

as a member of the cast. Hence the logic of Cyril Bailey's belief that Aristophanes himself played the part.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

L. P. E. PARKER

St. Hugh's College  
Oxford

<sup>21</sup> '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.

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

### When is a piglet not a piglet?<sup>1</sup>

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')<sup>2</sup> rather than size, and may even refer to something larger than of the

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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*<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> In *Ar. Thesm.* 237, similarly, there seems to be an obscene pun,<sup>5</sup> but no particular reference to age:<sup>6</sup> in fact, the indecent meaning of δελφάκιον seems to have a specifically mature reference.<sup>7</sup> 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'.<sup>8</sup> The same could easily be true of the 'three roast δελφάκια sprinkled with salt' of Eubulus:<sup>9</sup> 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 Delos<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> For whose point see below, n. 15.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> The immature equivalent being χοῖρος or χοιρίδιον: Henderson, *ibid.*

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

<sup>9</sup> ὅππᾳ δελφάκια ἀλίπασσα τρία, Eubulus *fr.* 6 K-A.

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

<sup>11</sup> *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.

and she generally cost them about thirty drachmas, a good ten times as much as a piglet—and not surprisingly, for of course she included a number of piglets and much meat besides. Once a year, however, they sacrificed three δελφάκια,<sup>12</sup> in and around the Thesmophoria. Here, too, the prices vary, but they are very different prices. They tended to average about twenty drachmas apiece; the cheapest known, indeed, cost as little as four drachmas and four obols, but the most expensive went as high as thirty-three drachmas. These are not quite the prices paid for pregnant sows, but they are much closer to that than to piglets; the conclusion seems inescapable that whatever a δελφάκιον was, it was not a piglet. It might, perhaps, have been an animal less than full-grown—an adolescent, if the term is properly applied to swine—while a δέλφαξ was a full-size boar; but there does not seem to be any need to presume as much, since the word δέλφαξ does not, in fact, occur anywhere in the inscriptions of the *hieropoioi*.

What were δελφάκια? The problem is complicated by the fact that the temple of Delos occasionally sacrificed κάπροι, which are also male swine. Κάπροι regularly cost less than a δελφάκιον; the cheapest was ten drachmas, the most expensive eighteen.<sup>13</sup> It is not likely that κάπροι were wild boars: wild boars were notoriously difficult to hunt and would presumably have commanded a high price, if indeed they were ever taken alive. More likely is that a δελφάκιον (or δέλφαξ) was a castrated pig, larger and—according to Galen<sup>14</sup>—tastier than an ordinary male.<sup>15</sup> Other suggestions are possible; but however it may have differed from a κάπρος, a δελφάκιον at Delos was clearly not a piglet but a pig, full-grown or nearly so. Although the meaning of one word is of small moment, it may provide a salutary warning to philologists to be cautious in interpreting the meaning of diminutives.

As a warning to philologists, this note can end here; as an example of the history of Greek usage, it can continue a bit further. In classical Athens, as we have seen, a δελφάκιον was surely a small pig, and perhaps an immature one; but when educated Greeks began to imitate ancient Attic, there can be no doubt that they took a δελφάκιον, as did LSJ, to be a piglet. We cannot, indeed, prove anything from the fact that Herodian the grammarian, in the second century, lists the word among

ὑποκοριστικά: it certainly is a hypocoristic form,<sup>16</sup> and for that matter, Herodian himself realizes that hypocoristic forms may be exchanged for the regular.<sup>17</sup> But when Plutarch earlier had spoken of ὕς τεκοῦσα δελφάκιον ἢ κύων . . . σκυλάκιον, he was surely taking δελφάκιον to the name for the offspring of a sow.<sup>18</sup> Clement of Alexandria, some hundred years after Plutarch speaks similarly of a sow that κατέφαγεν . . . τὰ δελφάκια because its owner had not fed it sufficiently,<sup>19</sup> and later writers echo the usage.<sup>20</sup> We should not hastily conclude that the *literati* had their way entirely; on the contrary, the papyri seem to indicate that in Roman Egypt, as in Delos, a δελφάκιον was not necessarily young, or even small. *POxy* 1684<sup>21</sup> speaks of half a 'big δελφάκια' (ἕμισου μεγάλου δελφάκιου, in the writer's poor orthography), and *PLond* 429,<sup>22</sup> from the fourth century or so of the current era, speaks of a δελφάκιον τέλειον—as 'full-grown piglet', if we are to believe the lexica.<sup>23</sup> We must surely conclude that while the scholars succeeded in 'correcting' the literary usage, the popular language—at least in Egypt—continued to speak of 'piggies' that were not small at all.

It may be that the scholars were 'correct' in their own terms, that is, that they understood by δελφάκιον what a classical Athenian would have done; it may equally well be that they had simply drawn the same hasty conclusion that LSJ did, and that the diminutive δελφάκιον, a little pig in classical Athens, a grown or nearly grown pig in Hellenistic Delos, reached its babyhood only among the more scholarly speakers of Greek in the first century of the present era.

DAVID SCHAPS

Bar Ilan University  
Ramat Gan, Israel

<sup>16</sup> Herodian, *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, in *Grammatici Graeci*, ed. Lentz (Leipzig 1868/76) iii 2, p. 457. Herodian, in any event, was interested only in its correct accentuation.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. id., *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφωδίας* 13 (*ibid.*, iii 1, p. 362), *Ναρούκιον πόλις Λοκρίδος, ἥ καὶ Νάρυξ λέγεται*.

<sup>18</sup> *Moralia* 497d (*De amore proliis*).

<sup>19</sup> *Stromateis* 7.4. Clement is repeating a story of Antiphon (a *τερατοσκοπός* of unknown date), but need not be using Antiphon's original words. The *τερατοσκοπός* reassured the owner that the omen was good—since the hungry sow had not eaten the children of its stingy owner.

<sup>20</sup> So Libanius, *Decl.* xxxii 1.23, so Joannes Philoponus (sixth century) in his commentary on Aristotle's *De generatione animalium* xiv 3.46.32 and *ibid.* 214.15, and so the δελφάκιον . . . γαλαθηνόν in the ninth century *Hippiatrica*. Lucian *Sat.* 23 also distinguishes an ὕς from δελφάκια.

<sup>21</sup> Line 13.

<sup>22</sup> Published in H.-A. Rupprecht ed. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten* xiv (Wiesbaden 1981) no. 11983, 8.

<sup>23</sup> Preisigke's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1925), in the spirit of Liddell and Scott, translated δελφάκιον as Ferkelchen; and A. C. Johnson, in the second volume of Tenney Frank's *Economic survey of ancient Rome* (Baltimore 1936) 232, spoke of a 'sucking-pig' in *PRossGeorg.* ii 41, where the papyrus mentioned a δελφάκιον (presumably, as in the case mentioned above, a δελφάκιον). Perhaps more strikingly, he saw in *PLond* 928 a 'pig' for 1 dr. 4 ch. and a 'sucking-pig' for 2 dr. 3 ob., where in fact the cheaper item is a χοῖρος, the more expensive a δέλφαξ.

<sup>12</sup> *IG* xi 278A.69, *Ins. Dél.* 291b.24, 290.88, 316.122, 338Aa.59, 372A.104, 440A.36, 61, 442A.200, 220, 444A.31, 445.3, 447.16.

<sup>13</sup> *IG* xi 199A.71, *Ins. Dél.* 440A.61, 445.3, 461Bb.50.

<sup>14</sup> *Περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς δυνάμεων* iii 6 (*Περὶ ὄρχεων*).

<sup>15</sup> For a parallel suggestion and a discussion of the difficulties involved, see Folkert van Straten, 'Greek sacrificial representations: livestock prices and religious mentality', in T. Linders and G. Nordquist, ed., *Gifts to the gods: proceedings of the Uppsala symposium*, 1985 (Uppsala 1987) 168–70. The suggestion gains plausibility from Ar. *Thesm.* 237, where Mnesilochus cries as Euripides prepares to singe him, οἶμοι κακοδαίμων δελφάκιον γενήσομαι.