political point.⁸ The speaker (Paris?) also mentions a previous failing (line 9) and a decision or dispute of some sort (line 10; conceivably a reference to the Judgement?). None of which speculation, admittedly, gets us very far. Nevertheless, the pluralization of Paris' name remains a feature with a certain interest, and my proposed reattribution might help us to fill in just a little more detail about this most fascinating of lost comedies.

University of Exeter

MATTHEW WRIGHT

m.wright@ex.ac.uk doi:10.1017/S0009838806000589

⁸ Most scholars assume that the Archidamian War is meant, and date the play c. 430 B.C.: see J. Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie*, Zetemata 51 (Munich, 1971), 6–23. However, it has also been argued that the play dates from 440/39 B.C. and refers to the Samian War: H. B. Mattingly, 'Poets and politicians in fifth-century Greece', in K. H. Kinzl (ed.), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory* (Berlin and New York, 1977), 231–45.

'THIS IS THAT MAN': STAGING CLOUDS 1142-77*

Socrates organizes an *agon* between the Stronger and the Weaker Arguments in Aristophanes' *Clouds* in order to teach Pheidippides, the son of the protagonist Strepsiades, how the Weaker Argument can defeat the Stronger. During the debate, Socrates himself withdraws into the *phrontisterion* (882–8). The Weaker Argument wins, the Stronger admits defeat (1102), and Strepsiades hands his son over to be converted into a 'clever sophist' (1111). 'A pallid and depraved one, I rather suspect', Pheidippides exclaims (1112), before being led inside the *phrontisterion* in turn. Strepsiades presumably enters his own house at this point.

To what does the relative pronoun $\delta \nu$ refer? Many editors (e.g. van Leeuwen, Starkie) maintain that the antecedent is $\tau \delta \nu \nu i \delta \nu$ ('that <son> whom you [Socrates]

^{*} I am grateful to Douglas Olson and Jeffrey Henderson for encouragement and suggestions on an early draft of this paper. The present argument was part of a talk delivered at a colloquium organized by Alan Boegehold under the title, 'What's so funny?', at the Florida State University in February 2004; my thanks to the participants, and especially to Alan Boegehold and Leon Golden, for helpful comments.

took into your school a little while ago'). Dover (ad 1148), however, following Blaydes and others on a hint from the Byzantine scholia, argues that the antecedent must be $\tau \partial \nu \ \lambda \delta \gamma \rho \nu$, and takes $\epsilon i \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon s$ accordingly to mean '[that argument] which you brought into the theatre'. Dover rejects the alternative possibility on the grounds that 'Socrates has shown that he remembers (1145) who Strepsiades is', and so Strepsiades would have no reason to remind him of it. Socrates then confirms that Pheidippides has learned his lessons, and that Strepsiades can now escape any lawsuit whatever.

Strepsiades launches into a brief, paratragic song of triumph, pointing to Socrates' house $(\tau o \hat{\iota} \sigma \delta' \hat{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\iota} \delta \omega \mu \alpha \sigma \iota)$ in which his son has been trained and hailing Pheidippides as the saviour of his own house (1158–62), and concludes: 'Run in and summon him to come out to me! O my son, my boy, come out of the house, listen to your father' $(\delta \nu \kappa \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu \ \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \ \dot{\omega} s \ \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}. \ \dot{\omega} \ \tau \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \sigma \nu, \ \dot{\omega} \ \pi \alpha \hat{\iota}, \ \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta' \ \sigma \dot{\iota} \kappa \omega \nu, \ \dot{\alpha} \iota \epsilon \ \sigma \sigma \hat{\nu} \ \pi \alpha \tau \rho \sigma s,$ 1163–6). On this, Dover remarks (ad 1163): 'Whether Socrates is so obsequious as to run is doubtful; but clearly he goes in to fetch Pheidippides.' In the next line (on the standard interpretation), Socrates declares, 'This is that man' $(\delta \delta' \ \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \nu \sigma s \ \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho,$ 1167), and Strepsiades, beside himself with excitement, exclaims, 'Oh dear boy, dear boy'. Socrates bids him, 'Take him and be off!', but Strepsiades continues, 'Ayyy!, my son, how happy I am, first of all, to see your pallor! Now you look ready to deny and contradict, our local "What do you mean?" blossoms on you, and he who wrongs, be he ever so wicked, seems to be wronged, I know it. You have the Attic look on your face'

```
ώς ἥδομαί σου πρώτα τὴν χροιὰς ἰδών.
νῦν μέν γ' ἰδεῖν εἶ πρώτον ἐξαρνητικός
κἀντιλογικός, καὶ τοῦτο τοὖπιχώριον
ἀτεχνώς ἐπανθεῖ τὸ τί λέγεις σύ; καὶ δοκεῖν
ἀδικοῦντ' ἀδικεῖσθαι, καὶ κακουργοῦντ', οἶδ' ὅτι.
ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου τ' ἐστὶν ἄττικὸν βλέπος (1171–6)
```

As far as I have determined, this account of the action is accepted by all editors and translators. Did Socrates run inside, fetch Pheidippides, and emerge with him in the space of three verses? Theatrically, it is doable, but as Dover notes it is contrary to Socrates' proud and peremptory manner to behave in so servile a fashion, and Strepsiades has throughout the play adopted a respectful, often wheedling attitude toward him. It is possible, of course, that Socrates ignores Strepsiades' order, and that Pheidippides emerges by himself, in response to Strepsiades' appeal, whereupon Socrates announces, 'This is that man.' But there seems no reason, on this scenario, why Socrates would have to identify Pheidippides. Surely Strepsiades would recognize his own son—or would he?

I propose that at line 1145, Pheidippides comes out of the *phrontisterion* together with Socrates, and that Strepsiades fails to recognize him, mistaking him instead for one of Socrates' regular disciples. The audience expects that a pupil will answer the door, since this happened earlier in the play (131–2), when Strepsiades, determined to enroll in the *phrontisterion*, says, 'Why do I keep hanging back rather than knock on the door? Boy, boy!' The surprise here is that a disciple opens the door, rather than a slave (cf. Dover on 132, 133). The novelty at 1145 is that Socrates emerges with the disciple—who is in fact Pheidippides—and this time it is Socrates himself who speaks. Pheidippides is now presumably unshod (cf. 103), and wears a disciple's mask, which will certainly be pallid; it is the pasty complexion of the initiates in the school that had most repelled him (103, 120), and it is what he feared would happen to him after studying with Socrates (1112). That a pupil attends Socrates is not cause for wonder,

nor the fact that he remains silent, since the audience will be expecting the third actor to take the part of Pheidippides, who will soon come out.¹

In fact, however, there is a role for him: at 1163–4, Strepsiades' imperious command, 'Run in and summon him to come out to me!', is addressed, I suggest, not to Socrates but to the disciple. So too, earlier in the comedy, Strepsiades had bidden the *mathetes* to call up to Socrates in the swing (220): 'Go on, you, holler out to him for me,' to which the disciple had replied, 'You call him yourself!' Here again, when the disciple—this time Pheidippides—makes no move, Strepsiades himself calls upon his son to emerge ('O my son, my boy, come out of the house, listen to your father'). At this point, to the surprise of both Strepsiades and the audience, Socrates announces: 'This is that man' $(\delta\delta' \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} vos \dot{\alpha} \nu \acute{\eta} \rho$, 1167), as he points to the disciple at his side (but see below). Strepsiades turns and cries out in amazement, 'My dear boy, my dear boy.' His subsequent comments on his son's pallor and the wily look on his face explain why he failed to recognize him right off.

The third instance of the expression, in Aristophanes' *Knights* 1331, requires further comment.⁴ Demos has just emerged from his house, summoned by the Sausage Seller, who declares (1326–8): 'Behold, for there is the sound of doors opening. Acclaim the return of old Athens, wondrous, famed in song, where glorious

- ¹ It is not exceptional for a character to come out of a door accompanied by one or more unannounced individuals, though it is unusual, and perhaps unparalleled, for the audience to be ignorant of their identity. A possible analogy is Aesch. Cho. 691ff., lines usually assigned to Clytemnestra but in the nineteenth century given by editors rather to Electra, who on this interpretation (defended by R. Seaford, 'The attribution of Aeschylus, Choephoroi, 691-9', CQ 39 [1989] 302-6) emerged from the palace earlier, unannounced, at her mother's side and has remained silent until now. The difference is that the audience will have recognized her, which is why she does not have to be identified. At Eur. El. 360, the farmer (Electra's husband) tells his men or slaves (opadoi), hitherto unmentioned, to carry the luggage of Orestes and Pylades indoors. Diggle, however, following a suggestion of Barrett's in Reeve GRBS 14 (1973), 153, deletes the line. In Ar. Frogs 605, Aeacus will have exited the inner part of Hades accompanied by several slaves (Ditulas, Skebluas, Pardokas, 608), though they are summoned immediately by name. It would appear that the Athenian audience was accustomed to seeing a character come out of a house accompanied by one or more slaves or servants, or, as here, disciples. An unidentified character entering from the wings or parodoi, however, is not unusual; witness the entrance of Ploutos at the beginning of Aristophanes' Wealth, accompanied by Chremylus and Cario (I owe this point to Alan Sommerstein).
- ² Examples are very numerous; cf. e.g. Acharnians 41, $\tau ο \hat{v} τ$ ἐκειν' οὐγὼ 'λεγου, 'this is that thing I was saying', i.e. that the prytanes arrive late at the assembly; 820, $\tau ο \hat{v} τ$ ἐκείν'; 1189, δδὶ δὲ καὐτος (this last is slightly different: the person, Lamachus, has already been identified, and so is introduced with the phrase, 'This is the very man'); Eur. Or. 804, Med. 98.
- ³ Dover's explanation, in his commentary on Theocritus ad loc. (1994 [orig. 1971], Wauconda IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, p. 160), that Simichidas 'adopts in his song the standpoint of someone who is explicitly other than Simichidas' is strained and unnecessary. For a person identifying himself with the demonstrative *hodi*, cf. *Ach*. 134, 313.

Demos dwells.' At this the Chorus Leader exclaims (1329-30): 'Oh sleek, violetcrowned, dazzling Athens, reveal to us the king of Greece and of this land.' Demos now steps forth from the skene, to the words (1331–2): 'This is the man $[\delta\delta' \epsilon' \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \sigma_s]$ you see, wearing the cicada-clasp, brilliant in antique garb, redolent not of jury ballots but of peace, annointed with myrrh.' The expression οδ' ἐκεῖνος clearly refers to Demos, and the lines are universally assigned to the Sausage Seller. Might they not, however, be given to Demos himself? In the subsequent verses, the Chorus Leader proclaims (1333-4): 'Hail, king of the Greeks! We rejoice with you, for what you are doing is worthy of this city and the triumph at Marathon.' Only here, on the conventional distribution of verses, does Demos speak up (1335-6): 'O dearest of men, come hither, Agoracritus [i.e. the Sausage Seller]. Behold all the good things you have done for me by boiling me down.' This is a bit lame for what should be an impressive entrance; besides, one might have expected that Demos would react with astonishment at being addressed as 'king of the Greeks', rather than turning his attention directly to the Sausage Seller. If, however, he has entered with a flair, proudly announcing his new identity, it will be less surprising to the audience that he takes the Chorus Leader's adulatory greeting in stride. Thus, it may be that here too, ὅδ' ἐκείνος is self-referential, and that, as in Clouds, it marks the entrance of a transformed character.

However this may be, in *Clouds* the reading proposed here makes for a much funnier scene. It also, I believe, makes sense of why Strepsiades would, in referring to his son, specify to Socrates that he is the one 'you just led in' (1149: $\delta \nu \ \, \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau i \omega s$ $\epsilon i \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon_s$), and it eliminates the need for Dover's rather strained interpretation of $\epsilon i \sigma \dot{\eta} \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon_s$ at this point. The line is a set-up for the revelation of the disciple's identity. If some in the audience have already caught on to who's who, they will be amused at Strepsiades' mistake. The rest will realize in moment that Strepsiades' insistence that his son is inside was meant to keep them off the track—or perhaps even tip them off—and they will laugh the more when the truth comes out.

There may be yet a further point in the reference to Pheidippides as that 'man' $(a\nu\eta\rho)$. Strepsiades has throughout referred to his son as a boy $(\pi\alpha\hat{i}s)$, and he does so again here when he sees him—or, if I am right, when he recognizes him. Labelling him a man signals a change of status, as he is now identified as an adult. Induction into the phrontisterion is compared in the comedy to initiation in the mysteries, a kind of rite of passage (747, 764). I suggest that Pheidippides indeed emerges as a grown-up, a young man now independent of his family after his training in the community of Socrates' disciples (for the contrast, cf. Aeschin. In Tim. 11, etc.). This new station prepares for the reversal in which Pheidippides assumes the role of father and treats Strepsiades as a child. After this, Pheidippides will beat his father and no longer recognize the rules that govern conduct within the family, proclaiming his adult status (1421–2): 'Was it not an aner who first set up this law, like you and me?' It is, then, just like the boy—if the line is indeed Pheidippides'—to insist from the moment he leaves Socrates' school on his new status as an adult.

D. KONSTAN dkonstan@brown.edu doi:10.1017/S0009838806000590

⁴ My thanks to Alan Sommerstein for calling my attention to this problem.

⁵ Thanks again to Alan Sommerstein for pointing out the relevance of these lines.