

# Authorial Collaboration? Aristophanes' *Knights* and Eupolis

*Keith Sidwell*

IN A RECENT ARTICLE in this journal,<sup>1</sup> Stephen Halliwell used evidence from Old Comedy to suggest that "authorial collaboration" occurred in the comic theatre of the fifth century. The purpose of this paper is to cast doubt on his findings. I shall suggest that "authorial collaboration," along with accusations of plagiarism and other evidence linking the comic poets to one another, is part of an elaborate series of jokes generated by *one* underlying characteristic: the tendency of poets to attack each other by making comedy out of each other's comedy ('paracomedy'). This practice will, I argue, explain the well-known relationship between Aristophanes' *Knights* and his contemporary Eupolis, with which we shall begin.

## I. The Primary Evidence

The basic evidence is as follows:

(1) In the revised parabasis of *Clouds*, Aristophanes accuses Eupolis of ἐκστρέψας τοὺς ἡμετέρους Ἰππέας κακὸς κακῶς (554) in producing his *Marikas* of 421. The play was an attack on Hyperbolus, portrayed as its central character the slave Marikas.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Eupolis (fr. 89 *PCG*) in the parabasis of *Baptai* (417?) wrote †κἀκείνος† τοὺς Ἰππέας/ ξυνεποίησα τῶι φαλακρῶι (-υ/-) κἀδωρησάμην.

(3) A relationship between Aristophanes and Eupolis is evident already in 423 in the parabasis of Cratinus' *Pytine*.

<sup>1</sup> "Authorial Collaboration in the Athenian Comic Theatre," *GRBS* 30 (1989: hereafter 'Halliwell') 515–28. I note that I. C. Storey has recently supported the collaboration theory in "Notus est omnibus Eupolis?" in A. H. Sommerstein, ed., *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari 1993) 387f.

<sup>2</sup> This is specifically mentioned in the ancient commentary (frr. 192, 150), Quint. 1.10.18 (=fr. 208 *PCG*), and fr. 209.

Fr. 213 *PCG* reads: ταῦτα ἀκούσας (the charge of *Eq.* 531 that Cratinus is παραληροῦντα) ὁ Κρατῖνος ἔγραψε τὴν Πυτίνην, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἐλήρησεν· ἐν ἧι κακῶς λέγει τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ὡς τὰ Εὐπόλιδος λέγοντα.

The date of *Clouds* II is unknown and the date of *Baptai* is conjectural.<sup>3</sup> So it is not possible to say with any certainty that Eupolis is 'replying' to *Clouds* II, especially since the ancient *didaskaliai* seem not to have recorded a performance of the second version at the major festivals.<sup>4</sup> If we postulate that Eupolis was replying to a 'reading text' of *Clouds* II,<sup>5</sup> we reduce the general intelligibility of the issue as publicly addressed in *Baptai*. It is possible to propose a scale of greater to lesser comprehension of detailed reference among the audience of a dramatic production. But it does not seem a particularly satisfactory way to account for the deliberate artistry of a poet who relied on a random cross-section of the Athenian public for a vote to win the prize, to assume that he would have wittingly risked by-passing any of his potential audience *at any point*.<sup>6</sup> It seems unlikely that we have here two interrelated moments of the dispute. I agree with Storey that there is an important rôle for Aristophanes fr. 58 from *Anagyros* (dated 419–412 by Geissler) in Eupolideans from the parabasis: ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς

<sup>3</sup> See E. C. Kopff, "The Date of Aristophanes, *Nubes* II," *AJP* 111 (1990) 318–29, for the argument that *Clouds* II should not only be dated *after* the ostracism of Hyperbolus (cf. S. Bianchetti, "L'ostracismo di Iperbolo e la secondo redazione delle Nuvole di Aristofane," *Silt* 51 [1979] 221–48), but as late as 414. I. C. Storey has certainly damaged the case for a very late date ("The Dates of Aristophanes *Clouds* II and Eupolis' *Baptai*: A Reply to E. C. Kopff," *AJP* 114 [1993] 71–84), but in arguing that the play must have been produced *before* the ostracism of Hyperbolus he avoids the implication of the comparison between attacks on Cleon κειμένωι and attacks on Hyperbolus. For the date of *Baptai* see Storey (n.7 *infra*). Kopff 326 put it as late as 413, unnecessarily, to fit in with the later dating of *Clouds* II. See below.

<sup>4</sup> This is the inference one should draw from Σ *Nub.* 522 (=Callim. fr. 454 Pfeiffer). See K. J. Dover, ed., *Aristophanes, Clouds* (Oxford 1968) lxxxff.

<sup>5</sup> The latest proponent of the "reading-text" theory is D. Fowler, "Taplin on Cocks," *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989) 257. On the book-trade see now K. J. Dover, ed., *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Oxford 1993) 34f.

<sup>6</sup> See R. Harriott, "Aristophanes' Audience and the Plays of Euripides," *BICS* 9 (1962) 1–8 for a useful analysis of the level of knowledge required from the audience to understand jokes about Euripides. For voting procedures see A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*,<sup>3</sup> rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford 1988) 95–99.

χλανίδος τρεῖς ἀπληγίδας ποιῶν.<sup>7</sup> Since Fritzsche it has been usual to see this as another attack upon Eupolis' use of *Knights* (comm. *ad PCG* Ar. fr. 59). We may be entitled to conclude that Eupolidean appropriation of Aristophanic material was a rather bigger issue—and more publicly accessible—between 421 and (say) 415 than we have been accustomed to suppose.

But if *Clouds* II was not *answered* by *Baptai*, because it belongs to the debate, there is nothing to prevent us from conjecturing that it was designed to *reply* to *Baptai*. The puzzling implication of ἡμετέρους at 554 suggests a complicity between the passages. The implied 'we' will on this reading transparently be the poet whose voice the parabasis represents (ὁ φαλακρός) and Eupolis. Part of the line's humour would then rely on the apparent acceptance by the poet of Eupolis' claim in *Baptai* ("so what if he *did* co-write it; he turned it inside out in *Marikas*").<sup>8</sup> The connection between the image of clothing as comedy in *Anagyros* (χλανίδος, ἀπληγίδας) and the metaphor of turning cloth to reuse it at *Clouds* 554 (ἐκστρέψας: *Dover in Nub.* 554) would fit well with a series of public accusations and replies. *Anagyros* comes first. *Baptai* replies. *Clouds* II picks up the image from *Anagyros* and the joke from *Baptai* as the basis for a further complaint.

In the evidence from Cratinus' *Pytine*, it is uncertain whether the connection with *Knights* 531 is that of the scholiast or was prompted by something in the parabasis. But it seems certain that the charge against Aristophanes for "saying the things of Eupolis" was in the text, and it is not easy to account for the precision of the scholion if there was not also some allusion to the *Knights*. So it looks reasonable to say that Cratinus was alluding here to a noticeably Eupolidean aspect of *Knights*.

Halliwell's interpretation of the evidence uses the *Baptai* fragment to unpack the *Pytine* fragment. Behind the accusation of Cratinus in 423 he sees the "collaboration" between Aristophanes and Eupolis alluded to in fr. 89. He also claims,

<sup>7</sup> "Dating and Re-dating Eupolis," *Phoenix* 44 (1990) 22; cf. Storey (*supra* n.1) 385f; P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* (Berlin 1925) 50.

<sup>8</sup> Halliwell (n.17) draws attention to the usage, contrasts it with 559f (reiterated singular possessive), suggests that it is not the norm for references to the poet, and proposes that it might be "an allusion (for those who knew) to some Eupolidean involvement in *Knights*." If my reading is correct, then there is no need for the rider "for those who knew," for the matter of the relationship would have been public knowledge at least since *Baptai*.

apparently basing his view on his (disputed) reading of *Wasps* 1018–22, as evidence for an early, secret, collaborative stage in Aristophanes' career, that this collaboration with Eupolis was a secret that was now revealed to the audience for the first time.<sup>9</sup> Halliwell writes (524), "it remains unclear how much he [Cratinus] gave away." This is tantamount to an admission that the crucial elements of the interpretation come from his underlying model and not from Cratinus. One has to say that even if that were the correct interpretation of the *Wasps* passage, the *Knights* collaboration would be a different matter, involving a similar exchange of material but between poets who were both established (with at least Lenaea victories behind them) and hence continual rivals for festival prizes (e.g. at Lenaea 425, where *Acharnians* won against Cratinus' *Cheimazomenoi* and Eupolis' *Noumeniai*).

This scenario seems to me to call for a good deal more justification than it receives from Halliwell. Is it really credible—in the agonistic atmosphere of Athens—that rival poets would *assist* one another in this way, especially when the evidence in Old Comedy for relationships between *named* poets reveals very little in the way of positive evaluation (and even that is rendered dubious by the weight of antagonistic testimonia)?<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> "Aristophanes' Apprenticeship," *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980) 33–45. See also G. Mastromarco, "L'esordio 'segreto' di Aristofane," *QuadStor* 10 (1979) 153–96 for the same view but more detailed reading of the text. D. M. MacDowell leads the opposition (*Wasps* [Oxford 1971] ad 1018, and "Aristophanes and Kallistratos," *CQ* n.s. 32 [1982] 21–26). For a recent assessment of the discussion see T. K. HUBBARD, *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Ithaca 1991: hereafter 'Hubbard') 227–30 (agreement with MacDowell: 228). For a new reading with important implications for the relationship between the comic poets and additional support for the conclusions of Part III below, see my "Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and Eupolis," *ClMed* 45 (1994) forthcoming.

<sup>10</sup> Storey (*supra* n.1: 387f) is content to assume a collaboration that *was* public. I think this needs arguing for, given the nature of the evidence. See Halliwell 517ff for the data on "collaboration." Remarks that claim that another poet "laboured for others" cannot be interpreted as friendly in a culture where the olive-picker is satirized for precisely that (*Vesp.* 712; cf. *Dem.* 57.45). See below. The best that can be said for Eupolis fr. 89 is that there is no open insult. But it *is* part of a slanging-match between poets and the whole notion of "helping a poet to write" is treated elsewhere as adequate grounds for attacking the "helped" poet (e.g. *Ran.* 73–79). See below. On top of these testimonia we have in Aristophanes insulting references to Cratinus (*Ach.* 849, 1173; *Eq.* 400, 531–34), Eupolis (*Nub.* 554), Hermippus (*Nub.* 557), Lycis, Phry-

To sum up, the principal objections to this way of reading the evidence are (1) that nothing in the scholion suggests or requires that Cratinus be accusing Aristophanes of collaboration; (2) that without the (chronologically later) *Baptai* fragment we would be likelier to interpret this as an accusation of plagiarism. It is necessary for us to accept that the debate that we can see opening up in *Baptai* and *Clouds* II is couched in terms of collaboration. But as things stand, we cannot safely say that the way the debate develops later is necessarily indicative of its earliest stage. After all, this *is* comedy and Athenian comic poets valued originality (hence the debate). So new twists (such as that suggested above between *Baptai* and *Clouds* II) are more rather than less probable in the treatment of the same material. One might add that the impact of an attack on Aristophanes' lack of originality (a matter of concern to comic poets; cf. Lysippus fr. 4: οὐδ' ἀνακνάψας καὶ θειώσας τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐπινοίας) would have been consequentially greater if one assumed that it was made against the background of something the audience already knew.

The inference is possible, then, that *Knights* at the time of its production somehow appeared Eupolidean to its audience and it was this open Eupolideanism to which Cratinus was referring in *Pytine*.

## II. Interpretations of the Primary Evidence

There are four main ways in which these pieces have been assembled into interpretative hypotheses. (1) The ancient scholars took Eupolis fr. 89 at face value and consequently undertook a search for Eupolidean material in *Knights*. At 1288 (ὅστις οὖν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα μὴ σφόδρα βδελύττεται) they saw what they were looking for and drew the inference that the

---

nichus, and Ameipsias (*Ran.* 14f), Magnes (*Eq.* 525), Crates (*Eq.* 538f with Hubbard 75), and in Plato (fr. 86) and Eupolis (fr. 62) attacks on Ar. *Pax*. Crates "attacked Cratinus" (having started as an actor in his plays: *PCG* 12a). It is true that Cratinus *seems* to be better treated at *Pax* 700 and *Ran.* 357, but (1) the evidence for antagonism precedes these passages and may need to be understood in their interpretation (this is the way an audience would operate); (2) in *Pax* the motif of Cratinus as drunken comic poet surely alludes to his own *Pytine* of 423: that play is likely to have been a self-defense (was he cured of alcoholism and rejuvenated?), whereas this passage implies (falsely) that this love of drink had in a sense killed him.

entire second parabasis had been written by Eupolis.<sup>11</sup> Pohlenz and Colonna suggested that what the scholiast had seen in Eupolis was a resemblance to *Demes* fr. 99.33: ὅστις οὖν ἄρχειν τοιούτους ἄνδρας αἰρεῖται ποτε.<sup>12</sup> As Sommerstein remarks, this was not a very intelligent guess, if it was the basis of their conjecture, since *Demes* must be located in the 410s.<sup>13</sup> But perhaps Hubbard (85f) is right to suspect that the scholiast was not after all so stupid. He points out that it is more likely that 1288 was an actual line of Eupolis. The scholiasts were quite good at spotting direct quotation, and Sommerstein (51f) has cogently argued that line 1225 was a line from Eupolis' *Heilotes*, which they did spot (though they did not specifically link it to Eupolis). The best explanation of Σ*Eq.* 1291, then, is that the discovery of a Eupolidean quotation at 1288 gave the answer to a *zetema* arising from our fr. 89. This focus on the second parabasis alone, however, puts in doubt Sommerstein's thesis about 1225, since the search through Eupolis would surely have revealed the *Heilotes* passage as well. See further under (2) below.

Scholars have rightly seen this ancient attempt to ascribe bits of *Knights* to Eupolis' cooperation with Aristophanes as naive and wrongheaded.<sup>14</sup> What we *can* say, however, is that we are able to detect some actual Eupolidean material in *Knights*. We cannot ignore its presence in any attempt at understanding the claim of Eupolis in *Baptai*.

(2) Sommerstein locates the exchange entirely in Aristophanes' appropriation of *Knights* 1225 from Eupolis'

<sup>11</sup> Σ*Eq.* 1291: ἐκ τοῦ 'ὅστις οὖν τοιούτον ἄνδρα' φασί τινες Εὐπόλιδος εἶναι τὴν παράβασιν, εἴ γέ φησιν Εὐπολις 'ξυνεποίησα τῶι φαλακρῶι'.

<sup>12</sup> M. Pohlenz, "Aristophanes' *Ritter*," *NAkG* (1952.5) 120ff; A. Colonna, "Aristofane ed Eupoli nella seconda parabasi dei Cavalieri," *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 32-37.

<sup>13</sup> "Notes on Aristophanes' *Knights*," *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980: hereafter 'Sommerstein') 52; for dating see Storey (*supra* n.7) 24-27.

<sup>14</sup> Halliwell (523f) is much more subtle, of course, in his theory of "authorial collaboration" ("... the balance of probabilities is that Eupolis' help had been slight or limited to some suggestions, rather than entailing extensive writing"). Nonetheless, he is perilously close to following such procedures as production of supposed facts from the text for which he elsewhere castigates the scholiasts ("Ancient Interpretations of ὀνομαστὶ κωμῶδειν in Aristophanes," *CQ* n.s. 34 [1984] 83-88, esp. 88: "an assumption that Aristophanic satire accurately reproduces the historical truth").

*Heilotes*.<sup>15</sup> Even if we accept the Eupolidean authorship of *Heilotes*,<sup>16</sup> however, we cannot be sure that this quotation belonged to a play by Eupolis. We have in fact already given grounds for arguing that Σ*Eq.* 1291 implies that 1288 was the *only* detectable citation from Eupolis in the play. Line 1225 could perfectly well be a citation from another comedy with a Spartan theme (e.g. Cratinus' *Lakones*). This would not have emerged in investigations centred on detecting *Eupolidean* material in the second parabasis.

Nonetheless, Sommerstein's argument could still be used in relation to the citation at 1288. If there was nothing more, however, than this one line of Eupolis in the play, it stretches credulity that Eupolis could so confidently use its citation to beat Aristophanes in public at least seven years on. Nor, by the same criterion, does Cratinus fr. 213 *PCG* suggest that the use/abuse of Eupolis was so limited. We can add Mastromarco's point that "strictly speaking ξυνεπιόησα should mean more than this" (*ap.* Sommerstein 52 n.33). Halliwell backs this up in a disavowal of his earlier opinion by adding that "his argument ... leaves the specificity of the fragment unexplained" (523 n.16; *cf. supra* n.9: 40 n.31).

If just this one line of Eupolis was embedded in *Knights* and the audience was to see the point of Eupolis' claim of co-authorship at least seven years later in *Baptai* (fr. 89), then according to Sommerstein's argument they must be presumed to have recognized this material as Eupolis' at the time of performance. If so, it seems highly unlikely that there was not some point to the appropriation of the line.

The serious question is this, then: is this line borrowed with Eupolis' blessing (a version of the collaboration model), plagiarized (with the expectation that the audience will not recognize it), or employed allusively (with the opposite presumption)? It does not seem likely that Aristophanes asked the author's permission, since this could hardly be communicated to the members of the audience who recalled that it was Eupolidean material. The borrowing would thus backfire, and be naturally interpreted as plagiarism. It does not seem likely that the material was plagiarized either. The poets do seem very sensitive to such accusations (otherwise the debate on both

<sup>15</sup> Sommerstein 51ff, and *Knights* (Warminster 1981) *ad loc.*

<sup>16</sup> Storey (*supra* n.7: 7) argues in its favor.

sides would not be conducted in these terms). And it would have been very risky. We know that Aristophanes makes jokes with lines of tragedy many years old, where the point sometimes depends on the assumption that the audience recalls their original form (e.g. the reuse of Eur. *Alc.* 177–82 at *Eq.* 1251f recalls a play produced in 438).<sup>17</sup> Much the most likely proposition is that the audience is expected to recall that this is Eupolidean material. Eupolis seems to have done the same thing to Aristophanes in *Marikas*, where fr. 208 (=Quint. 1.10.18) looks like a quotation of *Knights* 188f. The time-gap here is certain (L424 to L421) and well within the detailed memory requirement of the poets between one comedy and another (*Knights* is recalled in *Baptai*, perhaps seven years later). The reuse of this material may have been highlighted by similarity of situation between the plays and even pointed by some relationship—invisible to us—between the character who spoke it in one play and the one who uses it in the remake.

Given Aristophanes' record on tragic quotation (e.g. *Ach.* 543=Eur. *Telephus* fr. 709 Nauck-Snell), one might suspect a satirical purpose in reusing *Knights* 1288, and Eupolis would presumably be doing the same back to him in *Marikas*. Cratinus' accusation in 423 might be taken to indicate even more Eupolidiana. But on the foregoing argument, we can infer from the scholiastic method that the Eupolidean material located by Cratinus was imitative rather than quoted. By the same token, if the material stood in this relationship to Eupolis, the scholiasts would not have been looking for it. If the material, however, was *only* imitative, the continuing joke-sequence culminating in *Clouds* 554f outlined above would have made little sense. It is equally possible, however, that parody was intended. There is overuse of ὄστις in the second parabasis (1275, 1278f, 1288, 1301, 1306). This could point towards parody of what we know from the *Demes* fragment to have been perceptible as a Eupolidean stylistic trait (Hubbard 85f).

The upshot of this discussion is that (a) there is Eupolidean material, actual and imitated, in *Knights*; (b) its presence is likelier than not to be deliberate and satirical: the audience is invited to spot it and laugh. The implication for Eupolis fr. 89

<sup>17</sup> See Harriot (*supra* n.6) 2f; Cf. the use of *Telephus* of the same year in *Acharnians* with many detailed allusions to that text, which it is vital for an audience that wishes to follow what is going on to catch. See H. P. Foley, "Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *JHS* 108 (1988) 33f.



will be that Eupolis is making a joke about the obvious, intended, presence of this material in *Knights* and turning it to his own advantage.

(3) Halliwell accepts Eupolis' claim, in however attenuated a form, and, as we have seen, thinks of a system of authorial collaboration as underpinning the references. I have already given some reasons for disbelieving his account of the material. There are four further objections, however, that touch on the whole nature of "authorial collaboration" and the evidence for it. First, the notion of co-authorship by poets is highly suspect in a tradition where the mythical ideology, a Muse who inspires the bard (*e.g. Wasps* 1022, 1028), supports individuality.<sup>18</sup> Second, the whole notion of attacking someone for stealing ideas, using someone else's work, and pretending it is one's own, or having to rely on the help of another poet—the very ideas that Halliwell's collection of evidence sets out—fits neatly into this assumption of poetic individuality. It follows that, though there must be a visible basis for such attacks, it is unlikely in the extreme to be an actual collaboration between poets. A consequence of this is that problematic passages such as *Wasps* 1018 and Eupolis fr. 89 need to be interpreted on the basis that the revelation of collaboration constitutes an attack upon the poetic virility of the assisted party (ἐτέροισι ποιηταῖς at *Wasps* 1018; Aristophanes in Eupolis fr. 89). One should compare *Frogs* 73–79 (Sophocles and Iophon), 944 (Cephisophon and Euripides), Cratinus fr. 502 (Choerilus and Ekphantides).<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> See *e.g.* P. Murray, "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece," *JHS* 101 (1981) 96f.

<sup>19</sup> The idea of working for another, embodied in the material under Halliwell's sections A6–7 and A 9 may well be of a different order. Halliwell differentiates the references as follows: (1) in A6 Plato's description of himself as having given plays to others because of poverty is taken tentatively to be a reference to the same activity as *Vesp.* 1018–22, viz. "helping other poets" (collaboration); (2) the A9 fragments referring to Aristophanes in Heracleian fashion labouring for others are taken as either the same activity as in *Vesp.* 1018f as interpreted by Halliwell and Mastromarco (viz. collaboration) or as references to the Heracleian self-portrait in the parabases of *Wasps* and *Peace*; (3) the statement of Eratosthenes that Plato ἄλλοις ἐδίδου τὰς κωμωιδίας and εὐδοκίμει with them is taken to mean that more than one of Plato's earlier plays was produced through another, that they gained credit for these victories (so that the didascalical records gave names of both poet and *didaskalos*), and that these cannot have been first prizes. Here we are dealing with inferences made by Eratosthenes. Halliwell says (n.20), "it is hardly conceivable that E. was basing himself not on didascalical information ... but on the parabasis of

Heath<sup>20</sup> (see next section) is right to see the motive behind this usage as satirical, for the very idea that a poet would need or indeed accept help from another would in this particularly individualistic tradition detract from his τιμή.

Third, all the evidence for such collaboration presented by Halliwell comes from *comedy*. This is in itself suspicious. These passages might in fact be *jokes*, underpinned by some reference-point that presently escapes us. See further under (4) below. A passage from Eur. *Andr.* 476ff makes the case well by giving the exception that proves the rule: τεκόντοιν θ' ὕμνον ἐργάταιν δυοῖν ἔριν Μοῦσαι φιλοῦσι κραίνειν. It is true that this is evidence for poetic collaboration in the writing of ὕμνοι. The expectation is also that an audience would be familiar with the phenomenon.<sup>21</sup> ὕμνοι, however, are not comedies and we may here be looking at certain quite specific requirements of particular cults for certain festivals. Indeed, this hypothesis is rendered more likely by the placement of this example in the ode. For the chorus is here decrying the idea that the two heads (or rather beds) are better than one: οὐδέποτε δίδυμα λέκτρ' ἐπαινέσω βροτῶν, etc., 465. The exemplum of poetic collaboration is in this vein. When it happens, the Muses induce strife between the collaborators. And why? Because it is *normal* to have one man, one Muse.

Fourth, one requires an answer to the following question: "If Eupolis helped Aristophanes to write *Knights*, and such collaboration was actually quite common, why do we *never* meet in the *didaskaliai* the formulation 'Aristophanes and Eupolis won

---

*Peisander*; this would leave the use of εὐδοκίμει unexplained." But if *Vesp.* 1018–22 is to be taken as the model (whatever activity it refers to), then 1023 (on Halliwell's reading) corresponds to a possible claim by Plato in the parabasis of *Peisander* that he did gain fame by this procedure. The treatment of these references ignores the possibility (reinforced by the present argument) that such statements were part of a comic poet's laughter-creation kit. See *supra* n.9 for reference to a new interpretation of *Vesp.* 1018–22 and further discussion in nn.26, 29 below.

<sup>20</sup> M. Heath, "Aristophanes and his Rivals," *G&R* 37 (1990: hereafter 'Heath') 152.

<sup>21</sup> Both these points were made to me in correspondence by Professor Alan Sommerstein. I am grateful to him for bringing the passage to my attention. See P. T. Stevens' edition (Oxford 1971) *ad* 476: "... it is odd that such collaboration should be common enough to provide an obvious instance of divided authority and to justify the frequency implied by φιλοῦσι."

the prize'?"<sup>22</sup> We should now definitively reject Halliwell's account of cooperation between the poets Aristophanes and Eupolis. The basic explanation of fr. 89 is that material taken over from and imitative of Eupolis in *Knights* was obvious to the audience (and to Cratinus), and Eupolis can make a joke on the basis of this piece of public knowledge later. We have seen that these circumstances also point to an antagonistic and satirical use of Eupolis by Aristophanes. We must now turn to current views of the broader 'war between the poets'.

(4) Heath (152) takes the sceptical view that "charges of plagiarism are part of a system of ritualized insults ... not meant to be believed, but to make the other party lose face." Sommerstein too (52 n.33) has taken a similar line on Eupolis fr. 89: "One must expect ... that the accusations made by comic poets (especially against each other) will be wildly exaggerated." So far, so good. Heath, however, sees (152) comedy as having a "common pool or repertoire of comic material" that was contributed to and could be used, with consequential claims to originality, by all comic poets.

The problem with this view is that it ignores the particular terms of the claims and counter-claims as we have them. Neither Cratinus' nor Eupolis' words, however much designed (as I agree) to insult and undermine Aristophanes, make any actual sense if the audience could not see something Eupolidean in *Knights*. The same is likely to be true of the way Aristophanes speaks of Eupolis' *Marikas* at *Clouds* 554f. In fact, Storey has recently tabulated a series of thirteen points of appropriation from *Knights* to *Marikas*.<sup>23</sup>

Heath's view ultimately rests on the assumption that the body of comic material is independent of the comic poets who produce it. This cuts across the individualistic nature of ancient poetic practice and the desire of poets to claim originality that is the positive side to these attacks.<sup>24</sup> It is also contrary to what we know was made of tragic poetry.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> I am grateful to Dr David Braund for making this point to me in conversation.

<sup>23</sup> Storey (*supra* n.1) 383f, though he would class them as imitations.

<sup>24</sup> Halliwell (519) recognizes this aspect of the matter in putting Lysippus fr. 4 (quoted *supra* 5) in his set of evidence (A13).

<sup>25</sup> It is no use objecting that there was a clear stylistic distinction that made tragic diction recognisable. Time and again in Aristophanes the point is that a particular poet's tragic style is parodied. In any case, Dionysiades of Mallos did undertake stylistic analyses of Old Comedy (*Suda* Δ1169: see J. Hender-

As soon as we posit an antagonistic 'paracomedy', we obtain a real referent that contains and explains the humour of the material gathered together by Halliwell. For if poet A has attacked poet B by presenting his own production as though it were a composition of poet B, utilizing and satirizing verbal, visual, and musical material derived from his rival, it is then open to poet B (or others) to attack poet A in return by misrepresenting this satire. The poet has a number of options that all rest on the assumption that individual originality and poetic independence are central to the comic poet's art and to the audience's perception of it. He can accuse poet A of plagiarism (e.g. *Ar. Nub.* 553–56, fr. 55 *Anagyros*) or imitation (*Nub.* 559, Cratinus fr. 213, *Pytine*), placing emphasis on his own originality (*Lysippus* fr. 4; *Ar. Nub.* 546f). He can claim co-authorship of the piece (Eupolis fr. 89, *Baptai*), on the grounds that the parodied material utilized from his own work makes the pirated play identical with its original source of inspiration. He can humorously suggest that he has allowed others to produce his plays (Eupolis fr. 89 *Baptai*; Plato fr. 106–07 *Peisander*; *Vesp.* 1018ff). A poet may likewise be ridiculed as "working for others," because his material, style, and voice have been misappropriated by another comic dramatist for satirical purposes (*Aristonymus* fr. 3, *Ameipsias* fr. 27, *Sannyrion* fr. 5 *PCG*).<sup>26</sup> If the poet has produced paracomédies, he may be accused of putting on plays by others as though they were his own (*Hermippus* fr. 64, attacking *Phrynichus*). To this mode of attack probably belong references to stealing plays (Eupolis, *PCG* T 5=Ael. *NA* 10.41) or props (*Ar. Pax* 729–32).

---

son, ed., *Lysistrata* [Oxford 1987] lxii), which differentiated the poets on this criterion. In performance, as well as in language, there must have been clear idiosyncrasies (cf. e.g. the description of Cratinus' μουσική at *Ach.* 851).

<sup>26</sup> I suggest in "Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and Eupolis" (*supra* n.9) that there are two separate aspects to the joke at Eupolis fr. 89: (1) co-authorship with ὁ φαλακρός, (2) the rôle of Aristophanes as mere producer. I present grounds for distinguishing between the two poets involved in the process. Halliwell (521) disputes the link usually made between Plato fr. 107 and the similar use of τετράδι γενέσθαι found in *Aristonymus*, *Ameipsias*, and *Sannyrion*, because there is no reference to Aristophanes in Plato's fragment and its surrounding material. But in the current context, it occurs to me to wonder whether Aristophanes had not been subject to the same parody as is suggested here for Eupolis. He is associated with Heracles (*Vesp.* 1030, cf. 1043; *Pax* 752—though I think it is dangerous to assume that the poetic voice referred to here is Aristophanes') and could therefore even be the ventriloquial target of Plato's *Peisander*. See also *supra* n.19 and n.29 *infra*.

Within this metatheatrical milieu, two related games may be being played, which appear in the evidence collected by Halliwell. The first involves the notion of collaborative writing, either between two poets (Eupolis fr. 89), or between a 'servant' (or some other citizen) and a poet (Cratinus fr. 502; cf. Telecleides fr. 41–42 *PCG*; Callias fr. 15 *PCG*; Ar. *Ran.* 944, 1408, 1452f; cf. 73f). There is a scene in Cratinus' *Pytine* (fr. 208–09) in which two characters cooperate in writing a comedy. Pieters long ago suggested that the participants were Aristophanes and Eupolis.<sup>27</sup> Whether or not his particular solution is correct, it is certainly obvious that in the context of paracomedy satirical capital could be made by showing collaboration *on stage*.<sup>28</sup> The second involves the ironical effects invited by the metatheatre. If a comedy may be presented as though by another poet, then part of the humour might lie in the ironical presentation of that author's paracomical abuse by others. That is, the satirized poet may be ridiculed by being made to claim as his own plays that were in fact ventriloquial parodies of his comedy.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> J. T. M. F. Pieters, *Cratinus* (Leiden 1946) 151. In *Acharnians*, the scene in which Dicaeopolis borrows costume, props, and speeches (447) from Euripides is an example of a sort of collaboration between a tragic and a comic poet, since as early as 416f the character speaks as though he is an actor, and his rôle as a poet becomes clear at 499, if it is not forced upon the audience by the proximity of Dicaeopolis to Eupolis at 406 (so E. L. Bowie, "Who Is Dicaeopolis?" *JHS* 108 [1988] 183ff). See my forthcoming article (*supra* n.9).

<sup>28</sup> It is therefore untrue that the development of the term συμποιεῖν to mean "co-write" cannot make sense without a consequent referent in the real world to support it (Halliwell 520). There is no reason why in comedy a term may not be borrowed from the real world, where it has real meaning (e.g. Andoc. 1.62 of helping someone to do something; *ΣNub.* 857 of a sculptor's assistant), and applied to an invented situation where it is funny precisely because it has no application in the real world. The term is not used at *Thesm.* 157 in reference to collaborative writing (as Halliwell implies: 520 n.14). Euripides' relative is in fact offering Agathon the chance of being bugged, so that he will be able to empathize with satyrs, just as in the present scene his transvestism helps him to empathize with women. This amounts to material assistance but *not* to co-authorship.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. I do not think we ought to take seriously the claim reported from Plato (fr. 106 *PCG Peisander*) that he handed his plays to others "out of poverty," because this is tantamount to admitting he was a wage-earner, against which status there was great prejudice, visible in comedy and elsewhere (see *supra* n.10). Plato's remark recorded via Eratosthenes in Ar. fr. 590.44–51 (ὅτι ἕως μὲν ἄλλοις ἐδίδου τὰς κωμωιδίας εὐδοκίμει, δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ πρῶτον διδάξας τοὺς Ῥαβδούχους καὶ γενόμενος τέταρτος ἀπεώσθη πάλιν εἰς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους) is also suspiciously self-condemnatory and would make sense

The upshot of this discussion is that accusations of plagiarism and of collaboration are both aimed at ridiculing the party so accused. But the audience is invited in these instances to contemplate the misappropriation of specific, not generic, material. This means that comic plays could be—and often were—made out of other comic plays, not only consciously mimicking the techniques of their original authors in order to satirize them, but even pretending to be plays by that dramatist. I argue elsewhere (*supra* n.9) that it is this “ventriloquial paracomedy” to which *Wasps* 1018–22 refers, and that *Acharnians* is a thoroughgoing example of the genre, aimed at Eupolis.

The comic plays of Aristophanes' rivals, then, could be crucial to the audience's understanding of his own dramas. Our current model suggests that it does not much affect our reading of these texts that this material is missing except in fragments: after all, the ancient scholiasts had a great deal of it. But to set aside the conclusion of the discussion thus would be seriously to misprise the priority of *performance*, which was not available to ancient scholars any more than it is to us. It would also involve having to explain just why there are so many references in our *texts* to purloined material, but so little is made of this by scholiasts, if the material was not being reworked in ways that would qualify as original, while still retaining their referential basis (satirical) towards their source. It is worth pursuing the trail to see whether it can make any contribution to the unravelling of the puzzle about *Knights* and Eupolis, however speculative this is bound to be in a context where we have such meagre remnants of Eupolis' *oeuvre*.

### III. A New Hypothesis

The proposition is, then, that in *Knights* Aristophanes was satirically reworking material from an earlier Eupolis play (or plays). Several of Eupolis' plays were in the public domain, having been produced at festivals since 429.<sup>30</sup> It now becomes

---

as a joke aimed at another poet who had been subjected to paracomical ridicule. See also *supra* nn.19, 26. For an analysis of a satirical ventriloquial paracomical parabasis see *supra* n.9 (forthcoming).

<sup>30</sup> See Storey (*supra* n.7: 29) for a list of possible plays with dates of production. He sets four before *Knights*, but it is perfectly possible that there were more. See my forthcoming article (*supra* n.9) for the suggestion that *Poleis* belongs earlier.

possible to see Eupolis' *Marikas* as revenge for a previous slight, *viz.* the reuse of one of his plays to make *Knights* (which he later comically reclaims for himself in the parabasis of *Baptai*). On this hypothesis, the 'war between the poets' gains considerably in theatrical importance, because it is being conducted publicly at an intertheatrical level. For the basic assumption of such parody is that its audience will recognize it without being told directly "by the way, this is taken from Eupolis."<sup>31</sup>

What in *Knights* is so germane to the play as to constitute an unmistakable allusion when briefly expressed? We are fortunate to answer this question unequivocally. Commentators on *Ach.* 299–302 have no doubt that the linkage of Cleon and the Knights there provides a sort of 'trailer' to *Knights*. Sommerstein in 301: "Here the chorus foreshadows the violent attack on Cleon delivered in *Knights* the following year." Hubbard (34) goes considerably further in considering this passage as "a hint about his next play." But neither this passage nor 5–8 in the same play, which also mentions Cleon and the Knights together, contains a specific allusion to the plot of *Knights*. Cleon is not put on trial in *Knights*, as it appears he is at *Ach.* 5–8. The chorus of *Knights* is not the same as the chorus of *Acharnians* and in any case, Cleon is not cut apart for the knights' benefit, but for that of the Sausage-seller and Demos. Besides, how could an audience be amused or entertained by such a remote allusion if *Knights* was as yet not even written and certainly was not in the public domain?<sup>32</sup> If these are allusions to comedy (and it has often said

<sup>31</sup> A recent example from modern satirical parody might help. In the first programme of the 1993 Autumn series of "Spitting Image" (broadcast Sunday 7 November), members of the British cabinet were shown reacting with boredom to privatisations of the past, but with great pleasure to the anticipation of privatising British Rail. The visual and musical framework for the sketch was that of a current television advertisement for "Pepsi-Max" (itself designed to be amusing). It would have undermined the joke had there been any overt reference to the source of the parody. This example incidentally produces a good model for the amount and importance of the interpretative signals that may be missing from our *texts* of Aristophanes.

<sup>32</sup> It is, as one of my correspondents points out, possible to envisage an author giving "a tantalising (and possibly misleading) indication of the author's future intentions; compare *e.g.* the epilogue to Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part II*, where the author promises (disingenuously) to 'continue the story, with Sir John in it.'" But the example given from Shakespeare is unequivocal, because the above quote is prefaced by "our humble author will." In *Acharnians* on the other hand, the first mention of Cleon and the Knights (5–8) is on the lips of the main character (and is often taken to be a reference to a comic scene, see below and n.33), and the second (299ff) is spoken by the

that 5–8 is),<sup>33</sup> then they must be referring to plays already in the public domain by Lenaea 425. I have suggested elsewhere (*supra* n.9) that this consideration, wedded to a textual crux that surrounds the verb at *Ach.* 301 and a later self-reference by the chorus to itself as the chorus of an earlier play (1153), makes me suspect that the text originally contained a past tense very (say 'ταμον). Scholiasts related the passage to the *Knights* and their comments eventually crept into the text. So, despite the ever-popular notion that the old farmer is referring to Aristophanes' own *Babylonians*, the principle of economy of explanation suggests that for a central theme of *Knights* that predates that play we ought to be looking at Eupolis, not Aristophanes, for the inspiration.<sup>34</sup>

---

chorus in character to another character, and not (as in the parabasis) directly to the audience on the poet's behalf. No indication is given at all that this constitutes the author's future plan (contrast the Shakespeare example), as would have to be the case where an as yet unwritten, or at least certainly unperformed, work is supposedly advertised. Sommerstein on the latter passage argues: "there is no particular reason why the Acharnians should be hostile to Cleon [he means, no reason is established by this *text*, which in the light of the present argument is probably not the point]; rather, the chorus here (in the middle of a sentence) shift to speaking in their capacity as a comic, and specifically an Aristophanic, chorus." What theatrical grounds have we for believing that an audience could understand such a shift of voice *in the middle of a sentence*? Sommerstein's support is taken from the intrusions of the *actor's* voice in the speeches of the main character at 416 and of the *author's* voice at 377–82, 499, none in mid-sentence. I would in any case be inclined to suggest that theatrically, the latter passages could not be understood without a simultaneous identification of character and referent that is certainly not available from *within* the text. That (which cannot be what is happening with the chorus at 299ff, since they are *multiple*) is exactly what Dicaeopolis suggests to Euripides has to be the case when he is disguised (442ff). I deal with the problem of multiple voices in the *Acharnians* elsewhere (*supra* n.9).

<sup>33</sup> The first proponent of this view was H. Lübke, *Observationes Criticae* (Berlin 1883) 17f; see most recently E. M. CARAWAN, "The Five Talents Cleon Coughed Up (Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 6)," *CQ* N.S. 50 (1990: hereafter 'Carawan') 137–47.

<sup>34</sup> It seems reasonable to trust the evidence of *ΣAch.* 378 that *Babylonians* was produced before *Acharnians*, but the question of whether or not it won the prize is still uncertain (Storey [*supra* n.7] 10f). There is no ancient evidence to connect *Ach.* 5–8 with the play, however. Given the tendency of the major school of criticism in antiquity to attend to *names* as opposed to *caricatures*, the fact the Cleon was mentioned in the play (as the scholion says) is not in itself evidence that he was on stage as a character (though reference in *Eq.* 358, 976 to two of the play's disguised caricatures, *viz.* Nicias and Cleon, suggests that mention of a name *could* square with the appearance of that person in



There may be other Eupolidean connections in *Acharnians*, which would support the conjecture that the Cleon/Knights motif goes back to Eupolis. In 1988 Bowie suggested that the self-presentation of the leading character as a comic poet in conjunction with the possible comic relationship between the names Dicaeopolis and Eupolis might lead us to conclude that Eupolis stands behind the mask, rather than Aristophanes (*supra* n.27; *cf.* n.32). This identification has been strongly contested by Parker and Storey, and it has to be said that Bowie's arguments in its support are not especially strong.<sup>35</sup> That admitted, Fisher recently argues that the concatenation cannot be completely dismissed, especially in view of the extraordinary proliferation of "voices" in the play.<sup>36</sup> Storey, however, at least certainly does accept that there is para-Eupolidean material in *Acharnians*. He infers from the relationship between *Ach.* 3, ψαμμακοσιογάρ-γαρα, and Eupolis fr. 308, ἀριθμῆν θεατὰς ψαμμακοσίους, that "Aristophanes has gone Eupolis one better."<sup>37</sup> He is content to use this as one of his arguments for setting *Chrysoum Genos*

---

caricature). An anonymous referee points out that it is the *enthusiasm* of the reference that makes it seem more likely to refer to something in Aristophanes. I suggest (*supra* n.9), however, that the character who voices this enthusiasm would have been recognized instantly by the audience as a *character* from the play of Eupolis that contained this scene. The humour is not, then, necessarily direct but is filtered through a number of ironic structures, including paracomedy, which are at present invisible to us. In my view (see Part IV below), the humour of this passage also depends very much on *who* the character on stage represents and what the audience knows about his normal political attitudes.

<sup>35</sup> L. P. E. Parker, "Eupolis or Dicaeopolis?" *JHS* 111 (1991) 203–08; Storey (*supra* n.1) 388–92. See also S. D. Olson, "Dicaeopolis' Motivations in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *JHS* 111 (1990) 200 n.3.

<sup>36</sup> N. R. E. Fisher, "Multiple Personalities and Dionysiac Festivals: Dicaeopolis in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *G&R* 40 (1993) 31–47, especially 37: "this possibility is hard to dispel or reject completely." (I am grateful to the author for allowing me to see this paper in advance of publication; see also my forthcoming article [*supra* n.9]). But it is worth pointing out that if Eupolis is caricatured in *Acharnians*, then the same basic assumption of Aristophanic scholarship under question here will be set at risk there also (namely that plays by other poets are not essential to our reading and interpretation of Aristophanes). In that case, to dismiss Bowie's suggestion by adducing arguments based on the existing paradigm is irrelevant. His contention can only be tested by using it as a *positive* hypothesis.

<sup>37</sup> Storey (*supra* n.7) 18, who does not articulate the idea that the relationship may be antagonistic and parodic. For the notion of parody see Hubbard 85f.

earlier than traditional, at Lenaea 426.<sup>38</sup> It is interesting to note how closely this Eupolideanism is followed by the Cleon/*Knights* link. This proximity might be indicative of a desire to call Eupolidean comedy to the audience's mind and may act as further evidence the the Cleon/*Knights* scenario may go back to Eupolis. It would follow as a matter of course on this argument that this material would be amusing *because the audience had already recognised the Eupolidean parody*.<sup>39</sup>

There is a good case, then, for Aristophanic appropriation of Eupolidean material before *Knights*, including, perhaps, allusions to a play by Eupolis that had a scene in which the Knights, or someone acting on their behalf, forced Cleon to pay back a five-talent bribe (*Eq. hyp. II*).<sup>40</sup> Was it a trial (*cf. Wasps*)? If the proximity of the parody of *Chrysoun Genos* at *Ach. 3* is any indication, it will now be of interest to examine the remnants of this Eupolis play for signs of contact with *Knights*.

*Chrysoun Genos* contains an attack on Cleon in the parabasis, which has also two points of detail in common with *Knights*. Fr. 316.1f reads: ὦ καλλίστη πόλι πασῶν ὅσας Κλέων ἐφορᾷ, ὡς

<sup>38</sup> A similar argument to Storey's on fr. 308 and *Ach. 3* might be essayed for *Poleis*, on the basis of fr. 248 ἄσπουδος δ' ἀνὴρ σπουδαρχίδου κακίων and *Ach. 595*, πολίτης χρηστός, οὐ σπουδαρχίδης, given that the sense is reversed and the word σπουδαρχίδης occurs only in these two passages. See my forthcoming article (*supra* n.9) for the dating of this play to Dionysia 426.

<sup>39</sup> See above and n.31 for this argument and a parallel.

<sup>40</sup> Carawan (140f) puts together an impressive case against Lübke's theory of a stage-trial: (1) it requires us to ignore Theopomp. fr. 93–94; (2) the argument from context (references to other theatrical events immediately following) is unconvincing, because the move from a political to theatrical events would be typical comic logic; (3) the fragments of *Babylonians* have no room for the Knights and there is no hint of the five-talent scene. However: (1) There is no need at all to see a real political event and a theatrical scene as mutually incompatible. Indeed, it is highly likely that we must presuppose some actual antagonism between Cleon and the Knights for the comedy in *Knights* to operate effectively as satire. Theopompus is testimony to the real events. (2) "Comic logic" is too often a *pis-aller* in the study of Old Comedy. It is our own way of dealing with phenomena that may well have had different explanations for an audience versed in the political and theatrical life of the city and able to *see* what was going on on stage. Besides, the Eupolidean reference of ψαμμακοσιογάργα in line 3 already strongly suggests a theatrical context, and the play's metatheatre may in fact indicate a thoroughgoing allusion to other comic performances. (3) The case against an allusion to *Babylonians* even later on at 634–45 is strengthened by D. Welsh ("The Chorus of Aristophanes' *Babylonians*," *GRBS* 24 [1983] 137–50), who shows that the chorus must have been Babylonians, not allied states. The present argument by-passes Carawan's objection by tying the scene to Eupolis.

εὐδαίμων πρότερόν τ' ἦσθα, νῦν δὲ μᾶλλον ἔσθι. The two points of detail, the first more striking than the second (both noted by Kassel-Austin), are with *Knights* 75, ἐφορᾷ γὰρ οὗτος πάντ' (where οὗτος is Paphlagon/Cleon), and 159, ὦ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ταγὲ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων (addressed to the Sausage-seller). Fr. 302 is a fragment from a scene in which one character is being asked to look at geographical locations by another: (A.) ὀρῶ, (B.) θεῶ νῦν Μαριανδυνίαν.<sup>41</sup> Fritzsche compared this with *Knights* 162f (*PCG loc.cit.*). Cf. in particular 163: Δη. τὰς στίχας ὀρᾷς τὰς τῶνδε τῶν λαῶν; Αλ. ὀρῶ, 170f: Δη. καὶ κάτιδε τὰς νήσους ἀπάσας ἐν κύκλωι. Αλ. καθορῶ, and 173f: Δη. ἔτι νῦν τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν παράβαλλ' εἰς Καρίαν τὸν δεξιόν, τὸν δ' ἕτερον εἰς Καρχηδόνα. The absurdity with which the basic idea is extrapolated in Aristophanes (cf. 175 εὐδαιμονήσω γ' εἰ διαστραφήσομαι) might well indicate the purpose of antagonistic appropriation.<sup>42</sup> The coincidence of the mention of εἰσφορά at fr. 300 and *Knights* 924 might in such circumstances be significant, but it is hard to tell (the εἰσφορά is connected with Cleon by Theopompus *FGrHist* 115F94).

That Eupolis was concerned with both the *Knights* and Cleon in his plays might be indicated by the fragments of *Poleis* (whether or not it was earlier than 422 is irrelevant for this purpose: *supra* n.38). Fr. 257 cites the words ἀναγχίππους and ἀναγχιππεῖν from *Poleis*. The first is explained as τοὺς ἀναγκαστικούς ἰπέας. It looks as though the *Knights* had some mention in this play then, and it is interesting to note that Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115F93) tells us of antagonism against Cleon on the part of the *Knights*, and has Cleon attacking the *Knights'* κατάστασις (with Fornara's emendation)<sup>43</sup> and accusing the *Knights* (in court?) of λειποστρατούντων. Σ *Eq.* 225 and Tzetzes *ad Nub.* 549a tell us that Cleon had been a ἰπεύς before 428/427. Wrapped up in this fog we may perhaps discern the

<sup>41</sup> For the connections of Mariandynia with the Paphlagonians (and hence with the caricature of Cleon in *Knights*), see A. M. Bowie, *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge 1993) 59ff.

<sup>42</sup> The fact that the same scenario and even the same formulation is used again at *Av.* 175–78 is not an argument against this hypothesis. It is equally possible that in the scene in *Birds* Aristophanes is once again poking fun at his rival and misappropriating the same play to do so. His originality would consist in (1) the newness of the plot and (2) the characters in whose mouths the old material now appears. The sort of attack made by Aristophanes upon his rivals at fr. 58 and *Nub.* 546f shows that reusing the same piece of comedy several times was not unknown.

<sup>43</sup> C. W. Fornara, "Cleon's Attack against the Cavalry," *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973) 24.

outlines of an allusion to some aspects of this dispute in the locution of Eupolis. Of course, it is always possible that the allusion is to an earlier play and/or to something outside the play. But here is clear evidence that Eupolis was saying something about the Knights in a play that may be earlier than *Knights*.<sup>44</sup>

The evidence that the play concerned Cleon is only circumstantial, since in forty-one fragments there is no clear mention of him. Comparison, however, with *Knights*, certainly a play about Cleon, shows that this need not be an impediment. There Cleon is mentioned only once (976).<sup>45</sup> The play presented the allied cities as women coming to Athens (with their dowries? *i.e.*, tribute) and being given (Athenian?) husbands (fr. 243–47). Now it was Cleon at this period above other Athenian politicians who was concerned to keep a hold on the allied states by hard, rather than soft, means (Thuc. 3.37).<sup>46</sup> This attitude is comically transmogrified in *Knights* 312 and 1070f in particular, where it is misrepresented as concern for personal gain from the tribute brought to Athens, itself the physical symbol of the allies' continued subservience. The arrival of the tribute at Athens was mentioned in *Poleis* (fr. 254). Cleon's watching-brief over the whole Athenian empire emerges in *Chrysoum Genos* fr. 316, and this is reflected closely, as we have seen, in *Knights* 75. But it is repeated in other passages (237, 839, 1034, 1319—some of these alluding to transfer of Paphlagon's privileges to Sausage-seller, others hinting, like 361, 438, 835, and 930–40, at Cleon's propensity to get a rake-off). It is not

<sup>44</sup> In fr. 94 Theopompus tells us that Cleon was accused of taking bribes to lighten the islanders' tribute and then fined because of the *hybris* towards the Knights. Unlike the other references, this looks much more like a comic scene, not least because Cleon was in fact extremely hard on the allies (see below). Pace Carawan, it does not seem that Theopompus composed his picture entirely independently of comedy, even though he had other sources that evidenced a real conflict. An anonymous referee suggests as a possible Eupolidean source for the Knights' defense against charges of effeminacy *Astratentoï* (or *Androgynoi*). This is attractive, but (as often) the date is disputed. See Storey (*supra* n.7: 15ff) for dates in the 420s or 414–412. Bowie (*supra* n.27: 185) dates the play to Dionysia 426, though 425 would also be possible.

<sup>45</sup> This comparative evidence might suggest—if the circumstantial evidence from *Poleis* is strong enough to suggest Cleonian concerns—that Cleon was caricatured in the play *in disguise*.

<sup>46</sup> See R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 318f on Cleon's policy.

unreasonable to see the possibility of *Poleis* having been in some way concerned with Cleon and perhaps with the Knights too.<sup>47</sup>

Hence there are three types of Eupolidean material that we may with some justification trace from *Knights* to Eupolis: (1) the major theme of Cleon *vs* Knights, (2) the quotation at 1288,<sup>48</sup> and (3) the hypothesis that *Knights* may be a parody of *Chrysoun Genos* and designed as a recognizable attack upon Eupolis (not forgetting Cratinus, who appears to have been offended by it because he was insulted in the parabasis, and who is also attacked by name at 400). It remains to make a broad attempt to see what the problems of accepting this line of argument might be and what effect this hypothesis would have on our view of *Knights*.

#### IV. Puzzles for the Paradigm

It is worth reiterating first the chief findings so far. When poets reuse one another's material, they do so with antagonistic intent, as part of a battle at least for the prize.<sup>49</sup> The relationship cannot be merely *imitative* for the following series of interlocking reasons: (1) originality is highly prized; (2) accusations of plagiarism are the corollary; (3) time relationships between plays of known date where such accusations are involved make mere imitation in the circumstances of (1) and (2) highly unlikely; (4) the fact that the debate goes on *inside* comedies make it as likely

<sup>47</sup> Another coincidence of language between *Poleis* and *Knights* centres in *Knights* precisely upon Cleon's omnipresence and his propensity for theft. *Eq.* 78f, ὁ πρωκτός ἐστιν αὐτόχρημ' ἐν Χάοσιν, τῷ χεῖρ' ἐν Αἴτωλοις, ὁ νοῦς δ' ἐν Κλωπιδῶν has as a parallel in *Poleis* fr. 241 καὶ Χαόνων καὶ Παιόνων καὶ Μαρδόνων. A final, stylistic relationship completes the meagre haul. Kassel-Austin point to the use of the opening ὡς ... ἐγὼ at fr. 228 of *Poleis* and *Eq.* 1100, 1107. As with Hubbard's comments (85f) on the overuse of the Eupolidean ὅστις in the second parabasis, so here we might be looking at stylistic misappropriation with antagonistic intent.

<sup>48</sup> It would make sense to suggest that this belonged to *Chrysoun Genos*. We have no idea (except for fr. 298, if that lists part of the chorus) what sort of chorus this play had. But if *Ach.* 5–8, 299ff (*cf.* 1153) do refer back to it, then it may, like *Marikas*, have had contrasting hemi-choruses, or even two separate ones (Knights and old jurors). The wealth and leisure of the Knights would well suit the appropriation for them of the Hesiodic motif of the Golden Race (*Th.* 109–19). But equally the term would have a nice irony if applied to old jurors. See further on this question my forthcoming article (*supra* n.9).

<sup>49</sup> It is possible, given the political content of comedy, that there were also ideological axes to be ground, though it is difficult at present to differentiate between the attitudes of different poets.

(if not more so) that we are looking at *jokes* as at serious discussion; (5) authorial collaboration at any rate cannot be other than a joke at the expense of the poet supposedly assisted. Thus the speculation involved in section III was a necessary consequence of the discovery that the material gathered by Halliwell required an intertextual explanation. The coincidences that arise between *Knights* and *Chrysoun Genos*, then, are guaranteed as intended satirical relationships by the direction of the argument. Given this framework, it would be wrong to see them as trivial, though there is a problem of interpreting the satire that we shall face in a moment. Still less should one regard them as occurring because the scholia cite them as parallels for Aristophanic passages.<sup>50</sup> As a matter of fact, of the particular fragments we are dealing with here, none was preserved because of its associations with its parallels in *Knights*.<sup>51</sup>

The main problem with the proposition that *Knights* is "paracomic," rather than imitative, is that we cannot see the point of the satire. But if the foregoing argument is sound, we may justifiably ask whether we are missing some other structure vital to the function of such intertextual satire. That could only be something in the characters and/or plot of the paracomedy as contrasted with the original against which its humour resounds. It is possible to see what difference such a structure would make theoretically.

Let us suppose, for example, that in fr. 302 of *Chrysoun Genos* the speaker made to look at geographical locations had been Cleon. In that case, the humorous point of the reuse of this dramatic device would lie in the substitution of Sausage-seller for Cleon. The humour would have been more pointed if (1) the earlier play also charted the rise of a new leader (Cleon), (2) Sausage-seller were also recognizable as a caricature of a well-known Athenian political figure associated with the Knights. This hypothesis, of course, shifts the focus of interpretation onto what one might call 'disguised caricatures'. It may seem especially unsafe to support one hypothesis with another. Yet there are two reasons why it is worth taking this suggestion seriously.

<sup>50</sup> This point was made to me by one of my correspondents.

<sup>51</sup> Fr. 300 was preserved for its information on barbers' equipment (Poll. *Onom.* 10.140, 2.32; Phot. *Lex.* p.250.18), not for its mention of the εἰσφορά; fr. 302 was preserved for the geographical datum (Steph. Byz. p.433.5), not for the thematic and dramatic parallel (Fritzsche compared *Eq.* 163f; see *supra* n.50); fr. 316 was preserved by Priscian (*De metr. Ter.* 26) as a metrical example.

First of all, the disguised caricature is already found in Slave 1, Slave 2, and Paphlagon in this play. It is not especially radical to add another character to the list.<sup>52</sup> Second, the hypothesis produces a structure within which one can attempt to understand the dynamics of both plays, if one once accepts the possibility that the references to Cleon and Knights in *Acharnians* go back to Eupolis, and specifically to *Chrysoun Genos*, rather than pointing back to *Babylonians* or forward to *Knights*. Eupolis' play will have dealt with Cleon within his favoured legal milieu (if *Ach.* 5—8, 299–302 really do imply a trial) and to the political advantage of the Knights. *Knights* in contrast sidelines Cleon and makes comedy out of the idea of an even viler figure (e.g. 180f, 183ff, 213–219, 276f, etc.)—supported by the Knights—defeating Cleon on his own ground. The play will be fundamentally ironic if (1) the Sausage-seller represents a political figure actually supported by the Knights (and Eupolis?); (2) the play is presented *as though by Eupolis* (cf. Cratinus fr. 213).<sup>53</sup> The paracomedy, then, on this hypothesis, is not merely a means of artistic criticism. It is serving the end of political satire.

<sup>52</sup> One might also mention: (1) that the *recognition* of a disguised caricature is given dramatic prominence in this play at 232f; (2) that the opening scenario contains an anti-Cleonian (Slave2/Nicias) in cahoots with a person who had certainly helped Cleon at Pylos (Slave 1/Demosthenes), a paradoxical partnership that surely produced humour because the caricatures were meant to be recognized *before a word was spoken* (as Platonios suggests [in W. J. W. Koster, *Prolegomena de comoedia* (Groningen 1975) 5] against e.g. E. W. Handley, "Aristophanes and his Theatre," in J. M. Bremer and E. W. Handley, ed., *Aristophane [=Entretiens Hardt 38 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1993)]* 101f); (3) that the scholiastic tradition marked a change from "open" to "enigmatic" attack as beginning with the career of Eupolis (see S. Halliwell, "Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens," *JHS* 111 [1991] 56 n.9) and that this could have been a result of legislation μή κωμωδεῖν ἐξ ὀνόματος. Halliwell dismisses this idea casually (58): "we should not believe that the Athenians engaged in the casuistry of banning names but not personalites." But it is hard to see why ancient scholars should have invented legislation formulated thus when they believed that *naming individuals* was the primary mode of attack in Old Comedy; moreover, the disjunction between disguised caricatures and *named* attacks on the same individuals within *Knights* (Nicias 358, Cleon 976) might very well be the result of precisely the casuistry that Halliwell scouts. There is much more to be said on this matter, which I intend to deal with separately elsewhere.

<sup>53</sup> See *supra* n.9 on *Acharnians*, where I argue that this is what is happening in that play.

## V. Conclusion

To go any further at present would involve an even higher level of speculation, unacceptable until the merits of these arguments have been assessed. But it is important to recognize that speculation will ultimately be a necessary consequence of testing the two structures that have been outlined here, both because they clearly cut across ways we currently manage our negotiations with Old Comedy and because they hypothesize the importance of the plays of Aristophanes' rivals, of which we know so very little.<sup>54</sup> I shall look in conclusion at the general consequences for methodology of accepting the reality of disguised caricature and paracomedy.

If, say, Sausage-seller is a caricature of a real individual, then we shall have to find a better method of penetrating his disguise than the present idea that "Aristophanes was never coy about his caricatures."<sup>55</sup> It is simply not obvious who he is. By the same token, however, the argument that "because it is not obvious, he is not a caricature," is unsafe. If it does seem likely on the foregoing arguments that he *is* a caricature, we shall be forced to admit that the *text* was not constructed to give clues, but to produce laughter consequent upon *prior recognition*, by portrait-mask and other visual and aural signals. In that case, we shall have to accept that our philological tools must be subordinated to a much wider enquiry about the humour of these plays, which may edge us towards accepting identifications that would not be arrived at by current methods. The way that the figure of Socrates in *Clouds* is constructed so as to contain both reflections of the individual and attributes culled from others

<sup>54</sup> I am not encouraged, however, by the way in which scholars have generally responded to Bowie's radical proposal that Dicaeopolis=Eupolis to suppose that such testing will be allowed. I point out (*supra* n.9) that a suggestion such as Bowie's cannot be dealt with adequately by the technique of measuring it against what we already know, since it inherently challenges the framework by which that knowledge has been determined. Hence, it can only be assessed by being used as a *positive* hypothesis. So with the suggestion offered here.

<sup>55</sup> R. F. Moorton, "Aristophanes on Alcibiades," *GRBS* 29 (1988) 346; *cf.* Storey (*supra* n.3: 82): "Aristophanes does not hide his targets behind subtle disguises." In that case, why is there a debate about the identity of Slave 2 in *Knights* (see Sommerstein 46f)?



should be a warning about the omnipresence of irony and calumny in the caricatures of Aristophanes.<sup>56</sup>

The consequences of accepting paracomedy are just as far-reaching. Simple correlations between text and author cannot be trusted if we suspect that a whole play may be misappropriating the voice of another poet to produce satire. Even the referent of the parabasis may not be Aristophanes, but the object of his satire. This again destabilizes current readings. Paracomedy makes a global difference to the way we read and—like disguised caricature—can only be dealt with by a method that accepts its existence and is prepared to make the considerable hermeneutic inversions it requires.

In conclusion, it must be said that neither of these tools is of itself either unevidenced or practically impossible. Caricatures—both disguised and named—are a well-recognized part of Old Comedy's dramatic repertoire. The audiences who watched Aristophanes also saw the plays by other comic dramatists at the same festivals. They were expected to recall many details of past *tragic* plays. The parabases of *Acharnians* and *Clouds* (among others) make references to past comic productions by their own poet and others. What rational grounds have we for rejecting the possibility—and further for rejecting the investigation of its ramifications—that material from other comedies was an important factor in the audience's understanding of these plays?<sup>57</sup>

KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON  
ST PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH  
September, 1994

<sup>56</sup> Cf. the grounds of the complaint put into Socrates' mouth by Plato (*Ap.* 19c). See C. W. Willink, "Prodikos, 'Meteorosophists' and the 'Tantalos' Paradigm," *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983) 25–33, for the attractive suggestion that several attributes were borrowed from the popular conception of the sophist Prodicus.

<sup>57</sup> This piece has benefited greatly from discussion with colleagues at King's College, London, the Institute of Classical Studies, and the Fondation Hardt in Geneva. I am especially grateful to Eric Handley, Bernard Gredley, Jane Rowlandson, and Alan Sommerstein for reading an earlier draft. It has also been considerably sharpened as a result of the comments of anonymous referees. None of these should in any way be held necessarily to agree with anything in the argument I have presented.