

having stayed behind from it...'.<sup>12</sup> Or *ὑπολειφθέντες* may be, as it often must be, construed absolutely. Nor, in view of the effect of the tenses, does this make *ὑπολειφθέντες μίμνομεν*, 'having stayed [then], we [now] wait', a redundant combination. The latter alternative seems slightly more elegant. One could even group the anapaestic metra accordingly:

ἡμεῖς δ' ἀτίται σαρκὶ παλαιᾷ  
 τῆς τότε ἄρωγῆς  
 ὑπολειφθέντες μίμνομεν ἰσχύν  
 ἰσόπαιδα νέμοντες ἐπὶ σκήπτροις.

72

*Bedford Hills, New York*

J. F. GANNON

<sup>12</sup> Although one might expect the force of the passive of *ὑπολείπω* to be 'left behind' – or even, with Lattimore and Fagles, 'cast off' – most of the instances cited in LSJ<sup>9</sup> can be and some must be interpreted, rather surprisingly, in an active sense, 'stay behind'. See, e.g., Hdt. 1.165. That sense seems perfectly appropriate here.

#### TAPLIN ON COCKS\*

In *PCPhS* 213 (NS 33, 1987), 92–104 at 93–6, Oliver Taplin suggests that the Getty vase published by J. R. Green in 1985 represents not Aristophanes' *Birds* but the first version of *Clouds*. The purpose of this note is to offer some support for this, while perhaps raising further problems.

The kalyx-krater in question shows a piper between two men dressed as cocks with erect phalluses. Taplin argues that this does not fit *Birds*, where the birds are almost entirely wild ones, but does fit the famous VE scholion on *Clouds* 889, *ὑπόκεινται ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐν πλεκτοῖς οἰκίσκοις λόγοι δίκην ὀρνέων διαμαχόμενοι*. Dover in his commentary (xc–xciii) argued that this should be referred not to the extant revised version of *Clouds* but to the original performed version. If Taplin is right, the Getty vase would be an illustration of that version. Dover himself did not in fact believe that the scholion referred to stage action, but thought it possibly a deduction from metaphors used in the introduction to the scene. This was partly because of the statement in the first hypothesis that *αὐτίκα ἡ παράβασις τοῦ χοροῦ ἡμειπται, καὶ ὅπου ὁ δίκαιος λόγος πρὸς τὸν ἄδικον λαλεῖ...* Dover took this to be saying that 'the contrast of Right and Wrong belongs "in its entirety" to the revised version', but I do not see that that is necessarily the implication of *ἡμειπται*. I am not sure either that the universal assumption that there is no trace in the extant text of possible allusion to the *λόγοι* as cocks is correct. Certainly they are treated at times as men, but the opening words of the *κρείττων λόγος* at 889–90 would suit a cock 'displaying':

χώρει δευρί, δείξον σαυτὸν  
 τοῖσι θεαταῖς, καίπερ θρασὺς ὢν.

*κεντούμενος* in 947, despite the qualifying *ὥσπερ ὑπ' ἀνθρηνῶν*, would fit a cock, as would the chorus' *ῥῆξον φωνὴν ἥτινι χαίρεις* at 960. My own view is that the revision of *Clouds* was published as a reading version<sup>1</sup> (like the published version of a Cicero speech), and in the absence of indications to the contrary the Athenian

\* I owe best thanks for learning and scepticism to Angus Bowie, Michael Comber, Robert Parker, Ian Rutherford, and Oliver Taplin.

<sup>1</sup> *Contra* Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), p. 13 n. 1; cf. G. O. Hutchinson, 'Propertius and the Unity of the Book', *JRS* 74 (1984), 99–106 at 100.

reader will have mentally staged the action in the same way as in the performance of the first *Clouds*. This is perhaps the solution to Taplin's problem of why a vase-painter should choose to illustrate a play that failed (though in any case, are all extant illustrations of successful plays?). Those who wish to minimize the *letterarietà* of fifth-century Athens will of course jib at a revision published solely for reading, but no other hypothesis adequately explains how Eupolis in the *Baptai* can rely on the audience knowing the revised *Clouds* (PCG fr. 89). In fact, as I hope to show elsewhere, *Buchpoesie* is both earlier and more widespread in antiquity than is often supposed.

My main purpose here, however, is to suggest that if the *λόγοι* were represented in the first *Clouds* as fighting cocks, this could be more than an *ad hoc* joke. Cockfighting was of course a common pursuit at Athens,<sup>2</sup> and the associations of cocks with all agonistic contests,<sup>3</sup> and perhaps especially with the theatre,<sup>4</sup> would make them an apt choice for an *ἀγών λόγων*. Late sources, however, inform us that on one day each year there was a public cockfight in the theatre which all men of military age had by law to attend. This institution is said to go back to Themistocles. The two principle sources are Lucian, *Anacharsis* 37:

καίτοι τί ἂν πάθοις, εἰ θεάσαιο καὶ ὀρνύγων καὶ ἀλεκτρυόνων ἀγῶνας παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ σπουδὴν ἐπὶ τοῦτοις οὐ μικράν; ἡ γελᾷσι δὴλον ὅτι, καὶ μάλιστα ἦν μάθης ὡς ὑπὸ νόμῳ αὐτὸ δρῶμεν καὶ προστέτακται πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ παρεῖναι καὶ ὁρᾶν τὰ ὄρνεα διαπυκτεύοντα μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀπαγορεύσεως; ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦτο γελοῖον· ὑποδύεται γάρ τις ἡρέμα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὁρμῇ εἰς τοὺς κινδύνους, ὡς μὴ ἀγεννέστεροι καὶ ἀτολμότεροι φαίνονται τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων μὴδὲ προαπογενοῖεν ὑπὸ τραυμάτων ἢ καμάτου ἢ τοῦ ἄλλου δυσχεροῦς.

and Aelian, *VH* 2.28:

μετὰ τὴν κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν νίκην Ἀθηναῖοι νόμον ἔθεντο ἀλεκτρυόνας ἀγωνίζεσθαι δημοαῖαι ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ μίας ἡμέρας τοῦ ἔτους· πόθεν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὁδε ὁ νόμος ἐρώ. ὅτε ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐξῆγε τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν, ἀλεκτρυόνας ἐθεάσατο μαχομένους· οὐδὲ ἀργῶς αὐτοὺς εἶδεν, ἐπέστησε δὲ τὴν στρατίαν καὶ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς· ἀλλ' οὗτοι μὲν οὔτε ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος οὔτε ὑπὲρ πατρίων θεῶν οὐδὲ μὴν ὑπὲρ γονικῶν ἡρώων κακοπαθοῦσιν οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ δόξης οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ παίδων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἴττηθῆναι ἐκάτερος μὴδὲ εἰς αὐτῶν τὸν ἕτερον. ἅπερ οὖν εἰπὼν ἐπέρρωσε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. τὸ τοῖνυν γενόμενον αὐτοῖς σύνθημα τότε εἰς ἀρετὴν ἐβουλήθη διαφυλάττειν καὶ εἰς τὰ ὅμοια ἔργα ὑπόμνησιν.

Eustathius on *Il.* 9.124–7 (p. 740.47–8) repeats Aelian's notice with an interesting observation on Roman quail-fighting which merits further investigation (see Van der Valk *ad loc.*): Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber* 131–3, has an anecdote about Miltiades which is clearly related. All this may be fantasy. But if there were public cockfights in the fifth century which *πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ* were constrained to watch to the

<sup>2</sup> The material is collected in *RE* s.v. Hahnenkämpfe (K. Schneider), *DS* s.v. *Alektryonon agones*, and D'Arcy Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (ed. 2, Oxford, 1936), pp. 34–6. For further bibliography, see M. Gwyn Morgan, 'Three Non-Roman Blood Sports', *CQ* 25 (1975), 117–22 at 117 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> So cocks are found on Panathenaic vases: see the good discussion in G. von Brauchitsch, *Die Panathenaischen Preisamphoren* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 104–10. In general on the symbolism of the cock, see E. Baethgen, *De vi ac significatione Galli in religionibus et artibus Graecorum et Romanorum* (diss. Göttingen, 1887), esp. pp. 36–7, E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* 8 (New York, 1958), pp. 59–70.

<sup>4</sup> So on the high-priest's throne in the theatre of Dionysus (cf. e.g. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* [Oxford, 1946], fig. 40 with p. 143 n. 1). The interpretation of this and other monuments such as the Hag. Eleutherios calendar-frieze is uncertain, however: see L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), p. 251.

end,<sup>5</sup> the scene in *Clouds* as hypothesised by Taplin would acquire an extra dimension. Pheidippides (like the audience) is a spectator at a cockfight, but the outcome is to inculcate not martial virtue but its negation. The remark by the κρείττων λόγος at 985–6 that ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνα | ἐξ ὧν ἄνδρας Μαραθωνόμαχος ἡμῇ παίδευσις ἔθρεψεν would also have added point if the institution of the cockfights really did go back to the time of the Persian Wars. And if all this is correct, we have another possible instance of intertextuality between the Dionysiac drama and the civic events which also took place in the theatre.<sup>6</sup>

*Jesus College, Oxford*

DON FOWLER

<sup>5</sup> Parallels are hard to come by; but cf. Pausanias 3.14.10 on the boar fight put on by the Spartan ephebes at Platanistas. It would be interesting to know if there are analogies in other cultures.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S. Goldhill, 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology', *JHS* 107 (1987), 58–76.

### A CAREER IN THE NAVY (ARIST. *KNIGHTS* 541–4)

ταῦτ' ὀρρωδῶν διέτριβεν αἰέ, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοισιν ἔφασκεν  
ἐρέτην χρῆναι πρῶτα γενέσθαι πρὶν πηδαλίους ἐπιχειρεῖν,  
κᾶτ' ἐντεῦθεν πρωρατεύσαι καὶ τοὺς ἀνέμους διαθρῆσαι,  
κᾶτα κυβερνᾶν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ.

Aristophanes' description of the stages of promotion in the Athenian navy recently received renewed attention, when Mastromarco and Halliwell enlisted it in their battle against the traditional opinion that Aristophanes' early career fell into two stages, a secret one of writing plays but not producing them, and a public one in which he undertook both activities. Mastromarco argues for a tripartite career, and Halliwell, who is against a too strict correlation, for a gradual development, a sort of a complex apprenticeship, which eventually he divides also into three stages similar to those discerned by Mastromarco.<sup>1</sup> In summing up their position, MacDowell paraphrases the above passage according to its prevalent interpretation: 'The nautical metaphor (541–4), with its progression from oarsman to prow-officer to helmsman, indicates that Aristophanes did not take over his task all at once, but by stages. But what were the stages?'<sup>2</sup>

The interpretation of the passage as alluding to three stages of a navy career has a long history. It is achieved by an extrapolation of πηδαλίους ἐπιχειρεῖν from its place in line 542 and its equation with κυβερνᾶν in line 544. Thus, e.g., Kock (Berlin, 1882) *ad* 542: 'Die erste Stufe zu dieser ist der Dienst des Ruderers, die zweite die Beobachtung der Winde und Meersströmungen auf dem Vordeck. Dann erst darf man πηδαλίους ἐπιχειρεῖν oder κυβερνᾶν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ.' The difficulty posed by ἐντεῦθεν, which follows πηδαλίους ἐπιχειρεῖν and seems to refer to it, Kock (*ad* 543) solves by referring ἐντεῦθεν back to ἐρέτην γενέσθαι instead. Neil (Cambridge, 1901) *ad* 242–4, agrees with Kock: 'πρὶν πηδαλίους ἐπιχειρεῖν is not referred to by ἐντεῦθεν in 543'. Neil, however, reveals a certain uneasiness or dissatisfaction, for he adds: 'it might stand in that line as well as in 542'.<sup>3</sup> Rogers (London, 1910) *ad loc.*, paraphrases

<sup>1</sup> G. Mastromarco, 'L'esordio "segreto" di Aristofane', *Quaderni di Storia* 10 (1979), 153–96; S. Halliwell, 'Aristophanes' Apprenticeship', *CQ* 30 (1980), 33–45.

<sup>2</sup> D. M. MacDowell, 'Aristophanes and Kallistratos', *CQ* 32 (1982), 21.

<sup>3</sup> Neil also adds a fourth stage, that of the κελυσθής, who gives time to the rowers and is one step above the oarsman, and quotes Pollux 1.95, who gives four stages 'presumably in order of