

THE SYMPOSIUM AT WASPS 1299 FF.

IAN C. STOREY

IN THE SECOND PART OF *Wasps*, Bdelykleon is attempting to instruct his incorrigible father how to enjoy *la dolce vita*. Part of this instruction involves the proper behaviour at an elegant symposium (cf. τῶν πλουσίων [1171], ἀνδρῶν παρόντων πολυμαθῶν καὶ δεξιῶν [1175], ἐν ἀνδράσιν [1185], οἱ σοφοί [1196]). Two groups of *sympotai* are encountered, the first an imaginary one created by Bdelykleon as an example at 1219 ff.:

οἱ δὲ συμπόται
εἶσιν Θέωρος Αἰσχίνης Φᾶνος Κλέων
ξένος τις ἕτερος πρὸς κεφαλῆς Ἀκέστορος.

For this symposium there is general agreement among the critics that we have a unified group composed of Kleon and his circle, favourite targets elsewhere of Aristophanes.¹ The second symposium, at 1299 ff., which Philokleon actually attends, has provided critics with many problems of interpretation on which there has been little agreement:

καίτοι παρῇν Ἴππυλλος Ἀντιφῶν Λύκων
Λυσίστρατος Θούφραστος οἱ περὶ Φρύνιχον.

For Müller-Strübing this was a meeting of an oligarchic *betaireia* gathered to plot political strategy against the demagogues such as those mentioned at 1219 ff. This symposium is thus a deliberate counterpart of the earlier one. Antiphon and Phrynichos are the oligarchs of 411, and the unity of the group as a whole is a political one. For Rogers there was no political connexion at all; this was a gathering of "drunk and riotous paupers," hardly the sort to be found at a gentlemen's drinking-party. Van Leeuwen, assuming Phrynichos to be either a tragic actor or the comic poet, identified the group as a gathering of *literati* or of men connected with the theatre.² More recently MacDowell has accepted the overall

¹D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford 1971) 289; J. Vaio, "Aristophanes' *Wasps*. The relevance of the final scenes," *GBRS* 12 (1971) 335–352, at 337. Works cited in this note and the next are referred to subsequently by author's name alone, as are J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971), A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum* 2.1 (Berlin 1839), and A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes* 4, *Wasps* (Warminster 1983). Fragments of Aristophanes and Kratinos are cited from R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin 1983–).

²H. Müller-Strübing, *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik* (Leipzig 1873) 708 (followed by W. J. M. Starkie, *Aristophanes: The Wasps* [London 1897] 355); B. B. Rogers, *The Wasps of Aristophanes* (London 1914) 204 (a similar view was expressed by W. W. Merry, *Aristo-*

political colour of the group, but has argued that the point of the humour is not their politics but their social status (302 ff.). They are made fun of for their arrogance and snobbery. Given such a variety of interpretations, it may not be unreasonable to re-examine the various members of this symposium, to assess the possibilities for identification, and to ascertain what unity (if any) may be found. I shall conclude that, although the substance of MacDowell's interpretation is correct, certain of his prosopographical details require amendment.

1. *Philoktemon*.

The symposium seems to have been held at the house of one Philoktemon (ἐπὶ δείπνον εἰς Φιλοκτήμονος ἔμειν, 1250). His name, however, is not to be found among those enumerated later. Either (i) the name is a coinage, appropriate for a *bon vivant*, "Mr Acquisitive" (MacDowell 294), or (ii) the name belongs to an actual Athenian whom the audience would regard as a suitable host for a high-class drinking-party. However, by the time that the parabasis is over and the next episode begun, the audience will have forgotten the name, perhaps introduced only as a momentary jest, and ignore his exclusion from the symposium. This would be but one of many such inconsistencies in Aristophanes.³ Apart from certain names of chorus-members and some well-known *dramatis personae*, such "significant" names as suggested in (i) are not in fact particularly common in Aristophanes.⁴ As Philoktemon is a documented Attic name in both the fifth and fourth century,⁵ I find it unlikely that the audience would have caught the etymological significance here; rather a real Philoktemon would

phanes: The Wasps [Oxford 1898] 90); J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Vespaie* (Leiden 1893) 140 (followed by C. E. Graves, *The Wasps of Aristophanes* [Cambridge 1899] 215). A closely related view to van Leeuwen's is that of A. Willems, *Aristophane* (Paris 1919) 553 ff., E. Roos, *Die tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der altattischen Komödie* (Stockholm 1951) 126 f., and H. van Daele, *Aristophane* 2 (Paris 1964) 11 f., 74, all of whom stress the theme of the dance in the latter part of *Wasps* and identify both the *sympotes* and the Phrynichos of 1490, 1524 with the son of Chorokles, a tragic actor. Vaio combines the interpretations of Rogers and van Leeuwen ("starveling parasites and a second-rate theatrical coterie," 337).

³For an exhaustive study of inconsistency in Aristophanes see W. Süss, "Scheinbare und wirkliche Inkongruenzen in den Dramen des Aristophanes," *RhM* 97 (1954) 115-159, 229-254, 289-316.

⁴There are such *dramatis personae* as Philokleon, Peithetairos, Strepsiades, etc., and *choreutai* such as those named at *Ach.* 612, *Lysist.* 254 ff., 321 ff., *Ekk.* 293 ff. Some other names have been regarded as "significant," e.g., Derketes (*Ach.* 1028) built on *derk-*, Marpsias (*Ach.* 701) on *marp-*, Ktesias (*Ach.* 839) on *kt-*, and Ergasion (*Wasps* 1201) on *ergasia*; but all of the above (except Marpsias) are known Attic names, and even with Marpsias I should prefer to see an actual *rhetor* meant, rather than a fictitious "Snatcher."

⁵*PA* 14636-643 and *SEG* 23.86.299. The name is found in six different demes in the fourth century. The only instance from the fifth century is *PA* 14636, too early to be the *komodoumenos*.

more probably have come to mind. If *Wasps* 1256 has any bearing on the matter—οὐκ, ἤν ξυνῆς γ' ἀνδράσι καλοῖς τε καὶ γαθοῖς—Philoktemon was a well-to-do Athenian and an appropriate host for a symposium.⁶ No connexion with any of the known Philoktemons can be found.

2. *Hippyllos*.

Little is known about the first of the *sympotai*. The name is found once in Attic prosopography, as that of the dedicator of a silver bowl, *IG* 1³ 469.9, an inscription of unknown date, but taken by Woodward to be part of the accounts of the Nikai in 410.⁷ The feminine form, Hippylla, is known from the early fifth century as that of the wife or daughter of Onetor of Melite (Davies 421).

Müller-Strübing oddly contended (526 ff.) that the Hippyllos mentioned here (and also the Hipparchides or Hipparchos lurking beneath πανουργι-παρχίδας at *Ach.* 603) alluded to Thucydides the historian, who was related to the Peisistratidai (Markellinos *Bios Thouk.* 18), i.e., *Hippias* and *Hipparchos*. This “identification” provided him with much of his evidence for the oligarchic nature of the symposium. On the basis of *Cl.* 64 one might argue that the name *Hippyllos* in any case suggests an aristocratic background for its bearer, but Dover demonstrates the frequency of names based on the *hipp-* root.⁸

In view of the rarity of the name I am tempted to postulate a Hippyllos active in the late fifth century, quite possibly the man mentioned on *IG* 1³ 469, and on the basis of the presence of the name Hippylla in the family of Philonides (himself a *komodoumenos* on several occasions⁹) I should consider a connexion with that wealthy and prominent family.

3. *Antiphon*.

If this crucial *sympotes* can be identified with the oligarch of 411 to any degree of certainty, then the political interpretation is strengthened—if Antiphon is not the oligarch, then a political common denominator is much less likely. The inquiry is hampered by “the forest of Antiphons in the late fifth century . . . unlikely ever to be satisfactorily and completely mapped” (Davies 327). As many as fourteen Athenian Antiphons may have lived in this period:

- (i) *PA* 1299 — Kephisieus, whose son Epigenes was a follower of Sokrates in 399 (Plato *Apol.* 33e, *Phd.* 59b; *Xen. Mem.* 3.12.1,

⁶So Σ *ad loc.*: ἄσωτος οὗτος καὶ συνεχῶς συμπόσια ἐποίει.

⁷A. M. Woodward, “The Golden Nikai of Athena,” *ArchEph* 1937 159–163.

⁸K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford 1968) xxvi. For an equally bizarre view of *Ach.* 603 see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven, Conn. 1975); Henderson sees a ubiquitous *sensus obscenus* in names on the *hipp-*root (165).

⁹*Pl.* 179, 303; Theopompos 4; Philyllios 23; Platon 64; Nikochares 3.

- (ii) *PA* 1304 – Rhamnousios, orator and oligarch,
- (iii) *PA* 1278 – the sophist, who *may* be the same as (ii),¹⁰
- (iv) *PA* 1283 – Lysidonidou, builder of two triremes, put to death by the Thirty,
- (v) *PA* 1283 – father of the subject of a lost speech by Lysias (fr. 11), identified with (iv) by both Kirchner and Davies (317 f.),
- (vi) *PA* 1277 – archon of 418/7,
- (vii) *PA* 1279 – Hermokopid (And. 1.15),
- (viii) *SEG* 10.424, III 45 – of Leontis, war casualty ca 413,
- (ix) *PA* 1306 – Sphettios, whose son Leptines was named in a diadikasia ca 380 (*IG* 2² 1929.16),
- (x) *PA* 1276 – of Oineis, war casualty ca 409 (*IG* 1² 964.87 = *Agora* 17.231),
- (xi) *PA* 1285 – of Aiantis, *tamias* of Athene in 407/6 (*IG* 1³ 316.63),
- (xii) *PA* 1284 – son of Pyrilampes and younger half-brother of Plato,
- (xiii) *PA* 1282a – mentioned on a list ca 400 (*IG* 2² 2364),
- (xiv) *PA* 1292 – Eleusinos, early 4th cent. (*IG* 2² 2814).

As well as the mention of Antiphon at 1301 we must include also *Wasps* 1270 (of Amynias) πεινῇ γὰρ ἦπερ Ἀντιφῶν. Two unamplified references within thirty lines to an Antiphon are surely to the same individual. Which of the above Antiphons was sufficiently prominent in 422 to be recognized by the audience solely at the mention of his name? Most discussions assume the oligarch from Rhamnous. MacDowell argues that this man “at the period was reaching the peak of his oratorical career” (297). However, his political activities in 411 do not of themselves guarantee his prominence a decade earlier, and Thucydides does observe that Antiphon had kept a low political profile during those years (8.68.1). Antiphon Rhamnousios was made fun of in comedy (Platon 103; *com. adesp.* 66), but the one

¹⁰A. Andrewes in A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides 5 Book VIII* (Oxford 1980) 170 f. finds the identity “not proven,” but H. C. Avery, “One Antiphon or Two,” *Hermes* 110 (1982) 145–158 argues strongly for the identification. Sommerstein inclines toward identification and thinks that this is the man meant in *Wasps* (232).

datable allusion, that in Platon's *Perialges*, belongs to the 410s, not the late 420s.¹¹

I prefer Meineke's suggestion that our Antiphon is (iv), the son of Lysidonides (131, followed by Starkie [355] and van Leeuwen [140]) active in the late fifth century (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.40).¹² This man, a member of the liturgical class, was prominent enough to have been a comic target in Kratinos' *Pytine* (fr. 212), produced only months before *Wasps* (below, note 14), in which Lykon, another of the *sympotai*, was also mentioned (fr. 214). It is thus not unreasonable to assume that this man would come first to the audience's mind in 422.

At 1270 ff. Antiphon is linked with both Amynias and Leogoras:

ἀλλ' Ἀμυνίας ὁ Σέλλου
μᾶλλον, οὐκ τῶν Κρωβύλου,
οὗτος ὃν γ' ἐγὼ ποτ' εἶδον
ἀντὶ μήλου καὶ ῥοᾶς δειπ-
νοῦντα μετὰ Λεωγόρου· πει-
νῇ γὰρ ᾗπερ Ἀντιφῶν.

The implications for Amynias are disputed (MacDowell 139 f., Davies 471), but it is clear that to dine "on apple and pomegranate" is an indication of poverty and to dine with Leogoras is the exact opposite. Sommerstein (231 f.) sees Amynias' cleverness as the issue here, for he has managed to improve his impoverished station by dining off Leogoras. Amynias is almost certainly the son of Pronapes (see *Wasps* 74), a member of a wealthy and prominent family with considerable interests in horses and horse-racing, who himself appears to have fallen on hard times during the 420s (hence his nickname "son of Sellos," a contemporary colloquial term for what the scholiasts called the *pseudoploutos* or the *ptochalazon*). In what way can Amynias be said to be "hungry like Antiphon?" MacDowell, who identifies Antiphon with the oligarch, admits that nowhere is he described as hungry, and regards the allusion as having to do with Antiphon's enormous appetite. Sommerstein, who identifies the *komodoumenos*, the oligarch, and the sophist of Xen. *Mem.* 1.6, uses the picture of Antiphon in Xenophon to reach the same conclusion. It is worth noting that the company kept by Antiphon at 1270 is Amynias and Leogoras, two members of the liturgical class, and I submit that the son of Lysidonides, a known *leitourgos*, and a *komodoumenos* in the late 420s, is as likely a candidate as the sophist here. Such a rich man might very well have been made fun of for his appetite and rich style of life (cf. the other comic gourmands such as Morychos, Leogoras, Glauketes). In that case the

¹¹P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* (Munich 1969) XV, 51.

¹²[Plut.] *Mor.* 832f–833b adds to Xenophon and confuses the son of Lysidonides with the oligarch. Cf. Andrewes (above, n. 10) 170 and Davies 327 f.

sympotes is not the Rhamnousios, and one of the major supports for the political interpretation is removed.

4. *Lykon*.

The man most likely to be meant here is the father of Autolykos, best known from the charming portrait drawn by Xenophon in his *Symposium*, on the occasion of the party held by his son's *erastes*, the wealthy Kallias, to celebrate the boy's victory at the Panathenaia of 421.¹³ This Lykon was mentioned in other comedies of the 420s (Kratinos *Pytine* [423] fr. 214; Eupolis *Poleis* [422?] fr. 215 and *Autolykos* [420] *passim*).¹⁴ We learn from two scholia: Σ *Lysist.* 270 (on τὴν Λύκωνος) τὴν Ῥοδίαν λέγει οὕτω καλουμένην, μήτερά μὲν Αὐτολύκου, γυναῖκα δὲ Λύκωνος, ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς κωμωδουμένην, Εὐπολὶς Πόλεσιν "ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τὴν Λύκωνος ἔρρει πᾶς ἀνὴρ" (fr. 215), and Σ *Plat. Apol.* 23e: Λύκων, πάτερ Αὐτολύκου, Ἴων γένος, δῆμων Θορίκιος, πένης ὡς Κρατῖνος Πυτίνῃ (fr. 214). Εὐπολὶς δ' ἐν Φίλοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ Ῥοδίᾳ κωμῶδει αὐτόν (fr. 273). καὶ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Αὐτολύκῳ εἰς ξένον (fr. 53). Μεταγένης ἐν Ὀμήρῳ εἰς προδότην, "καὶ Λύκων ἐνταῦθά που / - - - προδοὺς Ναύπακτον ἀργύριον λαβὼν / ἀγορᾶς ἄγαλμα ξενικὸν ἐμπορεύεται." (fr. 10).

The designation Ἴων γένος is puzzling, but the emendation of Toepffer Ἴωνίδαι γένος is generally accepted, on which Lykon would become a member of the *genos* Ionidai.¹⁵ Given his son's association with Kallias, a *eupatrides* of the *genos* Kerykes, we may find this a reasonable conjecture and assign a superior social station to Lykon.

Kratinos' description of him as *penes* is odd in view of his likely noble status and his son's association with Kallias. Either the scholiast has misunderstood the joke (an ever-present possibility), or Lykon was made fun of in the same manner as Amynias, i.e., as a wealthy man fallen on hard times but still maintaining appearances. Even more puzzling is Eupolis' description of him as *xenos* (fr. 53). These jokes are usually directed against the demagogues as part of the malicious distortion of their true civic status.¹⁶ Lykon seems hardly of that sort. Again the scholiasts may have missed the point of the joke, but I suspect that it may have

¹³At least six contemporaries are known: (i) *PA* 9267—Athenian mercenary in Persia ca 425; (ii) *PA* 9270—Kekropid, war casualty (*IG* 1² 949.64); (iii) *PA* 9274—*tamias* of Athene in 419/8, of Prasiai (*IG* 1³ 354); (iv) *PA* 9269—son of Glauketes, recorded on a liturgical inscription ca 380 (*IG* 2² 1928.19); (v) Pandionid, war casualty ca 413 (*SEG* 10.424, II.55); (vi) *PA* 9271—father of Autolykos, wrongly identified in *PA* (as I argue below) with the accuser of Sokrates and the *komodoumenos* of Metagenes 10.

¹⁴The date of *Pytine* is given in the Second Hypothesis to the *Clouds*. For *Poleis* see Geissler (above, n. 11) XIV, 39; for the dramatic date of Xenophon's *Symposium* and for the production of *Autolykos* see *Ath.* 216d.

¹⁵J. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin 1889) 267–269.

¹⁶W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* (Princeton 1971) 168 ff., and K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford 1974) 32 f.

something to do with the possibility that Eupolis in his *Autolykos* linked Lykon with a Rhodian woman whom the scholiasts wrongly identified as Lykon's wife.¹⁷

One portion of the scholiasts' account of Lykon's career cannot stand: the identification of the father of Autolykos with the accuser of Sokrates.¹⁸ The Platonic scholiast is notoriously inaccurate in matters prosopographical. His technique appears to have been to consult a handbook of *komo-doumenoi* to handle each name which he met in his text (see his entries on Meletos or Aristophanes).¹⁹ There is no guarantee, therefore, that the Lykon he found in Plato was the *komodoumenos*. The name Lykon is not rare in the late fifth century (above, note 13). A Lykon made fun of in comedy ca 420 need not be the same man involved in a law case twenty years later. Plato describes Lykon as acting ὑπὲρ τῶν ῥητόρων (*Apol.* 23e); Diogenes Laertius uses the more explicit term δημαγωγός (2.38). Our evidence about Lykon the father of Autolykos does not suggest that he was a demagogue. If, as Aischines maintained, the real motivation behind the prosecution of Sokrates was his association with Kritias (2.73), a man of Lykon's status and background is a most unlikely prosecutor and associate of Anytos. Finally the depiction of Lykon and Sokrates in Xenophon's *Symposium* becomes ludicrous if the former were the accuser of the latter in 399. In particular, Lykon's words at 9.1 are very much out of place, unless Xenophon is resorting to a subtle (and most uncharacteristic) irony.

We should, therefore, reject the identification of the father of Autolykos with the accuser of Sokrates, and divide the entry in Kirchner (*PA* 9271) into two, if not three, men:

- (i) *PA* 9271a – the father of Autolykos and husband of “Rhodia,” a woman notorious in her own right, Thorikios by deme, and perhaps a member of the *genos* Ionidai; *Wasps* 1301, *Lysist.* 270; Eupolis 53, 215, 273 + *Autolykos* (*passim*); Kratinos 214; Xen. *Symp.* (*passim*),
- (ii) *PA* 9271b – the accuser of Sokrates, a demagogue; Plat. *Apol.* 23e; D.L. 2.38,
- (iii) *PA* 9271c – the man allegedly involved in the fall of Naupaktos; Metagenes 10.

¹⁷I hope to discuss elsewhere the matter of Lykon's wife, her name (not “Rhodia”), her status, and her caricature in comedy.

¹⁸Accepted by Rogers 204, Merry 90, Starkie 355, MacDowell 302. Sommerstein 235 has come to the same conclusion as I have. The Platonic commentators, J. Burnet, *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates, Crito* (Oxford 1924) 151, and W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969) 382, likewise have rejected the identification.

¹⁹Σ Plat. *Apol.* 18b, 19c. On the unreliability of the Arethas-scholiast see Burnet (*op. cit.*) 10.

As this last passage probably refers to Athens' loss of that ally in 405 (Paus. 4.26.2, 10.38.10), and as all that we know of the comedian, Metagenes, suggests a *floruit* in the years 410–400 (Geissler 58, 64 f.), this Lykon is in all likelihood not the father of Autolykos. He might be the same as (ii), a popular politician at the end of the war who would become involved in the prosecution of the philosopher a few years later.

The Lykon of *Wasps* 1301 is thus the father of Autolykos, a man who was “enjoying” a vogue in comedy at this time. The jokes appear to have concentrated on his personal life and his family, not on any political associations. The few hints about his own station, the portrait drawn by Xenophon, and his son's connexion with Kallias all combine to suggest a man of superior status and considerable prominence in the late 420s.

5. *Lysistratos*.

Most of the *penetes* in Old Comedy can be seen either as what I should call the “nouveaux pauvres” (e.g., Arynias) or as members of the philosophic community (Sokrates *et al.*). Lysistratos seems to fit into neither category. In the years 425–422 there are four certain references to this man (*Ach.* 854 ff., *Kn.* 1267, *Wasps* 787 ff., 1302 ff.), from which we learn that he belonged to the deme Chologargai (*Ach.* 856), wore little clothing and suffered from cold (*Ach.* 857, *Wasps* 1315), was constantly hungry (*Ach.* 857–859, *Kn.* 1267), and was a *skoptoles* (*Ach.* 856, *Wasps* 788, 1308–10).

The literary sources reveal a number of Lysistratoi from the late fifth century:

- (i) PA 9611 – son of Makareus, a *kinaidos* made fun of in comedy (Σ *Wasps* 787),
- (ii) PA 9595 – a friend of Andokides (*And.* 1.122),
- (iii) PA 9596 – a Hermokopid, denounced by Andokides (*And.* 1.53),
- (iv) PA 9630 – Chologargus, the *komodoumenos*,
- (v) PA 9630 – prosecuted by Philinos (*Ant.* 6.36),
- (vi) PA 9630 – associated with Alkibiades in a rhetorical context (*Ar. fr.* 205).²⁰

MacDowell proposed to regard all these Lysistratoi as one individual, arguing that the lack of any qualifying description in Andokides or

²⁰Most scholars accept Lysistratos Chologargus as the man meant here; so Meineke 2.2.1034; J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* 1 (Leiden 1957) 629; MacDowell 238; A. C. Cassio, *Aristofane, Banchettanti, i fragmenti* (Pisa 1977) 45; and most recently Kassel-Austin 3.2, 125. However, this joke seems to depend on Lysistratos' being a *rhetor*, and none of the usual elements is present (cold, hunger, etc.).

Antiphon indicated that there was only one well-known Lysistratos at this time in Athens.²¹

However, the evidence from epigraphy shows that the name is not uncommon; from the late fifth century the following Lysistratoi are known:

- (i) Morychidou Palleneus, *grammateus* in 426/5 (*IG* 1³ 300–302)—*PA* 9624,
- (ii) Aigilieus, *tamias* of the other gods in 421/0 (*IG* 1³ 472.11),
- (iii) Kothokides, *tamias* of the other gods in 420/19 (*IG* 1³ 472.13),
- (iv) Empedou Oethen, *strategos* in 418/7—*PA* 9620 (now read as $\text{Καλ-}[\iota\sigma\tau\rho]\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ at *IG* 1³ 370.21),
- (v) of Leontis, war casualty ca 412 (*IG* 1² 950.155)—*PA* 9607,
- (vi) of Leontis, war casualty ca 409 (*Agora* 17.23.151)²²—*PA* 9594,
- (vii) of Oineis, war casualty ca 409 (*Agora* 17.23.212)—*PA* 9593,
- (viii) of Antiochis, war casualty ca 409 (*Agora* 17.23.330).

Thus, the name is not rare, and we may suppose that four of these men would have been reasonably prominent, i.e., the *tamiai*, the general, and the scribe. The demotic forbids us to identify any of these with the *komodoumenos*. Thus I find two objections to MacDowell's thesis and wholesale identification. First, the epigraphical evidence reveals that there was more than one well-known Lysistratos in the late 420s, and second, at the first certain allusion to Lysistratos of Cholargai (*Ach.* 854 ff.) the comedian is careful to add a demotic in the phrase $\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma \text{Χολαργέων}$. May we not infer that Aristophanes is distinguishing for his audience this particular Lysistratos from others of different demes who might have come to mind first?²³

Two points about the comic Lysistratos may be made. First, he was a *skoptoles*, and from *Wasps* 787 ff., 1308–10 we learn that his joking took the form of both practical jokes and verbal sarcasm. Second, his perpetual cold and hunger must be the result of some personal habit; MacDowell asserts that Lysistratos "was probably in the habit of going about inadequately dressed. Perhaps he wore, even in winter, only a tunic and no cloak" (238). Can we improve upon this conclusion? I think we may. Two

²¹MacDowell 238. In his earlier discussion of Lysistratos, in *Andokides: On the Mysteries* (Oxford 1962) 99 f., 151, he is much more restrained.

²²In iii) the name is restored from [...]στρατο, in vi) from [...]ιστρατος.

²³See the sensible comments of A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes* 1 *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980) 199.

sorts of people might be described as going about in fewer clothes than one might think desirable. One would be Sokrates and his emulators; we may observe how the comic poets and Plato make a great deal out of this habit of Sokrates.²⁴ There is nothing to suggest that the Cholargeus was a member of the Sokratic company. The other sort of lightly-clad man would be the Laconophile. From *Birds* 1280–83 we learn that such devotees of things Spartan were not unknown at Athens:

ἐλακονομάνουν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι τότε,
ἐκόμων, ἐπείνων, ἐρρύπων, ἔσωκράτουν,
σκυτάλι' ἐφόρουν.

The verb ἐπείνων is the same as that used of Lysistratos at *Ach.* 858, and the comic coinage ἔσωκράτουν I should interpret as "they wore few clothes like Sokrates," as this characteristic of Sokrates and Laconophiles is otherwise lacking from the list. It could also include Sokrates' habit of going barefoot, also part of his caricature in comedy (*Cl.* 103–105, 363). If Lysistratos of Cholargai was such a Laconophile, his lack of heavy clothing is neatly explained, and his hunger is the result of a literally Spartan diet.

Such an explanation of Lysistratos' behaviour is not out of harmony either with an aristocratic or with an oligarchic view of the symposium, but it does weaken the case of those who would see the group as one of paupers and indigents. The friend of Andokides (ii), the Hermokopid (iii), or the victim of Philinos (v) would be an appropriate Laconophile. Laconophilia might help to explain an otherwise frigid joke in *Lysist.* At 1103 ff. the Spartans are asked whether Lysistrate should be summoned, to which query the answer is that they could even summon Lysistratos:

—τί οὐ καλοῦμεν δῆτα τὴν Λυσιστράτην,
ἥπερ διαλλάξειεν ἡμᾶς ἄν μόνῃ;
—ναὶ τῷ σιῶ κἂν λήτε τὸν Λυσίστρατον.

Most commentators ignore this as a reference to the Cholargeus and regard it as a weak pun on *luein* + *stratos*.²⁵ However, if Lysistratos was a notorious *Lakonomanes*, then this reply in the mouth of a Spartan has some point. Furthermore, if he were the Hermokopid of And. 1.55, presumably in exile in 411, the allusion becomes one to an infamous exiled Laconophile, to summon whom would be an absurd (yet appropriately comic) request. Sommerstein regards the significance of *Lysist.* 1103–05 as

²⁴Plat. *Symp.* 220a–b; Ar. *Cl.* 179 f., 497, 719, 857, 1104, 1498; Eup. fr. 352; Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.

²⁵So J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Lysistrata* (Leiden 1903) 151; B. B. Rogers, *The Lysistrata of Aristophanes* (London 1911) 128; and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristophanes Lysistrate* (Berlin 1927) 185. Compare the translation by Dudley Fitts, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (London 1955) 103: "Lysistrata? / Summon Lysis-anybody! Only, summon!"

alluding to the supposed Spartan penchant for homosexual behaviour. "Shall we summon Lysistrate (a woman)? Yes, and you can even summon a man (Lysistratos)." He identifies Lysistratos the pathic of *Lysist.* 1105 with the son of Makareus known as a catamite from Σ *Wasps* 787, observing that a fourth-century Lysistratos son of Makareus of Amphitrope is known from *IG* 2² 2645 (Sommerstein 206). However, Dover has subjected this alleged Spartan fondness for homosexual behaviour to close scrutiny and concluded that the evidence is scant and that this final scene of *Lysist.* has more to do with heterosexual anal intercourse than it does with Spartan homophilia.²⁶ Thus I submit that an explanation of Laconophilia makes good sense of *Lysist.* 1103–05, and that the comic caricature of Lysistratos of Cholgargai depends in great degree on his emulation of Spartan behaviour.

Thus Lysistratos becomes, not the pauper and the *penes* which Rogers *et al.* have imagined, but a man of Spartan affinities, possibly connected with the upper part of society. If he were the friend of Andokides, then he was associated with one of the wealthiest and most elegant families of Athens.²⁷ His *penia* was the result of personal habit and affectation, not part of his actual circumstances. His role at the symposium may have been that of the humorous joker.

6. *Thouphrastós*.

This man is but a name to us, but he is the most vividly described member of the symposium. At 1314 ff. we get a glimpse of him in action:

οἱ δ' ἀνεκρότησαν, πλὴν γε Θουφράστου μόνου·
 οὗτος δὲ διεμύλλαινεν ὥς δὴ δεξιός.
 ὁ γέρων δὲ τὸν Θούφραστον ἤρετ'· "εἰπέ μοι,
 ἐπὶ τῷ κομῶς καὶ κομψὸς εἶναι προσποιεῖ,
 κωμωδολοικῶν περὶ τὸν εὖ πράττοντ' αἰεῖ;"

The word κομῶς suggests a superior social status (or at least the affectation thereof), and the statement κομψὸς εἶναι προσποιεῖ that we are probably dealing with a social climber or parasite (cf. the *kolakes* of Eupolis fr. 159). The strange word κωμωδολοικῶν has been explained by MacDowell (305) as meaning that Thouphrastós was the counterpart of the *gelotopoiós* of Xen. *Symp.* 1.11–16. The final line certainly indicates both that the *sym-potai* are intended to be well-to-do Athenians and that Thouphrastós is a *kolax* fawning on such men.

²⁶K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London 1978) 187–189.

²⁷A. N. Oikonomides, in "Attic Choregic-Inscriptions," *Ancient World* 3 (1980) 17–22, includes (at 21–22) the Lysistratos of And. 1 in the liturgical-class family of Atarbos Thorikios (Davies 74), thus making him a different person from the Cholgareus. But there are too many Lysistratoi in the late fifth century for this identification to be certain.

The name is known at Athens, although the uncontracted spelling Theophrastus is the more common form (*PA* 7163–77; *SEG* 18.36 A.567; 25.177.27). The spelling Thouphrastos is found here and at *PA* 7176, Thouphrastos Pittheus, a trierarch in 323/2. The only contemporary of either spelling is Theophrastos Paionides (*PA* 7173), whose son Philotheros was a prytanis in the early fourth century.

7. *Phrynichos*.

Two interpretations of the phrase οἱ περὶ Φρύνιχον are possible. We may consider that the phrase is intended to sum up the five names listed before; thus Hippiyllos, Antiphon, etc. could be described by the comedian and understood by the audience as “Phrynichos’ set.” Alternatively, the comedian may be adding to these five *sympotai* another group of unspecified number, “Phrynichos and *his* crew.” The second interpretation may be somewhat more probable, as the comedian at the end of his description of the symposium appears to be throwing in a vague expression to increase the number of guests.

It is well-known that in *Frogs* Aristophanes can refer without any further description beyond that of the context to three different Phrynichoi: the comic poet (13), the oligarch (689), and the old tragedian (910, 1299). The question must be put, which contemporary Phrynichos would come to the mind of the audience after the names of Hippiyllos, Antiphon, etc.

The name is by no means uncommon in the late fifth century; we may exclude the old tragedian (*PA* 15008), as the reference must surely be to a living contemporary. The following are known:

- (i) *PA* 15006 – Eunomidou, comic poet and rival of Aristophanes, a *komodoumenos* at *Cl.* 556, *Frogs* 13, Hermippos fr. 64.
- (ii) *PA* 15011 – Stratonidou Deiradiotes, the oligarch of 411, a *komodoumenos* at *Frogs* 689.
- (iii) – Chorokleous, a tragic actor (*Σ Birds* 750).²⁸
- (iv) *PA* 15000 – father of Phainippos, a *grammateus* of the *boule* in 424/3 (*IG* 1³ 61).
- (v) *PA* 15001 – father of the subject of two fragments of Lysias (249, 250)
- (vi) – of Akamantis, war casualty ca 410 (*SEG* 19.42a.V 7).
- (vii) *PA* 15007 – ὁ ὀρχησάμενος, implicated in the affair of the Herms (*And.* 1.47)

This last Phrynichos has been the subject of much speculation and

²⁸The scholiast here distinguishes four Phrynichoi, the old tragedian plus (i), (ii), and (iii).

discussion. Several commentators have identified him both with the son of Chorokles (iii) and with the Phrynichos who appears during the dancing sequences at the end of *Wasps* (1490, 1524).²⁹ This latter Phrynichos is thus not, as in the orthodox interpretation, the old tragedian, but a contemporary dancer whom Philokleon will vanquish. Phrynichos "the ex-dancer" of 415 is the natural candidate for such an identification. Working backward to 1302, these critics argue that the same Phrynichos should be meant in all three passages, a contemporary dancer and tragic performer, an identification which has obvious consequences for the nature of the symposium.³⁰ This case may seem attractive and even compelling, but each step of the argument is open to controversy. First, the example of the *Frogs* demonstrates the danger of assuming that all the mentions of a Phrynichos in *Wasps* must be to the same man. Second, the traditional identification of the Phrynichos of *Wasps* 1490, 1524 with the old tragedian may still be argued with some confidence. The associations of the tragic poet with the dance are well attested, and given the earlier allusions to him in *Wasps* as the favourite of the old men (220, 269 f.), we may find his mention here quite acceptable. Third, the existence of the son of Chorokles is questionable, for he is cited by the scholiast to *Birds* 750 with no corroborating evidence (unlike the other three Phrynichoi cited in the same scholion), and MacDowell argues with some force that "the patronymic 'son of Chorokles,' meaning 'famous for choruses,' sounds too good a coincidence to be true" (324). Phrynichos a tragic actor or dancer is mentioned (without the patronymic) at Σ *Wasps* 1302 and Σ *Cl.* 1091, but on what authority we have no indication. Thus I am tempted to doubt the whole existence of the son of Chorokles. The allusion to Phrynichos a dancer and tragic performer may be just the result of confusion in the scholia with the old tragedian.

Finally, we have the puzzling description in Andokides, Phrynichos "the ex-dancer." Of the other men named at And. 1.47, four are mentioned with no further description, apart from their relationship to Andokides, and two others are named with a patronymic as well as their relationship to the speaker. We expect a patronymic or some other kinship term. Accordingly, some have emended ὁ ὀρχησάμενος to ὁ Ὀρχησαμενοῦ;³¹ one wishes only that Orchesamenos were a documented Attic name. Others have regarded ὁ ὀρχησάμενος as either a scholiast's intrusion or a gloss which has ousted the true patronymic which we cannot hope to recover (MacDowell

²⁹So Merry 99, Starkie 383 f., Rogers 230 f., MacDowell 324, and Sommerstein 245 (see the full bibliography in Vaio 347, n. 54). See also E. K. Borthwick, "The dances of Philocleon and the sons of Carcinus in Aristophanes' *Wasps*," *CQ* ns 18 (1968) 44–51.

³⁰In particular see van Daele 12—"il a voulu ridiculer ceux qui, à la suite de Phrynichos, avaient introduit dans la tragédie . . . des danses nouvelles."

³¹A. Wilhelm, "Vermuthungen," *Philologus* 60 (1901) 485; see also *PA* 15007.

[above, note 21] 97). Again, confusion in the scholiastic tradition with the dancing associations of Phrynichos the old tragedian may be responsible for the entire problem. In any case, Phrynichos "the ex-dancer" remains a most unlikely entity.³²

The fact does remain that in 415 there was a Phrynichos associated with the family of Andokides, who was an *anepsios* of either Andokides or Kallias son of Telokles and could be named in company with Kritias and Eukrates. He must, therefore, have been a reasonably prominent and well-connected individual, and a strong candidate for identification as the *komodoumenos* of *Wasps* 1302. The only other likely candidates are the comic poet (i) and the oligarch (ii). The fact that none of the other *sympotai* has any known connexion with the theatre may discourage identification with the former. MacDowell argues that the *komodoumenos* and the oligarch are one, principally because he considers Antiphon, Lykon, and possibly Lysistratos to have been politically prominent (302). Phrynichos should thus be a political figure, and the most obvious candidate is the oligarch.³³ However, I have argued that Antiphon is not necessarily the orator and oligarch of 411, nor is Lykon the *rhetor* of 399. Thus the necessity of finding a *political* Phrynichos is removed. Sommerstein argues that by 422 Phrynichos the oligarch must have been "a well-known public figure," but this does not guarantee that he was the only prominent Phrynichos or the one who would come to mind in the symposiastic context of 1299 ff. (Sommerstein 235 f.).

8. *The Group as a Whole.*

The following observations may be made about the descriptions of the symposium as a whole:

- (i) 1300 f.: καὶ τῶν ξυνόντων πολὺ παροινικώτατος.
καίτοι παρῆν Ἴππυλλος κτλ.

Our first glimpse of the *sympotai* stresses their drunken and riotous character. It is a reasonable assumption that Hippiyllos *et al.* are to be recognized as notorious *paroinikoi*.³⁴

- (ii) 1303: τούτων ἀπάντων ἦν ὕβριστότατος μακρῶ.

Again, the behaviour of these men, not their identities or their politics, is in question.

³²See now M. V. Molitor, "Phrynichos, a Note on Aristophanes, *Vespae*, 1490–3," *Hermes* 112 (1984) 252–254, who defends the existence of a contemporary Phrynichos, a dancer, whom he identifies with the "ex-dancer" of And. 1.47 and the *Komoidoumenos* of *Wasps* 1490, 1524. I am not convinced by his arguments or by his interpretation of 1431–32.

³³Andrewes, however, (above, n. 10, 59) finds the identification "not very likely."

³⁴Sommerstein, identifying Antiphon with the Rhamnousios, finds this description of him (and of Phrynichos) improbable at best (235).

(iii) 1304: ὡς ἐνέπλητο πολλῶν κα̑γαθῶν.

This suggests a symposium of some elegance and distinction, an argument against Rogers' collection of *penetes*.

(iv) 1318: κωμωδοιχῶν περὶ τὸν εὖ πράττοντ' αἰεί.

As discussed above, this line implies that we are to consider the members of the symposium as οἱ εὖ πράττοντες.

(v) 1319 ff.: τοιαῦτα περὶ βριζεν αὐτοὺς ἐν μέρει
σκώπτων ἀγροίκως καὶ προσέτι λόγους λέγων
ἀμαθέστατ' οὐδέν εἰκότας τῷ πράγματι.

These lines make it clear that Philokleon's boorish behaviour is totally at odds with the setting. The theme of the second part of *Wasps* is the old man's inability to behave in polite society; we are entitled to infer that these men are intended to represent that society.³⁵

9. Conclusion.

We may now consider the various interpretations of this symposium which we enumerated at the start. That of Rogers depends on a literal explanation of Lysistratos' *penia* and on an ironical tone throughout. Such irony may indeed be present in the description of the first symposium at 1219 ff., but is the comedian likely to have used the same technique twice running? A literal interpretation of an Aristophanic joke is dangerous, and I have argued that Lysistratos' *penia* may be explained by Laconophilia. I should thus reject Rogers' thesis, although he was correct to stress the drunken and riotous nature of the symposium. The arguments of van Leeuwen *et al.* depend principally on the identification of Phrynichos as either the comedian or the alleged tragic actor or dancer. However, even the existence of the latter is doubtful, and there is no hint that the former is meant here. We may regard this explanation as possible, but not probable.

A purely (or even largely) political approach to the symposium is discouraged by a careful examination of the prosopography. Such an interpretation rests mainly on regarding Antiphon and Phrynichos as the oligarchs of 411 and Lykon as the *rhetor* of 399. The last identification is certainly incorrect, and the first two unlikely at best. MacDowell makes the good observation that Phrynichos' conversion to the oligarchic cause came late (303). Thus a gathering in 422 with Phrynichos at its heart would not be an oligarchic one; this conclusion is valid whether we take

³⁵A reader suggests that the name first mentioned might determine the sort of interpretation the audience will give the rest; but Hippiylos gives *us* no particular clue of this sort, and we should remember that the *sympotai* of 1219 ff. take their decisive colour not from Theoros or from Aischines, but from Kleon, the third to be named. I suspect that παροιωνικώτατος and Antiphon and Lykon in 1300–1301 made the playwright's intentions clear.

"Phrynichos' set" to refer to the symposium as a whole or to just one part of the gathering. Nor is there in the comic text any suggestion of a political theme, by contrast with the pointed political allusions in the earlier description of Kleon and his circle (cf. 1226 f., 1232–35, 1241 f.). Much of the desire to find a political explanation for the second symposium stems from the clear political overtone of the first symposium and the feeling that the second symposium should be an oligarchic counterpart of that centered on Kleon.

The evidence points in another direction, that of superior social status. For Hippiyllos there is a hint that he may be connected with the affluent family of Philonides of Melite. Antiphon is, I suggest, the son of Lysidionides and a wealthy *leitourgos*, whose social position must have been considerable. Lykon is the father of Autolykos, a man whose son could move in the same society as Kallias, the richest man in Athens. For Lysistratos, I have suggested that he was a Laconophile, an explanation which implies a reasonable station in life. He may also have a connexion with the family of Andokides. Finally, Phrynichos, the man at the centre of some social set in 422, is not necessarily the oligarch, but could equally well be the man connected with Andokides' family in 415. Wealth and social standing, I suggest, are the connecting links. It is worth observing that two comedies by Eupolis from this period, *Kolakes* and *Autolykos*, were devoted to caricature of this sort of society, and thus there appears to have been a definite comic theme of the ridicule of men at the top such as Kallias and Lykon.

Thus I find that the thesis of MacDowell is essentially correct, that these are men of superior station, mocked for their style of living and arrogant behaviour. He reaches this conclusion, however, after certain incorrect prosopographical identifications (Antiphon, Lykon, Phrynichos) and on an underlying assumption that all these men have a political connexion. However, given the possibility that Lysistratos and Phrynichos can be linked with the family of Leogoras and Andokides and the mention of Antiphon in the same context as Leogoras (*Wasps* 1270), one can make an equally plausible case that an association with that wealthy family was the connecting link among the *sympotai*, or at the very least that they were all members of Athenian high society of the late 420s.³⁶ As MacDowell (303) observes:

And it is because of their social prestige, not for any political significance, that Ar.

³⁶This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in 1984 at the University of Guelph. I should like to acknowledge the support given to me by a Research Grant of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in 1981/2. I thank also the anonymous readers of this paper for Phoenix for their comments and suggestions and my colleagues at Trent University, Professors K. H. Kinzl and D. F. R. Page, who read earlier drafts and made many helpful contributions.

has chosen this group whose dinner Philokleon has attended: they are an outstanding and well-known part of Athenian high society. Ar. regards them as snobs, who treat too contemptuously those whom they regard as inferiors . . . That is why it is funny to hear that Philokleon has discomfited them.

TRENT UNIVERSITY, PETERBOROUGH