Satyrus' epigram, that Eubulus' allusion is ornithological rather than entomological.[3]

This epigram is one of a series of five (*A.P.* 10.1, 2, 4, 5, 6), each by a different poet, which are variations on the theme of the return of spring and good sailing weather. It shares with the others not only the same general theme but a whole set of motifs.[4] Where the others poets mention swallows Satyrus refers to the Cecropids, thus leading most translators and commentators to conclude that κεκροπίδες = χελιδόνες. This identification gave pause to Denys Page, who did, nevertheless, accept it after suggesting that, genealogical imprecision notwithstanding, the usage stems from an allusion to Philomela, the *Cecropis ales* of Ovid, *Amores* 3.12.32.[5] He did not note that Statius, without reference to Philomela, has an allusion to the swallows who built an earthen embankment for the Nile when he uses the phrase *Cecropio... luto* at Silvae 3.2.110.[6] This suggests that Ovid might have called Philomela a 'Cecropian bird' because this was a poetic convention for 'swallow' and not because of any particular genealogical relationship between Philomela and Cecrops of the sort that Page seeks. The etiology of the poetic convention might be irretrievable, but the evidence of Satyrus' fellow epigrammatists, combined with a couple of passages of Latin poetry, establishes that, for whatever reason, κεκροπίς = χελιδών.[7]

When this equation is brought to bear upon the fragment of Eubulus we have the poet referring, by a poetic commonplace, to the Athenians as the descendants of Cecrops, i.e. Κεκροπίδαι, while simultaneously alluding to them as swallows, i.e. κεκροπίδες. This neat paronomasia is facilitated by the fact that, apart from a difference in accentuation, the two terms are identical in the genitive plural. While lexical evidence from Latin poetry and from a Hellenistic epigram no earlier than the 2nd century B.C.[8] is on chronological grounds less than ideal for elucidating a piece of 4th-century comedy,[9] such evidence is here corroborated by the intrinsic suitability

---

[3] For reasons other than mine R. L. Hunter, ed., *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 98 expresses reservations about Borthwick's identification.

[4] Cf. the comments of D. Page, ed., *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 89f.

[5] Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, p. 90.

[6] For swallows constructing the embankment see Pliny, *HN* 10.94. Cf. D'A. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (London, 1936), p. 323.

[7] In a comment relayed by *CQ* a referee correctly observes in reference to line 3 of Satyrus that ἠχέω is commonly used of cicadas but rarely of birds. This observation implies the possibility that κεκροπίς = τέττιξ in Satyrus. Although this suggestion has not, I think, been aired before, it was my own initial reaction to reading the epigram while having in mind the fragment of Eubulus and being at the time persuaded by the arguments of Borthwick thereon. The consistency of motifs among the set of epigrams to which Satyrus' belongs, the fact that the swallow and not the cicada, who arrives later in the year, is so proverbially associated with the main theme of the poem, the return of spring (see Thompson, *Glossary*, p. 319), and the lexical evidence from Latin poetry now compel me to reject that possibility. In any case ἠχέω is used not only of cicada sounds but of a wide variety of inarticulate sounds. Also, the vocabulary associated with cicadas and swallows frequently overlaps, as it does, for example, in Evenus, *A.P.* 9.122.

[8] On the difficulties in dating Satyrus see Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, p. 89.

[9] Even so it compares well with any lexical evidence equating κεκροπίδης with τέττιξ. Such evidence amounts to Cook's speculations on κερκώπη and the *Cecropiae* (or *Cecropis*)... *cicadae* adduced by Borthwick, 'A Grasshopper's Diet', p. 109, from *Ciris* 128. This Latin evidence is both considerably later than Eubulus and based on a textual conjecture.

of swallows to the passage. This suitability is indicated by copious literary evidence, some of early date, as well as by some virtually timeless aspects of swallow ethology. The swallows are even more appropriate than the cicadas as paradigms for the musical but impractical Amphion, for their musicianship was proverbial but often disparaged, as witness the numerous literary references to their twittering.[10] One passage which seems particularly to the point here, since it refers to Athenian poetasters, is Aristophanes, *Frogs* 92f.

> ἐπιφυλλίδες ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ στωμύλματα,
> χελιδόνων μουσεῖα, λωβηταὶ τέχνης

There is, moreover, another feature of swallows' behaviour which makes them even more apposite to the context in which Eubulus has put them. Unlike the cicadas, the swallows really are conspicuous for gulping breezes (κάπτοντες αὔρας) in virtually a literal sense, as, open-mouthed, they feed on air-borne insects which are often invisible to the observer on the ground.[11]

University of Manitoba   RORY B. EGAN

[10] See Thompson, *Glossary*, pp. 320f.
[11] κάπτω is actually used of birds eating insects at Aristophanes, *Birds* 245.

THE LENGTH OF THE SPEECHES ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PENALTY IN ATHENIAN COURTS

The time-limits imposed by the κλεψύδρα on speakers in Athenian trials have been much discussed, but a valuable distillation of the ancient evidence and modern interpretations of it has recently been made by P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (1981), pp. 719–28. He prudently states his own conclusions in a cautious manner, but I find them convincing. One khous of water took 3 minutes to run out; this is indicated by the length of time taken by the κλεψύδρα found in the Agora (first published by S. Young, *Hesp.* 8 [1939], 274–84), which holds 2 khoes and takes 6 minutes, and it is also consistent with the evidence of Aiskhines about the διαμεμετρημένη ἡμέρα. In a 'measured-through day', used only for public cases, the total amount of time allowed for the speeches in a trial was 11 amphoreis (Ais. 2.126), equivalent to 132 khoes, taking 396 minutes; one third of this time was allocated to the prosecution, one third to the defence, and one third to the speeches on the assessment of the penalty (Ais. 3.197). Time taken for other proceedings, including the allocation of jurors to courts, voting, and payment of jurors at the end of the day (this last is not mentioned by Rhodes, but it was surely completed well before dusk, because the jurors had time to go shopping afterwards; cf. Ar. *Wasps* 303–11, 788–9), was additional. For private cases, figures are given by *AP* 67.2: if the sum at issue was more than 5000 drachmas, the prosecutor and defendant each had 10 khoes for the first speech and 3 khoes for the second speech; if between 5000 and 1000 drachmas (2000 according to Hommel's restoration; cf. Rhodes, p. 721), 7 khoes and 2 khoes; if less than 1000 (or 2000) drachmas, 5 khoes and 2 khoes; in a *diadikasia* in which there were no second speeches, each claimant had 6 khoes for his one speech.

One further figure is given in *AP*, and this is the point at which I think it is possible to add to what Rhodes has said. In almost the last sentence of the text we read: ἡ δὲ τίμησίς ἐστιν πρὸς ἡμίχουν ὕδατος ἑκατέρῳ. 'The assessment is made to half a khous of water for each party' (*AP* 69.2). This means that, when the verdict had been given for the prosecutor in a type of case for which no penalty was fixed by law, the