INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9113168

Character naming in Aristophanes

Holmes, Lorna Marie, Ph.D.
Harvard University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

(To be placed in Original Copy)

The undersigned, appointed by the Division Department

Committee * of the Classics

have examined a thesis entitled

"Character Naming in Aristophanes"

presented by Lorna Holmes

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Doctor of Science,* and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

* Cross out inappropriate words.

Signature Zeph Stewart

Typed name Zeph Stewart

Signature A. Henrichs

Typed name Albert Henrichs

Signature Richard Thomas

Typed name Richard Thomas

G-6-69

Character Naming in Aristophanes

A thesis presented

by

Lorna Marie Holmes

to

The Department of the Classics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Classical Philology

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

September 1990

Character Naming in Aristophanes: Thesis Abstract

This thesis examines Aristophanes' practice of naming characters in his extant plays; only names of characters who appear onstage are treated. Chapter One, *Historicity*, discusses the problems of determining whether a character is historical or invented, especially from the point of view of naming. Three classifications of characters are made: historical, of disputed historicity, and non-historical. The names of all the major characters and a selected number of minor characters are treated. The names of many protagonists are shown to be part of themes running through the plays. Conclusions drawn in this chapter include the idea that the presence of a significant name indicates that the character is invented, as does the absence of burlesque of a character. Only exceptionally does Aristophanes use cover names, as 'Paphlagon' for Kleon. His practice is to let the audience know immediately and clearly if a character represents a historical person. The characters Lysistrata and Myrrhine are shown to be non-historical. The idea that the two slaves in *Knights* represent Demosthenes and Nikias is rejected.

Chapter Two, *Aspects of Naming*, distinguishes and discusses other aspects of character naming: patronymics, demotics, the phenomenon of late naming, and the names of various categories of characters (choreuts, women, gods and mythical persons, personified abstractions, and slaves). Some conclusions drawn in this chapter are as follows. Patronymics: names in -ιδης are not patronymics in Attic; they are used by Aristophanes to indicate a type. Demotics: the demotic had a democratic quality sympathetic to the audience; Aristophanes often supplies invented characters with demotics but almost never mentions the demotics of historical characters. Late naming: the first naming of a major character only at an advanced point in the play is a convention of Old Comedy which died out as names became 'stock' names. Choreuts: some of the choreut names survived to become stock names in New Comedy. Slaves: slave names in Aristophanes are all type-names, although in real life there were many other kinds of slave names available.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In the book *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*,[1] Felix Solmsen observed that the personal names which a culture uses "bilden einen Spiegel seiner Sinnes- und Denkweise". On a smaller scale, the hundreds of names which a comic dramatist creates or chooses for his characters also form a mirror of his perception and thinking, within the culture in which he works. The impetus for this thesis came originally from the problem of Lysistrata, as posed by D. M. Lewis:[2] was the character Lysistrata intended to represent the contemporary priestess of Athena, Lysimache? In order to answer the question satisfactorily, one must find out whether Aristophanes would name a historical character a disguised name, and whether the character Lysistrata fits Aristophanes' normal treatment of historical characters. In short, a study of Aristophanes' practice in naming characters was required. I found that, while there are many discussions of individual names in the secondary literature, no general study of Aristophanes' practice of naming characters had been done.[3] Hence this thesis. It deals with named characters only, i.e. not characters without names, or people who are mentioned but do not appear onstage (although some characters who are not named in the text of the play, but are named in the manuscripts, are examined). For the most part, characters in comic fragments are not treated, because the lack of context in fragments makes study of the function of the name in the play impossible.

Chapter One examines naming of characters categorized on the basis of historicity: historical, disputed historicity, and non-historical (invented). The major principle arrived at

[1]Solmsen, F. and Ernst Fraenkel (1922), p. 113.

[2]In his influential article "Who was Lysistrata?" (Lewis (1955), 1-36).

[3]The dissertation *Der Eigenname in der attischen Komödie* by H. Steiger (Erlangen 1888) is rather a collection of remarks about various names than the requisite study. A. Komornicka (1962), in a 20-page Polish article *Aristophanes comicus qua ratione personis fictis usus sit* discovers and defines nine categories of characters in Aristophanes, but does not discuss their names *per se* (as far as can be determined from the Latin summary appended to the article). J. Truesdale (1940), *A comic prosopographia Graeca*, treats only names used with comic effect, and draws his examples from Greek literature in general.

in this chapter is that Aristophanes does not introduce contemporary historical characters onstage unless he is burlesquing or mocking them in some way. Serious characters are always invented. It is not surprising that this should be the case; after all, it is not the business of comedy to present people better than they really are, or even simply as they are, but, as Aristotle remarks, to show them as worse: *Poetics* 1448 a ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ διαφορᾷ καὶ ἡ τραγῳδία πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν διέστηκεν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ χείρους ἡ δὲ βελτίους μιμεῖσθαι βούλεται τῶν νῦν. The comic poet wishes to mock his contemporaries, not praise them, and so if he brings one of them onto the stage it will be for the comic purpose of mockery. When he requires the character to be taken seriously (seriously, that is, within the comic boundaries of the play) he invents a Dikaiopolis or a Trygaios. Perhaps it should be noted here that the converse of the principle is not true; that is, all characters who are burlesques are not necessarily historical. Aristophanes may invent a character and mock him (e.g. Pseudartabas in *Acharnians*). Presence of burlesque does not prove historicity, but absence of it does, on this principle, indicate invention. Another observation of this chapter is that names which are not significant or appropriate are likely to indicate historical characters, whereas invented characters virtually always have significant or appropriate names. Further, the fact that a name is historically attested should not cause us to look for a historical referent, if there is no other indication that the character is historical. Also, it is argued that Aristophanes does not normally use cover or disguised names for historical characters; in the exceptional case of the name 'Paphlagon' for Kleon in *Knights*, great care is taken to point out who the referent is. The section on major characters shows how these characters' names may be used thematically in the plays. In the area of minor characters, the treatment is of selected names; no attempt has been made to be comprehensive.

Chapter Two deals with other aspects of character naming. There are three general topics (Patronymics, Demotics, Late Naming), and five sections on categories of names (Choreuts, Women, Gods, Personified Abstractions, and Slaves). I shall summarize the

generalizations made in these sections, which contain many discussions of individual names as well. Patronymics: in Attic the ending -ιδης conveyed the idea of belonging, and these names are used to indicate a type in Aristophanes, without any notion of 'son of' attached. Demotics: Aristophanes often gives major invented characters demotics, and rarely gives them to mentioned contemporaries (who often get true patronymics); the demotic was perceived as more democratic and more sympathetic to the audience. Late Naming: there was a convention of late naming of major invented characters in Old Comedy, whereas historical characters are normally named before their appearance. Choreuts: some of the choreut names became stock names in New Comedy, and some may have been taken from (or common to) satyr plays. Women: the designation 'wife of X' should be considered a personal name, and not too much should be made of the idea that men do not mention women's names on the stage. Gods: due to their distinctive iconography, gods need not be identified by name. Personified Abstractions: these are introduced, like historical characters, before or upon entrance; the exceptions are Plutos and Penia, whose identity must be revealed. Slaves: Aristophanes uses only two kinds of slave names (ethnics and those indicating a characteristic) of the various types available in real life.

An alphabetical register of named characters follows.

Chapter One: Historicity

I. Historical Characters

Certain of Aristophanes' characters are named after, and intended to represent, people whom we know to have been historical people, for the most part his actual contemporaries. These are: Aischylos, Agathon, Euripides, Lamachos, Sokrates, 'Paphlagon' (Kleon); minor characters include Chairephon, Kleisthenes, Kinesias (in *Av*), Theoros, Meton. The list is remarkably short. One indication that a character is historical is that his name does not have a meaning significant to his role in the play; thus, the philosopher of *Clouds* is named Sokrates not because "safe strength" has any particular point, but because there was a historical person, a well-known philosopher, of that name whom the stage character Sokrates is burlesquing. Likewise, goodness has little to do with Agathon, or the Euripus with Euripides. On the other hand, when the poet is inventing a character, he is free to give him a significant name, and in fact generally does, either inventing the name, too (as Bdelykleon) or employing a real name chosen to suit the character (as Demos or Agorakritos). Only coincidentally will a historical character have a significant name; that is, if in real life the person being portrayed happened to have a name which described him in some way.[1] The character Meton in *Birds*, who offers to do the surveying and town layout for Nephelokokkygia, parodies an historical Meton who, since he did have to do with surveying, fortuitously possessed a significant name (suggesting a connection with μετρεῖν, measure). Possibly one thing which recommended the general Lamachos to Aristophanes was his warlike name. No doubt the poet was pleased to be able to take advantage of these rare instances. Still, in most cases an historical character will not have a significant name, whereas a name appropriate to the role in the play suggests that the character is fictional.

---

[1]For a discussion of the occurrence of historical Greeks with significant names, see Paine (1933).

The fact that a name is historical is not sufficient to show that the character is historical. An invented character may well have an historically attested name without any historical reference. An extreme example is the name Demos, one of the main characters in *Knights*. Demos is a personal name attested for Athens of the period; notably, there was a Demos, son of Pyrilampes, whom Plato mentions at *Gorgias* 481 d (*PA* 3573) , and whom Aristophanes himself refers to at *Wasps* 98. But to find in that handsome Demos a historical referent for the character in *Knights* of that name would be perverse. The basic notion of the play requires that Demos represent, not some historical individual, but the Athenian *demos*, being served by two demagogues (the competing slaves). The comic demotic 'Pyknites' alone makes the identification unmistakeable. Further, nothing about the character Demos requires explanation by reference to a real person--a consideration which should always be made in deciding whether a character is intended to be historical.

And in fact perhaps the major characteristic of an historical character which requires an outside referent is his name. Why should Aristophanes, with the resources of all the Greek proper names, as well as his own invention, at his disposal, call a philosopher 'Sokrates', a name which has no point at all, unless there was an historical Sokrates to whom he was referring? Main characters who are not historical do have significant names: Dikaiopolis, Philokleon, Praxagora, etc. (Even minor characters tend to have significant names: Kinesias, Pseudartabas, Plathane.) Thus, one preliminary test for a character's historicity is whether his name is significant to his role in the play.

Another feature which the certainly historical characters have in common is that they are all burlesqued in some way. Aischylos, Agathon, and Euripides are mocked for their writing styles, Lamachos for his militarism, Sokrates for his teachings, Kleon for his behavior as a politician. The only motivation a comic poet has for portraying a real person on the stage is to lampoon him, to show him, as Aristotle says, as worse than he really is. When the play requires a character who is not a burlesque, who is more clever than those around him, who invents and controls the action, then the poet invents a Dikaiopolis or a

Peisetairos. To give such a character the identity of a real person would not be comic. Praise of living people is infrequent in Old Comedy, as one might expect, with the largest share going to the poet himself in the parabases.

Of the six main characters who are certainly historical, three are tragic playwrights--an indication of comedy's interest in the theater as a subject. Of the three playwrights, Aischylos, the character in *Frogs*, comes in for the least criticism, especially in view of the circumstance that the criticism is coming from Euripides, who is himself being lampooned, and that Dionysos ultimately chooses him to return to the world of the living. However, Aischylos is in a unique position as a character; the real Aischylos had been dead for fifty years at the time *Frogs* was produced, long enough to make him one of the honored dead, no longer of οἱ νῦν. He represents the way tragedy used to be, before upstarts like Euripides began fiddling with it. Still, however venerable Aischylos may have been, Aristophanes cannot resist including an excellent parody of his bombastic style.[2] The absence of Sophokles from the tragedy contest of *Frogs*, notable in itself, accords with the principle that Aristophanes does not bring his contemporaries on stage without mocking them. Sophokles, like Euripides, had died in 406, but after Euripides, and probably after Aristophanes had conceived the plan of *Frogs*.[3] His recent decease made the question of why he was not included in the contest for best tragedian of the underworld unavoidable; Aristophanes disposes of it (*Frogs* 788-794) by explaining that Sophokles was not brash enough to claim the chair of tragedy from Aischylos, but would await the outcome of the contest, and fight Euripides himself afterward if necessary. Had he been so inclined,

---

[2]In the play Dionysos himself admits to confusion over the meaning of some of Aischylos' compounds, lying awake at night τὸν ξουθὸν ἱππαλεκτρυόνα ζητῶν, τίς ἐστιν ὄρνις (932). We see that even Aischylos' supporters had to admit that he was bombastic.

[3]Scholars are divided on the question of whether the idea for *Frogs* came before or after Sophokles' death; for a discussion and overview of the literature see Radermacher (1967), pp. 152-3, who himself believes that the play was conceived afterward, because "die ganze literarische Diskussion, mit 72 beginnend und bis 108 reichend, ist so, wie sie vorliegt, auf den Tod des Sophokles eingestellt; sicher lassen sich 76-82 nicht einfach auslösen."

Aristophanes could have had Sophokles appear as a character to make his own explanation at the contest; he chose, however, to have the slave of Pluto report the information. He has no intention of burlesquing Sophokles, and so does not bring him on.

Following are discussions of two historical characters who are atypical, in different ways: Kleon, who is disguised under the name Paphlagon, contrary to Aristophanes' usual practice, and Lamachos, who has a significant name, although it was not invented by Aristophanes.

A. Kleon

In the category of historical characters, one stands out as receiving special treatment from Aristophanes in the matter of naming, as well as in other ways, and that is Kleon. There is no question that the character called Paphlagon in *Knights* is intended to represent Kleon, although he is the only historical character to be given a new name. 'Paphlagon' is a name which is both a type-name and significant, the geographical or ethnic element suggesting a slave (like Karion or Thraitta), while the sound of paphla- plays on the verb παφλάζειν, 'to bubble, bluster' (cf. *Eq.* 919, *Pax* 314). There is no question about the identification because the poet takes such pains to point it out; in lines 230-233 the First Slave, breaking the theatrical illusion, tells the Sausage-Seller not to be afraid, since no likeness has been made of Kleon due to the fear of the property-makers. Still, he will be recognized, τὸ γὰρ θέατρον δεξιόν.[1] This unusual treatment seems to be Aristophanes'

[1]K.J. Dover (1967), in his article "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes" (pp. 16-28) discusses the feasibility of portrait masks in general and the reason for the property-makers' fear in the case of Kleon, concluding (p. 23) that Paphlagon was wearing "an exceptionally hideous mask," the joke being that "a portrayal of Kleon as he really was would have been too frightening even to the man who was making the mask himself!" It would indeed have been funny to put Paphlagon in a hideous mask; however, this could have been done without entailing the implication which Dover suggests. In fact, the alternative explanation which Dover rejects, "that the mask-maker was afraid that Kleon would wreak vengeance on anyone who, even in a humble capacity, contributed to an attack on him," is far more likely. After all, the Sausage Seller has just been told μὴ δέδιθ' (l. 230); he is not to fear attacking Kleon because technically he is not Kleon, he is 'Paphlagon' and not wearing a portrait mask of Kleon. All Kleon's grounds for objection have been removed. It is natural then to understand the property-makers' supposed fear in the next line as fear of prosecution by Kleon as well--an exaggerated fear in keeping with Aristophanes' theme of exaggerating fear of Kleon in order to mock him (cf. ll. 223-224 καὶ γὰρ οἵ τε πλούσιοι δεδίασιν αὐτὸν ὅ τε πένης βδύλλει λεώς). For Dover's interpretation to work, one must imagine a single mask-maker sitting down to make a portrait mask of Kleon and being terrified by the result; hence Dover keeps referring to 'the mask maker'. However, the text says that *none of the property-makers* consented to make a likeness (οὐδεὶς ἤθελε τῶν σκευοποιῶν εἰκάσαι), and the plural leads one to imagine a group or series of people being asked and simply refusing "ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους"; again, if they were put off by Kleon's appearance, we would expect a word for disgust or repulsion rather than fear, to make the point clear.

way of scoring a point against Kleon, the enemy of comic license.[2] In the entire play *Knights*, which is one sustained attack against Kleon, there is a remarkable avoidance of Kleon's name; it is mentioned only once, by the chorus at line 976. Yet the poet makes certain, with his numerous references to tanning--"so numerous as almost to insult our δεξιότης," as Dover remarks,[3] the historical reference to Pylos (ll. 54 ff.), and the broad hint at 230-233, that everyone would see Kleon in the character Paphlagon. Aristophanes' point is that there is no use attempting to restrict comedy by forbidding it to name names; the comic poet can create a character in such a way that the audience will recognize the referent even without the benefit of his real name, or a portrait mask. By ostentatiously avoiding Kleon's name, Aristophanes is mocking the impotence of Kleon's threats against the poet. Thus it is for a special effect that Aristophanes leaves his usual practice of burlesquing his contemporaries under their own names to bring on Kleon as 'Paphlagon'. Since the poet was not making this point in the case of other historical characters, he did not need to use such a roundabout method of identification, but simply called the character by the name of the real person being portrayed. Indeed, it would be strange if he gave himself the unnecessary trouble of changing the name and then using hints to get the audience to guess who it is supposed to be. The very fact that in the case of Kleon Aristophanes goes to such lengths to see that the audience recognizes the referent indicates that normally the poet is relying on the name to speak for itself.

In *Wasps* Aristophanes carries his retaliation against Kleon further and finds a new way to employ names for the purpose. We discover near the beginning of the play (lines 133-134) that the main characters, father and son, are named Philokleon and Bdelykleon--Kleon-Lover and Kleon-Loather. Of course the formations are comic; the name Kleon is itself a nickname form of any compound name beginning in Kle- (e.g. Kleainetos, the

[2]For a discussion of Kleon's attacks on Aristophanes see Dover (1968) p. xix-xx, and Dover (1963) p. 15.

[3]Dover (1967), p. 17.

name of Kleon's father), and even appearing at the end of a compound name would still have been understood to be a nickname form (instead of the usual -κλης). That is, 'Philokleon' should be a *Kosename* for 'Philokles' (or perhaps 'Philokleides'), but Aristophanes has forced it to mean 'Lover of Kleon', a comic interpretation of the formation[4]. Also, since no known Greek names used βδελυ- as an element, the name Bdelykleon is quite impossible, an even more comic opposite to Philokleon. Simply by using these two names, Aristophanes gives the conflict between father and son a broader political significance, and directs his argument and the action against Kleon without bringing him on stage at all. Thus, in *Knights* and *Wasps* Aristophanes has come up with two different ways of mocking Kleon on stage without naming him directly, first by giving him a new name, and second by naming other characters names which refer to Kleon. Both of these procedures appear to be special treament for one of the poet's favorite antagonists, warranted because of Kleon's attacks on the poet.[5]

[4]It is this novel meaning of the name (underscored by Xanthias insisting ναὶ μὰ Δία after he introduces it, *Ve.* 134) which would have made the audience laugh, I believe, rather than the fact that "men are not usually named after the politicians they support" (MacDowell on *Ve.* 134). Comic characters may be expected to have names which describe them, even if such names could not have been attached to real people at their birth.

[5]Kleon appears to have prosecuted Aristophanes twice, once after the *Babylonians* of 426 (scholia to *Ach.* 378), and again after the *Knights* of 424 (cf. *Ve.* 1284-91, with MacDowell's note).

B. Lamachos

The character Lamachos has a large role to play in the *Acharnians*, and Lamachos' name is mentioned a striking18 times in the play, including twice in the generalizing plural (270, 1071), and once in the diminutive compound Lamachippion (1206); in addition, the name is used to make the comic compound adjective πολεμολαμαχαικόν (1080). Elsewhere in the plays, Lamachos is mentioned as being among the chorus of *Peace* (*Pax* 473); the son of Lamachos has a small part in that play as well (*Pax* 1290); and the name Lamachos is used again to form a comic compound adjective, μισολάμαχος (*Pax* 304). After his death (in the Sicilian expedition) Aristophanes mentions him twice more, in more complimentary terms. At *Thes.* 841, the mother of Hyperbolos is said to be unworthy to sit next to the mother of Lamachos. Finally, the character Aeschylus in *Frogs* refers to Lamachos as *heros* (*Ra.* 1039), in a context of discussing Homeric virtue.

Lamachos of course was the name of the Athenian elected *strategos* in 425 (*PA* 8981) and it is clear that the character is a burlesque of the historical person.[1] The name is shouted by the chorus before Lamachos' first appearance, as is often the case with historical characters. The name has the distinction of being both historical and significant; it is formed from λα- (intensive prefix related to λίαν)[2] and μάχη, 'battle', hence 'the mighty fighter' (Starkie). It has been repeatedly suggested that it was the significance of Lamachos' name which led Aristophanes to choose him as the representative of the war

[1]On the question of whether Lamachos was general at the time *Acharnians* was written (i.e. 426-5), see N. Dunbar (1970), pp. 269-273. Dunbar demonstrates that the evidence in *Acharnians* is not self-contradictory, in particular that 1073-4 does not contain an inference that Lamachos was not a general.

[2]as in e. g. λακαταπύγων, Ar. *Ach.* 664. For λα- as an intensive prefix cf. Bechtel HPG p. 273, Schwyzer (1939) p. 434, and LSJ s.vv. λακαταπύγων and λακατάρατος. Some, e. g. Bechtel, *HPG* pp. 279-280, derive λα- in Λάμαχος from λαϝός 'people'; however, in Attic that is more likely to appear as λεω-, and in fact we do find the name Leomachos (*PA* 9097, father of someone buried in the early 4th century). Of course, either derivation will do for Aristophanes' purposes.

party.[3] But while it is certainly true that Aristophanes appreciated the significance of Lamachos' name, and made full use of it, we should not be led to imagine that his name was the only characteristic which distinguished Lamachos and caused him to be chosen as an object of satire. Such a view leads to Edmunds' mistaken conclusion that there is no personal parody intended at all ("Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," p. 13): "Perhaps it was the very name, Lamachus (λα- intensive + μαχ- 'battle') which caused him to be chosen for this role. If so, the comparison with Amphitheos is even closer: the implicit metaphor of the name is taken literally and dramatized by parodistic style. It is as a type, then, and as the representative of certain attitudes, and not as the historical person, that Dicaeopolis attacks Lamachus." In note 14 to this passage (p. 13), Edmunds goes on to label C. E. Graves' protest over the injustice of the charges of greed made against Lamachos[4] "an example of a still prevalent misreading of Aristophanes." While it may be true that Aristophanes chose to use Lamachos (over other possible candidates) as the archetypal military hawk partly because he had a suitable name, to conclude from this that the historical person is not being attacked is to go too far. We ought not to deny that the historical Lamachos is being lampooned merely to exonerate Aristophanes of making unjust accusations.

Here let us compare the portrait of Socrates in *Clouds*, also generally condemned as unfair. One may say there too that Aristophanes is using Socrates as a type and burlesquing sophists in general, not Socrates personally. However, we must take into account the section of Plato's *Apology* in which Socrates states that he must defend himself against popular prejudice, one source of which was the comedy of Aristophanes in which people saw him swinging through the air and talking nonsense (Plato *Apol.* 19 c.). Clearly

[3]The suggestion was made by Müller-Strübing (1873), p. 500, followed by Steiger, Starkie, Whitman, Edmunds.

[4]in note to *Ach.* 619: "This imputation of greed and favouritism is grossly unjust to Lamachus, who according to all testimony was brave and capable, but neither rich nor well-connected."

Plato felt that the audience's opinion of Socrates the individual was affected by his portrayal on stage. The audience did not silently admonish itself, "Of course that isn't really intended to be Socrates, it's just a satire on sophists in general". If the comic poet put a character on stage with the same name and occupation as a well-known historical person, then inevitably the audience would understand the satire to be directed against that person. Presumably most people would interpret the satire as including others of the same type, 'Sokrates and people like him', or 'Lamachos and people like him', but first and foremost they saw that an individual was being satirized. The circumstance that an individual may represent a type does not mean that he ceases to be an individual. We need not apologize for Aristophanes' unfairness by explaining it away as being directed against 'types'. He *is* unfair; that is in the nature of satire. Satire requires exaggeration, and exaggeration is necessarily unfair. Exaggeration and even wholesale fabrication for effect was an accepted part of Old Comedy--as it was of oratory.

The historical Lamachos must have had an ethos which inspired Aristophanes' treatment of him; in particular, he appears to have had an almost archaic military bravery and dedication. Hence in *Acharnians* Aristophanes satirizes him by making him into a cultic hero, whom the chorus invokes to appear and aid them as they would a patron hero (566-568); Dikaiopolis then ironically calls him *heros* at 575 and 579 (ὦ Λάμαχ' ἥρως)[5]. The heroic treatment accords with the later reference to him in *Frogs*, where Aeschylus uses Lamachos as his example of someone who learned military ἀρετή from Homer (1034-1039).[6] The portrait of Lamachos is confirmed by references in other sources. In

[5]For examples of the invocation of the aid of a hero in time of war, and the actual appearance of the hero, see Rohde (1907) I. pp. 195-6.

[6]It is remarkable that at *Ra.* 1039 Lamachos is again called ἥρως, which is virtually a technical term in Attic Greek, not a generally applicable epithet like 'hero' in English (despite Stanford *ad loc.* who treats it as merely a term of respect). There is still an element of satire in calling Lamachos ἥρως, made gentler by the basically laudatory context and by the fact that the word comes from the mouth of a tragic poet. Of course *de mortuis nil nisi bonum* meant little to Aristophanes.

Plato's *Laches* (197 c), where the discussion is of ἀνδρεία, Nikias brings up Lamachos' name as a man who would be considered ἀνδρεῖος; he comes naturally to mind when Laches accuses Nikias of trying to deprive the brave of their τιμή by redefining courage. Thucydides too shows Lamachos as a man of bold action in describing his part in the Sicilian expedition. When the three generals, after being disappointed of the promised money from Egesta, are debating what to do next, Lamachos is the one who favors an immediate direct attack on Syracuse (in contrast to Nikias, who wants to make a show of force and go home, and Alcibiades, who wants to persuade other cities to join the Athenian side).[7] Finally, Lamachos dies in the fighting at Syracuse displaying his characteristic bravery, indeed almost foolhardiness, when he attempts to come to the aid of a routed wing of the Athenian army and is isolated (μονωθείς) crossing a ditch and killed (Thuc. 6. 101). He may have left behind a son named Tydeus, the sort of heroic name a man like Lamachos would choose; at least Kirchner thinks it probable that Tydeus the strategos of Xen. *Hell.* 2. 1. 16 was Lamachos' son (cf. Kirchner *PA* 8981 and 13884).

Aristophanes accentuates Lamachos' 'heroic' aspect in *Acharnians* by giving him a comic patronymic 'son of Gorgasos' (ὁ Γοργάσου, 1131).[8] The commentators point out the reference to the Gorgon emblem on Lamachos' shield, but they fail to mention that Aristophanes is also providing Lamachos with an appropriate heroic ancestry.[9] Gorgasos was a hero, son of Machaon and Antikleia, who had a shrine in Pharai (in Messenia, Pausanias 4. 3. 10). By choosing a heroic name, Aristophanes adds an extra dimension beyond the wordplay (which he could have made by using a personal name such as Gorgias, Gorgilos, Gorgos).

In the last scene of *Acharnians*, Dikaiopolis in a boisterous mood calls Lamachos 'Lamachippion' (1207). The diminutive is common enough, but how does the *hipp-*

---

[7]Thucydides 6. 47-49.

[8]Lamachos' father's name was Xenophanes, Thuc. 6. 8.

[9]Pape-Benseler s.v. Γόργασος do say "Ar. Ach. 1131 nennt Lamachus im Scherz τὸν Γοργάσου".

element come to be included? Most explanations of this (or any) *hipp-* name incorporate the idea that *hipp-* names are aristocratic, with a reference to *Nu.* 63-64.[10] Here I would compare Apodrasippides of *Ve.* 185 and Kronhippos, *Nu.* 1070, both, like Lamachippion, occasional names. While it is true that the *hipp-* element may indicate aristocracy, it seems from these three names that there need not be any such interpretation; indeed, the notion of 'horse' itself is not particularly meaningful in any of the names. In *Wasps*, Philokleon is trying to escape by clinging under the donkey, in a parody of Odysseus' escape from Polyphemus; so, when Bdelykleon asks him where he is from, he replies Ἰθακος Ἀποδρασιππίδου (185). Clearly the comic point of the name lies in the use of ἀποδράς, 'runaway', to which *hipp-*, and *-ides* too, have been added to make a comic compound name. In *Clouds*, Worse Logos calls Better Logos 'Kronhippos' (σὺ δ' εἶ Κρόνιππος, 1070) as part of his demonstration that Better Logos is hopelessly old-fashioned in his ideas about σωφροσύνη. Again, the point is in the *Kron-* element, Kronos suggesting extreme antiquity (cf. Dover on *Nu.* 398); there does not appear to be any place for a connotation of aristocracy here.[11] From these two names I conclude that it is possible that Aristophanes sometimes used the root *hipp-* in invented names merely with the intent of

[10]However, there is also the peculiar explanation of Coulon: "Allusion à la manière dont Lamachos est porté par ses serviteurs, les jambes pendantes, comme s'il etait à cheval." But surely a man being supported under the arms on both sides by slaves looks nothing like a man astride a horse. If Lamachos were sitting on something, there would be some opportunity for such a joke, but that does not seem possible here.

[11]It is possible that in the context the *hipp-* element has an obscene sense and the name means 'hopelessly old-fashioned in your sexual practice'; at any rate, not a reference to aristocracy. Dover on *Nu.* 1070 remarks "The element ἱππο- seems to denote 'monstrous' in *Ra.* 929," for this connotation of ἱππο-, see LSJ s.v. ἵππος VII. "in compds., to express *anything large* or *course*, as in our *horse-chestnut, horse-laugh*"; however, all such usages employ ἱππο- as a *first* element, and at any rate the meaning 'large' does not suit the name Kronhippos.

making them longer (and hence more comic), and that may be the explanation of the *hipp-* in Lamachippion as well.[12]

In *Peace* Lamachos' name forms a small motif, with Lamachos again standing for those who are deeply committed to war. When the chorus enters excited at the prospect of recovering Peace, they sing that the 'Lamachos-hating' day has dawned, that is, the day of peace (304). As the work of pulling out Peace gets underway, Trygaios moves around complaining that various groups are impeding the progress (Boeotians, etc.), and first to be mentioned (as well as the only individual) among those holding things up is Lamachos, here representative of Athenians who try to impede making the peace treaty (473 ὦ Λάμαχ', ἀδικεῖς ἐμποδὼν καθήμενος). Later, after Peace has been rescued, two boys come in to sing at the wedding celebration. The first boy insists on singing epic verses on martial themes until Trygaios in exasperation asks him whose son he is (τοῦ καί ποτ' εἶ; 1289); the boy replies that he is the son of Lamachos. "I wondered when I heard you," says Trygaios, "if you weren't the son of some βουλόμαχος and κλαυσίμαχος man" (1291-1292). Aristophanes takes a final poke at Lamachos in the form of his son, who has inherited his father's single-minded interest in warfare. The adjectives 'battle-wishing' and 'battle-lamenting' play on Lamachos' name and imply that he is unhappy because peace has been made and he has no battles to fight, just as the weapons-dealers were unhappy in the previous iambic scenes. Although Lamachos scarcely appears in this play, Aristophanes still manages to bring him in by these various contrivances as representative of those who prefer war (or at least the Peloponnesian War) to peace. In *Acharnians* those people were a dangerous group who had to be persuaded that peace was better than war; in *Peace* their position has been made irrelevant by the treaty, and Lamachos' role is much smaller.

[12]Petersen (1910) suggests (p. 175) that possibly the name was Λαμαχίδιον, showing that the iota in this suffix (-ιδιον) was regularly scanned long where it received verse ictus (p. 217). Cf. Ξανθίδιον *Ra.* 582; Βοιωτίδιον *Ach.* 872; Ἑρμίδιον *Pax* 382, 924; Εὐριπίδιον *Ach.* 404, 475; Φειδιππίδιον *Nu.* 80. The conjecture is attractive. I note that ms. R has Λαμαχιππίδιον; Meineke conjectured Λαμαχίσκιον (which Van Leeuwen prints). The deprecatory diminutive is really all that is wanted here, and the -ιππ- does not add anything appreciable.

II. Characters of Disputed Historicity

In attempting to determine the historicity of certain characters, we shall find some of the observations made in the sections on historical and non-historical characters useful, especially 1) that historical characters are introduced for the sake of burlesque, 2) that a significant name normally indicates an invented character, and 3) that Aristophanes does not usually use disguised or cover names.

A. Amphitheos

Toward the beginning of *Acharnians* (l. 45) a man comes rushing in to address the assembly and gives his name as Amphitheos. Upon this the herald asks "οὐκ ἄνθρωπος;" playing upon the literal meaning of the name ('a god on both sides').[1] The joke might have stopped there, but Amphitheos continues it; no, he is not a human, but an immortal, and he proceeds to prove it with a genealogy going back to Demeter and Triptolemos, a quintessential Attic genealogy.

> ὁ γὰρ Ἀμφίθεος Δήμητρος ἦν
> καὶ Τριπτολέμου· τούτου δὲ Κελεὸς γίγνεται·
> γαμεῖ δὲ Κελεὸς Φαιναρέτην τήθην ἐμήν,
> ἐξ ἧς Λυκῖνος ἐγένετ'· ἐκ τούτου δ' ἐγὼ
> ἀθάνατός εἰμ'· ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ θεοὶ
> σπονδὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους μόνῳ.
> ἀλλ' ἀθάνατος ὢν ὦνδρες ἐφόδι' οὐκ ἔχω·
> οὐ γὰρ διδόασιν οἱ πρυτάνεις. (*Ach.* 47-54)

In the figure of Amphitheos more than one scholar has attempted to find a historical reference. The first historical interpretation was Müller-Strübing's idea,[2] accepted by Van Leeuwen and supported most recently by Griffith,[3] that Amphitheos is meant to be understood as Hermogenes (*PA* 5119, son of Hipponikos, brother of Kallias). The

[1]There is an epithet in which the prefix is analogous in meaning to that of Ἀμφίθεος, namely ἀμφιθαλής, 'flourishing on both sides,' used as a cult term of children who have both parents alive.

[2]Müller-Strübing (1873), pp. 697-699.

[3]Griffith (1974), pp. 367-369.

argument is as follows. Supposedly Hermogenes, like Amphitheos, traced his ancestry back to Triptolemos. Phainarete was Sokrates' mother's name; we are to understand Sokrates by the name Lykinos, because Sokrates frequented the Lycaeum;[4] Hermogenes was a follower of Sokrates, therefore his 'spiritual son', and the audience deduces that Amphitheos is really Hermogenes.

Another historical interpretation is that of Sterling Dow,[5] who pointed out from inscriptional evidence that Aristophanes had a fellow-demesman named Amphitheos. The inscription, IG II^2 2343, is on a cult table of a thiasos whose priest was from Kydathenaion, Aristophanes' deme; it gives the names of the members of the thiasos, among which are Amphitheos and Philonides, probably the Philonides mentioned in the hypotheses as the producer of *Wasps* and *Frogs*. (Aristophanes himself is not on the table.) Griffith says that "this fresh piece of information does not invalidate the current identification with Hermogenes", remarking that Dow "was concerned only with the inferences to be drawn from the name given on the stone",[6] by which he means that Dow is merely demonstrating that Amphitheos was an actual Greek name, not a comic coinage. But the inference which Dow is drawing is that Aristophanes knew someone named Amphitheos and was portraying this acquaintance when he named his character Amphitheos. The character cannot be meant at the same time to represent two different historical people, Amphitheos and Hermogenes. The question is whether he represents either one.

---

[4]This element of the argument, listed by Starkie in his note to *Ach.* 47 as if from Müller-Strübing, must have been another's contribution; M.-S. says simply "wenn meine Vermuthung aber richtig ist, dann muss auch in dem Namen Lykinos, dem Sohn der Phainarete und Vater unsres Unsterblichen, eine den Athenern natürlich augenblicklich verständliche Anspielung auf Sokrates selbst verborgen sein, für deren Aufklärung ich freilich nicht die entfernteste Vermuthung habe" (p. 698).

[5]Dow (1969), pp. 234-235.

[6]Griffith (1974), p. 23.

The first question to be asked is whether there is anything about the portrayal of Amphitheos which requires explanation by outside reference. It seems clear enough, first of all, why Aristophanes chose the name Amphitheos; that was for the purpose of the extended joke, first the response to the literal meaning of the name ("You're not human?") and then the comic genealogy explaining Amphitheos' divine origins. The name, then, is well motivated and meaningful in the context, and does not in itself require a referent to explain its presence. It is indeed interesting to find that Aristophanes may have known a person named Amphitheos; perhaps the poet got the inspiration for the joke by thinking about the meaning of his acquaintance's name. But this is not to say that he is presenting a portrait of Amphitheos. There is no reason to suppose that Amphitheos was a prominent enough person to be known to and recognized by the general audience.

The point of the passage lies in the genealogy, and in the gibe at the prytaneis for withholding travel expenses. It is not a burlesque of Amphitheos, who is a relatively serious character in that he carries out the business of making the peace for Dikaiopolis, action essential to advance the plot of the play. In fact, it is necessary for the purposes of this action that Amphitheos be just who he says he is, someone sent by the gods to make peace between Athens and Sparta. The claim that the gods sent him is epic or tragic in nature, and lends support to those who think that the genealogy is a parody of Euripides' genealogical prologues.[7] The claim means that the gods, like Dikaiopolis, favor peace, implicitly putting δίκη on the side of Dikaiopolis. But for dramatic purposes, at the beginning of the play Dikaiopolis is alone among the Athenians in desiring peace; hence

[7]Although the scholiast is evidently not correct in asserting that the prologue of the *Iphigeneia inTauris* is the subject of the parody, since the *IT* is dated about 414, still it is quite possible that this *sort* of prologue is being parodied; many of Euripides' plays do open with some kind of genealogy. Another possibly paratragic feature of the Amphitheos genealogy is that it makes changes in the usual myth (or at least in the versions we know of), while keeping the familiar names of the Eleusinian family; Keleos is made Triptolemos' grandson (instead of his father), and the original Amphitheos is inserted as the son of Triptolemos and Demeter, although there does not seem to have been any myth that Demeter had children by Triptolemos. On the complexities and variability of Eleusinian genealogy see Henrichs (1985) pp. 1-8 (with n. 8 on Triptolemos).

Aristophanes preferred to make Amphitheos a messenger of the gods rather than simply another citizen who wanted peace, and to leave Dikaiopolis in his lonely position.

The names Phainarete and Lykinos in Amphitheos' genealogy remain a problem, but the equation with Hermogenes is not the solution. None of the evidence brought to support this equation will stand scrutiny. First, it is said that Hermogenes traced his ancestry back to Triptolemos, a claim based on a misreading of Xenophon *Hell.* 6.3.3-6. This passage has an embassy speech made by Hermogenes' elder brother Kallias, seeking peace with the Spartans in 371. In it Kallias mentions that his family has a hereditary *proxenia* with Sparta;[8] he then goes on to argue that the two sides (Athens and Sparta) should not be fighting each other, because they have ancient friendly relations with one another going back to Triptolemos and Herakles (δίκαιον μὲν οὖν ἦν μηδὲ ὅπλα ἐπιφέρειν ἀλλήλοις ἡμᾶς, ἐπεὶ λέγεται μὲν Τριπτόλεμος ὁ ἡμέτερος πρόγονος τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης ἄρρητα ἱερὰ πρώτοις ξένοις δεῖξαι Ἡρακλεῖ τε τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀρχηγέτῃ καὶ Διοσκούροιν τοῖν ὑμετέροιν πολίταιν...). It is quite evident that Kallias is talking about the Athenians, not his own family, when he says "us" and "our", just as he means the Spartans when he says "your". This is no attempt to trace the family back to Triptolemos.

Griffith remarks (p. 23) that "Hermogenes was always, it seems, in poor financial circumstances (cf. Plato *Crat.* 384 c 5 and Xenophon *Mem.* 2. 10), so that the wry allusion by Aristophanes' Amphitheos to his lack of journey-money (ἐφόδι' οὐκ ἔχω. *Ach.* 53) gains in point." But from a comic standpoint, there is no point in mocking someone for being poor unless he was once rich (or perhaps is trying to appear rich). Hermogenes was the son of Hipponikos, an extremely wealthy man (And. 1.130, Lys. 19.48), and we may assume that, like his brother Kallias, he was in good financial circumstances at least while

[8]Kallias also says that he has been on peace embassies to Sparta twice before; since he is the ambassador, not his brother Hermogenes, it would seem that Kallias is a more likely candidate for the historical referent of Amphitheos than Hermogenes, if one must be found. Kallias was also a friend of Sokrates; Xenophon's *Symposium* takes place at his house. And Kallias was often mentioned in comedy (Ar. *Eccl.* 810; *Av.* 283, 284; *Ra* .432; fr. 117, 583 Kassel-Austin), whereas we have no references to Hermogenes.

his father was alive. And in 425, at the time of *Acharnians*, Hipponikos was very much alive; he had served as *strategos* in 426 and did not die until shortly before 422 (*PA* 7658). After Hipponikos' death Kallias was considered the richest heir in Greece and subsequently became known for losing most of such a large fortune (Lys. 19.48), but in 425 he was still rich, so the reference would not suit him, either. From the Xenophon passage (*Mem.* 2. 10) one may infer that at the time of that conversation Hermogenes has recently lost his money on account of some political turmoil, because Sokrates, in recommending Hermogenes to Diodorus, says νῦν δὲ διὰ τὰ πράγματα εὐωνοτάτους ἔστι φίλους ἀγαθοὺς κτήσασθαι (*Mem.* 2.10.4). Presumably this is Hermogenes' situation at the time of Plato's *Cratylus* as well; he is seeking money, not because he never had any, but because he has lost what he formerly had (*Crat.* 384c5). In short, it is most likely that Hermogenes was well off in 425, and did not find himself in poor financial circumstances until later, and most unlikely that Amphitheos' reference to lack of travel expenses has anything to do with Hermogenes. There is no need at all to seek a historical individual to connect with the remark about ἐφόδια; the point is that the prytaneis will not give any money, even to someone sent by the gods, if it will contribute toward making peace with Sparta.[9]

No doubt it was Müller-Strübing's desire to explain the presence of Phainarete and Lykinos in Amphitheos' genealogy which led him along the rocky path to Hermogenes in the first place. Since Phainarete was Sokrates' mother's name, Müller-Strübing would like to find in Lykinos a reference to Sokrates. The idea (perhaps Starkie's contribution) that by Lykinos the audience would understand "one who frequented the Lycaeum," and by that, Sokrates, is ingenious but desperate. Possibly if the name Lykinos were a comic coinage the audience might begin to look for a hidden referent, but Lykinos is a normal

[9]Contrast the two drachmas a day which the ambassadors to Persia have been receiving for the last eleven years (*Ach.* 65-67).

Attic name.[10] Also, it seems unlikely that mention of the Lycaeum, even if there were one here, would necessarily call Sokrates to mind. Many other sophists frequented the Lycaeum, and Sokrates could be found in many other places; there is no exclusive association of the Lycaeum with Sokrates. It is unfortunate that we cannot recapture the humor of Aristophanes' inclusion of Phainarete and Lykinos in the genealogy, because we simply do not know to whom these names belong; perhaps the point had something to do with the tragic parody, and would be made clear if we possessed the prologue which is being parodied. At any rate, there does not seem to be a good reason for supposing that Amphitheos is being called a son of Sokrates, spiritual or otherwise.

The results of this discussion of Amphitheos, namely that Amphitheos is not a cover name for Hermogenes, and that the passage stands on its own without an historical referent, accords with the principle that Aristophanes does not bring a historical person onstage without burlesquing him; properly interpreted, the passage is not a burlesque of Amphitheos, and this gives us reason to suppose that he is not a historical person. The treatment of Amphitheos may also be contrasted with the treatment of Kleon in *Knights*. The latter treatment suggests that Aristophanes does not normally introduce characters under cover names, and that when he does he makes it abundantly clear who they are supposed to be.[11] In the case of Amphitheos, for Aristophanes to have intended a historical reference in the way Müller-Strübing suggests would have been far too subtle to be effective; the comic poet gains nothing if the audience does not understand what he is talking about.

---

[10] A famous Lykinos was the plaintiff in a trial of 347 in which Demosthenes represented the defendant, Philokrates (Aeschin. 2.13., 3.62).

[11] Griffith's passing remark (p. 23) that Hermogenes' name "bears a rhythmical resemblance to Amphitheos" is irrelevant. Hundreds of Greek names bear a rhythmical resemblance to Amphitheos. We have no reason to think that, if Aristophanes used cover names, they were metrically equivalent to the referents' names. The one certain case of a cover name, 'Paphlagon', is not metrically equivalent to 'Kleon'.

B. 'Demosthenes and Nikias'

The prologue of *Knights* is spoken by two slaves of Demos, who are never named in the play. However, in complaining of the upstart slave Paphlagon's behavior, one of the two slaves remarks (lines 52-57):

> εἶτ' ἀναρπάσας
> ὅ τι ἄν τις ἡμῶν σκευάσῃ τῷ δεσπότῃ
> Παφλαγὼν κεχάρισται τοῦτο. καὶ πρώην γ' ἐμοῦ
> μᾶζαν μεμαχότος ἐν Πύλῳ Λακωνικήν,
> πανουργότατά πως παραδραμὼν ὑφαρπάσας
> αὐτὸς παρέθηκε τὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μεμαγμένην.

The historical reference is to the famous capture of the Spartans on Sphakteria in 425, a feat for which Kleon (Paphlagon), as the general in charge at the end, received the credit, although the idea of fortifying Pylos and the major work of the siege was carried out by Demosthenes.[1]

It must have been on the basis of these lines that the theory, reported in the second Hypothesis[2] to the play, was advanced, namely, that one of the slaves (the First Slave, Οἰκέτης Α', in most texts) is supposed to be the general Demosthenes, and the other represents Nikias. Since the statement in lines 54-57 is the only thing which either slave says to connect the speaker with an actual person, there is no evidence in the play at all that the Second Slave was intended to be Nikias. Even the writer of the Hypothesis is tentative: λέγουσι δὲ τῶν οἰκετῶν τὸν μὲν εἶναι Δημοσθένην, τὸν δὲ Νικίαν, ἵνα ὦσι δημηγόροι οἱ δύο. Clearly Nikias has been picked out as a suitable famous general to balance Demosthenes; the assumption is that if the one slave is Demosthenes, the other must be a statesman as well, even though Aristophanes does not tell us which one.

Editors and commentators have almost universally accepted the identification of the First and Second Slave with Demosthenes and Nikias, even when they adopt Dindorf's

[1]Thucydides 4. 3-23, 26-39.

[2]Hypothesis 2.2 in Hall and Geldart's Oxford edition; Hypothesis 1.3 in Coulon's Budé edition. The characters were designated Demosthenes and Nikias in the manuscripts (RV).

designations Οἰκέτης Α' and Β' (as most recently Coulon[3]) instead of actually printing the names Demosthenes and Nikias (as do Hall and Geldart, as well as Sommerstein). These identifications are even used as arguments for assigning particular lines to one slave or the other, on the basis of the supposed characterizations of the two generals; thus line 13-14, σὺ μὲν οὖν μοι λέγε, ἵνα μὴ μάχωμαι must be assigned to the 'Nikias' character because Nikias in real life was supposed to be timid and hesitant.[4] The lone skeptical voice is that of K. J. Dover, who has twice argued for a more cautious approach[5], while stopping just short of an assertion that the two slaves are in fact not intended to be Demosthenes and Nikias. It is possible, says Dover, that "conceptions of dramatic symmetry" on the part of later readers have led to the identification of the two slaves with historical individuals. "It is dramatically desirable, given that the Paphlagonian is Cleon, that the two other slaves should consistently represent real individuals. It is certain that if the speaker of 40-72 consistently represents any real individual, he represents Demosthenes. It then becomes doubly desirable that the remaining slave should consistently represent a real individual."[6] Dover goes on to make three points about the identification of the second slave with Nikias, without further argument on any of them:

---

[3]Coulon always refers to the characters as Demosthenes and Nikias in the *apparatus criticus*, e.g on line 16, "Niciae contin. et post 18 transp. Richards: Demostheni trib. et inter 15 et 17 inser. RVΦ." Also, the accompanying translation makes the identification explicit.

[4]The reader not predisposed to find a portrait of Nikias in the Second Slave will find that the amount of individualized characterization in the two slave roles is minimal. The First Slave is dominant; he has the idea of stealing something to drink and investigating the oracle, while the Second Slave carries out the plans. The dialogue is set up to introduce jokes rather than to characterize the slaves. We may note that when the First Slave reads the oracle predicting that a sausage seller will rule the state, the Second Slave does not show any hesitancy about the idea but is eager to start looking for the new ruler, points him out and shouts to him right away (lines 145-149).

[5]The first article is "Aristophanes, *Knights* 11-20," Dover (1959), 196-199; the second, "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes," Dover (1967), where the argument referred to is on pp. 24-26. Both articles are reprinted in Dover (1987).

[6]Dover (1959), p. 198.

> (i) If the second slave represents a real person, Nicias is not necessarily the best candidate. We have been influenced by Thucydides' selection, emphasis, and portrayal of the events of 425; so had the Hellenistic scholars; Aristophanes had not.
>
> (ii) If the slave is Nicias, he is not necessarily invested with the character which the Sicilian Expedition, several years after *Eq.*, revealed in Nicias.
>
> (iii) In the whole of the opening dialogue of *Eq.* there is no passage which requires for the appreciation of its humour any knowledge of the character of any real person.[7]

In Dover's second article, his skepticism is strengthened; speaking of the first article, he says "I was not at that time fully aware of the lengths to which irresponsible Hellenistic theorising about the identification of characters could go, and I consider now that I showed insufficient disrespect for the theory advanced in the Hypothesis of *Knights*."[8]

Certainly any argument that the First Slave is not Demosthenes must deal with the issue of consistency to which Dover refers. Is it possible for a character both to be and not to be representing a certain individual? In fact it is. The best example perhaps is the character Dikaiopolis in *Acharnians*. For most of the play Dikaiopolis speaks as the comic hero of the play, the Attic-farmer-become-polis-unto-himself protagonist. But at two points in the play, first just before he goes off to borrow Telephus' rags from Euripides (lines 377-382), and second when he comes back with the rags, at the beginning of his speech to persuade the hostile chorus (lines 496-508), Dikaiopolis suddenly speaks in the voice of the author of the play; he talks of himself as having suffered at Kleon's hands for last year's play (l. 378 διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμῳδίαν), as being a writer of comedy (l. 499 τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν), alludes again to the attack by Kleon (l. 502-3, οὐ γάρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι / ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω), and refers to the fact that the play is being produced at the Lenaia (l. 504). None of these remarks is appropriate to the character Dikaiopolis, who has for the moment 'become' the author. One cannot say

[7]Dover (1959), pp. 198-199.

[8]Dover (1967), pp. 24-25.

precisely where he becomes Dikaiopolis again, but he must be considered to be in line 406, where he gives his name (Δικαιόπολις καλῶ σ' ὁ Χολλήδης ἐγώ); and after the second passage, the reference to having had his vines cut in line 512 suggests that the farmer- hero is now speaking. Thus, for the space of 12 lines or so, a character in the play drops his persona, speaks as a real contemporary person, and then picks up the persona again.[9] Aristophanes clearly does not see this kind of inconsistency as a problem; consistency in characterization is not his goal.

It is possible, then, that the First Slave in *Knights*, who nowhere else gives any indication that he represents a real person, for a few lines speaks in the voice of the general Demosthenes, and then goes back to being simply the First Slave. However, it is more likely that Aristophanes did not intend the audience to see Demosthenes in the passage at all. The point of the lines is in the jab at Kleon for taking credit for the work of others; who the others are is not particularly important. The lines come in the middle of a 32-line speech by the First Slave, the purpose of which is to describe to the audience the dramatic situation at the opening of the play[10], a task which the First Slave accomplishes by characterizing Paphlagon and describing the hold he has over Demos. Part of the characterization of Paphlagon is the way he tyrannizes over his fellow household slaves, allowing no one else to be seen serving Demos, and causing the other slaves to be unfairly punished.[11] In this characterization the literal (the situation in terms of the the play) mixes

[9]There is a modern parallel in the way Groucho Marx, in his films, is both the character he is playing and at the same time still Groucho Marx. He will even turn directly to the camera and say, e.g. "Well, all the jokes can't be good. You have to expect that once in a while," (*Animal Crackers*).

[10]cf. line 35 βούλει τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῖς θεαταῖσιν φράσω;

[11]cf. lines 66-67, a sample threat of Paphlagon quoted by the First Slave: ὁρᾶτε τὸν Ὕλαν δι' ἐμὲ μαστιγούμενον; εἰ μή μ' ἀναπείσετ', ἀποθανεῖσθε τήμερον. There is no point in looking for a historical referent for Hylas (as Neil ad. loc., "Alcibiades may be meant here"); the situation is being expressed here solely in terms of slave life.

inextricably with the metaphorical (its application to Kleon and public life) in good Aristophanic fashion. So for example lines 58-60:

> ἡμᾶς δ' ἀπελαύνει κοὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν δεσπότην
> ἄλλον θεραπεύειν, ἀλλὰ βυρσίνην ἔχων
> δειπνοῦντος ἑστὼς ἀποσοβεῖ τοὺς ῥήτορας.

The image is of the slave Paphlagon sitting by his master at dinner and solicitously shooing away the--orators (a παρὰ προσδοκίαν for μυίας). Paphlagon is at the same time both the overbearing slave of the play and the demagogue Kleon keeping the other politicians at bay. The shooing has a metaphorical meaning, while the element of the slave sitting by the master at dinner belongs to the literal plane of the play. Likewise in the previous lines (54-57) about the "Laconian loaf" the image is of the slave Paphlagon stealing and serving up food prepared--"at Pylos"[12]--by another slave. I believe that the First Slave's complaint is made in his character of the slave of the play, and that the inserted contemporary reference did not require that every element of the picture be equated metaphorically with some feature of real life. That is, the loaf may represent the victory at Pylos without necessarily causing the First Slave to represent Demosthenes.

To continue further with the discussion of "symmetry and consistency," let us observe that *Knights* is not a consistent allegory. The mixture of literal and metaphorical noted in the preceding paragraph alone is enough to prevent consistent allegory. Although Paphlagon may represent Kleon and Demos may represent the Athenian people, they do not represent them consistently. And since Aristophanes is not writing strict allegory, he does not feel obliged to make every character in the play represent a historical person just because he has made one do so. If he did, then the Sausage Seller, Agorakritos, would represent some real demagogue, more distasteful than Kleon, who, in Aristophanes' opinion, should take over the leadership of the people; clearly this is not the case. The Sausage Seller is a comic invention of the playwright, with the paradoxical function of

[12]For the pun Πύλος/πύελος, see Neil ad loc.

being both worse and better than Paphlagon. Neither did Aristophanes have any obligation to make the First and Second Slaves represent particular historical politicians. They are much like the two slaves who speak the prologue of *Wasps*, introducing the dramatic situation to the audience, while taking the opportunity to drink some wine in the process.[13] But their part in the action of the play is more substantial than that of the slaves in *Wasps* ; in this respect they are similar to Peisetairos and Euelpides at the the beginning of *Birds* . It is the First Slave who formulates the problem and finds a solution to it; with the aid of the Second Slave, he discovers the oracle and induces the Sausage Seller to challenge Paphlagon. Thus, although the Sausage Seller later takes over as protagonist, in the beginning of the play the First Slave is really a small-scale comic hero, whose idea is worked out in the rest of the play.

His similarity to the prologue slaves of *Wasps* and to comic heroes such as Peisetairos leads one to expect that the First Slave of *Knights* does not represent a historical person, but is rather an imaginary character belonging only to the play. This conclusion accords with the principle that Aristophanes brings on historical characters only to burlesque them. The character of the First Slave is not at all a burlesque; no fun is being poked at him, any more than at Peisetairos. The same may be said of the Second Slave.[14] The absence of lampooning suggests that the two characters are not meant to be historical.

---

[13]Slaves drinking on the sly was evidently a comic *topos*; in *Wasps* both slaves drink, while in *Knights* the First Slave drinks and the Second argues with him about it. Attempts to see in this a characterization of Demosthenes and Nikias are misguided. (Plautus uses the *topos* as well, e. g. *Amph.* 427 ff.)

[14]cf. G. E. M. de Ste. Croix (1972), Appendix XXIX, "The political outlook of Aristophanes": "Even if Nicias is the second slave in *Knights* 6 ff., he is not blackguarded there," (p. 362). Ste. Croix also observes that there are almost no derogatory references to Nikias in Aristophanes: "...it is all the more remarkable how gently Aristophanes treats two men who were certainly among the most conspicuous political figures of their day: Alcibiades and Nicias... Nicias escapes Aristophanes' lash altogether, apart from the word μελλονικιᾶν in *Birds* 640 and perhaps the mysterious fr. 100...*Knights* 358 is if anything sympathetic" (p. 361). At *Knights* 358, the Sausage Seller boasts: λαρυγγιῶ τοὺς ῥήτορας καὶ Νικίαν ταράξω. This reference to Nikias fits rather badly with the idea that the Second Slave represents Nikias.

There is one final argument used to support the idea that the two slaves represent Demosthenes and Nikias, and that is that the actors were wearing portrait masks, masks which so closely resembled the men in question that no further identification was required for the audience to recognize them. The essential question here is whether it is likely that the playwright would rely solely on portrait masks to identify characters to the audience.[15] K. J. Dover[16] has discussed the problems attendant on making portrait masks in 5th century Athens; he points out quite rightly that most Greek men had dark hair and beards, and did not wear glasses, uniforms, or smoke cigars.[17] Furthermore, the masks had to have wide eye and mouth holes which could not be realistic. Under these conditions, it surely would have been impossible to make a portrait mask of most individuals which would be so distinctive as to be immediately recognizable.[18] There is another difficulty which Dover does not mention, and that is the size of the theater. T. B. L. Webster[19] describes the theater of Dionysos at Athens from the perspective of the audience:

> The distance from the front of the 'stage' across the orchestra to the front row of spectators was 60 ft. in the fifth century and over 70 ft. in the fourth century; in Drury Lane it is only 48 ft. from the front of the stage to the centre of the dress circle. The back rows of the theatre of Dionysos were about 300 ft. from the stage. This means that an actor 6 ft. high would look about 3 1/2 in. high to the spectator in front and 3/4 in. high to spectators at the back. On this scale without footlights facial expression

[15]The existence of portrait masks is not questioned by most scholars; indeed, the reference to a portrait mask in *Eq.* 230-233 seems certain. The literary testimonia are examined by Stone (1981), pp. 31-38.

[16]Dover (1967) 16-28.

[17]That is, they did not, for the most part, have convenient 'iconography' or objects associated with them by which they could be recognized, as the gods did. It is possible that some people did have such iconography; Lamachus, for example, was associated with a Gorgon shield and perhaps a distinctive crest on his helmet, to judge from *Acharnians*. Still, he is also identified by name, loudly and often.

[18]Stone, *op. cit.* p. 36, argues unconvincingly that there are "many subtle but important facial characteristics not mentioned by Dover" which might have been represented; such subtleties would be lost over the distance involved.

[19]Webster (1970), p. 4.

> would mean little to the front rows, and the advantage of a mask, necessarily slightly larger than the human face and with the features firmly painted, is obvious.

In other words, in order to allow the spectator 300 feet away to see the face at all, a large mask was necessary. At this distance, the best-made likeness in the world could hardly be expected to be effective. The use of portrait masks alone would not have been sufficiently reliable identification. For this reason, the poet normally has the person's name mentioned either before or shortly after his entrance, to make sure that no one misses the identification.[20] In the case of historical characters, there is the tendency to prepare for the person's entrance by mentioning his name considerably before he appears. Euripides and Lamachos in *Acharnians*, 'Paphlagon' (Kleon) in *Knights*, Sokrates in *Clouds*, Euripides and Aischylos in *Frogs*, Agathon in *Thesmophoriazusae*, all are announced before their entrances, to prepare the audience for the arrival of a historical character. Besides the tendency to name historical characters before or upon their entrances, one should also note that they are all in fact named. Aristophanes gains nothing if the audience does not recognize the person he is lampooning; thus, if it is important to know who the person is, he tells the audience his name so that it can't be missed. We should not look to portrait masks alone to identify 'Demosthenes' and 'Nikias'. If Aristophanes had meant these characters to represent historical people, he would have mentioned their names in the dialogue.

[20]Since this is the sort of name introduction which modern readers or audiences expect, it may be useful to point out here that for Aristophanes it was by no means *de rigeur*. Invented main characters are very often introduced only long *after* their appearance (see the section Late Naming of this thesis), and many characters never receive any names at all (e.g. the two slaves of *Knights* under discussion; the relative of Euripides in *Thesmophoriazusae*; the doorkeeper of Hades in *Frogs*, etc.).

C. Derketes of Phyle

In the iambic scenes of *Acharnians* where various people come to Dikaiopolis asking for a share in the peace, a character comes in who is blind from crying over the loss of his pair of oxen, stolen by the Boeotians. The man says his name is Derketes, from the deme Phyle (1028), and he asks Dikaiopolis to anoint his eyes with peace so that he can see to find the oxen; Dikaiopolis summarily refuses and Derketes exits (1036). Some readers have been troubled by the lack of sympathy Dikaiopolis shows the unhappy farmer; in particular, D. M. MacDowell (1983) in his article "The Nature of Aristophanes' *Akharnians*" seeks to defend Dikaiopolis by finding in Derketes a reference to a historical person. A. H. Sommerstein had already pointed out that there was inscriptional evidence for the name, but drew no conclusions from that evidence.

L. P. E. Parker, in a review of Sommerstein's *Acharnians*,[1] picks up the information about Derketes and sees possible significance in it, remarking that

> "...the question of whether an Aristophanic character is a caricature of an individual, or of a type, or a creation of pure fantasy is of literary importance, and any evidence which tends to resolve it is worth noting. A striking example is the fact recorded by S. on 1028 that there really was a man called Dercetes of Phyle. The identification, even if it were certain, would be worthless in itself, but the fact that the Dercetes of the play may be a caricature of a real person has a bearing on certain current interpretations of Dicaeopolis as a 'selfish' comic hero. To refuse a drop of peace to a destitute peasant looks selfish; to refuse it to a grotesque representation of some public figure of momentary notoriety is quite a different matter" (p. 11).

Thus Parker and MacDowell wish to solve the problem of Dikaiopolis' apparent selfishness by finding in Derketes a hidden contemporary reference to a real person who would have been perceived as deserving of Dikaiopolis' refusal. I quote from MacDowell's discussion, p. 159:

> "The key to this passage, overlooked by authors of books on Aristophanes and commentators on Akharnians, is that Derketes of Phyle is not a fictional character

[1]Parker (1983), 10-12.

> invented by Aristophanes, but a real person, like Lamakhos and Theoros in other scenes of the play. The evidence is in two inscriptions of the first half of the fourth century, which mention a man named Derketes of the deme Phyle (IG II^2 75.7, 1698.5-6). Derketes is a very uncommon name, and the coincidence of the same deme as well as the same name is most unlikely to be accidental. Either Derketes of Phyle in the inscriptions, who lived early in the fourth century, is the same man as Aristophanes has introduced into the play, or else he is another member of the same family, perhaps a son or grandson. In any case we should accept that Derketes in *Akharnians* was a real person."

MacDowell goes on to speculate that the real Derketes had done something known to the audience which caused him to be deserving of the treatment he got from Dikaiopolis, something such as supporting the war until he was personally afected by it; this supposition then frees Dikaiopolis of the charge of selfishness.

However, even granted that there was a historical Derketes of Phyle known to Aristophanes, I do not believe that the passage will support MacDowell's interpretation. Rather, the situation is similar to that of Amphitheos (q.v.): the name, which happens to be that of a real person, is used in order to make a joke, not to launch an attack against that person. Neither MacDowell nor Parker take any account of the fact that Derketes is a significant name in the context. Derketes, from δέρκεσθαι, "look, see clearly," is a comic name for someone who has just literally cried his eyes out. Starkie explains the name as "a jesting allusion to the loss of his eyes, as if he had called himself 'Argus,'" and renders the name as 'Bright Eyes'. Further, there is a point to the demotic as well; the deme Phyle was located on the Boeotian border, so the Boeotians had good opportunity to seize his cattle.[2] In other words, Aristophanes has used the name and demotic as inspiration in setting up the comic situation, but that is as far as we should look for a real Derketes of Phyle in the play. Certainly if Aristophanes meant the audience to understand that Derketes was being justly repulsed for something he had done, he would have made reference to the man's fault, or at the very least to the justice of his rejection. But Dikaiopolis rejects the man instantly, before he has any idea who he is. When Derketes first identifies himself as ἀνὴρ

[2]Here is also a word play, noticed by Starkie, between βόε and Βοιώτιοι.

κακοδαίμων (1019), Dikaiopolis immediately replies "Keep to yourself now!" [3] And when Derketes gives his name and asks for some peace salve, Dikaiopolis merely tells him that he is not a public doctor; it is not his business to 'cure' other people's problems. There is no hint at all that Derketes is being criticized for any fault or action. It would have been simple enough to have Dikaiopolis say "Derketes! The informer [or warmonger or father-beater or what have you]? I don't give peace to people like you." But the playwright is not attacking Derketes. Clearly Dikaiopolis is rejecting automatically any requests people make to share in his peace, and there is no idea here that Derketes has personally done anything special to deserve this rejection. Dikaiopolis also automatically rejects the Best Man's request; it is only when the Bridesmaid appears and he finds her request amusing that he makes an exception, ὁτιὴ γυνή 'στι τοῦ πολέμου τ' οὐκ ἀξία [or αἰτία, Blaydes] (1062). The logical implication is that the men *are* collectively deserving of [or responsible for] the war--all except Dikaiopolis, the only man willing to negotiate for peace. As the Chorus remarks upon Derketes' exit (line 1037), ἀνὴρ ἐνεύρηκέν τι ταῖς σπονδαῖσιν ἡδύ, κοὐκ ἔοικεν οὐδενὶ μεταδώσειν, "The man [Dikaiopolis] has found something pleasant in the treaty, and it doesn't look like he is going to share it with anyone." This statement of the chorus must be reckoned with by those who wish to explain away Dikaiopolis' selfishness. The chorus is underscoring the fact that Dikaiopolis *is* going to be selfish with his peace, as he has a right to be. The metaphor of the peace treaty as a skin of wine is continued; there is only a limited quantity of peace, Dikaiopolis purchased it, and he is not about to start doling it out to everyone.[4]

---

[3]cf. *Clouds* 1263, where Strepsiades rejects a creditor (who says he is ἀνὴρ κακοδαίμων) in exactly the same words.

[4]Derketes asks for "some peace--even just five years' worth" (μέτρησον εἰρήνης τί μοι, κἂν πέντ' ἔτη 1021); the metaphor has been changed a bit from the earlier one in which the age of the wine represented the length of the peace. Now it is the quantity which is proportional to the duration of the peace.

Aside from the question of Dikaiopolis' 'selfishness' (discussed further in the section on Dikaiopolis), we may ask whether the character Derketes really deserves all the sympathy which tender-hearted modern readers feel for him. I believe that Aristophanes wrote Derketes' part as ridiculous rather than pitiable, at least from a Greek point of view. Of course it is unfortunate that his oxen were stolen, but that is not the proximate cause of his visiting Dikaiopolis. The problem is that he spent so long blubbering over his loss that he ruined his eyesight; this is surely idiotic behavior on the part of a grown man, and would have been seen as such by the audience. By his foolish behavior he has caused his own difficulty, and this makes him much less deserving of pity.[5] Also, the Greeks did not consider physical handicaps or deformities automatically as grounds for pity; they are often treated as legitimate grounds for ridicule in Old Comedy.[6] Derketes, then, is a silly rustic; he wants the oxen back because they kept him supplied with dung (ἐν πᾶσι βολίτοις, 1026), not because he is starving or destitute. (The Megarian at Dikaiopolis' market, by contrast, is portrayed in a much more pitiable fashion than Derketes.) The character is thoroughly laughable, and, if played that way by the actor, should not have aroused any great pity in the audience. We need not look for a hidden and unrecoverable contemporary reference to explain this passage.

---

[5]Dover (1974) pp. 196-7 refers to two very apposite passages on this subject: "Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1114[a]25-8 considers that while it would be right to pity a man blinded by an accident it would be appropriate to reproach, not to pity, a man who had gone blind through alcoholism," and Soph. *Phil.* 1318-20: "When men are involved in ills that they have brought upon themselves, as you are, it is not *dikaios* that they should be forgiven or that anyone should express pity for them."

[6]For this point see Dover (1974), p. 201: "Both tolerance and compassion, of course, are relative. Not even Athenian society, let alone that of other Greek states, was tolerant by our standards, and in certain important respects we may judge the Athenians lacking in compassion, notably in the individual's reluctance to involve himself in the (perhaps divinely caused) misfortunes of others ('Go your own way!' says Strepsiades apotropaically to the creditor who announces himself as *kakodaimon* [Ar. *Clouds* 1263], or the brutal jokes against skin- or eye-diseases from which one eminent figure or another happened to suffer (Ar. *Birds* 150 f., *Eccl.* 400 f., *Wealth* 665 f., 716-25)." To this list add *Birds* 1569, the deformed Laispodias; *Birds* 1294, one-eyed Opountios; Cratinus fr. 71 σχινοκέφαλος (of Perikles).

D. Kleisthenes and Straton (*Acharnians* 118-122)

During the opening scene of *Acharnians*, three apparently Persian characters are introduced: Pseudartabas (the Eye of the King) and two eunuchs who accompany him. The ambassadors to Persia have brought them back to appear before the Athenian assembly (lines 90-91). The eunuchs are non-speaking roles, while Pseudartabas speaks two lines, one in Persian (or something like it) and one in pidgin Greek (100, 104), the import of which is that the Athenians will not get any gold from the Persian king (οὐ λῆψι χρῦσο, χαυνόπρωκτ' Ἰαοναῦ, 104). When the Athenian ambassador attempts to impose just the opposite meaning on Pseudartabas' statement (ἀχάνας ὅδε γε χρυσίου λέγει, 108), Dikaiopolis waves him off and proceeds to question the Persian himself, first threatening physical punishment in order to get the truth (just as one would have interrogated a slave). Pseudartabas and his attendants answer Dikaiopolis' two questions with nods, upon which Dikaiopolis declares that they must be Greek; he then says he recognizes one of the eunuchs as Kleisthenes, and suggests that the other is Straton. The passage is as follows:

> Ἑλληνικόν γ' ἐπένευσαν ἄνδρες οὑτοιί,
> κοὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐνθένδ' αὐτόθεν.
> καὶ τοῖν μὲν εὐνούχοιν τὸν ἕτερον τουτονί
> ἐγῷδ' ὅς ἐστι, Κλεισθένης ὁ Σιβυρτίου.
> ὦ θερμόβουλον πρωκτὸν ἐξυρημένε,
> τοιόνδε γ', ὦ πίθηκε, τὸν πώγων' ἔχων
> εὐνοῦχος ἡμῖν ἦλθες ἐσκευασμένος;
> ὁδὶ δὲ τίς ποτ' ἐστίν; οὐ δήπου Στράτων; (*Ach.* 115-122)

That is the end of the exchange, which is broken off by the σίγα, κάθιζε of the herald (123). The question, then, is, are the Persian eunuchs really disguised Athenians? That is, are the eunuchs, in the context of the play, intended to be understood as the effeminate Athenians Kleisthenes and Straton wearing eunuch costumes?

Most modern scholars have thought that they are; however, K. J. Dover,[1] followed most recently by C. Chiasson,[2] has argued that they are not; each offers a different interpretation of the stage business in the scene to help clarify it. Both Dover and Chiasson point out, rightly, that lines 114-115 refer to the entire Persian delegation, including Pseudartabas; Dikaiopolis says in jest that they must all be Greek. Yet only the eunuchs are identified with specific Athenians, whereas there is no further suggestion that Pseudartabas, clearly a Persian, is really Greek. This circumstance is an indication that the eunuchs are not disguised Greeks, either. Rather, this is a kind of joke, a form of personal invective, not infrequent in Aristophanes; it involves calling a character by another (real) person's name, because the two are alleged to share some characteristic. An example which involves Kleisthenes again may be found at *Thes.* 235; Euripides has shaved his relative and holds up a mirror for him to see how he looks. In reply to Euripides' question ὁρᾷς σεαυτόν; the man replies οὐ μὰ Δί' ἀλλὰ Κλεισθένην, as if he were looking at Kleisthenes in the mirror (because Kleisthenes is hairless). Similarly *Thes.* 97-98, where Euripides is attempting to point out to his relative the effeminate Agathon, and the baffled relative finally says ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐχ ὁρῶ ἄνδρ' οὐδέν' ἐνθάδ' ὄντα, Κυρήνην δ' ὁρῶ. Again, this does not mean that Agathon is disguised as Kyrene; he is simply called Kyrene to imply that he and Kyrene share a characteristic (femininity). The same sort of joke is being perpetrated in our *Acharnians* passage; Dikaiopolis claims to be seeing two Athenians in the Persian eunuchs as a way of comparing the Athenians to eunuchs. We should not imagine that the eunuchs are wearing portrait masks of Kleisthenes and Straton, or that the audience thought that Kleisthenes and Straton were being represented on stage. Further, such identification would add undesirable complication to the joke. It would mean that Kleisthenes and Straton were disguising themselves as Persians to deceive the

[1]Dover (1963), pp. 6-25.

[2]Chiasson (1984), pp. 131-136.

Athenian assembly for some reason, although the only deception they practice is that of wearing Persian dress. Aristophanes is not ridiculing Kleisthenes for fooling the people in the matter of the embassy to Persia (he ridicules the ambassadors for that), he is ridiculing him for being effeminate, and to do so all he needs do is suggest that Kleisthenes resembles a eunuch. Evidently this is a joke of which Aristophanes never tired; fourteen years later he is still mocking Kleisthenes for the same reason.[3]

One major problem in interpreting this scene has been caused by line 120 (τοίονδε γ', ὦ πίθηκε, τὸν πώγων' ἔχων), according to the scholia a parody of Archilochus, who has πυγήν for πώγων. Dover believes that the attendants are Persian eunuchs, and that they and Pseudartabas know no Greek, but merely nod to placate Dikaiopolis. Dikaiopolis then pulls aside a garment covering the lower half of the eunuch's face to show a beardless mask; thus "this sort of beard" in line 120 means either (i) since Kleisthenes is beardless, he can dress up as a eunuch, or (ii) Kleisthenes is so heavily bearded that he should not have tried to dress up as a eunuch (mock indignation on the part of Dikaiopolis). Dover seems to prefer the first interpretation, though he calls (ii) linguistically preferable. Chiasson has attempted to improve upon Dover's interpretation of the stage business by suggesting that the eunuchs are wearing obviously false beards of the long, square type normally worn by Persian royalty. Thus "this kind of beard" would mean a beard inappropriate to a eunuch. "With a beard like that you should be a king!" is Chiasson's interpretation. Such a joke seems to me without point; since the eunuchs are not attempting to pass themselves off as royalty, what could be the reason for such a disguise? Also, as I shall argue below, beards on the eunuchs would miss the point of the comparison between the eunuchs and the effeminates Kleisthenes and Straton.

I offer the following interpretation of the scene, to bring together the elements discussed above. Pseudartabas is a person who knows some Greek but is not fluent,

---

[3]*Thes.* 235.

understanding more than he can speak himself. The Ambassador may know some Persian, but he makes sure Dikaiopolis does not know any before going ahead with the false translation of Pseudartabas' first line. Pseudartabas was giving the official formal introduction to his message from the king;[4] he is annoyed at the Ambassador for slighting the king's titles and for giving what he knows is a false translation of what he was saying. Thus he adds the insult to his next utterance, which he puts into Greek to foil the Ambassador. Since he has responded to two requests put to him in Greek by the Ambassador (99 and 103), and has shown that he can speak some Greek as well (104), Dover's idea that he (and the eunuchs) cannot understand a word Dikaiopolis is saying must be wrong. The joke "they nodded in Greek, they must be from around here" (lines 115-116) is funny on its own account. It is then extended by suggesting which Athenians the eunuchs would be if they were Athenians.[5] Eunuchs are smooth and hairless, likewise Kleisthenes and Straton, hence the equation.[6] The notion that they are wearing beards, even funny Persian beards as Chiasson has it, does not work. That would destroy the equation between the eunuchs and Kleisthenes and Straton, and it is doubtful whether the two could have been recognized as eunuchs in the first place if they were not beardless. Beardlessness is an outstanding characteristic of eunuchs and one which the two characters

[4]See M. L. West (1968), pp. 5-7, for a plausible interpretation of *Ach.* 100 as a reproduction of Persian syllables meant to sound like the formulaic opening phrases of pronouncements from the Persian king (i.e. 'Says Artaxerxes, great king, king of kings, king of provinces, son of Xerxes the king'), which the Athenians would have heard in the assembly. The article is replying to Dover (1963) pp. 7-8, who interprets *Ach.* 100 as Persian meaning "Iarta by name, son of Xerxes, satrap," an introduction made by Pseudartabas on his own behalf. West's interpretation is preferable from a dramatic point of view, since Pseudartabas has already been introduced (in lines 91-92); what is asked for here is that he deliver his message from the king.

[5]Chiasson (1984), p. 134 compares the parodos (which he mistakenly calls the parabasis) of *Birds*, in which Kallias and Kleonymos are compared to two entering members of the bird chorus; the comparison is made by actually calling the birds Kallias and Kleonymos (lines 284, 290), although it is clear that they are merely birds and not two disguised Athenians.

[6]For Kleisthenes' notorious beardlessness, see *Eq.* 1373-4,*Thes.* 235. Straton is called beardless in Aristophanes fr. 422 Kassel-Austin.

surely must have had in order for Dikaiopolis (and the audience) to know immediately that they were eunuchs. It is not necessary, with Dover, to imagine that Dikaiopolis is pulling away some sort of veil or garment which covers the eunuch's face; he may just affect to take a closer look at him; perhaps the eunuchs have been standing somewhat behind Pseudartabas, and Dikaiopolis then walks right up to one of them for closer inspection. "This sort of beard" then means no beard (Dover's #i).

We may further remark that, a few lines after the speech in question, at 125-127, Dikaiopolis complains that, while he has to serve in the army, the city is always entertaining these foreigners. τοὺς δὲ ξενίζειν (127) implies that he is thinking of the three as Persians, not as Athenians, of whom he would not be likely to use the verb ξενίζειν. It is the thought that these ridiculous Persians are receiving free dinners in the prytaneion while he himself is out eating onions on campaign, which finally drives Dikaiopolis to take the drastic step of commissioning Amphitheos to make a private peace for him.

E. Lysistrata

Lysistrata (a name meaning 'disbanding the army') is the name of the heroine of Aristophanes' eponymous play; since the main idea of the play is her plan to 'disband the army' by organizing a women's sex strike, her name is obviously appropriate. It is just the sort of name one would expect such a character to have, a name like Strepsiades or Praxagora. Perhaps for that reason it was not until 1955 that anyone suggested that Lysistrata might have been a cover name for a historical person. In that year D. M. Lewis proposed that Lysistrata was meant to be a representation of the contemporary priestess of Athena Polias, Lysimache.[1] Since this proposal has been widely, even unquestioningly,[2] accepted, and since, as Lewis says, it "has important consequences for our understanding of Attic comedy in general and of the Lysistrata of Aristophanes in particular,"[3] it seems worthwhile to discuss Lewis' article in detail.

The search for Lysistrata/Lysimache was inspired by an article by Papademetriou[4] which found a historical referent for the Myrrhine of *Lysistrata* in a priestess of Athena Nike whose gravestone had recently been discovered. Lewis posits that "if there is one genuine priestess, there must be more, and at least one must outrank her."[5] Thus his argument that Lysistrata is a priestess is based partly on the auxiliary notion that Myrrhine

[1]Lewis (1955) 1-36. The treatment of Lysistrata is in Note 23 (pp. 1-7), "Who Was Lysistrata?"

[2]e.g. by Loraux (1981), pp 191-196 on Lysistrata. In his introduction to the *Lysistrata*, Henderson (1987) considers Lewis' proposition that Lysistrata represented Lysimache, and ultimately rejects it (pp. xxxviii-xl); I am in general agreement with his reasoning.

[3]Lewis (1955), p. 1.

[4]Papademetriou (1948-9) pp. 146-153.

[5]Lewis (1955), p. 2.

is a priestess.[6] He argues plausibly, but by no means conclusively, from a notice in Pliny the Elder and an inscribed statue base in the Agora that the priestess of Athena Polias in 411 was a woman named Lysimache.[7] Lewis then makes a case for the desirability of interpreting Aristophanes' Lysistrata as the priestess of Athena Polias, based on various points in the play, and concludes that the audience would have recognized the character Lysistrata as Lysimache.

Even granted that the priestess of Athena Polias in 411 *was* named Lysimache (not at all a certainty), still the arguments for identifying her with Lysistrata do not hold up. Lewis himself admits, in the midst of his discussion of Lysistrata's role in the play, that "there is still no need for Lysistrata to be a priestess. She does nothing which could not easily be attributed to any comic hero or heroine."[8] This is quite true, and ought to incline us against making a priestess out of her.[9] To go beyond the negative argument, the very basic idea of the play gives us reason to avoid connecting Lysistrata with Athena; her plan for the women to dress seductively and then refuse sexual relations is something completely inspired by Aphrodite, who is in fact mentioned in line 551 as the deity whose aid the women require. The plan would have been repugnant to a goddess like Athena and quite inappropriate as the idea of her priestess.

---

[6]See treatment of Myrrhine below; my conclusion is that the name was chosen because of its connection with myrrh, and the significance of that substance as an enhancement of sexual attraction (cf. her husband's name, Kinesias), and that there is no reason to suppose that she is a priestess.

[7]Pliny, *NH* XXXIV 76, says that Demetrios made a statue of Lysimache, who was a priestess of Athena for 64 years. The inscription on the base (*IG* II^2 2453) is fragmentary, but it commemorates a woman who did something for Athena for a period of years ending in four. The woman's name and the sculptor's name are both missing, as is the first part of the number of years. The base is tentatively dated to the early 370's (Lewis (1955) p. 6, who also says "The date of the base hardly matters.")

[8]Lewis (1955), p.3.

[9]More arguments against finding references to the priestess of Athena in the characterization of Lysistrata are given by Henderson (1987), pp. xxxix-xl.

The remainder of Lewis' argument is based on the names; first, on the similarity of the names Lysistrata and Lysimache, and second on the mention of the name Lysimache in line 554 of the play. In arguing that the audience would have made the identification on the basis of name similarity, Lewis says that Aristophanes must have intended it, because "he could easily have selected a name with the same meaning, but without the close resemblance."[10] But what is the point of altering the name? If the poet had intended his character as a portrait of Lysimache, it would have been much easier to name her Lysimache. Any argument that he changed the name to avoid disrespectful mention of a woman's name in public[11] must contradict the assertion that he presents Myrrhine on stage under her own name.

Lewis find the mention of the name Lysimache at line 554 a persuasive indication that Lysistrata is to be identified with Lysimache. The line comes at the end of a virtual invocation of Eros and Aphrodite by Lysistrata, in her hope for the success of the women's venture (lines 551-554).

> ἀλλ' ἥνπερ ὅ τε γλυκύθυμος Ἔρως χἡ Κυπρογένει' Ἀφροδίτη
> ἵμερον ἡμῶν κατὰ τῶν κόλπων καὶ τῶν μηρῶν καταπνεύσῃ,
> κἆτ' ἐντήξῃ τέτανον τερπνὸν τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ ῥοπαλισμούς,
> οἶμαί ποτε Λυσιμάχας ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησι καλεῖσθαι.

If the plan succeeds, "I suppose we will be called Lysimachai among the Greeks," Lysistrata says. But there is nothing about the expression which supports the conclusion that Lysistrata's real name is Lysimache. By "we" (ἡμᾶς) is meant not "I" (which would make a strange statement at any rate: "I will be called by my actual name," a pointless change to a name equivalent in meaning to the character's name) but "we, the participating women". The word play is a type, used elsewhere by Aristophanes, in which someone is

---

[10]Lewis (1955), p.7.

[11]cf. the interesting article by D. Schaps (1977), "The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names". There is no reason, however, to think that the principles deduced here apply to comedy. For a discussion see the section Women of this thesis.

called or calls himself a proper name because the literal meaning of that name describes him in some way. For an example, cf. *Knights* 615, where in answer to the chorus' question about how the contest went, the Sausage Seller replies "τί δ' ἄλλο γ' εἰ μὴ Νικόβουλος ἐγενόμην; " "I became Nikoboulos" here means "I was victorious in the *boule*." [12] The use of the name Nikoboulos does not suggest that Aristophanes means the audience to identify the Sausage-Seller with some historical person of that name; likewise in the *Lysistrata* passage, it is not probable that Lysistrata (and the other Greek women) are being identified with an historical person named Lysimache.

The conclusion that Lysistrata is not Lysimache accords with the principle that serious characters in Aristophanes (or characters who are not burlesques) are invented rather than historical. The comic heroes who motivate and are central to the action belong entirely to the play.

[12]Other examples include *Eq.* 570 (Amynias), *Eq.* 1044 (Antileon), *Ve.* 151 (Kapnios); for an instance using the very name Lysimache, see *Pax* 992.

F. Myrrhine and Kinesias

The suggestion was first made in 1948, by I. Papademetriou,[1] that the character named Myrrhine in Aristophanes' play *Lysistrata* was based on a contemporary woman named Myrrhine who was priestess of Athena Nike at the time. This notion, adopted and expanded by D. M. Lewis, [2] is based on an epitaph[3] of a woman named Myrrhine, daughter of Kallimachos, which appears to date *c.* 400.[4] I give Lewis' text of the inscription below, with my own translation:

Καλλιμάχο θυγατρὸς τηλαυγὲς μνῆμα ⟨τόδ' ἐστιν,⟩
ἢ πρώτη Νίκης ἀμφεπόλευσε νεών.
εὐλογίαι δ' ὄνομ' ἔσχε συνέμπορον, ὡς ἀπὸ θείας
Μυρρίν⟨η ἐ⟩κλήθη συντυχίας ἐτύμως.[5]
πρώτε 'Αθηναίας Νίκες ἕδος ἀμφεπόλευσεν
ἐκ πάντων κλήρωι Μυρρίνη εὐτυχίαι.

(This is) the far-shining tombstone of the daughter of Kallimachos
who first served the temple of Nike.
And she had a name as a companion to her praise, since by divine
chance she was appropriately called Myrrhine.
She first served the abode of Athena Nike,
Myrrhine, (chosen) out of all by lot, with success.

[1]Papademetriou (1948-49), pp. 146-153.

[2]Lewis (1955), pp. 1-36.

[3]CEG 93 = IG i^3 1330.

[4]This is Papademetriou's dating (p. 149), based on his analysis of the letter forms. Meiggs & Lewis (1969) p. 109 remark: "The purely epigraphic evidence for the date of the epitaph would not necessarily point to the last years of the century. The widespread intrusion of Ionic letters, though extremely rare in public inscriptions before the last decade of the fifth century, is not uncommon earlier in private inscriptions, and the lettering would not be out of place as early as 430." Of course, if the epitaph dates to any time before 411, the identification of the priestess with Aristophanes' Myrrhine is automatically ruled out.

[5]After line 4 Lewis prints three dots of punctuation (arranged vertically), noting that they are clear on the stone. I am treating this mark as a period, although it is possible that we are dealing with two separate poems.

Both Papademetriou and Lewis believe that Myrrhine was the first priestess of Athena Nike, who was appointed about 445,[6] and on the assumption that she held that position until her death, conclude that Myrrhine was priestess of Athena Nike in 411, when the *Lysistrata* was produced. That idea has been recently rejected, and rightly, by J. Henderson;[7] however, I believe his argument requires some clarification. Henderson analyzes the problem as follows:

> "The epitaph, however, seems to rule out the possibility that Myrrhine was the incumbent priestess of Athena Nike in 411. There is no way of determining when she held her post, but it must have been subsequent to the completion of the Nike temple in the 420s. Thus she cannot have been the cult's first priestess: the cult was established in the 440s and its priestesses were allotted ἐξ ἁπάντων, serving only a year or two, lifelong tenure being reserved for gentile priesthoods like that of Polias. The format and content of the epitaph rather suggest that Myrrhine held a low-echelon post whose only distinction was that she was the first to hold it."

In support of his assertion that Myrrhine was not a priestess, Henderson adds in a footnote (p. xli n.14) "For ἀμφιπολεῖν cf. Hdt. 2.56.2." Presumably he is referring to the entry in *LSJ*, who say that the verb is used there "of temple-slaves"; not quite correct. The woman in Herodotus 2. 56. 2 who is said to have 'tended' the temple of Zeus at Thebes (ἀμφιπολεύουσαν ἐν Θήβῃσι ἱρὸν Διός) was identified at 2. 54. 3 as one of two priestesses of the god (τοῦ Θηβαιέος Διὸς δύο γυναῖκας ἱερείας), so actually the verb is

[6]The evidence for appointment of the first priestess of Athena Nike comes from IG $I^2$24, an inscription which establishes the position, the salary of the priestess, and provides for the building of a doorway for the shrine of Nike as well as the building of a temple. The inscription has been dated by most (purely on the basis of the occurrence of the three-barred sigma without other early letters) to *c.* 450-445. However, in view of the general agreement that the temple of Athena Nike in fact was built in the 420's, such an early date for the inscription has remained problematic; the gap in time has been variously explained, and Mattingly (*Hist.* 10 (1961) 169 f.) solves the problem by dating the inscription to the twenties as well. To a non-expert, that seems surely the most sensible course. The inscription is discussed by Meiggs and Lewis (*A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C.* Oxford 1969. No. 44), and again by Meiggs in *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972), Appendix 9 "The Temple of Athena Nike."

[7]Henderson (1987), introduction pp. xl-xli. As recently as 1984 R. S. J. Garland could state that "Papademetriou's suggestion that the Myrrhine of Aristophanes' *Lysistrate* is modelled on the Myrrhine who was priestess of Athene Nike has won general acceptance," Garland (1984) p. 91.

used in Herodotus, as in Myrrhine's epitaph, of the activity of a priestess, not a temple slave. Further, the Myrrhine of the inscription was chosen "by lot from all" (line 6), suggesting a priestess. The objection of Henderson (in reply to Papademetriou's assertion) that she could not have been the first priestess of Athena Nike may be true but irrelevant, and his deduction that she was not a priestess probably incorrect. Henderson assumes that if Myrrhine was not (as she could not have been if the early dating of the Nike temple inscription is correct) the first priestess of Nike, then she must not have been a priestess at all. However, the epitaph does not say that she was the first *priestess* of Athena Nike, but rather that she was the first priestess to serve the *temple* of Athena Nike,[8] a building dated without controversy to the 420s.[9] What is important in the inscription is the information that Myrrhine first served in the temple, and was chosen by lot. J. A. Turner[10] has shown convincingly that only hereditary priesthoods had lifelong tenure, whereas those chosen by lot were passed on every few years.[11] Since the Nike temple was finished in the 420s, Myrrhine must have been priestess at that time; therefore it is highly unlikely that she was serving again in the same position in 411, when the *Lysistrata* was produced. (Had she been chosen twice, the epitaph writer would certainly have mentioned the fact.)[12] We must

[8]This point is made by Jordan (1979), p. 33 n. 54.

[9]Meiggs (1972), Appendix 9 "The Temple of Athena Nike," p. 501.

[10]Turner (1983), *Hiereiai: Acquisition of Feminine Priesthoods in Ancient Greece.*

[11]Although discussions such as that of Meiggs and Lewis (1969, No. 44) persist in speaking of the Nike temple inscription as if it provided for lifelong tenure of the priestess, the surviving portions of the inscription say nothing about tenure at all; the assumption of lifelong tenure is based on the (erroneous) reconstruction of L. Ziehen (1906) vol. II p. 48., who wished to restore ἀ[ν διὰ βίο hιερᾶτα]ι in line 4.

[12]An argument from silence cannot be decisive here, but we might have expected the epitaph to mention how long Myrrhine had held her position, if in fact she had served as priestess for the more than 40 years which Meiggs and others posit. Cf. the epitaph of Lysimache (*IG* II^2 3453), which tells how many years she served Athena (possibly 64; see discussion of Lewis (1955) p.5).

conclude that the Myrrhine epitaph gives us no reason whatever to imagine that the priestess of Athena Nike in 411 was called Myrrhine.

The conclusion that Myrrhine is not meant as a portrait of a real priestess is the same that we reach by examining the question from the point of view of the play.[13] As Henderson remarks (p. xli): "The Myrrhine in our play is a typical housewife with a farcical role. It is impossible to discern any contribution to her characterization that a connection with Athena Nike would provide. Furthermore, Myrrhine is one of the most common Athenian names and was evidently chosen (like 'Kinesias') for its sexual connotations (838 n.). If it suggested any cult it was Aphrodite's, not Athena's." Although the wording of the epitaph clearly shows that the name Myrrhine was capable of suggesting priesthood,[14] Henderson must be correct in his statement that the name was used by Aristophanes for its sexual meaning. The name, a common one, was used by hetairai, cf. Athenaeus 13. 590 (mistress of Hypereides) and 13. 593 (mistress of Demetrius Poliorcetes). Henderson connects it with μυρτός, 'myrtle', a word which may have the slang meaning 'female genitalia'.[15] In addition, it must have suggested μύρον, 'myrrh', a perfume which was used to enhance sexual attraction and lovemaking (and which some women found indispensible in that connection).[16] This association of

[13]For an unconvincing interpretation of Myrrhine's role as comprising a number of tongue-in-cheek references to the priestess of Athena Nike, see Papademetriou (1948-9), pp. 151-153.

[14]In the epitaph of Myrrhine, priestess of Athena Nike, remark is made that she was named "by divine chance, truly" (ἀπὸ θείας... συντυχίας ἐτύμως). Papademetriou (1948) p. 148 explains that the name comes from μύρτος, and the point is that priestesses (as well as archons, generals, and victors in the games) were crowned with myrtle. He may be correct in pointing to the story of a girl Myrsine turned into a myrtle by Athena (Bassus *Geop.* 11.6) as evidence that there was some particular connection between Athena and myrtle.

[15]See Henderson (1975), pp. 134-5.

[16]Cf. *Eccl.* 523-526, in which Praxagora offers to prove to her husband that she has not been with a lover by showing him that she does not smell of μύρον. To which her husband responds: οὐχὶ βινεῖται γυνὴ κἄνευ μύρου; Praxagora replies οὐ δὴ τάλαιν' ἔγωγε.

Myrrhine with myrrh is present in the scene in *Lysistrata* between Myrrhine and her husband Kinesias, a scene in which Myrrhine stalls her husband each time they seem to be about to have sex by going off to fetch some item she requires; the final items are two different kinds of myrrh (lines 938-947).[17] Thus Myrrhine, the woman who demonstrates the effectiveness of the sex strike, has an appropriate name suggesting female sexual attraction, and she is paired with a male character, representing the affected husbands, whose name (Kinesias) indicates his most dramatically important characteristic, his urgent need to have sex (κινεῖν).

Kinesias is another of the type of name to which Agorakritos (*q.v.*) also belongs, that is, an actual Athenian name in current use, but whose meaning normally would have been understood to be different from the one Aristophanes gives it. Thus Agorakritos meant 'chosen in the agora', but in *Knights* it is said to mean 'arguing in the agora'; it is given a comic etymology, playing upon a secondary meaning of κρινεῖν, for purposes of the play. Likewise Kinesias, in everyday life, meant 'mover', but Aristophanes uses it in *Lysistrata* to take advantage of the secondary obscene meaning of κινεῖν (as the scholia remark). Kinesias further receives the demotic 'Paionides', which emphasizes the obscene meaning of 'Kinesias' by adding another obscene reference, this one to the verb παίειν, which also has the secondary meaning βινεῖν (see LSJ s.v. παίω I. 4.). Henderson translates "Mr. Screw from Bangtown" (note to *Lys.* 852). There are no references or indications in the play which would lead one to think that the character Kinesias was intended to be understood as the dithyrambic poet of that name lampooned at *Av.* 1372 ff; cf. the discussion of Papademetriou (1948) p. 152.

[17]The use of myrrh for sexual attraction in general and in this scene is discussed by Detienne (1977) pp. 61-63.

III. Non-Historical Characters

Whereas historical characters generally of necessity do not have meaningful names, with non-historical characters the comic poet was free to exercise his ingenuity in naming. It is then perhaps not surprising that virtually every non-historical character has a name which is meaningful in one way or another. Excluded from this discussion are gods and mythical persons, and chorus members, who will be treated in separate sections.

The names of characters who are not known to be historical may be divided into two sorts: 1) type-names, and 2) significant names. Type-names are names which, apart from their literal meanings, are associated with a certain type of person. Most of these are slave names; thus a character named Xanthias or Manes is understood to be a slave. There are also some names associated with a particular region; thus a character named Ismenias[1] is understood to be from Thebes (as someone named Billy Joe would be understood by Americans to be from the South). Finally, there are some women's names which seem to be used simply as typical women's names whose meanings are not significant, as Philiste (asked to hold a coat at *Th.* 568) and Mika (one of the women in the crowd at *Th.* 760).

Other names which Aristophanes chooses for non-historical characters are significant in that their literal meaning is appropriate to the character's role in the play. It appears that it did not matter to Aristophanes whether or not the name he chose was actually in use; he could employ a real name, such as Dikaiopolis, if it suited his purpose, or invent a name like Bdelykleon with equal ease. His basic requirement was that the name fit the character.

Some names which may give the appearance of having been invented have turned out to be actual names of people: Dikaiopolis, Amphitheos, Demos, Agorakritos. However, the fact that a name is historically attested does not mean that we should suspect that the character is a portrait. The case of Demos in *Knights* makes it clear that an attested name

[1]The Theban trader who comes to Dikaiopolis' market has an assistant with him named Ismenias (*Ach.* 861), and one of the women whom the women's chorus of Lysistrata mention is Ismenia, Θηβαία (*Lys.* 696).

may easily belong to an invented character. If the name is significant, and there is no other reason to think that the character is historical, he should be considered invented.

A. Type-Names

1. Slave names: Xanthias

The largest category of type-names is formed by slave names. These fall into two kinds in Aristophanes, ethnic or foreign names (Karion, Manes) and names indicating a characteristic (Parmenon, Xanthias), and for the most part the names are not particularly significant except insofar as they show that the character is a slave.

Certainly the most frequent type-name in Aristophanes is the slave name Xanthias. Besides Dionysos' slave Xanthias who plays a major role in *Frogs*, there are slaves called Xanthias in *Acharnians*, *Clouds*, *Wasps*, and *Birds* as well, five in all. According to Athenaeus, slaves named Xanthias appeared in the plays of Kephisodoros and Sotion.[2] The name became practically synonymous with the stage slave; hence we find Aischines referring to an actor as Ξανθίας ὑποκρινόμενος,[3] "playing Xanthiases," meaning that he takes slave roles. Because of the strong association of the name Xanthias with slaves on stage, we might surmise that in real life Xanthias was a very common slave name, and that it was this everyday association which led to stage slaves' being called Xanthias. It is then perhaps surprising to find that Xanthias is very ill-attested as a slave name; there is in fact not a single example to be found in manumission inscriptions.[4] That lack may be compared with the instances of another slave type-name, Sosias, of which there are 17 in Reilly.[5] Pape-Benseler lists only one individual named Xanthias for Attica, the wrestling

[2]Athenaeus 8.336e, 12.553a, 15.689f.

[3]Aeschines 2.157.

[4]See Reilly (1978). Of course most of the inscriptions are not from Athens, or from the 5th century, and it is perhaps possible that the name enjoyed a brief popularity and subsequently fell into disuse.

[5]Reilly (1978) nos. 2656-2672.

teacher mentioned by Plato at *Meno* 94c. Why were there not more slaves named Xanthias?

The answer may lie in the meaning of the name. Ξανθίας is from the color ξανθός, which is brown, ranging from yellow to red-brown. It is generally thought to refer to hair color, and specifically to the red hair of the Thracians.[6] Xanthias, then, is a name much like the English "Red" (or "Rusty"), a nickname given to people with red hair.[7] It would have been an appropriate nickname for any red-headed person, but since most of the redheads in Athens were Thracian slaves, the name became particularly associated with them. Presumably one could address a slave whose name one did not even know as Xanthias, if he had red hair. This situation was ideal for the comic playwright; an actor with a red wig would immediately be recognized as a slave, and naturally addressed as Xanthias. Such convenience perhaps accounts for the popularity of Xanthias as a slave name on the stage.[8]

Other slave names are treated in the section Slaves of this thesis.

2. Regional Names

Twice Aristophanes uses a name which shows simply that the character is from Thebes; Ismenias (*Ach.* 861, the servant of the Theban merchant) and Ismenia (*Lys.* 696,

---

[6]cf. Xenophanes, DK 21 B16, where he says that Thracians have gods with gray eyes and red hair (to look like themselves, is the implication).

[7]Some support for the idea that Xanthias was a nickname is to be found in an article by P.J. Bicknell ("Themistokles' Father and Mother," *Historia* 31 (1982) 172-173). Bicknell's thesis is that the name Xanthias which appears on three ostraka of the 480's refers to Themistokles, who was supposed to have Thracian ancestry. If he is correct, then Xanthias was a nickname of Themistokles; perhaps Themistokles had brown or red hair, inherited from his non-Athenian mother (Plut. Them. 1.4).

[8]The fact that Xanthias was a nickname may explain the dearth of inscriptional evidence for the name; in an official document or inscription the real name of the person would naturally appear, and only a person to whom the nickname had become attached permanently and replaced his given name would be listed as Xanthias. Perhaps this was the case with the wrestling teacher Xanthias (in Plato *Meno* 94c); often people engaged in sports acquire nicknames which stick to them. Cf. Diog. Laert. 3.4, where Plato is said to have acquired the nickname Plato in the wrestling school, and that it replaced his original name, Aristokles (his grandfather's name).

the Theban representative among the young wives). The name is formed on the root 'Ισμην- from the river Ismenos which flows through Thebes, and was a common name in that city. If the Ismenias accompanying the Theban is a slave, as he seems to be, then in this case Aristophanes has left his usual practice of naming slaves typical slave names in favor of giving him a typical regional name instead.

B. Significant Names: Major Characters

Often Aristophanes' major characters have names which form part of a theme in the play. In this category should be included: Dikaiopolis (*Ach.*), Agorakritos (*Eq.*), Strepsiades and Pheidippides (*Nu.*), Philokleon and Bdelykleon (*Ve.*), Trygaios (*Pax*), Peisetairos and Euelpides (*Av.*), Lysistrata and Myrrhine (*Ly.*), and Praxagora (*Ecc.*). Philokleon and Bdelykleon have been discussed in the Kleon section, Lysistrata and Myrrhine in the section on characters of disputed historicity; the others will be treated below.

1. Dikaiopolis

The hero of *Acharnians* reveals his name for the first time at line 406, by shouting it outside Euripides' door: Εὐριπίδη, Εὐριπίδιον,/ ὑπάκουσον, εἴπερ πώποτ' ἀνθρώπων τινί· / Δικαιόπολις καλῶ σ' ὁ Χολλῄδης ἐγώ. The name will be repeated 8 (possibly 9) more times during the play. It happens to be a real name, inscriptionally attested (IG ii^2 1622, line 685), but chosen as appropriate to the character. The name means what it appears to mean, 'Just City', although many (e.g. Murray, Whitman, Sommerstein), evidently feeling ill at ease with calling a person 'city', have rendered it 'Just (or Honest) *Citizen*'.[1] Lowell Edmunds has a useful discussion of the name interpretation:[2]

> "'Dicaeopolis'...is one of 47 personal names ending in -πολις listed in Dornseiff (1957) 191-2. These names, as well as such adjectives as ἄπολις, ὑψίπολις, δικαιόπολις show that the name cannot mean 'Just *Citizen*'. Whether the first element in these -πολις compounds is verbal or adjectival, the second element is always 'city', not 'citizen'. ...the analogies of such personal names as Εὔπολις, Καλλίπολις, Κλεόπολις, Νεόπολις, Ἀγαθόπολις, (in Dornseiff's list) suggests that the first element of 'Dicaeopolis' is adjectival, and that the name means 'He of Just City'."

To Edmunds' treatment I would add that another indication that the name means 'Just City' is that most of the proper names ending in -πολις in Dornseiff (125 out of 182) are in fact place names. If a Greek heard the name 'Dikaiopolis' with no further context, he would most likely understand it as the name of a city; that meaning is quite appropriate to Dikaiopolis' role in the play.

In regard to the late naming of the hero (which is conventional, see section on Late Naming), we may observe that Dikaiopolis in fact cannot properly be called 'Just City' until after he has made the treaty and become his own *polis*. If he were introduced as '(he of) Just City' before that point, the epithet would have to refer to Athens, and would not

[1]"Dicaeopolis, 'the just politician'," Starkie on *Ach.* 561.

[2]Edmunds (1980) p. 1 n. 2. Virtually the same analysis is made by Cyril Bailey (1936) in "Who played 'Dicaeopolis'?" p. 236; however, his ultimate conclusion is that the name refers to Aegina and means 'the Aeginetan', who is Aristophanes himself.

make sense. Dikaiopolis' contention is that Athens has behaved unjustly, every bit as unjustly as Sparta, in carrying on the war (cf. lines 313-314). Since he has been unable to get the Athenians to change their policy, Dikaiopolis 'secedes' from the city and sets himself up as a *polis*--a just *polis*--with the power to make treaties, celebrate public festivals, establish a market and engage in foreign trade. The play is a fantasy based on an individual acquiring powers which in real life only states have,[3] and the nature of the fantasy is encapsulated in Dikaiopolis' name.[4]

There is in this play a theme of justice, of which Dikaiopolis' name forms a part. The idea is perhaps first suggested implicitly in Dikaiopolis' reverie at the opening of the play recalling and longing for peace and its concomitant life in the countryside which he has been obliged to give up for unpleasant city dwelling, because of the war.[5] Dikaiopolis longs for his δῆμος, where no one peddled coal or vinegar or oil (staples of life), but rather the place αὐτὸς ἔφερε πάντα (36). This description of peaceful, flourishing existence recalls the features of Hesiod's city of the just (*Op.* 225-237):

> οἳ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι διδοῦσιν
> ἰθείας καὶ μή τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου,
> τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ' ἀνθέουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ·
> Εἰρήνη δ' ἀνὰ γῆν κουροτρόφος, οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοῖς
> ἀργαλέον πόλεμον τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς·
> οὐδέ ποτ' ἰθυδίκῃσι μετ' ἀνδράσι Λιμὸς ὀπηδεῖ
> οὐδ' Ἄτῃ, θαλίης δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται.
> τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺν βίον, οὔρεσι δὲ δρῦς
> ἄκρη μέν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσση δὲ μελίσσας·
> εἰροπόκοι δ' ὄιες μαλλοῖς καταβεβρίθασιν·
> τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν·

---

[3]The point cannot be too strongly emphasized. Dover (1972) pp. 87-88 and others miss it in characterizing the play as a fantasy of the individual's escape from his responsibilities as a citizen. The individual does not escape responsibility, but takes on the responsibility of being a state.

[4]cf. Edmunds (1980), p. 14: "Since it is useless to be a just citizen in the Athens of Lamachus, Dicaeopolis must become, with his truce (cf. 599) and now with his agora, a city unto himself. He has now taken his own name literally, just as he had done with the names Amphitheos and Lamachus."

[5]For a discussion of the merging of the dichotomy between country and city in this play, see Henrichs (1990), pp. 269-271.

θάλλουσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι διαμπερές· οὐδ' ἐπὶ νηῶν
νίσονται, καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.

These blessings conferred upon the city of the just, that is, freedom from war, and the spontaneous supplying of necessities by the land, are the ones which Dikaiopolis desires. The fact that Athens is not enjoying the blessings of the just implicitly supports Dikaiopolis' argument that Athens itself has behaved unjustly, the argument which he will elaborate in his chopping-block speech. There is an underlying assumption that the good or bad condition of the city as a whole reflects (divine) reward or punishment for the moral actions of its citizens. Peace and justice have a real connection with one another, as Hesiod shows; the just city will have peace, the unjust city will have war. The connection between peace and justice was a natural one for the Greek audience to make, and Aristophanes mingles the two ideas in *Acharnians*, where justice is the cause of peace in a more direct way: the just city should make peace. Dikaiopolis wants peace, which means that he also wants justice, as the two go hand in hand.

Dikaiopolis at the beginning of the play does everything he can within the system to get his fellow citizens to discuss peace. They refuse even to allow it to be mentioned, much less pay Amphitheos' expenses to go to Sparta to get it. When Amphitheos is forcibly ejected from the assembly, Dikaiopolis protests (56-58):

ὦνδρες πρυτάνεις, <u>ἀδικεῖτε</u> τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπάγοντες, ὅστις ἡμῖν ἤθελεν
σπονδὰς ποιεῖσθαι καὶ κρεμάσαι τὰς ἀσπίδας.

An injustice is being done, an offence is being committed against peace, but no one listens to Dikaiopolis' objections. His exposing of the corruption in the Persian embassy earns him a σίγα, κάθιζε from the herald (123, cf. 59), and the last straw comes when the King's Eye is invited to dine in the prytaneion. Dikaiopolis is completely isolated from his fellow citizens in his desire for peace, as Aristophanes has set it up, and he finally realizes that he must act on his own. In his decision at 128 to do 'a great and awesome deed' he is about to declare himself a free agent, and when he gives the eight drachmas to Amphipolis

his instructions are to make peace 'for me...*alone*'. The μόνῳ is very emphatically placed at the end of 131:

> ἐμοὶ σὺ ταυτασὶ λαβὼν ὀκτὼ δραχμὰς
> σπονδὰς ποίησαι πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους μόνῳ.

He then washes his hands of the rest of the citizenry (ὑμεῖς δὲ πρεσβεύεσθε καὶ κεχήνετε, 133) now that he has taken the decision to strike out on his own.

This is the astonishing, fantastic conception of the play, the comic impossibility which the audience must accept, that an individual gets for himself the power of a *polis* to make a treaty. And the daring absurdity of it would have struck the Greeks, so acutely aware of themselves as first and foremost members of a polity, far more forcefully than it strikes us with our modern assumptions about the sanctity of the individual and his inalienable rights.[6] Dikaiopolis' deed really is δεινὸν καὶ μέγα,[7] and ranks in boldness equal to Peisetairos' construction of a new *polis* able to challenge the rule of the gods. No Greek could have missed the point that Dikaiopolis is now acting as a whole *polis* instead of as an individual citizen.[8]

Before Amphitheos can return with the treaty concluded there is one more scene in the assembly; the ambassador Theoros brings in the army of Odomanti from Thrace, who promptly steal Dikaiopolis' garlic. In tragic tones Dikaiopolis laments that he has been 'sacked' (πορθούμενος, 164), choosing a word appropriate to a city, and he complains to

---

[6]For a discussion of the differences in assumptions about the individual and his relationship to the state, see Dover (1974), *Greek Popular Morality* pp. 157-158. "The Greek did not regard himself as having more rights at any given time than the laws of the city into which he was born gave him at that time; these rights could be reduced, for the community was sovereign, and no rights were inalienable," (p. 157).

[7]μέγα sometimes has the sense 'over-great' (LSJ s.v. μέγας A. II. 5), that is, dangerously great, and perhaps some of that sense is inherent in Dikaiopolis' description of his idea. Peisetairos too calls his inspiration μέγα βούλευμα (*Av.* 163).

[8]I do not mean to suggest that this basic concept of the play, the individual acting as *polis*, is carried out with strict logical consistency throughout. It is natural that Dikaiopolis sometimes is treated as an Athenian citizen, but that does not affect the basic comic idea. Strict logical consistency is anathema to Aristophanes.

the prytaneis that they are allowing him to be attacked by barbarians in his own country. The prytaneis do nothing about the outrage on Dikiaopolis, and so his final act while still a citizen of Athens is to dissolve the assembly (the assembly he had been so anxiously awaiting at the outset) with a drop of rain: if he could not persuade the Athenians to act justly and consider peace, at least he can prevent them from the positive injustice of voting pay to the Thracian mercenaries.

Once Dikaiopolis accepts the 30-year treaty, he has completed the just act which validates his name, and the fact that he does enjoy the benefits of peace and prosperity which accrue to the just city demonstrates that he must be just, according to the logic of Hesiod. Stress is put in the rest of the play on the fact that he alone possesses the peace, and on the idea that the benefits of it are enviable. His only obstacle is the Acharnians, outraged because Dikaiopolis μόνος (290) has dared to make peace, whom he must convince of the justice of his action (i. e. that it was done καλῶς, 306, 307) in order to get them to stop attacking him. All he need do is show that the Spartans were not completely in the wrong, but had some legitimate grievance, that they too were ἀδικούμενοι (314). The logic is that, whereas on the Acharnians' assumption that the enemy is the impious aggressor and entirely to blame for the war (ἁπάντων...αἰτίους τῶν πραγμάτων, 310) no agreement with them is possible, if there was in fact any justice on their side, then it is legitimate to compromise with them. Dikaiopolis offers to speak with his head on a chopping block to demonstrate that the things he will say are δίκαια (317). When it comes time to make his defense, he again stresses the justice of what he has to say; comedy too knows τὸ δίκαιον (500), and he will tell things that are δεινὰ μέν, δίκαια δέ (501). After the speech, half the chorus is indeed convinced, and admit that all the things he has said were δίκαια (561). The other half of the chorus interestingly does not say that Dikaiopolis was wrong, they merely say that even if he was right, it was improper for him to make the argument at all (εἶτ' εἰ δίκαια, τοῦτον εἰπεῖν αὖτ' ἐχρῆν; 562). Thus the justice of Dikaiopolis' position is established, and it only remains for him to deal with

Lamachos, which he does in short order, by showing that Lamachos makes more money from the war than the members of the chorus do.

The justice theme is then picked up in the parabasis, where the poet claims the people's gratitude for daring to speak τὰ δίκαια among them (645); he even asserts that the side which has the poet who speaks τὰ δίκαια will win the war (649-651). The just poet makes the citizens just, and this will bring the reward of success.

In recent years there has been a tendency among scholars to take Dikaiopolis' name as problematic and to look for an answer to the question "Why would Aristophanes name a character Dikaiopolis when he behaves selfishly with his peace?" The problem seems to have been suggested by K. J. Dover's analysis of the play in *Aristophanic Comedy* (1972), in which he calls it "a fantasy of total selfishness" (p. 88) and compares Dikaiopolis unfavorably with Trygaios. Although L. Edmunds (1980) rightly points out that Dikaiopolis represents the Just City and warns that Dover is mistaken,[9] the question continues to be asked. MacDowell (1980) feels obliged to defend Dikaiopolis against the charge of selfishness;[10] most recently, E. L. Bowie (1988) has thought the question so problematic that he disposes of it in good nineteenth-century fashion by finding in the name Dikaiopolis a hidden reference to the poet Eupolis. Since Bowie then conveniently summarizes most of the arguments, I quote him here:[11]

> "That Dicaeopolis is chosen as a name to suggest a known individual [Eupolis] relieves us of the embarassing problems that have faced those seeking to interpret it as appropriate to the character's policy or conduct. It was never very plausible that Dicaeopolis suggested 'just city'. The leading character may start off expostulating at the corruption of Athenian politics, but at this stage we do not know that his name is Dicaeopolis, and once he has embarked on his private peace-project his interest in making Athens a just (or juster) *polis* evaporates. The alternative meaning 'he who treats his *polis* justly' is even less of a starter: many now agree that Dicaeopolis' implementation of his peace involves selfish pleonexia, almost a polar opposite of *dikaiosyne* in his dealing with his fellow citizens."

[9]see esp. pp. 28-30 and n. 89.

[10]A rather feeble defense, unfortunately; see section on Derketes of Phyle.

[11]Bowie (1988), pp. 184-5.

The whole problem is based on a stubborn refusal to recognize the basic conception of the play, that Dikaiopolis makes himself into a city, coupled with misunderstanding of the idea of justice. I shall take Bowie's points one by one. First, since there is really no question that the Greek name Dikaiopolis, formed from δίκαιος and πόλις, means 'Just City', it is nonsensical to say that such an understanding of the name was "never very plausible." That is the natural way of understanding the name, and other ways are strained or far-fetched. The name fits in quite plausibly with the theme of justice and peace as described above. The point that, at the time the hero is "expostulating at the corruption of Athenian politics", we do not yet know his name is irrelevant. He is attempting to get the city to behave justly and discuss peace, and the corruption he exposes all has to do with the conduct of the war (not politics in general). Justice here means being fair, admitting that the other side may have a grievance, and so consenting to make an agreement. Aristophanes usually does establish the nature of the main character before revealing his name for the audience to appreciate (see section on Late Naming); that does not invalidate what has been established or make the name less suitable. Dikaiopolis is clearly portrayed as primarily interested in having a just city. The observation that Dikiaopolis stops trying to make Athens behave justly once he has made his own treaty is true, but does not prove that he is in any way unjust. His fellow Athenians have isolated him, refused to listen to him (or anyone who mentions peace), and proven themselves quite incorrigible, all of which is what drove Dikaiopolis to think of his plan of a separate peace. Once he sets up as a *polis*, he is in effect no longer a citizen of Athens, he is a city within a city, like the Vatican within Rome, and Aristophanes is concerned to hold him up as an example of how the just city enjoys peace and prosperity--in contrast to Athens. The Athenians are supposed to envy the Just City for its blessings, and that is exactly what Aristophanes shows them doing in the rest of the play. To object that Dikaiopolis is no longer behaving like a responsible citizen of Athens is to miss the point that he no longer is a citizen of Athens at all. He has no more obligation to share his peace with his ex-fellow citizens than

Peisetairos in *Birds* has to share his power with other Athenians. Both are autonomous, both run their own shows. There is no hint in their portrayal that they are to be understood as behaving unjustly.

The final charge of pleonexia should never have been brought; it is based on modern confusion between justice and generosity. Justice is fairness, it is everyone getting what he deserves. If Dikaiopolis does not, as a good Christian should, forgive the Athenians for their unjust behavior and generously offer a share of his peace to them, that merely says that he is not behaving forgivingly or generously, not that he is unfair. Strict fairness dictates that the Athenians, who refused any share in making the peace, should not enjoy any of its benefits. In fact if Dikaiopolis had behaved as Bowie suggests he should have, the Greek audience would have considered him a fool. The most that Dikaiopolis can be accused of is a degree of selfishness, although it is most improbable that Aristophanes intended that impression, but certainly the charge of pleonexia or greed cannot stick. Greed is attempting to get more than is right, more than one ought to have, and Dikaiopolis does not display greed. He keeps what he is entitled to, namely peace and its benefits, which he paid for at a time when no one else would even consider it, and which he then earned the leisure to enjoy by defeating the Acharnians. For Dikaiopolis to keep his peace for himself is not greed, then, and even if it is selfish, it is not unjust. However, the audience response which Aristophanes encourages is not to see Dikaiopolis as mean and selfish, but to see him as enviable; that response, as often, is cued by the chorus right between the vignettes of Dikaiopolis refusing eels to Lamachus and refusing peace-ointment to Derketes:

> ζηλῶ σε τῆς εὐβουλίας,
> μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς εὐωχίας,
> ἄνθρωπε, τῆς παρούσης (1008-1010).

Now, even scholars who find Dikaiopolis unpleasantly selfish do not seem to expect him to share his peace with Lamachos. Lamachos personifies the ill conditions suffered by those who insist on war, and it would be dramatically unthinkable to share the

peace, in the form of eels or anything else, with him. Only two other parties come in asking for a share of peace, and the third (the bride, represented by the best man and the bridesmaid) does receive some, with Dikaiopolis justifying this exception[12] on the grounds that she is a woman, and hence had no responsibility for the war (1062). The only ground for complaint, then, is that Dikaiopolis does not share his peace with Derketes, the farmer whose two oxen have been stolen. I have treated this scene at length in the section on Derketes of Phyle, but let me restate here the conclusion that Derketes is portrayed as ridiculous rather than especially pitiable, and add that if Dikaiopolis had pitied him and given him some peace, it would have been an act of generosity, not of justice.[13] Justice requires that all Athenians as members of an unjust city suffer the consequences of that city continuing the war; and for them to envy the condition of the Just City, Dikaiopolis, is quite in accord with justice.

One final point which Bowie does not bring up is the comparison Dover made between Dikaiopolis and Trygaios, to Dikaiopolis' disadvantage. Dover says, "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Dikaiopolis does not concern himself even with the interests of his own city, let alone those of the Greek world; in this respect he is strikingly different from Trygaios in *Peace*... It is not easy to read into his behavior the implication that Athens would be a better and safer place if everyone else followed his example..."[14] The comparison is meant to show that the basis of Dikaiopolis' character is fantastic

[12]Note that he says she is the only one to whom he will give peace, 1061 φέρε δεῦρο τὰς σπονδάς, ἵν' αὐτῇ δῶ μόνῃ.

[13]Cf. Dover (1974) p. 198, "Greek forensic practice assumes that pity can motivate decisions contrary to justice."

[14]*Aristophanic Comedy*, pp. 87-88.

selfishness;[15] however, it fails to take into account the different dramatic situations of the two heroes and the difference in the conceptions of the plays. In *Peace*, peace is conceived of as something which the gods have decided to conceal from the Greeks; it requires the cooperation of all the Greeks, in the form of the chorus of Panhellenes, to get it back, and this cooperation is orchestrated by the hero, Trygaios. The assumptions of *Acharnians* are quite different. Peace is conceived of as something the Athenians could easily purchase, which they stubbornly refuse to do; the only way the hero can find to get it is to form his own *polis*. Subsequently Dikaiopolis is naturally concerned with the interests of himself as a *polis* rather than with those of Athens, from which he has seceded, and Aristophanes is interested in contrasting the two cities and making the Athenians envy the blessings of the Just City, shown of course in comic terms of food, drink, and festival. The idea is not that everyone individually should follow Dikaiopolis' example, but that the *polis* as a whole should follow the example of the Just City.

If Dikaiopolis is viewed, true to his name and to the idea of the play, as Just City, then the problem of selfishness, so far from being an embarrassment, simply disappears.[16]

---

[15]see Dover (1963), p. 22: "The dominant element in Dikaiopolis is a selfishness so pure that it exists only in fictional characters... This fantastic selfishness is fully savored when it is denied to an equal, but it may be granted, with lordly caprice, to an inferior, e.g. a woman or a child. The contrast between Dikaiopolis's selfishness and the benevolent international conscience of Trygaios in *Peace* is striking, but lest we draw too hasty conclusions about the development of Aristophanes' own conscience we must remember that *Peace*, composed at a time when the Athenians had turned their minds to peace and performed just before the treaty was formally ratified was a response, not a stimulus, to popular sentiment."

[16]For a defense of Dikaiopolis' selfishness based on his piety within the assumptions of the play, see Edmunds (1980) pp. 28-29. Edmunds compares the justice of Dikaiopolis with that of Sparta, "characterized by a narrow piety, specifically Dionysiac, and by self-interestedness. The primary aim of Dicaeopolis' new order of things, which is founded on the Dionysiac sacrament, is to celebrate the Dionysiac festival. It is to preserve the piety of this order that Dicaeopolis is selfish. His selfishness, in terms of the play, is primarily the result of pious justice, and only an ethic external to the presuppositions of the play can find fault with him" (p. 28). Edmunds probably goes too far in ascribing Dikaiopolis' selfishness at the end of the play to piety (i.e. a desire not to disturb the ritual); there is no ritual being performed, Dikaiopolis is merely preparing to go to the celebration to which he has been summoned, as Lamachos is preparing to go on the campaign to which he has been summoned.

1. b. Dikaiopolis and Aristophanes

Finally, we must attend to the problem of the identification of Dikaiopolis with Aristophanes himself. The occasion for this identification is the presence of two passages in *Acharnians* where Dikaiopolis speaks in the first person singular and says things which are appropriate to the author of the play.[1] The passages are 377-382 (from the chopping-block preface, before Dikaiopolis goes off to get the rags of Telephus) and 496-503 (from Dikaiopolis' harangue to the Acharnians); I give them here for reference:

> αὐτός τ' ἐμαυτὸν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἄπαθον
> ἐπίσταμαι διὰ τὴν πέρυσι κωμῳδίαν.
> εἰσελκύσας γάρ μ' εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον
> διέβαλλε καὶ ψευδῆ κατεγλώττιζέ μου
> κἀκυκλοβόρει κἄπλυνεν, ὥστ' ὀλίγου πάνυ
> ἀπωλόμηνμολυνοπραγμονούμενος. (*Ach.* 377-382)

> μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
> εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν Ἀθηναίοις λέγειν
> μέλλω περὶ τῆς πόλεως, τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν.
> τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οἶδε καὶ τρυγῳδία.
> ἐγὼ δὲ λέξω δεινὰ μέν, δίκαια δέ.
> οὐ γάρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι
> ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω. (*Ach.* 496-503)

Although the comic convention of the chorus or choryphaeus speaking temporarily in the persona of the poet (however peculiar it may seem) is acceptable to scholars because we have three examples of it,[2] the idea that a single character might speak temporarily in the persona of the poet is unacceptable, because we have only two examples of it.[3] Yet it is difficult to see how anyone looking at the play as a whole could seriously maintain that the character Dikaiopolis is a representation of Aristophanes (or Eupolis either, as Bowie will have it). First and foremost, the character is not a comic poet; he is a farmer from a rural

[1]Identification of Dikaiopolis with Aristophanes is asserted e.g. by Edmunds (1980), pp. 9-12, and taken as the basis for an interpretation of the play by H. Foley (1988).

[2]*Ach.* 659-664, *Pax* 759-773, *Nu.* 518-562.

[3]Another very good candidate is Plato com. fr. 107 K, discussion by Bailey (1936) pp. 234-235; see also Aristophanes fr. 488 Kassel-Austin.

deme, and his involvement with the theater has been as a spectator, all of which is made quite clear in the prologue. Nowhere in the play is he supposed to be plying the trade of comic poet. Contrast the treatment of Euripides, who is always shown as a tragedian; likewise Lamachos is a general, Sokrates a philosopher, Kleon a demagogue. Surely it is more difficult to believe that Aristophanes introduced a character who represented a comic poet without making him a comic poet than to believe that the character momentarily speaks for the poet. We know that the audience was prepared to accept that procedure in the case of the parabasis,[4] and given the small number of Old Comedies which we possess and the infrequency of the phenomenon, it is rash to say that these two examples from *Acharnians* are, or were, unique and so require unusual interpretation.[5]

In terms of the principles set forth in this thesis, the identification of Dikaiopolis with a historical person would be completely anomalous. It goes against the principle of introducing historical characters only for parody, as Dikaiopolis is not a burlesque figure; the principle of early introduction of the names of historical characters (the name comes at line 406); and the principle that Aristophanes does not normally use 'disguised' names.[6] Further, the demotic Cholleides given to Dikaiopolis points away from Aristophanes, who was from Kydathenaion.

---

[4]It is noteworthy that the second passage is in the form of a direct address to the audience (ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι 496) precisely in the manner of a parabasis. This type of temporary identification of character with poet must have its origin in early comedy in which author and actor were the same person.

[5]As Edmunds (1980) p. 9 implies: "Although it is hardly unusual for a character in Aristophanic comedy to overstep the boundaries of his role and address the audience directly, these are the only places in extant comedies of Aristophanes in which a character speaks for the poet. Elsewhere this function belongs exclusively to the chorus in the parabasis (cf. however, Ar. fr. 471 K)."

[6]In the exceptional case of the dogs' names in *Wasps*, Labes and Kyon, which are meant to suggest Laches and Kleon, Aristophanes is careful to assist the identification by giving them the proper demotics, Aixoneus and Kydathenaios.

Dover in a brief note has given an idiosyncratic interpretation of the passages, but one which also assumes a kind of temporary identity rather than one sustained throughout the play:

> "...it is remarkable to hear a character in the play using the first person singular in referring not to what had happened to himself in the course of the play but to what had happened to the author or producer. But it is not in the least necessary to interpret "I" as "I, Kallistratos" or "I, Aristophanes"; it is "I, the comic hero" or--looking at the same person from a slightly different standpoint--"I, the comic protagonist"... I would draw attention to the fact that in one type of Aristophanic comedy, exemplified by *Acharnians*, *Peace*, *Birds* and *Lysistrata*, the play revolves around a single "hero" who has the right to speak for Comedy. Aristophanes treats Dikaiopolis as an annual visitor to Athens who got into trouble on the last occasion on which he attempted to δίκαια λέγειν".[7]

I find the idea that Aristophanes would expect the audience to understand Dikaiopolis at this moment as a personification of comedy difficult, an unparalleled abstraction of a character without explanation; at the least it is no easier than supposing that Dikaiopolis speaks for Aristophanes.

In "Who played Dicaeopolis?" (1936) Cyril Bailey[8] suggested that the part of Dikaiopolis was played by Aristophanes, and that this circumstance enters into the play to some degree. Although the suggestion is incapable of proof, it is not impossible, and the arguments used for it are far more sensible than Bowie's arguments that Dikaiopolis represents the comic poet Eupolis.

I note that Bailey is not saying that the character Dikaiopolis *represents* Aristophanes, but just that Aristophanes was playing Dikaiopolis and took the opportunity to 'break character' and speak as himself on occasion. This solution may make the temporary identification of the character with the author easier to accept, but I do not think it is necessary to assume it, especially given the parallel of chorus speaking for author in the parabasis.

---

[7]Dover (1963) p. 15 (on lines 377-378 and 501-502).

[8]Anticipated by Starkie, notes to *Ach.* 377 and 501.

2. Agorakritos

Of all the names of characters in Aristophanes, the name of the Sausage-Seller in *Knights* is revealed latest; not until line 1257, 1110 lines after the character's first entrance, does he give his name, in response to a request from Demos.

ΔΗ: ἐμοὶ δέ γ' ὅ τι σοι τοὔνομ' εἴπ'.
ΑΛ: Ἀγοράκριτος.
ἐν τἀγορᾷ γὰρ κρινόμενος ἐβοσκόμην.
ΔΗ: Ἀγορακρίτῳ τοίνυν ἐμαυτὸν ἐπιτρέπω
καὶ τὸν Παφλαγόνα παραδίδωμι τουτονί. (1257-1259)

The etymology of the name Agorakritos here is an excellent example of the way Aristophanes can take an actual name, normally interpreted as meaning one thing, and give it a second meaning in order to make it significant for a comic character. While most Greek proper names suggested a meaning, based on the roots of their components, the meaning was not rigidly fixed. The name itself does not specify how to understand the components syntactically (in relation to each other) or give a context to show which of the possible meanings of the root is to be chosen. In the case of Agorakritos we have the character actually explaining how his name is to be interpreted for purposes of the play. The name Agorakritos, a normal Greek name, must usually have been understood to mean something like 'chosen (or distinguished) in the agora', but when the Sausage-Seller tells how he got his name, he gives it a different twist. The explanation ἐν τἀγορᾷ γὰρ κρινόμενος ἐβοσκόμην, 'because I was brought up wrangling in the agora' (1258), means that we are to take the root in -κριτος as from the present middle meaning of κρίνω, 'dispute', and not as from the aorist passive κριθείς, 'chosen, distinguished', and shows that the name now means 'arguing in the agora'.[1]

[1]cf. Neil, note to 1257-8: "The -κριτος in names really means 'approved by,' as in Δημόκριτος, Λάκριτος, Θεόκριτος; the derivation given is of course comic, from κρίνομαι, 'quarrel, brawl.' Euripides sometimes refined in a like manner, fr. 521 Μελέαγρε, μελέαν γὰρ ποτ' ἀγρεύεις ἄγραν...The sculptor Agoracritus of Paros, Phidias' favourite pupil, must have been well-known at Athens during this time." If Neil is suggesting that there is some reference to the sculptor here, that is out of the question.

Revelation of the name here is very deliberate; it is given prominence by the explanatory etymology, and the name is then ceremoniously repeated by Demos. At the moment of his final victory and the complete overthrow of Paphlagon, the audience finds out the Sausage-Seller's significant name. (For the phenomenon of late naming, see Chapter 2, Late Naming.) This naming of the protagonist puts the capstone on the agora motif which has been built throughout the play. Aristophanes mocks Kleon's vulgarity by portraying him as a common market vendor, so loud and vulgar that he can be vanquished only by someone even louder and more vulgar than he--another vendor from the agora. The scene of the play is the Pnyx, where Demos lives, which is near the agora; when the two slaves begin to look for their savior, the Sausage-Seller, they see him heading for the agora:

ἀλλ' ὁδὶ προσέρχεται ὥσπερ κατὰ θεὸν εἰς ἀγοράν (146-7).

167: The slaves then offer the Sausage-Seller dominion over "all these things, the agora, the harbors, and the Pnyx," putting the agora first on the list.

181: The Sausage-Seller will certainly succeed, because he is πονηρὸς κἀξ ἀγορᾶς καὶ θρασύς.

218: Furthermore, he has all the qualifications of a popular leader: φωνὴ μιαρά, γέγονας κακῶς, ἀγοραῖος εἶ. The adjective ἀγοραῖος will be used three more times, each time of a deity appropriate to this play.

297: The Sausage-Seller swears by Hermes *Agoraios*, in his duel to outface Paphlagon.

410: Paphlagon vows not to be surpassed in shamelessness, or if he is, never to partake of the sacrifices to Zeus *Agoraios*.

500: The chorus wishes the Sausage-Seller good luck and the protection of Zeus *Agoraios* in his offstage battle against Paphlagon.

636: The Sausage-Seller reports how he invoked the aid of various spirits before beginning his speech, and his final invocation was of the Agora ἐν ᾗ παῖς ὢν ἐπαιδεύθην ἐγώ.

1245: Paphlagon, in his mock-tragic discovery that the oracle predicting his replacement is coming true, asks one final question in hopes that this detail will not match; he asks the Sausage-Seller πότερον ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἠλλαντοπώλεις ἐτεὸν ἢ 'πὶ ταῖς πύλαις;

1257-9: The Sausage-Seller gives his name upon request, and Demos solemnly repeats it.

1335: Demos ceremoniously summons Agorakritos by name: ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ἐλθὲ δεῦρ', Ἀγοράκριτε.

1373-4: The newly enlightened Demos makes some new rules for the future, including this one, that no 'beardless young man' will hang around in the agora (οὐδ' ἀγοράσει γ' ἀγένειος οὐδεὶς ἐν ἀγορᾷ, using a *figura etymologica*).

The name Agorakritos, then, is the culmination of the agora motif which has been recurring throughout the play. We can see from the very late introduction of the name that one should view it as forming part of a theme in the play, rather than looking at occurrences of words related to the name as 'plays' upon it. Here the name is nearly the last in the series, and clearly cannot be played upon by the agora-words preceeding it. The agora theme which includes the name Agorakritos is comparable to the twisting theme which includes the name Strepsiades (in *Clouds*), and the late mention of the name in *Knights* tends to confirm the interpretation of both of these names as parts of themes.

3. Strepsiades

The name of the hero of *Clouds*, Strepsiades, comes from the verb στρέφειν, "turn, twist". While it is a historically attested name, belonging most notably to the wrestler lauded by Pindar in *Isthmian* 7 (and his uncle as well), it is not at all common; in fact, the root στρεψ- in general (including the forms στρεφ- and στροφ-) is very seldom used in Greek names. Kirchner *PA* has only one example, a Strepheneos (Στρεφένεως) of Kydathenaion (4th century). Bechtel *HPG* has two more compounds, Strephekydes and Strepsippidas, with the root as first element, and only two more using it as second element (Eustrophos and Naustrophos, the reverse name to Strepheneos, above). Judging from the compounds with ναῦς and ἵππος, it appears that the root in these names had the causal meaning "turn about" given by LSJ under στρέφω A. I, where we find examples of the verb used with objects such as ἵππους, πηδάλιον, οἴακα. However, in giving the name Strepsiades to the character in *Clouds*, Aristophanes, with his knack for giving a comic interpretation to normal names, makes it refer to the middle/passive meaning of the root, "twist or turn oneself, turn to and fro" (LSJ στρέφω B. I. 1 and II. 1). This middle meaning is emphasized by the use of the root in a short form in which there is no second element to act as object, and by the motif in the play of στρεφ- words which refer to Strepsiades' crookedness. For the ending -δης indicating a type in Aristophanes, see the discussion 'Patronymics in Aristophanes' in this thesis.[1]

LSJ (στρέφω B. II. 1) under the definition "turn or twist about, like a wrestler trying to elude his adversary" give some interesting examples from Plato of the sense of the στρεψ- root implied in our hero's name. At *Phaedrus* 236e, Phaedrus has threatened not

[1]Marzullo (1953) p. 108 is certainly wrong in interpreting this extremely common name suffix as having an elevated tone ("aulica et altisonante") simply because it is used in Homer, and in attempting to find humor in the supposed contrast of attaching a -δης name to a rustic like Strepsiades. Dover quite rightly protests, "There was certainly no social cachet attached to -(ι)αδης and -(ε)ιδης," (*Clouds* p. xxvi).

to report any more speeches to Socrates if he refuses to give his speech on Eros; Socrates playfully admits that Phaedrus has found the right way to force him to speak, to which Phaedrus replies impatiently τί δῆτα ἔχων στρέφῃ; "So why do you keep trying to wriggle out of it?"

Another illuminating example is to be found at *Republic* 405c , the person who spends his life in the lawcourts, ὡς δεινὸς ὢν περὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν καὶ ἱκανὸς πάσας μὲν στροφὰς στρέφεσθαι, πάσας δὲ διεξόδους διεξελθὼν ἀποστραφῆναι λυγιζόμενος, ὥστε μὴ παρασχεῖν δίκην, "as being clever about doing injustice and able to twist every twist and, exiting every exit, to escape by dodging so as not to render justice." Here the verb is used of a person making every attempt to avoid receiving his just deserts in court, exactly what Strepsiades is trying to achieve throughout the play.

In his "Strepsiade,"[2] B. Marzullo produces a collection of 13 passages in the *Clouds* where he finds echoes (or foreshadowing) of Strepsiades' name; many of these are merely fanciful,[3] as we shall see, but those which remain do demonstrate that there is a theme of twisting in the play, of which Strepsiades' name forms a part. It is more useful to look at the passages in this way, as forming a theme which includes the name, than to attempt (with Marzullo) to find actual references to or word plays on the name everywhere. For one thing, the name Strepsiades is not mentioned until line 134, and it is not reasonable

[2]Marzullo (1953), pp. 99-123.

[3]Dover (*Clouds* xxv n.1) says, without going into specifics, "I do not think that all his conclusions are defensible."

to think that Aristophanes can actually be playing upon the name at any point in the play before the audience knows what it is.[4]

The first verbal reference to the twisting theme comes at line 36; Pheidippides wakes up and asks his father τί δυσκολαίνεις καὶ στρέφει τὴν νύχθ' ὅλην; His son's debts have caused Strepsiades to spend the night tossing and turning in bed; they next make him try to find a way to twist or "wriggle' out of them, and we shall find him tossing and turning in another bed, in Socrates' school, in his attempt to learn the technique of στρεψοδικῆσαι.[5]

434 στρεψοδικῆσαι: here we have the next instance of the twisting theme. The Chorus has told Strepsiades that no one will carry more motions in the assembly than he,

[4]Marzullo (p. 116) finds some 'foreshadowing' of Strepsiades' name in the triple use of the verb ἐλαύνειν in lines 25-29; his interpretation is apparently based on the scholiast's paraphrase of πολλοὺς τὸν πατέρ' ἐλαύνεις δρόμους (29) as "στρέφεσθαί με ποιεῖς, ἤγουν πολλὰς στροφὰς φροντίδων διεγείρεις." If Aristophanes had written either of the latter, then there would be some case to be made for reference to the twisting theme, but as they stand the lines refer to horseracing, Pheidippides' passion; the verb ἐλαύνειν simply means 'drive'. Likewise to be rejected is Marzullo's next example, ἐξαλίσας in line 32. Pheidippides in his dream speaks to the groom, ἄπαγε τὸν ἵππον ἐξαλίσας οἴκαδε, "roll the horse and take him home." The technical term for rolling shows how involved Pheidippides is with his horses, but since it has neither any στρεφ- root nor is there in the vicinity any reference to Strepsiades, it can hardly have any place in the theme of twisting.

[5]In lines 40 and 88 the manuscripts have, for the words in τρεψ-, variants spelled στρεψ- (40 τρέψεται/στρέψεται V; 88 ἔκτρεψον E/ ἔκστρεψον cett.), which Marzullo finds significant. In both cases Dover, on the basis of meaning and usage, prints τρεψ-; however, even if one did read στρεψ-, the twisting of Strepsiades is really not the point here; he is speaking about or to Pheidippides, not himself, and since we do not yet know what his name is, it is difficult to see how he can be using his name "come esempio, come motto," as Marzullo will have it (p. 118).

Next in Marzullo's list is στρεπταιγλᾶν in line 335, a word which seems to mean "with twisted rays" (i.e. lightning), and is part of a list of references to clouds in lyric poetry which Strepsiades produces upon being convinced by Socrates that the Clouds are indeed deities. The word is used as part of a typical parody of lyric, and not an attempt to draw the Clouds into the twisting theme; it is Strepsiades, not they, who does the twisting in this play. Marzullo's assertion (p. 118) that the word has special significance or prominence here because it is not to be found in *Pax* 830 ff. or *Av.* 1383 is nonsense, as the two passages are not at all similar to *Nu.* 335 (certainly not "la stessa citazione").

if he studies with them; Strepsiades replies that he is not interested in motions, ἀλλ' ὅσ' ἐμαυτῷ στρεψοδικῆσαι καὶ τοὺς χρήστας διολισθεῖν. Strepsiades emphasizes over and over that his only interest is in learning to pervert justice, in consonance with his name. Dover remarks (*Clouds* p. 156), "Probably not chosen or coined solely to fit Strepsiades' name; it recurs in *Av.* 1468 στρεψοδικοπανουργία." This seems to be a grudging admission that the word does fit Strepsiades' name; it is not clear to me what Dover means by 'solely'. Of course the word also has a meaning which fits the sense of the passage, but it would be rather strange if it did not.[6]

702 σαυτὸν στρόβει πυκνώσας: the chorus urges Strepsiades, in bed with the bedbugs, to exert himself; this is certainly an example of the twisting motif which will be expanded and emphasized in a physical way as Strepsiades continues to twist and turn in the bed, attempting to invent clever stratagems and avoid the bedbugs. The scene is an example of Aristophanes' ability to take a verbal, metaphorical expression and give it physical reality on the stage;[7] Strepsiades, 'Mr. Devious', learns to στρεψοδικῆσαι by literally twisting himself about in bed.

776 ὅπως ἀποστρέψαι' ἄν: Socrates, in his final hypothetical problem for Strepsiades, asks him how he would 'wriggle out of it' if he were sued for money he owed and had no witnesses. Strepsiades displays his ineptitude at *strepsodikia* by replying that he would go hang himself, since no one will sue a dead man. This is surely another example of the twisting motif which is prominent in this scene.

792 ἀπὸ γὰρ ἀλοῦμαι μὴ μαθὼν γλωττοστροφεῖν· Socrates has dismissed Strepsiades as a hopeless student, and now Strepsiades wails that he is done for, since he

---

[6]450 στρόφις: Strepsiades lists all the things he is willing to be called, as long as he learns unjust rhetoric (θρασύς, εὔγλωττος, etc); there are 22 items in the list, and στρόφις is number 20. Thus it has no special prominence in the passage, and although the epithet is appropriate, I doubt that this is a conscious usage of the twisting motif on Aristophanes' part.

[7]One thinks of e.g. the σπονδαί appearing as actual skins of wine in *Acharnians*.

hasn't learned 'tongue-twisting'. This is the final appearance of the twisting motif in the bed scene; Strepsiades has not reached the goal suggested by his name.

1206 Στρεψίαδες: in his premature victory hymn, Strepsiades addresses himself using the vocative form Στρεψίαδες, instead of the correct form Στρεψιάδη, and no satisfactory explanation has yet been put forth. Dover (Clouds p. 238) rightly rejects the scholiast's notion that Strepsiades is being characterized as ignorant by his use of the wrong form; he continues, "The explanation of B. Marzullo, *Maia* vi [1953] 99 ff., that Ar. makes Strepsiades bring out the aptness of his name by treating it 'adjectivally', seems to me too recherché." However, Dover's own idea that "Strepsiades is under the impression that abnormal morphology makes his utterance poetic" also seems recherché; one would like to see more botched poeticism in the song than this to be sure that is the point. Perhaps yet another explanation will not be unwelcome. Earlier in the play (lines 659-692) there was a discussion in which Socrates attempted to teach Strepsiades something about the gender of Greek nouns; during this discussion, he made the point that some men's names sound feminine when put into the vocative (Ἀμυνίας, voc. Ἀμυνία, lines 689-691). It is possible that Strepsiades is displaying how σοφός (line 1207) he is by pointedly avoiding the feminine-sounding vocative Στρεψιάδη, in accordance with what he learned from Socrates earlier. Although this explanation involves a contradiction of the idea that Strepsiades forgets everything he tries to learn, that is not the sort of inconsistency which would have bothered Aristophanes. In fact, in the following scenes with the creditors, Strepsiades shows that he does remember something of what he learned from Socrates; significantly for our passage, he tells the first creditor that he wouldn't give one obol to someone who calls τὴν καρδόπην "κάρδοπον" (line 1251). Ἡ κάρδοπος was one of Socrates' examples in the gender discussion, and Strepsiades does remember it. He may also in 1206 be remembering Κλεονύμη and Ἀμυνία from that discussion, and cleverly avoiding calling himself a woman. The sense could have been conveyed by the actor

pausing before the last syllable of the vocative: μάκαρ ὦ Στρεψία-- (the audience expects -δη)--δες!

1455 στρέψας σεαυτὸν εἰς πονηρὰ πράγματα: The chorus of clouds, accused by Strepsiades of leading him astray, replies severely that his trouble is all his own fault because he 'turned' himself to evil. This is the last occurrence of the twisting motif and seems quite emphatic, the 'final echo' as Marzullo says (p. 124) of Strepsiades' name; Dover takes no notice of it.

The seven instances accepted above suffice to demonstrate that there is a motif in the play involving στρέφειν and its derivatives. To the list I would add the three places where Strepsiades name is mentioned (134, 1145, 1221), simply because at these points the audience is reminded of what the name is; they contribute to the cumulative effect of the recurring motif.

4. Pheidippides

The elaborate explanation made in the play of how the name Pheidippides came to be given to the character is unique in Aristophanes. In *Clouds* 60-67, Strepsiades describes how he and his wife argued over what to name their son; the wife wanted a name with ἵππ- in it, a root with upper-class and wealthy connotations, while Strepsiades was for naming the boy Pheidonides after his grandfather Pheidon (cf. line 134), a root (φειδ-) denoting the thrift characteristic of farmers like Strepsiades himself. The argument over the name shows that right from the start the two parents had opposing views on raising the boy, with the mother intending to encourage him to cultivate expensive tastes, and the father wishing him to be rustic and thrifty. The name upon which they agree, Pheidippides, in this context then means "thrifty with horses," an idea which encapsulates the impossibility of the parents' compromise. Horses were an expensive hobby, and the 'horse' element completely won out over the 'thrift' element in Pheidippides upbringing, as Strepsiades ruefully recounts (lines 69-74).

Although the name Pheidippides may seem tailor-made by Aristophanes to suit his play, in fact it is a historically attested name (inscriptional evidence given by Dover, *Clouds* xxv), as well as being, in the better manuscripts of Herodotus, the name of the long-distance runner who ran from Athens to Sparta to inform the Spartans of the impending battle of Marathon (Hdt. 6. 105-6).[1] The root φειδ- in Greek names may act as either a first or second element, but names compounded with it are not very numerous (Bechtel, *HPG* finds 8 different first-element compounds and 6 different second-element compounds, pp. 443-4). The name Pheidippos is very old, appearing in *Iliad* 2.678 (the son of Thessalos, son of Herakles). Presumably the meaning of the root φειδ- (from

[1]The other variant is Philippides, which How and Wells print, on the grounds that Pheidippides is a name invented by Aristophanes--not true, as we have seen. Probably the runner's name was Pheidippides, an unusual name easily corrupted to the much more common Philippides. Paleographically the two words are very similar. For a discussion of this problem see R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1969, pp. 68-69.

φείδεσθαι) in these names was "sparing, being careful with" (cf. LSJ s.v. I and II.1); thus Pheidippos would have meant "taking good care of horses".[2] In the *Clouds* it is Aristophanes' introduction of the idea of thrift which gives the name Pheidippides the comic, paradoxical meaning "thrifty with horses."[3]

Because the name is historical, Dover refuses to allow it any comic sense, and therein overlooks Aristophanes' ability to put a new twist on a familiar name. He says that the name is not "intrinsically humorous," and goes on to assert that "the passage in which Strepsiades describes his argument with his wife over the naming of their son is characterized by wit and ingenuity, not by absurdity; it is their attitude to the naming, not its outcome, which is meant to amuse us."[4] But the name, which indeed is not intrinsically humorous in everyday life, does have a humorous meaning in the play; after Strepsiades and his wife finish 're-inventing' it, a new interpretation has been created.[5] The outcome of the naming *is* absurd, then, and demonstrates the impossibility of the parents' reaching a true compromise on the way their son is to be raised. The middle ground is merely an oxymoron; there is no way that Pheidippides can be thrifty and keep horses at the same time, and as we see from the beginning of the play, the second element of his name has completely won out over the first.

---

[2]For an interesting discussion of the historical development of the meaning of the name from the pre-Homeric "doing without horses" to later "careful with horses", see O. Panagl, (1983), pp. 297-306.

[3]I do not understand why K. Lever (1953) renders Pheidippides as "the Horse-Wastrel" (p. 221). Although this term describes Pheidippides' character, it does not translate his name. 'Wastrel' is the very opposite of φείδων.

[4]*Clouds*, pp. xxv-xxvi.

[5]Grasberger (1883), p. 35, suggests that Pheidippides may belong to the group of words which use *hipp-* in an obscene sense ('horseback riding' as a σχῆμα συνουσίας, cf. *Ve.* 500-502). He does not, however, offer any explanation or interpretation, and I doubt that any would be convincing.

5. Trygaios

One major component of Greek farming was raising grapes, a subject on which Hesiod advises in *Op.* 564-572, and 609-617. The passage between these sections, on relaxing in the summer to enjoy the wine (*Op.* 582-596), is unique in Hesiod in describing the pleasures, as opposed to the chores, of farming life. Among Aristophanes' farmer-heroes, Trygaios in *Peace* most represents the farmer in his function of grape grower.[1] Both Trygaios' name and various other references to grapes throughout the play form a motif of grape farming in *Peace*, perhaps especially appropriate because of the connection of wine with peace treaties (the σπονδαί so graphically brought onstage as wineskins in *Acharnians.*).

The name Trygaios (Τρυγαῖος) is, as the scholiast remarks, παρὰ τὸ τρυγᾶν,[2] a verb meaning 'to harvest,' and is used since Homer to refer particularly to harvesting grapes.[3]

The name would also have held, for a Greek ear, a suggestion of two related nouns, τρύγη, vintage, and τρύξ, wine-must or wine-lees.[4] Trygaios himself emphasizes the meaning of his name in an exchange with Hermes, who meets him at the door after his flight to heaven. Some suspense is generated, before Trygaios reveals his name, by a joke; upon seeing Trygaios, Hermes twice calls him "μιαρώτατε," which causes Trygaios to reply to Hermes' questions about his identity with the name "Μιαρώτατος". Three times

[1]Dikaiopolis in *Ach.* mentions his vines, the only concrete reference to his activity as a farmer: ἐγὼ δὲ μισῶ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους σφόδρα... κἀμοὶ γάρ ἐστι τἀμπέλια κεκομμένα (lines 509 & 512).

[2]Σ^{R} to *Pax* 190.

[3]Il. 18.566 ὅτε τρυγόωεν ἀλωήν (here a vineyard); Od. 7.124 ἑτέρας [σταφυλὰς] τρυγόωσιν; and see LSJ s.v. τρυγάω II. 1-2.

[4]In fact, perhaps the nouns would have been uppermost in the minds of the hearers (rather than the verb), since the formation -αιος is adjectival; compare e.g. a name like Ἀλκαῖος, from ἀλκή (used as an adjective by Euripides, *Hel.* 1152), or Ὀμφακαῖος, from ὄμφαξ (Dornseiff-Hansen p. 224).

Hermes asks, first who he is, next of what race, and then who his father is, and each time receives the answer "Μιαρώτατος" (lines 184-187). Finally, after a threat from Hermes, Trygaios announces himself:

> Τρυγαῖος Ἀθμονεύς, ἀμπελουργὸς δεξιός,
> οὐ συκοφάντης οὐδ' ἐραστὴς πραγμάτων (190-191).

As is often the case with the names of Aristophanes' heroes, the name has been withheld, not mentioned at the opening of the play (although it easily could have been by the two prologue slaves), to be brought out with a flourish later on. Trygaios points up the meaning of his name by characterizing himself as ἀμπελουργὸς δεξιός; the fact that he is a grape farmer leads naturally to his further statement that he is not an informer or a lover of πράγματα. Aristophanes characterizes his farmers as people who prefer to mind their own business, and to spend their time living and working in the country, untroubled by the activities of city folk such as political gatherings, lawsuits, and war. Trygaios is the same sort of farmer-hero as Dikaiopolis, who also hated informers and busybodies, as well as the Spartans who had cut down his vines (*Ach.* 512).[5] Farmers had the most to lose from the war, and are naturally depicted as most anxious to see it end.

Trygaios' name in line 190 introduces a theme of grape growing which recurs throughout the play. At line 520, after the farmers have hauled Peace out, Trygaios addresses her with "ὦ πότνια βοτρυόδωρε", and in the next line wishes he had a ῥῆμα μυριάμφορον for her. A little further on (530-538), he lists the things Peace smells of, which include a τρύγοιπος (wine straining cloth; note the τρυγ- root) as well as a drunken woman slave and an overturned jug. Once the farmers have leave to go home, they express a desire to see two things: their vines and their fig trees (556-559).[6] Then, looking at the farmers' implements, Trygaios remarks that they could weed between the

[5]Having the vines cut down is in fact the only reason Dikaiopolis gives for hating the Spartans.

[6]Vines and figs seem to form a pair; cf. lines 596-7, 634, 1161-1166, and 1323-1324. The vines or wine always comes first, followed by the figs. There is a different series (figs-myrtle-new wine) at 575-576. Trygaios mentions his fig tree alone at 628.

vine rows well with them (568 ἦ καλῶς αὐτῶν ἀπαλλάξειεν ἂν μετόρχιον). He goes on to list the blessings which they owe to Peace, including ἡ τρύξ ἡ γλυκεία (576, another τρυγ- root). The theme is picked up in Hermes' speech describing Pericles' instigation of the war (603-614); the beginning of the war draws a reaction from vines and wine-jars (611-612); (the Spartans' smashing of wine jars is also brought up in a joke at 703). At 708, when Hermes is offering to give Opora to Trygaios as a wife, he tells Trygaios to engender grapes with her (instead of the expected children) as offspring (ταύτῃ ξυνοικῶν ἐκποιοῦ σαυτῷ βότρυς). Then at 909-919 Trygaios introduces himself by name a second time, a procedure unparalleled in any other play, giving unusual prominence to the thematic name. The second introduction (919) is led up to by two more vine references, both made by Trygaios, one containing yet another τρυγ- root. The chorus praise Trygaios (909-911), to which he replies that they will know better what sort he is when they harvest the grapes (ὅταν τρυγᾶτ' 912); the chorus praise him again as savior, and he says that they will indeed say so when they drink the new wine (916). It is in answer to the third tribute from the chorus that Trygaios brings in his own name again:

> πολλῶν γὰρ ὑμῖν ἄξιος
> Τρυγαῖος Ἀθμονεὺς ἐγώ,
> δεινῶν ἀπαλλάξας πόνων
> τὸν δημότην
> καὶ τὸν γεωργικὸν λεών (918-921).

Trygaios is demonstrating that his name is a significant one; he is the person who has enabled the farmers to harvest their grapes, τρυγᾶν, by bringing about peace.

The final play upon Trygaios' name comes in the wedding song at the very end of the play; the first semichorus asks about the bride "τί δράσομεν αὐτήν; τί δράσομεν αὐτήν;" to which the second semichorus responds "τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν, τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν" (1336-1339); the consummation of the nuptials is put it terms of harvesting grapes. Trygaios' marriage is to the personified abstraction Opora, 'Harvest Fruits', and his name and its use as a theme of the play give him a certain quality of abstraction as well. He represents the farmers, while still possessing the qualities of the individual hero; he is not

identified with them to the extent that Demos in *Knights* is identified with the Athenian people--but then his name is not Γεωργός, either. Trygaios' name puts him on a plane somewhere between individual and abstraction.

6. 'Peisthetairos'

The name of the hero of *Birds* appears in the manuscripts as 'Peisthetairos' (Πεισθέταιρος), a form which must be rejected because it posits a root πειστ- (from πείθειν) which does not exist, and there is no discernible reason why Aristophanes should have altered the root in such a way. Πεισθέταιρος "widerspricht den Gesetzen der Wortbildung und entbehrt aller Analogie," as Kock puts it.[1] The name must have been Πειθ-, Πεισ-, or Πισθέταιρος; these are the forms of πείθειν used to make names. Which should it be? Coulon, with Meineke, prints Πισθέταιρος. Kock dismisses Πισθ- as not being in accord with the character (following Dobree); he says Πεισ- is possible but prefers Πειθ- on paleographical grounds. Sommerstein prints Πεισ-, with no explanation. If we look to historical attestation, we find only one of these forms in inscriptions: Πισθέταιρος Ἀθμονεύς (Kirchner *PA11820*, from *PA* 11829 'Πιστοκλῆς Πισθεταίρου Ἀθμονεύς', II 1723 tit. sep. s. IV; Bechtel *HPG* says 5th c.).[2] However, the historical evidence is not decisive here; Aristophanes makes names to suit his characters, without regard for whether anyone has ever borne the name before (or even whether the name is possible, cf. 'Bdelykleon'). All three variations are possible as real names; the question then remains, which one best fits the character?

If we take Πιστ- to mean trusty (i.e. πιστός) and Πειθ-/Πεισ- to mean persuading (i.e. πείθων), we must ask which is more suited to the character, 'trusty companion' or 'persuasive of companions'? Is there a theme of trustworthiness or of persuasion to which we may turn? A word search of Aristophanes' plays for words from any form of the root πειθ- shows that *Birds* has a relatively large number of these words, second only to

[1]Kock (1864), note to *Dramatis Personae* of *Birds* (p. 50), perhaps the best short discussion of the problem.

[2]Clearly the root πιστ- was hereditary in this family, as we can see by the fact that the father Πισθέταιρος named his son Πιστοκλῆς, and was probably not chosen for its meaning in the compound.

Clouds.[3] There does appear to be some emphasis put on P's persuasiveness. P. is the consummate Athenian, possessing the typical Athenian character described in Thucydides I. 70 (the speech of the Corinthians); the Athenians are νεωτεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐπινοῆσαι ὀξεῖς καὶ ἐπιτελέσαι ἔργῳ ἃ ἂν γνῶσιν (I. 70. 2).[4] P. is portrayed as adventurous, resourceful, versatile, and perhaps most important, persuasive.[5] And his role requires him to do much more persuading than the average comic hero. Before the play, as it were, he persuaded Euelpides to go along with him on his mission to discover Tereus and a more leisurely place than Athens to live.[6] Finding himself in foreign territory, surrounded by a hostile army of birds, he manages to persuade Tereus and the birds to undertake his spur-of-the-moment plan (he is νεωτεροποιός) to build a bird empire, and to undertake it enthusiastically. Even in the iambic scenes[7] where the hero drives off various people who come in asking for something (in *Birds*, lines 1337-1469), P. attempts to use persuasion on the young man and on the informer, and actually does get the young man to agree to fight in Thrace instead of beating his father; the informer, however, is incorrigible. Finally, he persuades the delegation of gods from blockaded Olympus to agree to all his terms and to hand over the scepter of Zeus and Basileia to boot. P. is portrayed as a

---

[3] Number of occurrences per play, in order of frequency: *Nu.* 32, *Av.* 22, *Ve.* 20, *Ra.* 16, *Lys.* 13, *Plu.* 11, *Eq.* 10, *Thes.* 10, *Eccl.* 10, *Pax* 7, *Ach.* 6.

[4]The Athenians are also described as ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐελπίδες, 'optimistic', like Euelpides, P's companion (Thuc. I. 70. 3).

[5] cf. C. Whitman (1964), p. 170: "Peithetairus, "Companion-persuader" (if that is the right form), certainly implies the suspicious powers of rhetoric and guile."

[6]Euelpides momentarily regrets his decision to go along and blames P., lines 339-40: αἴτιος μέντοι σὺ νῷν εἶ τῶν κακῶν τούτων μόνος./ ἐπὶ τί γάρ μ' ἐκεῖθεν ἦγες;

[7]I refer to the second set of iambic scenes. The first one, 904-1057, is the series of professional men who want to sell their services to P.: the dithyrambic poet, the oracle-monger, Meton the geometer, the episkopos, and the decree-seller. P. does not try to reason with any of these. It is interesting that the first man in the series, the poet, actually receives the clothing he asks for and is not driven off with blows; likewise the first in the second series, the young man, receives decent treatment.

fantastically successful speaker, one who can talk anyone into anything, mostly by the very effective method of appealing to the listener's self-interest.

In view of this characterization of P., it is probable that Aristophanes named him Πειθ- or Πεισέταιρος, rather than Πισθέταιρος, as it is his persuasiveness, not his trustworthiness, which is at issue. There is little to choose between Πεισ- and Πειθ-: both are used in Attic name formation; we find Athenians named e.g. both Πείσανδρος (*PA* 11768) and Πείθανδρος (*PA* 11755). It is difficult to make a choice on paleographical grounds; perhaps the theta makes the fact that the second element is aspirated (i.e. from ἑταῖρος) more obvious, and may have been added later for that reason. Let us call him, then, Peisetairos.[8] Introduction of P's name does not come until quite far into the play (line 644), when we also learn Euelpides' name. The only character who waits longer for a name is Agorakritos, the sausage-seller of *Knights*, first named in line 1257 (see section on Late Naming). P's name will be mentioned again four times in the course of the last half of the play (1046, 1123, 1271, 1495). As in the case of Agorakritos, P. is asked for his name after he has won a significant victory: once he has won over the birds to his plan, Tereus invites him in and asks his name. There is thus a degree of ceremony attached to his naming which has the effect of emphasizing it.

[8]As does E. Fraenkel (1962), p. 61 (spelling it 'Peishetairos').

7. Euelpides

At *Birds* 643, the Hoopoe Tereus invites the two Athenians in and asks them their names, and it is at this point that the audience first learns that the hero's name is Peisetairos and his companion's is Euelpides. The name Euelpides is possible as a real name (i. e. both εὖ and ἐλπι- are used as elements of names), although it does not happen to be attested for the fifth century. However, no personal satire can be intended here; neither the characterization nor the late introduction of the name would lead one to suspect any. The name is significant, and another example of Aristophanes' fondness for the name-ending -δης to indicate a type (see section on Patronymics).

In Thucydides I. 70, the Corinthians' speech, we find the Athenians described as, among other things, ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐέλπιδες; in perilous situations, they are optimistic about the outcome. Euelpides' name is suggestive of this typical Athenian characteristic. The name is wrongly interpreted by Whitman:[1] "Euelpides, 'McHopeful,' suggests naiveté, if not exactly innocence. One might justifiably regard these two [Peisetairos and Euelpides], perhaps, as two familiar aspects of Athenian character, cleverness and gullibility, but in fact these possibilities are not dramatically exploited, for Euelpides is not duped."

In calling the Athenians εὐέλπιδες, the Corinthians are not saying that they are naive or gullible; rather, they are stressing the positive qualities in which the Athenians are superior to the Spartans. "Confident" would be a good translation. Ἐλπίς is more than just hope, it is expectation. People who are εὐέλπιδες have good expectations, that is, confidence. In the introduction of the name Euelpides there may be a reference to the behavior of the character in the previous scene; whenever Peisetairos mentions a feature of bird-rule, Euelpides plans to turn it to his own advantage. The birds will peck out the eyes of the cattle, so Euelpides is going to sell his oxen first (595); the birds will inform

[1]Whitman (1964), p. 170.

merchants of the good and bad times to sail, so Euelpides is going to buy a ship (598); the birds will reveal where treasure is buried, so Euelpides is going to sell his ship (!) and buy a pickaxe (602). He sees a prosperous future for himself in the new order, and ends by exclaiming αἰβοῖ, πολλῷ κρείττους οὗτοι τοῦ Διὸς ἡμῖν βασιλεύειν (610). It is perhaps as a representative of this Athenian spirit of optimism and confidence that he is named, as a suitable companion to the inventive and persuasive Peisetairos. We may further note that, in accord with the idea of 'expecting' in his name, Euelpides' role is only important to the first half of the play, during the conception and planning of Nephelokokkygia; once the city begins to be built, Euelpides has nothing more to do, and is sent off on an errand at line 846 never to return.

When introduced, Euelpides was also given a demotic Κριῶθεν 'from the deme Krioa' (645). Aristophanes was not under any obligation to supply a character with a demotic (Peisetairos, for example, does not have one) and it is not out of place to wonder why Euelpides is said to be from Krioa, although it may not be possible to answer the question. Most commentators merely remark that the location of the deme is unknown, which is true; Whitehead (1986, p. 333) lists this demotic among those which are appropriate to the character for the rather vague reason that they are rural, although there is nothing particularly rural about Euelpides. It is probable that the deme Krioa called up some association which we cannot recover, perhaps having to do with κριός, "ram", from which the name comes. The κριός seems to have been proverbial for ingratitude (cf. LSJ s.v. I. 1.), but it may have also suggested some other quality more appropriate to Euelpides' character.[2] Editors do note the apparent inconsistency in Euelpides belonging to the deme Krioa at line 645 when at line 496 he seems to say he lives in Halimous (κἀγὼ νομίσας ὄρθρον ἐχώρουν Ἁλιμουντάδε). Whitehead (*Demes of Attica* p. 333 n. 40) explains that a person could reside in a deme to which he did not officially belong.

[2]Van Leeuwen on *Av.* 645 engages in some unsatisfactory speculation, but is also unable to find an explanation for the demotic.

However, perhaps when Euelpides in telling the story of being robbed says he set out Ἁλιμουντάδε, "in the direction of Halimous," he is giving the direction he went rather than his ultimate destination. He sets the scene for the audience: ἐχώρουν Ἁλιμουντάδε· κἄρτι προκύπτω ἔξω τείχους... The information that he was leaving on the road to Halimous, which ran south from Athens, tells the audience which gate in the city wall he was poking his head out of when he was hit by the robber.

Another inconsistency in identifying Euelpides has caused more difficulty. At *Birds* 139, Euelpides[3] in speaking of the kind of city he wishes to live in, says that in it the father of a youth would reproach him for not making advances to his son; the hypothetical father addresses Euelpides as 'Στιλβωνίδης'.[4] Sommerstein translates 'old sparkler', from στίλβειν, "gleam, sparkle," and does not capitalize, treating it as "an appellation rather than a name" (as did Coulon; Van Daele translates "*flambard*"). However, it is a possible historical name; the very similar name Στιλβίδης belonged to a well-known seer of the time (mentioned at *Peace* 1032). It is difficult to say with certainty that the audience would have understood Stilbonides as only an appellation rather than as a true proper name. In Old Comedy there is often very little difference. However, to argue as Sommerstein does that "the audience cannot be meant to understand it as the speaker's real name, since otherwise they would be confused when his name was given later on (645) as Euelpides" is to beg the question. When the audience hears the name Stilbonides, they do not know that later on the speaker will be identified as Euelpides, so they cannot deduce that Stilbonides is an appellation and thus save themselves from confusion.

Dover (note to *Clouds* 134) remarks that "in *Av.* the names of Peisetairos and Euelpides are first given in 644 f., and if we had cared at all what their names were we

[3]Most editors attribute these lines to Peisetairos, but see Fraenkel (1962), p. 64, whose argument for giving them to Euelpides is surely correct, followed by Sommerstein in his line assignment.

[4]καλῶς γέ μου τὸν υἱόν, ὦ Στιλβωνίδη,/ εὑρὼν ἀπιόντ' ἀπὸ γυμνασίου λελουμένον/ οὐκ ἔκυσας... (*Av.* 139-141).

should have thought ever since 139 that Peisetairos' name was 'Stilbonides'.[5] It would seem that Ar. does not mean us to care..." Perhaps too severely stated, but it may be true that, while listening to Euelpides' fantasy, the audience is not meant to attach importance to the name as being that of the character. He is making up a hypothetical situation, and using a hypothetical name in it. The name looks as if it should have some significance in the context, but exactly what the significance is remains obscure. There is a reference in Athenaeus (12. 518 F) to the word στίλπων as designating some kind of dwarf, but that does not seem to be in place here.[6] Sommerstein explains: "Since the boy's father is "an old family friend" (142), we may be meant to suppose that in addressing Euelpides thus he is reminding him of the days of his youth, when it was he who used to walk home from the baths or the gymnasium "sparkling (stilbon) with handsomeness and grace" (Odyssey 6.237; cf. Theocr. 2.79-80)." If indeed such a reminder is being made, I do not see the point of it. The name awaits a convincing explanation; meanwhile we shall have to be content with Rogers' "This is merely a fancy name in a fancy picture."

[5]Assuming that the line is spoken by Peisetairos; I believe the attribution to Euelpides is better.

[6]Kock's note on the subject: "fingierter Name, wie πολυχαρίδας Lys. 1098, 1242. 'nomen ludicro modo ad exagitandum turpem puerorum amorem ab Aristophane fictum esse patet. tenebras discutiet Athen. 12. 518 F: ἐπιχωριάζειν παρ' αὐτοῖς (den Sybariten) διὰ τὴν τρυφὴν ἀνθρωπάρια μικρά, [καὶ] τοὺς σκωπαίους, ὥς φησιν ὁ Τίμων, τοὺς καλουμένους παρά τισι στίλπωνας.' Winckelmann. Mir ist die Stelle dadurch eben so wenig deutlicher geworden, wie durch die von anderen vorausgesetzte Beziehung auf Stilbides, den Seher, der mit Nikias nach Sikelien ging (Plut. *Nik.* 23) und dort vor der grossen Katastrophe starb."

8. Praxagora

The name of the heroine of *Ecclesiazousae*, Praxagora, meaning 'acting in the assembly', is divulged in a very offhand way at line 124, when one of the women says δεῦρ', ὦ γλυκυτάτη Πραξαγόρα, σκέψαι. There is no emphasis put on the name, and it does not appear to be part of a verbal theme of the play; even the name itself will be mentioned only twice more (241 and 520). Of course it is an appropriate name for the character, whose plan requires the women to take action in the assembly, but it does not have the importance in the play that names like Strepsiades and Trygaios have in their plays. It seems that this type of naming is intermediate between the thematic naming of earlier Old Comedy and the 'stock' naming of New Comedy. Praxagora is still significant, but not thematic; the final stage is reached in *Plutos* where Chremylos has a name appropriate only in the sense that it fits an old man.

Russo[1] finds some further meaning in the name, remarking that one could say that "per un fato nominale" Praxagora disappears prematurely from the scene, since then the Agora is the offstage location which Praxagora has to govern.

The name Praxagora is inscriptionally attested in the feminine (cf. Pape-Benseler s.v.).

[1]Russo (1984), p. 63.

C. Significant names: Minor Characters

Although minor characters do not, like major characters, have names thematic to the play, they do tend to have significant names, unless they are historical characters. This section will examine selected minor characters who have problematic names.

1. Blepyros and Blepsidemos

The husband of Praxagora, heroine of *Ecclesiazusae*, is called Blepyros, as we find out at *Ecc.* 327, the scene in which he comes out to relieve himself.

Certainly the βλεπ- element is from βλέπειν,[1] but the second element of the name has caused some difference of opinion. Ussher appears to approve the translation 'guardalgrano' ("Looking at grain"), taking πυρ- from πυρός, 'wheat', and referring to the long quantity of the upsilon in the name as if that were decisive.[2] However, aside from the fact that Aristophanes is not scrupulous about vowel quantities when he wishes to play upon words, it is the case that in the word πῦρ, 'fire', the quantity of the vowel is variable (long in the nominative-accusative); in other words, a Greek ear could hear 'fire' whether the vowel was long or short. Hence there is nothing against understanding πυρ- in Blepyros as 'fire', as Bechtel does (*HPG* p. 391), and that seems more likely than 'wheat'. In interpreting the name we ought to consider that βλέπειν means not only 'see (something)', but, with an internal accusative object, also often means 'look (a certain way)', e.g. *Eq.* 631 ἔβλεψε νᾶπυ '[the Boule] looked mustard' (had an angry look), *Av.* 1169 πυρρίχην βλέπων, 'looking like a war-dancer' (cf. LSJ s.v. βλέπω II. 1.). Blepyros' name, then, could have suggested 'looking like fire', or 'with a fiery look', and there is a point to the name in the context in which it appears. Blepyros has just come out of his house wearing his wife's yellow dress (τὸ κροκωτίδιον ἀμπισχόμενος 332), complaining about his missing clothes and his own constipation, and has become involved in a drawn-out scatological scene; the neighbor asks him τί τοῦτό σοι τὸ πυρρόν ἐστιν; (329) and wonders whether Kinesias has beshitten him. The color πυρρός covers a

[1]The expected form *Βλεπέπυρος undergoes regular loss of the syllable -πε- ; cf. Bechtel HPG p. 96 s.v. Βλεπέπυρος, which is equated with Βλέπυρος, the latter inscriptionally attested in Eretria, 4th century. For loss of syllable in dissimilation cf. Schwyzer (1935) p. 206 on Εὐελπίδης ("man erwartet *Εὐελπιδ-ίδης") and Kühner-Blass I. § 68. 12.

[2]Ussher in note to *Ecc.* 327: "Blepyrus' name is not repeated, but presumably Βλέπυρος [with macron over υ] ('guardalgrano', D. Comparetti, in A. Franchetti, *Le Donne a Parlamento di Aristofane* [Citta di Castello, 1901], xviii); a similar rhythm, 318."

yellow-red-brown range and is often used of feces in comedy, as here.[3] Blepyros is 'πυρ-looking' (i. e. πυρρός) in two senses, one in that he is wearing his wife's yellow dress, a comic consequence of the women's plot to go to the assembly disguised in their husbands' clothes, and the other in that he is defecating. Both meanings are explicitly mentioned in the passage, in close proximity to the only occurrence of Blepyros' name, so it would seem that Aristophanes did intend such an interpretation of the name here.

Ussher finds the point of the name 200 lines later (547-8), when Blepyros tells Praxagora that she has caused him to lose a hekteus of wheat (πυρῶν) which he might have had by going to the assembly. It is perhaps possible that there is a faint echo of the name there, but certainly difficult to detect, and not at all pointed. It looks rather as if Aristophanes named the character Blepyros in order to make a joke in the scatological scene, and lost interest in the name after that.

The only other known compound name formed from βλεπ- is Blepsidemos, a character in *Plutos*, named twice (332, 344). He is the gossip and busybody who shows up at Chremylos' door when he hears a rumor that his old friend is now rich. The name Βλεψίδημος seems to mean 'Looking at the people', with the connotation 'nosy'; that is the way the character is introduced in the passage where his name is used. He has heard λόγος πολύς from the people sitting in the barber shops (plural, 338) and runs right over to Chremylos' house to investigate further. Chremylos remarks when he sees him coming that one can tell from his hurried gait that he has heard something (333-4). In the manner of a true gossip, Blepsidemos prefers to believe his own suspicions that Chremylos has become a large-scale thief or embezzler, and ignores or misunderstands all protestations to the contrary (351-390). His name is part of his characterization as a busybody.

The name Blepsidemos is a possible Greek proper name, but is not attested in inscriptions. Neither Blepyros nor Blepsidemos appears as a name in extant New Comedy, although there are two other names which employ the βλεπ- root. In Menander's

[3]cf. Henderson (1975), pp. 189-190 for more examples.

Sikyonios 188 there is a character named Blepes from Eleusis (188), and in Plautus' *Amphitruo* the ship captain is called Blepharo.

2. Chremes and Chremylos

The name Chremes (Χρέμης) is given to the man in *Ecclesiazusae* who reports the results of the assembly to Blepyrus and later prepares to turn in all his goods; in the diminutive Chremylos, it is the name of the hero of *Plutos*.[1] The stem χρεμ- is quite uncommon in Greek. Two verbs employ it: χρέμειν, which means 'whinny' and χρέμπτεσθαι, which means 'clear one's throat, hawk and spit'. Clearly the root is onomatopoietic and indicates an inarticulate sound which starts in the throat. Aristophanes uses words from this root (other than the names) a total of three times in all his plays. At *Eq.* 553 the noun χρεμετισμός, 'whinnying,' appears. *Pax* 814 uses a compound καταχρεμψαμένη ("having spat upon..."). Finally at *Thes.* 381 χρέμπτεται is used of the clearing of the throat which orators perform before a speech.

There was also a type of fish called χρέμης (also χρόμις, see LSJ s.v.v.), and Bechtel (*HPG* p. 588) refers these χρεμ- names to the fish; the fish, however, was named after the noise it made.[2] Hug (in *RE* , 'Spitznamen' 1825.40) explains that the name is originally a nickname for people who make "unartikulierte Laute". The name Chremes is probably appropriate to an old man because it recalls the coughing or muttering associated with old men, and it became a stock name in Middle and New Comedy.[3] Chremylos is possibly the oldest of Aristophanes' heroes; he says at the beginning of the play that he went to the Delphic oracle, considering that his own lifetime was almost spent, to ask a

[1]Chremylos is a major rather than a minor character, but is included here because his name is not thematic in the *Plutos*, and it is convenient to treat Chremes and Chremylos together. The non-thematic treatment of Chremylos' name is typical of Aristophanes' later comedies (*Ecc.* and *Plu.*).

[2]"Eine Fischarte [sic], die gleichsam ein Knurren ertönen lasse," Hug (1929) 1825.40.

[3] On the difficulties faced by the comic playwright, the Middle Comedy poet Antiphanes says: πάντα δεῖ/ εὑρεῖν, ὀνόματα καινά, καινὰ πράγματα,/ καινοὺς λόγους κἄπειτα τὰ διῳκημένα/ πρότερον, τὰ νῦν παρόντα, τὴν καταστροφήν,/ τὴν εἰσβολήν. ἂν ἔν τι τούτων παραλίπῃ/ Χρέμης τις ἢ Φείδων τις, ἐκσυρίττεται (Antiphanes fr. 191 Kock). The name is often used by Terence (Chremes is neighbor in *Andria* , neighbor in *Heauton*, young man who turns out to be Pamphila's brother in *Eunuch*, father with 2 wives in *Phormio*).

question on behalf of his son (*Plu.* 32-36). The Old Woman calls him γέρων at 1066; the chorus, which consists of friends and fellow demesmen of Chremes is old and feeble as well (ἀσθενεῖς γέροντας ἄνδρας, 258).

Χρέμης is historically attested in the 4th century in Attica (Kirchner *PA* 15566, 15567, 15568); Χρεμύλος, the diminutive, is attested already in the 5th century in Styra (IG XII 9. no. 56.437). We also find the variations Χρέμων and Χρεμωνίδης, but the stem is not known to form any compounds.

3. Orthagoras/Epigenes

In the hag scene of *Ecclesiazusae*, a girl is waiting for her lover, a young man, while an old hag is threatening to take him away first, under the laws of the new regime. This young man is referred to by two different names: the girl calls him Orthagoras (916), and the hag Epigenes (931). It seems to me not possible to understand the name Orthagoras in the way Coulon and Ussher wish to, that is as "an ὄλισβος personified" (Ussher on *Ecc.* 916), if one takes the entire context into account. The hag and the girl are engaged in an amoebic song contest, explicitly set up at 887. At 907-910, the hag has wished unfulfillable sexual desire upon the girl, and specifically, that when the girl wishes φιλῆσαι, she will draw to herself a snake (ὄφιν 909) on the bed. That by 'snake' is meant *penis languidus* (not, as Ussher will have it, a real snake) is shown by the girl's reply; 916 should be understood as specifically referring to the hag's curse in 909. The girl asks her nurse to call her lover, and she refers to him as 'Orthagoras' (playing upon ὀρθός, 'erect') to demonstrate to the hag that he can perform in bed and will not turn out to be a 'snake'. The hag then replies (918-19) that the desire with which she cursed the girl is already afflicting her "in an Ionian way"; against the Ionian reference the girl counters with a Lesbian one, δοκεῖς δέ μοι καὶ λάβδα κατὰ τοὺς Λεσβίους (920). This appears to be a euphemistic reference to the verb λεσβίζειν, which should properly mean perform fellatio (cf. LSJ s.v. and Henderson (1975) p. 183). The euphemism is in place in the speech of the girl, who is 'nicer' than the filthy old hag because of her youth and inexperience.[1] The girl is implying that the only thing the hag could do to get a man is λεσβίζειν; but, she continues, the hag's experience in this area will not get her lover away from her (921-923, παίγνια of course understood to be a single person, like Latin *deliciae*).

[1]Hall-Geldart, Rogers, and Ussher give 920 to the hag. The girl, however, characteristically speaks in a less explicit and less obscene way than the hag; cf. line 914 where she modestly declines to say what may follow upon her mother's absence.

Thus ends the song contest, and the two begin to exchange insults in trimeter. At 930 the girl asks the hag why she is peeking out, and the hag replies that she is singing for her dear 'Epigenes'. The name, 'born afterward', is used to show that the man is much younger than the hag, and sets up the joke that follows, as the girl retorts σοὶ γὰρ φίλος τίς ἐστιν ἄλλος ἢ Γέρης (932), "Do you have another dear than Geres ('Oldster')?"

Thus, in this scene the young man for whom the two women are waiting is called by two different names, Orthagoras and Epigenes, neither one of which is necessarily thought to be his 'real' name. In other words, the names are used almost as appellatives in the places they occur, and are subsequently forgotten. Once the young man appears, he is never called by name. Orthagoras/Epigenes is an extreme example of the tendency Aristophanes sometimes has to be interested in a name for its value at the moment, or in the context, and not at all interested in it otherwise.

4. Plathane

In the scene at *Frogs* 549 ff., Dionysus has just put on the Herakles costume again, which he had traded for Xanthias' slave clothes during an earlier fright, when he is accosted by two women innkeepers angry at 'Herakles' because of his behavior on his last visit. The first woman is nameless, but she calls the second out by name. The second innkeeper's name is Plathane (Πλαθάνη), a name appropriate to a bread-seller[1] because it is formed from πλάθανον, a bread-pan. Stanford's assertion that "Plathane looks like a metic's name" (note to *Ra.* 553-4) is based on Kock's interpretation of *Ra.* 569 and the passage of Plutarch discussed below:[2] "Die beiden πανδοκεύτριαι... sind als Metökinnen zu denken (zu 569), wie auch der Name der einen zeigt. Denn auch die in der Vita des Isokrates erwähnte Plathane war wohl keine Athenerin" (Kock on *Ra.* 549). However, Kock's conclusion is, I believe, mistaken.

The name Plathane is attested in one other place in literature (besides *Frogs*), by Plutarch, as the wife of the sophist Hippias and mother of Aphareus, whom Isocrates adopted:

> Plutarch *Mor.* 838 A (*Life of Isocrates*): ἐγένετο δ' αὐτῷ [Ἰσοκράτῃ] καὶ παῖς Ἀφαρεὺς πρεσβύτῃ ὄντι ἐκ Πλαθάνης τῆς Ἱππίου τοῦ ῥήτορος ποιητός, τῶν δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς τριῶν παίδων ὁ νεώτατος.[3]

Hippias was from Elis, and it is certainly possible that Plathane was too; however, his name is not un-Athenian, and we have no reason to think that the name Plathane marked his wife as a metic either (*pace* Kock); in fact there was an upper-class Athenian lady in the 4th

---

[1]The loaves of bread which Herakles owes them for are the first concern of the innkeepers, *Ra.* 551.

[2]That interpretation perpetuated also in Coulon, n. 1 to *Ra.* 550: "Les deux hôtelières... sont des métèques, comme l'indique le nom de l'une Plathané...ce nom n'est pas athénien, cf. Plutarque *Morales* 838."

[3]Plathane's name occurs again at *Mor.* 838 B: people buried with Isocrates included Ἀφαρεὺς καὶ ὁ τούτου πατὴρ Θεόδωρος ἥ τε γυνὴ Πλαθάνη, μήτηρ δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ Ἀφαρέως.

century called Plathane, daughter of Hephaistodoros (IG II^2 7728). Editors wish the name to be 'metic' because they wrongly imagine that the innkeepers in *Frogs* must be metics, an inference from line 569, where the innkeeper sends for Kleon, calling him her προστάτης. That word need not have the technical meaning 'patron of metics' here, because the person requiring a προστάτης is a woman. Compare *Thes.* 576, in which Kleisthenes says that he loves women and is their πρόξενος; all that means is that he represents their interests in the society of men. It obviously does not mean that the women were foreigners. No more does *Ra.* 569 imply that the innkeepers were metics. Even citizen women needed men to help them in any public or legal situation, since they could not represent themselves. The word may also be a reference to some claim of Kleon's to be the 'protector' of the people; in Kleon's case, even the subject's death did not stop Aristophanes' satire.

There is inscriptional attestation for Plathane: Πλαθαίνη (IG II^2 12464), and Πλαθάνη (IG II^2 7728). On these names Bechtel speculates that, since Hesychius says the πλάθανον was round, the names may be used to designate people who are similar to the bread-pan in their roundness (*HPG* p. 603). That is a reasonable explanation, and also suggests that Aristophanes, as often, has taken a name which normally has one interpretation and given it a different twist, here using it to name someone who works with a bread-pan.

Chapter Two: Aspects of Naming

I. General Aspects

A. Patronymics

Before discussing in particular Aristophanes' practice of forming names in -δης, it is instructive to consider what Fick and Bechtel have to say on the subject of the -δης suffix, which is commonly interpreted as patronymic.[1]

Fick-Bechtel divide the -δ suffix in Greek into two categories, the general adjectival, and the diminutive; the suffix -δης, used in forming derivative names, belongs to the former category. Fick-Bechtel point out that, whereas the poets do use this suffix to form patronyms, such epithets are not the same as the given names of people. When one looks at actual given names ending in -δης, one finds that they are virtually never true patronyms; someone named Demades is not the son of a Demas, Ischaridas is not the son of Ischaros, and so forth. What the -δης suffix indicates is that the name derives from and

[1]Fick (1894), p. 26; I have summarized and rearranged the discussion, which is here appended in the original.
"Das δ-Suffix hat im Griechischen zwei Hauptbedeutungen, eine allgemein adjectivische, Zubehör im weitesten Sinne bezeichnend (wie φυγάς zu φυγή, γεννάδας zu γέννα, νεφρίδιος zu νεφρός), und eine verkleinernde in -ίδ, -ίδιον, -ύδριον. Demgemäß haben wir auch zwei Verwendungsarten des ableitenden δ in den griechischen Kosenamen zu unterscheiden. -δας = -δης und -διος treten secundär an Koseformen ableitend, um irgend welche Beziehung zu den primären Kosenamen auszudrücken. Gewöhnlich faßt man diese Beziehung bei -δης als eine patronyme, als müsste jeder Männername auf -δης den Träger desselben als den Sohn oder Nachkommen eines Mannes bezeichnen, welcher den einfachen Namen, an welchen -δης getreten ist, geführt hätte. Daß dem nicht so ist, lehrt der Augenschein. Zwar sind die Gentilnamen auf -δης wie 'Αλκμεωνίδης uralt und die Dichter bilden, diesen Gentilnamen erweiternd, von Homer an mit größter Leichtigkeit von jedem Namen das entsprechende Patronym auf -δης, allein ganz anders ist es, wenn wir die wirklichen Männernamen auf -δης in's Auge fassen. Diese sind mit verschwindenden Ausnamen *nie* Patronymika, die Fälle wo ein Δημάδης der Sohn eines Δημᾶς, ein 'Ισχαρίδας Sohn eines 'Ισχαρος ist, sind äußerst selten. Mit dieser allgemeinen Beziehung von -δης zum Stammnamen stimmt auch die Ableitung von -δ, -δης, -διος. Man kann nicht wohl zweifeln, daß φυγάδ- mit φυγάδε "zur Flucht" zusammenhängt, daß also φυγάδ- ein φυγάδε τετραμμένος sei. Mit dem Casussuffix -δα in θύρ-δα stimmt der Ausgang -δας in γεννάδας und 'ΑτρεΓίδας; Τελαμωνιάδας geht zunächst auf Τελαμώνιος..."

relates to the simple name in some sense (F-B compare φυγάς (-άδος) from φυγή).[2] Thus 'Atreides' means 'related to Atreus'; the inference is that the relationship is son to father, but of course it may indicate a grandson or one even more distantly related--and furthermore, this is only an inference. In essence the -δης suffix is adjectival, showing 'belonging' in a general way, and forms names which may have a patronymic connotation.[3] Indeed, Usener has shown that even in Homer names in -ιδης are used as appellatives, e.g. 'Ηπυτίδης of a κήρυξ at Ρ 324, Τερπιάδης of the singer Phemios at χ 330.[4]

The -δης suffix, then, should not be compared to the English suffix *-son* (as in Johnson, "son of John"), which specifically indicates that the bearer is the son of X, but to e.g. the Latin suffix *-(i)anus* which can be attached to names to make them adjectival. The

---

[2] Marzullo (1953) p. 108 is mistaken in his inference that Fick-Bechtel are equating -δης with the simple diminutive in meaning; they quite carefully distinguish the two, as one can see in the passage quoted in the previous footnote (*GP* p. 26).

[3] Cf. the explanation of Buck (1933), p. 341: "Such forms [names in -δης] are real patronymics in Homer, but in later times are merely a common type of personal names without patronymic force, as Θουκυδίδης, 'Αλκιβιάδης, Boeot. 'Επαμεινώνδας. (a) The starting-point of this type, peculiar to Greek, is probably to be sought in the feminine patronymics in -ις, -ιδος and -ας, -αδος, where the patronymic use is only one aspect of the fem. δ-stems..."
Note that for the feminines, too, the patronymic is merely one application of the stem.

[4] Usener (1896) pp. 20-29, especially pp. 20-21: "Das gewöhnliche patronymische suffix ist ι-δης α-δης. Auch dieses hat an sich eine ganz allgemeine bedeutung, die man etwa als die der zugehörigkeit definieren könnte, wenn sich auch die inhaerente eigenschaft unter diesen begriff fassen liesse... Auch bei freier schöpfung von eigennamen verwendet das epos diese rein adjectivische natur des suffixes." Usener's numerous examples include epithets of gods.

normal way of forming a patronym in Greek (except Aeolic[5]) is simply to put the father's name into the genitive case ('Aristophanes son of Philip' = Ἀριστοφάνης Φιλίππου), and of course such patronyms (very often comic) abound in Aristophanes. In short, in Attic Greek the nominal suffix -δης did not have patronymic force.[6] As C. Frei-Lüthy describes it, "Doch -ιδης hat sich im Laufe der Zeit aus dem Schoße des Epos weiterentwickelt (z.B. εὐπατρίδης S.+), so daß es für Aristophanes, einen großen Könner auf dem Gebiet der Wortbildung, möglich wurde mit -ιδης Appellative zu bilden, die auf dem Weg von Theateraufführungen in die Alltagssprache aufgenommen wurden".[7]

If we cease to regard -δης names as necessarily patronymic in meaning and understand the ending rather as forming names which indicate *Sippenzugehörigkeit* and may be used as appellatives, or adjectivally,[8] it is easier to see why Aristophanes was so fond of them. He uses the -δης suffix to form names which indicate a type; it has a generalizing adjectival force, 'belonging to' a category.[9] This sense is well illustrated by the series of -δης words at *Ach.* 595-597. In the confrontation between Dikaiopolis and

---

[5]cf. Buck (1955), p. 134, "Use of patronymic adjective instead of the genitive singular of the father's name. Though occasionally found in literature, as in Hom. Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, this is the regular practice in prose only in the three Aeolic dialects. Thus Lesb. Μέλανχρος Πιθώνειος, Ἀρχίππα Ἀθανάεια, Thess. Σύχουν Ἀντιγόνειος, Νικόλαος Ἀγεισίαιος..."

Note that the dialects which do use patronymic adjectives use -ιος (not -δης), another instance of an adjectival form which has a patronymic application rather than an exclusively patronymic meaning.

[6]For a linguistic history of the suffix -δης see M. Meier (1975). Meier concludes that the suffix basically expresses *Gehörigkeit.*

[7]C. Frei-Lüthy (1978), p. 43.

[8]cf. Schwyzer (1939), I. p. 509: "Sekundär ist der jüngere appellative Gebrauch von -ίδης (-άδης -ίαδης), auch als Adjektiv." Schwyzer (loc. cit.) calls "(halb) appellativ ('einer vom Schlage der und der')" the names Σπουδαρχίδης, Στρατωνίδης, and Μισθαρχίδης at *Ach.* 595 ff., discussed below.

[9]Plautus too could avail himself of the creative power of the -ιδης ending, as cf. *Pers.* 702 ff.: Virginesvendonides Nugiepiloquides Argentumextenebronides Tedigniloquides Nugides Palponides Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides.

Lamachos, the general, confused by Dikaiopolis' borrowed beggar costume, asks him who he is (ἀλλὰ τίς γὰρ εἶ; 594), to which Dikaiopolis replies:

> ὅστις; πολίτης χρηστός, οὐ Σπουδαρχίδης,
> ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου περ ὁ πόλεμος, Στρατωνίδης,
> σὺ δ' ἐξ ὅτου περ ὁ πόλεμος, Μισθαρχίδης.
>
> "Who am I? A decent citizen, not Spoudarchides ('Mr. Ambitious'), but ever since the war started, Stratonides ('Mr. Serviceman'), while you, ever since the war started, have been Mistharchides ('Mr. Payroll')." [10]

In reply to the question "Who are you?" which expects the person's name as answer, Dikaiopolis tells Lamachos what *kind* of person he is (and isn't) using names in -δης. In this passage all three names should be capitalized, as they are really more than adjectives here.[11] Perception of them as names which indicate types rather than mere apellative adjectives is perhaps assisted by the fact that Stratonides is an actual historical name, cf. Kirchner *PA* 13004-13010, but historicity is not essential.[12]

Aristophanes also uses normal Attic patronymics (i.e. the father's name in the genitive case) to adorn his characters. He rarely designates an historical person by his actual patronymic, but is fond of inventing fathers' names to characterize the son in a comic way; so Lamachos, whose father's name was Xenophanes (Thuc. 6. 8. 2) is called, at *Ach.* 1131, ὁ Γοργάσου, "son of Gorgasos", with obvious reference to the Gorgon emblem on Lamachos' shield. Even a god may be given a comic patronymic; Dionysos at *Frogs* 22 calls himself υἱὸς Σταμνίου, "son of Wine-jug". Fictitious characters may also have meaningful patronymics, as for example Strepsiades, who at *Clouds* 134 introduces himself as Φείδωνος υἱός; the thrifty element in his character was emphasized in the

---

[10]I believe that the generalizing 'Mr.' in English gives some of the feeling of the -δης names in Greek. A person may be called 'Mr. Know-it-all' or 'Mr. Big Spender' with similar freedom of invention.

[11]None of the modern editors capitalizes.

[12]Cf. the remarks of Frei-Lüthy (1978), p. 43: "σπουδαρχίδης u.a. sind meines Erachtens keine echten Appellative; der namenartige Charakter ist noch sehr stark zu spüren; die Nähe zu Spitznamen ist unverkennbar."

opening scene of the play. An interesting example of a character in disguise assuming a name and a patronymic occurs at *Wasps* 185, where Philokleon, trying to sneak out of the house by hiding under the donkey, like Odysseus under the ram, has been apprehended by his son. Continuing the Homeric burlesque, he gives his name as Οὔτις, and when pressed adds Ἰθακος Ἀποδρασιππίδου, "Ithakan, son of Escapee". Here the patronymic is itself an appellative name in -ιδης, with the ιππ- element lending it comic length and mock dignity.

B. Demotics

The custom of designating an Athenian citizen with a demotic goes back to the reforms of Kleisthenes in the late 6th century;[1] the Aristotelian *Athenian Constitution* describes how Kleisthenes reorganized the system of tribes, and established demes to replace the previous naukraries, with the intention of obtaining a broader, more democratic political basis.

> καὶ δημότας ἐποίησεν ἀλλήλων τοὺς οἰκοῦντας ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν δήμων, ἵνα μὴ πατρόθεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας, ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν· ὅθεν καὶ καλοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῶν δήμων. (*Ath. Pol.* 21. 4)

Kleisthenes wanted the Athenians to identify themselves with their demes and to use demotics rather than patronymics, so that class distinctions would be diminished. As one might have expected, many Athenians were loathe to give up their patronymics, and the result was that the demotic naming system was added to the patronymic, instead of replacing it, so that a man might give his full name using a demotic, a patronymic, or both. "An individual's choice of demotic or patronymic could become an issue and an expression of class, status, and political values," observes Whitehead (1986) p. 71. In the latter half of the 5th century official attempts were made to establish the patronymic and the demotic together as part of the official full name, although that did not become standard practice until the 4th century.[2]

[1]Occasionally men had used the equivalent of demotics even before Kleisthenes' reforms, but afterward the use became widespread (and politically weighted). See Whitehead (1986), pp. 11, 70.

[2]For full discussion and documentation on the use of demotics see Whitehead (1986), pp. 69-72. For demotics in literary sources, see Whitehead (1986) pp. 46-62. It is especially interesting that in Thucydides "not a single Athenian is designated by his demotic" (p. 48), while there is only one instance of a demotic in the entire corpus of Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.7.6).

Thus in Aristophanes' time the demotic, which had a democratic or populist character, was on the way to becoming one part of a 3-part official name (name-patronymic-demotic), but actual naming practice varied from individual to individual.

In the plays we have, 5 major characters are given demotics: Dikaiopolis (Cholleidai), Demos (Pnyx), Strepsiades (Kikynna), Trygaios (Athmonon), and Euelpides (Krioa). The only one of these given a patronymic in addition is Strepsiades (son of Pheidon). Only two major characters are given patronymics without demotics, and these are comic patronymics: Dionysos (*Ra.* 22) calls himself 'son of Stamnios (i. e. wine-jar)'; naturally gods do not have demotics; and Lamachos, in real life the son of Xenophanes, is called 'son of Gorgasos', mocking his Gorgon crest and heroic demeanor. No major *invented* character is given a patronymic without a demotic (only Strepsiades gets a patronymic at all).[3] Especially taking into account that Athenian women did not have demotics,[4] which rules out Lysistrata and Praxagora, 5 is a significant number of major characters to be given demotics. It must also be meaningful that Aristophanes rarely gives a patronymic to an invented character, and then not without a demotic. No doubt it is natural that Aristophanes, writing in a popular medium, gives his characters the more democratic form of name, rather than the more aristocratic. The demotic gives a popular quality to the name and indicates that the character is a 'man of the people', as indeed Aristophanes' protagonists are. One of these demotics is a comic invention; Demos in *Knights* is called 'Pyknites', 'from the Pnyx', which was not a deme but the place where the assembly met.

---

[3]Strepsiades is a special case because the audience already knows his father's name as a result of the monologue describing the argument between Strepsiades and his wife over what to name their son; Strepsiades wanted to name him Pheidonides after the boy's grandfather (*Nu.* 65).

[4]see Whitehead (1986), pp. 77-79. At *Thes.* 563, the Kinsman mentions a woman whom he calls simply Ἀχαρνική; since there is no proper name attached, and since women did not normally have demotics, we should probably understand this appellation merely as an indication of the woman's place of residence rather than a proper demotic. I have not included it in the list of demotics in this section.

A number of minor characters receive demotics, for various reasons. In *Wasps*, the two dogs involved in the trial have the demotics of the men they are caricaturing; they are called Labes of Aixone (= Laches) and Kyon of Kydathenaion (= Kleon). Here the demotics help identify the names as canine versions of the actual men's names, so the audience will not miss the point. One choreut has a demotic, Strymodoros of Konthyle (*Ve.* 233), and a friend of the chorus in that passage also has one, Chabes of Phlya (*Ve.* 234). Choreuts are never given patronymics in Aristophanes.

In contrast to characters on stage, people only *mentioned* in the dialogue are virtually never given demotics. Of the numerous historical people referred to, very often with patronymics,[5] only one is given a deme, and that is Lysistratos, who at *Ach.* 855 is called Χολαργέων ὄνειδος, 'the disgrace of the Cholargeans'.[6] One other, Proxenides (*Av.* 1126), is called ὁ Κομπασεύς, a comic derisive demotic invented from κομπάζειν, 'boast'. I have been able to find a total of 3 names of historical people mentioned with demotics[7] (including Lysistratos Χολαργέων ὄνειδος, not actually a demotic); the third, Nikostratos from Skambonidai, is a member of the audience named at *Ve.* 31; presumably this was the way he referred to himself, and Aristophanes does the same merely for purposes of identification (as with 'Labes" and 'Kyon' in *Wasps*). Probably the special

[5]While this thesis does not in general treat names of people who are not characters, perhaps a statistic is in order. Of the names listed in M. Molitor (1969) *beginning with A alone*, 30 are likely to be historical contemporaries not appearing on stage. Of these 30, 8 are given patronymics, and another's father's name is mentioned. Thus nearly one third of the sample has patronymics.

[6]This is not a proper demotic, and it is phrased so as to imply that the other demesmen of Cholargos are decent people who are ashamed of Lysistratos.

[7]I am leaving out of account Chairephon of Sphettos mentioned in *Clouds*, who probably does not appear in the version we have (although some mss. assign lines to him) but may have appeared in an earlier version, or was intended to be inserted in a revision. At any rate, his demotic seems to be comic (see below under Sphettos).

case of a member of the audience who is treated as though he is speaking to someone onstage should be considered as a minor character rather than merely a historical reference.

Of course Aristophanes usually mentions someone for the purpose of mocking or criticizing him, and it is clear that for that purpose he prefers patronymics to demotics. The demotic seems in general to have been perceived as more sympathetic to the audience, and the patronymic less.

Following is a listing of all the demotics found in Aristophanes' extant plays, alphabetically by deme. An asterisk indicates the person is not a character on stage.

*'**Achradous**,' man from, *Ecc.* 362. This is merely a pun occasioned by Blepyros' constipation because of having eaten a wild pear (ἀχράς); he says "an Achradousian" (pun on Acherdous, a real deme) has bolted his (back) door.

Aixone, Labes of, *Ve.* 895. One of the dogs in the trial scene, given the same demotic as Laches, whose name is being punned upon.

***Anaphlystos**, Sebinos of, *Ra.* 431 (cf. *Ecc* 979-80). A comic obscene name involving puns on βινεῖν (Sebinos) and ἀναφλᾶν.

Athmonon, Trygaeus of, *Pax* 190, 919. No reason is apparent for the choice of this deme. Pape-Benseler translate 'Blumenau', as from ἄνθος.

***Cholargos**, Lysistratos of, *Ach.* 855. Called Χολαργέων ὄνειδος, the only historical person mentioned who is given a serious deme (though not a true demotic).

Cholleidai, Dikaiopolis of, *Ach.* 406. Dikaiopolis announces his demotic while shouting outside Euripides' door to get him to come out: Δικαιόπολις καλῶ σ' ὁ Χολλήδης ἐγώ (406). Naturally one would like to know why this particular demotic was chosen, and the scholia provide a suggestion: ὁ Χολλείδης· παίζει διὰ τὸ χωλοὺς εἰσάγειν. It is a pun on χωλός, 'lame', used because Dikaiopolis is addressing Euripides, a playwright known for introducing lame characters on the tragic stage[8]. Dikaiopolis is trying to get his attention by appealing to his interest in cripples. The joke suits the context very well, is

[8]Aristophanes refers to Euripides as ὁ χωλοποιός at Frogs 846.

quite in Dikaiopolis' manner of mocking Euripides at the same time as he is asking him for something, and is followed up five lines later by another reference to 'cholopoiia' (οὐκ ἐτὸς χωλοὺς ποιεῖς, 411). The pun has been generally accepted, and I can only add that it is not difficult to simulate lameness on stage; Dikaiopolis may have taken an exaggerated limping step or two as he gave his name, to get the point across[9].

Gargettos, Antitheos of, daughter Kritylla, *Thes.* 898. Kritylla indignantly gives her full name in response to the kinsman of Euripides, who has said in mock-tragic context that she is "Theonoe, daughter of Proteus". No one has found any better explanation of this name than Van Leeuwen: "Certum aliquod matronae nomen requiritur, ergo fingitur, ut saepe. Iocosi nihil in his nominibus est quaerendum." The demotic should be considered part of the name of the invented character Kritylla, not a reference to a historical person.

Kikynna, Strepsiades son of Pheidon of, *Nu.* 134, 210. No reason is apparent for the choice of this deme. The creditor at *Nu.* 1218-19 says that he is a δημότης of Strepsiades, without mentioning the deme.

***'Kompasos'**, Proxenides of, *Av.* 1126. A comic deme formed from κομπάζειν, designating Proxenides as a boaster. It has been suggested that the demotic Kompaseus is a pun on Konthyleus (i. e. from Konthyle). Presumably Aristophanes would intend such a pun, in which the two words are really not very close phonetically, only if Proxenides actually were from Konthyle; but unfortunately we do not know whether he was or not.

Konthyle, Strymodorus of, *Ve.* 233. The only choreut given a demotic (cf. Chabes of Phlya, below).

***Kopros**, man from, *Eq.* 899, *Ecc.* 317. Both of the passages are simply jokes on the literal meaning of κόπρος. In *Knights*, Demos says that "a man from Kopros" told him that Kleon had given the dicasts silphium so that they would fart each other to death. In

[9]That would take care of Whitehead's objection (Demes of Attica p. 332 n. 35) that "while a reference to lameness might well *precede* the comic designation of someone as a demesman of Cholleidai (and so make it clear that is is comic), I cannot see that in the reverse situation, as here, the audience could be expected to take the demotic at anything other than face value."

Ecclesiazusae, Blepyros goes outside to the outhouse because "the man from Kopros" keeps knocking at his door (see above, 'Achradous'). Jokes about the name Kopreos had been around since Homer, who at *Iliad* 15.639 mentions a Periphetes of Mykenai, a man with the unusual distinction of being better than his father; the degenerate father is aptly named Kopreos.

Kothokidai, ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνα of, *Thes.* 620-622. When Euripides' kinsman, disguised as a woman, is questioned as to his identity, he cannot manage to come up with his husband's name; all he can think to say is "so-and-so, son of so-and so, from Kothokidai."

Krioa, Euelpides of, *Av.* 645. No reason is apparent for the choice of this deme.

Kydathenaion, Kyon of, *Ve.* 895, 902. The prosecuting dog in the trial scene; he is given the same demotic as Kleon, on whose name Aristophanes is punning.

Paionidai, Kinesias of, *Lys.* 852. The name Kinesias is used because of the obscene sense of κινεῖν, and likewise the demotic plays on the obscene sense of παίειν, both meaning much the same as βινεῖν; the name and demotic were chosen to suit the context[10].

***Phlya**, Chabes of, *Ve.* 234. An apparently deceased friend of the chorus; I believe this name should be considered in the category of choreut names.

Phyle, Derketes of, *Ach.* 1028. The name Derketes is chosen because its meaning, 'Looker', is in comic contrast to his situation of being unable to see well due to constant weeping over the loss of his oxen; he is made to come from Phyle because that deme is right on the Boeotian border, and it is the Boeotians who have stolen his oxen. (For full treatment of problems see section on Derketes of Phyle).

---

[10]It seems to me clear that the obscene meaning of the name and demotic is sufficient explanation of why Aristophanes chose to name the character Kinesias Paionides. Thus I find Whitehead's statement baffling: "The priapic scene which follows justifies the view of the scholiast *ad loc.* that the demotic is used for its sexual innuendo--but only if Kinesias was a real person known to the audience" (Whitehead 1986 p. 335 n. 55). The situation is rather that we may stop looking for a real person behind Kinesias once we understand his name.

'Pnyx', Demos of, *Eq.* 62. A comic demotic chosen to suit "The People" as an allegorical figure; the residence of "The People" is the ecclesia, where the people gather, hence their 'deme' is the Pnyx, the location of the ecclesia.

***Skambonidai**, Nikostratos of, *Ve.* 81. Member of the audience; here he is probably given his demotic because that is how he was known, and Aristophanes wanted to insure that he would be recognized.

?Sphettos, Chairephon of, *Nu.* 156. This passage is our only evidence for the deme of Chairephon, and doubt has remained as to whether Sphettos was really his deme, or whether the demotic is a comic one given, as Dover says, "for the sake of a weak pun on σφήξ, 'wasp', to suit the entomological context". From the analysis of Aristophanes' use of demotics made above, it is very likely that Sphettios is a comic demotic; Aristophanes does not like to give historical people serious demotics, whether they are characters or only mentioned.[11] Perhaps the demotic suits a characteristic of Chairephon, as well as suiting the 'gnat story' context. The same demotic adjective Sphettios is used at *Plu.* 720, of vinegar applied to the eyelids; in that passage it appears to be used with the connotation 'sharp, stinging', like a wasp.[12] In Plato's *Apology* (21a) Socrates describes Chairephon as keen for whatever he undertook. "You all know what sort Chairephon was," he says, "ὡς σφοδρὸς ἐφ' ὅτι ὁρμήσειεν," and this well-known 'keenness' of Chairephon may be in point here[13] (cf. LSJ s.v. ὀξύς, III. A. 1 "metaph., of the inner sense, *sharp, keen, hasty*").

---

[11]On the question of whether Chairephon appeared in the play, see Dover, *Clouds* pp. xcv-xcvii, who suggests that "Aristophanes intended to bring Chairephon into the revision, that 104 and 1465 belong to that early stage of revision, and that this intention was abandoned."

[12]Didymus *ap.* Athen. 1. 67d says that the vinegar was so called ἴσως διότι οἱ Σφήττιοι ὀξεῖς. One would rather suppose that it was because οἱ σφῆκες were sharp.

[13]Chairephon is elsewhere called a 'bat' (νυκτερίς, *Av.* 1296, 1563), 'half dead' (ἡμιθνής, *Nu.* 504), and 'yellow' (θάψινος, *Ve.* 1413), all of which seem to have to do with his complexion rather than his character.

C. Late Naming

It has sometimes been observed (e. g. by Dover, note to *Clouds* 134),[1] though apparently never discussed, that occasionally characters in Aristophanes are on stage for quite some time before the audience is told what their names are. The latest naming is that of Agorakritos in *Knights*, named 1111 lines after his first entrance; Euelpides and Peisetairos in *Birds* are named 645 lines after their entrance; Dikaiopolis in *Acharnians* is not named until 405 lines into the play; Chremylos in *Plutos* is first named 336 lines after he comes in, and so forth. The explanation of this phenomenon of late naming lies in the nature of Old Comedy, and should be recognized as a convention of comedy, one of the many in which it differs significantly from tragedy.

Within the first twenty lines or so of any tragedy, the audience is told the name of at least one of the main characters, and enough of the story that they can recognize what the subject of the play will be. The tragic playwright is treating a story whose basic elements and characters are familiar to the audience, and he wishes to let them know immediately what that story is. Tragedy does not normally involve suspense, at least not in the sense that the audience does not know what is going to happen. Thus when, at lines 7-8 of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the main character says αὐτὸς ὧδ' ἐλήλυθα, ὁ πᾶσι κλεινὸς Οἰδίπους καλούμενος, the name Oidipous is charged with meaning and vital information for the audience which helps them interpret what is to follow.

How completely different is the situation of comedy. The comic playwright has invented a new, hitherto unknown story (and new characters as well) for the occasion, and the audience can have no idea what will happen in it. If, at the beginning of *Acharnians*, the main character had said "Here I am, Dikaiopolis, sitting in the assembly," the

[1]Cf. Dover (1972), p. 128: "It is by no means normal practice to tell us the names of the chief characters before they have appeared," followed by a list of 5 characters named late. That is the extent of discussion which I have been able to find. As I shall show, it is normal practice to name *historical* characters before they have appeared.

information conveyed by the name would have been negligible. The audience would still have no idea of the plot, and they would have to reserve judgement on whether the name was appropriate or not. The dramatic motivation for naming the protagonist immediately, so strong in tragedy, is lacking in comedy. Whether it is this lack of motivation which is responsible for the comic convention of later naming, or whether the convention arose from some earlier element of ritual, perhaps one involving a revelation of identity, it is impossible now to tell.

In addition to the lack of motivation to reveal the name right away, there can also be a positive point to later naming. In order for the audience to appreciate the appropriateness of a character's name, it must first know something about him and what his function in the play is. After that has been established, the name then puts a finger on a theme of the play which the audience recognizes, so that it can see the significance of the name as part of the play. To return to the example of Dikaiopolis, by the time his name is introduced, there has been discussion of the injustice of refusing to discuss peace (esp. 56 ἀδικεῖτε), and of the idea that the enemy too has suffered injustice (314 ἀδικουμένους), the hero has offered to wager his neck that he is speaking τὰ δίκαια (317), and he has already declared his political independence by making his private treaty and celebrating the Rural Dionysia. When the audience then at line 406 hears the hero calling himself 'Dikiaopolis' it is in a position to understand that the name is pointing out a basic theme of the play and to enjoy its aptness. If the character were named right away at the beginning, the chance for the name epiphany would be lost. Perhaps we may compare this delayed naming in comedy to the phenomenon in tragedy of a character suddenly realizing the significance of his (or someone else's) name; so for example Ajax, after he comes to his senses, says αἰαῖ· τίς ἄν ποτ' ᾠεθ' ὧδ' ἐπώνυμον/τοὐμὸν ξυνοίσειν ὄνομα τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς; (Soph. *Ajax* 430-431).[2] The name is brought up at a point when its meaning has become clear. I

[2]Another example is the chorus' recognition of the meaning of the name Helen at Aesch. *Ag.* 681 ff. See Fraenkel's note to *Ag.* 687 for literature on name etymologies in tragedy.

believe that this phenomenon deserves recognition as a convention available to Old Comedy, one which it shed as it became more like tragedy in developing into New Comedy.

As one might expect, the convention of late naming applies only to invented characters. For historical characters the situation is more like that of tragedy, in that the playwright relies on the audience's previous knowledge of the character as background. If Aristophanes introduces a historical character, a real person whom he wishes to satirize, he mentions that person's name as soon as, or even before, the character comes on stage. In the case of a contemporary person, it is necessary that the audience know as soon as possible who the person is in order to perceive the satire; in fact, where he can Aristophanes actually prepares the audience for the character's entrance with advance notice of the name. So we find Socrates, Euripides (*Ach.*), Agathon, Paphlagon [Kleon], Lamachos all mentioned before they ever make their entrances. Euripides in *Thes.* cannot be announced in advance since he participates in the prologue, but his name is mentioned at line 4. Historical characters with very minor parts, principally those who drop in and out of iambic scenes, usually are not announced in advance but are identified soon after they arrive: Hierokles in *Peace* (+3), Meton in *Birds* (+4), Kinesias in *Birds* (+5), Nikarchos in *Ach* (0).

This tendency of invented characters to be introduced late and historical characters early is not proposed as a firm rule which the poet is obliged to follow; it is merely a tendency. Perhaps the biggest exception for historical characters is Kleisthenes (in *Thes.*) who comes in at 634, clearly identified as an effeminate man, but is not called by name for 60 lines[3]. On the invented side, we do not find invented charcters introduced before entrance (allowing the exception of Bdelykleon and Philokleon; see footnotes to following

[3]Kleisthenes had been the stock Athenian effeminate for at least 14 years, and it is possible that there were some items of costume which could identify him to the audience by sight. One could compare the pianist Liberace, also a long-time flamboyant homosexual with very recognizable iconography (candelabra, rhinestone jacket, peculiar hairstyle).

list). However, the name Lysistrata is introduced unemphatically in passing near the beginning, in the manner of New Comedy; Praxagora's name is introduced in the same fashion, although a bit further into the play. Following is a list of major characters with their respective points of naming. The numbers indicate how long after or before entrance the character is named; +5 means five lines after entrance, -5 means five lines before entrance.

Invented	Historical
Agorakritos, +1111	Euripides (*Ran*) -763
Euelpides +645	Paphlagon -234
Peisetairos +644	Sokrates -114
Karion +624	Aischylos -72
Dikaiopolis +405	Agathon -66
Chremylos +336	'Labes' [Laches] -45
Xanthias (*Ran.*) +271	Euripides (*Ach.*) -12
Strepsiades +134	*Philokleon*[4] -11
Praxagora +124	'Kyon' [Kleon] -8
Trygaios +108	Lamachos (*Ach.*) -6
Lysistrata +6	*Bdelykleon* [4] -2
	Euripides (*Thes.*) +4
	Kleisthenes (*Thes.*) +60

The ways in which names of main characters are revealed fall into certain patterns in Aristophanes; they may first be conveniently divided into two groups, A) the character names himself, and B) the character is named by another.

[4]The names of Philokleon and Bdelykleon are included in this historical list although they are invented characters because their names contain references to the historical Kleon and form an attack on him; therefore Aristophanes treats their names like historical names and reveals them early to get the point across right away. Cf. Edmunds (1987), p. 53: "the fact remains that the announcement of the names, which comes, remarkably, before the appearance of the characters themselves, links the names and thus Cleon thematically with the plot and thus with the issue of the jury system."

Bdelykleon is not easy to classify; although he is an invented character, his name is a reference to Kleon, and Aristophanes wants the audience to pick up this historical reference right away. He is introduced before he says or does anything (he will wake up and speak two lines after the introduction, hence the -2, considering that the equivalent of an entrance), but technically he has been on stage asleep on the roof since the play started and could be considered +133, or perhaps +67 since his sleeping presence was pointed out at line 67. I am considering him more a stage property than a character until he wakes up; Edmunds (1987, p. 53) does the same .

Having a character name himself puts a certain emphasis on the name; it has the tone of conveying information, because there is always some particular reason for a person to give his name. In Old Comedy there are two motivations for a character to give his own name: 1) someone asks him what his name is, 2) he is standing outside someone's door and wants attention. Main characters who give their names in response to a question are Agorakritos, Trygaios, Peisetairos and Euelpides, and Ploutos, all involving some degree of ceremony. Those who shout their names outside doors are Dikaiopolis and Strepsiades; Trygaios, Peisetairos and Euelpides are outside doors when they are asked for their names. In *Knights* and *Birds*, the inquiry as to the name forms an ending to a major part of the action. When the Sausage-seller has finally vanquished Paphlagon in the last contest, Demos asks him his name, and then ceremoniously repeats it in formally turning himself (and Paphlagon) over to his care (*Eq.* 1257-1260). Similarly in *Birds*, when Peisetairos has finally persuaded both the Hoopoe and the Birds to undertake the establishment of Nephelokokkygia, Tereus ceremoniously invites him and his companion in and asks their names (*Av.* 641-647). In *Ploutos* the naming scene forms the beginning of the action of the play proper; Ploutos delays and refuses to tell who he is (52-75), and when he finally does, both Chremes and the audience begin to see what the theme of the play will be. Trygaios' naming scene is extended by his first replies of "Miarotatos" in ironic answer to Hermes' irritated questioning; Hermes labelled Trygaios "miarotatos" on his arrival, and now Tryagios treats it as a proper name (*Pax* 182-189). He finally tells Hermes both who he is and who he isn't, 190-191 (cf. Dikaiopolis' reply to Lamachos, who has asked the 'beggar' who he is; Dikiopolis tells Lamachos who he is and who he isn't, this time without giving his name, which the audience already knows, *Ach.* 594-597). Shouting one's name outside a door, as Dikaiopolis and Strepsiades do, also lends emphasis to the name; in effect it is giving the name as the reason why the person inside should open the door.

There are also two basic styles of being named by others: 1) being named in the prologue, and 2) being addressed by someone who already knows the name. These are less emphatic, especially the latter; they are the methods favored by tragedy and, later, New Comedy. The variation of having the character mention his own name in the prologue (usually in quite an artificial way), often used in tragedy, is not employed in any extant Old Comedy. A prologue speaker giving information directly to the audience may tell the names of the main characters; this is the way Paphlagon, Demos, Philokleon and Bdelykleon are introduced. In this case there may be some emphasis on the name; when the prologue slave of *Wasps* says that the old man's name is Philokleon, he adds ναὶ μὰ Δία (134), underscoring the impossible name which no doubt made the audience laugh when they first heard it. The final method of finding out the name by hearing the character addressed by another character is least emphatic, and most often used in New Comedy; this is the way we discover the names of Lysistrata, Xanthias (in *Frogs*), Praxagora, Karion, and Chremes. Perhaps a bit of emphasis is added if the character is being summoned by having his name shouted; this is the way Lamachos is introduced in *Ach.*, and also the way most slaves receive names on stage.

One other aspect of late naming may be of interest. Whereas up to the point of naming other characters do not know the hero's name, and he often has to be asked for it, once the name is pronounced to the audience it is considered equivalent to announcing it to the whole world. Characters will then enter and call the hero by name who strictly speaking would not have known him. The Megarian comes in calling Dikaiopolis by name; the Episkopos, messengers, and Prometheus suddenly know Peisetairos' name; a priest comes in looking for Chremylos by name at the end of *Plutos*. It is as if the mention of the name in the play conferred instant universal fame upon the character. In this connection we observe that Lysistrata and Praxagora, because the conspiracy plots require them to be known to all the women before the plays begin, have this dramatic universal fame conferred on them in advance. The characters who arrive must already know who the

heroines are, so the opportunity for revealing identities later is diminished. The nature of the conspiracy plot may then be a reason why these two heroines are named in the unemphatic offhand way they are.

II. Categories of Characters

A. Choreuts

In six of Aristophanes' plays, some of the individual chorus members are mentioned by name (*Ach*, *Eq*, *Ve*, *Pax*, *Lys*, *Ecc*). In a seventh, *Birds*, the chorus members are identified as various kinds of birds, which I am not considering individual proper names for purposes of this survey. The preferred place for naming choreuts is the parodos. Only in *Birds* are all the chorus members introduced in a systematic way: as each appears, a comment is made about what kind of bird it is (*Av.* 294-306).[1] *Ecclesiazusae* has a comparable introduction of 7 (possibly 8) choreuts by name as they enter, with the characters already onstage saying "There's so-and-so" (*Ecc.* 41-53). (There is a rather similar style of entrance in *Lysistrata* (65-92) where as the wives enter comments are made about where they have come from, though they are not individually named.) Never are all 24 choreuts given individual names; the most named is in *Lysistrata*, where the men's semichorus has 5 members named, answered by 5 names of the women's semichorus (254-370).[2] Here we may consider T. B. L. Webster's maxim,[3] "It seems to be a rule in satyr-play and comedy, that when the chorus name one another in the vocative, four is the maximum of names used together, and if the names are put together they are connected by 'and' [i.e. καί]". It appears from his list in the footnote to that sentence that there are 5

[1]At *Av.* 268-288, four birds are introduced who do not seem to have been part of the chorus. The chorus enters at 294, after which precisely 24 individual bird names are mentioned.

[2]The fact that choreuts are named in satyr plays, as in Old Comedy, but never in tragedy, is pointed out by D. F. Sutton (1985), pp. 107-110. Sutton speculates that in Sophocles' *Ichneutae* seven (but perhaps only six) choreuts are named because they were the ones in the front row of two rows. However, if choreut naming in satyr plays is comparable to that in Old Comedy, we should not look for all, or the majority, or any particular number of the choreuts to be named. The number of choreuts cannot be deduced from the number of names.

[3]Webster (1970), p. 69.

instances of the phenomenon (of the chorus addressing each other with names connected by καί) in Aristophanes, but the list is misleading. Of Webster's 5 examples, *Eq.* 242-243 has 2 names in the vocative, not connected by καί, spoken by Slave A (i. e. not the chorus naming one another); *Ve.* 230 has one name in the vocative, *Lys.* 254 has one name in the vocative, *Lys.* 321 has one name in the vocative, and only *Ecc.* 293 is an instance of names in the vocative connected by καί (3 names).[4] In fact that is the only instance to be found in Aristophanes. There is one other example of the construction, 4 choreut names in the vocative connected by καί, and that is *Ve.* 401, if my interpretation of this line as addressed to the chorus is accepted (see below, *Wasps*), but the speaker is Philokleon, not the chorus. In very similar fashion Dikaiopolis addresses the chorus using 3 names in the vocative, but connected by ἤ, at *Ach.* 612.

The names of choreuts present an interesting mix of significant names and merely appropriate names. One would like to have many more comedies in order to generalize with any confidence about the treatment of choreut names, but we may at least make some observations on the limited examples we do have.

1. *Acharnians*

The chorus of *Acharnians* is composed of old men from the deme Acharnae (cf. *Ach.* 179-180). One choreut is named at line 220, in the parodos, while the chorus complains of its age and decrepitude: νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ στερρὸν ἤδη τοὐμὸν ἀντικνήμιον /καὶ παλαιῷ Λακρατείδῃ τὸ σκέλος βαρύνεται. The name Lakrateides, formed from λα- (intensive prefix) and κράτος, 'strength', with the -ιδης ending marking a type,[5] is significant in the context; as Starkie says, "a suitable name for an old fellow who boasts he

[4]It is possible that *Ve.* 230, *Lys.* 254, and *Lys.* 321 were intended to be examples of places where no more than 4 choreuts are named in the following passage. Webster wishes to show that a string of five names in the vocative is unlikely, and that is quite true. His rule as stated is correct for Old Comedy, but not very useful. On what basis he includes satyr plays I cannot tell.

[5]see section on Patronymics.

was a Samson in his youth." The further suggestion made about this, and many other names of old men, that it was old-fashioned, should be treated with caution. In a society where it was so common to name a boy after his grandfather, fashions in naming must have been much slower to change than they are in our times. The fact that a name is attested earlier in the 5th century does not necessarily mean that it sounded old-fashioned later.[6]

Four other choreut names are mentioned, at 609-612, when Dikaiopolis turns to the chorus and asks whether any of them have had well-paid positions during the war, as Lamachos has. The names, Marilades, Anthrakyllos,[7] Euphorides, and Prinides, all have to do with the charcoal trade of Acharnae. The names are all invented to suit the occasion, and we see again in this group Aristophanes' fondness for -δης names indicating a type. Each name contains a verbal echo of something already associated with the Acharnians earlier in the play. Marilades, 'Mr. Coal-dust', is from μαρίλη, the substance that the hostage coal-scuttle squirted on Dikaiopolis in its fright, line 350.

Prinides, 'Mr. Oakwood', hearkens back to line 180 where the Acharnians were called πρίνινοι; Euphorides,[8] 'Mr. Carry-well', recalls line 211 in which the chorus sang of running φέρων ἀνθράκων φορτίον ; Anthrakyllus, 'Briquette', may also recall the

---

[6]Kirchner PA 8967, 8968, 8969, and 8971 are all instances of the name Lakrateides, and they date from the early 5th century, 430, 353, and late 2nd century respectively. Thus, we have no reason to think the name sounded old-fashioned in the late 5th century.

[7]Accepting Reiske's conjecture for the Drakyllos of the mss. Among three significant names referring to charcoal, we do not want a fourth which falls flat and pointless. Paleographically the change is easy. Sommerstein's argument that "as Dracyllus or Draces appears to be a stock name for a chorus member (*Lys.* 254, *Eccl.* 294) emendation is not justified" is unconvincing. The name which appears at *Lys.* 254 and *Eccl.* 294 is Drakes, not Drakyllos, but at any rate in the *Ach.* context we clearly are not dealing with 'stock' names.

[8]This is the only one of the 4 names which is a possible historical name, though not attested. The name Euphorion (*PA* 6078, 6079) is well attested for Attica, however, and where there is a Euphorion there may be a Euphorides as well.

hostage scene where the Acharnians' 'philanthrakia' was tested (cf. 332, 336). Such a lovely group of significant choreut names never turns up again in extant Aristophanes.

2. *Knights*

In the next play, *Knights*, two members of the chorus of knights are addressed by Slave A as the chorus enters (242-243): ὦ Σίμων,/ὦ Παναίτι', οὐκ ἐλᾶτε πρὸς τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας; Both the names Simon and Panaitios are well attested for Attica (cf. Kirchner *PA*), and they do not seem to have any meaning *per se* in the context, leading to the suspicion that they are the names of real people;[9] as Neil says, "Simon and Panaetius here may be the names of the two hipparchs of the time." Xenophon *Eq.* 1. 3 and 11. 6 mentions a Simon who wrote a manual on horsemanship, perhaps the same person.

3. *Clouds*

No choreuts are named in *Clouds*.

4. *Wasps*

In the parodos of *Wasps* (at 230-234), 5 names are mentioned by the chorus, but it looks as though 2 of them are names of companions who have died. Komias and Strymodorus of Konthyle are certainly present choreuts, and Charinades is very likely one as well.[10] Then at line 234 the chorus says Εὐεργίδης ἆρ' ἐστί που 'νταυθ', ἢ Χάβης ὁ φλυεύς; The *Wasps* chorus is the oldest and feeblest of Aristophanes' choruses, unable even to walk without help (cf. 248, 299), and they here regret the loss of some friends, in the way of old people whose contemporaries have begun to die. Perhaps we may therefore consider Euergides, Mr. Serviceable (cf. Philourgos, choreut at *Lys.* 265), and Chabes (from χαβός, 'curved' Hesych.; 'krummbeinig' Bechtel *HPG* p. 492) appropriate names

[9]Aristophanes mentions men named Simon and Panaitios in later plays. Simon, *Nu.* 351, 399 (also Eupolis 218) is an embezzler of public funds and an ἐπίορκος. Panaitios, (Νῆσοι fr. 409 K-A) was called πίθηκος and 'son of a butcher'.

[10]The statement in the Suda that Charinades was proverbial for slowness looks like a conjecture from this passage.

for deceased choreuts. The name Euergides displays the quality the chorus misses in their absent friend; Chabes shows that they lived to a decrepit old age.

Komias (from κῶμος, 'revel'), is an appropriate choreut name; cf. Komarchides, the name of the choryphaeus in *Peace* (*Pax* 1142).

Charinades (from χάρις, 'grace') may also be an auspicious name for a comic choreut. The name is used again at *Pax* 1155 in a choral ode as the name of a neighbor; in that passage it is the counterpart of Aischinades in the previous line (from αἶσχος, 'shame, ugliness') which is its opposite in meaning.

Strymodoros, 'gift of the Strymon', is a puzzling name; it is also used for a choreut at *Lys.* 259, and was mentioned in Dikaiopolis' Phales song (*Ach.* 274) as the name of a neighbor. If Wilamowitz[11] was correct in his observation that an Athenian would not have been named Strymodoros until after the victory over Thasos in 462 then the name does not seem appropriate to a man who was over 80 years old in 422, having fought in the Persian wars (as we hear in the parabasis at 1060-1101); it would indicate a man no older than 40. However, there was an earlier Athenian victory which had to do with the Strymon; in 476 the Athenians and the Delian League captured the Thracian town of Eion at the mouth of the Strymon and ejected the Persian governor. If the name Strymodoros commemorates that event, then a man of that name would have been 54 in 422, at the time of *Wasps*. In that case, in an imprecise way the name would have been perceived as that of an 'older' man (over 50); since anyone named Strymodoros would not be old enough to have adult grandsons of that name yet, there would have been no middle-aged or young men called Strymodoros. On the other hand, Aristophanes may have chosen the name for some connotation other than age, which is not in point in the Phales song at least.

[11]On the name Strymodoros, Wilamowitz (1927), note to *Lys.* 254, observes: "Als Geschenk des Strymon konnte ein Athener sein Kind erst bezeichnen, als sie in dem Tale eine Kolonie hatten, also erst nach dem Siege über Thasos: da paßte der Name für einen dieser Greise eigentlich schlecht."

At 400-402 Philokleon calls out for help in the following manner (with the standard punctuation of Hall-Geldart and Coulon):

> οὐ ξυλλήψεσθ', ὁπόσοισι δίκαι τῆτες μέλλουσιν ἔσεσθαι,
> ὦ Σμικυθίων καὶ Τεισιάδη καὶ Χρῆμον καὶ Φερέδειπνε;
> πότε δ', εἰ μὴ νῦν, ἐπαρήξετέ μοι, πρίν μ' εἴσω μᾶλλον ἄγεσθαι;

If 400 and 401 are taken as one sentence, then the names Smikythion, Teisiades, Chremon and Pheredeipnos are the names of people who have a lawsuit pending this year, members of the audience. However, this appeal is immediately followed by a choral attack (in the form of shouting) against Bdelykleon; "What are we waiting for?" says the chorus in answer to Philokleon's plea (403), giving the impression that the appeal for help was addressed to them. MacDowell in his notes to 400 and 401 interprets the names as "members of the audience who are prosecutors[12] in forthcoming cases." That means that the names must be those of real people, leaving the problem that Chremon (from χρῆμα) and Pheredeipnos are comic invented names (χρῆμα and δεῖπνος were not used to form real names). MacDowell posits that these two names must have been deformations of the real names; indeed, that is the only possible solution, but it is not very convincing, and the parallels cited are not comparable, involving as they do alterations of instantly recognizable names ('Kometamynias' for Amynias, 'Kolakonymous' for Kleonymous). Surely the category 'everyone who has a lawsuit pending this year' must have been very large, and could have included almost anyone; particular individuals would not have immediately suggested themselves to the audience. It would seem to be much easier to take line 400 as addressed to everyone who has a lawsuit pending, i. e. the audience, and lines 401-402

[12]There is no need to assume, with MacDowell, that Philokleon is calling upon prosecutors only. He says "whoever has a case coming up this year," since anyone who is involved in a lawsuit on either side would be interested in securing the good will of a juror, and he would earn Philokleon's good will by helping to rescue him.

together as addressed to the chorus, which responds immediately.[13] The names then would be names of chorus members, to which they are suited. Smikythion in the non-diminutive Smikythos appears again as a choreut name at *Ecc.* 293;[14] Teisiades suggests τεῖσαι, 'Mr. Penalty'; Chremon may be 'Needy' (MacDowell's suggestion), as the wasp chorus certainly was; and Pheredeipnos, 'Lunch-carrier', could refer to a juror bringing his lunch with him to a long trial.[15]

5. *Peace*

In *Peace* the chorus is made up of 'all the Greeks' (Πανέλληνες, 302), and Trygaios exhorts them for the most part as various groups (464-511): Boeotians, Argives, Laconians, Megarians, Athenians, and finally the farmers (508) who must come from all the geographic groups. But there is one individual mentioned, and that is Lamachos; at 473-474 Trygaios says ὦ Λάμαχ', ἀδικεῖς ἐμποδὼν καθήμενος./οὐδὲν δεόμεθ', ὤνθρωπε, τῆς σῆς μορμόνος. Lamachos is imagined for a moment to be a member of the chorus who is hindering the recovery of Peace. There is no sustained characterization ('Lamachos' does not even have any lines), and it would have been possible to have Trygaios address his remark to a choreut undistinguished from the rest.

6. *Birds*

In *Birds* the choreuts are identified as different kinds of birds.

7. *Frogs*

---

[13]Note further the similarity of 402 (πότε δ', εἰ μὴ νῦν, ἐπαρήξετέ μοι) to *Lys.* 304, the men's chorus rushing to help Athena: ἢ πότ' αὐτῇ μᾶλλον ἢ νῦν, ὦ Λάχης, ἀρήξομεν; "It's now or never" is evidently a phrase used to stir a chorus into action. Also, the mode of address, ὦ Α καὶ Β καὶ Γ, is typical of an address to the chorus (cf. *Ach.* 612, *Ecc.* 293); the audience is very rarely addressed with individual names, and in the only extant instance of such address (*Ve.* 74 ff) the names are not bunched together, but spread out over a number of lines to give time to recognize each one.

[14]It is an alias used by one of the women choreuts while disguised as a man. We also find a woman choreut called the wife of Smikythion, *Ecc.* 46.

[15]For jurors getting hungry during a trial, see *Ve.* 776-778; for taking one's lunch to the assembly cf. *Ecc.* 306-308, with Ussher's note.

In *Frogs*, neither the chorus of frogs nor the chorus of initiates has any individual names.

8. *Lysistrata*

This is the only extant Old Comedy with a split chorus of half men, half women. Both halves are supposed to be old.

In the parodos of *Lysistrata* (254 ff.) the men's chorus enters urging one another on by name, and the women's chorus does likewise (319 ff). The men are called Drakes (254), Strymodoros (259), and Philourgos (265), at 304 one more is named Laches, and during the encounter with the women's chorus a Phaidrias is addressed (356).

Drakes: this name is used again as a choreut alias in *Ecc.* 293. The root is connected with δράκων, 'serpent' (which is itself connected with δέρκεσθαι, 'see'). It may be significant that a choreut in Sophocles' satyr play *Ichneutae* was called Drakis (*Ich.* 183 Radt). Perhaps we see in the name Drakes a survival from an earlier element of satyr play incorporated into Old Comedy.

Strymodorus: this name was used for a choreut in *Wasps* (233) (see above) as well as a neighbor mentioned at *Ach.* 274.

Philourgos: 'Fond of Work,' cf. Euergides, choreut name at *Ve.* 234 with a similar meaning.

Laches: became a stock name for old men in New Comedy; Menander has *senes* named Laches in the *Heros*, *Kitharista*, and *Perinthia*, and there is one in the *Hecyra* of Terence. Perhaps its connection with λαγχάνω and its connotation 'one who has obtained (something)' made it attractive for the *senes* of New Comedy as posessors of the family estate.

Phaidrias: this name became a stock *adulescens* name in New Comedy (cf. Terence *Eun.*, *Phor.*, and the girl named Phaedria in Plautus *Aul.*). Its derivation from φαιδρός ('beaming, cheerful') may have seemed appropriate for a young person's name; it could

well be rendered 'Sunny'. In the context of the irate old men's chorus of *Lysistrata*, the name was perhaps felt as comically incongruous.

The women respond with Nikodike (321), and Kalyke and Kritylla are mentioned as friends among the women occupying the Acropolis (322, 323); during the encounter with the men's chorus Stratyllis (365) and Rhodippe (370) are named.

On Nikodike, Henderson well observes: "Nikodike was a common name, here chosen probably for its auspicious meaning (cf. Kalonike) and possibly to underline the appearance of the women immediately following the koryphaios' prayer to Nike (317-18)."

The name Kalyke is from κάλυξ, flower-cup or bud; the κάλυξ had a pretty shape, which leant itself to women's jewelry (*Il.* 18. 401, *h. Ven.* 87, Aphrodite puts on κάλυκες when she wants to look attractive), and at *h. Ven.* 284 the adjective καλυκῶπις is used of a nymph.[16]

Of Kritylla, Henderson says: "It is tempting to think that our Kritylla (one of the occupying women) was the same woman [as Kritylla, daughter of Antitheos of Gargetto *Th.* 898] and an actual contemporary, perhaps a priestess of Demeter.[17] But it is not unlikely that Ar. arbitrarily chose the name..." Even though we cannot always understand why Aristophanes chose a particular name, we would be well advised to think of his choices as deliberate rather than arbitrary, if arbitrary means random. Kritylla is a diminutive feminine from κριτός, 'chosen', which can also mean 'choice, excellent'. It may be that the pair of names Kalyke and Kritylla suggest the attractiveness and excellence of the women occupying the Acropolis.

---

[16] Kalyke is a mythological name, reported variously to be a Nereid, nurse of Dionysos, daughter of Danaos, wife of Lynkeus, mother of Kyknos, daughter of Aeolus, mother of Endymion (references in Pape-Benseler s.v. Καλύκη). According to Athenaeus (14. 619 d) Kalyke was a lovelorn girl who threw herself off a cliff when rejected by the young man, Euathlos, and gave her name to a song of Stesichorus.

[17] It is not clear why we should be tempted to see a priestess of Demeter here.

Stratyllis is a feminine diminutive from στρατός, 'army,' and may suggest in the context of combat that she is the equivalent of a small army herself; such an interpretation would support the idea that in line 365 ἄψαι μόνον Στρατυλλίδος τῷ δακτύλῳ προσελθών Stratyllis is speaking herself and daring the man to approach her, rather than Henderson's idea that another woman is speaking and daring him to approach Stratyllis.

Rhodippe: In *The Maculate Muse* (pp. 127, 135) Henderson calls the name Rhodippe a "phallic-vaginal pun", ῥόδον referring to the female genitalia and ἵππος to the phallus.[18] However, in his commentary on *Lysistrata* (370) Henderson says only "Rhodippe is an hetaira-name at *AP* 5. 36, but Rhodippos occurs in inscriptions." Presumably Henderson has changed his mind on the point, and is arguing from the fact that Rhodippos was a normal name that the name Rhodippe did not *necessarily* have an obscene sense. While that is true, the relevant information is that the name *could* have an obscene sense (demonstrated by its use as a hetaira name) of which Aristophanes might have taken advantage.

9. *Thesmophoriazusae*

The chorus of women attending the Thesmophoria enters at 295. It is possible that 568 λαβὲ θοἰμάτιον, Φιλίστη is addressed to a choreut, in which case Philiste is the only choreut name in the play.

10. *Ecclesiazusae*

The chorus enters one by one very early in the play (41 ff.), and as they arrive Praxagora and the other two women call out their names in recognition. Named are: Kleinarete, Sostrate, Philainete, Glyke, Melistiche wife of Smikythion, Geusistrate wife of the κάπηλος, the wife of Philodoretos, and the wife of Chairetades.

[18]The evidence that ἵππος could mean phallus is very weak, consisting of one statement in Hesychius that the word could refer to female and male genitalia. However, horseback riding used in an obscene sense was common, cf. Henderson (1975) pp. 164-165.

Kleinarete, Sostrate and Philainete are named together (41-42), and their names do not appear to make any sort of jest. The name Sostrate was preserved as a *matrona* name in New Comedy (see Terence, *Heaut., Hec., Adelph.*). It is possible that one of them addresses 43-45 to their group, urging them on so as not to have to pay the penalty vowed by Glyke for the last to arrive. While Glyke ('Sweetie', PA 3039-3041)[19] is not addressed, she is thought of as among the women who will be present, and in that sense can be considered a chorus member. The penalty proposed was wine (and chickpeas), making the standard joke about women's bibulousness.

Melistiche wife of Smikythion has three lines spoken about her (46-48), containing a joke to the effect that she is the only wife who was able to get away from her husband at her convenience; Smikythion was not requiring her attention in bed, as the other husbands were. The joke is on Smikythion, but it is quite possible that no particular individual was intended; the joke stands on its own, and Smikythion (also Smikythos) was a very common name (cf. *PA* 12766-12798). The name Melistiche is quite unusual, though historically possible.[20] Very few names employ the root στιχ-. Bechtel (*HPG* 304) believes that all personal names in μελι- come from μέλει and mean 'taking care of'; Melistiche would then mean 'taking care of the στίχος' (rank? verse?). But it seems unreasonable to deny that some of these names may come from μέλι, 'honey', e. g. the woman's name Μελιτώ (IG II 2381); Melistiche could then mean 'sweet verse' perhaps, a fine name for a choreut.

Geusistrate: Ussher comments, "The names here are typical, not personal; for citizens' wives would normally not be public figures: except Geusistrata," and "The wife of the keeper of the 'local' would be better known." It appears that Ussher thinks Geusistrate was really the name of a tavern-keeper's wife known to the audience, but this is

[19]Glycerium (dim.) is a meretrix name in Terence, *Andria.*

[20]The name has been restored in a Cretan inscription, as [M]ελισσ[τ]ιχα; see Ussher on *Ecc.* 46.

impossible. Geusistrate is a comic formation (the root γευσ- was never used to form Greek personal names) made as a joke-name for a tavern hostess. The name has a double meaning, depending on whether we understand γευσ- as having an active or middle sense: either "giving the army a taste" (of wine, etc.) or "having a taste of the army" (in obscene sense).[21]

The last two choreuts are named by their husbands' names only, which is quite as individual and proper form of address as 'Mrs. Thatcher' is in English. This form has the effect of emphasizing the husband; we do not know who Philodoretos and Chairetades were, but perhaps they were undesirables of some kind, lending an ironic tone to 53 "everyone worthwhile in the city."

It is probable that the woman who says she brought Lamios' staff at line 77 is understood to be Mrs. Lamios. The name Lamios appears to have been introduced for the sake of the reference to Lamia and the joke about sticks and farting which follows (it is at least clear that 78-81 contain two jokes about Lamios, although no one has been able to explain exactly what they are).

Once the chorus has donned male disguise and is leaving for the assembly, the choreuts practice addressing each other with men's names, Charitimides, Smikythos and Drakes (293). These names appear to be male choreut names (rather than just "common men's names," Ussher). Possibly names from χάρις were appropriate for choreuts, as Charitimides here and Charinades, *Ve.* 232. For Smikythos cf. *Ve.* 401 Smikythion, and *Ecc.* 46; for Drakes cf. *Lys.* 254 (see above under *Lysistrata*).

11. *Plutos*

The chorus of *Plutos* is composed of fellow demesmen of Chremes (cf. *Pl.* 223, 254, 322); none is named, and no specific deme is mentioned.

[21]Ussher refers to the -στρατη element of the name as "the nominal ending" but fails to interpret it as if it meant anything at all. The 'army' calls to mind a large group of ordinary men (cf. LSJ s.v. στρατός I. 2, 3), a comic representation of the tavern's customers, and forms the object of the verbal element of the name (cf. Lysistrata, 'breaking up the army').

In surveying the choreut names in Aristophanes, we have seen that several of the names are preserved by New Comedy as stock names: Sostrate, Laches, Phaidrias. It may be significant that the name Phaedrias was made a stock name for young men (not old men, despite the age of the choreut in *Lysistrata*). Although there is a tendency to assume that choreut names are appropriate to the dramatic age of the chorus, it may be that we should look more often for them to be appropriate to comic choreuts *per se* (as e. g. the names Komias and Komarchides clearly are). The name Drakes may have been inherited from satyr play choruses, and perhaps other names were as well. The possibility presents itself that traditional choreut names now lost to us may have provided other stock names for New Comedy; perhaps names such as Chaireas or Demeas were originally names familiar in comedy from the chorus, and were taken over as character names as the nature of the plays changed. Social comedy began to prefer 'everyday' names to the thematic comic inventions of Old Comedy, and comic choreut names were available.

B. Women

Some years ago D. Schaps (1977) examined the practice of the Greek orators in naming women in speeches; he demonstrated that for the most part the orators refer to women as the wife or daughter (or mother or sister) of a man, without mentioning her given name. The exceptions to this practice generally are women for whom some degree of disrespect is being shown (prostitutes, slaves, women on the opposing side of the case).[1] Schaps concludes:

> "The most respectful way to refer to a woman, therefore, was not to say what her name was, but to indicate whose wife, or daughter, or sister she was: for indeed, if she was a proper woman, the jurors would not be expected to know her, but would be expected to know her *kyrios*. In a lawcourt, where one's words and the impression they made were carefully weighed, the overwhelming tendency was to use this oblique form of reference; in everyday life there was no need for it, nor is there any indication that women ever referred to themselves in this way" (p. 330).

Actually, there is some indication in comedy that women did refer to themselves in this way. In *Thesmophoriazusae* there is a scene (*Th.* 574-651) in which Kleisthenes warns the women of the presence of an intruder and begins to question the women as to their identity to find the impostor. Kleisthenes asks the first woman he questions who she is (τίς εἶ πρώτη σύ; 603), to which she replies Κλεωνύμου γυνή (605). It is clear that when asked in a formal context to identify herself, a woman would call herself 'Mrs. X'. When Kleisthenes then questions Euripides' kinsman, he asks, as a question equivalent to 'who are you?', τίς ἔστ' ἀνήρ σοι; (619). To this the slow-witted kinsman can only reply τὸν δεῖνα γιγνώσκεις, τὸν ἐκ Κοθωκιδῶν (further identified as τὸν δεῖνα τὸν τοῦ δεῖνα 622). From this scene we can see that 'wife of X' was considered proper identification, not just by courtroom orators, but by women themselves. Indeed, it would be strange if the courteous form of naming was never used in everyday life outside of the courtroom.

---

[1]Schaps (1977) divides the named women into three categories: "women of shady reputation, women connected with the speaker's opponent, and dead women" (p. 328). There are also women named in cases where the speaker is under some urgent necessity to be clear about the woman's identity (p. 329).

In a situation where formal identification is not at issue, we may still find women referring to each other simply as 'Mrs. X'. Near the beginning of *Ecclesiazusae* the chorus begins to arrive, and they are pointed out by name as they come on in small groups. Three different types of names are used, indifferently as it seems, though different types are not juxtaposed. First three women are named by their given names alone (Kleinarete, Sostrate, Philainete, 41-42). Next come two women named by husband's name and given name, in that order (the wife of Smikythion, Melistiche, 46 and the wife of the innkeeper, Geusistrate, 49). Finally two are named by husband's name alone (the wife of Philodoretos and the wife of Chairetades, 51). It appears that the situation in comedy, and probably in everyday life, is more complicated than in oratory.[2] A. Sommerstein[3] has taken Schaps' observations on the naming of women in oratory and examined all of Greek and Roman comedy in their light, to see whether Schaps' general rule holds for comedy, and has concluded that "with some interesting exceptions...the rule holds that in public--that is, in addressing or in the presence of one or more free men not related to the woman in question--a free man does not mention a respectable woman by her own name".[4] Sommerstein compiles a great many statistics in support of this conclusion; I reproduce his figures for the eleven plays of Aristophanes; of course, Sommerstein is including all women mentioned, not just women who are characters.

---

[2]I do not know why Schaps says "In comedy, in tragedy, in dedications, and on tombstones, women are regularly referred to by their given names, and rarely if at all by the names of their fathers, brothers, or husbands. It is clear that the orators are not calling the women by their customary names, but avoiding them, when they tell us whom they married" (p. 329). Of course it is regular in inscriptions to list the woman's husband's name, and often the father's as well, in addition to the given name. cf. e.g. *PA* 1757 ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΗ ΑΒΡΟΝΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΟΥ ΒΑΤΗΘΕΝ ΓΥΝΗ, or *PA* 1952 ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΗ ΖΩΠΥΡΟΥ ΟΤΡΥΝΕΩΣ ΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ, ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΧΟΛΛΕΙΔΟΥ ΓΥΝΗ, both from inscriptions.

[3]Sommerstein (1980).

[4]Sommerstein (1980) pp. 393-4.

> "In these plays I find one hundred and four places where a woman is addressed or mentioned by name; and in no less than sixty-two of these cases the speaker is also a woman (or a man pretending to be a woman). When the speaker is a woman, it does not seem to matter whether she is speaking to women or to men; twenty-one times, in fact, a woman names herself or another woman when addressing, or in the presence of, one or more men. Forty-two times, then, in the eleven plays a woman is named by a male speaker. In eight cases, almost certainly, the woman is dead; in a further nineteen she is a slave or a hetaira or a *lena*. Four times a husband addresses his wife by name, and once he names her to another woman; in these cases no other free man is present. So there remain only ten apparent cases of a respectable woman being named by a free man "in public" as above defined" (p. 394).

Six of these are explained away, and Sommerstein is left with *Pax* 992 (Lysimache; see below n. 10) and *Lys.* 1086, 1103, and 1147 (Lysistrate). He then makes it clear that in his statistics he does not include women who are named by their husband's (or father's) name *alone*.[5] Such naming, however, was the very thing which Schaps was examining. We cannot say, therefore, on the basis of Sommerstein's statistics, how the number of times a woman is named by her given name in the defined situation compares to the number of times a woman is named by husband's name alone. I shall be including the latter type of naming in my reckoning of named women characters; indeed, Sommerstein has missed Schaps' point[6] that 'wife of X' is in fact a designation of an individual woman, which should be taken into account by prosopographers. It seems that the difference in language and convention has prevented scholars from recognizing that 'Kleonymos' wife' is just as

[5]"Meanwhile we may note that there is a tendency in Aristophanes, just as in the orators, to identify women indirectly by naming their male relatives" (p. 394); Sommerstein goes on to mention four of these cases.

[6]Schaps p. 330: "For as long as prosopography restricts itself to women whose names are known it is limited, as far as the orators are concerned, to women of particular sorts, and most of them not the most honourable. If we wish to learn about Athenian citizen women, we must take into account not only Plangon, but Mantitheus' mother, Democrates' sister, and Meixiades' daughter. We may, perhaps, find that we know more about them than we had thought." I note that Schaps still stops short of recognizing these designations as names.

much the name of an individual woman as is 'Mrs. Thatcher'; it is quite misleading to say that a woman is not named when she is being named politely.[7]

In extant Aristophanes, 32 women characters are named.[8] Of these, five are slaves or hetairai, leaving 27 women with the possibility of being called by their husbands' (or fathers') names. Only four of these women are named with their husbands' names alone (i.e. no given name); two of them are the choreuts of *Ecclesiazusae* mentioned above (the wife of Philodoretos and the wife of Chairetades, *Ecc.* 51). A third, also in *Ecc.*, mentions her own husband's name so that we infer she is the wife of Lamias (*Ecc.* 77), but she is not specifically called Λαμίου γυνή. The fourth is in the identification scene of *Thesmophoriazusae* mentioned above, the wife of Kleonymos (*Ecc.* 605). None of these women is named by a man who is 'avoiding', as Schaps has it, her given name; all are named by other women or by themselves.

Of the remaining 23 women, four have their husbands' or fathers' names added to their given names. Two of these are choreuts of *Ecc.* already noted (wife of Smikythion, Melistiche, *Ecc.* 46 and the wife of the innkeeper, Geusistrate, *Ecc.* 49); Geusistrate's husband's occupation rather than his name is given. The other two women identify

---

[7]The way Strepsiades names his wife in *Nu.* 46-7 (ἔγημα Μεγακλέους τοῦ Μεγακλέους ἀδελφιδῆν) is, I believe, a comic twist on the usual formula. A Greek listener expected to hear whose *daughter*, not whose *niece*, the man married, and ἀδελφιδῆν would have come as a surprise for θυγατέρα. The wife is characterized as a social climber who stresses her relationship with her most elegant relatives; Strepsiades calls her 'niece of Megakles' because that name is more important to her than her connection with her father. The implication is that she gives herself airs because of her uncle (whom she also holds up as a model for her son, *Nu.* 70). One thinks of course of the family of Alcibiades with its numerous members named Megakles and its habit of naming son after father (rather than grandfather), cf. *PA* table to p. 53 no. 9688. Pheidippides is thus made a dramatic 'poor cousin' of Alcibiades. Strepsiades is not merely identifying his wife indirectly (so Sommerstein); there is a comic point to the unusual form of naming and to the name Megakles as well.

[8]This figure leaves out of account feminine personified abstractions (such as Basileia and Diallage) and mythological figures (such as Iris and Prokne); it includes the names Kritylla, and Sostrate twice, since each occurs in two different plays.

themselves (rather than being named by another), and each has a reason for wishing to identify herself emphatically. At *Th.* 897-8, Euripides' kinsman, acting the part of Helen, has just paratragically referred to the woman guarding him as Θεονόη Πρωτέως, and she rejoins indignantly μὰ τὼ θεώ, εἰ μὴ Κρίτυλλά γ' Ἀντιθέου Γαργηττόθεν. The fourth woman is the bread-seller whom Philokleon has injured in *Wasps*; she is about to sue him for damages, and says οὔ τοι μὰ τὼ θεώ καταπροίξει Μυρτίας τῆς Ἀγκυλίωνος θυγατέρος καὶ Σωστράτης (*Ve.* 1396-7), adding her mother's name as well for comic good measure; note that both Myrtia and Kritylla use the emphatic oath μὰ τὼ θεώ before giving their complete names.

We are left with 19 women who are named by their given names. Most of these are named by other women; however, that is to be expected since most of the women characters occur in the women's plays (*Lys., Ecc., Thes.*) where the women are talking to or about one another. The statement that in comedy free men do not name (with given name) respectable women in public would only be meaningful if, as in oratory, the men were seen to be naming women by their husband's name instead; that is not the case, at least with women characters' names, as shown above. It should also be taken into account that the situation required for the rule to apply (free man naming a woman in front of another free man not related to the woman) does not frequently occur in comedy. Thus the circumstance which Sommerstein, and Henderson after him,[9] make much of, that

[9]Henderson (1987) *Lysistrata* p. xxxix: "Lysimache would thus be one of only two examples in all of Greek comedy of a respectable woman being publicly named by a free man not related to her: her priesthood exempted her from the ordinary protocol. The other example is Lysistrata, who is so named at 1086, 1103, and 1147." Lysimache, named at *Pax* 992, really should not be included, since the context is that of a standard type of name-play on the literal meaning of a proper name and not a reference to an actual person, the same as we see at *Lys.* 554 (evidently not included by Sommerstein because the name is here used in the plural) where Lysistrata says οἶμαι ποτε Λυσιμάχας ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησι καλεῖσθαι. Similarly at *Pax* 992, Trygaios prays to Peace to show herself and λῦσον δὲ μάχας καὶ κορκορυγάς, ἵνα Λυσιμάχην σε καλῶμεν, obviously a name-play involving the phrase λῦσον δὲ μάχας. For a comparable example of the device cf. *Ecc.* 1021 Προκρούστης τήμερον γενήσομαι, with a play on 1017 προκρούσῃ and 1018 προκρούειν.

Lysistrata seems to be the only woman in Greek comedy named in violation of the rule, may not have the significance which they wish to attach to it (that her status as priestess made her a public figure, and such women were not accorded the usual courtesy). If in fact priestesses were customarily referred to by their given names in public, and Aristophanes meant his heroine to represent a real priestess, then why should he not have named her Lysimache, since that and not Lysistrata is the name of the priestess in question? I have argued (in the section on Lysistrata) that the heroine Lysistrata is not to be identified with the historical priestess Lysimache, for a number of reasons. Here it is most probably her status as protagonist of the play, and the thematic nature of her name, which causes Lysistrata to be named in public. Aristophanes never provided her with a husband at all,[10] and when her name is introduced by one of the other women, it fixes the name both for the audience and for dramatic purposes in the play. Henderson on *Lys.* 1086-7 remarks: "We are not told how the Athenian ambassador knows the name and role of Lys., for this is the first time in the play that she is named by a man..." But the phenomenon of universal knowledge of action in the play is not at all unusual. How did the Boiotian and Theban merchants, and others who come in during the iambic scenes, find out the name and actions of Dikaiopolis in *Acharnians*? They are considered to have learned them at the same time the audience did; and so with Lysistrata. The name and role of the protagonist is known to all, and it is as the protagonist of the play that Lysistrata is addressed by her name.

[10]Contrast Praxagora of *Ecc.*, who does have a husband, Blepyros. Aristophanes uses that circumstance to make jokes about customary forms of address twice in the play. At *Ecc.* 727, Blepyros says he will follow Praxagora so that people will say τὸν τῆς στρατηγοῦ τοῦτον οὐ θαυμάζετε; "Don't you admire the husband of the general?" And again at 1125-6, the maid comes in asking if anyone can tell her τὸν δεσπότην, τὸν ἄνδρ,' ὅπου 'στὶ, τῆς ἐμῆς κεκτημένης. Blepyros is comically called 'husband of the (lady-)general' and 'husband of my mistress' as part of the male-female role reversal of the play, since normally wives are designated in this way, not husbands.

Women Characters Named in Aristophanes

kp = κωφὸν πρόσωπον * = no given name + = husband's or father's name in addition to given name

[ ] = not certainly present

*Chairetades' wife (*Ecc.* 51) choreut
Dardanis (*Ve.* 1371) slave, kp
Elaphion (*Th.* 1172) slave, kp
+Geusistrate (*Ecc.* 49) wife of κάπηλος, choreut
[Glyke (*Ecc.* 43)]
Ismenia (*Lys.* 696) kp
Kalonike (*Lys.* 6)
Kalyke (*Lys.* 322) choreut
*Kleonymos' wife (*Th.* 605)
Kritylla (*Lys.* 323) choreut,
+ b. (*Th.* 898) wife of Antitheos of Gargetto
*Lamias' wife (*Ecc.* 77)
Lampito (*Lys.* 77)
[Lysilla (*Th.* 374)]
Lysistrata (*Lys.* 6)
Mania (*Th.* 728) slave, kp
+Melistiche (*Ecc.* 46) wife of Smikythion
Mika (*Th.* 760)
Myrrhine (*Lys.* 70)
+Myrtia (*Ve.* 1396) daughter of Angkulion & Sostrate
Nikodike (*Lys.* 321) choreut
Philainete (*Ecc.* 42) choreut
Philiste (*Th.* 568)
*Philodoretos' wife (*Ecc.* 51) choreut
Plathane (*Ran.* 549)
Praxagora (*Ecc.* 124)
Rhodippe (*Lys.* 370) choreut
[Sostrate (*Th.* 373)]
b. (*Ec* c. 41) choreut
Stratyllis (*Lys.* 365) choreut
Thraitta (*Th.* 279) slave
[Timokleia (*Th.* 373)]

C. Gods and Mythical Persons

In this category will be considered gods, heroes, and other figures from myth who appear as characters in Aristophanes. In addition to the deities some personified abstractions appear; these are treated as a separate category, for which see pp. 144-8.

Aristophanes does not, in his extant plays at least, bring very many gods on stage; most of them are in *Frogs* and *Birds*. Traditional gods who appear are: Dionysos (*Ran.*), Herakles (*Av.* and *Ran.*), Hermes (*Pax* and *Plut.*), Iris (*Av.*), Pluto (*Ran.*), Poseidon (*Av.*), and Prometheus (*Av.*). The poet invents a god for *Birds*, the Triballian god who accompanies Herakles and Poseidon on their embassy to Nephelokokkygia. To the gods may be added the mythical characters Tereus and Prokne who appear in *Birds*, Charon (and possibly Empousa) in *Frogs*.[1] The identification of the doorkeeper in the underworld (*Frogs*) as the hero Aiakos is discussed below.

In general, the gods tend to be identified by name after they enter the stage; a list of gods with indications of when they are first named with respect to their entrances follows. [+2 = named 2 lines after entrance; -2 = named 2 lines before entrance.]

Iris (*Av.*)	+5
Herakles (*Av*)	+9
Prometheus (*Av.*)	+10
Dionysos (Ran.)	+22
Hermes (*Plut.*)	+23
Triballos (*Av.*)	+62
Poseidon (*Av.*)	+73
Hermes (*Av.*)	+185
Herakles (*Ran.*)	+244 (118 lines after exit)
Pluto (*Ran.*)	-46

[1]Xanthias describes a θηρίον μέγα (288) which Dionysos is too afraid to look at, but concludes must be Empousa (293). It is not certain whether this creature actually appeared on stage, or whether Xanthias is merely pulling Dionysos' leg and describing an imaginary Empousa in order to frighten him. Another possibility is that there is something there, but that it is not frightening in appearance, and that Xanthias is embellishing his description. I believe that either of the latter possibilities is more humorous than having someone actually dressed as Empousa appear on stage.

The gods portrayed on stage form a category of characters who do not need to be named in order to be identified by the audience. The reason for this is that a god, having well-known iconography, could be dressed in an appropriate costume which would immediately disclose his identity. Especially convenient for the stage is the custom of portraying gods carrying certain objects which are associated with them, as the club with Herakles, the caduceus with Hermes, and so on.[2] Thus, in *Frogs*, Herakles can appear (ll. 38-164) for a conversation with his brother Dionysos (who was costumed as 'Dionysos dressed as Herakles'), and be readily identified by his costume, although his name is not mentioned at any point in the conversation.[3] From the dialogue alone one would not know he was Herakles until perhaps lines 62-63, where there is a reference to his appetite, or 109, where Dionysos refers to being disguised "κατὰ σὴν μίμησιν" (and we already know from lines 46-47 that Dionysos has a lion skin and club). Likewise, in *Birds*, Poseidon is not called by name until 73 lines after his entrance at 1565, but he too would have been easily recognized by his costume, which no doubt included a trident. This recognition facilitates the joke in 1614 of having Poseidon swear by himself (νὴ τὸν Ποσειδῶ).

1. Pluto

In the underworld of *Frogs*, another god appears whose name is not mentioned while he is on stage, the god Pluto. He does not even speak until line 1414, but he must have been present all through the final contest scene;[4] the audience expected to see Pluto there after hearing the conversation between Xanthias and Pluto's slave (lines 738-813) in

[2]For a detailed discussion of the gods' costumes and their iconography in vase paintings, see L.M. Stone (1981), pp. 309-332.

[3]Later, when Dionysos and Xanthias have already gone to the underworld, Herakles *is* named, as the person who told them where the monsters would be (line 282), clearly a reference to their conversation earlier in the play.

[4]Although D. MacDowell, "Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1407-67," *CQ* n.s.9 (1959) 261-268 believes that Pluto enters at 1410.

which Pluto is said to be about to stage the contest between the dramatists.[5] This set-up would have predisposed the audience to recognize Pluto, who would then also have been identified by his costume, with sceptre and perhaps cornucopia.[6]

2. 'Aiakos'

While Herakles and Pluto are not directly named, there is conversation before or after their appearances in which they are named, and assumptions are made during their scenes that they have been recognized; that is, things are said by or to them which are appropriate to their characters. No doubt can exist about their identities. This cannot, however, be said of the character in *Frogs* listed in the πρόσωπα as 'Aiakos' (his name is never mentioned in the play).[7] He is the person watching the doors of Hades, who reviles Dionysos (ostensibly Herakles) upon his arrival and runs off to fetch help for his attack (lines 464-478). He later reappears and conducts an inconclusive inquest to find out whether Dionysos or Xanthias is the real god, ending by taking them both in to be examined by Pluto and Persephone (lines 605-671).[8] Not only is there no indication that this character is meant to be Aiakos, a hero who acted as one of the judges in the

[5]Frogs 784-786: ΧΑ. τί δῆθ' ὁ Πλούτων δρᾶν παρασκευάζεται;
ΟΙ. ἀγῶνα ποιεῖν αὐτίκα μάλα καὶ κρίσιν
κἄλεγχον αὐτοῖν τῆς τέχνης.

[6]See Stone (1981), pp. 327-8.

[7]Kock, Hall and Geldart, Rogers, Radermacher, Stanford, and Coulon all adopt the designation 'Aiakos' for this character in their editions.

[8]Most editors also designate as 'Aiakos' the character who enters with Xanthias at 738 and carries on the "fellow slave" dialogue with him (to 813). This character, however, is a common household slave, whereas the doorkeeper was a person of some authority, who could command slaves himself (as he does in 608-9), and carry on an inquest. Clearly the two must be two different characters. Radermacher and Coulon call the second character Οἰκέτης Πλούτωνος rather than Aiakos, following the manuscripts (R and V have Θεράπων Πλ., M has Οἰκέτης Πλ.).

underworld, but there are many indications that he is not.[9] First, the character is not a judge, he is a doorman (line 465) who keeps an eye on Cerberus (467-469). Although Aiakos is said by Apollodorus and Lucian[10] to have held the keys to Hades, literature before Aristophanes does not mention this function, and in references in Plato, Isocrates, and Demosthenes[11] Aiakos appears as a judge in the underworld. It is very possible that the idea that Aiakos kept the keys was Hellenistic, and hence the character at the gate of the underworld in *Frogs* was surmised by Hellenistic scholars to be Aiakos.[12] Then, the circumstance that he is the first in the series of four underworld inhabitants who remember 'Herakles' from his previous visit and have unfinished business with him suggests that he should be considered in a class with the other three characters invented for the occasion (a maid and two female innkeepers), and not as the well-known hero Aiakos. These contra-indications, and the lack of mention of the name Aiakos anywhere, should warn us not to identify this character as Aiakos, regardless of whether or not it would have been possible to costume him recognizably.[13]

---

[9]Radermacher (1967) takes a rather ambiguous position on the question, believing that the doorkeeper was intended by Aristophanes to be a god, and designating the character Aiakos, but adding "auch gegen ein Lemma "Αιδου πυλωρός wäre nichts einzuwenden" (p. 212). The mistaken notion that the doorkeeper was both a god and Aiakos goes back to Zuretti (1896), pp. 67-69.

[10]Apollodorus 3. 12. 6; Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 13, 3. 20. 1 and 6. 22. 3; *de luctu* 4. Kock (n. to *Ra.* 464) suggested plausibly that Lucian made Aiakos the doorkeeper in reference to the character in *Frogs* (with the implication that the character was designated 'Aiakos' in manuscripts of Lucian's time).

[11]Plato *Apol.* 41a, *Gorg.* 523e; Isocrates *Euag.* 15.; Demosthenes *de cor.* 127.

[12]This is the view of Hiller (1874), p. 455; Rohde (1907) I. 310 f. n. 1 on the other hand believes that the *Schlüsselamt* of Aiakos was "alt", but nevertheless agrees that the character in *Frogs* was identified as Aiakos not by Aristophanes but by a later learned grammarian, who was thinking of Euripides' *Peirithoos* (fr. 591 N.), where Aiakos apparently met Herakles at the gates of the underworld.

[13]Unfortunately Stone does not discuss Aiakos. The index to mythological subjects in Beazley *ARV* and *ABV* has no references to Aiakos. E. Wörner (in Roscher, *Lexicon d. gr. u. röm. Mythologie*) found two vases with Aiakos identified by inscription; on one he has a ῥάβδος, indicating that he is a judge. That iconography alone would hardly be enough to identify him without the name attached.

3. Iris

Despite the possibility of identifying gods without naming them, most of them are in fact named while they are on stage; Herakles and Pluto in *Frogs* , discussed above, are the only exceptions. There is an interesting twist on the identification problem in *Birds*; the goddess Iris enters at 1202, and although she gives her name, Peisetairos does not appear to recognize her. This scene has given the commentators some trouble; Stone describes the problem as follows:[14]

> The appearance of Iris in the *Birds* is brief, but in terms of costume it poses a real difficulty. When the goddess enters at 1202, she announces that she is an emissary from Olympus. Pisthetaerus responds with two questions: Ὄνομα δέ σοι τί ἐστι; Πλοῖον ἢ κυνῆ; ("What is your name? Are you a ship or a hat?). Iris answers by giving her name. The scene continues in a tone of obscene verbal abuse. The goddess finally exits in anger to return to her father and the other Olympians; at this point it is made clear that she flies, and thus is winged. A minor point raised by the passage is that Iris may not be immediately recognizable, for she is at great pains to identify herself at the beginning of the scene. But the second question of Pisthetaerus, Πλοῖον ἢ κυνῆ, is difficult to interpret.

The 'ship or hat' question must refer to Iris' whole costume, where we need not look for any odd headgear.[15] Iris' iconography included a large pair of wings, and it was the appearance the wings gave her which prompted Peisetairos' question. "Are you a hat?" cannot mean "You are wearing a funny hat"; it means "You look like a hat." Peisetairos is deliberately misinterpreting Iris' iconography by suggesting that the wings represent either a ship (whose sails were often called wings) or a kind of hat which had a wing-like brim or flaps on it.

The humor, and the point, of the scene lie in the fact that Iris *was* immediately recognizable, but Peisetairos simply affects not to know who she is. That he is affecting is made clear by his third question to Iris; after she has identified herself as Ἶρις ταχεῖα, he inquires Πάραλος ἢ Σαλαμινία; Ignoring her name, he takes ταχεῖα as the answer to his

[14]Stone (1981), pp. 320-321.

[15]As most of the commentators do; cf. Stone (1981), p. 321.

inquiry as to whether she is a ship or a hat; she is a 'swift' ship, and now he wants to know which one! The dialogue between Peisetairos and Iris is a demonstration of the new order of things created by the establishment of Nephelokokkygia. Peisetairos and the birds are now on the level of, or even superior to, the old Olympian deities, and Peisetairos, instead of respectfully recognizing and obeying Iris, as she expects a mortal to do, is treating her as an inferior and a trespasser.[16] His refusal to recognize her as the goddess she obviously is leads up to his refusal to recognize the Olympians as gods at all later in the dialogue (*Av.* 1233-1237).

[16]It is perhaps in keeping with his treatment of Iris as a suspicious trespasser that Peisetairos makes his threats of sexual abuse against her. In his "Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*" K. J. Dover (1963) p. 13 observes that there may have been "a conventional assumption that a thief, slave or free, is fair game for the appetites of the offended farmer," comparing *Ach.* 271-275 and Theocritus 5. 116 ff. If he is correct about this assumption, it may be operating in the *Birds* passage as well.

D. Personified Abstractions

Thirteen characters who represent personified abstractions can be identified in the plays of Aristophanes; following is a list of them, arranged chronologically by play.

Acharnians: none
Knights:
1. Demos (42)
2. Spondai (1389)
Clouds:
3. Logos, Better (886)
4. Logos, Worse (886)
Wasps: none
Peace:
5. Polemos (205)
6. Eirene (221)
7. Kydoimos (255)
8. Opora (523)
9. Theoria (523)
Birds:
10. Basileia (1536)
Lysistrata:
11. Diallage (1114)
Thesmophoriazusae: none
Frogs: none
Ecclesiazusae: none
Plutos:
12. Plutos (78)
13. Penia (437)

Aristophanes' personifications have been extensively analyzed and discussed by H.-J. Newiger (1957), in the book *Metapher und Allegorie*, which deals solely with the subject of personified abstractions in Aristophanes. Newiger is concerned to distinguish various sorts of personification: metaphor, 'Bild,' symbol, rhetorical allegory, allegory proper. I do not intend here to sort through and evaluate all of the fine distinctions of Newiger; for the purposes of this thesis, I have examined both the mode of first naming the personifications, and the point of naming (whether before, after, or upon entrance), to see whether the abstractions fall into different categories on this basis. Following is a list of the personifications arranged by point of introduction.

Introduced before entrance:
Demos (-686)

Eirene (-300)
Basileia (-184)
Polemos (-30)
Logoi: (-3) Worse, (-3)Better

Introduced after entrance:
Plutos (+78)
Penia (+19)

Introduced upon entrance:
Spondai
Kydoimos
Opora
Theoria
Diallage

It appears that in general the more important personifications, who play or whose idea plays a large role in the action, are introduced before their entrance, while the more minor personifications, who make only a brief appearance, are introduced upon entrance. The introduction before entrance is in the manner of the treatment of historical characters; personifications, too, are characters whose names will immediately mean something to the audience.

It is striking that if it were not for Plutos and Penia in *Plutos* there would be no personifications who are introduced after their entrance. This late development in treating the introduction of names of personifications may support Newiger's observation that it is only with Plutos that Aristophanes develops a completely allegorical character: "In der Gestalt des Plutos finden wir schließlich eine allegorische Bühnenfigur, ausdrücklich als Gottheit gemeint, aber mit Eigenschaften des Begriffs ausgestattet, keinen eigentlich persönlichen Zügen" (p. 179). However, the reason for the late introduction of Plutos' name may simply lie in the situation of the play; the opening is so constructed that Plutos' identity is unknown to Chremylos at the beginning, and must be found out. The effect of concealment and then sudden revelation of the name is then echoed in the treatment of Penia, who answers several questions as to her identity in a riddling fashion, until she finally shocks Chremylos by telling him who she is (*Pl.* 422-437). Similar is the treatment of Prometheus upon his entrance in *Birds* (1494 ff.). Prometheus skulks about in disguise

during an exchange with Peisetairos, who wants to know who he is, and finally surprises him by revealing his identity--this time not by naming himself but by taking off his wraps to reveal his distinctive costume.

Special Problems: Demos, Logoi, Eirene, Basileia

1. Demos

By far the earliest introduction is that of Demos in *Knights*, introduced 686 lines before his entrance. Demos is a peculiar case, since he personifies not really an abstraction (i.e. the idea 'people') but a particular group, the Athenian people as a political body. As Newiger describes it (pp. 165-6):

> Bei Demos ist es ein lebendiges Kollektiv von Personen, die Einzelperson des Herrn Demos steht pars pro toto für das ganze Volk, das so oder so entscheidet und handelt. Es liegt Konzentration des Kollektivs in einer Person vor. Zugleich ist diese Personifikation in einem einmaligen Akt vollzogen: Demos wird handelnde Person eines Bildes, das das Staatsleben im Privatleben darstellt. Sie ist "aktuell" auch in dem zweiten Sinn, daß dieser Demos nur in die gegenwartsbezogene Handlung aus der politischen Situation nach Pylos mit Nikias, Demosthenes und Kleon gehört. Herr Demos ist also nicht ein für allemal "das Volk", sondern zunächst nur das athenische, dann aber eben auch dieses nur--überspitzt gesagt--im Jahre 425/4. Die Personifikation agiert also nicht für den Begriff "Volk".

The characterization of Demos also wavers between representing the Athenian *demos* and being just an individual citizen, somewhat as Paphlagon fluctuates between representing a slave and representing a demagogue.[1] Demos could be called a semi-personification; certainly he is not a full-fledged allegorical figure as Plutos will be in *Plutos*.

2. Logoi

It is difficult to say exactly when the two Logoi are introduced in *Clouds*; there is talk of the two kinds of *logoi* beginning back at *Nu.* 113, but it is not until Socrates says at *Nu.* 886 αὐτὸς μαθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῖν τοῖν λόγοιν that the audience would expect to see the Logoi appear as actual characters. Thus I list them as being introduced shortly

[1]See discussion of Paphlagon in 'Demosthenes and Nikias' section, pp. 26-7.

before their entrance, but it should be remembered that the idea of the existence of these two *logoi* at the school of Socrates was brought in long before.

3. Eirene

The figure of Peace has been included here, although it evidently was a large statue rather than an actor, because it is treated as a sort of character; Peace 'whispers' a number of lines to Hermes, who reports her opinions to the audience, and she somehow contrives to turn her head away (at *Pax* 682), further giving the impression of a 'live' deity. Similar, but somewhat different, is the business at the end of *Clouds* where Strepsiades addresses a statue of Hermes by his door, and reports receiving from it the advice to burn down Socrates' house (*Nu.* 1478-1485). In that scene it looks as if Strepsiades 'hears' what he wants to hear from the herm, and the audience would not really suppose that the god Hermes was involved in the action. The dialogue with Peace is much more extensive, and the situation more fantastic.

4. Basileia

The name Basileia for the mute character in *Birds* has since antiquity caused debate over its meaning.[2] The word itself has two different meanings in Greek, depending on the quantity of the final -α. With short -α and proparoxytone accent (βασίλεια), the word is the feminine of βασιλεύς and means 'queen' or 'princess' (see LSJ s.v. βασίλεια); with long -α and paroxytone accent (βασιλεία) it is the abstract 'dominion' or 'monarchy'. Since the meter at *Av.* 1536 and 1753 guarantees that the -α is short, it would seem that the character's name is "The Queen". Strictly speaking, then, she is not a personification of the abstraction 'monarchy', but a deity invented by Aristophanes to be a counterpart of Ζεὺς βασιλεύς and through whom the sovereignty may be transferred to Peisetairos. Thus Newiger describes the characterization of Basileia (p. 93):

"Da der metrische Befund eindeutig "Königin" ergibt, ist zunächst festzustellen, daß Basileia keine *Personifikation*, also weder die Volksregierung noch die Zeusherrschaft

[2]For examination of previous literature see Newiger (1957), pp. 92-102 (with notes).

ist. Das schließt nicht aus, daß sie--als Königin--die Herrschaft *haben*, ja sogar *bedeuten* kann. Auf dieser Unterscheidung müssen wir insistieren, da es uns auf die Form der Personifikation bzw. des Symbolischen ankommt. Basileia ist also eine *Person*."

The distinction between person and personification has become blurred with this character; indeed, it is not likely that Aristophanes was interested here in distinguishing between (let us call it) 'Monarch' and 'monarchy'. The figure of Basileia has control of the functions of Zeus as ruler (in particular she keeps the thunderbolt, *Av.* 1538); we have then a person with a general name (rather than an individual one) and possessing the characteristics of the abstraction which the name suggests. Basileia symbolizes rather than personifies sovereignty, but should certainly be considered to be in the general area of personified abstractions rather than a traditional deity.[3]

[3]Sommerstein on *Av.* 1536 (who translates Basileia "Princess"): "...not to be confused with Basileia "sovereignty, royalty". The identity of this divine personage has been endlessly and unprofitably debated...but...essentially she is a creation of the dramatist."

E. Slaves

In the extant plays of Aristophanes, 27 slave characters are named. Of these names, only two are used more than once: Xanthias (five times) and Manes (twice). Every play has at least one named slave character in it. Following is a list of the named slaves showing also the manner in which they are first addressed.

1. Chrysos (*Ve.*1251) παῖ παῖ, τὸ δεῖπνον Χρυσὲ συσκεύαζε.
2. Dardanis (*Ve.*1371) αὕτη πού 'στί σοι ἡ Δαρδανίς;
3. Ditylas (*Ra.* 608 f.) ὁ Διτύλας χὠ Σκεβλύας χὠ Παρδόκας/ χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε...
4. Elaphion (*Th.* 1172 f.) καί σὸν [ἔργον] ὦλαφιον ἅ σοι/ καθ' ὁδόν ἔφραδον...
5. Karion (*Pl.* 624) παῖ Καρίων τὰ στρώματ' ἐκφέρειν σ' ἔχρην...
6. Kydoimos (*Pax* 255) παῖ παῖ Κυδοιμέ.
7. Manes (*Av.* 1311) Μανῆς δὲ φερέτω μοι θύραζε τὰ πτερά.
   7.b. (*Ly.* 908) τοῦτο γ' οἴκαδ' ὦ Μανῆ, φέρε.
8. Mania (*Th.* 728) ἴωμεν ἐπὶ τὰς κλῃματίδας ὦ Μανία.
9. Manodoros (*Av.* 656 f.) ἄγε δὴ Ξανθία/ καὶ Μανόδωρε λαμβάνετε τὰ στρώματα.
10. Masyntias (*Ve.* 433) ὦ Μίδα καὶ Φρὺξ βοήθει δεῦρο καὶ Μασυντία.
11. Midas (*Ve.* 433) ὦ Μίδα καὶ Φρὺξ βοήθει δεῦρο καὶ Μασυντία.
12. Paphlagon (*Eq.* 44) ἔπριατο δοῦλον, βυρσοδέψην Παφλαγόνα.
13. Pardokas (*Ra.* 608 f.) ὁ Διτύλας χὠ Σκεβλύας χὠ Παρδόκας/ χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε.
14. Parmenon (*Ecc.* 867 f.) σὺ δ' ὦ Σίκων/ καὶ Παρμένων αἴρεσθε τὴν παμπησίαν.
15. Phryx (*Ve.* 433) ὦ Μίδα καὶ Φρὺξ βοήθει δεῦρο καὶ Μασυντία.
16. Sikon (*Ecc.* 867 f.) σὺ δ' ὦ Σίκων/ καὶ Παρμένων αἴρεσθε τὴν παμπησίαν
17. Skeblyas (*Ra.* 608 f.) ὁ Διτύλας χὠ Σκεβλύας χὠ Παρδόκας/ χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε...
18. Sosias (*Ve.* 136) ὦ Ξανθία καὶ Σωσία, καθεύδετε;
19. Teredon (*Th.* 1175) σὺ δ' ὦ Τερηδὼν ἐπαναφύσα Περσικόν.
20. Thraitta (*Th.* 279) δεῦρό νυν ὦ Θρᾷτθ' ἕπου.
21. Trochilos (*Av.* 80) οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον, ὦ Τροχίλε;
22. Xanthias (*Ach.* 243) ὁ Ξανθίας τὸν φαλλὸν ὀρθὸν στησάτω.
    22.b. (*Nu.* 1485) δεῦρο δεῦρ' ὦ Ξανθία.
    22.c. (*Ve.* 1) οὗτος, τί πάσχεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον Ξανθία.
    22.d. (*Av.* 656 f.) , ἄγε δὴ Ξανθία/ καὶ Μανόδωρε λαμβάνετε τὰ στρώματα.
    22.e. (*Ra.* 271) ὁ Ξανθίας. ποῦ Ξανθίας; ἤ, Ξανθία.

Very few slaves have large roles; leaving out of account Paphlagon in *Knights*, who is only metaphorically a slave, Xanthias in *Frogs* has the only really major role, followed by Karion in *Plutos*, and Xanthias and Sosias in *Wasps*. Slaves with smaller speaking parts are Kydoimos, slave of Polemos in *Peace*, and Trochilos, slave-bird of

Tereus in *Birds*. Those seven are the only speaking named slave parts;[1] the other named slaves are mute roles, 20 in all.

Slave characters' names are virtually always introduced in the vocative (sometimes nominative with imperative), as part of a command; occasionally the master asks where the slave is instead (ποῦ, as #2. Dardanis and #22.e. Xanthias).[2] (This natural practice of slave-naming contrasts sharply with the introduction of the name Paphlagon in *Knights* , where the name is brought up in the prologue (44) long before the character enters; we see again that Paphlagon is treated as more than simply a slave.) Since no notice is usually taken of slaves until they are ordered to do something, it is often difficult to tell whether there are slaves onstage or not. Frequently a slave may be onstage for quite some time before he is addressed. For instance, at *Birds* 656-7, when everything has been settled between Peisetairos and the birds, and Tereus has invited the two Athenians to go inside, Peisetairos instructs two slaves to take the luggage in: ἄγε δὴ Ξανθία καὶ Μανόδωρε, λαμβάνετε τὰ στρώματα. The protagonists have brought their luggage along from Athens, and two slaves to carry it. The natural inference from this line is that the slaves followed Peisetairos and Euelpides onstage at their entrance at the beginning of the play,

[1]There is a household slave in *Peace* who has a minor role at the beginning and the end of the play, but he is never named.

[2]The only exception is #4. Elaphion, who has already been summoned, so to speak, offstage by Euripides and is receiving a reminder of her instructions as she comes onstage.

and have been standing around for the last 650 lines waiting to take the luggage off.[3] At *Ecc.* 867-8, Sikon and Parmenon are told to pick up their master's possessions, in a tone which implies that the slaves are standing nearby: σὺ δ' ὦ Σίκων καὶ Παρμένων αἴρεσθε τὴν παμπησίαν. The two probably entered with Chremes at 730, and perhaps were assisting in bringing out the household goods, and so have been on for 137 lines before they are mentioned. At *Ly.* 908, Kinesias gives the baby to the slave Manes[4] to take home; Manes must have entered with Kinesias at 829. Of course in Aristophanes' society it was usual for free people to be attended by slaves, and it would have seemed quite natural for characters on the stage to be as well.

It is therefore conceivable, though of course not demonstrable, that many characters were accompanied by slaves who were never addressed at all, and so left no trace in the dialogue. At the end of *Ecclesiazusae* (1112), a maidservant enters to fetch her mistress' husband (1126); she does not name her mistress or master, but if she had earlier appeared

[3]Rogers (note to *Av.* 1) believes that the two slaves were stage attendants summoned out, and that Peisetairos and Euelpides had entered alone. However, if they did enter without slaves, and each one was carrying a bird, they could not have been carrying much luggage in addition. Now that the birds are gone, they each have a free hand, and could easily carry the small amount of luggage off themselves, just as they carried it on. It seems rather that the two slaves must have entered with them, carrying a sufficient amount of luggage to indicate that a change of residence was underway. Further, the form of address which Peisetairos uses, ἄγε δὴ Ξανθία καὶ Μανόδωρε, is appropriate to slaves who are already present. If one wishes to get the attention of a slave who is offstage (or out of sight of the speaker), usually παῖ or sometimes ὦ with the name is used. For παῖ cf. *Ve.* 1251, *Pl.* 624, *Pa.* 255 (all with name); *Ach.* 1097, 1118, *Nub.* 132, 1145, *Ve.* 152, *Av.* 850, *Ran.* 37 (all without name). For ὦ with the name cf. *Ve.* 136, 433. "Come now" (ἄγε δή) is properly addressed to someone present, not used to call someone out. Cf. *Av.* 434, where Tereus tells two slaves to take the armor back inside: ἄγε δὴ σὺ καὶ σύ. The two must be present so that Tereus can gesture to them; it would be impossible to call for two slaves who are out of sight in this fashion.

[4]Henderson, on *Lys.* 908, treats the name as if it were *always* a general designation for slave, and does not capitalize, saying: "Manes was one of the most common slave names in Attika... That it was used indiscriminately for Asiatic slaves generally is suggested by the article that often accompanies it, e.g. 1212 and *Pax* 1146... compare our use of 'john' as a noun = a prostitute's client, 'mick' = any Irishman." Of course there is no article *here* (i. e. *Lys.* 909) and no reason to imagine that the slave's name is not Manes. Likewise, there are today many individuals actually named John, despite the general usage of the name which Henderson mentions.

accompanying Praxagora, the audience would recognize whose slave she was when she entered later, making announcement of the name unnecessary. Positing here the previous unmentioned appearance of a slave would help to solve the problem of the identity of the master who leads out the chorus at the end; if the slave was recognizable as Praxagora's, then the master must have been Praxagora's husband, Blepyros[5]. In fact, there are probably a great many more silent slave characters on stage than are mentioned in the scripts. Perhaps it was quite regular for women characters especially to be accompanied by slaves onstage, even if they had no particular function; we see for example in *Thesmophoriazusae* how many of the women at the festival have slaves with them; even Euripides' kinsman rather abruptly acquires a maid (*Th.* 279) as soon as he is disguised as a woman. The possible presence of unmentioned slaves is something which may be taken into consideration in questions of staging.

Types of Slave Names

Helladius[6] says of comic slave names: ὅτι οἱ κωμικοὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας τὸ μὲν πλέον ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐκάλουν, οἷον Σύρον, Καρίωνα, Μίδαν, Γέταν, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἐπιθέτων, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ χρώματος μὲν Πυρρίαν καὶ Ξανθίαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τρόπου δὲ Παρμένωνα καὶ Πίστον καὶ Δρόμωνα. As a subset of names from nationality, Helladius could have distinguished names such as Midas, which are not strictly speaking ethnic names, but names which are common in the slave's native country[7] (comparable to calling an Irishman 'Paddy', or an American soldier 'Joe'). So defined, this division into names ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους and names ἐξ ἐπιθέτων works well for the slave

[5]See S. D. Olson (1987), who argues that the master is not Blepyros, or Chremes, but an anonymous character.

[6]Photius *Bibl.* 532b35 Bekker.

[7]Strabo makes the distinction, 304. I owe the Helladius and Strabo references to Headlam and Knox (1922), note to Herodas 1.1., where a list of ethnic and foreign slave names in comedy (and other literature) is also to be found.

names in Aristophanes. It is worth noting, however, that this twofold division of slave name types in comedy does not reflect the situation in real life; real slaves had many more kinds of names, including being named after their masters or their masters' relatives.[8] There are, for example, slaves in manumission inscriptions named Agathoboulos, Agathokleia, Agathon, Ageisippos, Eutychdes, Kleogenes, Sokrates, Pheidestratos, to pick out a few from Reilly.[9] Such slave names, which are indistinguishable from free names, are uncongenial to the comic poet, who likes to use the name to convey the information that the character is a slave.

I. a) Names denoting origin, ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους: ethnic names[10]

Dardanis (*Ve.* 1371): from Dardania in the Troad

Karion (*Pl.* 624): from Karia

Paphlagon (*Eq.* 44): from Paphlagonia. In *Knights* the name plays on the verb παφλάζω, cf. Neil, *Knights* p. 6.

Phryx (*Ve.* 433): from Phrygia

Sikon (*Ec.* 867): from Sicily, Sicanian. The name is probably a short form of Σικανός, cf. Bechtel HPG p. 543; Gomme and Sandbach[11] derive it from Σικελός, which is also possible. There was an Athenian named Sikon, *PA* 12650 ΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΧΘΗΙΔΟΣ, named on a gravestone of the mid-fifth century; in comedy the name came to be used especially for cooks (e. g. the cook in Menander, *Dyskolos*). Aristophanes himself used it

[8]cf. Reilly (1978) p. ix. M. Lambertz (1907-8), distinguishes no fewer than 15 categories of slave names; on his pp. 6-9 are numerous examples of slaves named after masters.

[9]In his thesis *De servorum graecorum nominibus*, S. Copalle (1908) lists slaves named after masters as the entire first half of the work, pp. 2-27.

[10]Of the list of ethnic slave names drawn from literature in Headlam-Knox (1922) note to Herodas 1.1, a number are attested in Reilly: Daos, Karion, Lesbios (masc. of Lesbia), Libys, Libyssa, Lydos, Lyde, Manes, Mania, Midas, Mysis possibly, Skythas, Syra, Syrion, Syricha, Thessalia.

[11]Gomme-Sandbach (1973), p. 131, where there is a discussion of the name.

as a cook name in the lost play Αἰολοσίκων. Here in *Ecclesiazusae* it seems not to have any culinary connotation; Sikon is a household slave who is told to carry the household goods, along with his fellow Parmenon.

Thraitta (*Th.* 279): from Thrace. Slaves named Thraitta are also mentioned, though they do not appear as characters, at *Ach.* 273, *Ve.* 828, and *Pax* 1138. It looks from these references and from Plato *Theaetet.* 174a, where Θρᾷττα τις has a part in an anecdote about Thales, as if the name was so common for female slaves that it became, like Manes, almost a generic name for them; it is at least a very 'typical' female slave name.

I. b) Names denoting origin: foreign names

Manes (*Av.* 1311, *Ly.* 908): a Phrygian name (Strabo 7. 304. 12; Athen. 487e, 667 a, e).[12] Whereas Xanthias became the typical stage slave-name, in real life it appears that Manes was the name which came to denote slaves (or at least foreign slaves) in general. Cf. Wilamowitz on *Lys.* 1212: "Μανῆς hießen so viele Sklaven, daß der Name die rein appellative Bedeutung verlor...Vor hundert Jahren wäre "mein Johann" wohl bei uns ebenso verständlich gewesen."

At *Ra.* 965 an Athenian is slightingly called Megainetos ὁ Μανῆς; the name also occurs at *Av.* 523 in the generalizing plural (the birds are said to be considered ἀνδράποδ', ἠλιθίους, Μανᾶς). The little kottabos figure was named Manes, also a bad throw at dice (see LSJ s.v.). All these general usages, however, should not lead us to imagine that when a slave character is called Manes, that is not intended as a name.[13] It is the very frequency of the name which led to its wider usage, and there continued to be many real slaves named Manes; stage-slaves could be so named as well.

[12]For an explanation of the development in Greek from the original Μάσνης to Μάνης see Lesky in *RE* s. v. Manes (1).

[13]as e.g. Henderson on *Lys.* 908; see Manes in general discussion of slave names above.

Mania (*Th.* 728): the feminine of Manes. Athenaeus (578b) tells of a Greek prostitute called Mania as nickname, and discusses the quantity of the α (which is short in the word for madness, long in the foreign name).

Manodoros (*Av.* 657): a kind of hybrid slave name, a Greek compound based on foreign element Man- (of Manes). This particular compound does not happen to be attested elsewhere, but Bechtel HPG p. 294 has Μάνιππος and Μανόδοτος, formed in a similar fashion.

Midas (*Ve.* 433): a Phrygian name (Strabo 7. 304. 12). Bechtel HPG lists the name under the category "Personennamen aus Namen von Märchenfiguren", i.e. the name would come from the mythical Phrygian Midas. It seems rather that the name is in the same category as Manes, a foreign name common in the slave's home country, and hence common to Phrygian slaves. This Midas is paired with another Phrygian slave, called by the ethnic name Φρύξ.

II. Names denoting characteristic, ἐξ ἐπιθέτων, :

Chrysos (*Ve.* 1251): "Gold". MacDowell ad loc. "presumably a name regularly given to slaves with blond hair. Wilamowitz 483 conjectured Κροῖσε, a name known to have been given to slaves. But it cannot be proved that a slave could not be called Χρυσός."[14] Χρυσός is a highly unusual name; Pape-Benseler list one Athenian from an inscription, Bechtel *HPG* does not have the name at all, nor does Kirchner *PA*. Fraser *LGPN* lists only two, a father and son from the imperial period. The name is not at all similar to a name such as Xanthias (as MacDowell imagines), where a (hair-)color word receives the appellative ending -ιας; the name Chrysos is itself the noun 'gold', and is not a

[14]It is virtually impossible to show that slave could not be called a particular name, since the range of slave names was so wide, including names identical to their masters'. Wilamowitz' point is that Chrysos is not a typical slave name, which is what one expects in the context.

natural choice as a name which is intended to mean 'Blondie'.[15] Wilamowitz' conjecture, or some such change, is attractive here, since one wants either a typical slave name or a name indicating an appropriate characteristic.

Elaphion (*Th.* 1172): "Gazelle". From ἔλαφος, 'deer', with neuter -ιον ending often used in women's names; the name describes the graceful quality of the character, who is a dancer, brought in by the disguised Euripides to distract the Scythian.

Masyntias (*Ve.* 433): "Muncher". The name appears to be related to Hesychius' μασύντης = μασητήρ, nickname of a parasite (see LSJ s.v.), from μασάομαι, 'chew'. It is not elsewhere attested; a comic slave-name made up to emphasize the characteristic of a slave most troublesome to his owner: he must be fed.[16]

Parmenon (*Ecc.* 868): "Standby". From παραμένω, see LSJ s.v. who give as opposite ἀποδιδράσκω. A typical and popular slave name (14 names in Reilly beginning Παρμεν-), used also in New Comedy (four instances in Menander and three in Terence).[17]

Sosias (*Ve.* 136): "Saver". Pape-Benseler translate the name "Helfer". In origin the name is a shortened form of a compound name, such as Sosikles. This is the one exception to the rule that Aristophanes does not name his slaves names which are also used by freeborn people, since the name Sosias is attested for citizens at the time (*PA* 13175,

[15]Reilly pp. 143-4 shows Χρυσᾶς (1st cent.) as a slave name, and on the female side there is Χρυσίον and Χρυσίς, but no Χρυσός.

[16]For a comic complaint about slaves who want to receive their rations without doing any work see Herodas 6. 4-8.

[17]cf. Gomme-Sandbach (1973), p. 544.

13176).[18] In fact, a member of the audience named Sosias is addressed at *Ve.* 78.[19] Plato (*Cratyl.* 397 b) lists Sosias as an example of names which people give ὥσπερ εὐχόμενος; the others are Eutychides and Theophilos, and Plato is not speaking of naming slaves. Ehrenberg[20] imagines that the name Sosias as a slave name was a comic innovation. This is highly unlikely, for two reasons. First, the stem Σω- was extremely popular for slave names; of the slaves in Reilly, nos. 2617 through 2974, or 358 individuals, have names beginning in Σω-. (The only prefix which begins to approach Σω- in popularity is Ευ-, with 250 examples.) Second, this is not the sort of slave name Aristophanes 'invents', a name already in use for citizens, with no particular point to it. If the poet took the trouble to invent a slave name, he made it something pointed, like Masyntias (*q. v.*). Sosias must have had a typical slave-name association to it already in the late 5th century.

Teredon (*Th.* 1175): "Termite", a name chosen as appropriate to a flute-player; "vermutlich zu τερηδών, 'Holzwurm'" says Bechtel, HPG p. 591. There are no other examples of the name.

Trochilos (*Av.* 79-80): "Road Runner". The identification of Tereus' slave-bird forms a bit of a joke at *Av.* 74-80 where, after the bird tells Peisetairos how he runs to fetch things (τρέχω, *Av.* 77, again at 79), P. concludes that he must be a τροχίλος (79) and proceeds to address him ὦ Τροχίλε (80). In bird terms this is like a proper name, much as Ἔποψ is, and could be capitalized. It appears to be the avian equivalent of Dromon (from δραμεῖν) as a slave name .

[18]This man is said by Antiphon (5. 69-70) to have been one of the Hellenotamiai in the generation before him.

[19]Some deny that this Sosias is a member of the audience, e.g. Ehrenberg (1951) p. 172 n. 9: "I consider it most unlikely that in W. 78 one of the spectators is meant by ὁδὶ...Σωσίας, and not the slave of this name who stands on the stage." The context, however, calls for the person to be part of the audience, and, as MacDowell ad loc. points out, the audience does not yet know the name of the slave, so they cannot become confused.

[20]Ehrenberg (1951) p. 172. "One slave-name was perhaps invented by a comic poet, that of Sosias; though at that time citizens also were occasionally so called, Sosias was later used exclusively and commonly for slaves."

Xanthias (*Ach.* 243, *Nu.* 1485, *Ve.* 1, *Av.* 656, *Ra.* 271): "Red." For a discussion of Xanthias see the section Type Names in Chapter I.

II. b) Names denoting characteristic: the underworld slaves

The names of the three slaves (Διτύλας, Σκεβλύας, Παρδόκας) called out at *Ra.* 608 form an interesting group of names invented by Aristophanes to suit his comic conception of slaves in Hades; I believe that all three names are intended to suggest characteristics, and that the three were costumed accordingly (probably rather grotesquely).

Ditylas, Skeblyas and Pardokas "are probably parodies of Scythian or Thracian names" says Stanford *ad loc*, without suggesting what names are being parodied. Radermacher (*Aristophanes' 'Frösche'* pp. 230-231) examines the names in more detail, remarking "Die Namen der Aufgerufenen sind sinnreich gewählt, wie es auch bei Plautus (*Rudens* 656, *Capt.* 657) der Fall ist."

All the names end in -ας, an ending which forms shortened names, nicknames, and appellatives.[21] Of course in Attic this ending (if not after ε, ι, or ρ) was -ης;[22] Aristophanes has intentionally formed these as foreign-sounding names.

Ditylas: "Quasimodo." The name, like the adjective δίτυλος, is formed from δι- and τύλη, swelling, callus. Pape-Benseler translate 'Kameelrügge' or 'Camel-back', probably with reference to the fact that the adjective δίτυλος was used of a camel (Diod.Sic. 2. 54). Radermacher (*Frösche* p. 230) affirms "trotz der falschen Länge des ι soll Ditylas der Mann mit einem Doppelhöcker sein." However, the word τύλη has a particular application which adds dimension to the name as a slave name: τύλη is the callus on a porter's shoulder from carrying loads (cf. LSJ s.v.). Ditylas, then, is a slave with a

[21]cf. Schwyzer (1939) I. 461e.

[22]cf. e. g. Kühner-Blass I. 386 Anm. 8.

porter's callus on *each* shoulder, instead of just one, and could be costumed as a double hunchback.

Skeblyas: "Fathead." Although most commentators refer this name to the entry in Hesychius κέβλος, "dog-faced baboon,"[23] I believe that the word κεβλή, a Macedonian form of κεφαλή (Call. fr. 657 Pf.; see LSJ s.v.) should be considered first.[24] Obviously κέβλος is formed from the same un-Attic contraction, and the animal must have been named for its large or peculiar-looking head. Likewise Skeblyas is a Macedonian-sounding nickname-formation which has reference to the size (most probably) of the character's head. It is interesting that in modern Greek the word κεφαλᾶς (with the same -ας ending forming appellatives) means, as Schwyzer has it, "Dickkopf".[25] The slave could have been costumed in an oversized, and perhaps deformed, mask.

Pardokas: "Fartacus." The similarity of this name to the name Sparadokas [Thuc. II.101.5, with variants Σπάρδακος, Σπάρδοκος, Σπαράδοκος], father of the Thracian noble Seuthes,[26] has been noted (Copalle, p. 50; Radermacher p. 230); Radermacher remarks further, "Tatsächlich hat der Venetus bei Aristophanes Σπαρδόκας, doch Wechsel zwischen σπ und π im Anlaut ist nach dem Muster von σπέλεθος πέλεθος, σπύραθος πύραθος u.a. nicht auffallend und der π Anlaut vom Dichter gewählt, um die volkstümliche Anlehnung an πέρδεσθαι zu ermöglichen." Indeed, it is quite likely that the reference to πέρδεσθαι is intended. The name is also suggestive of Perdikkas, however, and that better-known and contemporary name may have been what the audience associated this slave name with upon hearing it. That association would also fit with the Macedonian

---

[23]Hence Pape-Benseler's translation "Hundskoppe" (Dog-head).

[24]For alternation between initial σκ- and κ- see Kühner-Blass I. p. 76, who give Σκάμανδρος/ Κάμανδρος, σκάπετος/ κάπετος, among other examples.

[25]Schwyzer (1939) I. 461e.

[26]In 429 Seuthes persuaded his uncle Sitalkes, king of the Odrysians, to halt his campaign against Perdikkas, and married Perdikkas' sister Stratonike (Thuc. II. 101.5).

sound of Skeblyas, Pardokas' companion slave, with its un-Attic contraction; Perdikkas too is an un-Attic shortened form of Περιδίκαιος.[27] I suggest that here Aristophanes has invented a Macedonian-sounding name which recalls both farting and Macedonian royalty.

III. Abstract slave names

Whereas in real life slaves were often given names of abstract ideas, in Aristophanes the only slaves with abstract names are in fact personified abstractions. Kydoimos, the slave of Polemos (*Pax* 255) is a personification of Confusion, the companion of War, rather than a human slave; possibly the idea of making such a slave character was suggested to or made easier for Aristophanes by the fact that abstract names were associated with slaves;[28] cf. Lambertz (1907-8), category IX. a "Bezeichnungen abstrakter Begriffe als Sklavennamen,"[29] where we find such names as Elpis, Nike, Harmonia, Eutyxia, Paideusis, and so forth. In a similar category are the attendants of Peace, the (apparent) hetairai Theoria and Opora (*Pax* 523). Their status is unclear, and they have not been included in the list of slaves, but might well be.

[27]cf. O. Hoffmann (1906) 131 f.

[28]Kydoimos had been personified already in Homer, *Il.* 18. 535, but not as a slave.

[29]*Die griechische Sklavennamen*, part I pp. 39-42. Lambertz says that this sort of name "eine Tugend und Tätigkeit ausdrücken soll," (p. 39).

Abbreviations Used

HPG	F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit.* 1917.
LGPN	P. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek personal names. Volume I: The Aegean islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica.* 1987.
LSJ	H. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Jones, *A Greek-English lexicon*^{9}. 1968.
PA	J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica.* 1901-3.
P-B	W. Pape and G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen.* 1911.
RE	A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 1893-.

Bibliography

Autran, C. (1925). *Introduction `à l' étude critique du nom propre grec.* Paris.

Bailey, C. (1936). "Who played Dicaeopolis?" in *Greek Poetry and Life, Essays presented to Gilbert Murray on his seventieth birthday*, 231-40. Oxford.

Beazley, J. D. (1950). "Some Inscriptions on Vases: V," *American Journal of Archaeology* 54, 310-322.

Bechtel, F. (1902). *Die attischen Frauennamen.* Göttingen.

_____ (1917). *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit.* Halle.

_____ (1981). *Kleine onomastische Studien. (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 125.) Königstein.

Bowie, E. L. (1988). "Who is Dicaeopolis?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 183-185.

Buck, C. D. (1933). *Comparative grammar of Greek and Latin.* Chicago & London.

_____ (1955). *The Greek dialects.* Chicago.

Chiasson, C. (1984). "Pseudartabas and his Eunuchs: *Acharnians* 91-122", *Classical Philology* 79, 131-136.

Copalle, S. (1908). *De servorum graecorum nominibus.* Marburg.

Davies, J. K. (1971). *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.* Oxford.

Detienne, M. (1977). *The gardens of Adonis.* New Jersey. (Translation of *Les Jardins d'Adonis*, 1972.)

Deubner, L., "Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe," in W. H. Roscher *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie,* vol. 3, col. 2068 ff.

Dornseiff, F. (1940). "Redende Namen," *Zeitschrift für Namenforschung* , 24-38 and 215-218.

Dornseiff, F. and B. Hansen. (1957). *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen,* Berlin. Reprinted as *Reverse-lexicon of Greek Proper-names,* Chicago 1978.

Dover, K. J. (1959) "Aristophanes, *Knights* 11-20," *Classical Review* 73 n.s.9, 196-199.

_____ (1963). 'Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians,' Maia* 15 6-25. Repr. in Dover (1987), 288-306.

_____ (1967). "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes," in ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΤΡΑΓΗΜΑΤΑ: Studia Aristophanea Viri Aristophanei W.J.W. Koster in Honorem, 16-28. Amsterdam. Reprinted in *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie*, ed. H. J. Newiger, Darmstadt 1975, 155-169; also repr. in Dover (1987), 266-278.

_____ (1968a). *Aristophanes Clouds*. Oxford.

_____ (1968b). "Greek Comedy," in *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford. Repr. in Dover (1987), 190-219.

_____ (1972). *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley .

_____ (1974). *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

_____ (1987). *Greek and the Greeks: Collected papers, Volume I: Language, poetry, drama*. Oxford.

Dow, S. (1969). "Some Athenians in Aristophanes," summary in *American Journal of Archaeology* 73, 234-235.

Edmunds, L. (1980). "Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *Yale Classical Studies* 26, 1-41.

(1987). *Cleon, Knights, and Aristophanes' politics*. Lanham (Maryland) and London.

Ehrenberg, V. (1951). *The People of Aristophanes*[2]. Oxford.

Elderkin, G. (1940). "Aphrodite and Athene in the *Lysistrata*," *Classical Philology* 35, 390-394.

Fick, A. (1894). *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt*. 2nd ed. revised by F. Bechtel and A. Fick. Göttingen.

Foley, H. (1988). "Tragedy and politics in Aristophanes' Acharnians," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 32-47.

Fraenkel, Eduard (1962). *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*. Rome.

Fraenkel, Ernst (1934). "Namenwesen," in *RE* 16, 1611-1648.

Fraser, P. M. and E. Matthews (1987). *A lexicon of Greek personal names: Volume I, The Aegean islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*. Oxford.

Frei-Lüthy, C. (1978). *Der Einfluß der griechischen Personnennamen auf die Wortbildung*. (Beiträge zur Namenforschung N.F. Beih. 13.) Heidelberg.

Garland, R. S. J. (1984). "Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens," *Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens* 79, 75-123.

Gomme, A. W. and F. Sandbach (1973). *Menander: a commentary*. Oxford.

Grasberger, L. (1883). *Die griechischen Stichnamen*. Würzburg.

Griffith, J. G. (1974). "Amphitheos and Anthropos in Aristophanes," *Hermes* 102, 367-369.

Händel, P. (1963). *Formen und Darstellungsweisen in der aristophanischen Komödie*.

Heidelberg.

Halliwell, S. (1984). "Ancient interpretations of ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν in Aristophanes," *Classical Quarterly* 34, 83-88.

Headlam, W. and A. D. Knox. (1922). *Herodas: The mimes and fragments.* Cambridge.

Henderson, J. (1975). *The Maculate Muse.* Yale.

_____ (1987). *Aristophanes' Lysistrata.* Oxford.

Henrichs, A. (1985). "Zur Genealogie des Musaios," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58, 1-8.

_____ (1990). "Between country and city: cultic dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica," in *Cabinet of the muses*, ed. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde, 255-277. Atlanta.

Hiller, E. (1874). "Über einige Personenbezeichnungen griechischer Dramen," *Hermes* 8, 442-456.

Hoffmann, H. (1976). *Mythos und Komödie: Untersuchungen zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes.* (*Spudasmata.* 33.) Hildesheim.

Hoffmann, O. (1906). *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum.* Göttingen.

Holden, H. (1869). *Onomasticon aristophaneum.* (Vol. 2 of *Aristophanis Comoediae.*) Cambridge.

Hose, H. F. (1940). "Personalities in Aristophanes," *Greece and Rome* 9, 88-95.

Hug, A. (1929). "Spitznamen," in Pauly-Wissowa *RE* III A 1821 ff.

Jackson, J. (1955). *Marginalia Scaenica.* Oxford.

Jordan, B. (1979). *Servants of the gods.* (*Hypomnemata* Heft 55.) Göttingen.

Kakridis, P. I. (1972). "Κριτικὰ καὶ ἑρμηνευτικὰ στὸν Ἀριστοφάνη," *Dodone* 1, 109-124.

Kirchner, J. (1901-3). *Prosopographica Attica.* 2 vols. Berlin.

Kock, T. (1862). *Die Wolken.* Berlin.

_____ (1864). *Die Vögel.* Berlin.

_____ (1867). *Die Ritter.* Berlin.

_____ (1868). *Die Frösche.* Berlin.

Komornicka, A. (1962). "Aristophanes comicus qua ratione personis fictis usus sit," *Eos* 52, 237-257. (Polish, Latin resumé.)

_____ (1971). "Quelques remarques sur le caractère comique des personnages d'

Aristophanes," *Acta Conventus XI Eirene, 21-25 Oct. 1968* (resumé pp. 257-262). Warsaw.

Krause, K. (1939). "Griechische und alte deutsche Namengebung," *Neue Jahrbücher für antike und deutsche Bildung*, 121-127.

Lambertz, M. (1907-8). Die griechischen Sklavennamen. Vienna.

Leo, F. (1873). *Quaestiones Aristophaneae*. Bonn.

Lever, K. (1953). "Poetic metaphor and dramatic allegory in Aristophanes," *Classical Weekly* 46, 220-223.

Levy, E. (1976). "Les femmes chez Aristophane," *Ktema* 1, 99-112.

Lewis, D. M. (1955). "Notes on Attic inscriptions, II. Note 23: Who was Lysistrata?" *Annual of the British School at Athens* 50, 1-36.

Loraux, N. (1981). *Les Enfants d' Athéna*. Paris.

Lupas, L. (1981). "Noms propres et appelatifs," *Studii Clasice* 20, 7-20.

MacDowell, D. M. (1959). "Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1407-67," *Classical Quarterly* n.s.9, 261-268.

_____ (1978). *The law in classical Athens*. Ithaca (NY) and London.

_____ (1983). "The nature of Aristophanes' *Akharnians*," *Greece & Rome* 30 no. 2, 143-162.

Marzullo, B. (1953). "Strepsiade," *Maia* 6, 99-124.

_____ (1970). "L'interlocuzione negli uccelli di Aristofane," *Philologus* 114 , 181-194.

Méautis, G.(1932). "L' episode d' Amphitheos dans les Acharniens d' Aristophane," *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* , 241-244.

Meier, M. (1975). -ιδ-. *Zur Geschichte eines griechischen Nominalsuffixes*. (*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, Ergänzungsheft 23). Göttingen.

Meiggs, R. (1972). *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.

Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis. (1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C.* Oxford.

Mikolajczyk, R. (1979). "De nominum propriorum, quae deminutivorum formam habent, apud Aristophanem comicum usu et significatione," *Eos* 67, 221-231. (Polish, Latin resumé).

Molitor, M. V. (1969). *A prosopographical study of Aristophanes' comedies*. Diss. Princeton.

Morani, M. (1983). "Il nome di Prometeo," *Aevum* 57, 33-43.

Müller-Strübing, H. (1873). *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik.* Leipzig.

Murray, G. (1933). *Aristophanes.* Oxford.

Neil, R. A. (1901). *The Knights of Aristophanes.* Cambridge. Repr. Hildesheim 1966.

Newiger, H.-J. (1957). *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes.* Munich.

_____, ed. (1975). *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie.* Darmstadt.

Olson, S. D. (1987). "The identity of the Δεσπότης at *Eccl.* 1128 f," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 28, 161-166.

Paganelli, L. (1978-79). "Blepyros nome parlante.(Aristoph. *Eccl.* 327)," *Museum Criticum* 13-14, 231-235.

Paine, S. (1933). *Aspects of the appropriate name in Greek.* Urbana, Illinois.

Palmer, L. R. (1980). *The Greek language.* New Jersey.

Panagl, O. (1983). "Pheidippides. Etymologische Überlegungen zu einem aristophanischen Personennamen," *Festschrift für Robert Muth* . Innsbrucker Beiträge. zur Kulturwissenschaft 22, 297-306.

Papademetriou, I. (1948-9). "Attika I." *Archaiologike Ephemeris*, 146-153.

Pape, W. (1875). *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen.* Revised by G. Benseler. Braunschweig.

Parker, L. P. E. (1983). review of A. H. Sommerstein, *Acharnians*, *Classical Review* n.s. 33, 10-12.

Petersen, W. (1910). *Greek diminutives in* -ιον. Weimar.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1968). *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens.* 2nd ed. rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford.

Radermacher, L., and W. Kraus (1967). *Aristophanes' 'Frösche'.* Graz-Wien-Köln.

Reilly, L. C. (1978). *Slaves in Ancient Greece: A Prosopography from the Manumission Inscriptions.* Chicago.

Renehan, R. (1969). *Greek Textual Criticism.* Cambridge (Mass.).

Rohde, E. (1907). *Psyche*[4]. Tübingen.

Russo, C. (1984). *Aristofane autore di teatro.* Florence.

Schaps, D. (1977). "The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names," *Classical Quarterly* 27, 323-330.

Schmid, W. and O. Stählin. (1946). *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.* Munich.

Schmitt, R. (1973). *Indogermanische Dichtersprache und Namengebung.* (*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Vorträge 10.) Innsbruck.

Schwyzer, E. (1935). "Εὐελπίδης," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 62, 206.

Schwyzer, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik I.* Munich.

Solmsen, F. and E. Fraenkel. (1922). *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte.* Heidelberg.

Sommerstein, A. (1980)., "The naming of women in Greek and Roman comedy," *Quaderni di Storia* 11, 393-418.

Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de. (1972). *The origins of the Peloponnesian War.* Ithaca (NY).

Steiger, H. (1888). *Der Eigenname in der attischen Komödie.* Diss. Erlangen.

Stone, L. M. (1981). *Costume in Aristophanic Comedy.* New York.

Süss, W. (1954). "Scheinbare und wirkliche Inkongruenzen in den Dramen des Aristophanes," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 97, 115-159, 229-254, 289-316.

Sutton, D. F.(1985). "Named choreuts in satyr plays," *American Journal of Philology* 106, 107-110.

Taillardat, J. (1965). Les images d'Aristophane^2. Paris.

Truesdale, J. (1940). *A comic prosopographia graeca..* Menasha, Wisconsin.

Turner, J. A. (1983). *Hiereiai: Acquisition of Feminine Priesthoods in Ancient Greece.* Diss. Univ. of California Santa Barbara.

Usener, H. (1896). *Götternamen.* Bonn.

Van Leeuwen, J. F. (1893-1906). *Aristophanis Comoediae.* (12 vols.) Leiden.

Voegler, J. G. (1869). *Prosopographia Aristophanea de belli ducibus.* Diss. Darmstadt.

Webster, T. B. L. (1970a). *The Greek Chorus.* London.

_____ (1970b). *Greek Theater Production*^{2}. London.

_____ (1954). "Personification as a mode of Greek thought," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17, 10-21.

West, M. L. (1968). "Two Passages of Aristophanes," *Classical R eview* 18, 5-7.

Whatmough, J. (1952). "On 'Triballic' in Aristophanes (*Birds* 1615)," *Classical Philology* 47, 26.

Whitehead, D. (1986). *The Demes of Attica 508/7--ca. 250 B.C.* Princeton.

Whitman, C. (1964). *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero.* Cambridge (Mass.).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1927). *Aristophanes, Lysistrate.* Berlin.

Zgusta, L. (1955). *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste.* Prague.

Ziehen, L. (1906). *Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae: leges Graeciae et insularum.* Leipzig.

Zimmermann, H. D. (1963). *Historische Untersuchungen zu attischen Personennamen.* Diss. Halle.

Zuretti, C. (1896). "Su alcuni nomi di personaggi nelle comedie di Aristofane," *Rivista di Filologia* 24 (n. s. 2), 44-78.

Alphabetical List of Named Characters

(+5) = named 5 lines after entrance; (-5) = named 5 lines before entrance
ch=chorus sl= slave kp=silent role (κωφὸν πρόσωπον)

Agathon (Th) 29 (-66)
Agorakritos (Eq) 1257 (+1111)
*Aiakos (Ra)
Aischylos (Ra) 758 (-72)
Amphitheos (Ach) 46 (+1)
Amynias (aud. Ve)
Anthrakyllos* (Ach) 612 ch
'Ariphrades' (Ecc) 12

Basileia (Av) 1536 (-184) kp
Bdelykleon (Ve) 134 (-2)
Blepyros (Ecc) 327 (+16)
Blepsidemos (Pl) 332 (0)

Chabes of Phlya (Ve) 234 ch?
Chairephon (Nu?, Ve 1408 (+20) kp
Chairetades' wife (Ecc) 51
Charinades (Ve) 232 ch
'Charitimides' (Ecc) 293
Charon (Ra) 183 (+3)
Chremes (Ecc) 477 (+105)
Chremon (Ve) 401 aud
Chremylos (Pl) 336 (+336)
Chrysos (Ve) 1251 (0) sl/kp

Dardanis (Ve) 1371 (+45) kp
Demos (Eq) 42 (-686)
Derketes (Ach) 1028 (+10)
Derkylos (aud, Ve)
Dexinikos (Pl) (aud) 801
Diallage (Ly) 1114 (0) kp
Dikaiopolis (Ach) 406 (+405)
Dionysos (Ra) 22 (+22)
Ditylas (Ra) 608 (0) sl/kp
Drakes (Ly 254, Ecc 293)

Eirene (Pax) 221 (-300) kp
Elaphion (Th) 1172 (0) kp
Empousa (Ra) 293 (on?)
Epigenes (Ecc) 931 (-3) called Orthagoras 916
Euelpides of Krioa (Av) 645 (+645)
Euergides (Ve) 234
Euphorides (Ach) 612 ch
Euripides (Ach 394 (-12), Th 4 (4), Ra 67 (-763))

Geusistrate (Ecc) w/o kapelos 49
Glyke (Ecc) 43

Herakles (Av 1574 (+9), *Ra 282 (+244) (only onstage 38-164))
Hermes (Pax) 365 (+185), (Pl) 1122 (+23)
Hierokles (Pax) 1046 (1)

Iris (Av) 1204 (+5)
Ismenia (Ly) 696
Ismenias (Ach) 861 (0)

Kalonike (Ly) 6 (0)
Kalyke (Ly) 322
Karion (Pl) 624 (+624)
Karkinos, 3 sons of (Ve) 1501 kpp
Kinesias (Av 1377 (+5), Ly 838 (+2))
Kleinarete (Ecc) 41
Kleisthenes (*Ach) 118 (+24), (Th) 634 (+60)
Kleonymos' son (Pax) 1295 (+30)
Kleonymos' wife (Th) 605 (?)
Komarchides (Pax) 1142
Komias (Ve) 230
Kritylla (Ly) 323 ch, (Th) 898 w. or d./o Antitheos of Gargetto (+138)
Kydoimos (Pax) 255 (0) sl
Kyon (Ve) 895 (0?) or 841 (+54 or -8?)

Labes (Ve) (of Aixone) 836 (-45)
Laches (Ly) 304
Lakrateides (Ach) 220 ch
Lamachos (Ach 566 (-6), Pax 473 ch
Lamachos' son (Pax) 1290 (+25)
Lamias' wife (Ecc) 77
Lampito (Ly) 77 (0)
Logos, Better (Nu) (113), 883 (-6)
Logos, Worse (Nu) (113), 883 (-8)
Lysilla (Th) 374
Lysistrata (Ly) 6 (+6)

Manes (Av 1311 (-13?), Ly 908 (?) sl
Mania (Th) 728 (?)
Manodoros (Av) 657 (?) sl/kp
Marilades (Ach) 609 ch
Masyntias (Ve) 433 (0) sl/kp
Melistiche (Ecc) w/o Smikythion 46
Meton (Av) 996 (+4)
Midas (Ve) 433 (0) sl/kp
Mika (Th) 760 (+72)
Muse of Euripides (Ra) 1306 (0)
Myrrhine (Ly) 70 (0)
Myrtia d/o Angkulion & Sostrate (Ve) 1396 (+9)

Nephelai (Nu) 252 (-22)
Nikarchos (Ach) 908 (0)
Nikodike (Ly) 321 ch
Nikostratos of Skambonidai (Ve) 81 aud

Opora (Pax) 523 (0) kp

Panaitios (Eq) 243 ch
Panhellenes (Pax) 302 ch
Paphlagon (Eq) 44 (-234)
Pardokas (Ra) 608 (0) sl/kp
Parmenon (Ec) 868 (?) sl/kp
Peisetairos (Av) 644 (+644)
Penia (Pl) 437 (+19)
Phaidrias (Ly) 356 ch
Pheidippides (Nu) 67 (+67)
Pheredeipnos (Ve) 401 aud?

Philainete (Ec) 42 ch
Philiste (Th) 568 (?)
Philodoretos' wife (Ec) 51 ch
Philokleon (Ve) 133 (-11)
Philourgos (Ly) 265 ch
Phryx (Ve) 433 (0) sl/kp
Plathane (Ra) 549 (0)
*Pluto (Ra) nn?
Plutos (Pl) 78 (+78)
Poleis (Pa) 540 (0) kp
Polemos (Pa) 205 (-30)
Poseidon (Av) 1638 (+73)
Praxagora (Ecc) 124 (+124)
Prinides (Ach) 612 ch
Prokne (Av) 665 (0)
Prometheus (Av) 1504 (+10)
Pseudartabas (Ach) 91 (-4)

Rhodippe (Ly) 370 ch

Sikon (Ec) 867 (?) sl/kp
Simon (Eq) 242 ch
Skeblyas (Ra) 608 (0) sl/kp
Smikythion (Ve) 401 aud?
'Smikythos' (Ec) 293
Sokrates (Nu) 104 (-114)
Sosias (Ve) 78? 136 (+78 or+ 136)
Sostrate (Th 373?), Ec 41 ch)
Spondai [Eq] 1389 (0) kpp
'Stilbonides' (Av)
Stratyllis (Ly) 365 ch
*Straton (Ach) 122 cun
Strepsiades of Kikynna (Nu) 134 (+134)
Strymodoros (Ve) 233 of Konthyle, ch, (Ly) 259 ch

Teredon (Th) 1175, ?
Tereus (Av) 15 (-77)
Theoria (Pax) 523 (0) kp
Theoros (Ach) 134 (-1)
Thraitta (Th) 279 (0) sl
Timokleia (Th) 373 ?
Tisiades (Ve) 401 aud?
Triballian (Av) 1627 (+62)
Trygaios of Athmone (Pa) 190 (+108)
Xanthias (Ach) 243 (0), (Nu) 1485 (0), (Ve) 1 (0), (Av) 656,?, sl/kp, (Ra) 271 (+271)