

DATING AND RE-DATING EUPOLIS

IAN C. STOREY

RANKED BY THE ANCIENTS as one of the three great writers of Old Comedy,¹ Eupolis may fairly claim to be a neglected author. We know of fourteen (or perhaps seventeen) plays in a rather short career, and nearly five hundred fragments of his work remain, including 120 reasonably consecutive lines from his best-known play, *Demoi*, and extensive fragments from commentaries to three plays, *Marikas*, *Prospaltioi*, *Taxiarchoi*.² Yet no commentary to all of the fragments exists, nor any translation into English, apart from that of Edmonds, a work best used only with extreme caution.³ Full-length studies of Eupolis in the 20th century are limited to three doctoral dissertations and one monograph,⁴ while overall appreciations consist of the entry by Kaibel in *RE*, some twenty-six pages

The following works will be cited in the text and notes by the author's last name only or in an abbreviated form: E. L. Bowie, "Who is Dicaeopolis?," *JHS* 108 (1988) 183-185; E. Capps, "A New Fragment of the List of Victors at the City Dionysia," *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 1-11; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971); A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1956-1981); P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*² (Munich 1969); G. Kaibel, "Eupolis," *RE* 6.1 (1907) 1230-35; R. Kassel and C. Austin (= K-A), *Poetae comici Graeci* 3.2: *Aristophanes* (Berlin/New York 1984); 4: *Aristophan-Crobylus* (Berlin/New York 1983); 5: *Damoxenus-Magnes* (Berlin/New York 1986); T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta* 1 (Leipzig 1880); W. J. W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem, Pars 1, Fasc. 1a, Prolegomena de comoedia* (Groningen 1975); M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London 1981); W. Luppe, "Die Zahl der Konkurrenten an den komischen Agonen zur Zeit des peloponnesischen Krieges," *Philologus* 116 (1974) 53-75; G. Norwood, *Greek Comedy* (London 1931); F. Perusino, *Dalla commedia antica alla commedia di mezzo* (Urbino 1988); A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1968); K. Plepeltis, *Die Fragmente der Demen des Eupolis* (diss., Vienna 1962, published without revision 1970); C. F. Russo, *Aristofane autore di teatro*² (Florence 1984); F. Sartori, *Una pagina di storia ateniese in un frammento dei "Demi" eupolidei* (Padua 1975); W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1.4 (Munich 1946) 111-137; J. Schwarze, *Die Beurteilung des Perikles durch die attische Komödie* (Munich 1971, *Zetemata* 51); I. C. Storey, "The Date of Kallias' 'Pedetai'," *Hermes* 116 (1988) 379-383; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Observationes criticae in comoediam Graecam selectae* (Berlin 1870).

¹See, for example, Quintilian 10.1.65: *plures eius [antiquae comoediae] auctores, Aristophanes tamen et Eupolis Cratinusque praecipui*. The relevant *testimonia* can be found in K-A 5.294-301.

²POxy 2741, 2813, 2740 respectively (K-A 5, frs. 192, 259, 268).

³J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* 1 (Leiden 1957). See the review by K. J. Dover, "Greek Comedy," in *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 157-158.

⁴G. Schiassi, *De Eupolidis comici poetae fragmentis* (diss., Bologna 1944); Plepeltis; P. Reuter, *Die Fragmente der Poleis und Baptai des Eupolis* (diss., Halle 1979); Sartori.

by Schmid, and the only English discussion, one chapter by Norwood in 1931.⁵

Much of the problem with the consideration of Eupolis has been the lack of a complete and definitive text. That of Kock was soon made out of date by the papyrus discoveries of the 20th century; these new fragments were collected by Austin in 1973,⁶ but the full presentation of a new text of Eupolis had to wait until that of Volume 5 of Kassel-Austin in 1986. With a firm text in place, one can now begin the re-assessment of Eupolis' work, and it is my purpose in this article to examine the evidence for the dating of Eupolis' career and of the individual comedies, and to ascertain in light of the presentation of the new text of Eupolis just how confident we may be about the chronology of this comic poet.⁷

I THE DATE OF EUPOLIS' DÉBUT

Four *testimonia* in Kassel-Austin give an indication of the date of Eupolis' *début* in the comic competitions. In addition, the evidence from the victor-lists on IG II² 2325 (discussed below, v) will help in corroborating the conclusions based on the written texts. The texts in question are:

- 1) Anon. περὶ κωμῳδίας (Koster III.33–35):⁸ Εὐπολὶς Ἀθηναῖος ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀπολλοδώρου, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ Φρόνιχος· γεγωνὸς δυνατὸς τῇ λέξει καὶ ζηλῶν Κρατῖνον, πολὺ τὸ λοιδορὸν τε καὶ σκαιὸν ἐπιφαίνει. γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ δράματα ἰδ'.
- 2) Eusebius (Hieron.) for the 88th Olympiad, year 1 (= 428/7): *Eupolis et Aristophanes scriptores comoediarum agnoscuntur*.
- 3) Cyrill. Alex. c. Iul. 1.13: ὀδοηκοστῇ ὀγδῷ Ὀλυμπιάδι (428/7–425/4) τὸν κωμῳδὸν Ἀριστοφάνην Εὐπολὶν τε καὶ Πλάτωνα γενέσθαι φασίν.
- 4) Sync. p. 309,15 for the 88th Olympiad: Εὐπολὶς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης κωμικοὶ Σοφοκλῆς τε ὁ τραγωδοποιὸς ἐγνώριζετο.

The last is particularly unhelpful since it relates Eupolis to Sophokles whose career lasted over half a century. The second does place Aristophanes in the year of his *début* (427), but the connexion between him and Eupolis

⁵I would mention one other work, that of J. Carrière, *Le Carnaval et la politique* (Paris 1979) 232–253, which has a brief (and very conventional) summary of Eupolis, followed by the text of selected fragments with French translation and commentary.

⁶C. Austin, *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta* (Berlin/New York 1973).

⁷The primary discussion of the dating of Old Comedy is of course that of Geissler, but other discussions of date (both general and of individual plays) are scattered throughout the bibliography on Eupolis, most notably in Schmid and Carrière.

⁸Also in R. Cantarella, *Aristofane: Le commedie, vol. primo, Prolegomeni* (Milan 1948) VI.41–44; G. Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta* 1 (Berlin 1958) II.37–40.

may be nothing more than their known association. The verb φασίν in the third *testimonium* does not inspire much confidence.

The anonymous writer on comedy whose extract on Eupolis appears first has compiled a short history of Greek Comedy and the particular characteristics of each type (Old, Middle, New), as well as brief entries on twelve of the best-known comedians, from Epicharmos to Menander. Some of his details are based on misinterpretations of passages in the comedies (e.g., the death of Kratinos as reported at *Peace* 702–703) and on his attempt to see a vertical relation between poets (usually carried by the verb ζηλῶν), but much of what he has to record is based on evidence lost to us, some of it chronological records and *didaskalia*. Of the twelve comedians he gives chronological detail about nine, some general (e.g., for Epicharmos χρόνοις δὲ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν οἱ Ὀλυμπιάδα [488/7–484/4], or for Diphilos κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐδίδασκε Μενάνδρῳ), some with a *terminus post/ante quem* (e.g., for Kratinos νικᾷ μετὰ τὴν πε' Ὀλυμπιάδα [438/7–435/4],⁹ for Antiphanes μετὰ τὴν ς' Ὀλυμπιάδα [388/7–385/4],¹⁰ or for Philemon πρὸ τῆς ργ' Ὀλυμπιάδος [328/7–325/4]), and four with an actual year indicated by an archon-date:

- for Pherekrates νικᾷ ἐπὶ θεάτρων† where the restorations Θεοδώρου (438/7) or Πυθοδώρου (432/1) have been proposed;¹¹
- for Eupolis as cited above;

⁹This is a rather low date for Kratinos, as compared with the usual start of his career in the mid-450s (Meineke “corrected” π' to π' to place Kratinos' *début* in this period). The earlier dating for Kratinos depends on his appearance on the Dionysia victor-list (*IG* II² 2325.50) two places after Euphronios who won in 458 (*IG* II² 2318.46–48)—the former has in fact Εὐφρόνιος†—and the frequent dating of his *Archilochoi* to 449 (see, for example, Schwarze 87). The anonymous writer says only that he won “after the 85th Olympiad.” I suspect that he is using as evidence the Lenaia victor-lists, on which Kratinos comes fourth (after Xenophilos, Telekleides, and Aristomenes), and with the Lenaia-contests for comedy originating in the late 440s (Russo 9) he could just be guessing.

¹⁰I suspect that the anonymous writer on comedy is regarding *Ploutos* (388) as the last real play of Old Comedy (Aristophanes' later *Kokalos* and *Aiolosikon* were considered by ancient writers as typical of Middle or New Comedy—see Platonios [Koster I] 1.30, *Life of Aristophanes* [Koster XXVIII] 6, 54, [Koster XIX] 7). Thus the next Olympiad is selected for the *terminus post quem* for the *début* of Antiphanes, the first poet of Middle Comedy.

¹¹The preposition ἐπὶ certainly suggests an archon's name is to follow, although elsewhere the anonymous writer usually employs the formula ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος . . . (lines 33, 38 [Koster]) or ἐπὶ . . . ἀρχοντος (59). The earlier date, ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου (Dobree's conjecture), has been supported by a new fragment of *IG* II² 2318 which gives Hermippos a victory at the Dionysia of 435—see Capps here. Since Pherekrates precedes Hermippos on the Dionysia victor-list (*IG* II² 2325), if we assume that the anonymous writer is recording Pherekrates' first victory, the conjecture ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου seems assured (so Koster's text).

- for Aristophanes ἐδίδαξε δὲ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Διοτίμου (428/7);
- for Menander ἐδίδαξε δὲ πρῶτος ἔφηβος ὦν ἐπὶ Φιλοκλέους ἄρχοντος (322/1).

The writer seems to be giving exact dates either for a victory or for a first production. Since both Eupolis and Phrynichos follow Aristophanes on the Dionysia victors-list *IG II*² 2325 (see below, v) and since Aristophanes' *début* belongs to 427, neither can have won a Dionysia-victory in 429. It seems most unlikely that the anonymous writer is giving a Lenaia-victory for Eupolis or Phrynichos and a simple production-date for the other, and thus it is much more probable that the writer is recording a first production for both, in accordance with his usual practice.¹² Nothing in the fragments of Eupolis suggests a date of any comedy before 430, and we may be confident of a date for Eupolis' *début* in 429; at which festival we do not know, although it is frequently assumed that the Lenaia was the lesser festival and the one at which a novice might well begin.¹³

II THE DATE OF EUPOLIS' DEATH

Four ancient traditions give information about the death of Eupolis. First, we have the well-known account, found in several versions, of how Eupolis was drowned in the sea by Alkibiades who had been the target of Eupolis' *Baptai*. The various versions will be discussed below, but here we can observe Cicero's citation of Eratosthenes' refutation of this tradition:

quis . . . non dixit Εὐπολιν τὸν τῆς ἀρχαίας ab Alcibiade navigante in Siciliam deiectum in mare? redarguit Eratosthenes [= FGrHist 241 F 19]; adfert enim quas ille post id tempus fabulas docuerit. (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.18)

This would put Eupolis' demise in 415. Second is the intriguing statement by Pausanias (2.7.3) that one can find the grave of Eupolis, the Athenian comic poet, on the left as one leaves Sikyon and crosses the Asopos. Third, there is the story in Aelian (*NA* 10.41)¹⁴ that Eupolis had a Molossian dog, named Augeas, which detected the comedian's slave Ephialtes stealing one of Eupolis' comedies. The dog attacked and bit the thief to death. Afterward, when the comedian died and was buried in Aigina, the dog maintained a constant lament at the poet's grave and eventually wasted away from grief; the place was thus named Κυνὸς Θρήνος ("Dog's Lament"). Finally the *Suda* (ε 3657) records that καὶ ἀπέθανε ναυαγῆσας κατὰ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐν τῷ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους πολέμῳ· καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐκωλύθη στρατεύεσθαι ποιητήν. No firm

¹²See the theory of S. Kurz, *Die neuen Fragmente der altattischen Komödie* (diss., Tübingen 1937) 115, rejected by Schwarze 3, that the anonymous writer is recording the two victors for the festivals of 429.

¹³See, for example, Pickard-Cambridge 41.

¹⁴Lefkowitz (115) attributes the tale wrongly to Eratosthenes.

date is given by the *Suda*, but attention is drawn to two major battles in the Hellespontine region (Kynos Sema in 411¹⁵ and Aigos Potamoi in 405).

None of the above compels instant credence. Lefkowitz (7, n. 22) points out that the business of the faithful dog who benefits his master is a frequent motif in ancient literary biography, while the whole explanation of Κυνὸς Θρήνος is clearly an attempt at an aetiological explanation (see Kaibel 1230). The origin of this story may well lie in comedy; compare the business of Kephisophon and Euripides' plays (*Frogs* 944, 1046–48, 1408, 1452–53) which Σ *Frogs* 944 explains as ὅτι ἐδόκει δοῦλος ὦν ὁ Κηφισοφῶν συμπονεῖν αὐτῷ, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ μέλη, δν καὶ συνεῖναι τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ κωμφοδοῦσι. Kephisophon, like Ephialtes, is an unlikely slave-name, and a misreading of a comic text may be at work here.¹⁶

Kaibel suggests that the τάφος seen by Pausanias at Sikyon may be a memorial to the poet rather than the actual place of burial.¹⁷ The business about Eupolis, Alkibiades, and *Baptai* was shown by the ancients to have been wrong and is obviously the result of something in comedy. Lefkowitz (109) demonstrates that much of the "fact" in the ancient life of Aristophanes is derived from unimaginative deduction by the scholiasts from comic texts, and the "drowning" of Eupolis sounds very much like such a mistake, especially in the light of Eratosthenes' evidence of plays that postdate 415.

The story of Eupolis, Alkibiades, and *Baptai* can be found in several ancient sources. The details are not always the same, but the recurring elements of the story are these: (1) Eupolis attacked Alkibiades in his play *Baptai*, (2) Alkibiades drowned Eupolis by hurling him into the sea, (3) on his way to Sicily, (4) to the accompaniment of a satirical verse about his revenge, and (5) that this incident had some effect on the history of Greek Comedy.

- a) The report in Cicero which cites both Eratosthenes and Duris of Samos (= *FGrHist* 76 F 73) has been quoted above, and contains only elements (2) and (3).

¹⁵Details in Thuc. 8.99–109; the Athenian losses were 15 ships (106.2).

¹⁶Kaibel (1230) suggests that the dog may be a poetic representation of the watchful comic satirist (perhaps an image used by the poet of himself in a parabasis?). Kaibel speculates also that Ephialtes may have had to do with the evil spirit of that name (cf. Lamia, Gorgo, etc., Strabo 1.19, and the play of that title by Phrynichos). Again a reference in comedy may be the source.

¹⁷Kaibel 1230. The dative in Pausanias' text (τάφος Εὐπόλιδι Ἀθηναίῳ ποιήσαντι κωμῶ-
δῶν), rather than the genitive, might support this interpretation, but τάφος in Pausanias seems to indicate a grave rather than a memorial (see his use of μνημα κενόν at 1.2.2 for a cenotaph). At 1.43.6–8 he uses both the genitive and the dative for what is clearly the burial-place (τάφος) of Koroibos. Did Pausanias mistake the Eupolis buried at Sikyon for the Athenian comic poet, or did Eupolis of Athens have some familial connexion with Sikyon (cf. the Alkmaionidai)? I owe the last suggestion to Professor K. H. Kinzl.

- b) Σ Juvenal 2.92 makes it clear that Alkibiades had been Eupolis' special target in *Baptai* (*praecipue perstrinxerat*) (1), that Alkibiades had killed him by hurling him into the sea (2), with the words *ut tu me in theatris madefecisti, nunc ego te in mari madefaciam* (4).
- c) The scholiast to Aristeides 3.8 follows up his statement that Kleon's prosecution of Aristophanes led to a prohibition of τὸ ὄνομαστί κωμῳδεῖν with the qualification that personal humour must have lasted until the time of Eupolis (5). In this version Eupolis made fun of Alkibiades (no play specified) (1), was hurled by him into the sea (2), on the way to Sicily (3), with the words:
- βάπτες μ' ἐν θυμέλῃσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σὲ κύμασι πόντου
βαπτίζων ὀλέσω νόμασι πικροτάτοις (4).¹⁸
- d) Platonios 1.13 reports that Eupolis was drowned in the sea (2) by the man (unnamed) against whom *Baptai* had been written (1), and that this reprisal led to a decrease in τὸ ὄνομαστί κωμῳδεῖν (5).
- e) Themistios 8, p. 110, relates that Alkibiades bore Eupolis a grudge for his *Baptai* (1), even though the comic poets enjoyed immunity from the laws.

Two traditions have possibly combined to yield this story which may have been embellished as time passed (note that the details in Cicero are sparse compared to the later account in the scholiast to Aristeides): (i) something in comedy which could be interpreted as a "feud" between Alkibiades and Eupolis—compare, for instance, Aristophanes' account of his battles with Kleon (*Ach.* 377–382, 502–505, 659–660; *Wasps* 1284–91), and (ii) a tradition of Eupolis' service and death at sea.

Here we come to the fourth account, that he died serving at sea in the Hellespontine region. Kaibel is suspicious of the second statement—καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐκωλύθη στρατεύεσθαι ποιητήν—while Schwarze and Schmid regard a patriotic *topos* at work here, the poet's service to his city, although Schmid does allow that Eupolis may well have died young in a shipwreck.¹⁹ However, there were major casualties at both Kynos Sema and Aigos Potamoi, and a naval casualty-list of the late fifth century does list a Eupolis (*IG* I² 950.53). The name, however, is not rare (*PA* 5934–42), and the identification with the comic poet, though attractive, is not certain. But no

¹⁸M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci* 2 (Oxford 1972) 29–30, suspects that the verses may be genuine, although the historical data are false. He reads: †βάπτε με σὺ/ἐν† θυμέλῃσιν κτλ. See also his *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin/New York 1974) 17.

¹⁹Thereby anticipating Terence by some 250 years (Schwarze 114; Schmid 113). Norwood 178 is non-committal.

allusion in Eupolis demands a date after 410, and a career of 14 (or 17) plays in 19 years accords well with Aristophanes' 40 plays in 40 or so years, and most critics accept a lower date for Eupolis of ca 411, although only Geissler accepts authoritatively the statement in the *Suda*,²⁰ and identifies the naval encounter as that of Kynos Sema. If Eupolis did die at sea on military service, this would explain in part the business about Alkibiades (note *συστρατεύόμενον* in Σ Aristeides), and if he died at Kynos Sema, might this not explain the aetiological story in Aelian about Kynos Threnos?

I would accept the version then in the *Suda* about Eupolis' death at sea and regard the incident in question as the battle at Kynos Sema in the summer of 411. We thus have for the poet a career of 429–411, a reasonably brief period in which to locate the lost comedies.

III THE COMEDIES OF EUPOLIS

The *Suda* gives 17 as the number of Eupolis' comedies, the anonymous writer on comedy 14. For thirteen plays we can have no doubt about their genuineness: *Aiges*, *Astrateutoi* or *Androgynoi*, *Autolykos*, *Baptai*, *Demoi*, *Kolakes*, *Marikas*, *Noumeniai*, *Poleis*, *Prospaltioi*, *Taxiarchoi*, *Philo*, *Chrysoun Genos*. To these we may add a second production of *Autolykos* and three less well attested plays, *Heilotes*, *Lakones*, and *Hybris-todikai*. That there was a comedy called *Heilotes* is not in question; there are nine fragments from it presented in K-A 5 (frs. 147–155). The problem lies with the ancient sources who were themselves in doubt. On five occasions the play is attributed to Eupolis (Ath. 138e; Poll. 9.74, 10.98; Erot. η 4; Zenob. 3.61); on four others it is attributed to "the person who wrote the *Heilotes*" (Ath. 400c, 638e; Hdn. 917.1, 933.1). Either Eupolis did write a *Heilotes* and the ancients were uncertain whether the play before them was that play (cf. the *Rhesos*-problem in Euripides) or the matter is the actual authorship of the play (cf. the *Prometheus*-problem in Aeschylus). Fr. 148 does rather sound like *Clouds* 1355 ff., and the poet Gnesippos was made fun of by other comic poets (Kratinos 17, 104, 276; [Chionides] *Ptochoi* 4; Telekleides 34K). These allusions seem to be earlier than the 420s; if this *Heilotes* was by Eupolis, it was an early play.²¹

Lakones is a different matter. It is cited only once (for fr. 191) by Erotianus (μ 4), and others did write plays of this name (Euboulos, Kratinos, Platon), but each is likewise attested only by one citation. Kock suggested

²⁰Geissler 43; Schwarze 115; Schmid 113. A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (Eng. tr., London 1966) 422, prefers 412. Kaibel (1230) and Norwood (178–179) are less committed to ca 411. Sartori (12, n. 16; 38, n. 37) is dubious about the whole tradition.

²¹K. O. Müller, *Kleine Schriften* (Breslau 1847) 1.468, followed by several others (see K-A 5.378 ad fr. 149), interprets Σ Kn. 1224 *μμεῖται δὲ τοὺς εἰλωτας, ὅταν στεφανῶσι τὸν Ποσειδῶνα* as referring to this play, which thus belongs before 424. See also Kaibel 1234.

that Erotianos confused *Lakones* with *Heilotes*, but Kassel-Austin observe that Erotianos does know the latter title (see fr. 152). Runkel's emendation of ἐν Κόλαξι for ἐν Λάκωσι may perhaps be considered.

Hybristodikai is cited only once by Ptolemaios Hephaistion (ap. Photios *bibl.* 190, p. 151^a 10), τοὺς δ' Ὑβριστοδίκας Εὐκόλιδος πρὸς τῇ Ἐφιάλτου (κεφαλῇ εὐρεθῆναί φασι). The lexicographers explain the term as those who would not bring cases to court, e.g., Hesych. υ 36 ὕβριστοδίκαι· οἱ μὴ θέλοντες εἰσάγειν τὰς δίκας παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. This sounds like a reasonable comic idea (cf. *Wasps*, the parabasis of *Acharnians*, and the comic coinage ἀπηλιαστά at *Birds* 109–111), but these explanations sound suspiciously too aetiological. The name Ephialtes crops up again as that of the “slave” in Aelian's account of Eupolis and his faithful dog. The play could be genuine, but the evidence is not overly reassuring.

The thirteen genuine plays plus the re-production of *Autolykos* and the three doubtful plays do add up to seventeen (the number attributed to Eupolis in the *Suda*). The anonymous writer on comedy prefers fourteen (the thirteen genuine plays plus the second *Autolykos*?). However, we must be wary of assuming that we know all of the works by Eupolis. The hypothesis to *Acharnians* informs us that with that play at the Lenaia of 425 were produced Kratinos' *Cheimazomenoi* and Eupolis' *Noumeniai*. But were it not for that hypothesis, we would never have known of the existence of either comedy; no other allusion to or citation from them exists. More recently POxy 2737 has revealed a hitherto unknown play by Platon, his *Rhabdouchoi*,²² and IG II² 2321.87–89 has recorded a play at a Lenaia which has been restored by some as an *Odomantopresbeis* by Aristophanes.²³

IV THE SECURE DATES

Four dates for Eupolis' comedies may be considered as secure:

- 1) *Noumeniai* = Lenaia 425—*Hypothesis 1 Acharnians* . . . ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Εὐθύ-
νου ἄρχοντος ἐν Ληναίοις διὰ Καλλιστράτου· καὶ πρῶτος ἦν· δεῦτερος Κρατίνος
Χειμαζόμενοις. οὐ σφύζονται. τρίτος Εὐπολις Νουμηνίαις.
- 2) *Marikas* = Lenaia 421—Σ *Cl.* 553 δῆλον ὅτι πρῶτος ὁ Μαρικᾶς ἐδιδάχθη τῶν
δευτέρων Νεφελῶν. Ἐρατοσθένης δέ φησι Καλλίμαχον ἐγκαλεῖν ταῖς διδασ-
καλίαις ὅτι φέρουσιν ὕστερον τρίτῳ ἔτει τὸν Μαρικᾶν τῶν Νεφελῶν . . . καὶ ἐν

²²For the problems raised by the mention of this comedy see my comments in “Old Comedy 1975–1984,” *EMC/CV* NS 6 (1987) 1–46, at 41.

²³The stone in fact has [c 'Αριστοφ[]αντοπρε[]νικά. See the comments in K-A 3.2.226 for other suggestions, especially that of Körte that the poet Aristophon could be the author in question.

τῷ Μαρικᾷ προτετελεύτηκε Κλέων (fr. 211). The "third year" after *Clouds* (which must be the first *Clouds*, since Eratosthenes and Kallimachos are using *didaskalia* and the revised *Clouds* was never produced) is 422/1. Since we know the productions for Dionysia 421 which included Eupolis' *Kolakes* (see next item), *Marikas* can belong only to the Lenaia of that year.²⁴

- 3) *Kolakes* = Dionysia 421—*Hypothesis 1 Peace* ἐνίκησε τῷ δράματι ὁ ποιήτης ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀλκαίου, ἐν ἄσσει. πρῶτος Εὐπολις Κόλαξι, δεύτερος Ἀριστοφάνης Εἰρήνη, τρίτος Λεύκων Φράτορσι. The archonship of Alkaios is 422/1.
- 4) *Autolykos* = 420 (festival unknown)—Ath. 216d ἔστιν δὲ οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς καθ' ὃν Ἀριστίων ἄρχων ἦν. ἐπὶ τούτου γὰρ Εὐπολις τὸν Αὐτολύκον διδάξας διὰ Δημοστράτου χλευάζει τὴν νίκην τοῦ Αὐτολύκου. The archonship of Aristion is 421/0.

V THE EVIDENCE OF THE VICTOR-LISTS

The inscription IG II² 2325 contains lists of victors (both poets and actors) at the two festivals at which tragedy and comedy were produced. For the poets the list is in chronological order with the poet recorded on the occasion of his first victory at the festival in question and with the total number of victories at that festival.²⁵ The readings are not always clear and lacunae are frequent, but the lists for the victorious comic poets at the Lenaia and Dionysia do shed some light on the early career of Eupolis.²⁶ We have the beginning of the Lenaia list, but no absolutely firm date for the institution of formal comic contests at the Lenaia. The modern *opinio communis* is for a date in the late 440s, but we cannot be more certain than

²⁴We must of course take into consideration the thesis of Luppe that the number of plays produced was never reduced from five to three and that thus we cannot assume that we know *all* the productions at Lenaia 425 or Dionysia 421. Part of Luppe's argument is that there are too many plays known to fit the period 425–405 at only six productions a year. Geissler's chronology of Old Comedy is in great need of revision, and consideration of Luppe's thesis and the counter-argument of G. Mastromarco, "Guerra peloponnesiaca e agoni comici," *Belfagor* 30 (1975) 469–473, that the number returned to five for the years 420–416, must await that re-working.

²⁵Thus a representative precision may not be attained if a poet won remarkably early or remarkably late. Phrynichos, for instance, began his career in 429, but probably did not win a Dionysia-victory until 420 at the earliest. Ameipsias who competed in 423 against *Clouds* seems not to have won at the Lenaia until the last decade of the century or even later.

²⁶For these lists see Pickard-Cambridge 112–120; H. J. Mette, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland* (Berlin 1977) 166–170, 5 B 1 (Dionysia); 174–178, 5 C 1 (Lenaia).

that.²⁷ The relevant portion of the list runs: "Hermippos 4, Phrynichos 2, Myrtilos 1,"²⁸ Eupolis 3,"²⁹ followed by a lacuna of six names, one of which must be Aristophanes.³⁰ Since Aristophanes' *Acharnians* won at the Lenaia of 425, Eupolis' first victory must precede 425. Assuming a *début* of 429 for both Phrynichos and Eupolis, one may date the first Lenaia-victories of Phrynichos, Myrtilos, and Eupolis (in that order) to the years 429 to 426. Eupolis thus won his first victory at the Lenaia in 427 or 426, and we may add another certain date (plus or minus one year) to his career.

For the Dionysia things are less straightforward and depend on two restorations of names on the stone. The inscription as we have it reads as follows:

Φερ[εκράτης
 'Ερμ[ιππος
 'Αρι[
 Εὐπ[ολις
 Κα[
 Φρό[νιχος
 'Αμ[ειψίας
 Πλά[των

The debated readings are 'Αρι[and Κα[. For the former much discussion has surrounded the alternatives, 'Αρι[στοφάνης or 'Αρι[στομένης. The comic poet Aristomenes is known from the fifth and fourth centuries; his *Hylphoroi* finished third at the Lenaia of 424, behind *Knights* and Kratinos' *Satyroi* (*Hypothesis 2 Knights*), and his *Admetos* competed with *Ploutos* in 388 (*Hypothesis 4 Ploutos*). He appears also on IG II² 2325 third on the Lenaia victor-list and before Kratinos; his career thus began around 440 and lasted until at least 388. Several critics preferred to see his name on the stone before that of Eupolis and to leave Aristophanes' first victory at the Dionysia until much later where gaps appear in that list.³¹ More recent criticism, however, has tended to favour reading 'Αρι[στοφάνης here, principally on the basis of IG XIV 1097.10–14, which some refer to Aristomenes and a first Dionysia-victory for him in 394 and on the unlikelihood that the

²⁷ See for example Pickard-Cambridge 118; Russo 9.

²⁸ A minor comic poet whose brother Hermippos was one of the major figures in the history of comedy before Eupolis and Aristophanes.

²⁹ Since the *Suda* gives seven victories in total for Eupolis, he must therefore have won four at the Dionysia.

³⁰ When the list resumes, the names Metagenes, Theopompos, Polyzelos, Nikophon, etc., reveal that we are now in the last decade of the century.

³¹ A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen* (Vienna 1906) 176 ff.; see also the discussion in Geissler 2–10, viii–ix; Pickard-Cambridge 85, n. 9; Schmid 98, n. 9.

greatest of Old Comedians had to wait a very long time for his first victory at the Dionysia.³²

For the second restoration the leading candidates are Κά[νθαρος and Κα[λλίστρατος, the latter on the assumption that the inscription reflects the names of the actual producers and not the poet where the two were not the same. Thus Aristophanes may have won with *Babylonioi* in 426 at the Dionysia, but as Kallistratos was the producer (*Suda* c 77 = K-A 3.2 test. ii), his name appeared on the stone. Later on the same list the name Φιλ[appears, where Philonides is restored, the other man known to have produced the plays of Aristophanes.³³ Again recent criticism favours the interpretation that what we have is the list of poets, not the producers. Philonides is attested elsewhere as a comic poet in his own right,³⁴ but not Kallistratos.³⁵

Having eliminated Kallistratos, the critics generally read Κά[νθαρος in this line of the inscription.³⁶ Kantharos was a minor comedian of the

³²See Capps; W. A. Dittmer, *The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didaskalia Found in Rome* (diss., Princeton 1923). There are discussions also in L. Moretti, "Sulle didascalie del teatro attico rinvenute a Roma," *Athenaeum* 38 (1960) 263–282; Schwarze 98–99; Pickard-Cambridge 121. The comments of the last sum up the current *opinio communis* on both issues: "The long controversy as between the rival readings of 'Ἀρ[ιστοφάνης] and 'Ἀρ[ιστομένης] seems to have been finally settled in favour of the former" (118), and on IG XIV 1097.10–14 "probably . . . a record of Aristomenes . . . but the case is not perfectly made out" (121). If the play mentioned on the Roman inscription (*Koleophoroi*) is the same as *Hylophoroi* (by Aristomenes), then the identification of Aristomenes here would be greatly enhanced.

³³Philonides produced Aristophanes' *Proagon* at the Lenaia of 422 (*Hypothesis 1 Wasps*), his *Amphiaros* at the Lenaia of 414 (*Hypothesis 1 Birds*), his *Frogs* at the Lenaia of 405 (*Hypothesis 1 Frogs*), and also *Daitales* in 427 (see D. Welsh, "The Chorus of Aristophanes' *Babylonians*," *CQ* NS 33 [1983] 51–55).

³⁴His play *Kothornoi* is well attested (see Kock 254–256); its mention of Theramenes and the known application of *kothornos* to that politician suggest a late date in the 5th century, one that would fit well with the position of his name on the victory-list; see Geissler (60), who dates it 410–405.

³⁵On the Kallistratos-Aristophanes and *Babylonioi* business, see the recent studies of G. Forrest, "Aristophanes and the Athenian Empire," in *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C. E. Stevens on His Seventieth Birthday* (Farnborough 1975) 17–29; D. Welsh (above, n. 33); D. M. MacDowell, "Aristophanes and Kallistratos," *CQ* NS 32 (1982) 21–26, who revives the earlier view that Kallistratos was the man taken to court by Kleon. The most recent discussions are those of Perusino 35–57 and Bowie.

³⁶So E. Capps, "Epigraphical Problems in the History of Comedy," *AJP* 28 (1907) 199, accepted by H. Oellacher, "Zur Chronologie der altattischen Komödie," *WS* 38 (1916) 116, 136; Pickard-Cambridge 112, 118; Geissler 7; Mette (above, n. 26) 5 B 1, line 9 (p. 167); Schmid 137, n. 5; K-A 4.57. The only other possibility is Kallias, usually restored in an earlier line on the stone, after the name of Krates, Καλλία[ς] ||. Kallias' career does go back to the 440s and as late as the 410s (see Storey).

late fifth century, for whom the *Suda* (κ 309) attests five plays and *IG II*² 2318.115 records a victory at the Dionysia in 422.³⁷ It makes reasonable and economic sense to place the first victory of Kantharos at Dionysia 422, and thus to arrive at a *terminus ante quem* for the first victories of Aristophanes and Eupolis who precede Ka[on the list. Kratinos won at the Dionysia of 423 with *Pytine* (*Hypothesis 5 Clouds*); thus the first victories of Aristophanes and Eupolis belong to the years 427 to 424. We do not know at which festival Aristophanes' first play, *Daitales*, was produced, but his *Babylonioi* certainly was produced at the Dionysia of 426. If it won, as most critics now believe,³⁸ Kleon's wrath is even more explicable. Interestingly enough, as Geissler and Russo have observed, Aristophanes' victory in 426 (or in 425, if *Babylonioi* was not victorious) was the first by a new poet in ten years, since the previous poet on the Dionysia list, Hermippos, has a Dionysia-victory attested for him in 435.³⁹ Eupolis' first victory at the Dionysia thus belongs to 425 or 424, if *Babylonioi* did win the prize in 426, and to 424, if Aristophanes' first victory did not occur until the Dionysia of 425.⁴⁰

At this point one must mention the recent and controversial thesis of Bowie, that the main character of *Acharnians*, Dikaiopolis, is intended at *Ach.* 377 f. and 501 ff. to represent not Aristophanes, but another poet who competed at the Dionysia of 426 and who also was attacked by Kleon, i.e., Eupolis. This is not the place to consider Bowie's thesis in detail, but on Bowie's argument a political play by Eupolis belongs to Dionysia 426 in addition to the other secure dates (he suggests *Astrateutoi*).⁴¹

Thus a list of seven secure dates can be established:

429	(festival unknown)	(<i>début</i>)
427	Lenaia	(1 st Lenaia victory)
425	Lenaia	<i>Noumeniai</i>
425	Dionysia	(1 st Dionysia victory)
421	Lenaia	<i>Marikas</i>
421	Dionysia	<i>Kolakes</i>
420	(festival unknown)	<i>Autolykos</i>

³⁷ Again the conclusion is not absolutely certain, since the reading on the stone at this point has been restored as Κάνθαρος ἐδ[ίδασκε].

³⁸ Geissler 3; Pickard-Cambridge 118; Russo 36–38, where the discussion of the victories of Eupolis and Aristophanes in the 420s agrees with my own conclusions.

³⁹ *IG II*² 2318, a fragment discussed by Capps 1–3; see Geissler viii, Russo 36.

⁴⁰ If Κά[νθαρος] is not to be read here, the earliest Dionysia victory of Eupolis *might* then be with *Kolakes* in 421. Aristophanes could have then won with *Babylonioi* after all in 426, but if not, would have to have won at the Dionysia of 425 or 424.

⁴¹ Other plays whose dates are considered by Bowie are *Prospaltioi* (429), *Taxiarchoi* (429–427), and *Chrysoun Genos* (424?); it will be seen that I agree only with his judgement about the first.

VI DATING THE PLAYS

There are four ways in which the date of an ancient play may be determined:

- 1) an actual year given by an ancient source—here we may include the hypotheses to Aristophanes' plays which provide secure dates for *Noumeniai* and *Kolakes*, the indirect dating for *Marikas* ("third year after *Clouds*"), and Athenaios' dating of *Autolykos* to an exact archon-year;
- 2) the establishment of *termini post/ante quem* through a known and datable play (e.g., the parody of Sophokles' *Antigone* at Eupolis fr. 260.23 dates that play [*Prospaltioi*] after *Antigone*, or the mention of *Marikas* at Cl. 553 dates *Marikas* after the original *Clouds* [confirmed by Σ Cl. 553], or the mention of the colossal statue of Peace at Eupolis fr. 62 dates that play [*Autolykos*] after 421 [again confirmed by the ancient sources]);⁴²
- 3) an allusion to an historical event—for tragedy this sort of dating is notoriously unreliable (e.g., the dating of Euripides' *Elektra* on the basis of certain alleged contemporary references at the end of the play),⁴³ but the topical nature of comedy allows more security with this approach (e.g., the reference at fr. 99.30 [*Demoi*] to the battle at Mantinea indicates a date for that comedy after 418);
- 4) *komodoumenoi* in the fragments—perhaps the most frequent technique, but not always reliable since certain individuals "enjoyed" a lengthy career in comedy (e.g., Kleisthenes from 425–405, Pauson from 425–388). But a death-date or firm date of departure for an individual (e.g., Kleon in 422/1 or Hipponikos by 421) can help in narrowing down the date of a play,⁴⁴ and when several *komodoumenoi* appear in the extant fragments of a play, the overall pattern may suggest one range of dates rather than another.⁴⁵ Finally, certain individuals appear to have had a short notoriety, and thus allusions to them may fix a play reasonably securely (e.g., Amynias and Philoxenos; cf. *Poleis*).

⁴²Here we may include also a chronological sequence such as that at Ath. 267e, which records that Kratinos' *Ploutoi* was earlier than Krates' *Theria*.

⁴³See G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1963) 63–71, and M. Cropp, *Euripides: Electra* (Warminster 1988) 1–li.

⁴⁴For Kleon see fr. 311 (*Chrysoun Genos*); for Hipponikos fr. 20 (*Aiges*).

⁴⁵See Storey 382 on Kallias' *Pedetai* where I argue that the *komodoumenoi* suggest a date in the 410s, or compare Aristophanes' *Pelargoi* where the mention of Patrokles, Neokleides, and Meletos makes it plain that this comedy belongs to the 390s.

VII THE COMEDIES

Prospaltioi

A number of factors bear on the dating of this play.⁴⁶ Fr. 260.23 is clearly based on Sophokles' *Antigone* 712; thus a date after 442 is indicated, not very much help since Eupolis did not make his *début* until 429.⁴⁷ Σ Cl. 541 states that the allusion in that line to the old man and his stick is to Eupolis' *Prospaltioi*; in that case *Prospaltioi* predates the revision of *Clouds* ca 418. Many have attempted to see in fr. 260 a direct allusion to popular discontent with Perikles' handling of the war (cf. Thuc. 2.59 ff.); in particular line 17 ἵνα μὴ καθῆσθαι φῶς' ἀναλίσκ[is used in this way. This seems slender evidence indeed, but it was enough to convince several scholars that *Prospaltioi* belonged to the early years of the War and that Perikles himself played a considerable role in the comedy.⁴⁸

Confirmation, however, of that early date has come with the publication in 1971 of POxy 2813 (= K-A 5, fr. 259), a papyrus fragment of a commentary to what must be the *Prospaltioi* of Eupolis.⁴⁹ In what we have the writer states that certain people were sent to Eupolis as he was beginning at an early age⁵⁰ to write comedy with what seems to be a request τοὺς πολίτας μὴ γράφειν, but to do something involving heroes; four broken lines follow, and then the mention of the chorus of *Prospaltioi*. Whatever the truth of the story—and it is very likely that the author was relying on comedy; compare the autobiographical "facts" given by Aristophanes in the *parabaseis* of plays of the 420s—it seems clear that *Prospaltioi* was the comedian's first play and should be dated to 429.

Fr. 259.126 mentions the *Stheneboia* of Euripides, probably to be dated ca 430⁵¹ and fr. 267 records that in this play Aspasia was called "Helen." Comparison with Ach. 524 ff. reveals how a theme of Aspasia as Bringer of War could be used. There are few *komodoumenoi* in the nine fragments of the play. Fr. 259.72 has Συρακόσιον in the text, but there is no way of being sure that the politician of the late 420s and 410s is meant; it could just be an ethnic. Fr. 259.74 mentions an Exekestos, who *might* have something

⁴⁶For the recent *opinio communis* (i.e., early 420s) see Geissler xix; in his earlier edition (45) Geissler had preferred a date ca 420. Bowie also accepts 429.

⁴⁷This assumes that fr. 260, a papyrus fragment published in 1935, does come from this play. The strongest evidence is the mention in lines 13–15: καὶ φράζεθ' οἷα τ'ἀνθάδ' ἔσσι / Προσπαλτίουσιν ἢ στρατίαν / πέμπειν κελεύει'. For the bibliography of this fragment see Austin (above, n. 6) 111 and K-A 5.448.

⁴⁸See the arguments of Schmid 114 and Schwarze 115–122.

⁴⁹The words in line 13 η|γέθη χορὸς δ(ἐ) Πρ[οσπ]αλτίων, followed by the naming of Eupolis in lines 15, 17, make this a firm conclusion.

⁵⁰The *Suda* says that he began to write at age seventeen.

⁵¹See M. Cropp and G. Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides* (London 1985, BICS Supp. 43) 70.

to do with the Exekestides of *Birds*, but K-A 3.2.356 find it improbable. Fr. 262 alleges of someone that he had a Thracian ταινιόπωλις for a mother, but that this could refer to Kleophon (a *komodoumenos* of the decade 410–400) is only speculation. We may with confidence set this play in 429.

Aiges

Some thirty-four fragments of this play are extant, including fr. 13, part of the parabasis spoken by the chorus of goats. We know little about the play, but fr. 17 (a pair of references in Quintilian [1.10.17] and Athenaios [184d]) reveals that one character was a teacher named Prodamos who could teach both γραμματική and μουσική. One immediately seeks possible parallels with *Clouds* and *Kolakes*.⁵² There are only two persons mentioned in the play, Phaiax (fr. 2) who is made fun of at Kn. 1377 (424) and who was prominent at least until the middle of the next decade,⁵³ and Hipponikos the father of Kallias, who is spoken of in fr. 20, clearly alive and the butt of a joke. Since Hipponikos was certainly dead by the end of the decade when his son Kallias was spending his patrimony (cf. *Kolakes*, Plato *Protagoras*),⁵⁴ *Aiges* thus belongs to the 420s. If we could trust the tradition that Hipponikos was killed at Delion ([And.] 4.13), then the play would belong to the years 428–424, but pseudo-Andokides may just have confused Hipponikos with the Hippokrates who did die at Delion (Thuc. 4.101). We might place *Aiges* in one of the blank spaces for Eupolis' first victory at the Lenaia or Dionysia.

Astrateutoi

The alternative title, *Androgynoi*,⁵⁵ reveals that this comedy was in all likelihood built along the lines of the joke at Cl. 691–692:

ΣΩ. ὀρᾷς; γυναῖκα τὴν Ἀμυνίαν καλεῖς.
ΣΤ. οὐκ οὖν δικαίως ἦτις οὐ στρατεύεται;

The best known of the jokes at ἀστρατεία are those aimed at Kleonymos and his shield,⁵⁶ of which we have several from the late 420s, but clearly

⁵²Fr. 21 mentions the infamous κάρδοπος, consigned “ad aeternitatis memoriam” (K-A 5.311) by Cl. 669 ff., 1248 ff., and fr. 4 has someone “learning not even the slightest bit of μουσική.” Fr. 11 has someone promising to pay “whatever μισθός is necessary,” while in fr. 12 someone professes to know agricultural matters (αἰπολεῖν, σκάπτειν, νεᾶν, φυτεύειν). Is it the same contrast as the rustic Strepsiades attempting to learn from Sokrates?

⁵³PA 13921; see Davies 521–524.

⁵⁴See J. Walsh, “The Dramatic Date of Plato’s *Protagoras* and the Lesson of ἀρετή,” CQ NS 34 (1984) 101–106, who demonstrates that the primary stratum of chronological material in that dialogue is ca 420.

⁵⁵Attested only, however, by the *Suda* (ε 3657).

⁵⁶On these see I. C. Storey, “The ‘Blameless Shield’ of Kleonymos,” *RhM* 132 (1989) 247–261. There is also a good discussion of Kleonymos and the infamous shield by M. Heath, *Political Comedy in Aristophanes* (Göttingen 1987, Hypomnemata 87) 28.

any time of active campaigning would provide a suitable background for this sort of comedy. Kaibel was cautious in considering the date of this play, but Schmid (117) confidently sets it in the late 420s, while Geissler (36), following Wilamowitz (51) in his interpretation of fr. 41, assigned the play to Lenaia 423.⁵⁷

The evidence for such confident dating is not conclusive. Fr. 35 contains a reference to Peisandros' military service to the Paktolos where he was the most cowardly man in the army. Peisandros is a familiar *komodoumenos* of the years 426–411,⁵⁸ accused of bribe-taking, huge size and appetite, and using the war for his own ends. Thus this passage could fit anywhere in that fifteen-year period. Several critics saw the mention of Paktolos by Eupolis as a thinly disguised reference (or even the original reading of the text) to the expedition to the Spartolos recorded by Thucydides in 429 (2.79),⁵⁹ but as Kaibel objected, the passage need not be real fact at all; Paktolos possessed the overtones of wealth, and the joke may lie in the appropriateness of Peisandros serving on such an expedition.

Fr. 38 (ὡς ἦρξε περὶ Μίνωαν αὐτὸς οὐτοσί) likewise might be taken to have some connexion with the Athenian occupation of Minoa in 427 (Thuc. 3.51) or with similar actions there in 424 (Thuc. 4.66). If the subject of ἦρξε is meant to be a real person, then Kassel-Austin suggest Nikias or Hippokrates, the generals involved in the two campaigns respectively. Thus a possible date after 424 is indicated.

Fr. 41 (μή ποτε θρέψω / παρὰ Περσεφόνῃ τοῖονδε ταῶν, δὲ τοὺς εὐδοντας ἐγείρει) was used by some to refer to Pylilampes the father of Demos who raised peacocks (Plut. *Per.* 13) and in particular to his being wounded at the battle of Delion in 424 (Plut. *Mor.* 581d). Thus a date at the Lenaia of 423 could be assumed.⁶⁰ Again this is not an automatic assumption that can be made. *Ach.* 63 may well allude to Pylilampes and his peacocks, but the mention of a peacock does not of itself guarantee that the comedian was referring to the birds raised by Pylilampes and his son.⁶¹

Two other *komodoumenoi* are mentioned in this play, Melanthios a favourite target in the years 421–414,⁶² and Phormion, the admiral who disappears from the histories of Thucydides in 428 but who is mentioned in

⁵⁷Bowie (185) dates the play to Dionysia 426.

⁵⁸Found at Aristophanes *Babylonioi* fr. 84 (426), *Peace* 395 (421), *Birds* 1556 (414), *Lysist.* 490 (411); Eupolis *Marikas* fr. 195 (421), *Demoi* fr. 99.1; Hermippos *Artopolides* fr. 7 (420 to 418); Phrynichos *Monotropos* fr. 20K (414); Platon *Peisandros*.

⁵⁹R. Hanow, *Exercitationum criticarum in comicos Graecos liber primus* (Halle 1830) 81, followed by Geissler 36.

⁶⁰Wilamowitz 51, followed by Schmid 117, Geissler 36.

⁶¹On the birds and the Persian connexion see Plato *Charm.* 158a (for Pylilampes' Persian embassies), Plut. *Per.* 13.15 (for the birds), and Antiphon fr. 57 (for Demos' possession of them).

⁶²For this man (*not* the brother of Morsimos) see Storey 380.

comedy from 426 to 411.⁶³ Geissler punctuated the statement at *Σ Peace* 808 as ὅτι γὰρ ὁ Μελάνθιος ὀνοφάγος, προεῖρηται καὶ παρ' Εὐπόλιδι ἐν Ἀσ-τρατεύτοις to conclude that Eupolis' play predates *Peace*. However, the usual punctuation (so K-A 5, Eup. fr. 43) is a full stop after προεῖρηται. In that case the previous statement about Melanthios' gluttony becomes *Σ Peace* 803, and the mention of Melanthios in Eupolis a postscript to the note.

Thus although the bulk of critical opinion favours a date in the late 420s (and comedy of that period does contain several such allusions), a play about avoidance of service could belong to any period of major campaigning. A date of late 420s or 414–412 would suit both the theme of the comedy and the *komodoumenoi*.

Chrysoun Genos

The dating of this play depends primarily on fr. 311, in all likelihood from the parabasis:

ὦ καλλίστη πόλι πασῶν ὅσας Κλέων ἐφορᾷ,
ὥς εὐδαιμών πρότερόν τ' ἦσθα, νῦν δὲ μᾶλλον ἔσθι.

The allusion to Kleon in the present tense surely indicates a date before 421—Kleon's death belongs in the archon-year 421 (Thuc. 5.11). Thus a first approximation should be 428–422. However, most critics would consider the allusion to Kleon overseeing the cities to his period of prominence after Pylos (425), and thus find a date of 424 at the Dionysia.⁶⁴ One may also compare *Kn.* 75 (of Kleon) ἐφορᾷ γὰρ οὗτος πάντ' and *Kn.* 159 ὦ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ταγὲ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων. On this dating Eupolis' play continued themes that Aristophanes had launched against Kleon in *Knights*.

However, the business of Kleon and the cities (i.e., the ἀρχή) need not be dated after Pylos. The clear concern of Kleon for Athens' relationship with her allies is made plain by the Mytilenaiian Debate of Thuc. 3 (427), by Kleon's reaction to whatever was in *Babylonioi* (*Ach.* 503), and by the parabasis to *Acharnians*, which is very much about Athens and her allies and culminates with an attack on Kleon. If the speculation is correct that the business of Kleon and the five talents of *Ach.* 6 refers to a scene from *Babylonioi* (see K-A 3.2.63), then as early as 426 a comedian could write a play about Kleon and the cities of the ἀρχή.⁶⁵

⁶³ Aristophanes *Babylonioi*, fr. 88 (426), *Knights* 562 (424), *Nephelai* fr. 397 (423), *Peace* 348 (421), and *Lysist.* 804. For his appearance in *Taxiarchoi* see below, 22.

⁶⁴ T. Bergk, *De reliquiis comoediae Atticae antiquae* (Leipzig 1838) 361; Kaibel 1232; Geissler 35; Schmid 116. The comment of the last is typical of the confidence with which this play is assigned to Dionysia 424—"mit dem Χρυσούν Γένος gewann Eupolis an den Dionysien 424 den ersten Preis." So also Bowie 184, but with some hesitation.

⁶⁵ Professor David Welsh of the University of Ottawa has suggested privately to me that whatever was in *Babylonioi* about Kleon and the allies had to do with the Mytilenaiian business of 427.

Another fragment suggests a similar conclusion. At fr. 308 Eupolis coins the "number" *ψαμμακοσίους* ("sand-hundreds") to count the audience; at Ach. 3 Aristophanes enumerates his woes as *ψαμμακοσιογάργαρα* ("sand-hundred-heaps"). The inference is strong that Aristophanes has gone Eupolis one better and that thus *Chrysoun Genos* antedates *Acharnians* (425). I suggest *Lenaia* 426 for the production of this comedy (Eupolis' first *Lenaia*-victory?). In that case the theme of Kleon and the cities in this play precedes Aristophanes' use of the same theme in *Babylonioi* and *Acharnians*.

Other *komodoumenoi* include Lampon (fr. 319), who is one of comedy's favourite targets from probably the late 440s to the last decade of the century,⁶⁶ and a puzzling reference to an Arcestratos in fr. 298, which may be the enumeration of individual members of the chorus or of members of the audience. But the name Arcestratos is too common for any secure identification to be made (PA 2397–2432), nor is there any other extant allusion in comedy to him.⁶⁷ There is a real problem with the mention of Pantakles in fr. 318, one that deserves fuller treatment elsewhere. Briefly put, at *Frogs* 1036 a Pantakles is called *σκαϊότατος* for a public *faux pas* which seems to have happened in 406/5 (*πρώην*), but Eupolis in *Chrysoun Genos*, a comedy from the 420s, also calls him *σκαῖος*. Something is wrong, but one option that is not available is to move Eupolis' play down into the years 410–406. I intend to deal with Pantakles in a future discussion.

Poleis

Critical opinion almost unanimously assigns this play to the Dionysia of the year 422.⁶⁸ After *Demoi* this was the best-known play of Eupolis; forty-one fragments are extant, at least fourteen with *komodoumenoi*. Fr. 225, which mentions Stilbides the *μάντις*, clearly alive and active, gives a *terminus ante quem*. As Stilbides died in Sicily (Plut. *Nik.* 23), *Poleis* should be earlier than 414. Others give little assistance: the mention of Chairephon (fr. 253) could be anywhere from 423 to the end of the War, and the reference to Hyperbolos (fr. 252) could fit anywhere from 425 to 415.⁶⁹ Two other *komodoumenoi* appear

⁶⁶See Storey 380 on Lampon in comedy.

⁶⁷On prominent Arcestratoi in the late 5th century see Davies 346. The best candidates are PA 2398, the *ταμίης* of Athene in 429/8, and PA 2411, the son of Lykomedes and general in 433/2. Davies thinks that these two may in fact be the same man.

⁶⁸G. Kaibel, "Liber sententiarum VII," *Hermes* 30 (1895) 429–446, repeated in *RE* 1232; Geissler 39; Schmid 118. Norwood 197 puts the play before the expedition to Sicily, and A. C. Cassio, *Commedia e partecipazione: La Pace di Aristofane* (Naples 1985) 118, prefers the Dionysia of 420. Luppe 75, n. 91, is doubtful of the 422 date for *Poleis*.

⁶⁹Or even later, since Hyperbolos, ostracized in 416 or 415, could still be mentioned at *Thesm.* 840 and *Frogs* 570.

to belong to the 410s, Syrakosios (fr. 220)⁷⁰ and the wife of Lykon (fr. 232).⁷¹

Several allusions do seem to point to the late 420s. Fr. 227 makes fun of Demos the son of Pyrilampes, a καλός of the late 420s and mentioned at *Wasps* 98 (422). Fr. 235 relates that Simon had stolen money from Herakleia; Simon the embezzler is known only from *Cl.* 351, 398 (423).⁷² Similarly fr. 249 refers to Philoxenos the effeminate, whom we know from *Cl.* 685–687 (423) and *Wasps* 81–84 (422).⁷³ Fr. 231 contains an address in the vocative to Hierokles, the χρησμόςλογος who appears in *Peace* (1045–1121). If the vocative indicates that Hierokles was a character in this play also, then it could very well be close in time to *Peace*.⁷⁴ Finally the mention of the embassy of Amynias in fr. 222

χάμυνίας ἐκεῖνος ἀμέλει κλαύσεται,
ὅτι ὦν ἄγροικος ἴσταιται πρὸς τῷ μύρῳ
ῥῶτι θεῶν εἵνεκα† ἐπλευσε κακὸς ὦν εἴσεται

has been the clinching argument for many scholars, since the embassy in question (to Thessaly) is according to *Σ Wasps* 1271a, where the fragment from Eupolis is quoted, the same as that referred to at *Wasps* 1267–74.⁷⁵ Amynias is otherwise known only from *Cl.* 685 ff. (423) and *Wasps* 74–76, 325. (422); he seems thus to have had a vogue ca 423/2.

The late 420s do on balance seem likely, and since we do know the productions for Dionysia 423 (*Clouds*, Kratinos' *Pytine*, Ameipsias' *Konnos*), Lenaia 422 (*Proagon*, *Wasps*, Leukon's *Presbeis*), and Dionysia 421 (Eupolis' *Kolakes*, *Peace*, Leukon's *Phratores*) and the production of Eupolis' *Marikas* at Lenaia 421, the only date left is Dionysia 422.⁷⁶ Two frag-

⁷⁰Known from *Birds* 1297 and Phrynichos *Monotropos* (fr. 26K), both in 414.

⁷¹See Eupolis *Autolykos* (420) and Aristophanes *Lysist.* 270 (411).

⁷²There is no indication at all that this part of *Clouds* belongs to the revision ca 418. Of the others mentioned by Aristophanes with Simon (Hieronymos, Kleisthenes, Kleonymos, Theoros), the last is definitely a *komodoumenos* of the 420s.

⁷³Philoxenos the καταπύγων is also mentioned at Phrynichos 47K (*Satyroi*), for which play there is no hint of date. I have omitted the mention of Eryxis the son of Philoxenos at *Frogs* 931–934, as I hope to demonstrate in another paper that the father of Eryxis has no connexion at all with the καταπύγων.

⁷⁴The mention of the μάντις Stilbides in fr. 225 and the reference to Philoxenos in dactylic hexameter (most often used by comedy to parody oracles) indicate a theme or a scene with oracles or prophecies (cf. *Kn.* 997 ff., *Peace* 1045 ff., *Birds* 959 ff.).

⁷⁵The date and purpose of this embassy is unknown. See the comments of Gomme 3.622–623 and D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford 1971) 297. Kaibel (above, n. 68, 444) suggests that Amynias had returned to Athens in 423/2; hence the jokes at his service to Pharsalos.

⁷⁶This argument rests on the assumption that in this period there were only three comedies produced at a festival. Luppe (75, n. 91) in his attack on this assumption shows that on his argument plays such as *Poleis* could belong to other occasions.

ments present anomalies. First, fr. 224 mentions Adeimantos the son of Leukolophides, known only in comedy at *Frogs* 1513, but who was involved in the business of the Mysteries in 415 (And. 1.16) and who was associated with Prodikos of Keos at Plato *Prot.* 315e. Since Walsh has shown that the primary chronological material in that Platonic dialogue belongs to the late 420s, Adeimantos could have been a follower of Prodikos at that time and sufficiently prominent to have been a comic target in the late 420s. Second is the statement at Σ *Frogs* 970 that Theramenes was made fun of by Eupolis in *Poleis* (= fr. 251). This might seem out of line, since Theramenes belongs to the last years of the War, but the point of the allusion is that his father Hagnon had adopted him and made him a citizen; Plut. *Nik.* 2.1 adds that he was accused of being a Keian. The explanation of Davies (228) of this is that Theramenes was a pupil or follower of Prodikos, and since both Adeimantos and Theramenes are pupils of Prodikos and *komodoumenoi* in *Poleis*, we might see a sophistic theme in this comedy and postulate a connexion with his *Kolakes* (421) which featured Kallias and his household of sophists. Again dates converge ca 422.

Baptai

This lost comedy poses three problems for the critic: (1) the significance of the title and thus the identity of the chorus, (2) the role of Alkibiades in the play, and (3) any connexion with the events of 415.

The evidence about the chorus comes principally from Juvenal 2.91–92 and the scholia thereto:

*talía secreta coluerunt orgia taedo
Cecropiam soliti Baptae lassare Cotyto.*

Baptae titulus libri, quo in pudici describuntur ab Eupolide, qui inducit viros ad imitationem feminarum saltantes. Baptae autem molles: quo titulo Eupolis comoediam scripsit, ob quam ab Alcibiade, quem praecipue perstrinxerat, necatus est.

Σ (π) 2.92

Baptae dicuntur molles et effeminati, quo titulo Eupolis et Aristophanes comoediam scripserunt, in qua inducunt viros Athenienses ad imitationem feminarum colere Cotyton, id est psalterium deam Atheniensem, quam effeminati colebant.

Σ (φ) 2.92

But no explanation of the meaning of the title is given apart from the worship of the goddess Kotytto and the effeminacy of the male devotees.

The verb βάπτειν (the noun βάπτis is known only in connexion with this play) has three distinct meanings in classical Greek: (1) "to dip or immerse something in a liquid," e.g., *Cl.* 149–150 εἴτας τὴν ψύλλαν λαβὼν / ἐνέβαπεν ἐς τὸν κηρὸν αὐτῆς τὸ πόδε; (2) "to dip and so to draw <water>," e.g., *Eur. Hek.* 610 τὸ τεῦχος / βάψασα ποντίας ἁλὸς ἔνεγκε; (3) "to dye," e.g., *Ach.* 112 ἵνα μὴ σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδιανικόν. The last is the most common use of the verb in Aristophanes. Two interpretations have been advanced of the title,

that βάπτει should be connected to βαπτίζειν, that the devotees (the βάπτει) were immersed or "baptized" as part of the ritual of devotion,⁷⁷ or that the βάπτει had dyed their hair in an effeminate fashion.⁷⁸ The latter does allow for a greater "bite" in the reply of Alkibiades:

βάπτες μ' ἐν θυμέλῃσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σὲ κύμασι πόντου
βαπτίζων ὀλέσω νόμασι πικροτάτοις

if βάπτες means "dye" (meaning 3 above) and βαπτίζων means "dip" or "immerse" (meaning 1). Another possibility might be that the βάπτει dyed not their hair but their robes, again in an attempt to appear effeminate—for the dyeing of robes see *Peace* 1176, *Lysist.* 51, *Plout.* 530.

That Alkibiades was made fun of in *Baptai* is made clear from several sources, e.g., the scholiast to Juvenal quoted above *quem praecipue praestrinxerat*, but nothing in the extant fragments contains anything applicable to Alkibiades.⁷⁹ We cannot assume, as is commonly done, that the *Baptai* (who presumably form the chorus) were *sine dubio* . . . *sodales Alcibiadis, qui nocturnis orgiis sacra Cotyttia imitabantur* (Kock 273). Plutarch (*Alk.* 16) relates the riotous nature of his life in the period between Mantinea and the departure for Sicily; note especially καὶ θηλότητας ἐσθήτων ἁλουργῶν ἐλκομένων δι' ἀγορᾶς, which may have something in common with the *Baptai*.

However, the connexion with the events of 415 is not as obvious as is often assumed.⁸⁰ The only link is the later tradition that Eupolis was drowned in the sea by Alkibiades on the way to Sicily. I have suggested that this tradition is the result of Eupolis' death at sea at Kynos Sema and a "feud" with Alkibiades, the latter possibly originating in the parabasis of a comedy by Eupolis. There is no evidence that *Baptai* was produced immediately before 415, only that there existed an ancient anecdotal tradition about Eupolis and Alkibiades which was tied to 415. Some have seen a connexion between the worship of the goddess Kotytto in *Baptai* and the profanation of the Mysteries in 415—Carrière in fact sees the play as reflecting that scandal—but Alkibiades' life-style in the years 421–415 must have been so dissolute and infamous that we need not tie *Baptai* to the one event which we know best.

What firm indications are there, apart from Alkibiades and the events of 415? *komodoumenoi* are few: fr. 90 mentions a Chaireas (a ξένος) who may have some connexion with the "son of Chaireas" at *Wasps* 687 (422),

⁷⁷K-A 5.333 cites the relevant critics.

⁷⁸*Ekk.* 736 is cited by K-A 5.333 and the case of Lysikrates who blackened his hair to appear young. On Lysikrates and the relevant passages see R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes: Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford 1973) 179.

⁷⁹Fr. 78 (ὅτι οὐκ ἀνδρῆρος οὐδ' ἄωρος ἐστ' ἄνθρωπος) might allude to him.

⁸⁰Dates for *Baptai* are Dionysia 415 (Meineke), 416 or 415 (Geissler, Schmid), after 415 (Carrière [above, n. 5] 232).

and fr. 80 (ἐπιχώριος δ' ἔστ' ἡ ξένης ἀπὸ χθονός;) is said by Σ *Frogs* 418 to refer to Archedemos, known from the last decade of the century.⁸¹ But the most significant indication of date is fr. 89:

†κάκείνος† τοὺς Ἰππέας
ξυνεποίησα τῷ φαλακρῷ (. . .) κάδωρησάμην.

The "bald man" is of course Aristophanes and the lines (in the Eupolidean metre)⁸² are obviously a response to Aristophanes' charge that Eupolis had plagiarised his *Knights* to write his *Marikas*. This charge is best known from the parabasis of the revised *Clouds* (also in Eupolideans):

Εὐπολις μὲν τὸν Μαρικῶν πρότιστον παρείλκυσε
ἐκστρέψας τοὺς ἡμετέρους Ἰππέας κακὸς κακῶς. 554-555

But, as the revised *Clouds* was never produced, Eupolis can hardly be responding to this passage. I suspect that Aristophanes made the same charge in similar (or even the same words)⁸³ in another play. The best candidate is *Anagyros* in which fr. 58 reveals that someone "makes three tunics out of one of my cloaks"; as the metre is again the Eupolidean, it is a reasonable assumption that Aristophanes is complaining again of Eupolis' plagiarism. I would put *Anagyros* and *Baptai* at the same time as the revision of *Clouds*, i.e., ca 418/7.

Taxiarchoi

Of this comedy we now have the fragments of a commentary which provides some further details of the plot.⁸⁴ We knew from Σ *Peace* 348 that Phormion the Athenian admiral was a character in the play and that Dionysos had gone to him to learn τοὺς τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ πολέμων νόμους. Phormion is mentioned twice in the commentary (15, 34). Wilson has shown that there was in the play a rowing-scene which could be the antecedent of that in *Frogs*.⁸⁵ The usually accepted date for this comedy is 427, the year after Phormion vanishes from the histories of Thucydides.⁸⁶

⁸¹We may note that both these fragments have to do with ξενία and compare the incidence of these jokes in *Birds*.

⁸²On the Eupolidean metre see J. W. Poultny, "Eupolidean Verse," *AJP* 100 (1979) 133-144; L. P. E. Parker, "Eupolis the Unruly," *PCPS* NS 34 (1988) 115-122.

⁸³Compare his repetition of *Wasps* 1030-35 in the parabasis of *Peace* (752-758).

⁸⁴*OxyPap* 35 (1968) no. 2740 (= K-A fr. 268); see W. Luppe's discussion, "Der Kommentar zu den *Taxiarchoi* des Eupolis," *APF* 27 (1980) 37-47.

⁸⁵A. M. Wilson, "A Eupolidean Precedent for the Rowing Scene in Aristophanes' *Frogs*?", *CQ* NS 24 (1974) 250-252; "Addendum to 'A Eupolidean Precedent for the Rowing Scene in Aristophanes' *Frogs*?", *CQ* NS 26 (1976) 318.

⁸⁶First proposed by Wilamowitz 32 ff., and followed by Kaibel 1231, Norwood 198 (428 or 427), Geissler 32, and Schmid 115. See now Bowie (185), who argues for ca 428 and sees in Phormion a precursor of Lamachos in *Acharnians* and the comedy a "peace-play."

However, the fragments suggest another date. Fr. 282 mentions Opountios, the κόραξ of *Birds* 1294 (414), alluded to also at "Kallias" fr. 4 (*Atalantai*). Geissler dated *Atalantai* ca 430 on the grounds that Kallias is a comedian of the 440s and 430s and that on his dating *Taxiarchoi* belonged in 427. However, two of the four references assigned by Kassel-Austin to Kallias' *Atalantai* say only ὁ τὰς Ἀταλάντας γράψας/συνθεῖς (Hesych. δ 1890; Σ *Birds* 1294, who cites the allusion to Opountios). Confusion with Strattis' *Atalantai* is certainly possible, in which case a later date than 430 is to be preferred. Even if the fragment belonged to Kallias' *Atalantai*, I have argued that his *Pedetai* is to be dated ca 415 and that thus Kallias' career continued into the 410s. The one secure date for Opountios is 414.

In addition, the commentary (fr. 268.7–12) reveals that Eupolis parodied Sophokles' *Tereus* in this play, a tragedy made fun of by Aristophanes at *Birds* 100–101 (414). Later in the commentary (fr. 268.43) it is recorded that Eupolis mentioned a λωποδύτης; the only known *komodoumenos* of this sort is Orestes, made fun of by Aristophanes at *Ach.* 1165 ff. (425) and *Birds* 712, 1491 (414). A date ca 414 is being indicated.

Handley preferred a later date (415) than the usually accepted one on different grounds. He pointed to a series of *oinochoai* which may depict scenes from this comedy. One shows two characters with names]ONYCOC, ΦΟΡ[, for which ΔΙ]ONYCOC and ΦΟΡ[ΜΙΩΝ are plausible supplements. Another vase shows a man rowing astride a fish (cf. Wilson's rowing-scene in the play). Handley observed that with the vases was found a sherd used as an *ostrakon* "inscribed for the ostracism held in 415 B.C. or a neighbouring year, at which Hyperbolos was exiled."⁸⁷ Was the date of the play 415, and was its theme "Dionysos goes to Sicily"? The air of reckless optimism in the months preceding the expedition is well known (Thuc. 6.24), and such a comedy is certainly not unthinkable at, say, the Dionysia of 415.

But what about Phormion, who is not heard of after 428 (Thuc. 3.7)? What is he doing in a comedy of 415? The disappearance of Phormion and Thucydides' silence about why Phormion was not available in 428 have long been mysteries,⁸⁸ but he does not vanish from comedy after 428, being mentioned in *Babylonioi* fr. 88 (426), *Knights* 562 (424), *Nephelai* fr. 397 (423), *Peace* 347–348 (421), *Lysist.* 804 (411), and Eupolis *Astrateutoi* fr. 44 (late 420s or late 410s). Phormion may not have died in 428, but may have become ill, incapacitated, or just retired. If the grand old man of the Athenian navy was dead, he may have been summoned back from death like the four worthies in *Demoi* (see below); alternatively Dionysos

⁸⁷E. Handley, "Aristophanes' Rivals," *PCA* 79 (1982) 24–25. See also M. Crosby, "Five Comic Scenes from Athens," *Hesperia* 24 (1955) 76–84, at 81 ff.

⁸⁸See the discussion of Gomme 2.234–237.

may have sought him out in Hades, in which case the parallel with *Frogs* becomes even more pronounced.

Demoi

Demoi was the best known of Eupolis' comedies in the ancient world. Forty-five fragments are known from ancient authorities, and the basic theme of the comedy, the return of four Athenian leaders from the dead (Solon, Miltiades, Aristeides, and Perikles) to right the situation at Athens was cited by several ancient sources (e.g., Aristeides 3.365; Platonios 2). To the forty-five ancient fragments must be added the substantial fragment of the Cairo papyrus (fr. 99) which contains 120 reasonably consecutive lines from the end of the parabasis (part of an iambic antode and the antepirrhema in trochaic tetrameters) and the subsequent episode in which Aristeides encounters a sycophant.

Critical opinion has almost universally dated the play to 412.⁸⁹ This dating has implications for the interpretation of the play. Set in the aftermath of Sicily and the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia it becomes the response of comedy to the dark days of 413—Meineke in fact had used this argument in reverse to date the comedy to 412—or a comic reflection of the political in-fighting of the time leading up to the coup of 411 and of the absent but ever-present figure of Alkibiades (so Sartori). Against both these views one is directed to the useful corrective by Henderson, who observes the reasonably optimistic mood in *Lysistrata* (411) and the complete absence from that play of Alkibiades.⁹⁰

Apart from the *komodoumenoi*, who will be discussed below, four passages from the extant fragments have been used to suggest a firm date for *Demoi*:

- 1) Fr. 99.30–32 mentions the behaviour of an unnamed demagogue at Mantinea and his abuse of the *strategoi*. This refers to the battle of Mantinea in 418 and provides a *terminus post quem*.

⁸⁹ Meineke (ap. Geissler 54); Geissler 54–55, XVI; Schmid 124 ff.; Schwarze 134 (but leaning toward 413); Plepelits 39–45; Sartori 11–15, with useful bibliography in notes 19 and 24. C. Jensen, "Die Parabasis in den *Demoi* des Eupolis," *APAW* 14 (1939) 5, n. 3, argues for 411, Norwood (198) for 417–415. Kaibel 1234 ("Die Zeit der *Δῆμοι* steht nicht fest") was written before the appearance of the Cairo Papyrus.

⁹⁰ J. Henderson, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*, (Oxford 1987) xv–xxv (esp. xviii, xxiv). On the possible presence of Alkibiades in other plays of this period see the recent articles by M. Vickers, "Alcibiades on Stage: *Philoctetes* and *Cyclops*," *Historia* 37 (1987) 171–197; "Alcibiades on Stage: *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Helen*," *Historia* 38 (1989) 41–65; "Alcibiades: Aristophanes' *Birds*," *Historia* 38 (1989) 267–299. Vickers' arguments I find most improbable and far too ingenious for the spectator to grasp. When Aristophanes does make a pun depending on Alkibiades' lambdacism (*Wasps* 41–52), he is anything but subtle and almost bludgeons the point home.

- 2) Fr. 105 presents someone asking Aristеides how he became "the Just." The name Nikias was often read in the text of Galen who quotes the fragment; thus the play must be dated before Nikias' departure for Sicily in 415.⁹¹
- 3) In the margin of the Cairo Papyrus (K-A 99.37) Jensen read ΠΡ[, which he argued stood for Πρ[όβουλος (cf. the character of that title at *Lysist.* 387-613). Since the *probouloi* held that office only from the latter part of 413 (Thuc. 8.1.3) and Eupolis died in 411, the comedy comes very late in Eupolis' career.⁹²
- 4) Fr. 99.12-13 mentions τοὺς ἐν μακροῖν / τειχοῖν. Since the Athenians moved their population inside the Long Walls only during the invasions of the Archidamian War (431-425) and after the occupation of Dekeleia (413) and since Eupolis died in 411, the comedy must belong after 413.⁹³

Of these arguments only the first compels. The mention of the behaviour of the demagogue in connexion with Mantinea and with the generals is strong evidence for a *terminus post quem* of 418. At fr. 105 the restoration of the name of Nikias in the text of Galen has been shown to be unlikely at best. Kassel-Austin present several alternatives, including the name Πλούτωνος. Thus the presence of Nikias which could have tied the play to the years 417-415 is by no means established. For fr. 99.37 Kassel-Austin do see something in the margin, but the best that they can read is .M; thus the presence of Jensen's *Proboulos* is less than secure. Finally we cannot be certain that the Long Walls were occupied *only* during the years 431-425 and 413-404, and in fact And. 1.45, referring to events in 415 (two years before the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia), distinguishes those living ἐν μακρῷ τείχει from those ἐν ἄστει and ἐν Πειραιεῖ; these must have formed a significant group if they made up a separate group from the inhabitants of the Peiraieus or those in the city. Norwood (183) argues that we do not know the point of the allusion to "those in the Long Walls," and cannot automatically relate it to the Spartan occupation.⁹⁴ Thus this, the major support for a date of 412 or 411, cannot stand.

There are over fifteen *komodoumenoi* in the extant fragments of *Demoi*. Some are otherwise unknown and thus of no help in this inquiry (Nikeratos, fr. 99.15; Damasias, fr. 107). Others have long careers and likewise are

⁹¹See Norwood 186, Gomme 3.660.

⁹²C. Jensen, "Zu den *Demen* des Eupolis," *Hermes* 51 (1916) 321-354, at 338-339.

⁹³This is in essence the argument of Geissler 54.

⁹⁴The tone of the antode seems to be that certain people are in a better condition than the speakers (the chorus). Those in the Long Walls are linked with Kallias, who are "ἀ[ρ]ιστητικώτεροι than us." This hardly squares with the earlier mention of the inhabitants of the Long Walls at Kn. 792-793 whose situation is decidedly unpleasant.

of small value (e.g., Pauson [99.6–10] known from 425 to 388, Peisandros [99.1–5] from 426 to 411, Kallias [99.12] from 424 to 392). Some do assist in pinning down the date of *Demoi*. Demostratos is twice mentioned (103, 113), known from *Lysist.* 390–397 to have been active 415–411; Kleokritos (136) was made fun of at *Birds* 877 and again at *Frogs* 1437, and seems to have been a figure of the last 15 years of the century.⁹⁵ Fr. 112 mentions the sons of Hippokrates, ridiculed at *Cl.* 1001, which probably comes from the revised version ca 418.⁹⁶

At fr. 99.114–118 Aristeides mentions Diognetos τὸν ἱερόσυλον on whom he would like to lay his hands: ὅς ποτ' ἦν τῶν ἑνδεκά / ὅς τῶν πανούργων ἐστὶ τῶν νεωτέρων / πολλῶν κράτιστος. One immediately wonders whether there is any connexion with the events of 415 and in particular whether this Diognetos is the man implicated by Teukros (*And.* 1.15). The identification is complicated by the existence of several men of the name: (i) the ζητητής at the time of Andromachos' revelations about the Mysteries (*And.* 1.14); (ii) the man denounced by Teukros (*And.* 1.15); (iii) the brother of Nikias. The last two are often identified as the same man, since Nikias' brother is known to have been accused of something and to have had to go into exile.⁹⁷ However, the man mentioned in *Demoi* is unlikely to be (iii) since Eupolis describes him as one of the younger scoundrels and even a younger brother of Nikias (born before 470 [*Plato Laches* 186c]) would be rather more than a νεώτερος in 415.⁹⁸ Even if one leans toward (ii), distinguishing him from (iii), the word ἱερόσυλος need not refer to the profanation of the Mysteries in 415. The word is used by Aristophanes (*Plout.* 30) as a general term of abuse—cf. the term καταπύγων which need have no sexual innuendo at all.⁹⁹ There is also the consideration that none of those involved in the mutilation of the Herms or in the profanation of the Mysteries seems to have been mentioned in comedy, an observation that prompted Sommerstein to see in the shadowy decree of Syrakosios (Σ *Birds* 1296) a law forbidding mention of these men.¹⁰⁰ Körte's identification with (i), presumably on the

⁹⁵ On the identity of this man see A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes* 6: *Birds* (Warminster 1987) 257.

⁹⁶ *Hypothesis 1 Clouds* names three places specifically where *Clouds* has been revised, including this scene ἔπον ὁ δίκαιος λόγος πρὸς τὸν ἄδικον λαλεῖ.

⁹⁷ See D. M. MacDowell, *Andokides on the Mysteries* (Oxford 1962) 74–75; Davies 405.

⁹⁸ Davies suggests that Eukrates and Diognetos were younger half-brothers of Nikias by a second wife of Nikeratos (a foreigner?), but even so Diognetos should be at least 40 by the mid-410s.

⁹⁹ J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven 1975) 210; K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London 1978) 143.

¹⁰⁰ A. H. Sommerstein, "The Decree of Syrakosios," *CQ* NS 36 (1986) 101–108; also Henderson (above, n. 90) xxiv.

grounds that a man who had been a member of the Eleven would make a good ζητητής, seems better.

The *komodoumenoi*, then, do not narrow the range very much more than to the period 417–411. We may now consider the unnamed demagogue who is attacked at length at fr. 99.23–34. According to the text, he is now a demagogue (23), although recently he had no phratry membership (24) and would not even speak proper Attic Greek (25). In 26 some connexion with πόρνοι is made. At Mantinea he threatened the generals (30–32), and now is in a position of power (33). There has been considerable debate over the identity of this figure. Syrakosios, Androkles, and Demostratos have all been suggested,¹⁰¹ but two demagogues are attacked in comedy for foreign origins (including a distinctive accent) and abusive style, Hyperbolos and Kleophon. Both were the subject of an entire play by Platon (the former also in Marikas and Hermippos' *Artopolides*). The latter is really a *komodoumenos* of the next decade (cf. especially *Frogs* 674–685), but was a "candidate" for an ostracism, presumably at the same time as Hyperbolos was exiled in 416 or 415.¹⁰² The points in common would be his accent (cf. *Frogs* 679–683) and his bellicose attitude (cf. *Frogs* 1532). In favour of Hyperbolos is the mention of Mantinea—418 is right in the middle of Hyperbolos' primacy at Athens—the similarity to Platon 167K, 168K, and the fact that Marikas, the name applied to Hyperbolos by Eupolis, has homosexual associations. The principal problem with Hyperbolos, who is the best candidate for the identification,¹⁰³ is the date of *Demoi* in 412. Hyperbolos had been ostracized in 416 or 415, and it seemed unlikely that a demagogue now three years or more in exile would be good contemporary comic material.¹⁰⁴ But if we reject the wedding of *Demoi* to 412 and move the play a few years earlier to, say, 416, then Hyperbolos becomes the odds-on favourite. The allusion to Mantinea likewise becomes one to an event two years previous, not six years in the past. Forrest in an intriguing but completely unamplified statement proposes a similar date: "We see the whole attitude perfectly summed up by Eupolis . . . in his play the *Demes*, a few years later, in 416."¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹Syrakosios: A. Körte, "Fragmente einer Handschrift der *Demen*," *Hermes* 47 (1912) 298–302, followed by J. van Leeuwen, "De Demorum fragmentis nuper repertis," *Mnemosyne* 40 (1912) 132–133; Androkles: Edmonds (above, n. 3) 346–347; Demostratos: Sartori (97), whose entire study is devoted to the elucidation of this part of fr. 99.

¹⁰²R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) 41–42. The case for Kleophon was made by Jensen (above, n. 92) 336–337.

¹⁰³Strongly supported by Schmid 128 ("ohne Zweifel Hyperbolos").

¹⁰⁴The tone of the passage is clearly that the demagogue is a present reality, not a past danger now removed. Note the present tenses (κάξωι, 23; ὑφέρπει, 29) and the present untrue condition at 25.

¹⁰⁵W. G. Forrest, "An Athenian Generation Gap," *YCS* 24 (1975) 37–52, at 41.

Philoï

This must remain as one of the most mysterious of Eupolis' lost plays, since only 12 fragments survive, giving no real hint of the identity of the chorus or of the theme of the play.¹⁰⁶ Two fragments only refer to *komodoumenoi*: fr. 294, which records that Aspasia was called Omphale or ὠφάννης by Eupolis in *Philoï*, and fr. 295, which makes fun of Lykon for his wife Rhodia. Some have dated *Philoï* early, on the basis of the mention of Aspasia which should, it is argued, be in (or very soon after) the lifetime of Perikles.¹⁰⁷ But this is tenuous evidence, since Perikles is made fun of by Aristophanes four, six, and eight years after his death (*Ach.* 526 ff., *Cl.* 213, *Peace* 605 ff.), and Aspasia could have been fair game long after the death of Perikles.¹⁰⁸ The mention of Lykon in comedy runs from 423 (Kratinos' *Pytine* fr. 214) to 411 (*Lysist.* 270), and of his wife from 422 (*Poleis* fr. 232) to 411.

Geissler (34 f.) suggests "wohl 429–426 oder Di. 425," while Schmid (117) puts the play sometime in the period of the Archedamian War. I would prefer a date after 420, with Schwarze (122–124).

Autolykos β'

The first *Autolykos* is firmly dated by the testimony of *Ath.* 216d to the archonship of Aristion, i.e., 421/0. By far most of the citations to Eupolis' play(s) of this name are merely ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ (21 of 27 fragments), but there are six instances where the existence of two plays is made clear: *Suda* δ 756 and Galen in *Hipp. vict. acut.* 1.4, which reveal that Eupolis revised this comedy; Σ *Cl.* 109 (ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ β'); Σ *Thesm.* 941 (ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ θατέρῳ [= fr. 61]); Σ *Plato Apol.* 23e (ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Αὐτολύκῳ [= fr. 61]); Pollux 7.202 (the same wording). We cannot, therefore, disregard this evidence for a second play of this title. The words of Galen suggest that the plot was similar (τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν) with only minor variations from the original.

Apart from Lykon, *Autolykos*, and "Rhodia," only three fragments contain allusions to *komodoumenoi*. Fr. 62 relates that Eupolis in his *Autolykos* made fun of the colossal statue of Peace introduced by Aristophanes. This reference surely belongs in the first *Autolykos* of 420. Σ *Cl.* 109 states that Eupolis in the second *Autolykos* described Leogoras as having thrown

¹⁰⁶See Schwarze (123–124), who discusses the view of Wilamowitz 36 ff. that the φίλοι were ἐρασταί and that the play, like *Autolykos*, "sich . . . mit der Päderastie beschäftigt habe," but prefers that of Meineke who regarded the φίλοι as παρὰσχοι and saw affinities with *Kolakes*. We may safely dismiss the view of Müller-Strübing, *JCIPhil* 141 (1890) 545 ff., that the first *Autolykos* was an alternative title for *Kolakes*, and the second *Autolykos* an alternative for *Philoï*.

¹⁰⁷Coppola (ap. Geissler XIII) considers *Philoï* the play with which Eupolis made his début in 429, and Schiassi (above, n. 4) 298 puts it in 429 or 428, close to the death of Perikles.

¹⁰⁸See Storey for the argument that Perikles and Aspasia were mentioned by Kallias ca 415 in his *Pedetai*.

his money away on a *hetaira* named Myrrhine. Leogoras was still alive in 415, but dead by 399 (And. 1); in comedy he is found at *Cl.* 109 (423), *Wasps* 1269 (422), and Platon 106K (*Perialges*), a play which could be anywhere from 424 to 410.¹⁰⁹

Fr. 49 (ἤδη γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχον στρατηγοῦντ' ἄχθομαι) has been assigned by some to the second *Autolykos* and dated to 411/0. The argument is that Aristarchos is known to have been general in 411 and to have been an eager participant in the business of that year (Thuc. 8.90 ff.). Thus Eupolis is referring to that command, and the play must be dated to 410.¹¹⁰ Geissler has shown, however, that not only was Eupolis in all likelihood dead by the festivals of 410, but also Aristarchos would surely have been removed from command (cf. Thuc. 8.98) and not likely to be mentioned as general in the present tense. Therefore, Eupolis is alluding to an earlier generalship of Aristarchos, which could have been soon after the first *Autolykos* as well as nine years after.¹¹¹ There is also the problem that the Homeric scholiast who quotes fr. 49 (*ad Il.* 13.353) cites ἐν Ἀντολόκοις. If we assume that the scholiast knew and is indicating that the allusion to Aristarchos stood in both versions, then the likelihood is strong that there was not much of a gap between the two *Autolykoi*.

VIII THE PRODUCTION-DATES FOR EUPOLIS

With all the usual doubts that must accompany any venture into the dating of lost comedies, I suggest the following scheme for the comedies of Eupolis:

429 L or D	<i>Prospaltioi</i>
<428 or 427	<i>Heilotes</i> >
426 L	<i>Chrysoun Genos</i>
425 L	<i>Noumeniai</i>
424 D	<i>Aiges</i>
422 D	<i>Poleis</i>
421 L	<i>Marikas</i>
421 D	<i>Kolakes</i>
420 L or D	<i>Autolykos 1</i>
419 or 418	<i>Autolykos 2</i>
417 L or D	<i>Baptai</i>
416 L or D	<i>Demoi</i>
415 L or D	<i>Taxiarchoi</i>
ca 414	<i>Astrateutoi</i>
414-412	<i>Philoï</i>

¹⁰⁹Geissler 47 prefers ca 421.

¹¹⁰Meineke and Brandes *ap.* Geissler 42.

¹¹¹Schmid 122, n. 10, considers that there might have been two Aristarchoi who were generals.

It will be recalled that Cicero cites Eratosthenes' objection to the story of Eupolis' death on the way to Sicily that he knew of *plays* produced by Eupolis *post id tempus*. If Eratosthenes (or Cicero) meant by *post id tempus* plays produced after *Baptai*, then on my scheme *Demoi* and *Taxiarchoi* will do and *Astrateutoi* and *Philoï* are free to move elsewhere, if necessary. But if (as seems more likely) *post id tempus* means after the expedition to Sicily, i.e., 414 or later, then we must find plays to fit that time period; hence my dating of *Astrateutoi* and *Philoï* where they are above.¹¹²

If *Heilotes* is by Eupolis, it should be considered an early play (see the discussion above), and placed between *Prospaltioi* and *Chrysoun Genos*, i.e., 428 or 427.

One important corollary from the dating of Eupolis' plays is the nature of his relationship with Aristophanes. In the absence of firm dates, it is impossible to tell which of the two may have introduced or developed a particular comic theme. The survival of Aristophanes combined with the ancient judgements on the primacy of Aristophanes as an exponent of Old Comedy have perhaps given him an undue "edge" in this regard.¹¹³ Further, Aristophanes' own categorization at *Cl.* 551-560 (and also, I suggest, at fr. 58) of Eupolis as an inferior plagiarist has certainly helped to put Eupolis into the lesser role. This is clearly a matter for a separate article, but in several of the plays discussed above, I believe that one can argue that themes and jokes in Eupolis influenced subsequent comedy by Aristophanes. I suspect that Aristophanes may have done it better and won the plaudits of posterity, but on several occasions I suspect that Eupolis did it first.¹¹⁴

CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE

TRENT UNIVERSITY

PETERBOROUGH, ONTARIO K9J 7B8

¹¹²Another possibility is to move *Taxiarchoi* down to L 414, but I prefer it in the period immediately before the expedition to Sicily.

¹¹³In particular see the judgements of Platonios (= Koster I, II), on whom see now Perusino 61-92, and her (i.e., Perusino's) *Platonio: La commedia greca* (Urbino 1989), the anonymous writer (Koster III.34 f.), Σ Dion. Thr. (Koster XVIIIa.39 ff.), Evanthius (Koster XV.22 ff.), *Life of Aristophanes* (Koster XVIII.2-5). At least one critic (Evanthius) regarded Eupolis as *comoediae veteris pater*.

¹¹⁴A shorter version of this paper was presented in May 1989 at the meeting of the Classical Association of Canada at Laval University. I thank the referees of *Phoenix* for their comments and suggestions.