

## NOTES

### Who is Dicaeopolis?

The name given by Aristophanes to the leading character in his *Acharnians* has given rise to much discussion, and I take the opportunity of the appearance in this *Journal* of another well-documented assessment<sup>1</sup> to put forward briefly, and without a full and independent armoury of footnotes, a solution that contests the *communis opinio* that Dicaeopolis in some sense speaks for and as Aristophanes.

The grounds for this widely held view seem to be (briefly) the following. When Dicaeopolis prepares to plead his case to the Acharnians (366 f.) he refers to what he had himself suffered at Cleon's hands on account of his comedy of the previous year:

αὐτός τ' ἔμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον  
ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμῳδίαν . . .  
(377–8)

Later, at the start of his long ῥῆσις, he asserts that his claims will be just (δίκαια, 501) and that Cleon will not bring a διαβολή against him on this occasion for abusing the city in the presence of ξένοι (502–3). It seems that the *parabasis* refers to the same incident as these passages when it talks of a διαβολή that the poet insulted the *polis* and *demos* (630–1) and insists that he will continue to present δίκαια in his comedies (655). Since there can be little doubt that in the *parabasis* the poet is talking of his own career and productions,<sup>2</sup> it has often been inferred that at 377–8 the audience was intended to take Dicaeopolis to be speaking for Aristophanes and in the main did so.

Is this inference correct? It is dangerous to allow our knowledge of what is said in the *parabasis* to influence our interpretation of earlier parts of the play, and we should move cautiously in reconstructing the progress of the audience's knowledge and expectations as the action of the play proceeds. The first few hundred lines have built up a picture of a peace-loving Athenian (32), antipathetic to Cleon (6) and interested in music and drama (9–16). Though less emphatically rustic than Strepsiades he has marks of *agroikia* (30–1) and hails from a rural deme (33). There is little in this, and nothing in the development of a pugnacious comic 'hero' which is presented up to and including the encounter with the Acharnians, that can have suggested to the audience that this man is especially representative of Aristophanes. Nor, it should be said, have we any evidence that in 425 BC a poet of Old Comedy might be expected to introduce himself in one of his dramas. Admittedly little can be based on an *argumentum ex silentio*, and we know very little indeed about comedies produced before *Acharnians* in 426/5 BC, but nobody has ever suggested that this happened in any earlier play, and when in 424/3 BC Cratinus built the plot of *Putine* around a fantastic autobiography it is clear that the

'comic hero' was called Cratinus and not veiled under a *redende Name*.

Only, therefore, at line 377 was the audience suddenly forced to come to terms with an important biographical datum about the play's central character: he was a comic poet, and had suffered at the hands of Cleon as a result of a comedy produced in the previous year. From being a stereotype with whom many thousands of Athenian males in the audience might readily have identified, the character acquired a *persona* which might be expected to fit one of the comic poets who competed in the Dionysia of 427/6 BC. Would the audience draw the further conclusion that this comic poet was Aristophanes himself? If Aristophanes alone had been the object of some action by Cleon, doubtless they would. But it is only the tenuous reconstruction offered first by our scholia, and then by modern scholars with nothing sounder to turn to, which associates a move by Cleon after the Dionysia of 426/5 BC uniquely with Aristophanes. I suggest that at 377 ff. Aristophanes intends not to offer the audience a clear indication that the character in some sense speaks for himself, but to puzzle and tantalise them: the character is identified as representing a comic poet, but nothing, in my view, indicates which comic poet. The unusually late postponement of the use of the character's name might support this view.<sup>3</sup> A personal name might reasonably be expected to clear up the mystery, and the audience will now begin to realise that they have not yet heard one.

Aristophanes does not keep them in suspense for long. Although nothing further is contributed by the character's declared intention of seeking help from Euripides—the average member of the audience, after all, might imagine that all dramatic poets knew and had dealings with each other—it does give Aristophanes the chance to pull his leading character's name out of his hat: Dicaeopolis (406). It is important for the understanding of this name that it is revealed in the scene between the two poets and not, for example, in one of the early scenes where Dicaeopolis is in the assembly or when, at 496 ff., he is putting the case for seeing the Spartans as reasonable people. It is precisely in the context of the imbroglio of the Dionysia of 427/6 BC and his calling on the dramatic poet Euripides that the leading character becomes a named individual. That the audience should at this juncture have sought to interpret that name in the light of his *political* actions is therefore unlikely (and would, I suggest below, have been baffling). Rather, they would have used the name to discover to which of the comic poets of the Dionysia of 427/6 BC the leading character should be related. In the absence of any indication hitherto that the character was Aristophanes, they would only have made that identification now if the name or its components led them to it. That a memory of Pindar's description of Aegina as δικάσιόπολις could have gelled with a possible link between Aristophanes and Aegina is an implausible

<sup>1</sup> H. P. Foley, *Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' Acharnians*, above pp. 33–47.

<sup>2</sup> See however Macdowell (Foley n. 3).

<sup>3</sup> Postponement of leading character's names is of course exploited elsewhere, e.g. Strepsiades is first named in *Nu.* 134, Philocleon and Bdelycleon in *Vesp.* 133–4, Trygaeus in *Pax* 190. But in *Ach.* we learn the name even later.

proposal, and has not found much favour since it was proposed 50 years ago by Cyril Bailey.<sup>4</sup> Had they been clairvoyant or gained prior access to texts of the drama, they might have known that Aristophanes would claim in the *parabasis* to offer just comedy and to benefit the city, but it is hardly likely that this claim was made by him alone among competitors at dramatic festivals.<sup>5</sup>

Accordingly, in the absence of a comic poet actually called Dicaeopolis, the name could lead the audience—and would easily lead them—to only one man: Eupolis. Attic names with a component -πόλις are not uncommon, but most combine it with a verbal form: Archepolis or (the name of Eupolis' father) Sosipolis. A combination in which a term of commendation is joined to -polis is found only in the names Dicaeopolis and Eupolis. The move from the one to the other would therefore easily be made, and would be comparable to the move from Labes to Laches and Kuon to Cleon in *Wasps*, or to Lysimache from Lysistrata in *Lysistrata* (if that allusion is accepted).<sup>6</sup>

Two objections might readily occur. First, we do not know that Eupolis competed in the Dionysia of 427/6 BC. This must be conceded, but it is highly unlikely that he did not compete regularly after his first production, Προσπάλτιοι, in 430/29 BC.<sup>7</sup> Secondly, what of the coincidence between Dicaeopolis' references to Cleon and those of the *parabasis*? I have already hinted at how I would resolve this. It is possible that Eupolis' comedy for this festival, like that of Aristophanes, directed some shafts against Cleon (as he certainly did in his Χρυσοῦν γένος of (?) 424 BC, cf. fr. 316 K-A) and that Cleon retaliated against both comedians. Naturally Aristophanes' references in the *parabasis* of *Acharnians* only hint at, and those in later plays suppress, the participation of any other poet than himself in glorious combat with the monstrous politician. But if the hypothesis of an attack by Cleon on both Eupolis and Aristophanes is correct, then the audience of *Acharnians* will not have been puzzled by the parallelism. Dicaeopolis refers to Cleon's attack on Eupolis, the chorus in the *parabasis* to his attack on Aristophanes. The language is strikingly similar because the nature of the attack was similar.

That Dicaeopolis is chosen as a name to suggest a known individual relieves us of the embarrassing problems that have faced those seeking to interpret it as appropriate to the character's policy or conduct.<sup>8</sup> It was never very plausible that Dicaeopolis suggested 'just city'. The leading character may start off expostulating at the corruption of Athenian politics, but at this stage we do not know that his name is Dicaeopolis, and once he has embarked on his private peace-project his interest in making Athens a just (or juster) *polis* evaporates. The alternative meaning 'he who treats his *polis* justly' is

even less of a starter: many now agree that Dicaeopolis' implementation of his peace involves selfish *pleonexia*, almost a polar opposite of *dikaiosyne* in his dealing with his fellow citizens.

It is indeed the case that Aristophanes makes play with the term δίκαια. Dicaeopolis claims his arguments on behalf of the enemy will be δίκαια (317, 501)—which is conceded by the chorus (561, 562)—and that τρυγῶδία too knows τὸ δίκαιον (500). Likewise in the *parabasis* Aristophanes claims his comic message to be δίκαια (645, 655). All these may be directed to the *polis*, but it is hard to find a way in which this is especially related to the *polis* and which would elucidate the compound name Dicaeopolis. The final use of τὸ δίκαιον in the play rather points the audience to the verbal trickery in which Aristophanes has characteristically engaged. In the *parabasis* he proclaims (661) τὸ γὰρ εὖ μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ξύμμαχον ἔσται. We are asked to observe the δεξιότης of the poet who has given himself and his main character arguments that are δίκαια and has cleverly given his character a name that both fits these arguments and links him indissolubly with τὸ εὖ. A member of the audience who had doubted that Dicaeopolis represented Eupolis could no longer do so. Aristophanes might doubtless have adapted Eupolis' name in some other way, e.g. to Agathopolis (though clearly Sosipolis and Sopolis were out). That he adapted it to Δικαιοπόλις suits the play made with the concept of τὸ δίκαιον between lines 317 and 655, but this play cannot alone explain the name.

If this suggestion is correct, what follows? First, that we do not need to postulate an unparalleled and undeclared identification of a poet with his main character. Second, that inferences from Dicaeopolis' policies to those of Aristophanes become precarious: instead of finding in the supposed identification an emphatic endorsement by the poet of his character's desire for peace, we find a buffer between the views of the character and those of the poet. A demagogue who objected to the content of Dicaeopolis' speech could be countered on a number of levels: 'Telephus said that'; 'Dicaeopolis said that' or even 'that's the sort of thing that Eupolis says'. This will have made it easier for Aristophanes to develop Dicaeopolis' case without fear of a come-back from Cleon, but it makes it yet more difficult for us to determine (if we must) where Aristophanes 'himself' stood on the issue of peace. For that, I believe, we must confine ourselves to the *parabasis*, where victory rather than peace is what the poet claims to be bringing to Athens, and to a practical argument that I have not seen in modern discussions. Most men and states would agree that peace is preferable to war, but some choose war because the conditions attaching to peace are unacceptable. It makes no sense, therefore, to urge the making of peace unless you also make clear on what terms peace is to be made. About terms *Acharnians* says nothing, and because of this, and the *parabasis*, cannot be taken as a serious plea for peace.

My suggestion will not be persuasive if no point at all can be suggested in Aristophanes making a character associable with Eupolis urge peace. Had we evidence, for example, that in his plays Eupolis never touched the issue of war and peace, the device would appear arbitrary and humourless. If Eupolis had used his comedies to back the war whole-heartedly there would be some perverse point in turning his stance on its head,

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Foley (n. 6).

<sup>5</sup> I do not accept that (as suggested by a *Journal* referee) the similarity of phraseology between 497–502 and the *parabasis* demonstrates that the audience would take the passages to refer to the same person. Are we to assume that on hearing the *parabasis* the audience would actually change whatever identification it had already formed at 497 ff.?

<sup>6</sup> See D. M. Lewis, *ABSA* 1 (1955) 1–12, J. Henderson, *Aristophanes Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987) xxxviii–xl.

<sup>7</sup> See R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae comici graeci* v (Berlin/New York 1986) 294, *Eupolis Test.* 2a8.

<sup>8</sup> Foley (n. 52).

but it might be rather forced. As it is our evidence suggests just what the action of *Acharnians* and the character of Dicaeopolis would lead us to expect, that Eupolis criticised the conduct of the war and focused on some of its damaging or ridiculous concomitants and consequences.

It seems that in *Prospaltioi*, now established as his first play and so produced in 430/429 BC,<sup>9</sup> he attacked Pericles' conduct of the war, a fact that would enhance an audience's appreciation of how Dicaeopolis presents Pericles' rôle in the outbreak of war (esp. 530 ff.). *Prospaltioi* was also, so far as we know, the only previous comedy with a chorus of demesmen. Its few fragments include a reference to the story of Bellerophon (*fr.* 259.126) to lameness (*fr.* 264, *cf.* for both *Ach.* 427) and to a Thracian lady (*fr.* 262, *cf.* *Ach.* 273). There is also a verbal parallel between *Prospaltioi fr.* 260.30 and *Ach.* 162.<sup>10</sup> This may all be coincidence, but to me it suggests that in *Acharnians* Aristophanes had at least half an eye on *Prospaltioi*.

*Taxiarchoi* appears to have exploited the contrast between the effeminate and luxury-loving Dionysus and the martinet admiral Phormio. Although Phormio was mentioned in comedy as late as Aristophanes' *Peace* 348, there is much to be said for Wilamowitz's belief that his prominence in *Taxiarchoi* points to that play's production not long after his death in 428 BC.<sup>11</sup> Indeed I know of no reason why it should not actually belong to a festival prior to his death, the Dionysia of 429 BC or either festival in 428 BC. It must be conceded, however, that the date is unknown,<sup>12</sup> and hence that any inference is speculative. But if *Taxiarchoi* had been produced between 430/29 BC and 426/5 BC, then audience might see in Dicaeopolis some elements of Eupolis' Dionysus, and in Lamachus a version of Eupolis' Phormio. It is improbable that in Eupolis' play Phormio was not worsted by Dionysus and martial arts and ideals held up to ridicule.

*Astrateutoi* also dealt with contrasts between effeminacy and war (the *Suda* gives an alternative title *Androgynoi*) and has been placed early by some scholars. The leadership of a campaign involving Minoa in *fr.* 38 K-A should put the play no earlier than the summer of 427 BC (*cf.* *Thuc.* iii 51.1) and could (but need not) take it later than 424 BC (*cf.* *Thuc.* iv 66.3). The enigmatic reference to Peisander's *strateia* to Pactolus (*fr.* 35 K-A) could conceivably refer to the same abuse as the envoys' luxurious travel through the plains of the Cayster in *Ach.* 68–71, and Peisander was already a butt of Aristophanes in 427/6 BC (*Babylonians fr.* 84.) *Astrateutoi fr.* 41 K-A refers to the keeping of peacocks, a standard present from the Persian king to envoys which we know to have been in the air in 426/5 (*Ach.* 63). All this harmonises with, but cannot demonstrate, a date for *Astrateutoi* of 427/6 BC.

It is also necessary to suppose, if my explanation of 377 ff. is correct, that at the Dionysia of 427/6 BC Eupolis produced a play which seemed to attack the city's policies. The most economical hypothesis is that this was a play whose theme could be represented as attacking the city's prosecution of the Peloponnesian

war (like *Acharnians*, and in this respect different from *Babylonians*) and that it was indeed *Astrateutoi*.

If either or both *Taxiarchoi* and *Astrateutoi* do belong before *Acharnians*, (and there can be no doubt about *Prospaltioi*) then the audience in 426/5 BC will not simply have seen quickly that Dicaeopolis represents Eupolis, but will also have seen the appropriateness of ascribing to him a dislike of the war and a desire for a life of peace. His position will not have been confused with that of Aristophanes.

E. L. BOWIE

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

### Sisters, Daughters and the Deme of Marriage: A Note\*

With the publication recently of two valuable studies on Attic demes,<sup>1</sup> we are now more fully aware of what we know, and do not know, of the deme. With Osborne's work, we now have some idea of the tendency of Athenians to own and maintain property in the deme of origin, but the role of marriage in consolidating property in that deme is more difficult to assess.<sup>2</sup> In contrast to Osborne's focus on the ancestral deme, this brief study will concentrate on the deme into which the woman married; such a deme will be termed the deme of marriage or the marital deme. The study will focus particularly on the families who contracted more than one alliance for their kinswomen into the same outside deme and will emphasize the importance of siblings in securing and maintaining these alliances in the marital deme. In terms of siblings, the paper will then point out how the locally endogamous marriage contracted by Plato for his sister seems to have consolidated landed, neighbouring estates.

These repeated marriages into the same deme and the locally endogamous union consolidating landed estates exhaust the examples found in Davies' register.<sup>3</sup> Our dependence on Davies' reconstructions will be evident, especially as regards the assumption, typical of the prosopographer, that similar names derived from a root

\* I would like to thank Robin Osborne for many criticisms and helpful comments on bibliography. Any remaining errors are of course my own.

<sup>1</sup> R. Osborne, *Demos: the discovery of classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) and D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica 508/7—ca. 250 BC: a political and social study* (Princeton 1986).

<sup>2</sup> Osborne (n. 1) 52–63 for landholding in the deme of origin; 131–5 for marriages within the hereditary deme. To this add the remarriage of Socrates' mother to her first husband's demesman: J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Chicago 1981, reprint, hereafter *PA*) 11697. See W. E. Thompson, *De Hagniae hereditate: an Athenian inheritance case* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* xlv, Leiden 1976) esp. 11–13 for the remarriage of Hagnias II's mother to a demesman of herself and her first husband (also briefly described in *id.*, *CSCA* v [1972] 212). It is unknown whether the woman's second husband was also a kinsman: J. K. Davies, *Athenian propertied families 600–300 BC* (Oxford 1971, hereafter *Davies*) 83. In some inscriptions, kinship endogamy may be combined with marriage within the native deme, if the names of spouses and their patronymics, which derive from a similar roots, suggest a blood tie: for instance, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5698 *Philomachus* of Araphen and his wife *Philostrate* daughter of *Callimachus*; also 6028; for *SEG* xxiii 161, see: S. Humphreys, *The family, women, and death* (London 1983) 109.

<sup>3</sup> *Davies* 145–9 and 461–4 (Dicaeogenes' and Polyaratus' families); 232–3, 302–4 (Cimon's family); 332–4 (Plato and his sister); 437–8 (Deinas' family).

<sup>9</sup> Kassel-Austin (n. 7) 442 ff. on *Prospaltioi*.

<sup>10</sup> 260.30. μέγα στένοι μένταν ἄκι *cf.* *Ach.* 162. ὑποστενοί μένταν ὁ θρανίτης λέως.

<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 1 (1880) 66.

<sup>12</sup> E. Handley has even proposed a date as late as 415 BC, *PCAl* lxxix (1982) 24 ff.