

conflict by ramming or use of deck soldiers, to reach the enemy's rear. The final effect, if the move is successful, could be the same, as shown by the striking similarity between Aeschylus's description of the final stages at Salamis and Thucydides's description of the effect of Phormio's *periplous* (*AT* 68-71). The Greek ships in the preliminary skirmish at Artemisium did however show that the *periplous*, adopted by the Persians and resulting in the loss of thirty ships, was a risky tactic against a disciplined and opportunistic opponent.

J. S. MORRISON

Cambridge

### Dicaeopolis' motivations in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*\*

Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, performed at the Lenaea in 425 BC, is the story of Dicaeopolis' unilateral withdrawal from Athens' political system and her seemingly endless war against Sparta.<sup>1</sup> What seems never to have been appreciated is the extent to which the hero's motivations are specifically economic in character.<sup>2</sup> Dicaeopolis resents both his unhappy new status as an urban cash-consumer of staple goods, and the fact that he is excluded from all the pleasures the war-time city still has to offer, while others continue to enjoy themselves. It is a combination of these resentments which drives the hero to break ranks with his fellow citizens and make his separate peace with the Peloponnesians, and both problems are accordingly resolved in the 'ideal' new world of the second half of the play.

Dicaeopolis is (at least at first) a good citizen (esp. 28-9), although he is disgruntled with Athens and Athenians.<sup>3</sup> As he makes clear in his opening

\* Thanks are due to R. Hamilton, G. W. Dickerson, A. H. Sommerstein, and several anonymous referees, for their careful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank L. P. E. Parker, who graciously gave me advance access to her article 'Eupolis or Dicaeopolis', which appears elsewhere in this number of *JHS*.

<sup>1</sup> I refer throughout to the text of V. Coulon, *Aristophane* i (Paris 1923). Although there is no thorough modern scholarly edition of the play, the commentaries of W. Rennie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London 1909), W. J. M. Starkie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London 1909), B. B. Rogers, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London 1910), and A. H. Sommerstein, *Acharnians, The Comedies of Aristophanes* i (Warminster 1980), are all valuable.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the historical question of the content and effect of the Megarian Decree (for which see esp. G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The origins of the Peloponnesian War* [Ithaca 1972] 225-89), economic issues in *Acharnians* have received little sustained critical attention. V. Ehrenberg, *The people of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1943), is more concerned with Aristophanes as a source for day-to-day life in Athens than with the playwright's larger poetic purposes. I. Stark, 'Das Verhältnis des Aristophanes zur Demokratie der Athenischen Polis', *Klio* lvii (1975) 329-64, unfortunately fails to document her wide-ranging claims about developments in Athenian society, and seems out of touch with much of the modern European and American work on the play.

<sup>3</sup> On the significance of the hero's name, see E. L. Bowie,

this disaffection is rooted first of all in his altered economic position since the war began. Forced out of his deme and within the city walls by the hostilities, he has become a cash-consumer of charcoal, vinegar and olive oil, goods his old country home supplied without money and in abundance: ὃς οὐδεπώποτ' εἶπεν "ἀνθρακας πρίω", / οὐκ ὄξος, οὐκ ἔλαιον, οὐδ' ἦδει πρίω, / ἄλλ' αὐτὸς ἔφερε πάντα (34-6).<sup>4</sup> Secondly, while Dicaeopolis, trapped inside the city walls (see also 71-2), grows steadily poorer, others are growing rich.<sup>5</sup> The ambassadors to Persia (who complain unconvincingly about their difficult life—68-71), for example, have been given two drachmae a day for years of 'official business', most of which apparently consisted of eating and drinking massive amounts (66; 90; compare 73-5; 77-8; 85-6; 88-9).<sup>6</sup> Theoros as well was generously compensated for his 'services' (primarily an endless round of parties in Sitalces' court—141), and Dicaeopolis has little doubt that he too dawdled on his way home in order to draw as much pay as possible (136-7). None of these characters, of course, has the slightest interest in seeing the fighting come to an

'Who is Dicaeopolis?', *JHS* cviii (1988) 183-5. Bowie may be right to argue that the name 'Dicaeopolis' would remind an Athenian audience of the contemporary Comic playwright Eupolis. Bowie's theory that the aggressively self-assertive (esp. 633-58) Aristophanes wrote a play with one of his main rivals as a hero seems improbable on the face of it, however, and rests on a series of unprovable and generally unlikely assumptions: that Eupolis was prosecuted by Cleon in 426/5 BC along with Aristophanes (a hypothesis for which there is no evidence whatsoever); that an audience who heard the (as yet unidentified) hero's speech in 377-82 would automatically identify him with another poet, rather than with the author of the play (who, as many presumably knew, had recently had precisely the same sort of troubles cf. 628-31); and that the name 'Dicaeopolis', when finally given (406), would suggest 'Eupolis himself', rather than 'someone like Eupolis, who claims that his special concern is τὰ δίκαια' (see 655, 661), i.e., 'Aristophanes'. As A. H. Sommerstein has pointed out to me, however, this identification too is undercut by the fact that the hero says he is from the deme Cholleidae (406). The historical Aristophanes (*PA* 2090) was from Kydathenaion; the deme-affiliation of Eupolis (*PA* 5936) is unknown. For a separate response to Bowie, see the note by L. P. E. Parker, which appears below.

<sup>4</sup> This is certainly the point at which the observations of Stark (n. 2) 340-1, about the rise of an economy of 'exchange value' in Aristophanes' Athens, have their greatest relevance.

<sup>5</sup> The existence of economic corruption in the city's leadership has already been hinted at in Dicaeopolis' opening reference to the five talents which the Knights forced Cleon to 'vomit forth' (5-8). On the events alluded to here, see most recently E. M. Carawan, 'The five talents Cleon coughed up', *CQ* n.s. xl (1990) 137-47. A bankruptcy of political leadership is apparently not unique to Athens. The Megarian declares that when he left his city, the Councillors were doing their best to ruin it as quickly and miserably as possible (754-6).

<sup>6</sup> Meanwhile, Amphitheos' request for sufficient funds to allow him to go to Sparta to make peace leads to his expulsion from the Assembly (53-4). Two drachmae a day does not, in fact, seem to have been an excessive rate of pay for ambassadors, and (once expenses were paid) probably offered little opportunity to grow rich at public expense. See W. L. Westermann, 'Note upon the ephodia of Greek ambassadors', *CP* v (1910) 203-16; D. J. Mosley, *Envoys and diplomacy in ancient Greece*, *Historia Einzelschrift* xxii (Wiesbaden 1973) 74-7.

end. The primary goal of the ambassadors, who bring with them a 'Persian' whose very name (Pseudartabas, or 'False Measure')<sup>7</sup> hints at their economic duplicity, seems to be to bolster Athenian enthusiasm for the war with empty promises of support from the Great King.<sup>8</sup> Theoros brings Thracian mercenaries, for whom he asks two drachmae a day, promising they will overrun the whole of Boeotia (159-60).<sup>9</sup> The last straw for Dicaeopolis, however, is the invitation of the fraudulent 'King's Eye' into the Prytaneion (and its free meals) (124-5). It is specifically in response to this outrage that the hero undertakes a 'great and terrible deed', by seeking a separate settlement with the enemy (125-32).<sup>10</sup> Gone is his earlier resolve to insist on a public solution to common problems (compare 37-9). Let the other Athenians receive embassies (and suffer the accompanying dispossession) with a vacant expression on their faces if they wish (133). He will have peace.

Dicaeopolis is thus neither a pacifist nor a Laconizer. As he insists a little later, he has been 'a soldier, ever since the war began' (596), and he has no doubt that military action is sometimes the only reasonable response to provocation (541-56).<sup>11</sup> Although he repeatedly claims to be speaking on behalf of the Spartans (314; 356; 369; 482), moreover, he has had his vines cut by them during their annual invasions, and therefore wishes them only the worst (509-12). The fact of the matter is, however, as he insists in his initial confrontation with the Chorus, that international political considerations are irrelevant to what he has done, for it is not the Spartans who are responsible for all the city's troubles (esp. 305-6; 309-10; 313). Dicaeopolis has not sold out to the enemy, because the real enemies—as the play's opening scenes have been at pains to point out—are at home, in a city whose citizens are bought and sold without their even realizing it (κάνταῦθα λαθάνουσ' ἀπεμπολῶμενοι 374).<sup>12</sup> In the Telephus-speech,

<sup>7</sup> The ἀρτάβη was a Persian measure, equal to one medimnus plus three choenikes (Hdt. i 192).

<sup>8</sup> On the (immensely confusing) action in this scene, see most recently C. C. Chiasson, 'Pseudartabas and his eunuchs: *Acharnians* 91-122', *CP* lxxix (1984) 131-6.

<sup>9</sup> Two drachmae a day would be twice the wage of sailors in the fleet (Thuc. iii 17), and thus (as Dicaeopolis notes in 161-3) an affront to the city's rowers. No-one else in the Assembly seems disturbed by this. The only actual accomplishment of this 'horde of locusts' (148-52), of course, is to snatch food out of the mouths of real Athenians (163-5; 174).

<sup>10</sup> K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic comedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1972) 80, briefly notes the economic basis of some of Dicaeopolis' complaints, but does not develop the point. Similarly, P. Walcot, 'Aristophanic and other audiences', *G&R* xviii (1971) 42-3, sees that the play attacks 'those who had exploited the war for their personal gain', but never explores the issue in any detail.

<sup>11</sup> *Contra* G. Murray, *Aristophanes: a study* (New York 1933) esp. 29-32, who identified Dicaeopolis as a simple pacifist, who argues that 'the war has arisen out of a muddle and is a very bad way of correcting the muddle'.

<sup>12</sup> H. P. Foley, 'Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *JHS* cviii (1988) 33-47, esp. 38, does not see this, and

in fact, the hero argues explicitly that the war is the creation of a few greedy and self-interested individuals (compare 514-6), in particular sycophants (515-22),<sup>13</sup> young drunks (524-7),<sup>14</sup> and Pericles himself (530-4). The decisive demonstration of this takes place when Lamachus appears onstage.

The historical Lamachus (*PA* 8981) was something of an historical anomaly, an Athenian general so impoverished, Plutarch tells us, that he was unable even to buy his own boots.<sup>15</sup> Plutarch may be reporting as fact here what is actually an exaggerated characterization drawn from a lost comedy. All the same, Lamachus must have been at least moderately poor, and that fact must have been well-known, for the joke (if that is what it is) ever to have been made.<sup>16</sup> Although Lamachus was not among the ten στρατηγοί in 426/5 BC, Aristophanes presents him as one here (593).<sup>17</sup> One reason for this is certainly the pun on μάχη that the general's name makes possible (see also *Pax* 1290-3). More important, however, is the fact that Lamachus' poverty makes him an ideal target for a charge of trying to grow rich in public service.

Costuming is crucial here. Lamachus is gorgeously clad, with an elaborate shield (574; 582-3; cf. 964-5; 1122; 1124; 1181), a helmet with a commander's elaborate crest (584-5; cf. 965; 967; 1074; 1103; 1105; 1109; 1111; 1182), and probably a brilliant scarlet robe as well.<sup>18</sup> Dicaeopolis, on the other hand, is dressed in the rags he has just

is therefore compelled to join the as-yet-unenlightened Chorus (esp. 289-91; 307-8) in attacking the hero as a traitor to his fatherland.

<sup>13</sup> Dicaeopolis stresses the economic nature of the sycophants' behavior by characterizing them specifically as bad money, 'false-stamped, valueless, counterfeit, of foreign mintage' (517-8). For the image, cf. *Ra*. 718-33.

<sup>14</sup> It has long been recognized that the raping back and forth here is a parody of the opening chapters of Herodotus' *Histories*. For a dissenting view, see C. W. Fornara, 'Evidence for the date of Herodotus' publication', *JHS* xci (1971) 25-34, esp. 28, and the response of D. Sansone, 'The date of Herodotus' publication', *ICS* x (1985) 1-9. In any case, as R. M. Harriott, 'The function of the Euripides scene in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *G&R* xxix (1982) 41 n. 20, observes, the parody (if that is what it is) is at most incidental to the force of the speech.

<sup>15</sup> ὁ δὲ Λάμαχος ἦν . . . πένης δὲ τοσοῦτον καὶ λιτός, ὥστε καθ' ἑκάστην στρατηγίαν ἀπολογιζέσθαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μικρὸν ἀργύριον εἰς ἐσθῆτα καὶ κρηπίδας ἑαυτοῦ.—Plu. *Nic.* 15.1; cf. *Alc.* 21.

<sup>16</sup> For notorious poverty as a source of sarcastic humor in Old Comedy, cf. e.g. *V.* 1267-74.

<sup>17</sup> See M. V. Molitor, 'Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 593 and 1073-4', *CR* xix (1969) 141, and C. W. Fornara, *The Athenian board of generals from 501 to 404*, *Historia Einzelschrift* xvi (Wiesbaden 1971) 58-9, and further bibliography provided there. 1073, which refers to 'the generals' giving orders to Lamachus, should not be taken as evidence that Lamachus is not a general within the context of the play. As N. V. Dunbar, 'Three notes on Aristophanes', *CR* xx (1970) 269-70, argues, οἱ στρατηγοί here is probably to be understood as 'the (other) generals'.

<sup>18</sup> For the costume, cf. *Pax* 1172-4. Comparison with the arming-scene in 1097-1142 suggests that Lamachus also carries a spear (1118; 1120) and wears a breastplate (1132), since his intentions here are exactly the same as there—to wage war wherever necessary (572-3; 620-2; 1073-7; 1134).

borrowed from Euripides (414–70).<sup>19</sup> When he first notices this noisy ‘beggar’, Lamachus demands to know who he might be (593–4), and Dicaeopolis responds only by insisting that he is a πολίτης χρηστός (595). Russo, Edmunds, Stone, Harriott and Reckford all found their interpretations of the confrontation that follows on the notion that Dicaeopolis now flings off his disguise.<sup>20</sup> There is no indication of this in the text, no ἰδοῦ, no deictic, no sense of any surprise on Lamachus’ part or of any extraordinary revelation on Dicaeopolis’. In fact, the whole point of the scene (and, indeed, of the play) rests precisely on the fact that the hero wears rags throughout this confrontation with the general.<sup>21</sup>

Dicaeopolis begins his attack on Lamachus by denouncing him as someone who has been living off the public treasury ever since the war began (595; 597). He and others like him (such as the ambassadors to Persia and Theoros in the play’s opening scene, for example,) have been receiving three drachmae a day for years now to sightsee on ‘state business’ (601–6), which mysteriously seems to demand their services alone (607–9). Meanwhile, grey old men like Dicaeopolis and the Chorus serve in the ranks (600; compare 596) and nowhere else (609–14). The practical effect of the war has thus been to subsidize the personal extravagance of

a few political insiders at everyone else’s expense (614–7). As the costuming seems designed to point out, in fact, the fighting means that Lamachus can now afford to dress expensively, while decent citizens like Dicaeopolis are reduced to rags and pauperage (cf. 71–2). The general’s defense of all of this in the name of democracy is mere pretence, for democracy means nothing to him except the chance to secure a wage (618–9; compare 597).<sup>22</sup> It was precisely this form of economic and social perversity, Dicaeopolis insists once again, that drove him to break ranks with the rest of the city and make peace: ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐγὼ βδελυττόμενος ἐσπείσάμην (599; compare 124–33).

As the elaborate and extended contrasts drawn between the preparations and ultimate fates of Dicaeopolis and Lamachus in the play’s closing scenes (1097–1142; 1190–1234) are clearly intended to suggest, the hero’s new world turns the tables on the old.<sup>23</sup> No longer will he be a buyer in a seller’s market. No longer will he be deprived of all the good things in life simply so that others (who are actually less deserving) can have them instead. At the same time, Dicaeopolis’ new world of peace corrects his other initial complaint, about his forced participation in the city’s money-economy. Superficially, the New Agora is modelled on the old. It has boundary stones (719), ἀγορανόμοι (723), its own class of excluded persons (725–6), a stele to commemorate the truce (727–8), and an agora-tax (896). Although language of ‘buying’ and ‘selling’ continues to be used (625; 734–5; 737; 749; 812; 897; 901), however, this is no longer a cash-, but a barter-economy.<sup>24</sup> No longer will Dicaeopolis have to use coined money to buy the necessities of life (34–5).<sup>25</sup> Instead, the New Agora is precisely an urbanized version of the simple cash-less rural system that ‘produced all things’, whose demise the hero mourned in his opening monologue (36).

The Boeotian trader makes the principles of the New Agora explicit by announcing that he has brought ὅσ’ ἐστὶν ἀγαθὰ Βοιωτοῖς ἀπλῶς (873), and wants to take back to his own country goods available in Athens but not there (893–903). Com-

<sup>19</sup> On Euripides’ *Telephus* and the *Telephus*-parody in *Acharnians*, see esp. P. Rau, *Paratragödie: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Munich 1967) 19–42; Foley (n. 12). Dicaeopolis chooses specifically the rags of *Telephus*, because he thinks of him as particularly δεινὸς λέγειν (429; compare *Nu.* 920–4), and he needs to be persuasive here. As the *Telephus*-parody has already proceeded handily for over a hundred lines (from at least 326) without any such elaborate change of costuming, however, a desire to poke fun at Euripides is not a sufficient explanation for the stage-action.

<sup>20</sup> C. F. Russo, *Aristofane autore di teatro* (Florence 1962) 87; L. Edmunds, ‘Aristophanes’ *Acharnians*, *YCIS* xxvi (1980) 14; L. M. Stone, *Costume in Aristophanic comedy* (New York 1981) 417; Harriott (n. 14) 39; K. Reckford, *Aristophanes’ old-and-new comedy* (Chapel Hill 1987) 185–6. See also C. H. Whitman, *Aristophanes and the comic hero*, (Cambridge MA 1964) 68: ‘The role of the beggar . . . is explicitly abandoned.’

It is clear that Dicaeopolis’ decision to wear rags is heavily overdetermined in any case. His own explanation is that he wants to appear as pitiful as possible during his speech before the *Acharnians* (383–4; compare *V.* 556–7; 564–5; 568–73; 976–8; *Pl.* 382–5), but this is undermined by the Chorus’ insistence that a change in costume will have no effect on them whatsoever (385–92). The disguise is also said later not to be intended to deceive the audience in the theater (442). Harriott (n. 14) 37, argues that a more significant effect of the rags is to provide a visual confirmation of Dicaeopolis’ decision to step outside of Athenian society: ‘The beggar was an “outsider”, a man without the support of *philoi*, . . . not part of the system of reciprocal obligations on which society was based’. Edmunds 12, on the other hand, maintains that the disguise is a reference to the nature of comedy itself: ‘Although comedy comes before the people with a just claim and a didactic mission, it can do so only in disguise.’ Foley (n. 12) believes that the *Telephus*-disguise is intended to underline the morally ambiguous nature of the hero’s case.

<sup>21</sup> Thus also C. P. Segal, *AJP* lxxxvi (1965) 308. If the action that follows is intended to parody the confrontation between Achilles and *Telephus* in Euripides’ tragedy, we would certainly expect Dicaeopolis/*Telephus* to stay in costume.

<sup>22</sup> In all fairness, it must be pointed out that the historical Lamachus seems to have been a brave soldier (*Plu. Alc.* 18—φιλολόκινδυνος ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι; *Pl. La.* 197c), and that he died in action in 414 BC in the fighting in Sicily (*Th.* vi 101.6, 103.1). After this, Aristophanes seems to have softened his attitude toward him (*Th.* 839–41; *Ra.* 1039).

<sup>23</sup> See the discussion of A. M. Bowie, ‘The parabasis in Aristophanes: prolegomena, *Acharnians*’, *CQ* n.s. xxxii (1982) 36. For a detailed analysis of the arming-scene, see R. M. Harriott, ‘*Acharnians* 1095–1142: words and actions’, *BICS* xxvi (1979) 95–8.

<sup>24</sup> This has been noticed by D. F. Sutton, *Self and society in Aristophanes* (Washington 1980) 20, who does not develop the point. See also Foley (n. 12) 46 n. 52. Aristotle also argued that barter was a more primitive and local form of trade, although he believed that the beginning of truly ‘foreign’ trade (ξενικωτέρως βοηθείας) necessitated the introduction of money (*Pol.* 1257a).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. 31, where the hero spends his free time in the city doing his accounts (λογίζομαι). Even Dicaeopolis’ treaty can be obtained only by giving Amphiheos eight drachmae for travel expenses (130–2).

pelled to discover a domestic product of Attica in short supply elsewhere, Dicaeopolis thinks first of anchovies or pottery (901-2), but finally hits on a sycophant (904). After a little haggling (909), the deal is struck (952-8). Similarly the Megarian obtains in exchange for his daughters salt and garlic, two commodities specifically said to be controlled by Athens and unavailable in Megara (813-4; 830-1; compare 760-3).<sup>26</sup> When Lamachus' servant offers a drachma for a thrush and three for an eel (960-2), on the other hand, he is turned out on his ear (966-8).<sup>27</sup> Money is irrelevant to the new world, and Dicaeopolis would not give up peace for 10,000 drachmae (1055)<sup>28</sup>.

Dicaeopolis' complaints and the motivations for his actions in *Acharnians* are thus fundamentally economic in nature, although they have a strong political and social component as well. The hero has had enough of this pointless war, created and perpetuated by a small group of insiders for their own selfish purposes. In the end, his is a double success, as he escapes not only the fighting, but also the cash economy which the city of Athens has come to represent. In fact, the two ideas almost seem to be treated as one, as peace and a return to the ideal (and idealized) countryside bring with them the recovery of a simple pre-monetary existence, in which all wants are freely satisfied. It is only a pity life cannot be so simple.

S. DOUGLAS OLSON

*University of Illinois  
at Urbana-Champaign*

<sup>26</sup> Even the wager the Megarian proposes over the identity of the 'piggies' is not for money, but for spiced salt (772). The bridegroom understands the new world well enough to try to obtain peace only through an exchange of gifts (1049-53). The Farmer simply begs for some for free (1020-1).

<sup>27</sup> Dicaeopolis does, however, mention the barter possibilities of the general's shield (966).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the plot of *Peace* (421 BC), in which the war is blamed once again on greed and short-sighted self-interest (esp. *Pax* 447-52; 603-48), and the hero's ideal new world taken to imply a return to countryside not just for farmers, but for everyone (e.g. *Pax* 865-9a; 1316-28).

### Eupolis or Dicaeopolis?

It is sad that *Acharnians* is so rarely produced on stage; it is also strange, for, visually as well as verbally, the play is immensely inventive and funny, and has deservedly engaged a great deal of critical and interpretative attention. One cannot but hesitate to add to the abundant literature. However, Mr E. L. Bowie's theory, recently propounded in this journal,<sup>1</sup> that Dicaeopolis represents Eupolis would, if correct, have interesting consequences both for our interpretation of the play and of some of the surviving fragments of Eupolis, as Mr Bowie shows.

In the light of theatrical realities, however, I do not think that the theory can stand. It is, of course, true that when the audience hear 377-82 and 497-

503 they have not yet heard the parabasis, but when they hear the parabasis they *have* heard the earlier lines, and the verbal parallelisms are very close:

377-80 αὐτος τ' ἑμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον  
ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμωδίαν.  
εἰσελκυσας γάρ μ' ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον  
διέβαλλε καὶ ψευδῆ κατεγλωττίζε μου . . .

501-3 ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μὲν δίκαια δέ.  
οὐ γάρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι  
ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω.

630-1 διαβαλλόμενος δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐν  
Ἰθηναίοις ταχυβούλοις  
ὡς κωμωδεῖ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν  
δῆμον καθυβρίζει.

645 ὅστις παρεκινδύνευσ' εἰπεῖν ἐν Ἰθηναίοις  
τὰ δίκαια . . .

659-62 πρὸς ταῦτα Κλέων καὶ παλαμάσθω  
καὶ πᾶν ἐπ' ἔμοι τεκταίνεσθω.  
τὸ γὰρ εὖ μετ' ἔμοῦ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον  
ξύμμαχον ἔσται, κού μὴ ποθ' ἄλλῳ  
περὶ τὴν πόλιν ὦν ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος  
δειλὸς καὶ λακαταπύγων.

Even in modern performances of Greek plays it is surprising how verbal cross-references stand out, and Athenian audiences were evidently accustomed to picking them up. For example, the public who saw *Acharnians* in 425 had been expected to notice the play with εὐκλεῖς, εὐκλεία in Euripides' *Hippolytus* of 428.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it is not merely implausible that an audience should be expected to take the first two passages as referring to one person and the second three to another: the idea destroys the coherence of the play. Bowie's article, however, still raises important and interesting questions about the reliability of the *scholia vetera*, the presentation of contemporary figures from real life on the comic stage and the character of Dicaeopolis.

To take the least complex question first, the *scholium* on 378<sup>3</sup> is not a feebly obvious deduction

<sup>2</sup> On εὐκλεία in *Hipp.*, see, in particular, B. M. W. Knox, 'The *Hippolytus* of Euripides', *YCS* xiii (1952) 3-31 (reprinted in Knox, *Word and action* [Baltimore and London 1979] and Segal (ed.), *Oxford readings in Greek tragedy* [Oxford 1983]) and R. P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Hippolytus: a study in causation', *Entretiens Hardt* vi: *Euripides* 169-91.

The cross-references in *Ach.* are of extreme simplicity compared with the evolving redefinitions of εὐκλεία (and other terms) with which Euripides' audience had to grapple.

<sup>3</sup> διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμωδίαν: τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους λέγει. τούτους γὰρ πρὸ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν οἷς πολλοὺς κακῶς εἶπεν. ἐκωμώδησε γὰρ τὰς τε κληρωτὰς καὶ χειροτονητὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ Κλέωνα, παρόντων τῶν ξένων. καθῆκε γὰρ δράμα τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους <ἐν> τῇ τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτῇ, ἥτις ἐν τῷ ἔσσι ἐπιτελεῖται, ἐν ᾧ ἔφερον τοὺς φόρους οἱ σύμμαχοι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Κλέων ἐγράψατο αὐτὸν ἀδικίας εἰς τοὺς πολίτας, ὡς εἰς ὕβριν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς ταῦτα πεποιηκότα, καὶ ξενίας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγρά-

<sup>1</sup> 'Who is Dicaeopolis?', *JHS* cviii (1988) 183-5.