

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).²⁶ 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).²⁷ Money is irrelevant to the new world, and Dicaeopolis would not give up peace for 10,000 drachmae (1055)²⁸.

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*

²⁶ 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).

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

²⁸ 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,¹ 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.
εἰσελκύσας 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 428.² 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 378³ is not a feebly obvious deduction

² 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.

³ 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, ἣτις 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-

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

from the immediate text (like, for example, the attempts to explain 704). It is full and circumstantial, and it fits remarkably well with the text of the play, not at one point but at many. Just how well it fits has been demonstrated in this journal by Professor Helene Foley.⁴ On the other hand, Bowie's arguments in favour of the identification of Dicaeopolis with Eupolis rely heavily on conjecture. The dates of both Ταξίαρχοι and Ἀστράτευτοι are uncertain.⁵ The latter play, indeed, seems to have dealt in accusations of effeminacy, but this is not an issue in *Acharnians* (except momentarily at 117ff.). For the little we know of Ταξίαρχοι we depend quite heavily on the Aristophanic scholia (*Peace* 348e)—a reminder that valuable testimony from ancient sources now lost to us is indeed preserved in those notes, as well as improvised rubbish.

The evidence of echoes from Προσπάλοι is tenuous in the extreme. It needs the eye of faith to see a connection between Strymodorus' fresh, young wood-carrier (*Ach.* 272-3) and the Thracian ribbon-seller who was somebody's mother (Eup. fr. 262 K-A). χωλός in Eup. fr. 264 K-A cannot have anything to do with the lame heroes of Euripides, since the defective member is a hand, not a foot. There remain the trifling verbal similarity (ὑποστένοι μὲντᾶν *Ach.* 162 and μέγα στένοι μὲντᾶν Eup. fr. 260.30 K-A, differently placed in the line), and the references to Bellerophon (*Ach.* 427-8) and Stheneboea (Eup. fr. 259.126 K-A). But shared references of this kind are poor evidence of direct connections, since the Attic comedians, like any other contemporary group of satirists, evidently had a common fund of jokes and allusions (hence the citations of other comedians in the Aristophanic scholia). So the story of Bellerophon is also alluded to by Cratinus

ψατο καὶ εἰς ἀγῶνα ἐνέβαλεν. τὰ δὲ Λήναια ἐν τῷ μετοπώρῳ ἤγετο, ἐν οἷς οὐ παρήσαν οἱ ξένοι, ὅτε τὸ δῖαμα τοῦτο, οἱ Ἀχαρνεῖς ἐδιδάσκετο. REΓ (and the Triclinian L).

Scholia in *Aristophanis Acharnenses* ed. N. G. Wilson (Groningen 1975) 59-60. The author of the note slips up in placing the Lenaea ἐν τῷ μετοπώρῳ, but this is his only demonstrable mistake, and it does not affect his argument. Aristophanes returns to the attack on τὰς χειροτονητὰς ἀρχάς in his treatment of Lamachus in *Ach.*

⁴ 'Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *JHS* cviii (1988) 33-47.

⁵ On the date of Ταξίαρχοι see Kassel-Austin *ad loc.* Wilamowitz dated the play to 427, but Handley (*PCA* lxxix [1982] 24-5) would bring it down to within a year of 415. Ἀστράτευτοι (Eup. fr. 35 K-A) shares a joke about Peisander's cowardice with *Birds* 1556 (414). According to schol. NEΓ on the same line, Aristophanes attacked Peisander in *Babylonians* in 426 (*Ar.* fr. 84 K-A). If this is true, it is the earliest reference to him in a securely-dated play. Other dated references to him are: *Peace* 395 and Eupolis 195 K-A (both of 421), Phrynichus 21 K-A (414, like *Birds*) and *Lys.* 490-1 (411). Reference to Peisander in a play earlier than 425 cannot be ruled out, but mentions of him become noticeably more frequent from the late 420s until his disappearance from the scene in 411. P. Geissler (*Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*) dates Ἀστράτευτοι to 424-3, and other plays which mention Peisander to 420-19 (Hermippus, Ἀρτοπώλιδες 7 K-A) and 416-11 (Plato, Πείσανδρος 102-113 K-A). See now I. C. Storey (*Phoenix* xlv [1990] 1-30).

(fr. 299 K-A) and by Aristophanes in other plays (*Peace* 76, 135, *Thesm.* 404, *Frogs* 1043ff.). The case, such as it is, that Dicaeopolis represents Eupolis has to rest on the name.

Bowie seeks confirmation of his thesis in the supposed inappropriateness of Dicaeopolis' name to his character: 'many now agree that Dicaeopolis' implementation of his peace involves selfish *pleonexia*, almost a polar opposite of *dikaiosune* in his dealing with his fellow citizens.' It follows that, if the name does not suit the dramatic character, it must have been chosen to indicate the person who is being caricatured. The idea of the 'selfish' Dicaeopolis goes back to Cedric Whitman.⁶ His book is subtle, imaginative and rich in literary insights. His theory is seductively coherent, and is expounded with a verbal panache which has made it hard to resist. Nonetheless, his reading of *Acharnians* is curiously distorted. When dealing with the prologue, he is shrewd and perceptive: 'The political satire is evident enough, but its chief purpose is to make clear the position of Dicaeopolis, the individual citizen. His helpless isolation is dramatized throughout . . . He is the self, trapped and mocked by the institutions of an alien society.' It can certainly be objected that this is too introvert, but the scene does have a certain nightmarish quality: Dicaeopolis is like a man who dreams that he is warning people of impending disaster, only to realize that they cannot hear or see him. Amphitheus is forcibly silenced, but Dicaeopolis can say and do what he likes. This 'invisibility' has advantages: he can even shake his fist in the face of a person who is ostensibly the representative of a major foreign power, and, apparently, suffer nothing but the herald's mild, impersonal σίγα, κάθιζε (122). Yet nothing that he does or says has any effect.⁷ Dicaeopolis' reintegration in society actually begins with the entry of the chorus: *they* pay attention to him.

Whitman, then, is right in perceiving that Dicaeopolis' alienation comes in the first place

⁶ *Aristophanes and the comic hero* (Cambridge, Mass. 1964). On *Acharnians*, see in particular Chap. III. Cf. K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic comedy* 87-88, Foley, *op. cit.* (n.3) 45-6.

⁷ We do not, of course, know how the curiously ghostly prytaneis and assembly were represented on stage. The suggestion of D. M. MacDowell ('The nature of Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *G&R* xxx [1983] 147) that the audience were drafted in to play the part, is plausible (compare the use of the audience to represent the sinners in Hades at *Frogs* 274ff.), but I do not think it necessary (or likely) that Dicaeopolis actually sat 'beside or among them' during the scene. His description of the arrival of the assembly in his opening speech would have had to be imaginary. At 20, the Pnyx is empty; by 40 the rest of the assembly has arrived, and the belated prytaneis have to push their way to their seats in the front. One may wonder whether the whole assembly is not left to the imagination of the audience, so that, by a comic paradox, the citizens who treat Dicaeopolis as if he did not exist are themselves non-existent.

The dissolution of the assembly does, indeed, follow Dicaeopolis' announcement of a sign from Zeus, but with no apparent reference to him. He has now decided to make his private peace (130-1), and the disappearance of the assembly may be seen as the first sign that things are now going mysteriously right for him.

from his society, not from himself. His recognition of it and the decision it drives him to are presented as a personal crisis of paratragic dimensions:

ἀλλ' ἐργάσομαί τι δεινὸν ἔργον καὶ μέγα.

It is at this point that Whitman begins to distort. For him, Dicaeopolis now 'becomes a comic hero . . . He conceives an idea which transcends the Assembly with its corruptions, and at the same time startlingly liberates and exalts his own individual self . . . The private treaty with Sparta puts Dicaeopolis on a level with a whole polis and even above it.' He 'ceases to be the small man crushed under the wheels of government; instead he towers over it.' Anyone reading this without a knowledge of the play would form a completely wrong idea of the following action. In fact, Dicaeopolis' magical autonomy is strictly confined to his own immediate ambience. He has simply managed to withdraw into a tiny world of individual sanity, realizing the fantasy that lies behind the car-sticker inscribed 'nuclear-free zone'. He has no *power*—except that of tragic persuasion, borrowed from Euripides. Here again Whitman distorts: 'Euripides represents, as often, the new rhetoric, and Dicaeopolis, by having recourse to him, allies himself with a whole series of figures who elsewhere are treated as incarnate powers of darkness, the spirits of *poneria* . . . There is more than mere tragic parody here. It is a real shift of rôles. Dicaeopolis becomes Telephus in his own right as comic hero, that is a low character triumphant through *poneria*.' The phrase 'incarnate powers of darkness' will at once strike a jarring note with any sympathetic reader of Aristophanes, and, again, Professor Foley⁸ has demonstrated the full complexity of Aristophanes' literary relationship with Euripides. The 'comic hero triumphant through *poneria*' is Whitman's own invention, and has nothing to do with even Dicaeopolis' parodic description of Euripides' Telephus:

χωλός, προσαιτῶν, στωμύλος, δεινὸς λέγειν

Whitman's determination to flesh out his own creation makes his reading of the play from now on increasingly idiosyncratic and inattentive. Thus, Dicaeopolis' plea on behalf of the Spartans is not, as Whitman says, that they were fighting in self-defence, but that they were helping their allies, an eminently acceptable manifestation of international δικαιοσύνη.⁹ Once the chorus is won over,

⁸ *Op. cit.* (n.4).

⁹ MacDowell (*op. cit.* [n.7] 148-54) analyses Dicaeopolis' speech at 497ff., and I agree with his main contentions. I would add that Dicaeopolis is made to use a common strategy of opponents of wars. A war has causes on two levels: an immediate *casus belli* and an underlying international problem which is far more serious, far harder to resolve, or even to formulate (τὴν ἀληθεστάτην πρόφασιν, ἀφανεστάτην δὲ λόγῳ . . . Thucydides i 23). The opponent's strategy consists in completely ignoring the underlying problem and concentrating on the immediate *casus belli*, which in isolation tends in any case to sound trivial, and which can be yet further belittled by rhetorical means. Compare Voltaire's famous judgment on the Seven Years' War: 'Vous savez que ces deux nations sont en guerre

Dicaeopolis rapidly rejects the Telephus-rôle and reasserts his own integrity in the dialogue with Lamachus:

Δι. ἐγὼ γὰρ εἶμι πτωχός; Λα. ἀλλὰ τίς γὰρ εἶ;
 Δι. ὅστις; πολίτης χρηστός, οὐ σπουδαρχίδης,
 ἀλλ' ἐξ ὄτου περ ὁ πόλεμος στρατωνίδης

Moving to the part of the play that follows the parabasis, Whitman (76) remarks: 'Of the later scenes little need be said, except to emphasise the *poneria* of Dicaeopolis.' This is done by major misrepresentation. The Megarian and the Boeotian are both, he says, 'dexterously cheated.' They are not. Dicaeopolis simply asks the Megarian how much he wants for the 'pigs' and receives from the prototype Alfred Doolittle¹⁰ the amazing reply:

τὸ μὲν ἄτερον τούτων σκορόδων τροπαλίδος,
 τὸ δ' ἄτερον, αἰ λῆς, χοίνικος μόνος ἄλῶν

There is a touch of mischief in the impounding of the Copaic eel as market-tax, but the Boeotian shows no sign of minding, and the items Dicaeopolis offers in exchange for his other goods are genuinely desirable Attic products.¹¹ It is worth noting that Dicaeopolis conducts his marketing not with money, but in the normal, peacetime farmer's way, by barter. Where he gets the goods he offers need not trouble us: αὐτόματα πάντ' ἀγαθὰ τῷδ' ἔγε πορίζεται.¹² It is in no way Dicaeopolis' fault if, once he has taken his solitary decision on the right course, he inhabits a delightful world where the people with whom he does business are completely mad and prepared to sell

pour quelques arpents de neige vers le Canada . . . ' (*Candide*, Chap. 23). A notorious example from real life is Neville Chamberlain's description of Czechoslovakia in 1938 as 'a far-away country of which we know nothing'. The editor of this journal compares Andocides, *On the Peace*, and adduces the final chapter of A. J. P. Taylor's *Origins of the second world war*, which is entitled 'War for Danzig'. The mixture of fantasy, parody and serious intent in this speech, so baffling to us, will have been disentangled instantaneously and without conscious effort by a contemporary audience.

¹⁰ 'Well, the truth is, I've taken a sort of fancy to you, Governor; and if you want the girl, I'm not so set on having her back home again but what I might be open to an arrangement. Regarded in the light of a young woman, she's a fine handsome girl. As a daughter she's not worth her keep; so I tell you straight. All I ask is my rights as a father; and you're the last man alive to expect me to let her go for nothing; for I can see you're one of the straight sort, Governor. Well, what's a five-pound note to you? and what's Eliza to me?' Bernard Shaw, *Pygmalion*, Act II.

¹¹ Attic pottery needs no comment. On the high quality of Phaleron whitebait (ἀψύσαι) and general appreciation of them, see Athenaeus vii 285b-d.

¹² The point that Dicaeopolis operates by barter is observed by Foley (*op. cit.* [n.4] 46, n.51), but even she is swayed by current orthodoxy to argue that because Dicaeopolis' Golden Age is not shared, it is in some sense 'corrupt and perverted'. But there is no suggestion of anything of the kind in the text of the play. On the contrary, the chorus at 971ff. point him out to 'the whole city' as τὸν φρόνιμον ἄνδρα τὸν ὑπέροσφον and look forward to enjoying that same Golden Age themselves, through their union with Διαλλαγῆ.

their goods for a derisory or even a noxious return. However much common-sense (a poor guide in the comic world of Aristophanes) may rebel, we must accept that the Megarian and the Boeotian are both delighted with the bargains they have struck, for they say so.¹³ The sight of the Athenian triumphing over the caddish Megarian and the stupid Boeotian is calculated to please the audience, yet the pacific victory has been won without pain to the enemy. Everybody is happy.

Finally, Dicaeopolis' selfishness is supposedly exemplified in his treatment of Dercetes and the bridegroom: he will not let either the destitute peasant or the young man have a drop of *his* peace. Anyone awake to the distinction between literature and life will have long suspected that Dercetes was presented on stage with a grotesqueness designed to exclude compassion.¹⁴ A. H. Sommerstein's discovery (*ad loc.*) that there really was a Dercetes of Phyle reveals the true nature of the scene: it is a personal attack on someone of some temporary notoriety who is no more likely to have been in reality a destitute peasant than Cleon was a Paphlagonian slave or Laches a dog.

To contrast the 'selfish' Dicaeopolis of these scenes with the 'generous' Trygaeus of *Peace*, who acts on behalf of all Greeks, is to ignore the comic axiom on which the play is based. Dicaeopolis' fellow-citizens were blind and deaf to the benefits of peace. By his paratragic rhetoric and his personal example he has made them hear and see. The chorus draw the right conclusion: *they* do not ask to share Dicaeopolis' peace, but instead sing a love song to Διאלλαγή (peace negotiations). In asking for a share of Dicaeopolis' own personal peace, Dercetes and the bridegroom attempt an illicit short-cut. Lamachus is completely obdurate and completely despicable. First, he tries to buy the benefits of peace without peace itself (960-2); then, when actually called upon to fight, he shows no enthusiasm (1078-83), and his attempt to 'guard the passes' is a fiasco.¹⁵ Eventually, the poet subjects

him to a particularly direct and brutal demonstration that war is a mug's game, even for those who think they can profit by it.

Dicaeopolis does, of course, give a share of his peace to one person: the bride, who, as a woman, has no part in the making of political decisions (1062), and so shares the impotence that he himself suffered at the beginning of the play. His sympathy for her is coarsely and comically expressed, but it is sympathy none the less. It is worth the risk of seeming over-solemn to point out that compassion for women as a distinguishing mark of the co-operative man and the sympathetic literary character goes very far back in Greek literature, to Homer's Patroclus (*Il.* xix 287ff.) and Hector (*Il.* xxiv 762ff.). Obliquely, the voice of the woman at the mill (*Od.* xx 105ff.) is a confirmation (one among many, but poignant and crucial in timing) that the suitors are villains and that it is Odysseus who represents humane and civilized values. In the manner of comedy, Dicaeopolis is earthy, irreverent and individualistic, but comparison with the truly outrageous self-assertion of, say, Philocleon or Strepsiades should be enough to show that Aristophanes has taken some care to ensure that his behaviour should not render his name inappropriate.

The audience, of course, does not have this clue to Dicaeopolis' identity until 406. Up to that point the character is anonymous. This postponement is seen by Bowie as a deliberate device to 'puzzle and tantalize' the audience. I do not think that it can be shown from any of the other surviving plays that Aristophanes is likely to have used such a device, nor does it make sense in dramatic terms. In what sense can Dicaeopolis be said to 'represent' Eupolis if he is recognizable only by the name after he has been on stage almost continuously for over 400 lines? In order to entertain, a stage caricature needs to be recognizable, as nearly as possible *instantly* recognizable, for jokes that pass before the victim is recognized are wasted. Thus, Aristophanes most frequently identifies caricatured personages by name before or very soon after they appear. This applies in *Ach.* to Amphitheus (most probably a caricature, see *CR* xxxiii (1983) 11), Theorus, Euripides, Lamachus, Nearchus and Dercetes. Another aid to identification will have been the portrait-mask. *Knights* 230ff. seems good enough evidence that stage caricatures normally wore portrait-masks, and Dover in his now classic study of the subject¹⁶ accepts that portrait-masks were worn 'when it was technically possible to make them'. I should prefer to conclude that they were worn unless a better joke could be made in some other way.¹⁷ For example, Dover conjectures,

M. Lewis, 'Double representation in the *strategia*', *JHS* lxxxi (1961) 119-20.

¹⁶ 'Portrait-masks in Aristophanes' in ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟ-ΤΡΑΓΗΜΑΤΑ (Studies in honour of W. J. W. Koster), (Amsterdam 1967) 16-28, reprinted in H.-J. Newiger (ed.), *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie* (Darmstadt 1975) 155-69.

¹⁷ The recognizability of a caricature depends far less on the distinctiveness of the victim's features and the accuracy of the portrayal than on how well known he or she is. Here, the

¹³ 816-7, 906-7, 947.

¹⁴ What *exactly* is the point of Dercetes' white clothes (1024) and of his repeated use of the dual of βούς, conspicuously placed at line-end and culminating in the oblique case in his exit-line (1022, 1027, 1031, 1036)? On the double function of the scenes of Dercetes and the wedding party, see L. P. E. Parker, *CR* xxxiii (1983) 11. On Dercetes, cf. MacDowell, *op. cit.* (n.7) 158-60.

¹⁵ It is important to dissociate what we know about the real Lamachus from the caricature in *Acharnians*, which Aristophanes himself knew, at least later, to have been grossly unfair, as his subsequent mentions show (*Thesm.* 840-1, *Frogs* 1039). As the *bête noire* and complete antagonist of Dicaeopolis and the (converted) chorus, the character on whom Aristophanes has chosen to confer the name of Lamachus has to be young (because they are γέροντες, aristocratic (because they are ordinary folk), and a bragging sham (because they are honest veterans). A combination of some aspects of the real man's character, in parodic form (διάπυρος καὶ φιλοκίνδυνος ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 18.1), with some current celebrity would account for the poet's choice. The neatest and most attractive historical solution both for Lamachus' rôle in the play as archetypal warmonger and for the fact that he is treated as στρατηγός before the elections for 425/424 is provided by D.

most plausibly, that Aristophanes chose with comic purpose to represent Cleon in *Knights* as some sort of monster.¹⁸ Similarly, the small spindly body, long, spike-like nose and bisected-cone eyelids of 'the Maggon' in *Private Eye's Dan Dire* strip did not resemble Mrs. Thatcher's features, but the lack of resemblance was deliberate. In *Ach.*, Lamachus is emphatically announced by name before he appears. This could be because he was neither striking in appearance nor a well-known public figure. His election as general, however, suggests that he *was* enjoying some celebrity at the time. A likelier explanation is that Aristophanes had chosen to represent him as a monstrous *miles gloriosus* in absurdly grand armour (towering plumes, gorgon shield), so that the real man, even in caricature, would not have looked right for the part. The effect on the audience of the entrance of the stage 'Lamachus' will have been a comic shock.

Dicaeopolis, as envisaged by Bowie, does not come within either category of stage caricature. He cannot look like the young poet¹⁹ (for in that case the guessing-game that Aristophanes is supposed to be playing with the audience would not work), nor like any monstrous or absurd projection of his personality (since there is no hint of any such thing in the text). Dicaeopolis looks, as far as we can judge, like an ordinary comic γέρων, and he is only to be identified as Eupolis by a few verbal hints. Moreover, in Bowie's words, 'only . . . 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.' This uncomfortable re-interpretation would, of course, have been forced on the audience whether Dicaeopolis were to be taken as a representation of Eupolis or of the other young poet, Aristophanes. Further, it can be observed at once that this 'bio-

analogy of the modern political cartoon, aptly adduced by Dover, repays further exploration. I think it can be observed that as a figure stays in the limelight cartoonists tend to develop a sort of short-hand image which resembles its model in detail less and less.

The art of personal caricature seems not to have been universally known and practised (see E. H. Gombrich, *Art and illusion*, Part Four, X), but evidence that it existed in the Athens of Aristophanes is to be found, in part, in this play. At 854, the chorus congratulate Dicaeopolis because οὐδ' αὖθις αὖ σε σκώφεται Παύσων ὁ παμπόνηρος. The *scholium vetus* on 854 says that Pauson was a ζωγράφος πένης σκωπτολόγος. Both σκωπτολόγος and πένης look like deductions from the text of Aristophanes (*cf. Thesm.* 949 and *Wealth* 602), but the information that he was a visual artist cannot be so derived, and is confirmed by Aristotle (*Poetics* 1448a) who cites him as an artist who depicts people as 'worse than they are', the visual equivalent of Ἡγήμων . . . <δ> τὰς παρωδίας ποιήσας. We do not know what medium Pauson worked in, and there is, of course, absolutely no reason to connect him with theatrical masks. However, the fact that the art of caricature was practised makes the use of portrait-masks in comedy all the more plausible.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.* (n.16) 22-23.

¹⁹ On the chronology of Eupolis' early career, see K.-A. *Testimonia* 1, 24 and on 259,4.

graphical datum' is produced only to be forgotten instantly by everybody on stage. This is not how Aristophanes treats fellow-poets elsewhere.

Stephen Leacock's thriller-addict who went to *Hamlet* concluded, by an impeccable process of reasoning, that the murderer was Horatio, acting as the agent of Fortinbras. The fantasy illustrates in extreme form the results of interpreting a work of literature by the wrong set of conventions. Breach of dramatic illusion is a feature of Aristophanic comedy with which the Athenian audience will have been thoroughly familiar.²⁰ Together with fluidity of time and place, momentary shifts of identity allow the poet to take short-cuts and produce effects excluded from the conventional drama with which we are familiar. The scene of the Persian embassy in *Acharnians* is an interesting example of such technique. The Persian's name, Pseudartabas (91), and the manifest ἀλαζονεία of the Athenian envoys tend to confirm that Dicaeopolis is right in claiming that the attendant 'eunuchs' are Athenians in disguise, and that the whole embassy is, therefore, an imposture. Yet Pseudartabas himself is not explicitly unmasked, and his one intelligible line, 'You no get gold, Ionian sod', is the last thing that a disguised Athenian ought to say in the circumstances. Nor, of course, would a real Persian ambassador say it. He might, however, think it, and Aristophanes is suggesting to his audience that that is what Persians really do think: they despise Athenians (*cf.* 79) and, whatever flowery diplomatic ambiguities they may produce, have no intention of providing real help. For the device to work, however, the audience must feel (feel, rather than think) that a real Persian is speaking, even though they have already received a hint that he is bogus. The omission of the explicit unmasking of Pseudartabas aids this delicate piece of dramatic sleight of hand.

The device at 377ff. is, in fact, much simpler, and there is a closer analogy to it at *Wasps* 54ff., where the slave, Xanthias, speaking in his real person as comic actor, delivers very much the type of direct advertisement that usually belongs in the parabasis. The audience there will not have readjusted their ideas about the identity of Xanthias, the dramatic character. Dicaeopolis at 377ff. takes a step further by speaking momentarily as the author, rather than

²⁰ Breach of dramatic illusion deserves a full-scale literary study as an essential and distinctive part of Aristophanes' technique. For an interesting approach, see G. A. H. Chapman, 'Some notes on dramatic illusion in Aristophanes', *AJP* civ (1983) 1-23. O. P. Taplin ('Fifth-century tragedy and comedy: a synkrisis', *JHS* cvi (1986) 163-74) gives the phenomenon its proper significance, and restores important distinctions which tend to be lost in some recent discussion. The subject is touched upon from a particular point of view by D. Bain, *Actors and audience* (Oxford 1977) 3-4, 87-89. G. M. Sifakis, *Parabasis and animal choruses* (London 1971) 3ff.) adopts a definition of 'illusionist' so artificially restricted as to obviate discussion. I use the familiar term, since it seems to me to be clear in the context, and also to point towards the more general fluidities and ambiguities of place and personality that distinguish aristophanic comedy both from Attic tragedy and from conventional post-renaissance drama. 'Theatrical self-reference' (Taplin, *op. cit.* 164) is strictly only a part of the phenomenon.

as a member of the cast. Hence the logic of Cyril Bailey's belief that Aristophanes himself played the part.²¹ But there is no need to tie the poet with logic of that kind. In the πνίγος to the parabasis of this play (659-64) the chorus (or chorus-leader) suddenly speaks in the first person as the poet. In the parabasis of *Peace* (729ff.), the shift from speaking of the κωμωδοδιδάσκαλος in the third person to speaking as him in the first comes without any formal break at all, within the space of three lines in the tetrameter-section (ἐπεχείρει 752, μάχομαι 754). For the extension of this device outside the parabasis the traditional explanation is good enough: after Cleon's accusation, Aristophanes chose to make a special self-justificatory demonstration. There is no need to see Dicaeopolis as anything other than a variation of the standard comic γέρων, adapted, indeed, to speak momentarily for the poet, but, much more importantly, to assert the paradoxical δικαιοσύνη of comedy.²²

L. P. E. PARKER

St. Hugh's College
Oxford

²¹ 'Who played Dicaeopolis?' *Greek poetry and life: essays presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford 1936) 231-40. It is important to note that Bailey's theory is that Aristophanes played the part of Dicaeopolis, not that the stage character is intended as a self-caricature. The long-running controversy about whether Aristophanes or Callistratus is the διδάσκαλος spoken of in the parabasis, and which of them was prosecuted by Cleon, does not seem to me significant for the literary and dramatic appreciation of the play. The idea that Callistratus (on the assumption that he was the διδάσκαλος) acted the part of Dicaeopolis goes back to the nineteenth century (see W. Rennie on 378ff.). D. F. Sutton (*LCM* xiii (1988) 105-8) re-explores the idea that Aristophanes played Dicaeopolis, in the mistaken belief that it is a new one. He is corrected by S. Douglas Olson (*LCM* xv (1990) 31-2), who traces it back to W. W. Merry.

²² Cf. O. P. Taplin, 'Tragedy and tragedy', *CQ* xxxiii (1983) 331.

When is a piglet not a piglet?¹

When it is a full-grown pig. Specifically we have to do with the word δελφάκιον, defined by LSJ as a 'sucking pig'. Now, it is true that the word itself is a diminutive of δέλφαξ, and that a δέλφαξ is a full-grown pig; but not every diminutive indicates something small or immature. A diminutive may be disparaging ('kinglet'), friendly ('Joey'), pleonastic ('Katyushka'), ironic (Robin Hood's Little John), or simply a regular part of a word ('Mädchen') or a name (Theodor Herzl). A diminutive may refer to a difference of importance ('baronet') or sex ('majorette')² rather than size, and may even refer to something larger than of the

¹ The research for my forthcoming book on Greek prices (of which this note is a spin-off) has been supported, on different occasions, by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and by the American Council of Learned Societies. Both have my sincere thanks.

² Prof. Sommerstein points out a Greek example, μαιράκιον, where the diminutive (at least in the classical and Hellenistic periods) denotes a male, the simple form (μείραξ) a female.

simple form: it is by a quirk of historical linguistics that a hamlet is larger than a home, but it is a fact of the synchronic language. The -ιον ending in and of itself cannot establish that a δελφάκιον is immature.

In classical literature the few occurrences of the word are surely diminutive, but with no necessary reference to age: when the chorus of the *Lysistrata*³ say that they had a δελφάκιον but have sacrificed it, they mean 'a little pig', but only because they are speaking disparagingly of the contents of their pantry; a little pig is not necessarily a piglet.⁴ In *Ar. Thesm.* 237, similarly, there seems to be an obscene pun,⁵ but no particular reference to age:⁶ in fact, the indecent meaning of δελφάκιον seems to have a specifically mature reference.⁷ Aeschines the Socratic spoke of innkeepers raising δελφάκια, and although one supposes the innkeepers raised them from babyhood, the term may indicate no more than size—'piggies' as easily as 'piglets'.⁸ The same could easily be true of the 'three roast δελφάκια sprinkled with salt' of Eubulus:⁹ although full-grown pigs are not, to my knowledge, roasted entire and sprinkled with salt, we cannot tell whether the use of the diminutive here refers to the size or to the age of the pigs. It does not matter very much.

There is one place, however, where a δελφάκιον does not seem to be immature, and that is in Delos. The temple managers (*hieropoioi*) of Delos¹⁰ sacrificed a piglet every month 'to purify the sanctuary'. The price paid for them varied from year to year and even from month to month, but the average price was between three and four drachmas; out of more than a hundred whose prices are known, only five cost more than six drachmas. These monthly sacrifices were regularly called χοῖροι, and there can be little doubt that they were piglets.

The *hieropoioi* also sacrificed swine that were undoubtedly full-grown, for each year, at the Thesmophoria, they sacrificed a pregnant sow,¹¹

³ *Ar. Lys.* 1061. Although Jeffrey Henderson includes this passage in his exhaustive list of obscenities (*The maculate muse*, 132) he makes no suggestion as to what the point of a double-entendre would be here. It seems to me that the passage is to be taken at face value except, of course, in so far as Aristophanes always considered it funny to have women use any word connected with pigs.

⁴ It may, for example, be a mature pig of small size; or it may even be quite a large pig whose owner is disappointed because it is not an ox.

⁵ For whose point see below, n. 15.

⁶ The reference to 'hams of tender δελφάκια' in *Ar. fr.* 236 K-A does not, on the face of it, require the translation 'piglet', though I am happy to have no expertise in the taste of ham.

⁷ The immature equivalent being χοῖρος or χοιρίδιον: Henderson, *ibid.*

⁸ Athenaeus xiv 656f; Athenaeus quotes nothing but the expression ὡσπερ αἱ καπηλίδες τὰ δελφάκια τρέφουσιν.

⁹ ὅππᾳ δελφάκια ἀλίπασσα τρία, Eubulus *fr.* 6 K-A.

¹⁰ The inscriptions of the *hieropoioi* were published in *IG* ii 1633-1653, *IG* xi 2, 142-289, and *Inscriptions de Délos*, 290-498.

¹¹ *IG* xi 145.4, 148.62 (where it is not mentioned that the sow is pregnant, and she costs a very cheap 6½ drachmas), 204.48, 287A.69, *Ins. Dél.* 290.88, 372A.104, 440A.36, 442A.200, 444A.31, 460t.66. In this and in the next note I list only those places where a reasonably certain price is preserved.