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ABSTRACT

In this thesis I examine the evidence for Cleon's career, for his treatment of Aristophanes and for the poet's attitude towards him down to 424 B.C. In a sense the relationship between the two men came to a climax early in this year for Cleon was then at the peak of his influence in the city, and Aristophanes won first prize at the Lenaea with the Knights, a play which was devoted to attacking him.

After a preliminary discussion of Cleon's background and of his career prior to 427 when Aristophanes' first comedy was produced, the fragments of the playwright's early works and the Acharnians and Knights are considered in chronological order. As far as possible, the over-all impact of each of the plays of this period is assessed against the background of Cleon's career at the time when it was performed. In the case of the two extant comedies, special attention is focussed upon the references to Cleon which they contain, and these references are examined in the light of what is known about Cleon from other sources. By this means I try to analyze the different ways in which Aristophanes reacts to Cleon and to what he has done, and in a number of instances it is suggested that the comic allusions throw new light upon Cleon's career. An original explanation of the 'litigation' which followed the Babylonians is advanced, and its importance as one of the reasons for Aristophanes' hostility towards Cleon is considered.

Adhering to a strictly chronological approach, I attempt in this thesis to trace the course of the feud between the two men down to 424, to analyze the poet's attacks upon the politician and to estimate their significance as evidence for his own political viewpoint early in his career.
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ABBREVIATIONS

For the names of ancient authors and their works, I have tried to use customary and obvious abbreviations; so too for familiar works of reference such as CAH, OCD, PA, RE. For the titles of periodicals, I have been guided by the abbreviations used in L'Année Philologique, while feeling free to employ a different abbreviation in common use or none at all.

For the titles of modern works which I have cited frequently in the notes, the following abbreviations are used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beiträge</td>
<td>G. Gilbert, Beiträge zur innern geschichte Athens im zeitalter des peloponnesischen Krieges, Leipzig, 1877.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGH</td>
<td>F. Jacoby, Die Fragmenten der Griechischen Historiker, Berlin and Leiden, 1923-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>G. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte, Gotha, 1893-1904.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td><em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em>, Berlin, 1873--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference to the following is made by author's name only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Except in a few instances the comic fragments are cited from Kock's edition, the scholia from Dübner.
INTRODUCTION

My main objectives in this thesis and the approach which I have adopted need some definition and elaboration. The title itself perhaps requires a word of explanation. I have not attempted to cover the relationship of Aristophanes and Cleon down to the latter's death or to the production of the Peace in 422/1, because I do not think that it would have been feasible to do so adequately in a work of this length. Reference is made to Cleon's later career and to passages in the Clouds, Wasps and Peace where this seems relevant, but I have taken 424, or rather the Lenaea of 424, as a 'cut-off point'. This is not an arbitrary terminus. It was at this festival that Aristophanes won first prize with his Knights, a comedy which embodied an extensive attack upon Cleon, and the politician was at the height of his influence in the city when the play was performed.

Individual chapters of the thesis are devoted to Cleon's early career; to the Banqueters; the Babylonians; Cleon's reaction to the Babylonians; the Acharnians; and the Knights. Detailed examination of several important questions is relegated to appendices in order to try to keep the main line of argument clear, but there is inevitably considerable imbalance in the length of the chapters.

The possibility that Cleon attacked Aristophanes following the production of the Knights is briefly discussed in connection with Cleon's action after the Babylonians.
Almost every line in the *Knights* is concerned with Cleon, and the chapter in which I analyze the play is far longer than any other. There does not seem to be any way of avoiding this, and to facilitate examination of the comedy I have considered Cleon's 'activities' here in nine different sections. In the third of these, a section dealing with the politician's use of oracles and religion, I argue that there is some reason to think that Cleon had recently been involved in the Athenian decision to start work upon the Nike temple and that Aristophanes pokes fun at this in his play. For clarity and completeness, the inscriptions connected with the temple as well as modern controversy about the date and context of its building have to be discussed, and this 'expository material' makes the section somewhat unwieldy. Yet it is difficult to see how the material could have been treated separately in an appendix, and I decided that here too I should simply have to tolerate a certain lack of proportion.

When I first began work on this subject my main interest lay in Aristophanes rather than in Cleon. By this I mean that I wanted to concentrate on analyzing the various ways in which he attacks the politician in his comedies. I soon realized, however, that in order to do this it was necessary to try to 'unearth the real Cleon', and the thesis in its final form is at least as much about Cleon as about Aristophanes. Although my aim is not primarily historical, it is suggested throughout that in various ways (some apparently not noted before) the
comedies do shed considerable light upon the politician's career.

My main purpose is to examine in as comprehensive a manner as possible the evidence for the relationship between Aristophanes and Cleon (chronologically viewed) from 427 to (early) 424. This, I think, requires no justification. The validity of trying to trace the course of the feud between the two men and (particularly) of attempting to make any estimate of the seriousness of Aristophanes' attacks upon Cleon is perhaps slightly more controversial. These objectives certainly involve considerable difficulties. It is impossible to reconstruct the plot of either the Banqueters or the Babylonians, and another of the poet's lost plays may have been performed in 427, 426, or 425. Moreover, any judgment which one makes about Aristophanes' intentions when he wrote the Acharnians and the Knights (not to mention the lost comedies) is necessarily subjective.

The problems should not be minimized. The best evidence for Aristophanes' political viewpoint would undoubtedly be the miraculous emergence of one of his comedies which was performed prior to Cleon's attack upon him in 426. If he wrote a fifth (or sixth?) play before the beginning of 424 any reconstruction of the development of his feud with Cleon is (at best) incomplete, and no two

---

1 This possibility is considered in the Conclusion of the thesis.
modern readers are likely to be in total agreement about what he was trying to do in his extant works.

Because of these and other difficulties, certainty here is often impossible and doubts have to be frankly expressed. Yet it still seems important to try to uncover the feud between Aristophanes and Cleon and to trace its development as fully as one can. It is beyond the scope of this Introduction to take up the arguments advanced by Gomme when he urged that it was pointless to try to discover Aristophanes' political opinions and that only Aristotelian canons of consistency and probability should be invoked when analyzing the comedies. Gomme's vigorously argued viewpoint has had a considerable impact on the course of Aristophanic criticism but in recent years there have been growing signs of a healthy counter-reaction. I simply wish to say that I find Gomme's position here untenable. Any play can embody or contain a serious political 'message'. Particularly because of the intimate connection between an Athenian audience and the stage and the intentional 'violations of the dramatic illusion', I believe that Aristotelian criteria are of limited relevance where Old Comedy is concerned. Gomme may be nearer the mark in arguing that it is impossible to discover what Aristophanes' political opinions were. At least it seems doubtful whether they will ever be established to

1 CR l1i 1938, 97-109 = MEGHL 70-91.
everybody's satisfaction, but the attempt must surely be made to determine what (if any) political purpose and hopes he had when he wrote his plays.

It may appear a little curious to close this Introduction by referring to an epigraphical controversy, but the subject is important and it seems as well to make my position clear at the outset. In a series of articles which began in 1961, H.B. Mattingly has consistently argued that a number of Athenian decrees which are usually dated earlier belong to the 420s. He believes that they reflect a strong imperialism which developed after the death of Pericles with Cleon and his successors, but I am very far from being convinced that certain letter forms (notably the 3-bar sigma) are not reliable criteria of date. Consequently, I have not (e.g.) referred to the Coinage Decree when discussing Cleon's attitude towards the Empire. Essentially, I follow Meiggs, Meritt and those other scholars who uphold the 'orthodox' view that the

1 Hist. x 1961, 148-88. Most of Mattingly's later articles are listed by M.B. Walbank, Phoros: Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt, N. York, 1974, 161 n. I.

2 Walbank, supra cit. 161-9, has recently published lists of dated fifth-century documents noting changes in all the letters of the Attic and Ionic alphabets. As he observes, they support the orthodox view that the disappearance of the three-barred sigma and the tailed rho are reliable indications of date.

3 The dating of the Coinage Decree involved peculiar problems since only the Cos fragment uses the sigma with three bars, but this seems decisive. For modern controversy on the subject, see Meiggs, 167-72; B.D. Meritt, PAPhs cxix 1975, 267-74.
important steps in changing the Alliance into an Empire were taken in the forties, and that Cleon had nothing to do with them.
Cleon's position in Athens when Aristophanes began to write is extremely difficult to assess. His age is unknown but since he was a member of the Boule before 425/4, the terminus ante quem for his date of birth is 456,\(^1\) and it should almost certainly be placed more than ten years prior to this. J.K. Davies has estimated from the probable ages of his children and from his possible marriage to a daughter of his fellow-demesman, Dicaeogenes, that he is unlikely to have been born after 470,\(^2\) and while his data are not firm enough to make this certain,\(^3\) it is quite probable that Cleon was born about this year. The impression of the politician which emerges from the writings of both Thucydides and Aristophanes is that he was a vigorous man in early middle age during the Archidamian War, and he is never attacked in Comedy for his youth as (e.g.) was Hyperbolus.\(^4\) It would seem then that Cleon was in his forties in the summer of 427 when he is mentioned for the first time by Thucydides and described

---

\(^1\) Knights 773-6 show that he was a Councillor before 425/4, the year when the play was performed. Thirty was the minimum age for this office; see Rhodes, AB 1 with n. 7.

\(^2\) APF 319-320.

\(^3\) See below, App. A.

\(^4\) Eupol. fr. 238, Cratin. fr. 262.
as being 'the most violent of the citizens and as possessing at that time by far the most influence with the people' 1

In his discussion of the 'Athenian demagogues' M.I. Finley well emphasized that, given the nature of the political system in which they operated, Athenian leaders had to earn and exert their influence immediately and directly. 2 Particularly because of the importance of rhetorical skill as a source of power, an aspiring politician, if he was gifted, could come to the forefront quickly. Cleon may well have done so, but it is still impossible to believe that he suddenly appeared from nowhere to achieve the influence with the Assembly which Thucydides describes. He is known to have attacked Pericles for his conduct of the war, 3 and this could not have been an isolated venture into the political arena. He must have 'served his apprenticeship' while Pericles was dominant and made himself known by his speeches in the Assembly, presumably assailing the political 'incumbents' and displaying his growing expertise in the complex details of the city's business.

1 Thuc. iii.36.6.
2 Past and Present xxi 1962, 3-24.
3 Thucydides, ii.21.3, describes how the Athenians €κάλλιζον Pericles for his 'strategy of inactivity' during the first Peloponnesian invasion in 431 and Plutarch, Per. 33.7, supplements his account with further details. He states that Cleon was involved in these attacks and he quotes lines (fr. 46) from the Fates, Hermippus' contemporary comedy, to illustrate this.
The date of his entry into politics cannot be fixed, but there is no reason to place it much, if at all, before the beginning of the war. Nothing is known about his ancestors before his father Cleaenetus who was the wealthy owner of a large tannery, and it is likely enough that Cleon was the first member of his family to embark upon a political career. In this case, as he was not 'born into politics' (which in the late fifth century was virtually a full-time occupation), it is quite plausible to suppose that at some point in the 430s, Cleon, who had hitherto been busy with the family tannery, made the conscious decision to devote himself to the affairs of

1 In a sense it is misleading to talk about a man's 'entry into politics' in the context of the Athenian political system. Any citizen had the right to address the Assembly and a single speech could be construed as involvement in politics. It is argued below, however, that there is reason to think that at some point Cleon decided to devote all his time to political affairs, and the phrase is used with reference to this decision.

2 The identification of his father with the Cleaenetus of Pandionis, who won a victory as choregos in the men's dithyramb at the Dionysia in 460/59 (IGii 2 2318), is now generally accepted. It fits chronologically and according to the scholium on Knights 44, Cleon's father owned a workshop of slave tanners which would have provided him with his wealth.

3 See P.A. Brunt, Cr xi 1961, 143-4; A. Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 83ff.

4 As his father's only known son, presumably Cleon would have inherited the tannery with which he is continually associated by the comic poets; see Davies, APF 319. Cf. the scholium on Lucian, Timon 30, where Idomeneus is reported to have called him αὐτὸν ἑτερέβεγγον ἐτερεβεβίστηκεν.
This would give greater point to the jokes of the Comic poets about his connection with the leather trade, and it is supported by an anecdote in Plutarch's Moralia. The biographer relates that when Cleon first decided to enter politics he brought his friends together and renounced their friendship as something which would interfere with the right choice of policy in public life. This implies that his decision was a mature and premeditated one, involving a considerable change in his personal life-style.

The authenticity of this anecdote can naturally be questioned but it should not be discarded lightly; the mere fact that Plutarch reports (albeit briefly) something favorable about Cleon deserves attention. Cleon's wealth would presumably have ensured that he did have influential friends as the biographer implies, and if his wife was the daughter of Dicaeogenes whom Davies describes as 'the first known member of one of the wealthiest and most distinguished families of democratic Athens', some of his circle of associates must have been of high rank. At first sight it seems strange that Clean should have turned

1 A possible comparison with Pericles may be seen here. According to Plutarch (Per. 16), the latter entrusted the management of his estate to Evangelus in order that he might be able to concentrate on State affairs.

2 Mor. 806f.

3 Plutarch then quickly proceeds to criticize Cleon's irresponsibility in driving away his friends, subjecting himself to the multitude, and making the worst elements his associates against the best.

4 AFF 145.
his back upon such potentially useful supporters (particularly if he had established this 'marriage-alliance'), but a number of his political methods were flamboyantly unusual and some of the policies which he advocated seem to have run counter to the immediate interests of his own class.

In the chapter dealing with the Knights it will be argued that there is some substance to W.R. Connor's thesis that Cleon did publicly repudiate personal friendships in order to proclaim himself 'the friend of the people'.\(^1\) It may be noted here too that a marriage to a daughter of Dicaeogenes could scarcely have taken place after 440,\(^2\) and it is interesting to speculate that at some point in the following decade Cleon's new connection with this family may have sparked his own political ambitions.

Connor has linked this anecdote in the Moralia with Cleon's well-known feud with the Knights and with a statement in a scholium to Knights 225 that he was once a member of the corps of cavalry. He theorizes that the politician's early associates may have been Knights who bore a special animosity towards him after he had repudiated them.\(^3\) This, however, is unlikely. Cleon was

---

1 \textit{KP} 87ff.

2 Dicaeogenes was probably killed in battle in 460 or 459; see below, App. A.

3 \textit{KP} 152 n. 32.
certainly rich enough to qualify for the corps\(^1\) but if he was ever a Knight, it seems probable that this would have been in his youth, apparently long before he had any thoughts of a political career. There were older men in the cavalry and these included not only men who had been members for some time\(^2\) but (surprisingly enough) men who were enrolled in middle-age.\(^3\) Cleon's feud with the Knights, however, is firmly rooted in the Archidamian War and if he had belonged to either of these categories and been a member of the corps even some little time before the war broke out, there would surely have been an echo of this in Aristophanes' play of 424.

Elsewhere, Connor has seen a further reference to Cleon's entry into politics in a scholiium to Knights 226.\(^4\) The scholiast attempts to explain the cavalry's hostility towards Cleon by quoting Theopompus as his authority for the statement that the Knights hated the politician

---

1. The liturgy performed by his father Cleaenetus, who was choregus for the men's dithyramb at the Dionysia (IGii\(^2\) 2318), was an expensive one. Demosthenes, xxii.156, states that Meidias' tragic chorus cost less than his own dithyrambic one (which is logical as there were more choreutai in the latter), and the outlay was heavier for the Dionysia than for the other festivals. A speaker in Lysias (xxi.1-2) states that a dithyrambic chorus of men at the Thargelia in 411/10 cost him 2,000 dr., and a similar chorus at the Dionysia in the following year 5,000 dr. In general, see Pickard-Cambridge, Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy\(^2\), Oxford, 1962, 36; DFA 87ff.; APF xxff.

2. Xen. Hipparch. 1.2.

3. Xen. Hipparch. 1.17, ii.3.

because 'having been insulted by them and having become enraged, ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ and continued planning evil for them'.¹ As it stands, the phrase ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ is virtually impossible to translate. Connor, citing what he believes to be analogous uses of ἐπετέθη and πολιτείᾳ in Plato's Gorgias and in Aeschines, suggests that it means 'Cleon applied himself to holding political power.' He thinks that Theopompus is here referring to 'Cleon's decision to win the greatest political power in the State and thereby teach the Knights a lesson', and he tentatively theorizes that this decision should be placed sometime shortly before Λ29/8.

This translation of the crucial phrase, ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ, however, is no improvement over Gilbert's idea that there is a reference here to Cleon's becoming a member of the Boule in Λ28/7.² Neither interpretation of the words inspires any confidence and there is now good reason to think that they allude to a specific attack which Cleon made upon the cavalry when he was a Councillor later in the war.³

There are no grounds then for supposing that Cleon's entry into politics had anything to do with his feud with the Knights which came to a head a few years

1 FGH 115 F 93. The fragment is quoted in full and discussed below, App. B.

2 Beiträge, 133.

3 Fornara's very plausible explanation of the phrase (CQ xxiii 1973, 24) is examined below, App. B.
later. It may be pertinent to note, however, Plutarch's description of his attack upon Pericles which he places in

1 Plut. Per. 33.8.
2 See Croiset, 21.
3 Thur. v.16.i. For Aristophanes, see below, pp. 395ff.
Whatever his motives were, it is certain that Cleon was involved in politics while Pericles was alive, but it is impossible to connect him specifically with any major event before the Mytilenaean debate of 427. Although he attacked Pericles for his conduct of the war, it is not known whether he took any part in the latter's trial in the summer of 430. The third-century writer Idomeneus did state that Cleon was the accuser, but he is a poor authority and Busolt is very sceptical whether Cleon could have been involved. Theophrastus and Heracleides Ponticus (admittedly also unreliable sources) give the names of Simias and Lacratidas respectively, and Gomme has noted that if such obscure names as these survived in the tradition, they may have been prominent either as prosecutors in the lawcourt or as speakers in the Assembly urging the prosecution.

The nature of the accusation against Pericles is unknown. Thucydides describes the prevailing mood of the Athenians as anger at their sufferings caused by the plague and by the second Peloponnesian invasion; he states that they blamed Pericles as the author of the war and of

1 Thuc. ii.65.3.
2 Plut. Per. 35.5.
3 GG iii.2.953 n. 5. Plutarch himself sometimes (e.g. Per. 10.7) recognizes Idomeneus' inadequacies.
4 Plut. Per. 35.5.
5 ECT ii.182.
their misfortunes and that they sent peace-envoys to Sparta (who accomplished nothing). If the charge was that Pericles had deceived the people in persuading them to go to war in the first place, it is perhaps doubtful whether Cleon could have participated in the trial.

Thucydides, however, represents the Athenians as renewing the war with greater fervor after Pericles had addressed them, so it seems more likely that Pericles was attacked for his conduct of the war, either with reference to the Argolid expedition or to his strategy during the invasions. Cleon obviously could have directed an impeachment of this kind, but there is no way of establishing whether or not he did so.

A number of modern scholars have argued that the decree of Dracontides calling upon Pericles to submit to the prytaneis accounts of the public money which he had spent (which Plutarch expressly connects with the attacks upon Pericles' friends on the eve of the war), must in fact belong to the occasion since this is the only definitely attested trial of Pericles. It is interesting that in the long speech which Thucydides puts into Pericles' mouth, in which he attempts to defend himself

---

1 ii.59.
2 ii.65.2.
3 Per. 32.3.
4 F.E. Adcock, CAH v.478; Jacoby, FGH iiiib (Komm.) 88; Gomme, HCT ii.187. See, however, F.J. Frost, JHS lxxxiv 1964, 69-72, who challenges this view.
and to reassure the Athenians, he (seemingly irrelevantly) emphasizes both his own incorruptibility\(^1\) and its importance in public life.\(^2\) Yet it is hard to believe that if he had been convicted of klôpē or embezzlement of public funds (a common enough method of attack upon politicians), he could have rid himself of his atimia\(^3\) and obtained re-election as a general so quickly.\(^4\)

It seems more likely that the decree of Dracontides should be connected with the charge against Phidias of stealing the sacred material used in the statue of Athena Parthenos, when Pericles, as an epistates for the project was responsible for the accounts.\(^5\) If Pericles ever came

---

1 \(\text{ii.60.5.}\)

2 \(\text{ii.60.6.}\)

3 Thucydides (\(\text{ii.65.3}\)) states that Pericles was fined. According to Plutarch (\(\text{Per. 35.4}\)), his authorities disagreed on the amount of the fine and that the figure ranged from 15 to 50 talents. Diodorus, \(\text{xii.45.4}\), says that it was 80 talents which must be too high. Kagan, 90-2, believes that the charge was embezzlement, but that the jury 'was obviously not fully convinced of Pericles' guilt, for the crime of peculation might carry with it the death penalty' (\(\text{Lys. xxx.25}\)).

4 Thucydides, \(\text{ii.65.4}\), says that 'not much later' Pericles was re-elected general and again entrusted with the whole conduct of affairs. Busolt, \(\text{GG iii.2.955 n. 2, 963 n.2}\), argues that he was re-elected in the normal annual elections of 429. Gomme, \(\text{HCT ii.183}\), believes that Thucydides' words indicate that he did not have to wait this long, and that no successor was elected so that he was back in office after a few weeks when he had paid the fine. See Kagan, 93 n. 69, who upholds Busolt's view.

5 Phil. \(\text{FGH 328 F 121, Diod. xii.39.1-2, Plut. Per. 31.2-32; cf F.J. Frost, JHS lxxxiv 1964, 69-72}\), who makes out a strong case for this.
to trial on this occasion he must have been acquitted, but the penalty, had he been convicted, would have been severe. The date of the attack upon Phidias is uncertain. The tradition reflected in Plutarch and Diodorus (following Ephorus) that it immediately preceded and (according to Diodorus and πλεῖστοι μάρτυρες not named by Plutarch) that it was partially responsible for the outbreak of the war is clearly in part at least derived from the Peace. It is unlikely, however, that even Aristophanes would have invented (or repeated) the story or that it would have been taken at face-value by later authorities unless the attack upon Phidias had occurred before 431, and there are solid grounds for placing it between 438/7 and 432/1.

The considerable problems presented by this affair and by the other reported attacks on members of the Periclean circle are well known, and most of them need not

---

1 The decree of Dracontides required that all suits arising from the investigation of Pericles' accounts should be tried on the acropolis and that the dicasts should vote with ballots taken from the altar. A rider from Hagnon changed this to provide for a normal trial by fifteen hundred jurors (Plut. Per. 32.3-4). For arguments that this trial never took place, see Frost, supra cit., 72; Kagan, The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Cornell U.P., 1969, 200-1. Socrates (Gorg. 516A) says that Pericles was convicted of klopē towards the end of his life and that the death-penalty was almost imposed. If he is referring to this occasion, he must be exaggerating. It seems dangerous to take this passage as proof that the charge was embezzlement in 430.


3 See, however, the doubts of Adcock in CAH v, 480; he argues that it is hazardous to make this assumption about Aristophanes. For the dating between 438/7 and 432/1, see the very full discussion of Jacoby FGH iiib (Suppl.) i. 484-96.
be discussed in detail here. The only pertinent question is what part (if any) did Cleon play in the harassment. Plutarch's account of the litigation is in itself reasonably coherent and he reports (as one explanation of the cause of the war to which he himself does not necessarily subscribe) that on the eve of hostilities Phidias was accused of peculation by a certain Menon and died in prison; that Aspasia was prosecuted by the comic poet Hermippus (for impiety and for being a procuress for Pericles), but escaped through Pericles' personal pleas; and that Anaxagoras was sent away from Athens by Pericles, when threatened by the oracle-monger Diopeithes who moved a decree providing for the prosecution of those who did not believe in the gods or who lectured upon the heavenly bodies. The purpose of these attacks was to test the possibility of injuring Pericles and to cast suspicion upon him, and finally the decree of Dracontides was moved (and amended by Hagnon) after that of Diopeithes. Pericles, fearing for his own safety, passed the Megarian decree and brought on the war to save himself.¹

Diodorus (following Ephorus) tells much the same story. He gives three reasons why Pericles precipitated the Peloponnesian War: (a) he was on the point of having to submit an account of his public expenditure and took the advice of Alcibiades in seeking how to avoid this;

¹ Plut. Per. 31.2-32. The biographer also records a decree of Glycon rewarding the informer Menon (31.5).
(b) Phidias was accused by his enemies of peculation and Pericles himself of being his accomplice; (c) Anaxagoras was prosecuted for impiety and attacks were made upon Pericles himself.¹

Even if one passes over the inconsistencies in the details as well as the motives ascribed to Pericles for 'kindling' the war, the objections to accepting this version of events are considerable. According to the scholiast on Peace 605, Philochorus in his Atthis said that it was in 438/7 that Phidias was accused of stealing the ivory used in the statue of Athena.² He also states that λέγεται that he fled (or was exiled) to Elis where he worked on the statue of Olympian Zeus and was put to death after again being accused of peculation. A.E. Taylor has argued that Anaxagoras returned to Lampsacus nearly twenty years before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War and that his troubles in Athens took place c. 450,³ while the fact that

---

1 Diod. xii.38.2-39. He does not mention the prosecution of Aspasia.

2 FGH 328 F 121. The scholiast examined Aristophanes' account of the antecedents of the Peloponnesian War in Peace 603-18 by checking the case of Phidias and the Megarian ραξισμα in Philochorus. He found the events under different archons, who in the MSS. are called Pythodorus and Scythodorus. As Jacoby (FGH iiiib (Suppl.) 1.485-6), has emphasized, it does not matter that these names are corrupt since the scholiast expressly states that Scythodorus was ἔσπερος ἀνδρὸν; 'it is annoying that the names of the archons are corrupt in both excerpts, but not more than just annoying, as the interval between the two archons is preserved in the first excerpt: the alterations made already by Lepaulmier (Ποιητώρων to θεοτώρων and Συνοδώρων to Ποιητώρων) are slight and certain.'

3 CQ xi 1917, 81-7.
Hermippus is named as the accuser of Aspasia naturally arouses the suspicion that it was in a comedy not in court that he attacked her.¹

These difficulties are not absolutely insuperable. There is no compelling reason to assume that a comic poet could not have been active in other fields and that Hermippus could not have prosecuted Aspasia, while although the ancient testimony on the chronology of Anaxagoras' life is conflicting, it is impossible to disprove his presence in Athens in 432/1.² It is the evidence provided by the Atthidographer which raises the most serious questions about Plutarch's grouping of events, but even here an explanation of the contradiction can be advanced. It is just possible that Philochorus, who knew that the Parthenos statue was dedicated in 438/7 and that Phidias had later worked in Elis, only inferred that the sculptor

¹ The charge that Aspasia was a procuress is levelled by Aristophanes at ACh. 526ff.
² The main sources for his life are collected by J.A. Davison, CQ xlvii 1953, 39, G.S. Kirk and J.E. Raven, The Pre-Socratic Philosophers, Cambridge, 1957, 362-5. It is generally accepted that he lived from c. 500 to 428/7, but there is considerable controversy about the date of his Athenian period(s). According to tradition, he spent thirty years in Athens, but as Davison, supra cit. 41, points out, these were not necessarily continuous. The arguments of Taylor (accepted by Adcock in CAH v 1978) that Anaxagoras retired permanently to Lampsacus c. 450 are in conflict with the evidence for his later activity in Athens; see Wade-Gery, JHS lli 1932, 220, J.S. Morrison, CQ xxxv 1941, 5 n. 2. Davison has suggested (in line with his theory that there were two separate prosecutions of the philosopher) that he left the city during the mid-fifties and returned in the mid-forties. This theory is given qualified support by Meiggs, L35-6.
had been prosecuted and exiled in 438/7. The charge against him may conceivably have been laid six or seven years later on his (undocumented) return to Athens from Olympia.1

It is impossible to resolve the matter conclusively. Plutarch (or rather his sources) may well have misdated (or worse) one or more of the trials which he

1 See Gomme, HCT ii.186-7. Arguments that Philochorus did not date the trial of Phidias but only the dedication have been answered by Jacoby, FGrH iiiib (Suppl.) i.484-96. M. Donnay, AC xxxvii 1968, 19-36, has strongly argued that the style of the frieze and metopes of the Parthenon cannot be adduced as evidence that Phidias worked upon them in the late 430s, and that the excavation of the sculptor’s workshop at Olympia proves that the Zeus is later than the Parthenos, and that Phidias worked upon it. The theory that he returned to Athens just in time to face prosecution does not inspire confidence, but it is apparently the only way that the two accounts might be reconciled. It means discarding the story of Phidias’ death in Elis but Jacoby, supra cit., has emphasized that Philochorus is here only repeating αλεγέμενον, and the story does not in any case seem probable. That Phidias after once being convicted of peculation should be given a second opportunity to commit the same offence, duly do so, and again get convicted, seems to be straining the bounds of credibility. Moreover, Phidias and his descendants were later accorded special honor at Olympia (Paus. v.14.5).
describes. Alternatively, his account may be substantially correct. The only action with which Cleon is explicitly linked by any ancient authority is the attack on Anaxagoras. Sotion claimed that he was the prosecutor in the latter's trial but Satyrus stated that it was Thucydides, son of Melesias. In Sotion's account, the charge was asebeia and the philosopher was fined five talents and exiled; according to Satyrus, the charge was jedism as well as asebeia and Anaxagoras was condemned to death in absentia.

R. Sealey has suggested that Thucydides and Cleon may have collaborated on this occasion and that the former was more prominent, but collaboration here seems impossible. Cleon and Thucydides may have been united in their common hostility towards the Periclean group, but the

---

1 Gomme, HCT ii.184ff., argues that since Thucydides is silent about personal attacks on Pericles just before the war (apart from the crude attempts by the Spartans to discredit him at i.127.2-3) his position could not have been shaken by attacks on him or his policies at this date. Consequently, he puts 'the decree of Diopeithes and the attacks on Aspasia and Anaxagoras (and perhaps those on Phidias as well) in 430'. This is a possible reconstruction of events with the exception of the tentative dating of Phidias' trial; Jacoby, supra cit., has well argued that Aristophanes' words in the Peace cannot be taken as evidence for placing this in 432/1, but they do indicate that it preceded the war. There is no evidence to support Gomme's theory, however, and since Thucydides does not mention the attack upon the Periclean circle at all, his silence can scarcely be held to be decisive. Peace 619-21 seems to indicate that there were internal struggles in Athens before the outbreak of the war.

2 Diog. Laert. ii.12.

3 Ibid.

4 Essays in Greek Politics, New York, 1965, 81.
accounts of Sotion and Satyrus are irreconcilable in that nobody could be sentenced to a fine and exile and to death in absentia at the same trial. Davison has theorized that both men prosecuted the philosopher on different occasions, Thucydides before his ostracism in 443 and Cleon shortly before the Peloponnesian War.\(^1\) This is a more plausible reconstruction, particularly since the additional charge of ἡδισμός, which Thucydides is alleged to have brought, would seem to have been rather dated in 432,\(^2\) and it may be correct.

Yet it is equally possible that the identifications advanced by Sotion and Satyrus were simply the product of learned speculation. Jacoby has doubted that Anaxagoras was ever brought to trial\(^3\) and in his *Life* of Pericles it is notable that Plutarch states that he was sent away from Athens, although elsewhere he contradicts himself by reporting that he was imprisoned.\(^4\) The decree of Diopeithes was certainly passed. It did not name Anaxagoras explicitly but (provided that he was in Athens) it would have prepared the way for someone to attack

\(^1\) *CQ* xlvii 1953, 41ff.
\(^2\) *Knights* 478 shows, however, that it was still a comic possibility in 424.
\(^3\) *FGH* iiib (Suppl.) ii.167.
\(^4\) *Nic.* 23.4.
CLEON'S EARLY CAREER

There is good evidence that Cleon was a 'conservative' in religious matters and he may have done so. It should at least be noted, however, that according to a scholiast on Knights 1085, Diopeithes was a friend of Xias, not of Cleon. The latter's hostility towards Pericles, his propensity for litigation, his religious orthodoxy and general 'anti-intellectualism' were probably all known to the Alexandrians. These would have made him a likely candidate for the role of the prosecutor of Anaxagoras whether he actually filled it or not.

If one assumes that the charges against Pericles' friends were concurrent, it would seem that there must have been a carefully orchestrated attempt to undermine his position, but Plutarch does not say who was responsible. Modern scholars, just like Sotion and Satyrus, have

1 Adcock (in CAH v 478) assumes that the decree simply marked some orthodox reaction. He suggests that 'it may belong to the year 430 and be the outcome of the emotions evoked by the plague, the visible sign of the anger of heaven (Thuc. ii.54).’ The decree seems, however, to have been designed for some specific purpose.

2 See below, pp. 243-79, where the Paphlagonian's devotion to Athena and his use of oracles in the Knights are discussed.

3 Schol. Wasps 380 simply describes him as a rhētōr. See below, p. 54, n. 4.

4 It seems doubtful whether anything should be deduced here from the statement that Cleon prosecuted Euripides for impiety in the fragmentary Life of Euripides by Satyrus (F. Oxy. 1176). The statement does not inspire much confidence since it occurs in a passage dealing with Euripides' general unpopularity, and it is immediately followed by the assertion that the women attacked the playwright at the Thesmophoria. The origin of the latter story is obvious, and as P.T. Stevens, JHS lxxvi 1956, 88, has observed, the story of Cleon's prosecution may be based on some allusion or incident in Comedy.
adopted diametrically opposite views on the question. D. Kienast, following up a suggestion made by Wade-Gery who believes that Thucydides, son of Kelesias, returned to Athens in 433 and 'made his presence felt', has argued that it was Pericles' old rival who organized the campaign against him.\(^1\) F.J. Frost has maintained that the weapons of anti-intellectualism and religious bigotry employed against 'the sacrilegious thief Pheidias, the ἀσεβής Aspasia, the intellectual Anaxagoras' point to the involvement of the 'demagogues'.\(^2\) He argues that the attacks were 'the handiwork, if not of Cleon, then of someone very much like him' and that they should be placed not on the eve of the war but in 438/7.

Frost's arguments for this date are not convincing. He accepts Philochorus' testimony that Phidias was proscribed in 438/7, and his arguments for putting Aspasia's trial at this time are ingenious, but he makes no real attempt to fit in the attacks of Anaxagoras. Because Philochorus gives 438/7 as the date of Phidias' trial and because Plutarch says that the other events took place 'about this time', he assumes that the biographer misdated the attack upon Phidias but that he knew that the litigation was concurrent. This is flying in the face of the testimony of both Plutarch and Diodorus, who treat all the

---

1 Wade-Gery, JHS liii 1932, 219; D. Kienast, Gymnasium lx 1953, 210-29.
2 Hist. xiii 1964, 392ff.
Frost's arguments are cogent, his attempts to find some sort of link between Hermippus, Diopeithes and Cleon are fruitless, and it is very difficult to accept his tentative conclusion that in 438/7 Cleon was already influential enough to organize harassment on this scale.1

On the other hand, there is little real evidence to support Kienast's view that after Thucydides' return from exile he united all the elements in the State which were unfriendly to Pericles into a strong opposition.2 He sees the prosecution of Thucydides which may have taken place not long before the production of the Acharnians in 425 as a retaliatory manoeuvre by the Periclean circle,3 but Thucydides was not only very old but apparently on the verge of senility at this time.4

1 Kagan, The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, 198-202 follows Frost in placing all the attacks in 438/7 and in ascribing them to the 'demagogues', but thinks that they were the work of Eucrates and Lysicles, 'helped, no doubt, by the up-and-coming dealer in hides, Cleon'.

2 op. cit. 215-6.

3 Ach. 676ff., Wasps 946ff. Wade-Gery, op. cit. 208ff., has shown that the wrestling motif frequently applied metaphorically to Thucydides in a political context makes this identification certain. A scholiast on Ach. 703 also states explicitly that the lines in the play refer to the son of Melesias; see Kienast, op. cit. 219ff., 228 n. 44.

4 He was born c. 500 and thus must have been c. 75 years old when the Acharnians was performed; cf. Wade-Gery, op. cit. 208ff., Davies, APF no. 7268. For his apparently hopeless discomfiture in court, see the passages in the Acharnians and Wasps referred to above.
Pericles had many political foes from different walks of life who would have rejoiced at his discomfiture and who would probably have been willing to use almost any means to achieve it. If one accepts that these attacks upon his friends took place at about the same time and that Sotion possessed reliable information for his statement that Anaxagoras was prosecuted by Cleon, the latter must have taken a prominent part in them. The whole question, however, is beclouded with uncertainties. As it stands, only a circumstantial case can be built up for Cleon's involvement in this affair and on this basis it is unwise to make any judgments about Cleon's position in Athens before the war broke out.

The evidence that he was especially prominent on any other occasion during the first few years of the war is equally tenuous. Marchant believes that in the summer of 430 he was probably responsible for the execution of the Lacedaemonian envoys who had been sent to the Persian King, but who were handed over to the Athenians by Sadocus.\(^1\) He argues that Pericles 'had now no voice in the government, and Thucydides hints that he views this act as a blunder'. This is obviously highly conjectural. Gomme has emphasized that the dates of Pericles' deposition and re-instatement as a general are not known,\(^2\) and since the Spartans had rebuffed their peace-offers the Athenians as

\(^1\) Thuc. ii.67.3-4.

\(^2\) HCT ii.183, 201.
whole may have felt that they had little alternative except to wage the war with all vigor.\(^1\) Marchant observes that the proper course for the Athenians would have been to have kept the Peloponnesian ambassadors in prison as hostages, and Cleon's behavior in 425 certainly shows that he appreciated the value of Spartan hostages.

In the winter of 430/29 the beleaguered Potidaeans finally surrendered to the Athenian generals, Xenophon, Hestiodorus, and Phanomachus after a siege of two and a half years.\(^2\) Although the terms which were given to the people of Potidæa were fairly rigorous, Thucydides states that the Athenians τῶν στρατηγῶν ἔπητιάσαντο ὦν ἄνευ ἀυτῶν ἄνδρας ἱκεῖσθαι.\(^3\) The attitude which Cleon was later to display towards imperial rebels makes it highly likely that he was a vociferous critic of the generals' behavior on this occasion, but Thucydides also says that Xenophon τρίτος ἀυτὸς led the army which was defeated at Spartolus in the following summer.\(^4\) This seems to indicate that the same three men were also in command on this occasion\(^5\)

---

1 Thuc. ii.59.2. The historian says (67.4) that the Athenians acted out of fear of Aristeus and in retaliation for Spartan atrocities. Meyer, GdA iv.2.46, emphasizes the effect of the collapse of peace-negotiations on the internal situation at Athens.

2 Thuc. ii.70.1-2.

3 ii.70.4.

4 ii.79.1.

5 Diodorus, xii.47.3, says that Xenophon and Phanomachus were in command. Plutarch, Nic. 6.3, gives the name of Calliades as commander.
which makes it improbable that they were recalled to face prosecution. Presumably Cleon's denunciations were confined to the Assembly.¹

By the end of the summer of 428 the Athenians were experiencing some financial pressure, particularly because of the expenses involved in the Mytilenean revolt. A squadron was dispatched to collect money from the Allies² and it is probable that there was an extraordinary assessment of tribute in this year. The evidence for this, however, and for the role which Cleon may have played in requiring the allies to increase their contributions can be more conveniently discussed in connection with the assessment of 425.³

On the domestic front, Cleon is commonly believed to have been responsible for the introduction of the eisphora, a capital tax which was levied on the citizens for the first time (in the war) in 428/7 to meet this same emergency,⁴ and also to have been a member of the Boule in that year.⁵ Although he was certainly to be active in

¹ Busolt, GG iii.2.962 n.1, believes that the generals were prosecuted but that they were acquitted. For a possible reference to this incident in Knights 438-9, see below, p. 363.
² Thuc. iii.19.1.
³ See below, pp. 382ff.
⁴ Thuc. iii.19.1.
⁵ Gilbert, Beiträge, 127ff.; Busolt, GG iii.2.998 n.1; Keyer, GdA iv.2.85. Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, Berlin, 1893, i.129 n. 11, placed his membership of the Boule in 427/6.
making sure that the tax was collected, there is no real evidence for the first assumption, and it is argued below that he did not become a Councillor until 426/5 when he took full advantage of his office.  

Very little is known then about Cleon's position in 428 when the Banqueters, Aristophanes' first play, must have been composed. The death of Pericles in the autumn of 429 had left an enormous void and there were a number of men who hoped to take his place. Constitutionally, the powers of any individual (even of Pericles) were extremely limited. It was only by gaining the confidence of the Ecclesia that a man might achieve pre-eminence and for a time at least become the real leader of the State. According to the Athenaion Politeia Cleon was the direct successor of Pericles, and a scholiast on Lucian says that he was the leading demagogue at Athens for seven years which has been interpreted as meaning from 428/7 to 422/1 and from 429 to 422. How much real knowledge either authority had is debatable. Aristophanes is a contemporary source and he places Cleon after Eucrates and Lysicles in his

1 App. B. Cleon's connection with the eisphorà is also discussed in this appendix.
2 Thuc. ii.65.6.
3 A.P. 28.1.
4 Schol. Timon 30.
5 Busolt, GG iii.2.998 n.1.
6 Croiset, 36 n. 2.
'Seller-Dynasty' which had controlled the State, but for different reasons it is dangerous to take his words literally. He may well be grouping the three men in chronological order because they were (or he could pretend that they were) of similar background, and collectively they marked the beginning of a new phenomenon in Athens: the rise to political prominence of men whose families had been or still were engaged in business.

The testimony of Aristophanes is useful, however, in that it warns against oversimplifying the situation and postulating any sort of smooth transference of power from Pericles to Cleon (implied in the Athenaion Politeia) or even a two-way fight for the leadership between Cleon and Nicias such as Plutarch seems to have had in mind. For

1 Knights 128-37 with schol.

2 Eucrates, the συναδειοπωλής (Knights 129), was certainly connected with commerce. For the ancient references, see Busolt, GG iii.2.807 n. 4, 987 n. 3, PA 5759. The name is a common one and Busolt doubts whether he can be identified with the general of 432/1 (IGii2 296), the father of Diodotus (Thuc. iii.41), or the brother of Nicias (Andoc. Myst. 47). Kagan, 126-7, following West (CP xix 1924, 130-2), thinks that he is the general named in IGii2 296 and that he was probably the father of Diodotus. For the references to Lysicles, see Busolt, GG iii.2.988 n. 1, PA 9417. He is almost certainly the general of 428/7 (Thuc. iii.19.1), and at this date the generals were still normally chosen from the 'best' families. Busolt has noted, however, that Thucydides does not give his father's name and suggests that this may indicate that he did not come from an aristocratic family. Aristophanes designates him a προβατοσώλης (Knights 132), and there are a number of references to his 'humble background': Plut. Per. 24, D. Chr. lv.22, schol. Plato, ?'enex. 235E, Knights 739. For arguments supporting his connection with Pericles, see West, supra cit. 132-4, who, however, concludes that 'he was of undoubtedly bourgeois origin.'

3 Plut. Nic. 2.2.
the last months of 429 and for the whole of 428 when Aristophanes was writing the Banqueters, the more ambitious of Pericles' successors must have been jostling for position, ἵσοι μᾶλλον αὐτῷ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὀντες καὶ ἀρετομένοι τοῦ πρῶτος ἕκαστος γίγνεσθαι. Among the aspirants were probably men whose names have disappeared or are barely known, Nicias, Eucrates, Lysicles, and Cleon. There is no apparent reason why Aristophanes should have picked out the last-named for special attention in his first comedy and it will be argued in the following chapter that there is nothing to indicate that he did so.

1 Thuc. ii.65.10.

2 If Eucrates and Lysicles were likely to attract the same potential supporters as Cleon, their early disappearance from politics must have aided his advancement. Lysicles was killed in the winter of 428 (Thuc. iii.19.2) and although Eucrates appears to have been mocked in the Babylonians of 426, Knights 128-32 show that he was no longer a force to be reckoned with in 425. Gilbert, Beiträge, 126, and Müller-Strübing, 583, think that Knights 254 indicates that he retired into private life following a prosecution, but this is very speculative.
CHAPTER II

THE BANQUETERS

It has been emphasized earlier that the disappearance of Aristophanes' first two comedies, the Banqueters and the Babylonians, is a particularly serious loss in the present context, since they might well have afforded valuable evidence for distinguishing between the poet's personal and political feelings. His attitude towards Cleon had not yet been embittered by the latter's attack, and because of his youth he could scarcely have had any grounds for private enmity towards the politician at this stage. While it is impossible to attempt a detailed reconstruction of any lost Aristophanic comedy, in the case of these two plays it is important to assemble what evidence there is. It can at least be shown that there is little justification for the view that Aristophanes, from the outset of his career, consistently and specifically attacked Cleon on the same fronts as in his later work.

1 See above, p. 12.

2 The date of Aristophanes' birth is discussed below, pp. 133-41.

3 Aristophanes himself boasts at Wasps 1029ff. that he attacked Cleon διε πρωτον γ' ἡροῦ διδάκειν, but he must be referring here to the Knights, the first play which he produced in his own name.
The Banqueters was produced by Callistratus in 427 B.C.\(^1\) and obtained the second prize.\(^2\) The play took its name from the chorus which was composed of members of a religious association who met to sacrifice to Heracles and to feast in his honor.\(^3\) Many of the surviving fragments are concerned with feasting and culinary matters in general,\(^4\) and while this may be partly coincidental since most of them are preserved by Athenaeus\(^5\) for whom they would have had a special interest, it is tempting to think that a banquet-scene provided a riotous finale to the comedy.\(^6\)

It is clear at any rate that the action centered around a conservative old father and his two sons whom

---

1 Anon., de Com. (Dübner, Proleg. III.49-50): ἕσσας τῇ δὲ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ἐρύγοις Διονύσῳ δὲ Καλλιστράτου.
2 Schol. Clouds 529.
4 Frs. 200, 202, 203, 204, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 224, 236, 239, 244.
5 Frs. 200, 202, 203, 209, 212, 214, 215, 224, 244.
6 Wilamowitz, Hermes xliv 1909, 454, argues that the banquet must have taken place after the parabasis because many of the fragments which refer to it are in iambic trimeters. He has also suggested that it was a private feast, speculating that the chorus came from a temple of Heracles to the orchestra. J. Denis, La Comédie Grecque, Paris, 1886, 298 n.1, believes that the aorist participle, ἀναστάτες, used by Orion (see above, n. 3) proves that the action of the play took place after the official banquet.
Aristophanes himself in the parabasis of the Clouds calls ὁ εὐφρων and ὁ κατανύγων. The former seems to have been raised in the time-honored manner while the other had apparently immersed himself in the ways of the fashionable society of the city and became a debauchee, totally ignorant of the traditional learning. Galen records how in the play the father called upon the κατανύγων to explain the meaning of difficult words from Homer, and how the latter retaliated by inviting his dutiful brother to expound legal terms used in Solon's tables. Part of another dialogue is also preserved by Galen and shows the κατανύγων inundating his father with strange words taken from his heroes, the contemporary politicians and sophists. Other fragments are not specifically assigned to any of the characters in the ancient sources, but seem to show the old man expressing his disappointment at the luxurious habits which his son has acquired, and inviting him (presumably in vain) to sing a σκίλιον of Alcaeus or Anacreon.

1 Clouds 528-9: ἐξ ὤν γὰρ ἔνθεσεν ὑπένθερσαν οἷς ἡδύ καὶ λέγειν ὁ εὐφρων τε ἐπὶ κατανύγων ἐφίστη ἦκουσάτην The schol. ad loc. confirms that the poet is recalling his first play

2 Fr. 222.

3 Fr. 198.

4 Fr. 216.

5 Fr. 223: Ἀσάν δὲ μοι ἔχοιν τε λαβὼν Ἀλκαῖον καταλείπων Cf. Clouds 1354ff. where Strepsiades recalls his lack of success when he bade his recalcitrant son ἔδειξεν Σιμωνίδου μέλος.
Probably, too, it is the young profligate who indignantly refuses his father's request that he should undertake physical labor when he is exhausted from playing the flute and lyre, and a number of fragments are concerned with litigation and an actual or proposed lawsuit which may have been between the two.

Several of these fragments which deal or seem to deal with the conflict between the father and the Kataçeyoun are written in tetrameters, and it may well be that this conflict formed the γύν of the play. There is, however, one obvious difficulty here. It does look very much as if Aristophanes in his first work employed a small farmer from the countryside as his protagonist, and constructed a plot based on the generation gap as he was to do frequently in the following years. Yet this would automatically seem to relegate the moderate son to a secondary role, and it was the contrast between the two youths which

---

1 Fr. 221: Ὠτὸς αὐλὸς καὶ λύρας. Kataçeyoun χρώμενος ἐτοί με σκάπτειν κελεύεις.
2 Frs. 201, 210, 217, 219, 225.
3 Frs. 216, 217 and 219 are iambic tetrameters, frs. 222 and 223 anapaestic, while fr. 221 is a trochaic tetramer.
4 This is assumed by Wilamowitz, Hermes xlv 1909, 454-5, and by M. Whittaker, CQ xxix 1935, 186.
5 Apart from the old man's obvious traditionalism and attachment to the old ways, the word σκάπτειν in fr. 221 (see above n. 1) would appear to indicate that he was a rustic.
6 For the small farmer protagonist, see the Acharnians, Clouds and Peace. For plots involving a clash of generations within the family, the Clouds and Wasps.
Aristophanes specifically, if pithily, emphasized when he recalled his first play. If fr. 222 does indeed belong to the ἀγων, it would indicate that the σύμφων participat
in it on his father’s side against his brother. No doubt the two of them emerged victorious and if the play ended with a celebratory banquet it seems not improbable that the κατανύτων alone was excluded from it. It may well be then that when he refers to the comedy in the Clouds, Aristophanes particularly has in mind the contrasting fates meted out to the two brothers at its joyous conclusion.

The role which the chorus played in the action and even its exact constitution are doubtful. Bergk has noted that the king-archon annually supervised the selection from each deme of twelve Athenian citizens of property and good repute to serve as the official παράκτων, who dined in a temple of Heracles as the guests of the god. Because

---


2. Croiset, 33, has pointed out that it is difficult to see how Aristophanes could have avoided making the ‘good son’ a mere duplicate of his father. He has urged that Aristophanes must have realized ‘what a bore reasonable and reasoning young men are on the comic stage’, but it is dangerous to accept his conclusion that the part which he took in the action must have been negligible.

3. Apud Meineke ii.2.1024. A long fragment of Diodorus, a playwright of Middle Comedy, which is quoted in Athen. vi.239d, attests the care with which the State had always selected these men. An ancient law recorded by Crates ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῷ διάλεκτῳ, and an obscure passage of one Themison (Athen. vi.235c, 235a) show that the king-archon was responsible for their selection. Cf. the testimony of Cleidemus and Philochorus about these parasites (Athen. vi.235a, 235d).
a passage in Isaeus may indicate that it was customary for a father to take his son with him on such occasions.\(^1\)

Bergk has suggested that the chorus of twenty-four in the <i>Banqueters</i> represented twelve of these παράσιτοι proper each of whom was accompanied by a son.\(^2\) There were of course many sanctuaries of Heracles in Attica and his cult was extremely common.\(^3\) A psēphisma of Alcibiades, recorded by Polemon, shows that the παράσιτοι who assisted the priest in the monthly offerings to Heracles at Cynosarges in Diomeia were selected ἐκ τῶν νόθων καὶ τῶν τούτων παιδῶν καὶ ἐν ταύτικα.\(^4\) Almost certainly, too, Wyse is correct in suggesting that there were 'many societies which combined the worship of the jovial demi-god with feasting and merriment, clubs like in kind to the famous Sixty',\(^5\) who

---

1 Isaeus ix.30: Εἰς τοῖς ἱεραὶ τὸ πατὴρ ἤ ἥμοι τῶν λειτυργῶν τωσα ἄγε μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ὤμερ καὶ ἐμε ποιήσην, καὶ ἐς τῶν Θεᾶς τῶν Ἡρακλεός ἔκειν ἐενήγαγεν, ἵνα μετέχοι τῆς κοινωνίας.

2 The ancient sources are unanimous in asserting that the choruses of Old Comedy consisted of twenty-four members; cf. (e.g.) Poll. iv.109; schol. Ach. 211, Birds 297. A scholiast to Knights 589 denies, however, that semi-choruses were always equal in number. He states that when they were composed of old men and young men respectively, τοὺς πρεσβύτας πλεονεκτεῖν δεῖν φαῦν, but this is rejected by most modern scholars. When Orion testifies that the feasters Χοροὶ ἐγένοντο in the play (see above, p. 44, n. 3), the plural may refer to their division into ἠμιχοροὶ.


4 Apud Athen. vi.234e.

5 The Speeches of Isaeus, Cambridge, 1904, 643.
also met at Cynosarges and whose jokes were sent to Philip of Macedon.\textsuperscript{1} It is by no means definite then that Aristophanes' chorus was made up of the demesmen\textsuperscript{2} or indeed that the relevant passage of Isaeus alludes specifically to their celebrations as Bergk suggested,\textsuperscript{3} but his theory is attractive. Norwood has pointed out that it is 'supported not only by the exigencies of arithmetic, but also by the fact that it would be artistically good to have one half of the chorus supporting the father, the other half his depraved son, though (no doubt), as elsewhere in Aristophanes, the two companies came to enthusiastic agreement at the end'.\textsuperscript{4} Moreover, Galen in quoting the play refers to the old man as \textit{ēk tōu δημον τῶν Δαιτακέων πρεσβύτης}.\textsuperscript{5} These words cannot mean that the \textit{Δαιτακής} formed an imaginary deme as a number of modern commentators have supposed.\textsuperscript{6} Such an interpretation is totally

\textsuperscript{1} See Athen. xiv.614d-e, vi.260b.

\textsuperscript{2} F. Im Fahraeus, \textit{De argumento atque consilio Daetalensium}, Upsala, 1866, 20, has noted that Athenaeus who provides a wealth of testimony about these \textit{παράσιτοι} does not mention Aristophanes' play.

\textsuperscript{3} Wyse, op. cit. 643, reads \textit{Θιάστας} for \textit{Θέας} in Isaeus ix.30, and argues that the words \textit{τίνα μετέχον τῆς κοινωνίας} point to a private association.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Greek Comedy}, London, 1931, 280-1.

\textsuperscript{5} See Kock, 438.

\textsuperscript{6} See (e.g.) G. Murray, \textit{Aristophanes}, Oxford, 1933, 20.n.1, who states that 'Aristophanes' \textit{Δαιτακής} are evidently the people of the imaginary deme of that name; cf. \textit{Πελαγής}, \textit{Μελατής} etc. The suggestion is 'Plentyville' rather than 'Eatanswill'.
irreconcilable with the testimony of the lexicographers and grammarians that the chorus were \( \theta i a k w t a \). ¹ Galen's statement is perfectly intelligible, however, if the chorus were the selected members of a deme who met in honor of Heracles and the old man belonged to the same deme. Then his relationship with them would be somewhat similar to Philocleon's with the chorus of jurors in the Wasps.

The only other point that can be made about the chorus is that they apparently did not come forward in the parabasis to proclaim the merits of their \( \delta a \ddot{s} k a l a s \). ² Exactly why Aristophanes chose to make these \( \theta i a k w t a \) of Heracles his chorus remains uncertain, but Heracles did have many connections with youth and was indeed a special patron of the young men of Athens. ³ This may well have been a determining factor since Aristophanes was putting on the stage and contrasting two youthful brothers whose attitude to the demi-god's worship would presumably have differed radically.

---

¹ See above, p. 44, n. 3. Wilamowitz, Hermes xliv 1909, 453-4, and Norwood, op. cit. 278 n. 5, are disposed to dismiss Galen's statement as a mistake, but this is unnecessary.

² Ach. 628-9:

³ See in general S. Woodford, op. cit. 214, who cites his marriage to Hebe and his gift of youth to Iolaus. She also notes that he was one of the gods of the gymnasion and had a special relationship with the ephebes (Hesych. s.v. \( \text{αιώνιος} \)).
The crucial question in the present context is how far the play was politically oriented and, more specifically, whether it attacked Cleon in any way. The well-known simile in the Clouds does involve a comparison of the two comedies, but it is not particularly helpful here; it cannot be taken as evidence for much more than their common 'intellectualism'. One fragment of the Banqueters concerns the necessity for spending the State's money on the defence of the city, but without knowing the context it is again impossible to draw any conclusions from this.

A. Rostagni has argued that the Banqueters was dominated by Heracles who was present either in person or spirit, not as the usual gluttonous figure of Comedy, but as the Ælektroo and the conqueror of monsters, who in this case were the rhetors, demagogues and sycophants. He points out that in the Peace Aristophanes boasts that he has eliminated the traditional characterization of the

---

1 Clouds 534-6:

2 Despite the arguments of R. Hackforth, CR liii 1938, 5-7, who pushes his analysis of the lines too far.

3 Dover, n. ad Clouds 528, remarks that the two plays had a certain community of theme—the contrast between old education and new, traditional poetry and modern rhetoric, and the relations between father and son.

4 Fr. 220:

5 RFTP liii 1925, 175-7.
demi-god from the Comic repertoire;¹ that in the Wasps and Peace he relates in almost identical language how he had joined battle with Cleon and his attendant sycophants Ἡρακλῆς ἄργην τίν' ἐξών, ² and again that in the Wasps he refers to himself as ἄλε γίκανος.³ From all of this Rostagni concludes that the image and spirit of Heracles extended itself as a symbol over Aristophanes' later work. He believes that at the beginning of his career he satirized the 'new education' which the καταστάγων had received, as the origin of all the evils against which he later struggled, and was thus consciously consistent in his attacks upon the contemporary politicians.

The hypothesis is ingenious but Rostagni clearly overstates his case. Aristophanes may or may not have brought the gluttonous Heracles on to the stage in the Banqueters as he later did in the Birds, Frogs and Aeolosicon.⁴ There is simply no way of determining whether he is being strictly accurate when he boasts at Peace 741-2 that he has driven away the Ἡρακλῆς τοὺς μάττοντας, but when he compares himself to the hero at Peace 752 and in the Wasps, he is surely turning the tables on his Comic rivals who had long belabored the joke that by presenting

---

¹ Peace 739ff. Cf. Wasps 54-60, where Xanthias informs the spectators that Ἡρακλῆς τὸ σφίνων ἐξαπατώμενος is not present in this play.

² Wasps 1029ff., Peace 752ff.

³ Wasps 1043.

⁴ For the Aeolosicon, see schol. Peace 741.
his plays through Callistratus and Philonides he was toiling like Heracles on behalf of others. ¹

While the extant fragments of the Banqueters show little trace of political satire,² it is true that the play was indirectly at least concerned with politics. By satirizing the education which the κατασκύλων had received in the city Aristophanes was attacking a relatively new phenomenon which had a certain connection with Athenian politics. Rhetorical training formed a large part of the 'new education' and its political importance in the second half of the fifth century is indisputable. Particularly because of the predominance of the Assembly and the nature of the conditions under which it operated,³ the ability to speak persuasively was indispensable to any politician who aspired to power.⁴ It was the sophists above all who had developed and elaborated the technique of rhetoric, and the κατασκύλων of the Banqueters has every appearance of having

¹ Aristonymus (fr. 4), Sannyrio (fr. 5), Am্বępsias (fr. 26), and Plato Com. (fr. 100) had all made this joke. The Vita (Dübner, Proleg. XI) states that Aristonymus and Am্বępsias had ridiculed Aristophanes in this way because he exhibited his first plays through Callistratus and Philonides.

² Alcibiades is mocked in fr. 198.

³ These have been well detailed by M.I. Finley, Past and Present xxi 1962, 9ff. He emphasizes the sheer size of the Ecclesia, its unique composition on any given day with its attendant unpredictability, the frequency of its meetings, the pressures that 'narrowness of time' generated and the 'spontaneity' of debate and decision making.

received a sophistic training.¹ Yet extreme caution is needed before assuming with Rostagni and Croiset that the play therefore constituted an attack on the 'professional politicians' of the day.²

In the first place, it is impossible to determine how explicitly Aristophanes made the link between the 'new education' and politics in this, his first comedy. On one occasion the old father accuses the καταδρύμων of adopting the vocabulary of the ῥητόρες,³ but it is only the neologisms of the politicians⁴ which are ridiculed and there is no reason to suppose that Aristophanes attacked them in the same way as in his later works. The young man also uses the vocabulary of the ἱστογόροι⁵ and is well versed

¹ This is not to imply that any particular sophist was presented as his teacher. The Thrasylos who is mentioned in fr. 198 is generally identified with the well-known rhetorician of Chalcedon, and Dover, CQ xliv 1950, 46 n.1, has seen a possible echo of Antiphon in the same fragment, but it was probably the intellectual movement as a whole which was parodied.

² See Croiset, 34: 'It was against the professional politicians that the poet inveighed, and by this term we mean those who at that time were beginning to transform politics into a lucrative trade in Athens.'

³ Fr. 198.

⁴ Finley, op. cit. 12-13, has well remarked that because of the extraordinary importance of eloquence in Athenian politics, 'it was perfectly precise language to call political leaders 'orators' as a synonym. It is sometimes argued that the word was not applied in classical times to the leading statesmen, but to the lesser figures who helped them. This, however, is slightly misleading. Usually the prominent politicians would be designated by name, but Cleon, like Pericles (Eupolis fr. 98), was certainly a 'rhetor'.

⁵ Fr. 198.
in legal terminology;\(^1\) there is some talk in one of the fragments of \( \delta \imath \pi \alpha \),\(^2\) in another of demands for money, of threats and sycophancy,\(^3\) while a third announces someone's intention of bringing a γραφή \( \gamma \epsilon \upsilon \iota \alpha \varsigma \).\(^4\) Even if all of this means that the καταγωγήν had a definite propensity for politically inspired litigation, however, there is no indication how important an element it was in the play. The main burden of the comedy may easily have been satire of his attitude to religion, his morality, his knowledge of literature and music, his appearance\(^5\) and even his eating and drinking habits.\(^6\) Aristophanes could have extracted a great deal of humor from showing how all of these had been influenced and shaped by his upbringing in the city.

Secondly, the old view that the fifth-century sophists were largely responsible for the emergence of a new species of politician, the so-called

---

1 Fr. 222.

2 Fr. 217.

3 Fr. 219.

4 Fr. 225.

5 Cf. fr. 218: καὶ λέεις ὡς ἑρέπει ἐγκέλους, Χρυσῶς ἐχων κικίνους.

6 Cf. the first three lines of fr. 216: ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἐμεθέ πρότ' ἐμοῦ πέρσαντος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῶν, ἔπειτ' ἄδειν κακός, Εὐρικοῦν πράσεων, Συβαρίτιδας τ' ἑωμυίας καὶ χίον ἐκ λακωνίαν
'demagogues', is now rightly regarded with scepticism by most scholars. It is probable enough that some members of the rich industrial classes, without any previous tradition of participating in politics but able to pay substantial fees, were among those who took advantage of what the sophists offered. Yet it is clearly impossible to estimate how many did so or how important a factor this may have been in their success. Moreover, in the case of Cleon, the most prominent of these 'demagogues', there is obvious reason for caution here. What is known about the

1 See Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen I, Berlin, 1893, 129 n.11; R.J. Bonner, Aspects of Athenian Democracy, New York, 1933, 48-9; C. Hignett, 259. Finley, supra cit. 4-5, has emphasized that the word Σημαγύγα is extremely rare in the fifth century; Aristophanes never applies the noun to any individual, and uses Σημαγύγα (Knights 191), Σημαγύγικα (Knights 217) and Σημαγύγειν (Frogs 419) only once each.

2 Hyperbolus is the obvious example; see below, p. 61, n. 1. In general, see H.I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity, tr. by G. Lamb, New York, 1956, 47ff. He observes that it is impossible to discern in the fifth-century sophists any definite political bias: they had a wealthy clientele, which generally included some of the newly-rich seeking 'polish', but 'the old aristocracy far from resenting them, were eager to sit at their feet, as we can see from Plato's Dialogues.' Cf. Hignett, 272, who notes that a number of the aristocrats who supported the anti-democratic movement in 411 are also known to have acquired their training from the sophists.

3 On the difficult question of the number of pupils taught by individual sophists, see R. Johnson, AJP lxxviii 1957, 297-30. He cautions that the 'crowds' of young men thronging about the masters in the dialogues of Plato are not members of fixed schools or courses, but 'random popular gatherings'. Johnson concludes that the average fifth or fourth-century sophist 'was doing well to have half a dozen regular fee-paying pupils'.
politician suggests that he fits into the category
described above on both counts, but in his case at least
the 'sophist-demagogue' connection simply will not stand.
The unanimous testimony of the ancient sources about his
style of oratory and his attitude towards rhetoric is
against it.

The Athenaión Politeia describes his style of
public speaking in these words: καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος
ἀνέκρυε καὶ ἐλοίδορήσατο καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε,
tῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόμῳ λεγόντων. ¹ Plutarch repeats this
description and adds a few colorful details when he refers
to him as τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος κόμοιν ὄνομαν καὶ πρῶτος
ἐν τῷ δημηγορεῖν οἰκηραγαῖν καὶ περισπάσας τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν μηρὰν
ποτᾶς καὶ δρόμῳ μετὰ τοῦ λέγειν ὁμον θρησκεύοντος. ²
Some of this certainly reflects class prejudice,³ but even
so it is scarcely the picture of a man who had carefully
mastered and who utilized the formal techniques of rhetoric.

Thucydides too vividly shows Cleon's anti-intel-
lectualism and distrust of sophistry. The one speech which
he puts into his mouth (during the Mytilenean debate)⁴ is

---

¹ A. P. 28. 3. Cf. Schol. Lucian, Timo 30 (Theopomp. FGH
115 F92): πρῶτος δημηγορῶν οἰκηραγαῖν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ
ἐλοίδορήσατο; schol. Aesch. 1. 25: λέγεται ὡς κλέων ὁ
dημηγορεῖς παραβάς τὸ ἔθους αὐτοῦ περιζωσάμενος δημηγορήσει.


³ Neil, App. II, 204, has shown that κόμος is a favorite
aristocratic catchword.

⁴ iii. 37-40.
itself a notable example of elaborate rhetoric, but this is hardly surprising since from a stylistic point of view there is very little individual characterization of any of his speakers. Moreover, in this speech Cleon warns his fellow citizens of the dangers of κατα λόγων ήσώμενοι καὶ σοφιστῶν θεωτικών καθήμενοι μᾶλλον ἡ περὶ πολέως βουλευόμενοι. Finally, in a remarkable passage in which the sophists are specifically mentioned for the only time in the History he berates them at length as ὡς ἄκοψ ἡ ἄκοψ ἡσεύμενοι καὶ σοφιστῶν θεωτικών καθήμενοι μᾶλλον ἡ περὶ πολέως βουλευόμενοι.

To warn one's audience against the deinotēs of others can itself be deinotēs, and much of this of course

1 See Gomme, HCT ii.304ff. He has observed that it is full of the rhetorical figures which Gorgias favored.

F.M. Wassermann, TAPA lxxxvii 1956, 32, sees this as 'one of the many touches of subtle irony in Thucydides'.

2 Cf. K.J. Dover, Thucydides, Oxford, 1973, 23ff. He cites the speech of Sthenelaidas (i.86) as an obvious exception.

3 37.3.
4 37.5.
5 40.2.
6 38.2.
7 40.3.
8 38.4-7.
is tactically useful,¹ but it goes far beyond the actual issue which was being debated.² The controversy over the relation that the speeches in Thucydides bear to anything actually said by real persons continues unabated,³ but it can scarcely be doubted that these words of Cleon, expressing his total antipathy to the whole sophistic movement, reflect the politician's actual sentiments. Ehrenberg believes that Thucydides would not have put this criticism of the Assembly into the mouth of the 'despised Cleon' unless the latter had actually made it,⁴ but this is a weak argument. The real proof is surely that many of the historian's readers would have known Cleon (and his oratory) at first hand, so that misrepresentation on this scale for whatever motive would have been totally impossible.⁵

---

¹ G.B. Grundy, Thucydides and the History of His Age,² Oxford, 1948, ii.75, notes that he is playing on the common man's suspicion of deinotes. Winnington-Ingram, BICS xii 1965, 71ff. has emphasized that it was crucial for Cleon to establish his anti-intellectual line in order to stop his listeners from thinking coolly and listening to dispassionate argument.

² Cf. Wasserman, op. cit. 31. Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 73-4, has suggested that his opponent Diodotus may have been a pupil of the sophists and have gratified the Athenians with a rhetorical display on the first day of debate.

³ The different views of modern scholars on this subject are referred to by Andrewes, op. cit. 64-71.

⁴ The People of Aristophanes, 351.

⁵ See Connor, NP 95 n. 12. Gomme, HCT ii.279 argues (against Mme. de Romilly) that the words ἀν τὰ τῶν ἐκ τῶν παρακάτων ἀντίκειται which are used in the description of Cleon at Thuc. iii.36.6 show that the speech which follows was 'not written until some time afterward'. This is probably true, but it does not affect the argument even if it was written after Cleon's death. Gomme sees no reason to place it after 418 or 417.
The picture of Cleon that Aristophanes, his other contemporary, provides complements the rest. Violent, blustering and loud, he has no time for the sophist-trained rhetors with their 'pretensions'\(^1\) and it is implied in the *Knights* that he is completely\(^2\) *ἀμαθής*. There is obvious comic exaggeration in this last point, but it lends weight to the view that Cleon owed none of his effectiveness as a speaker to the sophists, and this is important here for two reasons. First, it indicates that Aristophanes could scarcely have attacked him in the *Banqueters* even if that play was more 'political' than there is reason to believe. Secondly, it perhaps tends to support the theory developed earlier that Cleon entered politics relatively late in life after being actively engaged in business.\(^3\) In the main, it appears to have been the young who employed the techniques of the sophists to develop their speaking ability. Cleon, a mature and, no doubt, pragmatic man when he took up the affairs of State would have been a somewhat

---


3 See above, pp. 18ff. Andrewes, op. cit. 83 n. 46, states that his father's wealth meant that he was 'brought up to inherited leisure', but it may be doubted whether a man of Cleon's temperament would ever have been inactive.
incongruous pupil. Naturally, any observant speaker would be virtually bound to pick up some of the new rhetorical techniques which were currently being employed, but it does appear that Cleon relied much more on his native intelligence, his voice, and his natural force to exercise his control over his audiences.

The fact that Cleon was a man in his early middle age when the Banqueters was performed in 427 is of some importance for another reason. It has been suggested that the characters of the Kataklysmos and his conservative father, and the conflict between the two, may have been

---

1 The contrast with Hyperbolus may be instructive here. He is mocked for having entered politics at an excessively early age by Cratinus (fr. 262) and by Eupolis (fr. 238), and at Clouds 876 it is said that he paid a talent for his sophistic education. He is represented as knowing (μεσοκέφαλος) οὐκέταν εἰ μὴ γράμματα by Eupolis (fr. 193), but this is not necessarily incompatible with the testimony of the Clouds, since the joke may be that he had totally neglected the more traditional studies in order to master rhetoric. A talent is an enormous fee, and Dover, n. ad Clouds 876, suggests that the implication is that Hyperbolus' prowess as a speaker owed everything to an abnormal effort on the part of a teacher. Plato Com, fr. 168, ridicules his pronunciation.

2 G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, Princeton U.P., 1963, 52ff. has emphasized that rhetorical instruction in the fifth century could be provided in two different ways: through direct contact with a teacher and through rhetorical handbooks. Cleon could possibly have made private use of handbooks (although there is nothing to indicate that he did so), but in any case it is his professed hostility towards the sophistic movement which is important here.

3 H. Ll. Hudson-Williams, CQ 2 i 1951, 70 n. 15, has argued that Cleon 'relied upon voice and gesture to compensate for his lack of rhetorical training', but it seems doubtful whether he was conscious of any deficiency.
particularly striking to an Athenian audience because of the increasing importance of Alcibiades in opposition to the older and more cautious Nicias.\(^1\) It is perhaps possible that the character of the Κατανυμών was partly modelled on the brilliant young Alcibiades,\(^2\) but an identification of any sort between Nicias and the old rustic seems extremely far-fetched. At all events, it is absolutely clear that the audience could not have seen Cleon in either character.\(^3\) Indeed what is known about the play indicates that far from being an attack upon the politician it was almost exactly the opposite. Cleon would doubtless have been totally in sympathy with Aristophanes' satire of the precocious sophist-trained youth of the day.

There remains one final possible source of information about the Banqueters which requires examination. In the parabasis of the Acharnians the chorus begin to answer the charges which Cleon had brought. (after the production of the Babylonians in the previous year) with the words:

\[ \text{φησίν ὅ ἐστιν πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄπιστος ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ πάυεις ὅμως ἄριστος λόγος μὴ λίαν ἐξαπατώμεθα μὴ θ' ἡθεθαὶ θαυμάζομεν, μὴ ἐστὶν Χαυνοπολής}.\(^4\)

---


2 Cf. schol. Ach. 716: Ἀλκιβίαδον τον Κλεινίου ῥας Κατανυμών κωμικῶσιν.

3 Cleon is referred to as a λακατανυμήν at Ach. 664, but there is no particular significance to this; see below, pp. 197-8.

4 Ach. 633-5.
The crucial line is \( \pi\alpha\nu\varepsilon\alpha\varsigma \ \eta\mu\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\nu\kappa\iota\iota\varsigma \ \lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \ \mu\iota \ \lambda\iota\nu \ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\omicron\varsigma \), and, like a number of commentators before him, B.H.G. Williams has seen here a reference to Gorgias who in 427 led a mission from Sicily appealing to Athens for help in the war which had broken out on the island.\(^1\) On this occasion, Gorgias apparently made an enormous impression when he addressed the Assembly,\(^2\) and the Athenians responded by sending an expedition to Sicily under the command of Laches and Charoeades.\(^3\) It is generally assumed that in the lines of the *Acharnians* quoted above Aristophanes is referring to the *Babylonians*, and that he is trying to show that the play had not (as Cleon claimed) harmed the Athenians but actually benefited them. Williams, however, points out that the *Babylonians* was not performed until 426, i.e. after the expedition of Laches sailed, so that Aristophanes could not possibly be claiming that the play had influenced public policy and prevented the Athenians from being 'too much deceived' by Gorgias. Indeed, Williams believes, he is referring to the *Banqueters*.

---

1 CQ xxv 1931, 52-6; cf. Gilbert, Beiträge, 150 n. 15; W.R. Roberts, CR xviii 1904, 20. Diodorus, xii.53, describes how Gorgias \( \tau\acute{\epsilon} \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\nu\kappa\iota\iota\varsigma \ \tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \ \lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \ \epsilon\acute{\tau}\omicron\nu\iota\nu\kappa\iota\iota\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma \ \lambda\theta\eta\pi\nu\alpha\varsigma \varsigma \), and these scholars link his words with the phrase \( \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\nu\kappa\iota\iota\varsigma \ \lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \) in *Ach.* 634, but see below, n. 71, n. 1.

2 Plato, Hipp. mai. 282B; Diod. xii.53-4. Thucydides, however, does not mention him in his brief reference to the embassy at iii.86.3, and J.H. Finley, HSCP xlix 1938, 23-68, ibid. 1 1939, 35-84, has shown that the so-called 'Gorgian rhetorical figures' were not unknown in Athens before 427.

3 Thuc. iii.86.1.
The expedition of 427 only consisted of twenty ships. Williams argues that it accomplished little and describes it as an inadequate force under half-hearted leadership. He suggests that it was sent only as the result of a political compromise between the conservative and radical factions, and that in Ach. 633-635 Aristophanes is boasting that he had espoused the conservative cause. By mocking the eloquence of Gorgias in his Banqueters he had not allowed the Athenians to enjoy the celebrated rhetorician.

Williams maintains that an attack upon Gorgias would fit in well with the general theme of the play: given the romantic appeal of Sicily, especially to the Athenian youth, the Katairigmov would have been a natural victim for the great man's rhetoric in contrast with his more prudent brother and conservative father who ultimately were presumably made to triumph over him. From this he deduces that 'the play was a vigorous attack on Gorgias and all he stood for: sophistry, preciosity and the lure of Sicily.'

1 Thucydides gives a brief and scattered account of the expedition at iii 86, 88, 90, 99, 103. Justin, iv.3.4-7, adds little of value, but a papyrus fragment, perhaps by Philistus (FOH 577 F2), supplies a few more details.

2 Williams argues from the words of Nicias and Alcibiades (Thuc. vi.13.1, 18.6) that it was the young men who were enticed by the prospect of Sicily in 415, and he believes that it was probably the same with their predecessors in 427. Plato, Hipp. mai. 282B, describes Gorgias as σωφρόνεστος. 
In concluding that there was considerable dissen-
sion in Athens over these twenty ships, Williams is
following the same general line as those scholars who see
the influence of the 'radical democrats' or the 'war party'
headed by Cleon behind this decision to intervene in
Sicily. If this were strictly correct and if Aristophanes
really did oppose Gorgias' mission in his Banqueters it
would clearly be of primary importance here, but the first
theory seems (at best) a half-truth while the second is
plainly untenable.

There is no reason to believe that the Sicilian
request for help aroused any considerable opposition in
the Assembly. Westlake has argued that the modest size
of the expedition was inevitable given the relative weak-
ness of Athens in 427, and this cannot be construed as
evidence that it was controversial. Thucydides explains
that the real reasons why the Athenians agreed to send
help to the Leontines and their allies was that they wanted
to stop Sicilian grain from reaching the Peloponnese and
to make a preliminary test whether Sicilian affairs could

1 See (e.g.) J. Beloch, Die Attische Politik, 33, 'die
Absendung einer Flotte von 20 Trieren unter Laches nach
Sicilien in Herbst 427 ist ohne Zweifel von Kleon's Partei
veranlasst worden.'

2 See in general Kagan, 182ff., who, however, perhaps
everestimates the significance of the choice of Laches, a
friend of Nicias, as one of the commanders of the expedi-
tion.

3 Hist. ix 1960, 392.
be brought under their control.¹ Westlake observes that the first of these aims was negative and defensive, the second positive and offensive, and he concludes that those who voted for the expedition fell into two groups who were influenced by different considerations.² It seems clear at any rate that the expedition enjoyed broadly-based support; no doubt there were also some Athenians who responded to the Sicilian claims upon kinship and wanted to honor the terms of their alliance with the islanders,³ while even the most cautious may have believed that they were risking relatively little and that the dangers were not great.⁴ Cleon almost certainly voted in favor of helping the Ionians in Sicily. One can easily imagine that he belonged to the group who wanted 'to test the possibility of bringing Sicilian affairs under Athenian control', although it is more doubtful whether this means that in l.27 (or in 426/5) he had plans for the military occupation of the whole island or for the incorporation

¹ iii.86.4.
² op. cit. 392.
³ Thucydides, iii.86.3, says that the Sicilian ambassadors appealed for help κατά τε παλαίων θυμωνίων και ἃ τῆς Ἰονίως
heid. At 86.4 he states that the Athenians acted ὁικειοτήτος
προφαίει.
⁴ Even after the death of Charoeades the Athenians voted to send forty ships as reinforcements to Sicily in 426/5 partly because they wanted to give their fleet practice (Thuc. iii.115.4). It has been suggested that Thucydides is being intentionally ironical here, but see Gomme, HCT
ii.431.
of Sicilian cities into the Athenian Empire. In any case, the important point here is that there is nothing to indicate that he had to exert his influence in the debate which must have taken place. There is simply no evidence that the Athenians were sharply divided on the question whether they should send help to Sicily when the Ionians requested aid.

With regard to Williams' argument that the Banqueters represented an attack upon Gorgias and the embassy which he headed, it must be emphasized that his chronology is extremely difficult to accept. Thucydides states that Laches and Charoeades sailed for Sicily τῶν Ἐρώτων, i.e. towards the end of August or possibly even of October. The Banqueters was performed in

1 Thucydides' statement at iii.86.4 that the Athenians wanted to find out εἰς σφίες διαγωνίας εἰς τῇ ἐν τῷ Σικελία τῇ ἔνωσι εὐγένειως is ambiguous. Meiggs, 320, takes it to mean that they were assessing 'the chances of conquest in Sicily', but this may be an exaggeration. It seems quite possible that the Athenians were only aiming at predominance to prevent further trouble and to forestall the possibility that the Syracusans might send money and ships to the Peloponnesians in the event that they became totally dominant on the island. Cleon was concerned with Athens' financial problems and Sicily would be a rich prize, but there is little evidence to support the view that he hoped to absorb the Sicilian cities into the empire. Plutarch does not mention him among those who were seized with a passion for Sicily when Pericles was dominant (Per. 20.3-4), and nothing can be deduced about his own policy from his attacks upon Laches (for these, see below, pp. 346ff.). Moreover, although the Knights was aimed directly at Cleon, it is Hyperbolus who is represented as having ambitious plans in the west (Knights 1302-3). For Cleon's attitude to the empire and the extension of Athenian power, see below, pp. 382ff.

2 iii.86.1. On the date, see Gomme, HCT ii.386-7.
February or (less probably) in March of the same year.¹ This means that Gorgias would have had to have arrived in Athens in mid-winter and addressed the Assembly at least six (perhaps ten) months before the expedition finally sailed if Aristophanes was to have time to insert a parody of his speech into the play.² Even if the negotiations and preparations were time-consuming, such a delay still seems impossible.

Moreover, the extant fragments of the Banqueters show no trace of any reference to the Sicilian expedition³ or to a foreign embassy. It would be strange too for Aristophanes to choose the beginning of 425 as an appropriate time to make the boast that he had prevented his countrymen from being 'too much deceived' by the Sicilians approximately a year and a half earlier when they had just decided to reinforce this expedition with forty ships.⁴ It is safe to conclude that Williams has taken the words of the poet at Ach. 633-5 much too literally.

¹ None of the ancient sources say at which festival the play was produced, but since Aristophanes was very young and this was his first play, it seems likely that he competed on this occasion at the smaller, domestic Lenaea. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether Ach. 1150ff. refer to this performance; see Rennie, n. ad loc: Dover, Maia N.S. xv 1963, 23.

² Even in this case the play could not have been centered around Gorgias, as Williams at times seems to say.

³ In fr. 216 there are allusions to western luxuries, Συμποσίων Τράπεζας, Συμμετέχων τ' είσιν, but obviously nothing can be inferred from this.

⁴ Thuc. iii.115.3-5. There is a mocking reference to these reinforcements at Ach. 606.
The theory that these lines do refer to the Banqueters and not to the Babylonians appears to have been first developed by H. Weber who saw no allusion to Gorgias here, but based his argument on the fact that in this parabasis of the Acharnians the chorus make two points to support the claim that ὁ ποιητὴς deserves praise from the Athenians.1 The relevant lines are 633-645:

The two basic points are made in 634 and 642; the phrase πολλῶν ὄγαθῶν αἱτίας ὑμῖν in 641 picks up πολλῶν ὄγαθων ἄγιος ὑμῖν in 633 and shows that everything standing in between is a whole, and that it amplifies the first point. Because the demarcation is so clear and because the two points are quite distinct, Weber believed that Aristophanes must be referring to the Banqueters in 634-641 and to the Babylonians in 642-5. The Babylonians, he argues, could have had no unity of theme if Aristophanes was able to claim that it had benefited the Athenians in two such different ways.

1 Aristophanische Studien, Leipzig, 1908, 73-4.
This whole argument is again extremely suspect. It is obviously rash to assume that any play of Old Comedy could not contain two quite different elements, and it is very doubtful whether the audience would have been able to pick up a reference to the Banqueters in 634-41 when Aristophanes had specifically informed them immediately prior to this at the beginning of the anapaests that he was going to answer the charges which Cleon had made because of the Babylonians:

Moreover, in the course of elaborating his first point at 634-41, after making the initial claim that he had put an end to the deception of the Athenians ἀντικείμενοι λόγος, Aristophanes adds that it was the ambassadors ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων who had practised it in order to win their favor, and ἀπὸ πόλεως here must mean the members of the Athenian Empire. There may be a reference to Gorgias in ἀντικείμενοι.

---

1 Ach. 630-3.

2 This is a very common usage in Aristophanes; cf. Knights 802, Wasps 657, 670. It is wrong, however, to assume with J.H. Gunning, De Babyloniis Aristophanis Fabula, Traj. 1882, 32, that ἀπὸ πόλεως in Aristophanes' comedies are always the members of the Empire. At Peace 231, 266 they are all the cities of Greece, and at Wasps 925 the reference must be to the cities of Sicily; cf. Westlake, op. cit. 394 n. 37. Here, however, there can be no doubt about the matter, particularly because the phrases ἐν τῷ ἄθροι ἀπὸ πόλεως and ἐκ τῶν πόλεων occurring immediately afterwards (Ach. 642, 643) must refer to the allies; see W.G. Forrest, Phoenix xvii 1963, 1 n. 3.
λόγος \(^1\) just as there is a reference to Pindar in ἰστεφάνουs and ἄναρις, \(^2\) but in both cases it could only be as notable examples of those who had deceived the Athenians in the past. The main point is that Aristophanes is claiming that by satirizing somebody's speeches and 'flowery' eloquence he had benefited Athens \textit{vis à vis} her subject allies. In 632-641 then, he is concentrating (exactly as he does in 642-645) on showing how his work had affected Athens' relationship with her Empire. It is known that the Babylonians, unlike the Banqueters, was concerned with this relationship and that one of the accusations which Cleon had made was that the play had damaged it. It follows logically that in presenting his (somewhat lighthearted) case that he is actually \textit{πολλοί} ὄγυπτον ἄρσις, Aristophanes is concerned only with the Babylonians, \(^3\) the play which marked the beginning of the feud between the two men.

\(^1\) It seems dangerous to infer that Aristophanes had Gorgias specifically in mind. Τὰ Σέλευκον can be used rhetorically to mean an affectation of style (cf. Arist. Rhet. 1405a 8), or there may be a reference to the foreign origin of most of the sophists. Alternatively, the best explanation may be the simple one provided by the schol. ad loc., that the phrase only means 'by words spoken ὑπὸ τῶν Σέλευκον πρέβεσεν'.

\(^2\) Ach. 637, 639; Pindar fr. 92 (Turyn).

\(^3\) Cf. Wilamowitz, Hermes xlii 1909, 452, 'Vor allem kann aus der Acharnerparabase für das älteste Drama des Aristophanes gar nichts gewonnen worden.' If there is a reference to Gorgias at Ach. 634, this is clearly no reason for concluding that he was a character in the Babylonians. It would be very similar to the references to Pindar a few lines later and no one supposes that he figured in the comedy of L26.
The main points which have been made in this chapter can be briefly summarized and some conclusions can be drawn. There is nothing to indicate that Aristophanes harked back to the *Banqueters* when he answered Cleon's charges in the *Acharnians*, or that his first comedy was concerned in any way with Athenian foreign policy. It appears to have been set in the everyday life of the city and perhaps amidst the rural celebrations of Attica.\(^1\) The action revolved around a family triangle, an old father and his two sons, and virtually the only 'evidence' that politics figured in the play is that the 'disreputable son' imitated the language and behavior of the fashionable speakers of the day. He was probably a disciple of the sophists who offered their talents to anyone wishing to acquire the rhetorical talents which would be useful in the political arena.

As far as Cleon is concerned, everything that is known about the politician suggests that he would have endorsed the satire of the *Kratìoi* and his circle.\(^2\) It may be an exaggeration to say that he shared any real community of attitude with Aristophanes at this stage in their relationship. They belonged to different generations.

---

1 It has been argued above that the old man was from the country and that he was probably a member of the same deme as the chorus.

2 Apart from the young man's 'name', there is little to indicate that he was a sexual 'degenerate', but for some (slight) evidence that Cleon was rigorously orthodox in sexual matters, see below, pp. 286-7.
and although the poet consistently satirizes the sophistic movement (and particularly its young devotees) in his later works, he does show a degree of interest in it. Moreover, in his own craft at least, he prides himself on being ἰοξεύω and ἔργο and he frequently makes special appeal to οἱ ἐπισκόποι, οἱ ἰοξευτές among his audience. His attitude seems to have been rather different from that of Cleon; there is some reason to think that the latter's apparent disdain for the new rhetorical techniques and his blunt hostility towards those who practised them and to the sophists was rooted in a broader anti-intellectualism.

1 The passages containing attacks upon the sophists and their followers have been collected by C.T. Murphy, HSCP xlix 1938, 71-8, who make (with some exaggeration) the point that the way Aristophanes parodies many of the devices of rhetoric and uses its technical terms shows a certain familiarity with rhetorical theory. Murphy's further arguments, 79-113, that the poet consciously employs these devices himself, especially when he presents 'the unpopular side of a public question', and his speculations that Aristophanes had received rhetorical training are less convincing.

2 See Gomme, MEGHL 90-1, who cites the best examples, including Clouds 547: ἀφί θεατῆς ἵκες ἐσφερῷον σοφίσταμι. It should be noted too that Cratinus (fr. 307) describes a κεραυνή θεατῆς as ὑπολεπολόγης, γνώμοναίματας, ἐφηθαστατόμον. Gomme rightly concluded that these passages in Aristophanes render untenable the view that the poet consistently spoke specifically to the rural population who dominated the theatre (on this, see below, pp. 180ff.). However, Gomme's further (apparent) implication that apart from a genuine dislike of Socrates and 'dissolute young exquisites', Aristophanes was not serious in his attacks upon the 'New Learning', is more controversial. See Dover, Clouds, lli-lvi, AC 113-4, who points out that a gulf can (and often does) exist between professions which one might have supposed to be akin, and that this was probably the case in fifth-century Athens even more than in modern times.

3 For the ancient testimony that Cleon prosecuted Anaxagororas and Euripides, see above, p. 32ff.
The important thing, however, is that it is certain that Cleon could not have been one of Aristophanes' main targets in the *Banqueters*, and indeed there is nothing to suggest that he was attacked in the play at all. There is no evidence that either man suspected at the beginning of line 27 that they were destined to become bitter enemies.
CHAPTER III

THE BABYLONIANS

The Babylonians, Aristophanes' second play, was produced at the Dionysia of 426, again under the name of Callistratus.¹ In this play the poet did attack Cleon, but the extent of the attack and its direction is uncertain. The view, once widely held, that the chorus of the comedy represented the members of the Empire working as the slaves of the Athenian People has in recent times fallen into disrepute. For this an influential article by Norwood² is largely responsible, but although his arguments have found a receptive audience they are far from conclusive. It will be argued in this chapter that whether or not Aristophanes made the allies the chorus of the Babylonians, he did satirize their status as the subjects of Athens, and thus criticized Athenian imperial methods (and perhaps the 'principle of empire') in a manner which he did not repeat in his extant plays.

In the Acharnians which was produced at the Lenaea of 425, Aristophanes makes three explicit allusions to the Babylonians and to the troubles which had followed it, but these provide tantalizingly little information about the play itself. In the first of them Dicaeopolis (speaking out of character) simply recalls the slander and lies to

¹ Suid. s.v. Σαμιήν の δημοσ.
² CP xxv 1930, 1-10.
which he had been subjected by Cleon who had dragged him before the Council because of the Babylonians.\(^1\) The second allusion also occurs in lines spoken undramatically by Dicaeopolis when he claims that he is now immune from Cleon's attacks:

\[\text{Ou gar me yin ye Siaxydh e, Klewn oti.}\]

From this two things emerge: Cleon had accused Aristophanes of 'speaking ill of the State' in the Babylonians, and he had considered the offence more serious because the play was produced at the Dionysia when foreigners, particularly members of the allied cities, were present. The first point is confirmed later in the play by the chorus when they introduce their long defence of the author in the parabasis by noting that his enemies had asserted

\[\text{Oo kymh d' ein polv eimw kai evon eimw kathypres.}\]

They then proceed to make the two claims on his behalf which have been discussed above: he deserves credit for having stopped the Athenians from being deceived and he has benefited the city, that is, and is referred to in the parabasis of the Acharnians.

---

1 Ach. 377-82. In the following chapter it is argued that it was Aristophanes not Callistratus who was attacked by Cleon after the Babylonians, that Dicaeopolis is serving as his mouthpiece when he speaks undramatically, and that he is the referred to in the parabasis of the Acharnians.

2 Ach. 502-6.

3 Ach. 631.
They intimate that the first means that the ambassadors from the Empire will no longer succeed in duping the Athenians, the second that the ambassadors will come to Athens with the tribute, eager to see the poet 'who has dared to say what is just before the Athenians'.

Aristophanes' own words show that the presence of the subject allies when the Babylonians was performed was a definite factor in arousing Cleon's anger. It is natural to infer from this that the harm that he was accused of doing the city lay in his treatment of Athens' relationship with these allies and this is proved by the fact that he devotes most of the anapaests to claiming that he had actually improved it. The crucial words in these anapaests are τοὺς ἃμοις ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν δείχνῃς ὁμοκρατοῦται, but there is little agreement among modern scholars as to how they should be translated. Clearly they must mean 'having shown how the peoples in the cities are governed' but whether by their own democracies or by the Athenian is uncertain. Apart from this, the only point that emerges from the Acharnians is that Ἰονίαν λόγοι were a definite element in the Babylonians.

1 Ach. 633-45.
2 Ach. 642.
3 The different views of Richards, Rennie, Starkie and Gomme are discussed (in a different context) below, pp. 166-7. It is argued there that Aristophanes may be punning on the two meanings of ἀμοῖος.
The scholia to these three passages are disappointing. A scholiast to Ach. 642 writes καὶ τῶν δήμων ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν: Ἀντὶ τῶν τῆς ἡμῶν αὐτῶν πολιτῶν έπιστέψας ταῖς εὐμάθεις πόλεις, τούτεστι, διδάσας τῶν εὐμάθεως ἐς ἱρὴ δημοκρατεῖσθαι, εὖν οὖν αὖτος ἐποιήσαν. As Norwood has observed, this sounds as if neither he nor his authorities had even read the Babylonians. The scholium to Ach. 503 states only that in the play Aristophanes spoke out κατὰ πολλῶν but a scholiast to Ach. 378 offers a little more precision. After remarking that in the play Aristophanes πολλῶν κακῶς εἶπεν he elaborates with these words: ἐκαμάδην γὰρ τὰς κληρώτικας καὶ Χερσονήσια ἄρχω, καὶ Κλεόνια, παρόντων τῶν βένων. Since all Athenian magistrates were either appointed by lot or elected, this information seems useless, but Norwood may be correct in theorizing that the separate enumeration of the magistrates suggests two separate scenes of derision of the type commonly found in the extant plays after the parabasis. Moreover, in his account of the legal proceedings which he claims that Cleon instituted after the play the same scholiast states that οἱ Κλεόνικας ἐγράφατο αὐτῶν ὑδεῖς καὶ τῶν πολιτῶς, ως ἐς ύβριν τῶν δήμων καὶ ταῖς βουλαὶς τῶν πεποικοῦσας. This may indicate that satire of the Boule figured somewhere in the

1 CP xxv 1930, 3. A second scholium here seems to take δήμων as meaning the demes of Attica.

2 op. cit. 9. The Vita (Dübner, Proleg. XI. 29-30) simply states that in the Babylonians Aristophanes διέβαλε τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὰς κληρώτικας ἄρχας.
play, although it must be admitted that the whole testimony of this scholiast about the litigation looks suspiciously as if it was simply derived from the text of the Acharnians.

None of these scholia explicitly confirm that it was the way that Aristophanes treated Athens' relationship with her subject allies which provoked Cleon, but two passages in later plays seem relevant here. The ending of the Knights, a play in which Cleon was ferociously attacked, is peculiar and requires an explanation. In all the other comedies the finale is choral but here Demos speaks the closing lines and orders that the Paphlagonian (Cleon) should be carried away in disgrace,

\[ \text{εὔ} \text{δοξών} \text{αὐτῶν} \text{οἵ} \text{εὔβολοι} \text{οἱ} \text{ξένοι}. \]

Cleon's treatment of the allies was a minor element in the Knights and yet the play ends with these words, \( \text{ο} \text{ξένοι}. \)

It may not be too fanciful to suppose that the triumphant conclusion was deliberately intended to recall to the audience the Babylonians. If that comedy had got Aristophanes into trouble with Cleon over the way it depicted the \( \text{ξένοι} \), he has now exacted full revenge with his

---

1 This scholium is quoted in full and discussed below, pp. 121ff.

2 Knights 1408.

3 It is impossible to agree with Murray, Aristophanes, 47ff., that throughout the Knights Aristophanes is 'secretly championing the cause of the allies', but that this does not emerge until the very end of the play.
Knights, and a rejuvenated Demos concurs.\footnote{1}

Again, in the parabasis of the \textit{Peace} the chorus, speaking in the first person in the name of Aristophanes, give a vivid picture of the monstrous Cleon against whom he had fought so bravely.\footnote{2} They end with this claim:

\[
\text{τειοντων ιδειν τερεσ ου κατεδεια, \'\'\'λλ'\'\'υπερ υμων πολεμιζον
\\text{αντειχον αει και των α\'\'λλων νη\'\'σων.}\footnote{3}
\]

The words \textit{κα\'\' των α\'\'λλων νη\'\'σων} mean 'of the islands as well'\footnote{4} and refer to the Athenian Empire.\footnote{5} Aristophanes certainly did not tangle with Cleon on behalf of the allies in any of the extant plays performed before the \textit{Peace}, so if there is any truth in his boast here it seems likely that he must be referring to the \textit{Babylonians}.

The surviving fragments of the Comedy have been reserved for analysis because they are relatively few in number, short, and difficult to interpret. A few elements can be identified. Athenaeus has preserved the information that the god Dionysus was one of the characters in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1} It is often assumed that some lines have been lost at the end of the play, but there is no trace of this. Neil, \textit{n. ad loc.} states that 'we are not forced to suppose that Aristophanes confined himself to a single form of ending for his comedies,' but giving the closing lines to Demos has more point if the theory proposed above is correct.
\item \footnote{2} \textit{Peace} 752-60.
\item \footnote{3} \textit{Peace} 759-60.
\item \footnote{4} See Platnauer, \textit{n. ad} 760, who aptly compares Thuc. vii.61.1: \διεδρες \στρατιώτωι Αθηναίον τε και των α\'\'λλων \\γυμνά\'\'σων.
\item \footnote{5} \textit{αι νησοι} generally has this meaning in Aristophanes; cf. \textit{Knights} 170 (with Neil's \textit{n.}), 1319.
\end{itemize}
From this it seems that he appeared in court where he was apparently prosecuted and perhaps blackmailed by the demagogues. One fragment gives a vivid picture of an audience seemingly spellbound by rhetoric:

\[
\text{ανέχασκον εἰς ἑκατος ἐμφερέστατα ὁπτωμένως κοίλησιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.}
\]

This may be a description of the jury at the trial fascinated by the god's eloquent defence, or of the effects of the \text{θεόκα λόγοι}, which are known to have been parodied in the play. Also, at some point a person or persons unknown arrived at Athens by sea. One fragment records the words of someone who had apparently witnessed the landing:

\[
\text{εὖ γ' ἐξεκολύμμης ὀπισθᾶς, ὡς ἐδοείσων ἐπίγυν}
\]

---

1 Athen. xi. 494d.
2 Fr. 71 may refer to this blackmail.
3 Fr. 68.
4 A suggestion made by Norwood, op. cit. 7, who compares Knights 651, 663.
5 Ach. 634. There seem to be two further allusions to this Rhetoric. The Etymologicum Magnum, 311.1, quotes a line from the play, \text{ἀνέχασκον ἑκατος ἑμφερέστατα ὁπτωμένως κοίλησιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων}. Aristotle, Rhet. 1405b 30-3, notes how Aristophanes made fun of diminutives in the Babylonians and cites four examples: \text{κρυσίδαριων, ἰματιδαριων, λοιδορριματιων and νοματιων}.
6 Fr. 80;
and four others mention harbors or rowing. Again it is tempting to tie this in with the arrival of the 'foreigners' about to practise their eloquence on the Athenians.

The key question is the identity of the Babylonians who formed the chorus. Hesychius states that a character in Aristophanes seeing the chorus coming out of a mill says

\[ \text{Σαμύνον ὁ δῆμος ἔστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος.} \]

The exact joke involved in πολυγράμματος is not of primary importance here. Three quite different explanations of it are recorded by Photius, but the essential point is that before he enumerates them the lexicographer states that Aristophanes is mocking the chorus of Babylonians because they were ἐστηγμένοι. Again, under another lemma Hesychius notes that Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν βαβυλωνίσι τὰ μέτωπα τῶν ὀικτῶν Ἴστρινα φησιν, ἐπεὶ ἐστηγμένω εἰσίν. Οἱ γὰρ ποιήται τῶν

1 Frs. 78, 83, 84, 85.

2 Norwood, op. cit. 5, has rightly emphasized that whenever a Greek play has a name indicating a class or collection of people, that name is the name of the persons composing the chorus. A partial exception is the Frogs where they form a subsidiary chorus.

3 Hesych. s.v. Σαμύνον ὁ δῆμος.

4 498.1: (1) Aristotle in his Constitution of Samos describes how the Samians needing more citizens ἔπεχραιν τοῖς δαυλοῖς ἐκ πέντε στατήμων τὴν ἰσοπολίτειαν. (2) Andron in his Tripod stated that the Ionian alphabet of twenty-four letters which was adopted by the Athenians was invented by Callistratus at Samos. (3) The Athenians in 439 branded Samian prisoners of war with an owl, and the Samians branded their Athenian prisoners with a σαμώνα. Plutarch, Per. 26.4, reverses this but quotes the line from the Babylonians as perhaps referring to the incident. Aelian, V.H. II.9, states that the Athenians used an owl. One or more of these explanations may be correct, but see below, p. 90, where an additional suggestion is put forward.
This shows that the branded Babylonians whom he has previously described as coming from a mill are δικέται, 2 and the Etymologicum Magnum confirms that in the Babylonians the mill was the place where the slaves were punished. 3

Taken together, these items of information show that the Babylonian chorus were presented as branded slaves working in a mill. One fragment of the play reads ἡ ποὺ κατὰ στοῖχος κεκράβονται τῷ βαρβαρίστῳ. 4 This must refer to the chorus since στοῖχος is a technical term and κατὰ στοῖχος is used of the rectangular formation of the comic chorus in four ranks. 5 Accordingly, βαρβαρίστι almost certainly indicates that the Babylonians were foreigners or at least non-Attics, 6 and since Hesychius explains their

1 Hesych. s.v. Ἰστριανά.
2 Photius, 538.20, quotes the word στῆγων from the play and defines it as δ φιλοτροφίας; cf. Eust. 1542, 48.
3 s.v. Ἰωτεῖον Hesychius, s.v. Ἰωτεῖον, also states that the mill was τὸ τῶν δελφίων πολεμίων.
4 Fr. 79.
6 Gilbert, Beiträge, 149ff., has pointed out that an Athenian writer can use the adjective βαρβαρός of another Greek dialect: Plato, Protag., 341c, calls the Aeolian dialect a φωνὴ βαρβαρός. βαρβαρίστι could refer only to some musical peculiarity, but this is irrelevant. Someone is anticipating a choral song and knows from the appearance of the chorus or from what has happened earlier in the play what it will be like.
name as \( \delta \iota \beta \alpha \rho \beta \alpha \rho \alpha \iota \varepsilon \alpha \tau \iota \). It seems reasonably safe to conclude that they were or were imagined to be foreigners.

It seems impossible that the chorus were Samians, so the larger question is whom did they represent. Bergk has suggested that they were a 'magna comitum caterva' who accompanied an ambassador from the Persian king to Athens. He believes that Aristophanes took the idea from an Athenian embassy which was actually sent to the Persians at the beginning of the Archidamian war and is referred to in the Acharnians. Pointing out that the Greeks and especially the Athenians considered the subjects of the Great King to be slaves, Bergk notes the \( \epsilon \gamma \omega \iota \nu \alpha \varsigma \chi \rho \nu \sigma \iota \omega \)

1 s.v. \( \beta \alpha \theta \omega \lambda \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \). He does not mention the Aristophanic comedy here, but since he cites fragments from it he obviously knew the play.

2 Gunning, op. cit. 7, has observed that if they were, Plutarch, Per. 26.4, could not have called the line from the play quoted by Hesychius a riddle.

3 Ap. Meineke, ii.2.969ff.

4 Ach. 61-127. Busolt, GG iii.2.960 n.2, accepts Aristophanes' chronology literally and suggests that an Athenian embassy was sent to Persia in 430 to discuss the capture of Colophon (Thuc. iii.34.1). If this arrived in Susa 'in the fourth year' (Ach. 80) and did not see the King for eight months (Ach. 82), it might still have returned to Athens in time for Aristophanes to insert this scene into the Acharnians. This theory, however, is not too persuasive; cf. J. Wells, Studies in Herodotus, Oxford, 1968, 175, who concludes that 'it is perhaps safer to say that negotiation was in the air.' Gomme, HCT ii.6-7, follows Wade-Gery, JHS lxix 1949, 83-4, in taking Thuc. ii.7.1 (against the schol. ad loc.) to mean that both the Athenians and the Spartans prepared to send embassies to Persia when the war broke out. He sees Ach. 61-127 as referring to the 'first embassy to Persia during the war that we know of'.
which Pseudartabas supposedly promises the Athenians in the *Acharnians*¹ and suggests that the Persian embassy in the *Babylonians* made similarly 'lavish offers'. In this he sees a parody of the Sicilian mission which was led by Gorgias to Athens in 427. It seems intrinsically unlikely, however, that if Aristophanes had introduced a Persian embassy in the *Babylonians* he would have repeated this in the *Acharnians* a year later.² Moreover, Bergk does not attempt to explain how and why the Persian attendants came to be represented as slaves working in a mill at Athens.

Norwood, after attacking the older interpretation of the play, put forward a quite different theory of his own.³ According to his detailed (although admittedly tentative) reconstruction of the comedy, the chorus was composed of wild Asiatics, the followers of Dionysus. He suggests that they arrived in Athens with the god but were thrown into prison by the authorities.⁴ Dionysus somehow obtained their deliverance, placed them in the orchestra as the chorus⁵ and put himself forward as the best

---

¹ *Ach.* 100ff.
² See Gunning, *op. cit.* 35.
³ *op. cit.* 7-10.
⁴ Norwood notes the correspondence here with Euripides' *Paeon* which was written considerably later, and theorizes that this part of the comedy was a burlesque of Aeschylus' *Edoni*. He suggests that the Asiatics may have been tattooed on arrival or branded by the State.
⁵ *Fr.* 66: ἐπί τρεῖς ἀσιάτας. This, however, can scarcely refer to the disposition of the chorus as Norwood believes. For the arrangement of the comic chorus in *four* ranks see above, p. 83.
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representative of Athens. In this capacity he received envoys from the allies bearing tribute, mocked their absurd rhetoric eulogizing Athens and was attacked for this by Cleon and another demagogue who dragged him off to trial. On his return he recounted what had happened: how the demagogues had sought to blackmail him and how he had won over the jury with his eloquence. The chorus congratulated him and performed the parabasis which perhaps included a discussion of the way the allies were treated by the Athenians. Finally, in the iambic scenes Dionysus, now secure in his power, dealt severely with members of the Athenian bureaucracy who attempted to win his favor and perhaps finally departed with the rejoicing chorus in order to ensure the spreading of his worship in other countries.

Much of this is obviously more ingenious than convincing. Above all, there is no special connection between Dionysus and Babylon but Norwood makes no attempt to explain why Aristophanes should have named the followers of the god Babylonians. He notes that Hesychius explains 'Babylonians' as \( \delta \iota \beta\acute{\alpha}\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \varepsilon \tau\iota \varsigma \ \alpha\beta\omicron\nu\alpha\iota \varsigma \), but it is inconceivable that the name was employed as a synonym for 'foreigners' in Athens. Suidas defines 'Babylonians'

1 s.v. Βαβυλωνίοι.

2 There is absolutely no evidence for this in the ancient literature. Reference to Babylon and Babylonians are rare, and if Hesychius is not making a trite generalization he must be basing his note on the Aristophanic comedy.
as meaning 'slaves' but this again is misleading. Barbarian slaves were very common in Athens and they came from many different nations: in Old Comedy there is frequent mention of Lydians, Phrygians, Syrians, Carians, Egyptians, Thracians and Scythians but there is not a single reference to Babylonians. Clearly the name could only be used generically to mean 'slaves' in the sense that they were subject to the Persians. This must be the key to their role in the comedy and since it has been shown that after the performance Aristophanes was accused of harming Athens vis-a-vis her allies, the irresistible conclusion is that he more or less explicitly compared the status of these allies with the status of the Babylonian subjects of Persia.

Exactly why he should have chosen to make the comparison with the Babylonians rather than with another of the Persian subjects is uncertain, but it is tempting to

1 s.v. βαβυλωνία.

2 The references are assembled by Ehrenberg, 171-2. See the discussion in ML 247 of the property confiscated from those who were accused of mutilating the Herms and profaning the Eleusinian mysteries in 414. The authors observe that of the slaves whose origins can be ascertained, 12 are Thracian, 7 Carian, 3 Scythian, 3 ἐκτενεῖς, 2 Syrian, 2 Illyrian, with 1 each from Colchis, Lydia, Macedonia, Phrygia, Messenia, and (probably) Cappadocia. Babylon itself is mentioned just once by Aristophanes at Birds 552. The allusion to Babylonians in Lucian, Pisc. 19, certainly does not indicate that they are being regarded as typical slaves as Frütsche, De Babylonis Aristophanis commentatio, 19, believes. Cf. schol. Plato Laches 187b: ἐν τῷ Καρί... ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ δόλῳ. καὶ γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ Καρδάν καὶ Ὁρακών τοὺς δούλους ἐποιήσαντο.
link his choice with the fact that Herodotus' *History* had recently reached the Athenian public. The generally accepted theory that the *History* was published some short time before the production of the *Acharnians* at the beginning of 425 has been attacked by C.W. Fornara, but his arguments are essentially subjective, at least in so far as he claims that the work is not parodied in the *Acharnians*. Precisely because of this they are difficult to answer; one can only say that it is hard to see how parody of Hdt. i.133 and i.144 at *Ach.* 84-7 and 91-2 respectively can be denied, and that the opening chapters of the *History* are probably also parodied at *Ach.* 524ff. Fornara passes over Wells' observation that Pseudartabas, the name of the King's Eye, is 'a Herodotean coinage', and when he argues that Aristophanes 'would not have stumbled as badly as this' if he had intended to poke fun at Herodotus, his critical priorities are wrong and he is ignoring the dramatic effectiveness of this whole scene. This is not to deny that there is a definite problem in the fact that Aristophanes parodies Herodotus mainly in the *Acharnians* and *Birds*, and that there is an eleven-year gap between the two plays. The chronology cannot be discussed in detail here but Herodotus may only have recited parts of

---

1 *JHS* xci 1971, 25-34.
2 Cf. J. Wells, op. cit. 123, who notes how Aristophanes created 'a preliminary Oriental atmosphere' at *Ach.* 68-83.
3 See De Ste. Croix, 240.
his work in Athens or had it circulated there for the first time by his friends at the beginning of the Archidamian War.\(^1\) In any case it seems certain that Aristophanes (and his audience) knew the History at least as early as the beginning of 425.

The two main passages in the History which deal with Babylon occur at i.178-87 and iii.150-60. Of these the second seems the more likely to have inspired Aristophanes to make his chorus Babylonians; the colorful account of how Zopyrus mutilated himself in order to effect the capture of Babylon must have attracted considerable Athenian interest,\(^2\) especially since his grandson had defected to them, perhaps shortly before the Babylonians was

---

1 See W.W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus, Oxford, 1928, 6-9, 13, who give the evidence for the historian's visits to Athens and his recitations in the city, and emphasize that an ancient prose work was never 'published' in the modern sense. After copies had been made, an author could rehandle or expand any part of his work at any time without the formality of a new edition.

2 Herodotus, iii.154.2, states that (among other things) Zopyrus cut off his nose and ears, and it may be significant that Theophylactus Simocatta describes a man who had suffered exactly these injuries in his account of an 'entertainment' which Chosroes, the Persian king, provided for Roman and Median commanders (Hist. v.5). Norwood, CP xxv 1930, 224ff., and Edmonds, i.634-4, have strongly argued that Theophylactus quotes lines from Aristophanes' Banqueters in this passage-- the lines are attributed to Aristophanes by Suidas (s.v. Δαμας), and the attribution was accepted by Bergk (ap. Meineke ii.2.1029), but withdrawn by Meineke (v.1.62). If this is correct, it is interesting to speculate that Aristophanes alluded to Zopyrus' injuries in the Banqueters, and that this is the reason why Theophylactus quoted from the play here. This would probably mean that Herodotus' work was known in Athens before 427.
Definite evidence that Herodotus was parodied in the comedy cannot be resurrected from its scanty fragments, but since πολυγράμμως can mean 'very learned' there may be a subsidiary allusion to the historian's well known 'Samian connections' when the adjective is applied to the islanders. The fact that the chorus were represented as working in a mill might tie in too with Herodotus' graphic account of how the Babylonians preparing for the siege of the city sent away their mothers, chose one woman each from their households to serve as a 'bread-maker', and strangled the rest so that they would not consume their bread. This, however, is obviously speculative. The important point is that Aristophanes must have made his chorus Babylonians because the latter were a subject people.

It has been noted earlier that in the past most scholars who studied the play recognized this, and advanced (with minor variations) the theory that the Babylonians actually represented the subject allies of Athens working as slaves in the mill of their master, the Athenian

---

1 Hdt. iii.160.2. On the date, see Keiggs, Endnote 21, 136-7, who argues that the revolt of Caunus from Athens (during which Zopyrus was apparently killed) should be placed either between 437 and 433 or between 431 and 425.

2 On these 'Samian connections' see B.M. Mitchell, JHS xcv 1975, 75-91. For the explanations of the word recorded by Photius, see above, p. 82, n. 4.

3 Hdt. iii.150.2.
Demos. The situation of the allies had been steadily deteriorating as the war continued. Less than two years before the production of this play, the Athenians in the autumn of 428 had dispatched twelve ἀργυρολόγους ναύς to collect money from the allies when the siege of Mytilene was proving costly. It is not absolutely certain whether this action should be connected with a special levy upon the allies (comparable to the domestic εἰσφορά), or with an extraordinary assessment of tribute in 428. The evidence tends to support the latter view, but in any case there can be no doubt that the cities of the Empire were experiencing increasing financial pressure. Moreover, the events which had followed the surrender of Mytilene in 427 vividly showed how repressive Athenian policy could be.

1 Gilbert, Beiträge, 148ff.; Schrader, Philologus xlii 1884, 577ff.; Busolt GG iii.2.1061; Neil, vi; Weber, Aristoph. Studien, 81; Starkie, 6. Fritzche, op. cit. 20, thought that the Babylonians were the subject allies, but that they were characters in the play, not the chorus. He denied that a Comic chorus could be composed of slaves and argued 'constitit ex optimatibus qui popularem auram nullo modo captantes saluti reipublicae unice prospicerent'. While there is no known example of a chorus of slaves in Comedy it is common enough in Tragedy and there is no foundation for this theory.

2 See Meiggs, 306-23.

3 Thuc. iii.19.1.

4 The view of Gomme, HCT ii.279.

5 See below, pp. 382ff., where the evidence for Cleon's involvement with the assessment of 425 and for the theory that the allies had previously been required to increase their contributions in 428 is discussed.

6 See below, pp. 103ff.
It is natural to contrast the harshness of the Athenians on this occasion with their relative moderation when Potidaea surrendered in 430/29, although it is true that Thucydides implies that the Assembly would have insisted on more severe terms than those which the generals offered on their own initiative to the beleaguered Potidaeans, and he makes it clear that there were special factors involved in the revolt of Mytilene which exacerbated the Athenians.

This is not the place to discuss the relative popularity or unpopularity of the Empire among the subject-allies during the war. It is enough that it is known that when the Babylonians was performed in 426 the nature of Athenian imperialism and the status of the allies were the subject of keen interest throughout Greece and particularly in Athens. Eupolis in his comedy the Cities, which was probably produced not too long after the

---

1 Thuc. ii.70.3.

2 ii.70.4. At 70.2, he also states that the generals offered these (none too lenient) terms because the Athenian army was in some distress and the siege had already cost two thousand talents.

3 iii.36.2.

4 See R.P. Legon, Hist. xxii 1972, 145 n. 1, for references to the opinions of modern scholars on this controversial subject. The controversy was sparked by a stimulating article by G.E.M. de Ste. Croix (Hist. iii 1954, 1-41) in which he argued that Thucydides' clearly expressed opinion that it was unpopular is contradicted by the historian's own narrative.

5 For fifth-century judgments on the Empire, see Meiggs, 375-96.
Babylonians, presented twenty-four members of the Empire introduced individually as his chorus. Norwood indeed has argued that the purpose of the play was 'to introduce a plea for better treatment of the allies' and that one fragment points to their enslavement, but this is far from certain. Plutarch describes how the Comic poets had earlier attacked Pericles for the despotism which he exercised, and quotes a fragment of Teleclides which asserts that the Athenians had handed over to him

Moreover, the Athenian empire is explicitly described as a tyranny not only by the Old Oligarch, but also consistently by Thucydides. G.E.M. de Ste. Croix has noted that the historian 'makes no less than eight of his speakers accuse the Athenians of 'enslaving' their allies and of wishing to 'enslave' other states'. He also twice uses the same expression in his own person and he represents both

1 Geissler, 39, believes that it was performed in 422 because an embassy of Amyneas to Pharsalus was apparently mocked in this play (fr. 209) and at Wasps 1271-4 in the same way (see schol. Wasps 1271).

2 Greek Comedy, 194-5; Eupol. fr. 225.

3 Per. 16.1-2.

4 Fr. 42.


6 Hist. iii 1954, 2.

7 I.98.4, vii.75.7; cf. i.122.3, 124.3, where the Corinthian envoys at Sparta call Athens 'the tyrant city'. The meaning of σουλείων is analyzed in ATL iii.155-7.
Pericles and Cleon as frankly admitting that the empire is a tyranny.  

If, therefore, Aristophanes did depict the allies as Athenian slaves and called them Babylonians he would have been putting into dramatic form an idea which was certainly not unknown in the city when he was writing the play. In this case when the chorus at Ach. 642 describe the poet as "τοὺς δῆμους ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν διέτρακε ὡς δημοκρατοῦντων, this would give the essential theme of the comedy if one assumes that the 'δῆμος' of δημοκρατοῦνται is quiescent.

It has been noted that Norwood’s withering attack upon this interpretation of the play has attracted considerable support, but while he is right to insist that there is no real proof that the Babylonians did represent the subject allies, his objections to the theory are exaggerated. He makes great play of the fact that in the

1 11.63.2, iii.37.2. Plutarch, Per. 12.2, makes Pericles' opponents say (about the building program) καὶ δειμνὴν ὑφήν ἡ Ἑλλάς ὑπερθεῖ ὑπὲρ βασιλέως καὶ τυμαντείπθαι περὶ φιλοπόσ.

2 See (e.g.) Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 80 n. 40; W.G. Forrest, Phoenix xvii 1963, 1 n. 3; de Ste. Croix, 363 n. 11; Meiggs, 393. At the beginning of his important article Norwood stressed that his chief objective was to correct what he termed 'a grave misconception', i.e. the (then) prevailing view that the chorus of the Babylonians were the subject-allies. Only after this did he proceed to offer the tentative reconstruction of the comedy which has been discussed above. Croiset, 42, had anticipated him in attacking the 'orthodox' interpretation of the play, but only on the very weak grounds that if the allies were represented as slaves from the beginning of the comedy, it is impossible to see what worse fate could subsequently have befallen them.
Acharnians Aristophanes does not mention slaves or mills or ill-treatment of the allies as elements in the Babylonians. This, however, is misleading since he himself (inevitably) concludes from the evidence cited above that the chorus was composed of branded slaves working in a mill. His suggestion that Ach. 642 could 'on the face of it' refer to the justice and generosity shown to the allies by the Athenian Demos is simply ironical. If this were the case the question immediately arises why did Cleon attack the poet. Norwood's reason for opposing this theory seems to be essentially that Aristophanes would not have dared to depict the allies as branded slaves in a play presented at the Dionysia, at this critical moment in the war when 'the revolt and dreadful chastisement of Mytilene were fresh in all minds'. This is a more serious point, but Aristophanes was very young and may have acted with the traditional rashness of youth. In any case, it certainly seems from Cleon's response to the play that he did go very far. In his later plays, it is true, Aristophanes does not dwell on the injustice of the Empire; he is not concerned about the imposition of tribute per se, but with the fact that it is monopolized by the politicians at the expense of the ordinary Athenian. Against this, however, it might well be argued that he had learned

1 See especially Wasps 656-679. The references to the Empire in the Knights are collected and analyzed below, pp. 282ff. ; in this play too Aristophanes adopts a similar line.
discretion (in this area at least) at an early age, and that he was not about to give his enemies the same obvious opening again. Moreover, while none of the ancient authorities say what prize the play obtained, the fact that Aristophanes makes no mention of its success in the Acharnians while Cleon felt in a strong enough position to take action against him because of it, may indicate that it was a failure with the judges and audience. ¹ This could be another reason why Aristophanes should have steered clear of the subject in later years. In any case it must always be kept in mind that his métier was to attack. Even if the allies were the chorus of the Babylonians, Aristophanes would probably have satirized Athenian imperialism in the play rather than explicitly championed their cause. Scarcely any real contemporary figures or institutions escaped wholly unscathed when he presented them in the theatre and it is safe to conclude that the allies would have 'taken their lumps' along with the Athenian leaders. ²

This theory that Aristophanes actually put the allies in the orchestra as his chorus, and that by making them slaves and calling them Babylonians he compared their

¹ Cf. Clouds 528-36, where the success of the Banqueters is fondly recalled although this play only won the second prize.

² In the Cities of Eupolis, which is generally supposed to have represented the allies in a favorable light, there is an unpleasant reference to Tenos (fr. 231), and a scholium to Peace 1176 describes the way Cyzicus was satirized in the same play.
status to that of the Persian subjects is by no means indefensible. The problem is that if the allies were the chorus it is difficult to account for Aristophanes' claim that he had put an end to the deception of the Athenians _ἐνυποσία λύσις_ , and for the arrival at Athens by ship of some person or persons which is indicated in a number of fragments. While these are not insuperable objec-
tives, it is tempting to link the two and to suppose that it was the ambassadors from the allies who arrived by sea and addressed the Athenians. In this case the allies could scarcely have formed the chorus, and there is another possibility which would fit the facts, namely that the Babylonians were actually natives of Babylon working as slaves in Athens.

This explanation has the merit of simplicity and if the situation of these Babylonians was compared with that of the subject allies (whose ambassadors were charac-
ters on the stage), the play itself would remain an attack

1 Ach. 634.
2 Frs. 75, 80, 83, 84, 85.
3 Croiset, L3, has well remarked that Clfd Comedy is essentially fanciful in its conceits, and that its episodes frequently bear little or no relation to the main subject.
4 Bergk, op. cit. 971, and Norwood, _CP_ xxv 1930, 8, suggested this.
5 If they entered the play as ambassadors and were only later reduced to servitude, it seems highly improbable that they could have been named 'Babylonians' from the outset.
upon Athenian imperial policy.1 The presence of the Babylonians in Athens could be explained by the negotiations with Persia which were going on or were at least in the air about this time.2 Aristophanes may have invented a situation in which they had been sent to the Athenians by the Persian King as a gift, or barter of some sort may have taken place.3 The most plausible scenario, however, is that they had fled to Athens like Zopyrus, only to find that they had exchanged one form of servitude for another. Runaway slaves were sometimes branded,4 so this would explain the frequent references by the lexicographers to the marks which the chorus bore, and it has been observed earlier that Photius specifically defines the word στιγματις (which occurred in the play) as ὁ στηματις.5 It should be noted too that in the parabasis of the Acharnians Aristophanes jokingly claims that the Persian King has been enquiring about him.6 Everything else in these

1 Fr. 64 is a definite example of a comparison being made between the chorus and the Samians, but only because of their appearance.

2 See above, p. 84, n. 4.

3 In this case it might not be too far-fetched to speculate that the Athenians traded some of their allies for the Babylonians. This would emphasize their similarity to the King's subjects in their lack of autonomy.


5 Phot. 538.20; cf. Eust. 1542.48. The fact that Hesychius (s.v. Βασιλικος) defines Babylonians as βασιλεας also gives some support to the theory that the chorus were non-Greeks.

6 Ach. 647-51.
anapaests refers either to the Babylonians or to its aftermath, so this seems to indicate that the King was mentioned in the comedy or entered into it in some way. One can speculate that he may have been disturbed by the loss of his subjects. If the chorus were Babylonians, it is possible that they were sentenced to work in a mill to expiate the 'crime' perpetrated by their ancestors on the women-folk, but in any case it is tempting to connect this with the fact that Eucrates, one of the popular leaders of the day, is represented in Comedy as a miller. Presumably the Babylonians had somehow fallen into the clutches of the politicians.

It is impossible to put together any elaborate reconstruction of the plot of the comedy. Most of the fragments are too short to be analyzed meaningfully, and it is futile to speculate which Athenian magistrates were ridiculed or how the play ended. Nevertheless, one can say that if the theory outlined above is broadly correct, it would seem that at some point in the comedy allied ambassadors arrived and addressed the Athenians with fulsome rhetoric. For this they may have been suitably derided perhaps, as Norwood has suggested, by Dionysus. At least it seems natural to connect his presence in the

1 Hdt. iii.150.2; see above, p. 90.
3 Schol. Ach. 378; Vita (Dübner, Proleg. xi.29-30).
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play with the fact that the Dionysia were the date when the payments of allied tribute were due.\(^1\) Why the god should have been brought to trial by the 'demagogues'\(^2\) is quite uncertain, but it may have been he who pointed out how similar the position of the subject-allies was to that of the Babylonians, first under the Persians and now under the Athenians.

Whether the chorus of the Babylonians actually represented the allies, or, as seems more likely, were explicitly compared to them, it is safe to conclude that the play did mock the imperial policy of Athens. The precise extent to which Cleon figured in the comedy is impossible to determine. The fact that it was he who attacked Aristophanes afterwards naturally does not prove that he was one of the main characters in the play. In itself this would not even be definite evidence that he was responding to personal satire. M.I. Finley has acutely commented upon the incalculable psychological effect of the reversal of Athenian policy during the second day of the Mytilenaean debate upon a man like Cleon.\(^3\) His narrow defeat in the Assembly might well have made him eager to retaliate if he saw the policy which he supported being ridiculed in the theatre, even if he himself had escaped notice.

---

1 Ach. 504-6; schol. Ach. 504, 378. See ATL iii.14ff.
2 Athen. xi. 494d.
3 Past and Present xxi 1962, 12.
Yet the scholiast to Ach. 378 does say that Cleon was specifically attacked in the Babylonians, and Athenaeus' testimony makes it very probable that 'the demagogues' played a part in the action. When one combines these items of information it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Cleon did appear on the stage.\(^1\) Presumably he was one of these 'demagogues' who prosecuted Dionysus.

A.E. Raubitschek has noted that at Knights 313-4 the chorus accuse the Paphlagonian, the comic Cleon, of \(\text{ἀνο} \ \text{τῶ} \ \text{πετρῶν \ αύ} \ \text{ω} \ \text{θεν \ τοὺς \ φόρους \ θωνοοκώμω} \) and that he replies \(\text{δὲ \ ἔγω τὸ \ πράγμα τοῦ \ θ' \ θ' \ θεν \ πολι \ καταύτειν} \). Raubitschek takes the response to indicate that Aristophanes is repeating the joke 'from an earlier comedy, probably the Babylonians'.\(^2\) He thinks that the words \(\text{ἀνο} \ \text{τῶ} \ \text{πετρῶν} \) would put the audience in mind of the rock-cut seats of the theatre, and that Aristophanes may well be comparing the porters who each carried one talent into the theatre with a shoal of tunny-fish. From this he suggests that Cleon was responsible for the decree quoted by Isocrates, providing for the tribute to be carried into the orchestra during the Dionysia,\(^3\) and that the decree was passed between the death of Pericles and the performance of the Babylonians. If this were correct it would

---

1 Croiset, 44, believes that this is proved by Peace 759-60.

2 TAPA lxxii 1941, 356-62.

3 Isoc. viii.82. On the text of this passage, see Meiggs, 434-4.
prove that Cleon's interest in the tribute was mocked in the Babylonians. It would also add weight to the theory that the allies were not the chorus, but that they were characters in the play who brought the tribute to Athens since this would have allowed Aristophanes to satirize the new practice. Unfortunately, however, the basis of this theory is extremely flimsy. Raubitschek's interpretation of Knights 313-4 does not inspire any confidence and it is by no means certain that the decree cited by Isocrates was passed during the Archidamian War.¹

It is very possible that Cleon's concern for the tribute was an element in the Babylonians. 426 was a Great Panathenaic year and when the play was produced there may well have been controversy in Athens over the question whether the allies' contributions should be raised.² The theory that Cleon was one of the Athenians who argued

¹ In ATL iii.17, Raubitschek's theory is noted without comment, but the authors seem to assume that the decree mentioned by Isocrates belongs to the period of the early Archidamian War. They also translate the words τὸ περὶ γυμνίμενον ἐκ τῶν φόρων in the decree as 'the surplus of the funds derived from the tributes' but it is very doubtful whether the decree was passed during the Archidamian War if this is correct. The annual spectacle of a dwindling reserve could scarcely have reassured the allies about the state of the Athenian economy. Meiggs., 534, supports Raubitschek's translation 'the annually incoming tribute money', and notes that the display may have been intended as 'a collective receipt'. He also observes, however, that there is nothing in Isocrates' text which requires the decree to be dated from the early years of the Archidamian War.

² New assessments normally coincided with the Great Panathenaeae; see Meiggs, 239-40.
THE BABYLONIANS

(unsuccesfully) for a new assessment when the festival was celebrated some months after the performance of the play is persuasive,1 and this background should at least be kept in mind when the theme of the Babylonians and Cleon's response to the comedy are considered.

Yet because the play followed so closely upon the surrender of Mytilene in 427, it is natural to suspect that it was Cleon's attitude towards the islanders which was the chief reason why he figured in it. Thucydides' description of the second debate in the Assembly over the fate of the Mytilenaean is well-known, and Cleon's speech in which he exhorted his countrymen to stand firm by their earlier decision to put to death the adult males and to enslave the women and children2 does not require detailed analysis. One point, however, can be emphasized. It is notable that Thucydides makes Cleon address himself not only to the immediate issue but also to the larger question of 'imperial management' when he urges his policy of stringent repression. Whether Cleon actually adopted this line on the specific occasion is not of immediate concern here, since his whole career speaks for itself. After the Athenian change of heart, it was he who successfully proposed that those Mytilenaean most responsible for the

1 See below, pp. 384-5.
2 Thuc. iii.37-40.
revolt should be executed, and in 423 he also carried a motion to put to death the people of Scione after the rebellion. When he personally recaptured Torone in 422 he sold the women and children into slavery, and there is every reason to suppose that he was among those who had attacked the generals in 430/29 for their behavior towards the Potidaeans. In short, throughout his career Cleon consistently followed the same repressive policy; there can be no doubt that the speech which Thucydides gives him in the Mytilenaean debate (at least) reflects the broad view which he held about the way Athens should treat recalcitrant members of her Empire.

As Meiggs has observed, it would be naive to think that Cleon did not have associates who shared his opinions. Indeed, by 423 a majority of the Athenians must have been in sympathy with them, and their treatment of

---

1 Thuc. iii.50.1. The number is given in the manuscripts as 'slightly more than a thousand'. This has been questioned by many scholars who think it impossibly large, but it is difficult to emend the text convincingly.

2 Thuc. iv.122.6.

3 Thuc. v.3.4. He sent the men (including Peloponnesians and Chalcidians) back to Athens, and they were subsequently set free or ransomed after his death when the peace was signed. In all, these captives only numbered seven hundred, but Comrie, HCT iii.632, speculates that those who had been pro-Athenian or at least not against them may have been dealt with earlier by Pasitelidas or Brasidas.

4 See above, pp. 38-9.

5 Meiggs, 318.
Melos in the following decade shows that they no longer needed Cleon to urge them on. Yet it was he who introduced and, in a sense, perhaps 'legitimized' this stringently harsh policy towards imperial rebels. He was certainly the first to propose the death-penalty for all adult males in a city of the Empire.

His proposal clearly aroused considerable controversy in Athens and it is natural to suspect that it directly inspired Aristophanes to satirize the Empire as a tyranny in which the Athenians (like the Great King) had the power of life or death over their 'subjects'. More specifically, whether Aristophanes compared the allies to slaves or represented them in this way, it is tempting to link this with the original Athenian decision to enslave the non-combatants of Mytilene. It may be more than a coincidence that the chorus in the parabasis of the Acharnians begin their defence of the poet against Cleon's charges by gibing at the Athenians who are both τεχνεύρολοι and μεταβολολοι. This looks like a reference to the behavior of the Assembly during the Mytilenean debate which

1 Thuc. v.116.4.
2 It seems strange that Dover, Thucydides, 32, should wonder why we are not told who originally proposed the massacre of the Mytileneans on the first day of debate. It seems clear from the historian's words at iii.35.6 that it was Cleon. Xenophon, Hell. ii.2.3, brackets the earlier Athenian treatment of Hestiaea with the atrocities of the Archidamian War, but although the population was expelled, no capital punishment was imposed on this occasion.
3 Ach. 630-2.
may indicate that it was his treatment of this episode in the Babylonians which was at least partially responsible for the trouble in which Aristophanes found himself. In this case Cleon, as one of the principals in the debate, could not have been ignored and it seems quite possible that Aristophanes fleetingly recalls the line which he had adopted in the earlier comedy at Knights 1030 when the Sausage-seller describes the Paphlagonian as an ἀνυπάρεχος.

To attempt to go further than this is to enter the realm of total speculation. Cleon's behavior in 427 has been roundly condemned by most modern commentators, but the reaction of Aristophanes is more elusive. One can only repeat that the Babylonians was probably not a direct appeal for better treatment of the subject-allies although this may have been implicit. If anything can be deduced from the poet's technique in later years, it is much more likely that he concentrated on ridiculing the part which the politicians of his day had played in making the empire a 'tyranny'.

Two general conclusions seem to emerge from the discussion in this chapter: the play of 426 contained or constituted mockery of a policy which Cleon upheld until his death and this mockery was very different from anything which can be found in Aristophanes' extant works. The feud between the poet and politician begins at this

1 Woodhead, Mnem. xiii 1960, 298-300, is a notable exception.
point with Aristophanes on the offensive. The nature of Cleon's immediate response is analyzed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

CLEON'S COUNTER-ATTACK

Virtually everything about this reprisal which Cleon undertook in 426 after the performance of the Babylonians is controversial. It has not even been definitely established whether he made a direct attack upon Aristophanes as the author of the play, or upon Callistratus as its producer, or indeed upon both of them.\(^1\) The point is often overlooked by modern scholars, however, that even if Cleon was only involved in formal proceedings with one of the two men, the other would almost certainly have suffered his share of abuse for his part in the alleged offence. Very little is known about the relationship between Aristophanes and Callistratus apart from what Aristophanes himself says in the parabases of the Knights and Clouds,\(^2\) and this does not indicate that their relationship had any kind of political basis. The statement

---

1 Starkie, Excursus v, gives a good survey of earlier opinions on the subject. More recently, St. Srebny, De Aristophanis origine peregrino, Charisteria Th. Sinko oblata, Warsaw, 1951, 315-30, has argued that Callistratus was indicted. For the view that it was Aristophanes, see C. Bailey in Greek Poetry and Life. Essays presented to Gilbert Murray on his 70th Birthday, Oxford, 1936, 232; V. Steffen, Eos xlvi 1954, 7-21; ibid. xlviii 1956, 67-73. The argument is still continuing, but there is a general tendency among modern scholars to assume that it was Aristophanes who was prosecuted, without specifically studying the question. See, however, Dover, Maia N.S. xv 1963, 15, Clouds, xix-xx, who remains undecided.

2 Knights 512ff., Clouds 530-1.
in the Anonymous that 'they say' that Aristophanes brought out his political plays through Callistratus may simply be based on the fact that the latter was known to have produced the Babylonians, Acharnians and Lysistrata. It does not necessarily prove active political collaboration between poet and producer, but one would think that Callistratus must at least have been sympathetic to the political ideas expressed by Aristophanes at the beginning of his career. Otherwise he would hardly have consented to be the didaskalos of the Acharnians after the troubles of the previous year.

The ancient testimony strongly indicates that Aristophanes was actually indicted by Cleon. His Vita states that Cleon brought a graphē xenias against him and a second Life, which in many ways summarizes the first, gives the same information. Both biographers place their statement about the litigation immediately after a discussion of the Knights, but both quote Ach. 377-8 as referring to this graphē which shows that they believed

---

1 Anon. de Com. (Dübner, Proleg. iii.49-52): τὰς μὲν γὰρ πολιτικὰς τούτων φασίν αὐτὸν Σίδόνων, τὰ δὲ κατ' Ευριπίδου καὶ Σωκράτους Φιλωνίδη
2 Dübner, Proleg. xi.27-8.
3 Dübner, Proleg. xii.15-16.
that it took place before the Acharnians was performed. 1

The Knights is placed before the Acharnians in the Ravenna manuscript and in most of the other manuscripts which contain the two plays, 2 and it is clear that the author of the two Lives thought that it was the earlier work. 3 The Ravenna scholiast to Ach. 378 states that two processes (graphai adikias and xenias) were brought against Aristophanes, and a scholiurn to Ach. 503 indicates a judicial action against the playwright without giving any more precise information. The only explicit testimony that Callistratus was attacked is found in a scholium to the Wasps. At lines 1284-91 in the play the chorus of jurymen speaking in the name of Aristophanes recall how the poet has been attacked by Cleon. 4 The scholiast to Wasps 1284 is undecided whether the reference is to the trouble after the Babylonians or to a later imbroglio between Aristophanes and Cleon which presumably followed the Knights.

1 After making his initial statement that 'Aristophanes was hostile to Cleon since he brought a graphē xenias against him', the first biographer continues καὶ ὅτι ἐν δράματι αὐτῶν Ἀριστοφάνης ἀνέβαλε τὰς Ληστὰς τῶν Κληρών ἀγώνας, παρέτεις ἴχνον. This would mean that the political content of the Babylonians was a second reason for Aristophanes' hostility towards Cleon which does not make sense. If (with Bergk) καὶ is deleted, the Babylonians becomes the reason for the lawsuit.


3 The Vita (Dübner, Proleg. xi.16-26), states that the Knights was responsible for Cleon's being fined five talents and that Ach. 5-6 refer to this.

4 These lines are discussed below, pp. 170ff.
He tends to favor the latter view, but he does say that Cleon εἰπήγαγεν Callistratus εἰς τὴν βουλὴν and, as he implies, this could only have taken place after the Babylonians since Aristophanes produced the Knights in his own name. A clear majority of the ancient sources indicate then that Aristophanes was prosecuted, but their testimony is conflicting and the prudence of this last scholiast has led some scholars to accept his one categorized statement that Callistratus was brought before the Council.

Ultimately the solution to the problem must lie in the biographical element in the Acharnians and particularly in the answers to two questions: whether Dicaeopolis speaks as the mouthpiece of Aristophanes or Callistratus when he drops his dramatic characterization at 377-82 and 502-3 to recall what had happened in the previous year, and which of the two men is defended in the parabasis. The first question, however, is complicated by the fact that theoretically either Aristophanes or Callistratus could have played the part of Dicaeopolis, so attention must first be focused on the parabasis.

1 Schol. Wasps 124a: Ἄρηλον ἐστερόν τῷ Καλλιστράτου εἰς τὴν βουλὴν εἰσαγωγής οὐ. νῦν μην ἔχεις ἵν, ἵνα αὐτὸν Κλέον εἰπήγαγεν, ἢ ἔτερος κατ' αὐτοῦ γενομένης Ἀριστοφάνου, καὶ μὴ εἰσαγωγής, ἄλλω ἀσείλης τινας, ὅπερ καὶ μᾶλλον εὑρίσκεται, ἐκεῖνο τε τῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνωπόλεμῳ ἀρχ' ἀστέρων ἔσται, νῦν τε ὡς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει.

2 There is nothing to indicate that Callistratus did so. The theory that Aristophanes took the role is more plausible; see below, pp. 158ff.
The chorus begin the anapaests with the statement (628-32) that ὁ διδάκατος ἢμῶν who has never before come forward to proclaim his personal merits now wishes to defend himself against the slander which has been directed against him. Yet the actual defence which takes up the rest of the anapaests (633-658) is put into the mouth of ὁ ποιητής and finally in the πνίγος (659-664) there is a defiant challenge to Cleon spoken in the first person.1

The difficulty lies in the anapaests as Callistratus was again the official didaskalos of the Acharnians2 while Aristophanes was naturally the author or poet. It is perhaps just possible that both producer and playwright are being defended here if one accepts that the producer's case is simply the poet's insistence that his drama has actually done great service to Athens,3 but the shift of reference would have been extremely difficult for the audience to pick up. The anapaestic address as a whole is coherent and it is much more probable that the person designated as the didaskalos at 628 is also referred to

1 The closest 'parallel' to this in other parabases is in the anapaests of the Peace where the chorus first speak of Aristophanes as ὁ διδάκατος ἢμῶν (737), and then abruptly shift to the first person when describing his exploits (754). However, since Aristophanes may well have produced the Peace in his own name, this sheds no light on the problem here.

2 Ach. Hyp. 1.32.

3 This was argued by Schrader, Philologus xxxv 1877, 400, and by A.T. Murray, TAPA xxxiv 1903, 36, who believed that the opening lines of the parabasis refer to Callistatus, the rest to Aristophanes.
as the poiētēs at 633, 644, 649 and 654. In this case, the question is whether this didaskalos/poiētēs is Aristophanes or Callistratus.

Those modern scholars who believe that it was Aristophanes who was attacked by Cleon and who was subsequently defended in this parabasis appear to be on very firm ground simply because it is natural to suppose that the majority of the audience would have immediately identified him as the poiētēs; his authorship of the Babylonians must have emerged during the proceedings which followed the play even if there had been some secrecy about the matter before. Consequently, the audience watching the Acharnians would have been aware of his collaboration with Callistratus in the preceding year and must have known that he had also written the play before them. This is partially confirmed by lines in the parabasis of the Knights which show that the fact that Aristophanes was the author of the Acharnians was public knowledge well before the beginning of 424 B.C. In this play which was produced at the Lenaea of that year, the chorus, speaking for the poet, allude to the interest which has been aroused by his relationship with Callistratus. The discussion of this and the reasons which are

1 This is a very controversial question and depends upon the exact significance of Wasps 1016-22; see below, pp. 116ff. It is obvious in any case, however, that a man in Cleon's position would have had no difficulty in ascertaining the identity of the real author of the play.

2 Knights 512-14.
given for it take up all of the ananaestes so they cannot have been a 'late insertion' into the play, but they must have been written at some point in 425. It is quite likely in fact that the parabasis is a rejoinder to other playwrights who had mocked Aristophanes for toiling on behalf of others.\(^1\) If so, this could only have been in plays performed at the festivals of 425 or even of 426, which would further antedate public knowledge of the real facts. The view that the audience could not have known of Aristophanes' identity while they were attending the performance of the *Acharnians* is certainly wrong, and it is based upon a misinterpretation of *Wasps* 1016-22, which only indicate that Callistratus enjoyed official recognition as the producer of the play.\(^2\)

Moreover, once it is accepted that the spectators would probably have automatically identified Aristophanes as the poiētēs of the parabasis, didaskalos in *Ach*. 628 presents no real difficulty since the two nouns were apparently interchangeable in Aristophanes' usage.\(^3\) The words didaskalos and didaskein when used in a dramatic or

---

1 See below, pp. 141ff. , where this explanation of the parabasis is developed. It has been noted earlier (p. 52-3) that Aristonymus, Sannyrio, Amīnias and Plato Comicus had all made this joke and that the *Vita* states that Aristonymus and Amīnias had done so with reference to his first plays.

2 See below, pp. 116ff.

3 Cf. *Knights* 507 and 509, *Peace* 734 and 737, and especially *Thesm.* 30 and 88, where Agathon is called first a θραγῳδοποιός , then a θραγῳδοδιδάσκαλος .
dithyrambic context were originally associated with teaching or training the chorus. In early times this function was performed by the poet himself who, because of this secondary activity, was regularly designated the didaskalos.\(^1\) It was only at the end of the fifth century and at the beginning of the fourth with the emergence of 'literary' dramatic writers who did not concern themselves with stage-management, and with the production of old plays becoming a regular feature of the festivals that poetic composition and producing commonly became separate. At this point the word didaskalos which had originally been confined to the poet was naturally applied to the producer or chorus-trainer,\(^2\) and as Aristophanes' career belonged to and may indeed have initiated this transition-period

---


2 Demosthenes (xxi.17) calls the trainer whom he hired for his chorus a didaskalos; cf. Xen. *Mem.* iii.4.3. The hypodidaskalos is mentioned by Plato (*Ion* 536d) along with the didaskalos, so he is not to be confused with the latter whom he apparently assisted. Photius (s.v. ὑποdidaskαλος) specifically naming Aristophanes does say that the poet was the didaskalos, and the chorus-trainer the hypodidaskalos. However, if this is not a lexicographical deduction, it would appear to mean that when Aristophanes produced his own plays, he employed a hypodidaskalos for the routine part of his work.
ambiguity sometimes resulted.\(^1\) Thus, although Callistratus was the official didaskalos of the Acharnians, Aristophanes could use the word in its non-technical sense as a synonym of poïētēs to refer to himself.

In the light of this, it seems highly likely that Aristophanes is the didaskalos/poïētēs of the parabasis. It could only be Callistratus if it was a convention in Comedy that personal allusions to 'the poet' could refer to the man in whose name the work was produced. This possibility, however, cannot be dismissed out of hand,\(^2\) and the language which Aristophanes uses in the parabasis of the _Wasps_ seems to make it clear that officially Callistratus ranked not only as the producer of the early plays of Aristophanes but also as their author:

\[
\text{μέμψασθαι γὰρ τοῖς θεάταις ὁ ποιητὴς νῦν ἐπιθυμεῖ...}
\]

\[
\text{ὁ δὲ ἰσόμεται γὰρ φησὶν πρῶτος πόλεμοὺς ἐν πεποιημένοις...}
\]

\[
\text{τὰ μὲν οὐ φανερῶς ἄλλ' ἐπικούριον κρύβολην ἐτέροις ποιήσαι... μημεσομεν...}
\]

\[
\text{τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν καὶ σιάνοιαν...}
\]

---

1. The lexicographers and grammarians usually attempted to preserve the distinction between authors and producers by using such expressions as ἐπίθυμη ὁ καλλιστράτου (Ach. Hyp. 1.32), or by mentioning the name of the playwright when using ἐπιθυμή of the producer (see Suid. s.v. Ἐσπάνη). The verb is also used of the poet when he brought out his work through another man, but usually with ἐπὶ followed by the latter's name. See, however, schol. Ach. 378: Τῶν βαβυλωνίων λέγετο τοὺς γὰρ πρὸ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπιθυμή.

2. Dover, Clouds, xix, appears to exaggerate in maintaining that 'It may well have been a convention that the Chorus in the parabasis should speak of the didaskalos of the play as if he were also the poïētēs (whether he was or not).'}
Here Aristophanes is describing his career before 422 as falling into two parts: before the Knights he had spoken through the lips of 'other poets', i.e. Callistratus and Philonides; the Knights itself he had produced in his own name. In the case of the Acharnians at least, the words où φανερῶς and κρύβον as well as the imagery of ventriloquism cannot be pushed too hard. They must be interpreted not as meaning that his authorship of the play was hidden from the theatre-going public (which has been shown to be impossible), but rather that officially, in the eyes of the State, Callistratus was its author. If they are to be taken at all literally, they must mean that Aristophanes is referring not so much to the Acharnians but to the Banqueters and the Babylonians when the circumstances may well have been different. If he had not yet been enrolled as a citizen when they were produced and consequently was not a citizen when he brought out his other plays.

1 Wasps 1016-22.

2 Since Callistratus is known to have produced the Banqueters, Babylonians and Acharnians this may mean that Philonides had brought out one of Aristophanes' lost plays before the Lenaea of 424. Alternatively, there may be an anachronistic reference to the Clouds; see below, pp. 423-4.

3 The poet cannot possibly give a complete summary of his career in seven lines; instead he may be making a broad distinction between the Knights which he brought out in his own name and his other plays.
ineligible to compete in his own name at this stage, temporarily it may have been necessary to preserve the fiction that Callistratus was the author of these plays. The latter was a poet himself and it is wrong to assume that it was common practice for playwrights to bring out their works through other men at this date although it certainly became quite customary later. Apart from Aristophanes himself, the only fifth-century comic playwright who is reliably stated to have done so appears to be Eupolis who in 420 brought out his Autolycus under the name of Demostratus. Plato Comicus is reported by the grammarians to have sold his plays to other men who brought them out as their own, but the evidence for this is suspect, and in any case he was (like Eupolis) a contemporary of Aristophanes. If Aristophanes was breaking new ground at the beginning of his career, this would explain why his

1 Clouds 530-1 indicate that he was still a minor in 427 and was thus prevented by law or tradition from producing the Banqueters himself. It is quite possible that Aristophanes was in the same position in 426; see below, pp. 133ff.

2 This is proved by poiētais in Wasps 1018 which must refer to Callistratus and Philonides. Although Callistratus is never explicitly named as a playwright in the ancient sources, Suidas (s.v. φιλόνιδος) describes Philonides as a κωνικὸς ἀριστοκρατος and names three of his plays: Κοθόρες, Ἀρινής, φιλοταραπος. Some fragments of the first of these have survived.

3 Athen. v.216d.

4 See Meineke, i.161-3; Norwood, Greek Comedy 166.

5 Suidas (s.v. Ἀριστοφάνης) says that he was a contemporary of Aristophanes; other authorities wrongly assign him entirely to Middle Comedy.
reliance upon Callistratus and Philonides was such a source of humor to the other playwrights, and an audience unfamiliar with the practice may have assumed that Callistratus was the author of these early works until the proceedings after the Babylonians illuminated the situation.

Even if this were the case, however, it is doubtful whether the secret could have been religiously kept. Aristophanes would probably have attended the rehearsals and generally helped in the preparation of his first plays,¹ and it is difficult to believe that the majority of those in the theatre had been under the impression that they were watching plays written by Callistratus, only to find when the works were published and circulated that they had been totally deceived. Still, whatever element of secrecy was involved, the main point seems clear: Callistratus must have borne the overall responsibility for these early works or the language used at Wasps 1016-22 would be totally inexplicable. Knights 512-13 confirm that at the beginning of Aristophanes' career it was Callistratus who applied to the archon for a chorus,² and the language employed at Clouds 530-1 indicates that in these cases the producer assumed responsibility for the

¹ See Croiset, 48-9.

² The phrase choron aitein which is used in Knights 513 refers to the formal application for permission to compete. When the archon made his choice he was said 'to give a chorus' (choron didonal); cf. Arist. Poet. 1449b, Suid. s.v. χορευτής.
plays. One would tend to expect that the prize should be awarded to the man in whose name the play had been produced,¹ and some confirmation of this is provided by the jokes which other comic playwrights levelled against Aristophanes. The sallies of Plato, Aristonymus, Amipsias and Sannyrio who taunted him for laboring like Heracles on behalf of others would seem to have been pointless if he had been granted the prize himself.

This official responsibility of Callistratus is important, particularly because it makes it more difficult to envisage how Cleon could have made a direct legal attack upon Aristophanes because of the Babylonians, and it is strongly supported by the epigraphical evidence.² Of the dramatic records which have survived in fragmentary form, the Fasti (IGii² 2318) is crucial here. This fourth century inscription must be derived from the State records and it lists (among much other information) the names of the victorious comic poets for each year. The names of the individual poets are followed by the verb edidaske and one fragment states that in the year 387 Araros edidaske. It is virtually certain that Araros was competing with a play of Aristophanes, his father, on this occasion, so it seems to follow logically that when Callistratus produced the


² For more detail on what follows, see below, App. C. It is argued there that the other records are irrelevant in this context.
Acharnians in 425 the relevant entry in the records was Kallistratos edidaske.

On this basis, therefore, the situation regarding Cleon's attack seems inconclusive. The audience watching the Acharnians, who knew what had happened in 426, would have had no difficulty in identifying the didaskalos/poietês of the parabasis as Aristophanes (whom they knew to be its author), or as Callistratus, if it was a convention that the chorus could refer to the 'official author' as the poietês. It has been emphasized that the former identification seems much more likely, but there remains the problem how Cleon could have attacked Aristophanes who apparently did not bear the responsibility for producing the Babylonians.

The only specific details about the charge(s) found in the ancient sources are provided by the two Lives which both state that Cleon brought a graphê xenias against Aristophanes, by the scholium to Wasps 1284 which appears to indicate that Cleon resorted to eisangelia against Callistratus and by the following scholium to Ach. 378: τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους λέγει τούτους γὰρ πρὸ τῶν Ἀχαρνῶν Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδιδαχέων ἐν ὀÏς πολλῶς κακῶς εἶπεν. ἐκμισθησεν γὰρ τὰς τῆς κληρωμᾶς καὶ χειροτονήσας ὀρθάς, καὶ Κλέωνα, παρόντων τῶν μὲν ἑλένων. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁργισθεὶς ὁ Κλέων ἐγράφατο αὐτὸν ἀδικίας ἐπὶ τοῦ πολιτᾶς ἐις εἰς ὑβρίν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς ταύτα πεποίητον καὶ ἑλένως δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγράφατο καὶ εἰς ἁγῶν ἐνέβαλεν.

This appears at first sight to be authoritative, but there
is no evidence that a graphē adikias existed in the Athenian legal code.\footnote{R.J. Bonner and G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, U. of Chicago P., 1930-8, ii.6. A considerable number of different graphai are known; see the Index to J.H. Lirisius, Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren, Leipzig, 1905-15, 994-5, s.v. \textit{γραφὴ ἀδίκια}. It has sometimes been suggested that adikia should be read for adikias in the scholiast, but a graphē adikias was employed against officials for misuse of authority; see Lirisius, 380ff.} The charge of adikia is extremely general and the very early 'decree of Cannonus' conferred jurisdiction on the ecclesia \textit{ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἱστορίας ἀδικίας}.\footnote{Xer. Hell. 1.7.20.} Later, different graphai and dikai were instituted which specified the adikia involved,\footnote{See in general, Bonner and Smith, supra cit. ii.1ff., 205ff.} but these came before the lawcourts while Ach. 378-9 clearly refers to an appearance before the Boule. It is just possible that the scholiast to Ach. 378 has used the technical term egransato in a non-technical sense meaning that Cleon employed an eisangelia which could have come before the Boule,\footnote{For the confusion and overlapping in Athenian legal terminology, see Rhodes, AB 162 n.1, 170 n.1. If this did happen, a case of similar looseness in language may perhaps be seen in Plut. Them. 23.1. The prosecutor of Themistocles is described by Plutarch as \textit{γραφής ἀντίκαρος}, while in the Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense (s.v. \textit{ἐγγυησια} ) the 'trial' is regarded as an eisangelia.} but there is nothing to indicate that this is the case. The details which he provides about the graphē adikias are suspicious in that they could all easily have been derived from the allusions to the incident in the
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The other hand, his final statement that Cleon brought a graphē xenias against Aristophanes harmonizes with the testimony of the two Lives and could not have been deduced so readily from the text of the play.

There is some unanimity in that three authorities state that Cleon brought a graphē xenias against Aristophanes, but against this must be set the fact that the language of the Acharnians shows that Cleon's action was not only politically motivated but political in nature. The first reference to it in the speech which is delivered out of character by Dicaeopolis at 377-82 only indicates that a process had taken place before the Boule. It is possible that the preceding lines (375-6) in which Dicaeopolis reflects that he knows the minds τῶν γερόντων, who 'look for nothing' except θηφησομεν are also spoken undramatically. If so, it means that the defendant also appeared in a lawcourt since although any citizen over thirty years of age was eligible to become a dicast, the office was generally sought by older citizens whom Aristophanes constantly designates γερόντες or πρεσβύτεροι. This must remain conjectural, however, since it is equally possible

1 For the graphē adikias itself, see the repetition of δίκαιος at Ach. 501, 645, 655, 661; for εἰς ὑβρίν τῶν δήμων, see Ach. 631: τὸν δήμον καθυβρίζει; for the mention of the Council, see Ach. 379.

2 A.P. 63.3, Dem. xxiv.150.

3 See below, p. 314.
that Dicaeopolis is here making a general observation on his own plight, in which case oi γέροντες are the chorus of Acharnians.

The second allusion to the incident (500-8), again made undramatically by Dicaeopolis, shows its political nature. It reveals that the performance of the Babylonians at the Dionysia in the presence of members of the allied cities had made the offence, in Cleon's eyes at least, more serious, and that one of the charges which Cleon had made was that the play had 'slandered the State'.

This latter point is confirmed by the final treatment of the affair in the anapaests (628-58). This lengthy defence of 'poet' and play makes it clear that two issues had been involved in the proceedings: the harm done to the City by the Babylonians and the 'poet's' connection with Aegina. While it is not explicitly stated that Aegina was involved, it is plain that it must have entered into the picture in some way. Aristophanes introduces the reference to Aegina with the statement that the Spartans are proposing peace and asking for the return of the island, not because they care about it but so that they may get their hands on the 'poet'. It is possible that the Lacedaemonians had made a specific peace-offer in 426 with proposals based on a return to the Thirty Years' Peace

---

1 Ach. 502-3.
2 Ach. 630-1.
3 Ach. 652-5.
(which would have involved, among other things, the restitution of Aegira to the Aeginetans),¹ but there is no evidence for this. Thucydides does not mention any negotiations at this period and there may only have been as Gomme suggests, 'some unofficial 'kite-flying', much hinting of peace in Sparta and Corinth, with 'back to the Thirty Years' Peace' as a general basis rather than an embassy with specific proposals'.² It is quite possible that the whole thing is the product of Aristophanes' imagination, but even if one assumes that negotiations had recently taken place, the Athenian presence on Aegina could not have been the only issue involved. The reference in the Acharnians is obviously introduced specifically to enable Aristophanes to make a joke about the 'poet's' connection with the island. This, however, would have had no relevance in the context of the anapaests and above all it could not have been a matter of common knowledge to the audience unless it had recently been brought to their attention during Cleon's action after the Babylonians.

This reference to Aegina is the most specific item of biographical information in the play and it is final proof that the 'poet' of the parabasis must be Aristophanes,

---

¹ This is the view of Adcock in CAH v, 1940, 226-7, who thinks that the ephors took advantage of an earthquake to open negotiations. Busolt, GG iii.1079 n.5, theorizes about a peace-offer in the autumn after the Peloponnesian defeat in Amphipolochia.

² HCT ii.391. He links these with the return of Pleistoanax.
since it is clear that he had some links with the island. The Vita states that some authorities said that he was an Aeginetan and gives various reasons for this: the amount of time that he spent on the island, his ownership of property there or the fact that his father Philip was an Aeginetan.\footnote{Düübner, Proleg. xi.31-5.} The scholium to Ach. 653 also states that he had \( \text{xýmía} \) there, but the scholiast on Plato's Apology 19c, quoting Theogenes as his authority, says that Aristophanes was a cleruch on the island\footnote{Düübner, Proleg. xiii.19-20 = FGH 300 F 2.} and the same information is provided by a corrupt scholium to Ach. 654. It is impossible for Aristophanes himself to have been a cleruch because of his youth, so it seems likely that this is a surmise made by Theogenes, and (perhaps independently) by the scholiast who knew that he had some connections with Aegina and that Athens had sent 'settlers' there in the first year of the war,\footnote{Thuc. ii.27.} and simply combined the two facts.\footnote{It is not certain that these settlers were cleruchs. In ATL iii.285 nn. 45, 46, the authors argue that there was a clear distinction between \( \text{aroikoi} \) and \( \text{klēsouchoi} \), and that these settlers whom Thucydides describes as \( \text{epoikoi} \) and \( \text{okêtores} \) were in fact \( \text{aroikoi} \). Brunt, Ancient Society and Institutions, Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday, Oxford, 1966, 71-87 argues that this precision can not be found in the historian's language and also against the assumption that Athenian settlers abroad in the fifth century lost their Athenian citizenship unless they were technically cleruchs.} Perhaps Philip, Aristophanes' father, was one of those who went to the island in 431, or the family may conceivably...
have possessed estates there which, as Athenian citizens, they were allowed to retain after the expulsion of its inhabitants. Alternatively, either Aristophanes' father or his mother might have had some Aeginétan blood in their veins. Herodotus describes how much earlier important families from Aegina had settled in Attica¹ and this could explain the fact that Aristophanes was an Aeginetan name.² Nothing can be deduced from the implication in Ach. 652-5 that the poet would be lost along with the island if Athens gave it up as this would be a fair assumption in Comedy whatever the exact circumstances were.³ It is unfortunate that these cannot be established, but at least it is well attested that Aristophanes had a connection of some sort with the island and must therefore be the 'poet'  

---

¹ Hdt. vi.90.  
² Pindar celebrates the victory of the Aeginetan Aristoclides, the son of an Aristophanes, in Nem. iii. It was also naturally a well-known Athenian name; see Davies, APF 63-6. If the anecdote that Aristophanes jokingly quoted lines from Homer when his claims to citizenship were queried is authentic (see below, p.169), this would seem to indicate that it was the status of his father which was in question. Van-Leeuwen, Mnem. xvi 1888, 273, has speculated that Philip was one of these Aeginetans who, according to Herodotus, care to Attica and that it was these who returned to the island in 431, but this is totally without foundation.  
³ See Rennie, n. ad loc., who, however, wrongly insists that the 'poet' must be Callistratus; cf. Gomme, HCT ii. 391.
of the anapaests.\(^1\)

Accordingly, if (as seems certain), Aristophanes' links with Aegina entered into the proceedings which followed the Babylonians, the natural inference is that they afforded some grounds for disputing his claim to Athenian citizenship. This seems to tie in with the testimony of the two Lives and of the scholium to Ach. 378 that Cleon brought a *graphē xenias* against him. Equally, the appearance of the 'defendant' before the Boule taken in conjunction with the strong defence in the Acharnians against the apparent accusation that the Babylonians had harmed the State has led many modern scholars to the conclusion that Cleon resorted to an eisangelia. The lexicographers' definitions of this procedure differ in certain respects and its exact nature and scope at the time when the Babylonians was performed is uncertain.\(^2\) The important point is whether it was limited to certain specific

---

1 The only ancient authority who states that Callistratus had any links with Aegina is a scholiast on Ach. 654, who maintains that 'nobody has reported that Aristophanes had any possessions on Aegina, but these things seem to be said about Callistratus who became a cleruch in Aegina after the expulsion of the Aeginetans by the Athenians.' The first statement of this scholiast is demonstrably wrong and the second is almost certainly an inference from the text. If Callistratus went to the island in 431 he could scarcely have been in Athens for periods long enough to produce Aristophanes' plays on a regular basis during the Archidamian War.

offences or whether it could be employed against ἄγορα ἄμες ἀδικήματα, into which category the production of the Babylonians might have fallen. 1 According to the Athenaios Politeia, Solon instituted eisangelia to enable the Areopagus to try τοὺς ἑπὶ καταλύει τῶν ἄμες συνετριμένους, 2 and if this is correct his purpose was simply to provide a means for dealing with attempts to undermine his reforms or to establish a tyranny. 3 The evidence for the fifth century is not conclusive, but it suggests that the scope of eisangelia was widened so that any major public offence was liable to be tried by this means. 4 It is very doubtful if there was a nomos eisangel-tikos specifying definite offences chargeable under the procedure until at least after the fall of the Four Hundred in 411, and in any case whenever the law was formulated, 5

1 In LRC Theophrastus is represented as saying that the procedure was only applied in certain specified cases, and Caecilius as stating that it was employed for dealing with new offences not listed in the legal code.

2 A.P. 4.4.

3 The source of this information in the A.P. is unknown and some scholars have queried it. See, however, Rhodes, AB 162, who notes that the careers of Cylon and Pisistratus show that tyranny was a real threat and that Solon's poems are evidence for his appreciation of the dangers of his time.

4 Bonner and Smith, op. cit. i.299ff., have assembled what they believe to be the fifth century cases, but it is not certain that all of these are eisangeliai.

5 The different theories about the date of the law are cited by Bonner and Smith, op. cit. i.302ff., Harrison, op. cit. 52-3. Rhodes, AB 164 n.1, argues against the rigidity of attempting to set a specific date for its enactment.
its purpose may have been to ensure the use of the pro-
cedure in certain cases not to limit it to definite
cfences.\footnote{This is suggested by Hyperides' complaints (iv.1-3) about the degeneration of \textit{eisangelia} into a method of dealing with minor crimes; see Bonner and Smith, op. cit. i.307.} Apparently, then, in the time of Aristophanes, \textit{eisangelia} could be employed against any acts which injured or threatened public stability, and it is known that at this date defendants were tried either by the Boule or the Ecclesia depending on the gravity of their offences.\footnote{For the transference of \textit{eisangelic} jurisdiction from the Areopagus to the Boule and Ecclesia, see Bonner and Smith, op. cit. i.290-300. They follow Lipsius in ascribing the change to Cleisthenes. Rhodes, \textit{AB} 199ff., believes that it was the work of Ephialtes. The Boule had the power of imposing a fine of up to five-hundred drachmas. If a case seemed to merit a heavier punishment, it had to be referred to the lawcourts or to the Assembly; see Hignett, \textit{2L0-l}; Harrison, op. cit. 56.} Presumably Cleon could have interpreted the production of the \textit{Babylonians} as an act prejudicial to the interests of the State and brought an \textit{eisangelia} before the Boule, although there is no known precedent for such an action.\footnote{The tradition that Cleon prosecuted Euripides for impiety betokens harassment of a rather different kind and in any case its authenticity is open to question; see above, p.31n.4. The closest analogy would seem to be the trial of the tragedian Phrynichus who was fined a thousand drachmas c. 493 for his Capture of Miletus. Herodotus, \textit{vi}.21.2, says that he was fined by 'Athenians', which probably means that he appeared before the Assembly. If this was an \textit{eisangelia}, the transference of jurisdiction from the Areopagus apparently must have been effected by this date. However, Rhodes, \textit{AB} 200, inclines to the view that his trial came before the people by 
\textit{ehesis} from the personal jurisdiction of an archon. See Sealey, \textit{CP} lix 1964, 18 = \textit{Essays in Greek Politics}, New York, 1967, 50-1.}

If he did so, however, it would seem that it must have
been against Callistratus. It is extremely doubtful whether the writing of the play could in itself have constituted an indictable offence and Aristophanes, as has been shown, was not responsible for its production. If an eisangelia was brought against Callistratus, it automatically follows that Dicaeopolis is speaking as his mouthpiece at Ach. 377ff., and 502-3, and he is probably the didaskalos of the parabasis. The poiētēs of the parabasis, however, must be Aristophanes (because he is the poet who would be lost if Aegina were handed over to the Spartans), and the defence of the Babylonians which is put into his mouth by the chorus would have to be interpreted as an answer to the 'slander' to which he was subjected in the course of Callistratus' appearance before the Boule.

This, while perhaps not impossible, would have been remarkably difficult for the audience to follow, even if Callistratus had taken the role of Dicaeopolis and there is no evidence for this. Moreover, it would still leave to be explained the reason for the reference to Aegina at 652-5 as well as the persistent tradition that Cleon brought a graphē xenias against Aristophanes.

It is perhaps just possible that Cleon simultaneously or in quick succession brought two actions, an

---

1 The statement in a scholium to Clouds 531 that Philoniades and Callistratus were actors is almost certainly based on a misunderstanding of such expressions as ἔδιδον δὲς Ἑλληνικής τὸν Ἐλληνικὴν (Philoniades), which were commonly used by the ancient commentators to show that a play had been brought cut in their names; see Rennie, ii; Haigh, The Attic Theatre, 59 n.2.
eisangelia against Callistratus for producing the Babylonians and a graphē xenias against Aristophanes on the grounds of his connection with Aegina. At first sight this seems plausible particularly because it is doubtful whether Cleon could have reached the poet in any other way. Yet despite the weight of the tradition behind the graphē xenias, there is good reason to doubt that it ever took place. There is another explanation which seems to fit the facts better and which does away with the necessity of postulating an eisangelia against Callistratus with the resultant confusion in the anapaests.

It is known that Aristophanes was an Athenian citizen, a member of the deme Cydathenaeon and of the tribe Pandionis. The Vita and Thomas Largister both state explicitly that he was a citizen and give the name of his father, his tribe and his deme. The Anonymus also attests his citizenship giving the name of his father, and the shorter Life which repeats this information adds the name of his deme. The unanimity of the ancient authorities

1 Schrader, Philologus xxxv 1877, 390ff., believes that Cleon attacked Callistratus with a graphē adikias and Aristophanes with a graphē xenias which had not come to court at the time of the performance of the Acharnians. He interprets Achar. 552-5 as an appeal for help addressed to the spectators.

2 Dübner, Proleg. xi.1-3, xv.1-3.

3 Dübner, Proleg. iii.47, xii.1-2.
ruts these facts beyond question, but it has not been established when his registration as a citizen which should have taken place at the turn of the year following his seventeenth (or conceivably eighteenth) birthday\(^2\) took place.

The exact date of Aristophanes' birth has been the subject of considerable speculation,\(^3\) but it is clear at any rate that he began writing comedies when he was extremely young. The scholium to Frogs 501 reads \(\sigma\chi\varepsilon\delta\omicron\) γαρ μειρακίσκες ἡν ἤστετο τῶν ἄγωνων and Thomas Magister states ἐν νέᾳ κομιδῇ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ηὐδοκήσασεν ἐν καμηθίασι.\(^4\)

The latter statement is too vague to be helpful but the scholiast's testimony does seem to narrow the range of possibilities for the year of the poet's birth, although the terms which were used to designate the different stages in youth and early manhood were necessarily flexible since

---

1 They have in fact been rejected by Van-Leeuwen, Μμεμ. xvi 1888, 270ff., Prælegomena ad Aristophanem, Leiden 1908, 176. He supposes that the ancient scholars based their statements on Λανσα 895 where they wrongly identified the Κωνικός Ἐκαθηρείσις as Aristophanes instead of Cleon, but this is a desperate hypothesis. The Aristophanes of Cydathenaion who is listed as one of the ἐπεντείου of Panticidas at the beginning of the fourth century (IGii2 865) may be the poet. V. Coulon, Aristophane (Jude' ed.) i. Paris, 1964, iii-iv, goes too far in accepting this without reservations.

2 For arguments that the age of majority was seventeen in the fifth century, see below, App. D.

3 The opinions of a number of different scholars are cited by R.G. Kent, CR xix 1905, 153.

4 Dübner, Præleg. xv. 4-5.
physical development varies with the individual.\(^1\) There was a clearly defined line of demarcation, albeit a legal one, between \textit{rāides} and \textit{andres} which is proved by the two different types of expression used to denote coming of age: \textit{δεκαμήνεσθαι, εἰς ἄνδρα, ἄνδρα γίνεσθαι, ἄνδρα εἴναι δομηματην}, and on the other hand \textit{ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ παιδῶν, ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐκ παιδῶν}.\(^2\) The term \textit{meirakiskos} which the scholiast to \textit{Frogs} 501 employs with reference to \textit{Aristophanes} at the beginning of his career was not commonly used, but, like the other diminutive \textit{meirakion}, it denoted the intermediary stage between boyhood and manhood.\(^3\) They were not legal terms and overlapped both the upper limits of \textit{rāis} and the lower limits of \textit{anēr} when these words were used in a legal sense. In the Hippocratic division of man's life into seven periods \textit{meirakion} comes third (between \textit{rāis} and \textit{meirakiskos}), denoting the age from fourteen to twenty-one,\(^4\) and this is probably an accurate enough representation of everyday usage. Plato describes Socrates when he was speaking to \textit{Alcibiades} who was still

\(^{1}\) See in general A.A. Bryant, \textit{HSCP} xviii 1907, 72-6.

\(^{2}\) For the sources, see W. Dittenberger, \textit{De enebeis Atticis}, Gottingen, 1863, 40; Lipsius, \textit{Das attische Recht}, 282-3 nn. 55, 57.

\(^{3}\) Cf. Xen. \textit{Symm.} iv.17: \textit{ἔπει οὕτωρ γε παῖς γίνεται}, καλὸς εὖών καὶ μειράκιων παῖς ἄνθρωπος καὶ πρεσβύτας; Plat. \textit{Theaet.} 173b: \textit{εἰς ἄνδρας ἐκ μειρακίων τέλευταν}. Bryant, \textit{op. cit.} 75, has pointed out that whenever the words \textit{rāis} and \textit{meirakion} are used together, the latter is always slightly older.

\(^{4}\) Poll. ii.4.
under twenty as counting back five years and saying ἀλλα μὴν τὸ γε πρὸ τεύτου παῦ ηρθα. 1 Taken literally, this means that fourteen or fifteen years of age constituted the upper limit of boyhood and that after this the boy became a meirakion. On the other hand, Aeschines uses the word in reference to a young man who has just come of age and must therefore have been at least seventeen years old, 2 while in one passage of Plutarch it means a youth under twenty-one. 3 If, therefore, the scholiast on the Frogs is correct in saying that Aristophanes was somewhere between fourteen and twenty-one years old when the Banqueters was produced in 427, theoretically he could have been born at any time between 449 and the beginning of 441.

More 'information' is provided by the short biography of the poet found in Suidas 4 and in the Codex Ambrosianus L 39 sup. which was published by Novati. 5 The crucial statement in Suidas reads as follows: κωρίκος, ὅς φιλίππου, γεγονὼς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶνεῖς κατὰ τὴν ἱ.δ' ὀλυμπιάδα. The date is obviously wrong as 01. 114 is 324-321, but the Ambrosian version reads γεγονὼς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶνεῖς.

---

1 Alc. i.110a.
2 i.22.
3 Brut. 27.
4 s.v. Αριστοφάνης = Dübner, Proleg. xiv.
5 Hermes xiv 1879, L61ff. As Novati remarked, the Life in the manuscript nihil aliud est nisi brevis illa vita quae in Suidae vulgo reperitur'.
κατὰ 96' ὀλυμπιάδα, and it seems very likely that ἰδ' in Suidas is merely a textual error for 96', i.e., Cl. 94 or 404-401. If γεγονός is understood here to refer to Aristophanes' ἄκμη, this means that his fortieth year fell in the 94th Olympiad and that his date of birth must be placed in 444/3. ¹

The year 404/3 for the poet's ἄκμη has been regarded with suspicion by many modern scholars. It is natural to suspect that it may have been reached by taking the end of the Peloponnesian War as an appropriate date, particularly since the poet's first production of a play in his own name in 424 could then mark his 'half-ἄκμη'. ² Yet while the phrase ἐν τῶι ἄγει which occurs in both notices also does not inspire confidence, there does seem reason to believe that 444/3 is the correct date of Aristophanes' birth even if it was arrived at fortuitously here.

When Athenian youths came of age they were not registered as citizens individually, immediately after their seventeenth (or eighteenth) birthdays, but in an

---

¹ See W. Schrifl, Gesch. d. griech. Lit. 1.iv.177 with n. 4. 444/3 seems to be the latest possible date as the Banqueters was produced in 427.

² See Kaibel, Ἱ. ii.971; Gelzer, BE Suppl. xii.1396; Jacoby, Anecd. Chronik, Berlin, 1902, 301.

³ J.T. Allen, Cal. Publ. CP xi.6, 143ff., believes that it should be connected with the theatrical competitions rather than the war, and more specifically with a second performance of the Frogs in 404.

⁴ Dem. xxx.15; see below, App. D.
annual ceremony which was held about the turn of the official year. The language which Aristophanes uses in the parabasis of the Clouds at 530-1 to describe the production of the Banqueters, certainly implies that he was still a minor early in 427:

καγώ, παρθίνις γάρ ἐτ' ἥν, κοῦκ ἐφιν πὼ μοι τεκεῖν,
ἐγέθην, παῖς ἵπτερα τίς λαβεῦς ἀνείλειο.

He seems to state here that he was unable to compete in his own name because of his youth, but there is no evidence that there was a statutory minimum age for producing plays, and Europolis, his contemporary, is reported to have brought out his first play in his own name when he was seventeen. The most natural explanation of Clouds 530-1 is that Aristophanes' name had not yet been enrolled on the citizen-register. It is not known whether the privilege of acting as a didaskalos was restricted by law to those who had attained their majority. Possibly the circumstance of a minor's wishing to compete had not been foreseen or was so rare that it was not deemed necessary to enact a specific prohibition against it. In any case,

---

1 Der. xxx.15; see below, App. E.

2 Suid. s.v. Εὔπολις. Much later Menander is said to have produced his first comedy while he was still an ephebe; see Anon. de Com. (Dübner, Proleg. iii.80-1) Ἡγιαστὴς 2323a also records that a poet brought out a comedy as an ephebe in 311. For the argument that this early start to Europolis' career may indicate that the age of majority was seventeen in the fifth century, and for the errors in the scholium to Clouds 530, see below, App. D.

3 See Coulon, Aristophane, ii; cf. Schmid, op. cit. 177.
the archons had the responsibility of deciding which poets should present their plays at the festivals and it appears unlikely that they would have entrusted the privilege to a boy who had not yet gained the other rights of citizenship.

If Aristophanes was still a minor when the Banqueters was performed, it is naturally possible that he was registered as a citizen some months later at the turn of 428/7. This would mean that he was born in 445/4 if the age of majority was seventeen, or in 446/5 if it was eighteen. In this case, however, Cleon who happened to be one of the members of his deme would have participated in his initial examination by his demesmen which was the first stage of the ἔκκινασια of new citizens, and presumably he must have agreed to his registration as a demesman and citizen. Accordingly, he could scarcely have brought a γραφη xenias against him after the Babylonians approximately nine months later. Not only would it have been an incredibly clumsy manoeuvre and too obviously politically motivated, but it is clear that the demesmen were to some extent held liable for the propriety of the proceedings when the young men were enrolled on their deme-lists.

1 Wasps 895 with schol.

2 The demesmen were under oath when they decided the 'fate' of the young applicants for citizenship (A.P. L2.1), and if the Council later judged that they were mistaken about their age they were fined (A.P. L2.2).
If Cleon did not bring a pranō̂ xenias against Aristophanes, the one possibility which would seem to explain the facts is that Aristophanes became eligible to be enrolled as a citizen not at the turn of 428/7 but at the turn of 427/6. His dokimasia would then have taken place a few months after the performance of the Babylonians, and it is tempting to think that it was Cleon's opposition to his enrolment as a citizen which caused the poet's difficulties. This would mean that he was born in 444/3 if the age of majority was seventeen, and although this should not be adduced as evidence to support any theory, it has been noted that L44/3 seems to be the birth date which is assigned to the poet in the Life contained in Suidas and in the Codex Ambrosianus.

If this date is correct Aristophanes must have been very young when he wrote his first play, but this is no real reason for rejecting it. Athenian dramatists generally seem to have started their careers at an early age, and it has been observed that Aristophanes' contemporary Eupolis is said to have been only seventeen when he acted as the producer of his own work. If Aristophanes was born at the very beginning of 444/3 he would only have been a few months short of his seventeenth birthday when the Banqueters was performed, and the plot of this play appears to show his interest in the education of the young at this time.

1 If the age of citizenship was eighteen in the fifth century, Aristophanes would have been born in 445/4.
The only modern scholar who seems to have tried to advance real arguments that the year of the poet’s birth should be placed much earlier than this is R.G. Kent who has tried to prove that he was born in 455/4.\(^1\) Kent’s thesis (which involves emendation of the numeral in the Ambrosian manuscript) is based on the fanciful scholium to Clouds 510. This wrongly states that thirty was the minimum age for a poet ‘to read a play in the theatre’, and adds that when he reached this age Aristophanes presented the Clouds in his own name. Kent is well aware of the scholiast’s errors, but assumes that he is referring to the Knights not to the Clouds, and that he had ‘learned from some source unknown to us that Aristophanes was thirty years old at the time of the production of the Knights and made up the rest of this story from this basis’. This is ingenious but highly implausible, and Kent’s further ‘general’ arguments to support his theory that Aristophanes was born approximately a decade before 444\(^2\) carry little weight in the face of the testimony of the ancient sources and Aristophanes’ own words in the

\(^1\) CR xix 1905, 153-5.

\(^2\) Among other things Kent stresses the significance of the apparent allusions to Aristophanes’ baldness at Knights 545-50, Peace 767-774, Clouds 540 and in various scholia. To these might be added Eurol. fr. 78, but as Dover, n. ad Clouds 540, observes, they need not mean more than that the poet had an ‘abnormally high hair-line’. One may suspect too that Aristophanes in the passages cited above is jokingly emphasizing that he is quite different from the young, long-haired Knights who served as the chorus in his play of 424.
Clouds.

There does not in fact appear to be any compelling reason to suppose that Aristophanes must have become a citizen before L26. Apart from Clouds 530-1, the only other occasions when he himself discusses his early career in a manner which is pertinent here are in the parabases of the Knights and Wasrs.¹ In the anapaests of the Wasrs which have been quoted and discussed earlier, the chorus in the name of the poet apparently allude to the secrecy which surrounded Aristophanes' early plays, and their words could well refer to the fact that he was a minor when the Banqueters and the Babylonians were performed. In this case his identity may have had to be kept an 'official secret' since he was ineligible to compete in his own name. In the parabasis of the Knights the chorus explain to the audience that their poet has never undertaken production before out of caution and modesty.² They preface this explanation which involves a long dissertation upon the difficulties of komöidodidaskalia and upon the treatment accorded to earlier playwrights with the statement that Aristophanes has ordered them to give this answer to a question which has perplexed many:

α' Ἐ θαυμάζειν ὃμων φησιν πολλοὶ σῶτῳ προσόντας καὶ βασιλεύον ὡς σώκτι πάλι. Ὑποίν οἰτοίν καθ' ἔσωτόν ᾦ ημᾶς ὑμῖν ἐκέλευε φράσαι τερ' τούτου.

¹ Knights 512ff., Wasrs 1016-22.
² Knights 511-5, 541-6.
³ Knights 512-4.
These lines certainly imply that the poet could have brought out a play in his own name before the *Knights* but they do not show that he could have done so at the Dionysia of 426. Logically, *πάλαι* is inappropriate since *Aristophanes* had written his first play only three years earlier and at *Clouds* 520-1 he says that it was impossible for him to compete personally then. His use of the word must be ironical; *προσόντας* and *βοσάνζευ* imply that the interrogators had approached a superior in a meddling manner, and just before this at 503-6, when the chorus bid the spectators to turn their attention to the anapaests, the words *καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ* are purposely emphasized:

||
|úμεις δ’ ἥμιν προσέχετε τὸν νῦν
|τοῖς ἀνωπάστοις.
|ἐπὶ παντοῖς ἡ Ἐ̈δή, Μοῦσσις
|περαθέντες καθ’ ἑαυτοῖς.

It seems clear that something about the public reaction to his exhibiting plays through Callistratus and Philcnides had annoyed *Aristophanes* and that he is ridiculing it with exagge ration. If he had been enrolled as a citizen at the turn of 427/6 there is no known reason why he should not have competed in his own name at the festivals of 425, and curiosity may have been aroused by the fact that he did not do so then. Alternatively, he may be reyling to the gibes of the other playwrights who had derided him for presenting his work through Callistratus and Philcnides. These jokes seem to have started at the very beginning of

1 See Neil, *n. ad Knights* 512-3.
his career although Clouds 530-1 indicate that he was prevented either by law or by tradition from competing at this stage. In his boastful rejoinder in which he emphasizes his caution and modesty, Aristophanes could jokingly be making a virtue out of the fact that he did not personally apply to the archon for a chorus earlier; in practice (as far as the Banqueters and the Babylonians were concerned), it may well have been impossible for him to have done so with any hope of success.

His own words in the three parabases strongly suggest that Aristophanes was still a minor at the beginning of 427 and harmonize reasonably well with the assumption that he achieved citizenship not in the course of that year but during 426. If his application was forwarded shortly after the Babylonians was performed and there were any grounds, however tenuous, for doubting his eligibility for citizenship it is difficult to believe that Cleon would not have taken advantage of the situation. This may well have been his only way of attacking the poet and he was apparently in a position to make trouble for him.

The fullest account of the dockimasia of new citizens is found in the Athenaion Politeia. Here it is stated that it involved in the first place an examination of each young Athenian by the members of his deme who decided under oath whether he had reached the legal age.

1 A.F. 42.
and ἐλεύθερος ἐστι καὶ γέγονεν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους. If their verdict was that he had not reached the legal age he returned to the ranks of the boys; if they decided that he was not ἐλεύθερος, he still had recourse to the courts. In the latter case, the demesmen delegated five of their number to act as prosecutors, and if the court found in their favor the appellant was sold as a slave. If, however, the court upheld his appeal, the demesmen were compelled to enroll him. Finally, the Council examined those who had been enrolled and if it judged that any of them were not of the required age it imposed a fine upon the demesmen who had registered them.

This account is extremely succinct. It passes over the whole procedure under which the cases of the applicants were initially presented, their duration, and the question whether a quorum of demesmen was mandatory. It does not explain if a candidate who was rejected by the demesmen because of his age had the right of appeal nor what happened to candidates rejected as not being eleutheroi who did not wish to exercise this right. It is also uncertain exactly what the Athenaion Politeia

1 A.F. 42.1.

2 Ibid. The stipulation that the youth γέγονεν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους is not mentioned in this second instance.
meant by eleutheros in this instance, but it seems to be a legitimate assumption, whether it means simply 'free' or 'of citizen birth', that a youth rejected by the demos because one of his parents was not an Athenian enjoyed the same rights of appeal as one rejected on the grounds that he was of slave extraction. Because of these uncertainties and lacunae in the account of the procedure, it is impossible to reconstruct the exact situation that Aristophanes would have faced if he did apply for citizenship at the turn of 427/6. Moreover, the Athenaios Politeia was written about one hundred years after this date, and the procedure itself may have undergone some minor changes in this time. Most notably, the reorganization, if not the actual institution of the enhēbia in the second half of the fourth century, may have meant some accompanying changes in this dokimasia which became a

1 Wyse, The Speeches of Isaeus, 281, believes that here and in other fourth-century cases eleutheros must be translated 'of citizen birth'. This would mean that the words ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου which are added to eleutheros earlier must either be pleonastic or (as Wyse suggests) 'born in lawful wedlock'; see Hignett, App. x, 343-7. This question is not of primary importance here, however, as there is nothing to suggest that Aristophanes' troubles arose from the fact that his parents were both Athenians who had never married.

2 See Harrison, op. cit. 206-7. It is difficult to believe, however, that such a candidate would also have been sold into slavery if his appeal failed.

3 There are a number of earlier references to this dokimasia in the craters but they do not shed any more light on the procedure; cf. Lys. x.1.31, xxii.1, xxvi.21, xxxii.9.

4 See below, App. D, r.473, n. 2.
rrerequisite for entry into it.\(^1\) Still, there is no reason to suppose that the basic structure of the examination was radically different in the fifth and fourth centuries. The date of its institution is unknown,\(^2\) but *Wasps* 576 shows that it existed during Aristophanes' lifetime. He represents the old jurors who form the chorus of the play as expressing their enjoyment at participating in the examination with these words:

\[ \text{παίδων τοίνυν δοκιμαζόμενων αίσθημα πάρεται θεάσθαι.} \]

This has been taken by some modern scholars as an example of the kind of minor difference which may have existed between the *dokimasiai* of the fifth and fourth centuries since the *Athenaion Politeia* represents the Boule as reviewing the age of the applicants.\(^3\) It is possible, however, that the dicasts in the *Wasps* are referring to appeals which came before them; the *Athenaion Politeia* does not say that candidates rejected by the demesmen because of their age had the right of appeal, but this may be another instance of the incompleteness of its

---

1 It is suggested below (App. D) that the age of majority may have been raised at the time of this reorganization.

2 Rhodes, *AB* 173, maintains that it 'is unlikely to have been a more recent creation than Cleisthenes' deme organization'. Ch. Félekidis, *Histoire de l'éphèbe attique des origines à 31 avant Jesus-Christ*, Paris, 1962, 82, believes that prior to this, new citizens were enrolled on the registers of the phratryes which were then replaced by those of the demes. See Hignett, 119-20.

3 *A.P.* L2.2.
account.¹ The Athenaios Politeia also does not mention the oath of allegiance which was taken by new citizens when their names were entered on the deme-lists,² but its relative antiquity is well attested. It certainly went back to the time of Aristophanes and in all probability to a much earlier period. Lycurgus spoke of the oath as one of the παλαιοί νόμοι ³ and Plutarch represents Alcibiades as invoking it.⁴ The text of the oath has been transmitted by Stobaeus and Pollux in what is basically the same form,⁵ and it has also been found engraved on a stele which was set up in Acharnae, probably in the second

1 Alternatively, Lipsius, op. cit. 264, may be correct in referring Wasrs 578 to the examination of orphans prior to their registration in a deme; Ps. Xen., Ath. Pol. 3-4, uses the phrase ornhanus dokirasi when describing the activity of the courts. W.K. Lacey, The Family in Ancient Greece, London, 1964, 85, suggests that if the members of a deme appealed to the courts against a fine imposed by the Bcule for registering an underage youth, the jurors would have had to inspect the young man for themselves to decide the case, and that Wasrs 578 refers to this.

2 It was certainly taken by the ephebes after the reorganization of the ephebia c. 335 (see below, App. D), and even before this it may have been generally called the ephebic oath (see Plut. Alc. 15.7, Dem. xix.303). This cannot be taken as evidence, however, that there was a highly developed ephebic organization before the second half of the fourth century; the word ἐφήβος had long been used in a general sense to designate youths who had recently reached puberty. Cf. C.A. Forbes, Greek Physical Education, New York, 1929, 123-4.

3 Lexcr. 75.

4 Alc. 15.7.

5 Stobaeus, Flor. xliii.48, Poll. viii.105-6. There are some variants in the texts and Stobaeus' version is superior.
half of the fourth century.¹ The oath-formula covers the three essential aspects of Athenian citizenship, the civic, military and religious, and its vocabulary and the names of its witnesses, appended in full only in the Acharnian version, also attest its antiquity. This indicates that the oath which new citizens took when they had completed their dokimasia had not changed in more than a hundred years and the same is probably essentially true of the dokimasia itself. It is a reasonable assumption that the examination of the youths by their demosmen concerning their age and legality of birth, certain rights of appeal in the case of adverse verdicts, and a final examination before the Council were the principal elements of the process in Aristophanes' time as they were later.

If then Aristophanes did apply for citizenship in 426 it would seem that Cleon was in a unique position to raise difficulties. Not only was he a member of Cydathe-naeon, Aristophanes' dene, which meant that he would have participated in his initial examination but it is very likely that he was also a member of the Boule of 426/5 before which the poet would probably have appeared in the

¹ L. Robert, Études épigraphiques et philologiques Paris, 1938, 293-316; Tcd 201. The stele also contains the 'oath' attributed to the Athenians before the battle of Plataea, the authenticity of which has been widely suspected. In an influential article C. Habicht, Hermès lxxxix 1961, 1-35, has suggested that this second oath and a number of Athenian decrees were invented in the fourth century as propaganda against Macedonia, but he recognizes that the 'ephebic oath' cannot be numbered amongst them and that its genuineness is not open to question.
final stage of his dokimasia. If this was the case, the most likely scenario seems to be the following: at the first examination by the demesmen Cleon opposed Aristophanes' enrollment on the grounds of his connection with Aegina and exerted sufficient influence to obtain his rejection. Aristophanes won his appeal in court over the opposition of Cleon and his henchmen but Cleon took advantage of his membership of the Boule for a display of rhetoric at the final examination, no doubt shifting his ground and proclaiming that the poet was unfit to take the oath of allegiance because of his unpatriotic behavior in writing the Babylonians. The details of this are naturally conjectural and other possibilities can be envisaged: Cleon may have been outvoted at the preliminary examination in the deme in which case the appeal to the lawcourts would obviously have been unnecessary, or in the fifth century the final dokimasia before the Boule may have been confined to doubtful cases. The Athenaion Politeia does intimate that the one specific function of the Boule at this final examination was to review the age of the applicants but this must be a description of general practice. No doubt in the vast majority of cases all that the Boule

---

1 See below, App. B.

2 Dem. lvii which is concerned with a diapsēphisis provides an illustration of the procedure of a deme-assembly, and it indicates that the demesmen were not always impartial on this sort of occasion.

3 The view of Bryant, HSCP xvii 1907, 77 n. 1.
could do was to decide from their physical appearance whether the youths had reached the age of majority; it was the demesmen who would be most familiar with their family backgrounds. If, however, a member of the Boule wished to raise objections to any candidate on other grounds, there is no conceivable reason why he could not have done so. Moreover, in the absence of any other obviously competent authority, it was probably the Boule which administered the oath of allegiance to the State and this would have given Cleon the opportunity of protesting against the poet's 'lack of patriotism'. In this case it is uncertain how effective his protest was. It is clear that Aristophanes was duly enrolled as a member of his deme and that he gained his citizenship but the relative caution that he displayed in the Acharnians and in his choice of subjects for representation at the Dionysia in the following years indicates that he had been frightened and possibly that he had agreed to some compromise about his future behavior.

1 Rhodes, Α 3173, suggests that the Boule may have been entitled to take notice of all criteria of citizenship.

2 After the reorganized of the enhebia in the second half of the fourth century, the oath may have been administered by the enhebic officers, the sōphronistai and kosmētai; see below, App. D.

3 Ach. 502-6, 515-6.

4 The Acharnians, Knights, Wasps and Lysistrata were presented at the domestic Lenaea, the Clouds, Peace and Birds at the Dionysia. At Ach. 502-6 Aristophanes specifically emphasizes that he is safe from Cleon's attacks because the Acharnians is being produced at the Lenaea.
Exactly what transpired before Aristophanes' registration as a citizen was completed can probably never be ascertained but this theory as a whole does seem to fit the known facts. Above all, it explains the discrepancy between the obviously political nature of Cleon's attacks and the persistent tradition that it was a graphē xenias which he brought against Aristophanes. This dokimasia would have given him a unique opportunity of making two quite disparate charges on the same occasion. The tradition of a graphē xenias could easily have arisen from Cleon's opposition to Aristophanes' enrollment in his deme, while a graphē proper seems impossible if Aristophanes was still a minor some nine months before the production of the Babylonians as Clouds 530-1 indicate. Yet the tradition that such a process did take place cannot be dismissed as completely lacking foundation. Apart from the explicit statements that Cleon brought this action in the two Lives and in the scholium to Ach. 378, there is the allusion to Aegina in Ach. 652-5 and the abundant testimony in the ancient authorities that he had some links with the island.

Moreover, there is evidence for further curious speculation about Aristophanes' birthplace. The Vita says that some authorities claimed that he was a Rhodian from Lindus and the second Life repeats this information.¹ Suidas also states this, adding that others said that he

¹ Dübner, Proleg. xi.30-1, Proleg. xii.16-7.
was from Camirus, others again that he was an Egyptian, while both Heliodorus and a scholium to Clouds also assert that he was an Egyptian. Obviously none of these statements are true, but they have a certain consistency and the question is why they should have been made at all. The most natural explanation is that once Cleon had questioned Aristophanes' eligibility for citizenship, other comic playwrights derived great humor from the situation. If they amused themselves (and their audiences) with these fanciful speculations about his birthplace, their speculations could well have been the ultimate source of the statements cited above. This is far more plausible than the alternative assumption that somehow these traditions arose independently and that they gave rise to the tradition of a graphē xenias. Suidas also states that some authorities claimed that Aristophanes was of slave extraction. This is a remarkable piece of information and it is difficult to envisage any explanation for it unless one

1 Suid. s.v. Ἀριστοφάνης. = Dübner, Proleg. xiv. 1-2.
2 Anud Athen. vi.220e.
3 Van Leeuwen, Πρεμ. xvi 1888, 266, emphasizing the rivalry which existed between Aristophanes and Eurolis, has seen mockery of the former as a foreigner in Eurol. fr. 357. Here the chorus apparently berate the audience for considering 'foreign poets' sophous in contrast to their domestic rivals. If this identification is correct, it naturally does not mean that Aristophanes was really of foreign birth as Van Leeuwen believed, but (presumably) that Eurolis was exploiting the comic possibilities of the situation. However, Kaibel, RE ii.972, favors the view that the reference is to Pindar and Simonides.
4 Dübner, Proleg. xiv.7.
of the comic playwrights had seized upon the fact that a primary purpose of the *dokimasia* was to ensure that new Athenians were *eleutheroi* and had jokingly claimed that Aristophanes' servile birth was the reason for his difficulties.

This theory that Cleon did not actually bring a *graphē xenias* against the poet but rather that he attempted to prevent his enrollment as a citizen is supported in fact by the language of the *Vita*. The biographer does state that a *graphē* took place but he says that Aristophanes was acquitted on the first charge and adds: *Debeferon δὲ καὶ τρίτον συνοφαντηθεὶς ἀπέφυγεν, καὶ ὀφθαλμὸι φανερῶς κατασταθεὶς πολίτης κατεκράτησε τῷ Κλέωνος.* This information has generally been dismissed as meaningless, since it is plainly impossible for Cleon to have brought three separate suits before the performance of the *Acharnians*, but it could well be a rather distorted reminiscence of the enrollment proceedings. The statement that three actions took place seems too specific to be the product of the biographer's imagination, but it could easily be derived from the three stages of the *dokimasia* through which Aristophanes had to pass, i.e. the initial examination before the demesmen, the appeal in the lawcourts, and the final examination by the Boule. Certainly the words καὶ ὀφθαλμὸι φανερῶς κατασταθεὶς πολίτης κατεκράτησε τῶν

---

1 Dübner, Proleg. xi.39-40. The second Life (Proleg. xii.2C) simply states: *Debeferon δὲ καὶ τρίτον συνοφαντηθεὶς ἀπέφυγεν.*
are much more appropriate to the poet's final registration as a citizen than to his surviving a graphē xenias.

Ultimately, however, this whole theory that Aristophanes' ἀδριάσια took place at the turn of 427/6, and that this gave Cleon the opportunity to make him answer for the Babylonians, can only be tested by establishing how well it harmonizes with the poet's own language in the Acharnians. It is true that there is only one direct reference in the play to his connection with Aegina which, if this is correct, must have made him vulnerable. If, however, the real reason for Cleon's action was not so much a conviction that the poet was ineligible for citizenship but anger at the political content of the Babylonians, it is natural that Aristophanes in his reply should concentrate on this. It would have been difficult for him in any case to have inserted into a comedy what must have been largely technical details about his parentage and about his family's connections with the island. These would have held little interest for the audience and any references to them would almost have to be allusive. When he does reply directly to the political charges it is interesting to note that he does not specifically attempt to prove that the Babylonians was not a dangerous play,

1 Ach. 652-5.

2 The significance of the name Dicaeopolis is discussed below, pp. 157-8.
as one might have expected if he had been formally indicted because of it. 1 Instead he contents himself with generalizations and expatiates about his services to Athens which fits in well enough with the hypothesis that the charge that Cleon had ta'ie before the Boule was that the poet was unworthy of citizenship.

The language which Aristophanes employs when he refers explicitly to the incident in the *Acharnians* 2 could certainly apply to a display of rhetoric directed against him by Cleon as a Councillor during his *dokimasia*. There is nothing which proves that Cleon must have actually impeached anyone. The verb *diaballein* which is consistently used in reference to the politician's action 3 does not indicate that a formal prosecution took place, and the only possible difficulty lies in the first allusion to the incident:

\[
\text{αὐτὸς τ᾽ ἐμετῶν ὑπὸ Κλέωνος ἀπάθου ἐπίστημα, διὰ τὴν πέρας κοιμωδίαν ἐισέκυσαν γὰρ μὲν ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον διέβαλε κἀ̂ γενὴ κατεγλώπτημεν. 4}
\]

Here the participle *eiselykas* does imply that Cleon took his victim before the Council and apparently it would not be strictly appropriate if the examination before the Council was a regular feature of the *dokimasia* for new

---

1 Starkie, n. ad 642 remarks upon this as a peculiarity.
2 *Ach.* 377-82, 502-6, 628ff.
3 *Ach.* 380, 502, 630.
4 *Ach.* 377-80.
citizens as the Athenian Politeia intimates. It has been suggested, however, that this examination may have been confined to doubtful cases, or those youths who had made successful appeals in the courts (against unfavorable decisions of their demesmen) may have appeared before the Boule separately from the rest. Otherwise it seems that the main body of new citizens whose registrations were undisputed would have had to await the courts' verdicts in these cases and the delay might have been intolerable. If this was the procedure and if Aristophanes was examined on his own by the Council, he could well be describing here his isolated position as he faced Cleon's denunciations. In any case Aristophanes is obviously intent on emphasizing Cleon's savagery, and the passage could easily be an example of Comic license. The participle eiselkusas is not too much of an exaggeration if this dokimasia before the Council was normally a formality for the young men before they took the oath of allegiance, but Aristophanes found himself being subjected to a violent diatribe from Cleon.

The 'political' charges of Cleon could well have been delivered then during the final stage of Aristophanes'

1 A.P. 42.2.
2 By Bryant; see above, p. 149, n. 3.
3 See below, App. E
4 Such an occurrence must naturally have been extremely rare and it would undoubtedly have aroused a great deal of public interest. This could be another reason why Aristophanes should focus attention on it in the Acharnians.
If the hypothesis outlined above is correct, the immediate cause of the poet's difficulties was his (or at least his family's) connection with Aegina. It is difficult to explain Ach. 652-5 adequately except by making this assumption, and the play contains other indications that this was the case. The name of the hero Dicaecrolis is generally taken to mean 'The Just Citizen', and it is quite appropriate for a character who claims throughout the comedy that he is totally patriotic. Aristophanes did not coin the name, however, for the adjective dikaecrolis had been used once before in its simpler and more straightforward meaning by Pindar in reference to Aegina. Therefore it would be a particularly apt choice for the name of the protagonist of the Acharnians if Aristophanes had just been made an Athenian citizen despite his links with the island. Through the name of his comic hero, himself the just citizen of the drama, the poet could triumphantly allude at once to his own connection with Aegina and to the fact that he was now a fully-fledged, patriotic,

---

1 See Starkie, n. ad Ach. 377; Murray, Aristophanes, 29; Schmid, Gesch. d. griech. Lit. 1.IV.224 n. 3. De Ste. Croix, 36L-5, has vehemently objected to this translation, urging that Dicaecrolis must be the 'Just City', but he does not take note of Bailey's observations in Greek Poetry and Life, 236-7. When compound words ending with -crois are applied to people, it is customary for the first element to 'govern' the second: cf. philorolis, piso-crois, anolis, orthorolis, hysirois. In this context dikacrolis should mean 'Just towards (in) the City', or 'Just Citizen'.

2 Pyth. viii.31.
Athenian citizen. 1 In one sense Dicaeopolis certainly represents the poet and it is quite possible that Aristophanes himself played the role. 2 The main reason for thinking this is of course the violation of the dramatic illusion and the use of the first person singular when Dicaeopolis recalls the event after the Babylonians at Ach. 377-82, 502-3. Even in the parabases of comedies it is comparatively rare to find the first person being employed in reference to the playwright who is usually designated the didaskalos or poïetēs, 3 and these speeches of Dicaeopolis are the only two certain examples of their kind in the dialogue of Greek Comedy. 4 The scholia on both passages suggest that the actor broke off and spoke

---

1 De Ste. Croix, 365, objects to Bailey's theory that Dicaeopolis' name would evoke Aegina on the grounds that there is nothing to indicate that the lines from Pindar were well-known in Athens. It seems quite possible, however, that Aristophanes is catering here to a desire among his audience, while the rest would pick up the allusion to his citizenship.

2 This idea has been tentatively advanced by a number of scholars before and most fully developed by Bailey, op. cit. 231-40.

3 The first person is used at Ach. 659-64, Peace 759-73; cf. Wasps 1234-31. The anapaests of the Clouds (518-62) are spoken in the first person. didaskalos is employed at Ach. 628, Peace 738; kō-ōidodidaskalos at Knights 507, Peace 737; poïetēs at Ach. 633, 644, 649, 654, Knights 509, 518.

4 It is wrong to assume with Rennie (n. ad Ach. 378) that a line or part of a line from the Periampēs of Plato Ccm. (fr. 107), which coincidentally also refers to a conflict with Cleon, is another clear instance of a break in the dramatic illusion. It could equally well have been delivered within the context of the play and there is no need to see a reference to the author here.
these lines in the person of the poet, but there is no
evident reason why the actor should not have been Aristo-
phanes himself. The Acharnians was performed at the
smaller festival, the Lenaea, which would have made it a
less nervous occasion for the poet if he was acting in a
comedy for the first time, and in earlier days poets
frequently acted in their own works. The method of selec-
tion of comic actors in the second half of the fifth
century is unknown, but Crates is said to have acted in
the plays of Cratinus and Pherecrates in those of Crates.
Aristophanes himself is reported to have played the part
of the Paphlagonian in the Knights by four ancient author-
ities although their accounts do not inspire much confi-
dence. The most detail is supplied in the Vita: οὐδ᾽ ἔν
πάντι σκηνοποιήν τολμήσατο το πρόσωπον αὐτόν (sc. τοῦ
Κλέωνος). σκεύασάς, δι᾽ ὑπερβολὴν φόβου. ἄτε δὴ τυραννὶ
όντες, μηδὲ μὴν ὑποκρίνασθαι τινος τολμᾶτος, δὲ ἔναν
ὁ Αριστοφάνης ὑπεκρίνατο, αὐτῶ το πρόσωπον μὴν ἀρέσ.
Bailey maintains that this story that no costumier dared
to make the mask so that Aristophanes had to smear his
face with red dye is too explicit and too gratuitous to

1 See in general 93-5.
2 Schol. Knights 537, Anc. de Com. (Dübner, Proleg. iii. 34-5).
3 Anc. de Cor. (Dübner, Proleg. iii. 38-9).
4 Dübner, Proleg. xi. 18-22; see also the second Life (Proleg. xii. 13-15), schol. Knights 230, Knights Hyp. 11.9-12.
have been invented, but the statement δ' έαυτῷ υπερήφανο is suspicious to say the least. Most modern scholars view this whole anecdote with scepticism, but there are some other indications that Aristophanes may have taken the role of Dicaeopolis in the Acharnians. At Knights 541-3 the chorus employ a nautical metaphor to describe the three stages through which he had 'graduated' in his dramatic career. The first of these is apparently the writing of plays, the last producing in his own name, but if these words are to be taken at all literally, a possible explanation of the intermediary stage seems to be that at some point before the Knights he had also acted in his own work. Moreover, if he did play the part of Dicaeopolis, Ach. 440-3 would gain considerably in meaning. After begging Euripides for the properties that went with the rags of Telephus Dicaeopolis concludes

δει γαρ με δίψαν πτωχον ειναι τιμεραν,
ειναι μν οσπερ ειμι φανεραν δε μη.
των μεν θεασα εισελθη μ' ος ειμι εγις,
tων δ' ου κρευτες ηλιθιον παρεσταναι.

The first two lines of this quotation are taken from the Telephus of Euripides, but the meaning of 442-3 is more obscure. The chorus are always fully aware of the identity of Dicaeopolis: they agree to his donning the effects of

1 Bailey, op. cit. 235-6.
2 See Haigh, The Attic Theatre, 228 and n. 4; Schmid, op. cit. 187 and n. 8; Gelzer, Re Suppl. xii.1423-4. It is natural to suspect that the tradition arose from Knights 230-2.
3 Schol. Ach. LLC.
Telephus at 386-92 and they immediately recognize him on his re-appearance before them at 490. The scholiast ad loc. believes that the lines constitute a general criticism of Euripides' management of his choruses, but his observations about the tragedian's technique, while sensible enough in themselves, have little relevance to the language of the comedy. The effect of 442 in particular is greatly enhanced if the audience knew that Aristophanes was taking the part of Dicaeopolis, but the chorus are assumed to be ignorant of it. 1

These arguments are very far from being conclusive, but the theory is attractive and even if Aristophanes did not play the role, it is clear that Dicaeopolis is his representative. His very name, 'The Just Citizen', would make this obvious to the spectators from the outset. This naturally is not to imply that Aristophanes means everything that his character says. The more serious part of the Acharnians ends with the parabasis, and henceforward

1 There is another possible reason for supposing that Aristophanes may have played the role. It is generally concluded that Lanachus must have been born by c. 470. He had a command on Pericles' Pontic expedition (Plut. Per. 20.1-2), which cannot be placed after 435 (see below, p. 200), and he was well on in years when he was chosen as one of the leaders of the Sicilian expedition in 415 (Plut. Aíc. 14.2). Yet at Aíc. 601-6 Dicaeopolis refers to him as if he were very young. Gomme, MOM iii.536-7, theorizes that 'there may be a remote and elaborate jest in Aristophanes (e.g. Lanachus playing the young man's part when nearing 50)'. If the youthful Aristophanes was acting the part of the aged Dicaeopolis, it would no doubt amuse the audience to hear him addressing the middle-aged Lanachus as if he was a mere boy.
the drama is mainly episodic and burlesque. Even in the first part of the play the serious element is interlaced with parodies and it is full of comic exaggeration; Dicaeopolis to a certain extent almost always retains his dramatic identity as a small Attic farmer, but here he does also serve as the poet's mouthpiece. This is proved not only by his two allusions to Cleon's attack, but by the opening words of his long speech criticising Athenian policy:

This identification of protagonist with playwright by the audience must be emphasized. The Pindaric echo in his name has already been shown to support the contention that Aristophanes had just been enrolled as a demesman and citizen despite Cleon's strenuous opposition, and there are other indications in the play that this is what had happened. Most notably, in the first half of the drama (where the audience would doubtless have been eagerly awaiting Aristophanes' response to Cleon's action), there is a peculiar emphasis upon demes and demesmen. This must

1 In the second part of the play, as Dover, Μaia N.S. xv 1963, 22, remarks, 'the dominant element in Dicaeopolis is a selfishness so pure that it exists only in fictional characters: he is the real hero of popular comedy, through whom the spectator vicariously escapes from duties and discomforts and commitments, and takes refuge in a world of fantasy.'

be intentional and one logical explanation is that Aristophanes is playing on the fact that he himself had recently become a fully-fledged demesman. If this were the case, almost any reference to demes would gain an immediate laugh from the audience, particularly if it was at all incongruous or if it occurred in lines spoken by Dicaeopolis (the poet's representative), and there are six such references before the end of the parabasis.

The early allusions to a deme are all made by Dicaeopolis. At the opening of the play when he soliloquizes about his misfortunes and compares the city unfavorably to his country home, he describes himself as

στυγην μὲν ἀέτω τὸν δ' ἐμὸν δήμον πολέων.1

In the Phallic song he joyfully welcomes Phales into his deme to celebrate the private peace which he has concluded:

Εἴκτω σέ έτει προσεύξον ἐστὶν ὁ δήμος ἔλθεν ἄσμενος.2

Finally, at 466 he introduces himself to Euripides with these words:

Δικαίοπολις καλεὶ σε Χοληστῆς, ἐγώ.

If they are taken individually, there is nothing exceptional in any of these three allusions. The word δήμον in the first is slightly peculiar as ὁ δήμος would more

---

1 Act. 33.
2 Act. 266-7.
naturally have been expected;¹ the supposition that a change of scene is involved in the second has troubled some commentators,² and there has been a certain amount of controversy over the exact pun in the last.³ Yet there is nothing really implausible in these lines. It could be coincidental that Dicaeopolis, alone of Aristophanes' small-farmer protagonists, is assigned a deme for which he professes his love and to which he (impossibly) returns to celebrate a private sacrifice. All of this certainly harmonizes well enough with his characterization in the play as a farmer angry at being cooped up in the city. It is equally true, however, that the audience would have derived great amusement from these lines if the poet had struggled for and finally achieved membership in his deme, particularly if Aristophanes or whoever played the part of Dicaeopolis had emphasized the appropriate word each time, turning to the audience as he did so.

Moreover, the other 'incongruous' allusions cannot be so readily explained except by this assumption. When his rural celebrations are interrupted by the chorus, Dicaeopolis is only able to command an audience from them.

---

1 According to the schol. ad loc., this line is taken from a tragedy, where démon must have meant 'people', so the change of context would have emphasized its new meaning.

2 Cf. Starkie, Excursus iv.

3 See Rennie, n. ad 406. There has been some fruitless speculation about the deme to which Dicaeopolis actually belonged.
holding their coal-basket hostage, and the Acharnians initially ranic:

\[ \text{εἵ} \, \text{άπωλέμεθο: \ ο} \, \text{λάρης δημοτής \ οῦ} \, \text{έστ \ ἐμός.} \]

Once Dicaeopolis has prevailed upon the chorus to make a truce, he reflects upon the narrowness of his hostage's escape:

\[ \text{όλιγου \ τ' \άπεθανον \ ἀνθρώπες \ Παρνηβίοι \ χαί \ τάτω \ διὰ \ τὴν \ \ αὐτοίποι \ τῶν \ δημοτῶν} \]

Both of these passages emphasize the highly peculiar representation of the larkos as a fellow demesman of the Acharnians, while the words \text{όλιγου τ' \άπεθανον} anticipate the language used by Dicaeopolis some thirty lines later to describe his sufferings at the hands of Cleon.\(^3\)

In the last of these three allusions the chorus in the strophe of the parabasis invoke their Muse and again represent it as a member of their deme. The construction of this song is peculiar and they conclude:

\[ \text{οὕτω σοφοῖς \ έλθη \ μέλος \ ἐυτοίου \ ἀγροικότερον \ ύσ \ \ εμι \ \ αρχαῖα \ τὸν \ \ δημότην.} \]

This triumphant ending is apparently designed to emphasize the words \text{τὸν \ δημότην}. The strophe follows immediately upon the defence of the poet in the anaestes and the ringing challenge to Cleon in the mnigos, which might well have made the invocation of the Muse as 'a demesman'

\[ \text{1 \ Ach. 333.} \]
\[ \text{2 \ Ach. 348-9.} \]
\[ \text{3 \ Ach. 381-2: \ \όλιγου \ πάνυ \ ἀπωλέμη}. \]
\[ \text{4 \ ach. 673-5.} \]
particularly striking to the audience.

In addition to these six explicit references to demes and demesmen it seems quite possible that on three occasions in the parabasis Aristophanes puns on the two meanings of Δημος when the chorus reply to the charges which Cleon has brought. At 626 they rejoice that the man (Dicaeopolis) is winning by his eloquence and τὸν Δήμον μεταφέιθε. A few lines later they say that their didaskalos wants them to reply to the accusation levelled against him that he makes fun of the city and τὸν Δήμον καθυβήζε. ¹ Finally, at 642 they claim that he has benefited the Athenians τοὺς Δημοσ ἐν τὰς πόλεσ ἔσχας ὡς Δημοκρατῶνται. As it stands, this boast virtually defies translation.² Comme inclines to the view that it means having shown 'what sort of democracies they are' or 'how the people are gulled by their popular leaders'.³ Rennie suggested 'how they are governed by your democracy', Starkie, 'how badly they were faring under a democracy'.⁴ It has been argued in the previous chapter that there is reason to think that the δημο- of δημοκρατῶνται is quiescent, and the use of the compound verb would plainly gain

¹ Ach. 630-2.
² H. Richards, CR xvii 1903, 7, believes that τοὺς Δημοσ should be read in 642 for τοὺς Δημοσ, and that it should be joined in construction to ἔσχα in the preceding line.
³ HCT iii.557-8.
⁴ nn. ad loc.
in effect if the theory developed above is correct.

This also applies to a number of other passages in the play. When Dicaeopolis expostulates with the prytaneis at 167-8 for their lack of concern at his suffering, ἐν τῇ πατρίς καὶ ταῦθ' ὑπ' ὄνδρῳ βαρβάρῳ, his words would hold a second meaning for the audience if they recalled what the poet had experienced during his examination by the Council, before he was granted his citizenship. A similar point can be made about the challenge to Cleon in the πνίγος:

These words would be particularly apt if Aristophanes had recently become a new citizen and the chorus, in his name, were vowing to be worthy of the obligations which citizenship entailed.

There is an obvious danger of reading too much into the language of the play but there are other lines which can be explained or which are more effective on this hypothesis. If Aristophanes did play the part of Dicaeopolis, special allusion may well be being made to the fact that the poet has now reached his age of majority and that legally he is no longer a ῥαῖς but an ἀνήρ, 2 in such

1 Ach. 659-64

2 For the different terms employing παιδεῖς and ἀνήρες which were used to denote coming of age, see above, p. 134.
Again, in the first two lines of the play, Dicaeopolis prefaces his recollection of the different pains and pleasures which he has experienced:

\[ "Οδὸς δὲ δέδημα τὴν ἐμαυτῶν καρδιὰν, ἡσθῆν ἕβαία, πάνυ ἕβαία, τεττάρα. \]

The numeral tettara has never been satisfactorily explained, since in its context after haia it must mean 'precisely four', but Dicaeopolis proceeds to enumerate only two 'pleasures'. It is tempting to think that the reference here is to the majority of four votes by which Aristophanes had won his appeal against his deme's decision in the lawcourts, or by which he had been confirmed as a citizen by the Poule. The verb daknein in the first line is sometimes used in a 'legal' sense,\(^3\) the discomfiture of Cleon is mentioned immediately afterwards as the first 'pleasure' which Dicaeopolis had experienced,\(^4\) and the audience must have been anticipating some reference to the incident at the very opening of the play.

---

1 Ach. 626.
2 Ach. 367.
3 Ach. 376: Ψφήσακεν; cf. Hermipp. fr. 46: Στράτευσ αἰθωνι  
κλέωνι.
4 Ach. 5-8.
These last points are obviously conjectural and if Aristophanes did struggle to obtain his citizenship, it is naturally not essential to assume that he made an appeal in the courts prior to his dokimasia by the Council. The reasons for thinking that he did are the references to three separate graphhai in the two Lives (which could be a reminiscence of the three stages in the enrollment proceedings), and the further statement in the Vita that he disarmed the jurors by quoting two lines from Homer.

The important point, however, is that the theory as a whole does seem to harmonize with Aristophanes' language in the Acharnians and it explains much of the testimony in the ancient sources. Moreover, the alternative to it would appear to involve either postulating a much earlier date of birth for the poet or entirely discarding the whole tradition of the grauchē xenias, and neither seems possible.

In addition to opposing Aristophanes' enrolment on the citizen-list, Cleon may have brought an eisangelia against Callistratus for producing the Babylonians, but there is no real reason to suppose that he did so. The only ancient authority who intimates that an eisangelia took place is the scholiast to Wsrs 1284 who says that

---

1 Dübner, Proleg. xi.35-5; Cd. A. 215-6.

2 If Aristophanes did not become a citizen until the turn of 427/6, he could not have been indicted immediately after the Babylonians. As a minor he would not have been liable to legal redress.
Callistratus was brought before the Council. Otherwise it is simply a deduction from the language of the Lacharrians which could well refer to Aristophanes' dokimasia before the Boule.

The passage in the Wasps on which this last scholiast comments is controversial:

This must refer to some conflict between Aristophanes and Cleon, but whether it was the one after the Babylonians or a later incident is uncertain. On balance, it seems more likely that the lines do refer to the proceedings of L26. The use of the imperfect εἶγον in 1284 indicates that the poet is not replying to current mockery and although it might be objected that the trouble in L26 would be too remote to warrant mentioning in L22, Aristophanes refers quite allusively to the production of the Banqueters four years previously in the parabasis of the Clouds. Moreover, if other comic playwrights had alluded to Cleon’s action in the meantime, this would have made the passage more topical for the audience. In any case it would have been difficult for Aristophanes to pass over completely his own

---

1 Wasps 1234-91.
2 Clouds 528-32.
earlier embarrassment in a play about the lawcourts which emphasized Cleon's propensity for litigation. If Cleon had tried to prevent him from being registered in his deme the designation of the politician as the κύριος Κυσάθνυατος earlier in the Ηάςπς would inevitably have recalled to the audience the events of 426 and made it virtually mandatory for the poet to make some allusion to them.

The exact meaning of the lines is notoriously obscure but if they do refer to the aftermath of the Babylonians, they tend to support the theory developed in this chapter in that they obviously refer to an actual confrontation and not to mere threats, and yet they do not contain any specifically judicial expressions. The 'reconciliation' which is mentioned in 1284 could be an allusion to the concessions which Aristophanes may have made during his dokimasia by the Boule, and the jest which the 'outsiders' were awaiting may refer to the lines from Homer which he is said to have quoted in court. The final proverb in 1291 is cryptic and two interpretations of it seem possible. It could mean that the Athenian people (the stake) had deceived Aristophanes (the vine), i.e. Aristophanes had not enjoyed the support which he had expected from his public who had been amused at his discomfiture. Alternatively, a more plausible interpretation is that Aristophanes (the stake) had deceived Cleon (the

1 Ηάςπς 895, 902.
2 See above, p. 150.
Cleon's Counter-Attack

vine), i.e. Cleon thought that he had imposed silence on the poet only to find that his adversary had deceived him. Once Aristophanes had been confirmed a citizen he may have felt immune against Cleon's attacks on this front and he clearly lost little time in renewing his personal attacks on the politician in the plays he presented at the domestic Lenaea, the 
Acharnians, Knights, and 

Wasps.

On the other hand, if 
vōv in 
Wasps 1291 is to be translated literally as 'now',¹ this would seem to indicate that Cleon, angered by the 
Knights, had made a fresh attack on the poet who had been compelled to make a 'truce' with him. In this case 
Wasps 1291 could either refer to Aristophanes' anarchy at his lack of support from the people in this new imbroglio, or (again more plausibly) to the fact that he was breaking this 'truce' with the production of the 
Wasps. If this did happen, nothing is known about the charge which Cleon brought or threatened to bring against the poet.² Some scholars have put forward the view that Cleon brought the 


graphē xenias which is attested in the two Lives and in the scholium to 
Ach. 378, after the

---

¹ MacDowell, n. ad 1284-91, insists upon this.

² Müller-Strübing, 508-9, reads 
Kai ἐκ νᾶ 
Kōklēs ἐνύι 

at 1286. He supposed that Cleon, the general of Pandionis (Aristophanes' tribe) in L24/3 had menaced the poet with a 


graphē astrateias which he withdrew when the latter made concessions about his future behavior. MacDowell, n. ad 1281-91, conjectures that Cleon attacked Aristophanes by an abusive speech and other unspecified methods, perhaps a legal prosecution or a threat of one', and that Aristophanes may have made some kind of public apology.
Knights, and that this is the incident alluded to in *Wasps* 1264c-2 cl. There is, however, absolutely no evidence to support this hypothesis and it is totally irreconcilable with the language used in the *Wasps*, which shows that an actual confrontation between poet and politician took place and that some compromise was reached. It is impossible to see how Cleon could have taken the case to court and then midway through the process suddenly withdrawn it. Van Leeuwen has indeed suggested that the *graphē xenias* was successful and that Aristophanes lost the rights of Athenian citizenship which he had usurped. He dismisses all the ancient testimony that Aristophanes was an Athenian by birth, a member of the deme Cydathenaeon and of the tribe Pandionis, arguing that his father Philip was an Aeginetan. The starting point for his hypothesis is the fact that throughout his life (apparently to a degree unique among the fifth-century comic playwrights), Aristophanes consistently produced his works through other men. According to Van Leeuwen, this was because he was a foreigner and consequently ineligible to compete in his own name. He assumes that Aristophanes in his elation at the success of the *Acharnians* was rash enough to present the *Knights* himself, thus giving Cleon an opportunity which he immediately seized.

---

This whole theory is plainly untenable. It does not fit the language of the Wasp\(^1\) and the assumptions which Van Leeuwen makes about Aristophanes' parentage are unfounded. Moreover, there is no evidence that the right of producing comedies was restricted to Athenians in the fifth century and in any case both Aristophanes and his sons acted as didaskaloι subsequently to the Knights.\(^2\) Van Leeuwen was right, however, to emphasize the fact that Aristophanes' reliance upon other producers was unusual at this date. The explanation may well be that as a minor he was ineligible to produce his first two plays in his own name and he was thus compelled to make an arrangement with Callistratus. One can speculate that he found this arrangement satisfactory as it enabled him to devote his time to writing, and that by choice he continued with it in \(L25\). His critics naturally charged that he was incapable of putting on a play himself, but he demolished these accusations with the highly successful production of the Knights in \(L24\) and thereafter commonly employed other producers for the remainder of his career, presumably because he was more interested in writing than in stage-

---

1 See Croiset, 92 n. 1.

2 Hyp. ii of the Peace and Hyp. iv of the Plutus (both of which Van Leeuwen emends) state that Aristophanes produced these two plays himself and he may have exhibited others. Schol. Clouds 510 indicates that he produced it in his own name. The scholium on Plato's Apology 19c (Dübbner, Proleg. xiii.14-6) says that of his three sons, Philip competed with the plays of Eubulus, and Araros with his own plays as well as with those of Aristophanes. For Araros, see also below, Arp. C.
If the theory which has been put forward in this chapter is correct, Cleon took prompt advantage of what he must have regarded as a heaven-sent opportunity a few months after the performance of the Babylonians. His apparent attempt to deny Aristophanes Athenian citizenship failed, but it seems that he was able to deliver a biting attack upon the young poet for his 'lack of patriotism', and perhaps he succeeded in compelling him to make public promises that he would not repeat his 'mistake', at least at the Dionysia. If Cleon had gained all his objectives, the consequences for the poet would have been very serious and the nature of the scattered abuse which Aristophanes directs against the politician in his next comedy, the Acharnians, clearly shows that he was now engaged in a personal feud. It will be argued in the following chapter, however, that the theme of this play proves that by 425 there were also deep political differences between the two men.
CHAPTER V

THE ACHARNIANS

The plot of the Acharnians which was produced at the Lenaea of 425 is dominated by one theme, the desirability of peace. The action revolves around Dicaeopolis who is introduced in the prologue as a man yearning for peace and soon achieves it. Frustrated by his fellow citizens who have refused travelling money to Amphitheus, the negotiator appointed by the gods to end the war, his protests are violent but futile. When he realizes that the Assembly is concerned solely with other matters which he considers nonsensical, he determines to arrange a private peace for himself and for his family and sends Amphitheus to Sparta in order to effect this. The latter soon returns, hotly pursued by the chorus of warlike Acharnians, offering Dicaeopolis a choice of treaties and he accepts the 'Thirty Years' variety. His celebrations are cut short by the entry of the Acharnians, but he finally prevails upon them to give him an audience and in a famous speech he argues that the detested Spartans are

1 Ach. 26-7, 32, 37-9.
2 Ach. 51-3.
3 Acharnae was the largest deme in Attica some seven miles to the northwest of the city; for its territory, see Wade-Gery in Mélanges Glotz, Paris, 1932, ii.885-6. The demesmen must have formed a colorful chorus; see Croiset, 55-6.
4 Ach. 194-9.
not entirely to blame for the outbreak of the war; that Pericles over-reacted to a minor incident with the Megarian decree, and that when the Athenians refused to repeal it, war began for a frivolous reason.\(^1\) His eloquence convinces half the chorus but the other half are only converted when Lamachus whom they invoke as their bellicose champion is worsted by Dicaeopolis' mockery. Finally, after the parabasis is delivered by the united chorus in praise of their poet, the remainder of the play is devoted to showing the material benefits which have accrued to Dicaeopolis because of his private treaty. These he proceeds to enjoy in splendid if somewhat selfish isolation.

The plot of the comedy is an impossible fantasy and can be viewed on different levels. Politically, however, the Acharnians looks remarkably like an anti-war play\(^2\) and until forty years ago it was accepted as such by most scholars. Some were disturbed by the seeming callousness and lack of patriotism evidenced by Dicaeopolis towards the end of the play once his private goal was attained, but the difficulties here are more apparent than real. In one way the Acharnians does fall into two halves separated by the parabasis, and, as is commonly the case with Aristophanes' plays, the second half is mainly episodic and burlesque. The two things which caused most

---

1 Ach. 496-556.

2 Cf. Ach. 1.30-2: τὸ δὲ ὅρμα τῶν ἐν σφάδα \(\text{περιοιμαζόμενων} \) καὶ ἑκ παντὸς τρόπου τὴν εὐρήνην προκαλοῦμενον.
Risgivings about the 'seriousness' of the drama and the consistency of Dicaeopolis' character are his refusal to share his peace with an anonymous farmer, and his exuberant enjoyment of material pleasures while Lamachus drags himself off to fight. To some extent Dicaeopolis does show a new side of his character here, but the plots of most Aristophanic comedies, however fantastic, are usually carried to a riotous conclusion with a certain logic. It was only after Dicaeopolis was thwarted in his attempts to interest his countrymen in peace that he embarked upon his private enterprise. It would destroy much of the humor of the situation if he suddenly decided to share his hard-won victory with others. Above all, the contrast between Dicaeopolis and his arch-foe Lamachus had to be maintained. The essential point is that the benefits of peace are vividly depicted in these iambic scenes after the para-basis, and they are applauded by the chorus, who, as zealous converts to the cause, denounce Polemos and invoke the blessings of Diallagē.

In 1938 Gomme first delivered a really frontal attack upon the 'obvious' and conventional interpretation.

1 Ach. 1018-36.
2 Ach. 1071-1142.
3 See above, p.162, n.1 where the comments of Dover, MAIA n.s. xv 1963, 22, are noted.
4 The bridegroom is an exception because of the obvious comic potential of the short scene in which he appears (1048-1068).
5 Ach. 971ff.
of the comedy in his powerful article in which he assailed the general trend of Aristophanic criticism. He devoted comparatively little attention to the *Acharnians*, but argued that it simply gave a 'probable' picture of Athens in L25, and that it is impossible to determine from the play whether Aristophanes himself was in favor of peace at that time. In Gomme's opinion the military situation of Athens when the *Acharnians* was written was exactly what 'would keep alive an intense fiery patriotism in the majority and a conviction that early peace was necessary in a few'. Accordingly, he took the *Acharnians* and *Lamachus* to be the representatives of the majority, Dicaeopolis to be the representative of the minority. As W.G. Forrest has observed, Gomme maintained that Aristophanes 'sets out two real or near-real views and then works out the humor in their opposition with no thoughts of any practical political implications'. It is possible to feel some reservations about Gomme's analysis of the Athenian mood in L25, but in any case while his first 'identification' may or may not be correct, his second is certainly a gross oversimplification. Dicaeopolis cannot be regarded as a mere

1 [CP lli 1938, 97-109, = MEGL 70-91.](#)

2 Gomme noted that Athens had not suffered any serious military setback in the five and more years of war, and he describes the annual invasions as 'a series of pin-pricks'.

3 *Phoenix* xvii 1963, 9-10.

4 See below, pp. 183ff., where the alternative view of Forrest is discussed.
symbol of the 'peace-movement'. De Ste. Croix has well emphasized that a main function of the long introductory scene in the play (1-173) 'is to establish Dicaeopolis as the one really sagacious man in Athens, who is shrewd enough to see through all deceptions, even when all those round him are being taken in', ¹ and his character is totally consistent at least before the parabasis. ² Moreover, and most importantly, his very name and the fact that Aristophanes in two separate passages which are unique in Old Comedy explicitly identifies him as his own mouthpiece show that here he is speaking for the poet. ³

The characterization of Dicaeopolis was ignored by Gomme, partly because his analysis of the Acharnians was so brief, but also (apparently) because one of his main objectives was to attack the widely held view that Aristophanes had a definite predilection for the old farmers who were the protagonists or choruses in so many of his early plays, and that he consistently championed the conservative

¹ De Ste. Croix, 365.
² See above, pp. 161-2. C.H. Whitman, Aristophanes and the Comic Hero, Harvard U.P., 1964, 64-5, argues that by having recourse to Euripides (Ach. 393-489), who represents the new rhetoric, Dicaeopolis 'allies himself with a whole series of figures who elsewhere are treated as incarnate powers of darkness, the spirits of ὑπάτηρα'. He concludes that 'Dicaeopolis becomes Telephus in his own right as comic hero, that is, a low character triumphant through ὑπάτηρα'. This is an obvious exaggeration and ignores the humor of the scenes involving Euripides. For the significance of the parody of the Telephus, see below, pp. 183ff.
³ Ach. 377-82, 502-3. On all of this, see above, pp. 158ff.
rural population against the urban proletariat.¹ This theory is plainly inadmissible and Gomme had little difficulty in demolishing it, in part by emphasizing that Aristophanes frequently represented the older generation and particularly the farmers as totally misguided. Why the poet should have presented these old Attic peasants on the stage and in the orchestra so frequently is uncertain, but it may be more than a coincidence that he did this mainly in the plays which were produced during the Archidamian War. When Aristophanes wrote his first play, the Banqueters, the country folk had on three occasions been compelled by the invasions to spend at least a month each campaigning season cooped up in the city.² Their presence in Athens for an extended period of time was a new phenomenon,³ and the interaction of the city-dwellers and peasants must have been interesting to say the least. This may well have given Aristophanes the idea of reflecting the new situation and of using the farmers as characters or choruses in his

¹ This interpretation of the comedies is most fully developed by Croiset, I-II.

² In 431, 430 and 428. In 429 the invasion did not take place (Thuc. ii.71.1). The invasion of 430 was the longest and lasted forty days (Thuc. ii.57.2). Thucydides does not specify the duration of those in 431 and 428, but he states that the Peloponnesians remained in Attica 'so long as their provisions lasted'. Gomme, HCT ii.252, estimates that in 428 they were in Attica 'some thirty to thirty-five days'.

³ Thucydides, ii.14.2, describes how difficult it was for the rural population to uproot themselves because most of them had always been accustomed to live in the country. He amplifies this at ii.16.1-2.
THE ACHARNIANS

comedies, particularly as many of the ways of the city
must have been alien to them. It clearly had the advantage
of enabling him to look at Athenian society through their
eyes when satirizing the notable individuals, institutions
and fashions of the city. As Gomme has well remarked,
Aristophanes was virtually bound to treat his foremost
character with a kind of personal sympathy and, given the
nature of Comedy which demands a 'happy ending', the
peasant-protagonist usually enjoyed some spectacular tri-
umph at the play's conclusion. It is clearly wrong, how-
ever, to argue from this that Aristophanes consistently
regarded him in any sense as 'the ideal Athenian'. There
is a world of difference between (e.g.) Dicaeopolis and
Strepsiades. The essential point which Gomme did not take
into account here is that each protagonist (and chorus)
must be regarded individually within the context of the
play in which he (or they) appear. In the case of

1 This is not to deny that Comedy had its roots in the
countryside, but Aristophanes was writing a long time after
its formative period. Croiset, 8-11, believes that his
love of the countryside indicates that he must have been
torn and reared outside the city, but he belonged to
Cydathenaeon, a city deme. Membership of a deme did not
necessarily mean residence there, but, as Gomme has noted,
there is no more reason to suppose that Aristophanes was
not born and brought up in Cydathenaeon than that Cleon
was not. Sterling Dow, AJA lxxiii 1969, 234-5, thinks
that a cult table of Heracles (IG ii² 2343) indicates that
the poet was intimate with a number of important members
of the deme. Ehrenberg, 92, states that 'it is both
strange and significant that Aristophanes, in spite of
his affection for them (sc. the peasants) says on the
whole less about the social situation of peasants than
of traders and craftsmen.'
Dicaeopolis, the man who loves Peace, there can be no
doubt that he is characterized as the only sane individual
in Athens and that he is the representative of the poet.

W.G. Forrest has also opposed the conventional
interpretation of the play but he takes a different line
from Gomme in maintaining 'more positively, that in Febru-
ary 425 when the Acharnians was produced Aristophanes was
not opposed to the Archidamian War'. Essentially, he
builds his case on trying to refute the significance of
the long speech which Dicaeopolis delivers to the Achar-
nians and in which he argues that Pericles was more to
blame for the outbreak of war than the Spartans. This
speech, Forrest claims, is the 'only solid argument for
the traditional view of the play, and since it is parody
from start to finish it cannot be taken seriously at any
level'. This is an evident exaggeration. There are at
least two, probably three, parodies contained in this
speech, the most important of which is the parody of the

1 Phoenix xvii 1963, 1-12.
2 He also draws analogies between the situation of Athens
in 426/5 and that of Britain during the Second World War,
but see De Ste. Croix, J70, who argues that the most
important of these is totally misleading, in that it
involves exaggeration of Athenian weakness.
3 Forrest, supra cit. 8-9.
Telephus of Euripides. Because of the preceding scene between Euripides and Dicaeopolis in which the latter borrowed rags and other accoutrements from the tragic poet, the audience would have had no difficulty in recognizing that the Telephus was being parodied. Euripides' play was produced thirteen years earlier in 438, however, and how close the parody is and how well the audience would have known the Telephus it is impossible to say. R. Harriot has noted that Aristophanes drew more heavily upon this play than any other, and that he parodied it as late as 405 in the Fugs. She puts forward a number of plausible explanations how a mass audience could have appreciated the wealth of Euripidean quotations, references and parodies in Aristophanes. However, she also emphasizes that while the cultural level, memory and perception of the Athenians must have been impressive by modern standards, detailed knowledge of a particular tragedy was in many cases unnecessary for enjoyment. Dover, adopting a

1 For this, see E.W. Handley and J. Rea, BICS Suppl. v 1957. Probably Telephus delivered a major speech to the Greek heroes in which he justified the part which he had played in the recent war. A scholium to Ach. 532 shows that a drinking song of Timocrecn is parodied at 533-4; see De Ste. Croix, 392, for a discussion of the text of both poets. The opening chapters of Herodotus' History also seem to be parodied at 542ff; see above, p. 88.

2 For the difficulties involved in reconstructing the Telephus, see Handley, op. cit. 18-39. It seems clear that Dicaeopolis used the garb and words of Telephus to defend both himself and the Spartans, and that he employed lines from different parts of the tragedy.

3 BICS ix 1962, 1-3.
more moderate approach than Forrest, has remarked that 'the parody of the Telephus diverts our attention away from the content of the argument towards the incongruous humor of parody', but whether Aristophanes intended to divert his audience's attention is another matter. R. Harriot believes that all the 'Telephus material' in the Acharnians is employed 'to get the audience in a receptive mood for Dicaeopolis' hometruths', and this theory is supported by the care with which the hero chooses his words and Aristophanes' evident fear of repercussions.

It is only if one considers the speech in isolation (as Forrest does), that it is possible to argue that its effect is totally lost because of the parodies it contains. Dicaeopolis is presented from the beginning of the play as a man dedicated to peace. At 309-10 he tells the chorus that the Spartans are not entirely responsible for the war; a few lines later he says that he could show that on many occasions they had been injured by the Athenians. Again, at 355-6, 369 and 482 he refers to his

---

1 AC 87.

2 supra cit. 4.

3 At 515-9 when he recalls how trouble with Megara had started, he twice emphasizes that the blame should be laid upon individual Athenians and not upon the city.

4 Ach. 496-512; cf. 369-76. It is notable too that the beginning of this speech is one of the two places in the drama where Aristophanes identifies the protagonist as his spokesman.

intention of speaking ὑπὲρ Λακεδαίμονιν. The audience must have been eagerly anticipating this, and the crucial point which he makes in his long address to the chorus has nothing to do with the Telephus. He says that it was Pericles' enactment of the Megarian decree and the Athenian refusal to repeal it which brought about war.¹

The extent and nature of the Megarian decree are controversial and cannot be discussed here. What is important is that in the winter of 432-1 the Spartans had apparently stated that war might be avoided if the decree was repealed.² Pericles had convinced his countrymen that war was inevitable and that if they made this concession, it would have serious repercussions and further demands would follow.³ Thucydides, however, makes it clear that there were many Athenians at that time who thought that the decree should not stand in the way of peace, but that they should repeal it,⁴ and Gomme has remarked that in popular opinion (but not in that of Thucydides) Pericles and the Megarian decree became established as the chief cause of the war.⁵ This may be a slight exaggeration, but it is clear at any rate that there were those who thought

¹ Ach. 530-9. The σκόλιον of Timocreon is parodied here but the evident purpose of the parody is to show how ridiculous the decree was.
² Thuc. 1.139.1.
³ Thuc. 1.140-4.
⁴ 1.139.4.
⁵ HCT 1.147.
that war had broken out 'on account of the Megarians' and that Aristophanes utilized this in the Acharnians.\(^1\) In L26/5 there must still have been a number of Athenians who thought that their city had erred in not repealing the decree. It is totally consonant with Dicaeopolis' characterization that he should have been one of them but this in itself is not of primary importance. Invoking the decree as the cause of the war was virtually the only way he could present some sort of case against Athens and for Sparta, and it was also the argument which might be expected to have a special appeal for the chorus of warlike Acharnians.\(^2\)

Like Gomme before him then, Forrest falls into the trap of not analyzing the character of Dicaeopolis and he simply regards him as an ordinary peasant. However, he differs from Gomme (who thought that the chorus of Acharnians represented the belligerent mass of the Athenian population) arguing that 'a dramatist who makes one real view win an outright victory over another and sheds no

---

1 See De Ste. Croix, 244. Later writers followed and embellished Aristophanes but on this occasion the comic poet did not invent a totally new version of events, but rather he reflected an opinion which was currently held in some quarters. The Argument of the Dionysalexandrus of Cratinus (P. Oxy. iv.653) states that Pericles was satirized in the play for having brought war on the Athenians, although it does not mention the Megarian decree. At Ach. 524-9 Dicaeopolis also makes fun of the Athenian counter-charge that the Megarians had given refuge to runaway slaves (Thuc. i.139.2), and his whole account of what had happened, although heavily embroidered, is at least based on the facts.

2 See below, p. 195.
tears about it, must he taken to imply that he favors the victor.\(^1\) To Forrest, the chorus are a group of bellicose 'eccentrics', but in fact it makes little difference whether or not they represent a larger body of opinion. In either case Dicaeopolis is made to triumph over those who are most fervently committed to the war and the moral is clear. The just citizen, Aristophanes' representative, makes peace and derives great benefits from it. The obvious implication is that if the Athenians had any sense, they would follow his example.\(^2\) Forrest maintains that for Aristophanes to campaign for peace at the beginning of 425 when things were going very badly in the war would have been treason but, apart from any other considerations, he exaggerates the weakness of Athens at this time. He also repeatedly confuses the issue by stating that the 'traditional' interpretation of the play means attributing to the poet what he calls 'pacifism'. As Dover has observed, 'Neither in Acharnians nor anywhere else in Aristophanes does the question of 'pacifism' arise, if by that term we mean the willingness to endure, or to see inflicted upon others, any suffering whatsoever in preference to committing the sin of homicide. The issue which does arise is the utility of continuing war for uncertain

---

1 Forrest, op. cit. 10.

2 At Ach. 626-7, before they begin their anapaests, the chorus rejoice that the arguments of Dicaeopolis are prevailing and that he is winning over the people about peace.
and marginal gain when it is possible to make peace at a trivial cost.\(^1\)

Whether Aristophanes had any real hopes that his countrymen would take active steps in this direction is less certain. De Ste. Croix believes that the return of King Pleistoanax to Sparta some time in 427/6 had 'appreciably increased the chances of peace'.\(^2\) Pleistoanax and Nicias are described by Thucydides as the leaders of those who wanted peace in 422/1,\(^3\) and while there is no evidence that the king was in a strong enough position to influence events decisively in 426, or even that he favored peace at this date, it is not an implausible hypothesis.\(^4\) At all events, the Peloponnesian invasions had signally failed to bring the Athenians to their knees and barring some dramatic change in the situation stalemate was fast approaching.\(^5\) In 426 the Athenians did take offensive

\(^1\) AC 84.

\(^2\) De Ste. Croix, 366. Thucydides, v.16.1-3, describes the return of the king. He had been compelled to leave Sparta when he retreated from Attica in 446 without pressing home the invasion. On the date of his return, which is not mentioned by Thucydides in its chronological place in the History, see Gomme, HCT iii.664.

\(^3\) v.16.1.

\(^4\) See, however, Gomme, HCT iii.664; Kagan, 193-4. Kagan emphasizes that Pleistoanax was the object of suspicion in Sparta because of his earlier behavior and the manner of his recall, and that Thucydides does not mention him when Sparta made a truce in 423 (iv.117), when he was not among the signatories (iv.119.2).

\(^5\) The Athenian success at Pylos did in fact drastically alter the status quo not long after the Acharnians was performed.
action in different theatres of the war, but if this is evidence for a policy of concerted aggression it may have been inspired by a desire to break the deadlock. While there is no evidence of any real peace-movement in Athens, it is not unreasonable to suggest that (on both sides) there was a growing sense of futility in carrying on a war which seemingly could not be won. Moreover, in the spring of 426 the Peloponnesians had not been able to carry out their annual invasion of Attica. This must have given a certain respite to the Athenians and presumably it meant that the countryfolk had been able to stay on their farms (which escaped being ravaged), or at least had returned to them much earlier than usual. They had thus been given a vivid reminder of what the war was costing them and how much they would gain if it ended. This must have been the atmosphere in which Aristophanes conceived the _Acharnians_ and which he attempted to exploit.

1 Nicias led an expedition against Melos (Thuc. iii.91), Demosthenes began his Aetolian campaign, and the Sicilian expedition was re-inforced (Thuc. iii.115).

2 It is commonly assumed that the elections to the _stratēgia_ of 426/5 had brought the 'war-party' to power and signalled a new spirit of offensive warfare. See (e.g.) Busolt, _GG_ iii.2.1056; West, _CP_ xix 1924, 201. Kagan, 187ff., has emphasized how little evidence there is for this. R. Sealey, _PACA_ i 1958, 82-7, and D.K. Lewis, _JHS_ lxxxii 1961, 119, have noted that Athenaeus (21b) dates the battle of Tanagra to 426/5, and they argue that Nicias was re-elected general for this year. There is no reason to doubt this and the conclusions which have been drawn from his supposed defeat in the elections are invalid.

3 Thucydides, iii.89.1, reports that Agis was compelled to turn back at the Isthmus because of earthquakes.
Whatever the poet's hopes were, his play did stand in virtually direct opposition to the policy which Cleon advocated. Thucydides explicitly describes him as the Athenian who was most opposed to peace¹ and although the historian is describing the situation after Cleon's death in 422, there is every reason to think that his verdict would have been the same at the beginning of 425.² Yet Cleon scarcely figures in the Acharnians and he is mentioned only six times.

A number of these allusions have been discussed in earlier chapters. The three passages in the play which deal with the Babylonians and the trouble which followed it have been analyzed for the evidence which they provide both about the lost comedy and its 'sequel'. It remains only to note that the first of these gives a vivid picture of Cleon's stormy eloquence. Dicaecpolis, speaking for the poet, relates how Cleon dragged him before the Council and

\[ \text{διέβαλλε καὶ ψευδης κατεγλύτης μου} \\
\text{kακωλιβρες, καπλυνεν, ὦ ἔτο διηγου πάνω} \\
\text{ἀπωλόμην μολυσμονομένοις.} \]

These few lines well illustrate the points which have already been made about Cleon's turbulent style of speaking,⁴

---

1 Thuc. v.16.1.

2 For Cleon's rebuffal of the Spartan peace-proposals later in the year after Pylos, see below, pp. 395ff.

3 Ach. 380-2.

4 See above, pp. 57ff.
and Aristophanes shows a certain consistency in the language which he uses to describe it. At Knights 351-2 the Sausage-seller accuses his opponent of having brought it about ὑدراس (sc. τὴν πόλιν) ὠρα σοι μονωτάτου κατεγωρισμένης εἰς παν. Earlier in the same play the politician is described by Demos as Κυκλοβόρου φωνη ἔχων, and the scholiast, quoting from a lost comedy, notes that Aristophanes τὴν κακοφωνιάν σοι τῷ Κλέωνος εἴκασε τῷ ἥλιῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ in this work also. Again, the chorus in the Wasps say φωνη δέ ἔχειν Χαράδρας ὀλεθρον πετοκιάς and the chorus in the Peace use identical language. The image plainly must have appealed to Aristophanes and his audiences and the verb diaballein which is employed at Ach. 380 and in the other two passages in the Acharnians which refer to Cleon's action after the Babylonians, is also frequently used of or by the politician in the

1 Knights 137.
2 Fr. 636.
3 Wasps 1034.
4 Peace 757.
5 Ach. 502, 630.
Knights. Yet in the Acharnians at least, the word could only imply that Cleon had distorted the effect of the Babylonians upon a foreign audience or Aristophanes' motives in writing the play. Cleon could scarcely have misrepresented the plot of the comedy in any way since most of his listeners would have been present at its performance.

In the first of the other three allusions to Cleon in the Acharnians, Dicaeopolis (in the prologue) recalls, as one of the things which have given him pleasure, the sight of Cleon's disgorging five talents at the instigation of the Knights:

\[\text{γε τὸ κέαρ ηὐφρανθην ἴσων, τοῖς πέντε ταλάντοις οὐς ἔσημεκεν, ταῦθ' ὡς ἐγαμώθην, καὶ φιλῶ τοὺς ἵππες δὲ τῷ τόντο τούργεν· ἄφιον γὰρ Ἑλλάδι.}\]

It is argued below that this sum of five talents must have been one of the emoluments which the cavalry received from the State and which Cleon as a member of the Boule...

1 Knights 64, 262, 288, 486; at Knights 7 and 491, the Paphlagonian is accused of employing diabolai, and at Knights 45 of being diabolotatos. Diaballein is also used with reference to the Sausage-seller, who for most of the play is a caricature of Cleon, at 496, 711, 810. It is perhaps slightly surprising that the verb is only applied to Cleon in the Acharnians and in the Knights, and not in the later comedies. C.T. Murphy, HSCP xlix 1938, 73, cites two passages from Aristotle to show that 'the use of ὑφελάγια to gain goodwill for oneself by slandering the opposition is well-known to the handbooks of rhetoric.' Obviously, however, it cannot be inferred from this that Cleon had made any formal study of the rhetorical principles.

2 Act. 5-8.
attempted (vainly) to withhold. What needs to be examined here is how Aristophanes treats the incident, and the question is whether the verb ἐφημεσεν would have implied to the audience that Cleon had pocketed or had intended to pocket the money for himself. On the only other occasion when Aristophanes uses the word in this metaphorical sense, it clearly refers to the disgorging of ill-gotten personal gains. This is not conclusive, but it does at least indicate that at Ach. 6 it might have been understood by the audience to mean that Cleon had converted the State finances to his own personal use. Moreover, it is clear that the scholiasts who commented on this passage did take the word in this sense, and were thereby compelled to invent fanciful explanations of how Cleon had been fined or convicted of bribery in order to account for the 'fact' that he had suffered a personal loss. Even if there is an insinuation of peculation here, however, the charge is not labored. Dicaeopolis simply professes joy at the setback which Cleon has suffered and his final pronouncement on the Knights' obtaining their money, ἄμφων γὰρ Ἐλλήνηδ', is a quotation from the Telenhus of Euripides.

1 See App. B.

2 Knights 1118; cf. Knights 404. ἐμειω and its various compounds are used literally by Aristophanes at Ach. 586, 587, frs. 49, 126, 152, 351.

3 The scholia are discussed below, App. B.

4 Schol. Ach. 8.
The feud which existed between Cleon and the corps of Knights is again recalled in the next reference to the politician in the Acharnians when the irascible chorus address Dicaeopolis:

The reason for their anger is that Dicaeopolis has concluded his private peace with the Spartans to whom (at this stage in the play) they are implacably opposed. The actual hostility of the Acharnians to Sparta is attested by Thucydides, who recounts how they led the opposition to Pericles during the first Peloponnesian invasion of 431. They demanded that they should face the Spartans in battle rather than simply watch their land being laid waste.

Since it seems that Cleon also attacked the Periclean

1 Ach. 299-301.
2 ii.21.3.
3 Thucydides, ii.20, reports that 'it is said' that Archidamus deliberately camped at Acharnae and ravaged the land, hoping that the demesmen would persuade the rest of the Athenians to risk a hoplite battle; if this did not happen the king thought that he would at least provoke internal divisions in Athens and that the men of Acharnae would be less eager to fight for the land of the other Athenians. These explanations are regarded with scepticism by Kagan, 51-2, who emphasizes that Thucydides does not adopt them as his own. He suggests that Archidarus did not move directly into the fertile plain of Attica because he wanted to 'hold as a hostage' the best land. Aristophanes' comedy may well have prompted Thucydides to recount current explanations of Archidamus' strategy, but it is impossible to question the accuracy of his narrative; i.e. the Peloponnesians (for whatever reason) did spend a long time ravaging Acharnae and the men of the deme were vociferous against Pericles.
strategy of 'inactivity' during this invasion, there is no apparent reason for the Acharnians' hatred of him. The farmers presumably would not have been Cleon's natural supporters but Ach. 299-301 should probably be regarded more as a gratuitous side-sweep at the politician than a reflection of the real sentiment of the demesmen. The allusion to Cleon's family-tannery in καττύματα (which is employed also because of κατατεματ) is mild enough. Since καττύματα were the thick under-soles of coarse, rough shoes, part of the joke appears to be that Cleon's own hide would only be good enough to make these, and there may also be a gibe at the fastidious elegance of the Knights who are to be presented with this unsuitable footwear. However, there is no reason to think (with A.T. Murray) that the poet played the part of the κριφωνος in the Acharnians and that he is here declaring his intention of 'carving up' Cleon in the following year.

The final reference to the politician in the Acharnians occurs in the πώγος where he is abused directly for the only time in the play. Here the chorus in the name of Aristophanes defy Cleon to do his worst, saying that

---

1 Plutarch, Per. 33, describes how Cleon pressed Pericles hard on this occasion and quotes lines from a comedy by Hermippus (fr. 4c) which, he says, illustrate this; see above, p. 17, n. 3.

2 Schol. Ach. 300. Neil, n. ad Knights 314 remarks that υποδήματα διάτυπα were the elegant wear.

3 TAPA xxxiv 1903, 86.

4 Ach. 659-664.
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the poet will always have Justice and Right on his side,

κοῦ μὴ πεθανῶ
πέρι τὴν πολιν ἵπτερ ἐπείνας
Σελῶς καὶ λατανύγων.¹

The epithet deilos is applied to Cleon on only one other occasion in the comedies when the chorus in the Knights urge the Sausage-seller to attack the Paphlagonian fiercely, assured that if he does so he will find him craven.²

The main point here seems to be that Cleon's propensity for attacking others conceals a cowardly nature,³ and the word is probably employed in a similar way in the πνιγος of the Acharnians since the chorus have just concluded their defence of Aristophanes against Cleon's charges.

The word λατανύγων was apparently coined by Aristophanes who uses it only here, but κατανύγων is found eight times in his extant comedies.⁴ Dover has remarked that etymologically it originally meant a man who practises anal coitus but that it came to be a general term of contempt, comparable to the English 'bugger'.⁵ As far as Aristophanes is concerned, however, this is slightly misleading. Three of the five individuals to whom he applies

---

¹ Ach. 662-4.
² Knights 389-90.
³ See also below, p. 229, n. 3.
⁴ Ach. 79, Knights 639, Clouds 529, 909, Wasps 84, 687, Lys. 776, Thesm. 200.
⁵ n. ad Clouds 529.
the word were evident effeminates and only the Wrong Logic
and perhaps the degenerate son of the Banqueters do not fit automatically into this category. Plainly the word could be used of notorious homosexuals or employed as a random term of abuse. When Cleon is labelled \( \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \nu \gamma \nu \) at Ach. 604 the intensive prefix \( \lambda \) actually makes the term less specific and there is no gibe here at his sexual proclivities.

These references to Cleon are comparatively innocuous by the standards of Old Comedy and a number of scholars have sought to explain why he does not figure more prominently in the play. H. Lloyd-Stow believes that Aristophanes did not attack Cleon here because he was 'evidently slightly chastened' after the events of the previous year. Gilbert Murray assumes that the poet wanted 'a breathing space'. Croiset thinks that Aristophanes did not wish to rekindle narrow party enmities and to alienate Cleon's large following by a violent attack

1 Philoxenus (Wasps 84); a son of Chaereas (Wasps 687); Agathon (Thesm. 200). For Philoxenus, see Clouds 686 and schol. Wasps 82 which quotes Eupolis (fr. 235); for the son of Chaereas, see Wasps 688; for Agathon, the whole scene of the Thesmophoriazusae in which he appears, schol. Lucian 178, Plato, Symp. 172a. The word is not applied to specific individuals at Ach. 79, Knights 639, Lys. 766; there may be, however, a distinction between \( \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \\nu \) and \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \gamma \nu \) at Ach. 79.
2 Clouds 529, 909.
3 See below, pp. 287ff.
4 CJ xxxviii 1942, 86.
5 Aristophanes, 38.
upon their leader. Ehrenberg takes the play to be 'a round-about attack' on the weakest point in Cleon's lines; he concludes that by converting the chorus of Acharnians from war-mongers into promoters of peace, Aristophanes was probably hoping to undermine the desire to prolong the war which was still alive among the rural middle class who had been deliberately deceived by the politicians. There may be some truth in one or more of these explanations, but all of these scholars seem to have allowed their judgment of the Acharnians to be moulded by the Babylonians and by the Knights, and to have assumed that Cleon totally dominated the Athenian political scene when it was performed.

The Acharnians is a remarkably effective and above all coherent drama. Because their hostility to the Spartans was so well-known the men from Acharnae are the natural opponents of Dicaeopolis at the beginning of the play. Ehrenberg has remarked that for Aristophanes to lay the responsibility for the war on Pericles and his Megarian decree was 'surely an astonishing line to take at that particular moment', but this misses the point entirely. Not only was it the one argument which could be put

1 Croiset, 59-60.
2 Ehrenberg, 45-6.
3 See below, p. 422.
4 Thuc. ii.20-21. Pindar had earlier sung of the Acharnians' martial spirit (Nem. ii.16); cf. E.M. 288.17.
5 Ehrenberg, 46.
forward ὑπὲρ Λακεδαίμονις, it was also the argument by
which the chorus of Acharnians might plausibly be imagined
to be convinced in view of their bitter opposition to
Pericles while he was in command.¹

Lamachus too serves as an excellent foil to Dicae-
opolis. West regards him as the protégé of Cleon, arguing
that he was a professional soldier not a politician, and
that 'he could only succeed in politics under the wing of
some leading politician.'² If this theory were correct it
would plainly be of some importance here, but it is pure
surmise and West does not take into account the earlier
command of Lamachus with Pericles on the Pontic expedi-
tion.³ The date of this is uncertain but even if one
assumes that it did not sail until c. 435 (and it surely
could not have been later),⁴ there is no reason to think
that Cleon was influential in the city as early as this.
Lamachus and Cleon both favored the vigorous prosecution

¹ Thuc. 11.21.3. Members of the deme may have played a
part in bringing Pericles to trial in the summer of 430
if he was attacked then for his strategy during the inva-
sions; see above, pp. 24ff.

² AJP xliv 1924, 150.


⁴ For a survey of the different views of scholars, see
Kagan, The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Cornell U.P.,
The authors of ATL (iii.114-117) place the expedition c.
450 (i.e. before the 'Peace of Callias') and assume that
the reference to Lamachus as a young man in the Acharnians
(601-6) is comic exaggeration. On this, see also above,
p. 161, n.1.
of the war,¹ but there is nothing to indicate that they
had any kind of 'special relationship'.

Lamachus' exact status in 426/5 when the Acharnians
was performed is doubtful: at Ach. 593–619 he clearly
represents himself as a general but at 1073ff he is
apparently a subordinate, and 569 perhaps implies that he
is a taxiarch. D.M. Lewis has adopted the theory earlier
proposed in rather different forms by Müller-Strubing and
Mayor that 593–619 were last minute additions to the play.²
He suggests that the lines may have been inserted to
accommodate the fact that Lamachus had been elected general
'at a by-election just before the play was produced, in a
poorly attended assembly at which the voters consisted more
or less of κομμήτες ἑπέτειος (Ach. 598).³ However, Fornara
has argued that there is no evidence in literature for
by-elections at this date,⁴ and there are other explana-
tions of Ach. 593–619. Van Leeuwen and Starkie have

¹ For Lamachus, see Plut. Aic. 18.2.
² Lewis, JHS lxxxi 1961, 119–120; Müller-Strubing, 498ff.;
Mayor, JHS lxix 1939, 57ff.
³ The evidence of the A.P., which places the date of the
elections to the stratēgia after the sixth prytany (44.4),
was not available to Müller-Strubing who believed that
they were held earlier. Lewis does not support Mayor's
hypothesis that the elections of 426/5 were held early in
order to allow Pythodorus to be appointed general before
he sailed to Sicily to take over the command of Laches.
Gilbert, Beiträge, 173–5, and West, AJP xlv 1924, 147, had
earlier suggested that an extraordinary election was held
theorizing that Lamachus took the place of Procles who
was killed during the Aetolian campaign (Thuc. iii.98.5).
⁴ The Athenian Board of Generals, Note B, 74–5.
suggested that the reference to the στρατηγός at Ach. 593 is a parody of the Telenhus, but Lamachus was apparently elected general for the following year, 425/4, and it seems more likely that Aristophanes is depicting him as boastfully claiming the office although the elections had not yet taken place. Alternatively, M.V. Molitor has pointed out that if Meritt is correct in arguing that 426/5 was an extraordinary year and that the length of Athenian months was alternately twenty-nine and thirty days, the elections might have been held before the Lenaea was celebrated in Gamelion. This would mean that Aristophanes represents Lamachus in the play as a general-elect, who, because he had not yet been installed in office, was still subject to the orders of the generals then in office.

In any case, whatever his rank at the beginning of 425, Lamachus was a superb and logical choice as διέσωμα of the play. Fornara believes that he owed his presence in the comedy and his treatment in it to the reputation which he had already achieved, but this is only partially

1 nn. ad loc.
2 Thuc. iv.75.1.
3 See W.K. Pritchett, AJP lxi 1940, 473 n. 22, who notes that Dicaeopolis calls Lamachus a στρατηγός at 595. Pritchett takes this to mean that he was canvassing for the generalship as the elections approached.
5 Fornara, op. cit. 58.
true. Perhaps he had recently distinguished himself in the Aetolian campaign, but more important is the fact that he belonged to the deme Oe which like Acharnae was part of the tribe Oeneis. The real reason why half the chorus of Acharnians should appeal to him for help against Dicaeopolis is simply that he was (as his election to the stratēgia in 425/4 shows) one of the most important soldiers of their tribe. It must have been because of this and the martial ring to his name that Aristophanes put him on the stage.

There is a certain logic then to the structure of the central scenes in the Acharnians which are based on the real positions and attitudes of the Acharnians, Pericles and Lamachus. Cleon was obviously a force to be reckoned with when the play was performed, and West indeed believes that he had a hand in a number of important events in 426/5: the re-election of Eurymedon and Laches as generals for the year, the reinforcement of the Sicilian expedition, the subsequent indictment of Laches and the rejection of Spartan peace-proposals. Most of this, however, is extremely fanciful. Cleon probably favored a more forceful strategy being adopted in Sicily but there is no reason to connect him with the re-election of

---

1 West, AJP xlv 1924, 147-8, following Müller-Strübing, develops this theory to improbable lengths.
Laches\(^1\) and it is not certain that the latter was actually prosecuted\(^2\) or that the Spartans attempted to negotiate for peace at this time.\(^3\) It is argued below that Cleon was probably a member of the Boule in 426/5 and that he used this position to good effect.\(^4\) If he had lost any of his influence with the Assembly because of his defeat in the Mytilenaean debate, this could only have been a temporary set-back. He was also in favor of prosecuting the war with all vigor but he was by no means alone in this, and to speculate why Aristophanes did not put him on the stage in the Acharnians is almost tantamount to asking why the poet did not write a totally different play. The references to the Babylonians in the Acharnians show that Aristophanes had been stung by Cleon’s attack but it is much more important that the Acharnians also shows that at the beginning of 425 poet and politician, personal differences

---

1 Eurymedon is considered by a number of scholars to have shared the views of Cleon; cf. Beloch, Attische Politik, 35; Busolt, GG iii.2.1019 n.2. The 'evidence' is his behavior towards the oligarchs during the civil war in Corcyra. Thucydides (iii.81.4) makes it clear that for seven days he permitted their massacre by the democrats. There is an implied contrast with Nicostratus who with a much smaller force had negotiated a moderate settlement between the warring factions a little earlier (Thuc. iii. 75). Eurymedon (and Sophocles) later showed total indifference to the fate of the remaining oligarchs after they had surrendered to them, and Thucydides vividly describes the slaughter which ensued (iv.46-8).

2 The relevant passages and scholia in the Wasps are discussed below, pp. 346ff.

3 See above, pp. 124-5.

4 See App. B.
apart, were deeply divided on the most important question of the day.
CHAPTER VI

THE KNIGHTS

In the following year, 424, probably about six months after the remarkable Athenian success on Sphacteria, Aristophanes presented the Knights at the Lenaea and gained the first prize. This was the first occasion when he acted as his own producer, and it is now for the first time that he is definitely known to have attacked Cleon on a wide front.

At the beginning of the Knights the Athenian Demos is represented as the head of a household who has recently bought a rascally Paphlagonian slave, a thinly disguised

---

1 The time-table of events at Pylos is discussed in connection with the tribute-assessment of 425, below, pp. 386-7.

2 Hyp. ii.25-7.

3 Knights 512-4.
Cleon. By disreputable means the latter has quickly earned his master’s favor and he has used his new eminence to terrorize his fellows. Two of these (one of whom certainly represents Demosthenes) are introduced in the prologue deploring their plight, but they learn from an oracle which they steal from the sleeping Paphlagonian that he is destined to be overthrown by a sausage-seller.

1 Cleon's name occurs only once in the play at 976, and even here it is not applied directly to the stage-character. Paphlagon is naturally intended to suggest the verb paphlazein (which is expressly used to describe the comic Cleon's manner of speaking at 919), but J.K. Davies, APF 318, believes that it is too facile to dismiss the name as an invention ex nihilo. In his opinion, Aristophanes must have had some real grounds for sneering at Cleon as being a Paphlagonian, and he suggests a cult-association or an administrative or marital association with Sinope as the obvious possibilities. In this case, however, one might expect some references to the region in the Knights, and there are few, if any, of these. At 199 and 1095, skorodalmē is mentioned in connection with the Paphlagonian, and Lucian, Alex. 39, speaks of ἡπαθλονεν παρβατίας ἐποδεσμενοι, πολλή τὴν σκοροδαλήν ἕμφυτοντες. Neil, n. ad 963-4 also sees in these lines a possible reference to the practice of circumcision which, according to Herodotus (ii.104.3), was followed by Syrians on the Parthenius in western Paphlagonia, but this is doubtful.

2 These two slaves are commonly identified as Demosthenes and Nicias, but the second Hypothesis (13-14, 21-22) says only 'the one delivering the prologue seems to be Demosthenes' and 'they say that one of the slaves is Demosthenes, the other Nicias.' This indicates that the names of these characters were not given in the early copies of the play, although in the surviving manuscripts which contain sigla personarum they are Δημοσθένης and Νίκις. Dover, CR ix 1959, 196-9, Kômôidotragêmatata, Studia Aristophanea ... W.J.W. Koster in honorem, Amsterdam, 1967, 16ff., has emphasized this and cast doubt on their identification with the politicians. The speaker of 40-72, however, must be Demosthenes because of his complaints about Pylos (Dover accepts this in AC 94-5), and Nicias is at least a likely candidate for the other role. See Gelzer, RE Supp. xii.1427-8.
Fortuitously, a particularly villainous member of that trade passes by on his way to market and they inform him that it is his destiny to rule over the whole Athenian Empire. When the Paphlagonian awakes, his brawling threats initially terrify the Sausage-seller, but the situation is saved by the chorus of Knights who charge into the orchestra intent on belaboring their arch-foe.1 Transformed into a man of courage and urged on by the chorus, the Sausage-seller engages the Paphlagonian in a spirited contest of denunciations, boasts, and threats. Finally, both leave for the Boule, the Paphlagonian determined to denounce his adversaries as conspirators, the Sausage-seller anxious to refute the charge.

The parabasis is performed during their absence2 and the Sausage-seller returns in triumph with an hilarious account of how he has out bribed the Paphlagonian in the Council-chamber. The re-appearance of the latter interrupts the celebrations and after some preliminary sparring,

1 247-54. For the actual feud between Cleon and the Knights, see below, App. B. It is argued there that Cleon had recently tried to prevent the cavalry from receiving their katastasis. Gilbert, Beiträge, 190, has suggested that the choreutai were actually young men belonging to the class from which the cavalry was recruited. Hyp. i.6 states αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἵππεῖς συλλαβότες ἐν χορῷ σήμερον παραφίλουται and in Hyp. ii.19-20 and a scholium to 247 there are references to the chorus as being composed ἐκ and ὑπὸ τῶν ἰππείων respectively. There is nothing to suggest, however, that these words should be taken literally. On the significance of 507-11, see below, p. 213, n. 5.

2 498-610.
the two men call Demos out of his house and compete in professing their undying love for him. Demos eventually decides that the grosser flatteries of the Sausage-seller, the gifts which he provides and his exposure of the Paphlagonian's crimes prove his superiority. Accordingly, he demands that the Paphlagonian return to him the ring which he has worn as his steward, but at the latter's insistence a second contest takes place in which the two heroes compete in reciting oracles for their master. Again the Sausage-seller is pronounced victorious, but another stage of the duel remains in which the two men vie in presenting Demos with gifts. For a third time the Sausage-seller prevails, in part by showing that his adversary keeps far more for himself than he gives. The Paphlagonian then reluctantly hands over his crown to his rival after he is convinced by one of his own oracles that the Sausage-seller is indeed the man of destiny who alone can overthrow him. The latter now reveals that his real name is Agoracritus and after the chorus have recited the second parabasis, he delivers to them a rejuvenated Demos. Restored to the majesty which he had enjoyed in the days of Miltiades and

1 725-940.
2 997-1095.
3 1151-1226.
4 Dover, AC 91-2, believes that 'the three successive throws required for a victory in wrestling, influential in Greek imagery, may be relevant here.'
5 1264-1315.
Aristides, he shamefacedly confesses his mistakes in the past and (prompted by Agoracritus), he vows that his future conduct will be better. The play ends with the Paphlagonian's being carried away to take up the trade of a sausage-seller while Agoracritus is invited by Demos to dine with him.

The Knights falls then into two very unequal parts. Most of the play is a withering satire on the contemporary political scene while the last scene of ninety-five lines (1315-1409) shows the benefits which accrue to Athens once Demos is regenerated. In the first part of the play it is not only Cleon but the Athenian democracy which is satirized. Demos is consistently described as being at the mercy of the politicians because of his stupidity, and the part which he plays in the action amply confirms this judgment. He is both gullible and greedy, pre-occupied with his own material comforts, but unaware that he has been cheated even of these by

1. In the prologue (41-2), Δήμος ἄκνητος is introduced as ἀγροικὸς ἔρημον κυστετρῷ ἀκράκολος, and a σύσκολον γερόντινον, but it is his obtuseness which is emphasized at 61-2, 395-6, 712-20, 752-5, 1115-20. The verb μικρακάω is used of him in 62 and 396, Χάσω in 755 and 1119, while at 1263 the Sausage-seller (ambiguously) refers to Athens as Τῆς Κέρυκας ηγείμουν τὴν. At 753-4 and 1119-20 the Sausage-seller and the chorus respectively maintain that it is when he is engaged in politics that Demos' native intelligence deserts him.

2. The Sausage-seller and the Paphlagonian compete in showering him with gifts and flattery, and he welcomes both, finally deciding at 1107-9 that whoever gives him more will receive τὰς ἱγίνεις of the Pnyx. The concerns of the Boule are similarly parodied at 624-82.
those who purport to serve him. 1 It is regarded as
axiomatic too that the essential qualifications for poli-
tical power are low birth, an agora-training and a loud
voice, supported by ἀνάσεια and general πανηγία. 2 Given
these advantages, a man may achieve eminence by dint of
flattering and cozening the people and this eminence is
regarded above all as a unique opportunity for pleasure
and personal gain. 3

In the last scene the situation is totally changed
with the transformation of the Sausage-seller who in turn
reforms Demos. Any estimate of the political seriousness

1 From the time he enters the stage at 728 until his
rejuvenation at the end of the play, Demos' silliness is
only relieved by occasional flashes of intelligence. At
1121-30, 1141-50, he cynically defends his behavior and
he expresses loathing for the two 'servant-politicians' at
1156-7, but the shrewdness which he evidences here is
totally at odds with his surprise and remorse at the end
of the play (1344, 1346-7, 1349, 1355), when he discovers
what he had been like earlier. He has been deceived by the
Paphlagonian in the past, and because of his gullibility
he is an easy victim for the quick-witted Sausage-seller.

2 This is spelled out to the Sausage-seller by Demosthenes
(180-93, 217-9), and particularly emphasized during the
preliminary stage of his long struggle with the Paphlagon-
ian. Both men assume that it is because they possess
these qualifications in abundance that they are entitled
to pre-eminence (285-7, 293, 296-9, 336, 409-14), and the
other characters in the play unreservedly, if sardonically,
accept this choice of criteria (276-7, 328-32, 337, 382-5,
683-6). At 322-5 the chorus remark that it is ἀνάσεια
μὴν μόνη τροφεῖα ἐπηρέας, and at 333-4 that τὸ σωφρόνως
τροφεῖα is worthless. They agree too (427-8) with a
rhetor's judgment that thieving, perjury, and sexual
aberrations are the hallmarks of political leaders, while
the Sausage-seller maintains at 878-80 that it is οἱ
θινυρένεοι who are the potential rhetors.

of the play must hinge largely upon the significance of the reformation, but this should properly be considered at the end of the chapter after the different aspects of Aristophanes' attack upon Cleon have been analyzed. A few preliminary observations, however, can be made about the characterization of the Paphlagonian's opponents who bring about his downfall.

The chorus of Knights who aid the Sausage-seller in overthrowing the comic Cleon were an aristocratic body. It is possible that even as early as 424 some members of the corps were inclined towards oligarchy,¹ but they are not depicted in this way in the comedy. They are vociferous about Cleon's low birth and vulgarity and about the type of leader in whom the people now put their trust, but this kind of criticism is typical of democratic political practice, and it is expressed not only by the chorus but also by the other characters in the play.²

By presenting the Knights as the high-born opponents of Cleon Aristophanes was reflecting the actual situation of the day, but at this point reality becomes submerged by fantasy. Their champion is the Sausage-seller, and while it is fair to assume that the audience

---

¹ For the significance of the charges of conspiracy which the Paphlagonian makes frequently in the course of the play, see below, pp. 336-9.

² For the references and further discussion of this, see below, pp. 283ff.
would have recognized from the outset that because he was opposed to the Paphlagonian he must (appearances notwithstanding) be on the 'right side', he is depicted as an even more uncouth rascal than his rival.\(^1\) The chorus have no illusions about him and when they urge him on,\(^2\) rejoice at his worst villainies\(^3\) and hail him with fawning adulation,\(^4\) it is extremely difficult to avoid the suspicion that Aristophanes is poking fun at the young aristocrats.\(^5\) In any case they do not enunciate any

1 He consistently boasts of this throughout the first part of the play. At times he does briefly emerge as an upright political critic who sternly censures the Paphlagonian's crimes, and this is particularly evident at 791-819. This passage, however, is inorganic in the sense that it does not fit his character as it has previously been developed, and he soon returns to his old ways. Landfester, 75, places more emphasis upon the contradiction in his nature and his explanation of its resolution in the final scene is considered at the end of the chapter.


3 328-34, 382-4, 421-2, 683-90, 836-40, 941.

4 457-60, 611-4, 616-23, 1319-20, 1322.

5 The alternative is to suppose that when they deliver these lines the Knights drop their special identity and speak simply as 'a comic chorus', but this is not persuasive. There is no reason to think that the chorus was actually made up of cavalrmen, but throughout the play there are many realistic touches which would keep their dramatic identity firmly in the minds of the spectators. At the beginning of the anapaests (507-11) they proclaim their alliance with the poet, but this only extends to a common hatred of Cleon, and it is wrong to assume a real political alliance here. Since they are opposed to the Paphlagonian they (like the Sausage-seller) are on 'the right side', but the part which they play in the action is scarcely creditable. See too the mockery of their long hair, homosexual inclinations, and upper-class affectations at 580, 735ff., 1121; cf. Whitman, Aristophanes and the Comic Hero 82, Gomme MEGHL 85-6 with n. 21.
political program. Neither of the parabases which they deliver is really concerned with factional politics, and they take no part in formulating Demos' future code of conduct at the play's conclusion.2

The incongruity of the coalition which is assembled against the Paphlagonian adds considerably to the humor of the comedy,3 but the unlikely alliance does achieve its purpose. The essential point here is that in the first part of the play one really significant event takes place: the comic Cleon is deposed from power. By replacing him with a seemingly worse villain, Aristophanes is able to mock the democracy which welcomes the latter and the Knights who support him, but in a sense this is incidental. Within the dramatic context it is contrary to all logical expectation that the situation should miraculously improve when the Sausage-seller takes control. The ending of the comedy is open to different interpretations but one thing at least which the poet is

1 At 509-11 they declare their hatred for Cleon but the rest of the anapaests are devoted to explaining why Aristophanes has not produced a play in his own name before this. In the epirrhema (565-80), they praise the spirit of their noble ancestors, contrast them with the generals of the day and vow to imitate their fathers. In the antepirrhema of the second parabasis (1300-15), they mock the imperialistic ambitions of Hyperbolus, but there is nothing else of politics in their addresses.

2 After rejoicing at the return of the rejuvenated Demos (1333-4), they are silent until the end of the play.

3 Demosthenes is a 'junior partner', and presumably included because of his exploits at Pylos. He does not seem to have been a politician; see below, p. 242, n. 2.
saying seems clear: if only the Athenians will get rid of Cleon they will find themselves in a much improved position.

The Knights is a vitriolic attack upon Cleon\(^1\) and the attack is so comprehensive that it is difficult to analyze. In the following pages the 'picture' of the politician which Aristophanes gives is broken down and examined under nine headings: i. Cleon's position in Athens at the beginning of 424; ii. the part which he played in the Pylos episode which was the immediate reason for his eminence; iii. his use of oracles and his attitude towards Athena; iv. his social background and its importance in contemporary politics; v. his oratory; vi. his 'bribery' of the people; vii. his treatment of individual citizens; viii. his alleged corruption; ix. his position on foreign affairs. To break down Aristophanes' satire in this way is inevitably somewhat artificial since many of these sections overlap or are closely interlinked, but a division of this kind does at least seem to have the merits of clarity and convenience.

---

1 It is impossible to follow Gomme, MECHL 86 n. 21, who believes 'that though, when he wrote Ach. 300-1, Aristophanes had in mind a definite attack upon Cleon, later when he came to write the Knights, his dramatic genius got the better of him; and that in fact he does not attack, but gives a picture of contemporary Athenian politics'.

i. Cleon's position in Athens

At the beginning of the *Knights*, the Paphlagonian is represented as the all-dominant politician in the city. In the prologue (75-6) Demosthenes states that it is impossible to escape his notice:

ēφασά γάρ αὐτὸς πάντι: ἔχει γάρ το σκέλος
τὸ μὲν ἐν Πόλις, τὸ δ' ἐτερον ἐν τῇ κληρίσι.

When the Sausage-seller is urged to take up his destiny and to oppose him, he plaintively enquires from what quarter he may expect help since both rich and poor stand in dread of him. ¹ He is assured by Demosthenes, however, that his foe is not ἐφηκαρχεῖος because all the mask-makers were afraid to make a likeness of him. ² After his success on Sphacteria he has been granted εἰρήνης ³ and προσφυγία, ⁴ and the chorus of Knights complain that his ὑπάρχει domi-
nates the land and its institutions. ⁵ He wears the Δακύλιος ⁶ and στέφανος ⁷ of Demos, and the whole plot of the play is based upon the premise that before the advent of the Sausage-seller he is totally in command of the city's affairs.

---

1 222-4.
2 230-3. On the significance of these lines, see below, App. F.
3 280-3, 709, 763-6; cf. 573-6, 819, 1404.
4 702; cf. 575-6, 1404-5.
5 304-10.
6 947-8.
7 1227.
It seems certain that this picture, although exaggerated, does reflect the actual situation of the day and that when the Knights was performed Cleon enjoyed a dominant position in the city. The Athenian success at Pylos in the previous year had completely changed the course of the war in their favor. Pylos itself was now garrisoned and used as a raiding base against the Peloponnese;¹ the Helots had begun to desert from Sparta,² and Athens was in possession of the Spartan fleet.³ Most importantly, she also held in custody two hundred and ninety-two prisoners, including one hundred and twenty Spartiates,⁴ and this made her immune to the threat of Peloponnesian invasions.⁵ The Spartans, thoroughly alarmed at the turn of events, had made repeated overtures for peace, but these were rejected by the Athenians⁶ who hung the Spartans' shields as trophies on the walls of the Stoa Poecile.⁷ They also dedicated a bronze Nike statue to Athena on the Acropolis ἐξ μνημείων τῶν ἐν τῷ

---

1 Thuc. iv.41.2.

2 Thuc. iv.41.3.

3 Thuc. iv.23.1.

4 Thuc. iv.38.5.

5 Thuc. iv.41.1.

6 Thuc. iv.41.3-4.

7 Paus. i.15.4. In 1936 one of these shields was discovered in a cistern cut in the rock south of the Theseum; see T.L. Shear, Ἑσπ. vi 1937, 347-8.
and it is argued below that there is reason to think that it may have been about this time that they finally undertook the construction of the Nike temple.

Thucydides, who records the advantages which the Athenians derived from their success and describes at some length the profound psychological impact which the surrender of the Spartans had upon the Greek world, gives no indication that his countrymen accorded Cleon special honor for the part which he had played in the victory, but this cannot be doubted. He must have been in the spotlight since making his celebrated promise to the Assembly, and there is ample evidence that its fulfilment greatly enhanced his power and prestige in the city.

In his comedy, the Golden Age, Eupolis refers to the extraordinary influence which Cleon wields, and this

---

1 Paus. iv.36.6. Pausanias, v.26.1, also states that the Messenians who had been settled at Naupactus later believed that the famous figure of Victory by Paeonius, erected at Olympia, was set up specifically to celebrate the victory at Sphacteria; for the help they gave the Athenians on this occasion, see Thuc. iv.9.1, 36.1, 41.2. Cf., however, ML 74, where it is suggested that the dedication should be referred to all the Messenian operations in support of the Athenians during the Archidamian War.

2 iv.40.

3 After concluding his treatment of the episode at Pylos, the historian does not mention Cleon again until iv.122.6, when he records that in 423 he proposed the motion to destroy Scione and to put the citizens to death.

4 Fr. 290: ὅ καλλίστῃ πόλιν παρὰ οὖς Κλέων ἐφορᾷ. It is interesting to note that Aristophanes also uses the verb ἐφορά: when he describes the Paphlagonian's power at Knights 75.
Play was probably produced not long after the *Knights*.\(^1\)

In a fourth-century speech which is contained in the
Demosthenic corpus, a certain Mántitheus recalls that his
mother's first husband had been Cleomedon 'whose father
Cleon, while serving as a general of your ancestors, is
said μάλιστα πάντων ἐν τῇ πόλει Λακεδαιμονίᾳ, after having
captured many Lacedaemonians alive at Pylos'.\(^2\) Plutarch
too alludes to the δόξα and δόξα ἀντίγραφο, which Cleon had gained
from his success,\(^3\) and both he and Theopompus relate an
incident which illustrates Cleon's high-handed effrontery
in the Assembly and which probably took place after Pylos.\(^4\)
Aristophanes himself at *Clouds* 549 later boasts how in his
play of 424 he had attacked Cleon when he was at the height
of his power.\(^5\)

Modern scholars are unanimous in seeing this as the
peak of the politician's influence,\(^6\) and the great majority
of them connect his ascendancy with the new assessment of

---

1 Geissler, 35, believes that it was performed at the
Dionysia of 424. Fr. 290 seems to show that it must be
dated before Cleon's death.

2 [D] x1.25.

3 Nic. 8.2.

4 See below, pp. 324-5.

5 At *Wasp* 1029-37 and *Peace* 751-60, the poet recalls (in
almost identical language) how, in the first play which he
had produced in his own name, he had not deigned to assail
small quarry but had ventured against the monstrous Cleon.

6 West, *CP* xix 1924, 215-8, and Meyer, *GdA* iv.2.107, go
so far as to compare his position with that of Pericles
earlier, but this is slightly misleading.
tribute which was levied on the allies some little time
after Cleon's return from Pylos.\(^1\) He was elected general
for 424/3, probably a short time after the production of
the Knights,\(^2\) and although nothing is known of his military
career prior to this, it is virtually certain that this was
the first time that he had been voted to this post.\(^3\) This
would tie in with the fact that he does not seem to have
been prominent in the actual fighting on Sphacteria,\(^4\) and,
according to Thucydides, the disgruntled hoplites at
Amphipolis contrasted his ἀνεπιστημοσύνη with the ἑπετεία
of Brasidas, although this was at least the second time
that he had been elected general since the command at

\(^1\) See below, pp. 386-9.

\(^2\) Clouds 581ff. Gomme, HCT iii.505-6, has expressed some
doubts about the reference here but they seem unwarranted.
The chorus recall an eclipse which should have warned the
Athenians against electing Cleon and it is of little im-
portance that it apparently occurred shortly after the
election. Cf. Fornara, The Athenian Board of Generals,
Wiesbaden, 1971, 61: 'People will have remembered both the
election and the eclipse, and that was enough to permit
Aristophanes to combine them.' Fornara also rightly
emphasizes that the language used by the chorus of Clouds
must refer to an election of Cleon to the strategia, not
to his dispatch to Pylos, and Gomme himself admits that
Clouds 590-4 'seem to show that Kleon was strategos at the
time of production, spring 423, for they speak of the
future'. In the fourth century at least the elections were
held 'on a day of favorable omens after the sixth prytany'
(A.P. 44.4).

\(^3\) The fact that he is not known to have served on the
board of generals earlier in the Archidamian War is not in
itself decisive, since the evidence for these years is far
from complete. Cf. the lists constructed by Fornara,
supra cit. 52-3, which contain the names of only three
generals for 429/8 and for 428/7.

\(^4\) Thucydides makes it clear that Demosthenes was in charge
of Athenian strategy; see below, pp. 232-3.
It is certainly debatable whether the events of 422 showed that these hoplites had real grounds for complaint. Thucydides' description of Cleon's campaigns in the north is unsatisfactory and it has attracted a certain amount of criticism. A number of scholars have emphasized that the historian's plain narrative does not do justice to Cleon's success in storming Torone; West and Meritt long ago argued from the assessment list of 422/1 that he recaptured for Athens many more cities in the area than the two (Torone and Galepsus) with which Thucydides credits him, while the account of the final battle at Amphipolis has also aroused considerable controversy. There is plainly reason to suspect that Cleon may well have displayed more effective leadership in 422 than the historian would have

1 Thuc. v.7.2. It is uncertain whether he was a general in 423/2 as well as in 422/3 and 422/1. Fornara, op. cit. 61-2, inclines to think that he was, on the grounds that Thucydides (v.2.1) states that he sailed north μετὰ τῆς ἐκθέσεως, and that the truce expired in the spring of 422. This reasoning, however, leaves out of account the historian's (difficult) reference at v.1.1 to the end of the truce in connection with the Pythia which were celebrated in the summer. On the textual problems here, see Gomme, HCT iii.629, who argues that Cleon did not depart before August, i.e. in 422/1.

2 v.2-3, 6-10.

3 Gomme, MEGHL 114, HCT iii.631-2; Woodhead, Mnem. xiii 1960, 304.

4 AJA xxix 1925, 54-69. The list is A10 in ATL. Woodhead, supra cit. 324-6, has argued strongly against those who do not take their inclusion in the list to be proof that the cities were under Athenian control, or who deny that Cleon was responsible. See, however, the caution of Neiggs, 338 with n. 4.
his readers believe, but for two reasons his generalship is not given detailed analysis here. In the first place, it is the crucial battle at Amphipolis to which one must mainly look for evidence of Cleon's abilities or deficiencies in the field, and Thucydides' description of this engagement is in places both confused and confusing. Possible reconstructions of what happened have been advanced by scholars who modify or supplement this account, but

1 For good discussions of the obscurities and inconsistencies see Gomme, JEGHL 112-21; Woodhead, op. cit. 306-10; Kagan, 322-330. All emphasize also that Thucydides seems to be extremely well informed about what was going on in Cleon's mind during the fighting, and all are (rightly) sceptical about his description of Cleon's death. The account of the battle itself in Diodorus is worthless but, as Woodhead observes, despite his fondness for heroic death-pieces, it may be significant that after following Thucydides up to this point Diodorus abandons his account to represent Cleon as being killed while fighting bravely (xii.74.2). On the Athenian monument commemorating those who died at Amphipolis Cleon's name was at the head of the list, while Nicias' was excluded from the stone honoring those who died in Sicily (Paus. i.29.11-13).

2 As far as Cleon's grasp of tactics is concerned, in recent times the extreme positions seem to have been taken by J.K. Anderson, JHS lxxxv 1965, 1-4, and by B. Baldwin, A Class xi 1968, 211-4. Anderson suggests that Cleon caused confusion when he gave the signal to retreat: 'he had not troubled to make himself properly familiar with the basic techniques of commanding hoplites in the field.' Baldwin believes that 'Cleon's entire campaign was fruitful, and was conducted competently;' that Thucydides' account of his activities 'is deliberately inadequate, confused, and distorted to the point of dishonesty'.
none of them can be regarded as certain. Secondly, even if one could be confident of making an accurate assessment of the military skills which Cleon possessed in 422, the man who sailed north in this year may have been very different from the man who was elected general in 424. It would be dangerous to assume that Cleon had learned nothing during his tenure(s) of the generalship or even to deny the possibility that he had taken care to surround himself with capable subordinates. It is his military experience early in 424 which is at question here and the evidence strongly suggests that it was not great.

In his account of the meeting of the Assembly which voted the command to Cleon, Thucydides describes at some length his alarm and confusion when Nicias first offered it to him. Unless one assumes that this was feigned, it suggests that he had not previously held any

1 Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 82 with n. 43, has argued that no positive result is obtained by abandoning Thucydides' account: 'if the narrative stands, then Kleon exposed his right wing dangerously and gave Brasidas the opportunity; if it does not, we really have no information beyond the irreducible fact that Kleon was defeated and killed.' He also suggests that while there may be battles about which one can go on arguing after having rejected the primary source, this is not one of them.

2 Kagan, 318, believes that it is 'almost impossible' that Cleon did not have a colleague in Thrace. He notes that no other Thracian campaign in the war was commanded by a single general, and suggests that Thucydides' failure to mention Cleon's colleague(s) was not an accidental omission, but that he wanted blame for the disaster to fall upon him.

3 iv.28.2-4.
important military office,\(^1\) and his later promise that he would either kill the Lacedaemonians on the spot or bring them back alive within twenty days,\(^2\) gives the same impression. Kagan has recently criticized Thucydides' description of it as 'mad' on the grounds that Demosthenes had already made the plans for an assault and that a quick decision one way or the other was inevitable,\(^3\) but it was not the kind of promise that an experienced soldier would make. As Gomme has observed, it is easy to imagine possible delays caused by bad weather at Athens or at Pylos, or by a stricter watch being kept by the Spartans on the island.\(^4\) Given the traditional conservatism of the Athenians in their choice of military leaders,\(^5\) it would seem that in the normal course of events, Cleon could not realistically have aspired to the strategia because of his

---

1 Plutarch, Comp. Nic. Crass. 3.1,4, twice alludes to the inexperience of Cleon when criticizing Nicias for handing over the command to him. For Westlake's suggestion that Cleon purposely manoeuvred his way into the appointment see below, p. 239, n. 1.

2 Thuc. iv.28.4.

3 Thuc. iv.39.3; Kagan, 244.

4 HCT iii.478-9.

family background. His election in 424/3 opened up new possibilities for him and it also showed how much prestige he currently enjoyed.

It is apparent then that the broad picture of Cleon's dominance which Aristophanes draws in the *Knights* is firmly based upon reality, and some of the details illuminate the internal situation in the city. The fact that the comic poet alludes nine times to Cleon's στηρατής and ἐρωτήσθαι proves that he must have been accorded these privileges; it would be impossible for Aristophanes to refer to them so frequently otherwise. It should be emphasized too that the total pervasiveness of the Paphlagonian's influence harmonizes well with the view that Cleon had been a member of the Boule in 426/5 when Aristophanes must have been working on or planning the *Knights.* The Council was an essential adjunct of the Assembly and since it was in charge of the day to day management of the city's affairs, it had a wide range of duties and powers. Not

1 G.F.H. de Ste. Croix, Hist. iii 1954, 33 n. 3, has cited three fragments of Eupolis as evidence that from the early or middle years of the Archidamian War, one or two men of no social standing were elected to the generalship. As he observes, however, the fragments show that this was regarded as an innovation, and the earliest of them (fr. 205 from the Cities, probably produced in 422) may well be directed against Cleon himself.

2 See below, App. B, where it is emphasized that Aristophanes must at least have outlined the plot of the play before Cleon's success at Pylos.
all of its members could have been conscientious\(^1\) and a man like Cleon would have had the opportunity of spending a very busy year engaged in public administration,\(^2\) familiarizing himself thoroughly with the city's business and making his presence felt during his tenure of office. At 77L-6 the Paphlagonian boasts of the 'energy' which he had shown in financial matters while he was a Councillor and there is reason to think that Cleon was active in other areas.

On the other hand, although the Paphlagonian is represented in the *Knights* as possessing the \(\delta \sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \lambda\iota \epsilon\iota\sigma\varsigma\) and \(\sigma\tau\omicron\epsilon\phi\nu\epsilon\varsigma\) of Demos, there are no grounds for the assumption that Cleon held any financial or political office in 425/4. When Demos demands the return of his seal-ring, he informs the Paphlagonian that he will no longer serve as his *tamias*,\(^3\) and, in the past, some scholars concluded from this that Cleon was *\(\tau\alpha\omicron\mu\iota\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \kappa\omega\iota\nu\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\) in this year.\(^4\) It is now generally accepted, however, that this office did not exist (at least) in the fifth century. Moreover, while there were many fifth century *tamiai* of

---

1 Demosthenes, *xxii.36-8*, distinguishes between the inactive members of the Boule, who remain quiet or do not attend meetings, and \(\delta \lambda\iota\omega\omicron\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\) or \(\tau\omicron\omega\iota\tau\omicron\epsilon\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\) .

2 The various functions and powers of the Boule in the late fifth century are conveniently summarized by Rhodes, *AB* 211-9.

3 947-8. The ring's *sêreion* or 'device' is emphasized at 951-9.

the various funds\(^1\) who sometimes employed seals in discharging their duties,\(^2\) in the fourth century at any rate the Athenian public seal was kept by the \(\text{ἐπιστάτης τῶν ἐφοίτησεν}\).\(^3\) The \text{tamiás} was also an important figure in a prosperous Athenian household,\(^4\) who would naturally use his master's seal-ring in the course of his everyday tasks;\(^5\) it seems clear that Aristophanes is playing on the public and private meanings of the word to harmonize with the double representation of Demos as the head of a

---

1 See Jones, \textit{op. cit.} 101ff., who notes that while the Athenian financial system seems unnecessarily complicated and rigid, the multiplicity of financial magistrates made 'peculation or improper expenditure of public funds or slackness in exacting State dues difficult by making the money and accounts pass through many hands'.

2 See \textit{(e.g.)} ML 58A.13-18. In this first financial decree moved by Callias, the treasurers of the other gods are to share responsibility for security with the treasurers of Athena. The latter are to join them in depositing money and sealing the doors of the treasury.

3 \textit{A.P.} 44.1. Wallace, Phoenix \textit{iii} 1949, 70-4, has suggested that a single official seal was first used at Athens just before the middle of the fourth century. It is not certain what seal the \textit{fifth-century tamiás} used; see Bonner, \textit{OP} \textit{iii} 1908, 401.

4 \textit{Wasps} 612-4, \textit{Eccl.} 211-2; cf. Ehrenberg, 176ff. The Paphlagonian uses the verb \textit{epitropéō} in referring to himself at 949, and the duties of a \textit{tamiás} and an \textit{eritropós} in the household were very similar; cf. Neil, n. ad loc. who cites Arist. \textit{Pol.} i.1255B.

5 \textit{Thesm.} 415, \textit{Lys.} 1195-1200. Cf. Xen. \textit{Lac. vi.4}, D.L. iv.59. Seal-rings were very common in Athens and Diogenes Laertius, i.59, quotes a law of Solon forbidding jewellers to keep impressions of seals which they had sold. In IG ii\(2^\) 204 it is decreed that any Athenian who wishes may add his own seal to the official one. See in general, Bonner, \textit{op. cit.} 397-407.
household and the Athenian democracy. The reference to the stephanos gave Aristophanes the opportunity for literary parody. Crowns were worn as a badge of office by Athenian archontes and they were also awarded by the Athenians as a sign of special honor. It is quite possible that Cleon had been granted his stephanos after Pylos, but in any case it is an appropriate though 'general' symbol of the power which he currently exercised. The ways in which (according to Aristophanes) he achieved this power and the uses to which he puts it are examined in the following sections.

1 See Dover, AC 93, who notes that the brilliant idea of presenting Demos as the master of a household and politicians as his slaves is not carried through consistently; 'purely domestic relationships and purely political relationships run side by side throughout the play, and we have to be prepared for constant shifts from one level to the other.'

2 Schol. Knights 1225: μείται δὲ τῶν Ἐυπόμοι τῶν Πεισίδων. This play is sometimes assigned by the ancient sources to Eupolis, other times to an unknown author.

3 Lys. xxvi.8, Dem. xxii.32-3, Lyc. Leocr. 122.

4 Theopompus (FGH 115 F92) and Plutarch (Nic. 7.5) both relate how on one occasion Cleon entered the Assembly wearing a stephanos, and it is very likely that this was shortly after his success at Pylos; see below, pp.324-5. They may well mean that he was wearing a wreath, however, since they describe him as being on the point of offering a sacrifice or having come from a sacrifice.
ii. Pylos

The immediate reason for Cleon's dominance was certainly the great Athenian success on Sphacteria and there are more than twenty explicit references to Pylos scattered throughout the Knights. In the prologue Demosthenes complains that the Paphlagonian stole the success from him, and this is generally the line which the Sausage-seller adopts throughout their confrontation. In the main, he claims or insinuates that Cleon himself had done nothing, although at times he varies his tactics by saying that he was drunk, by apparently parodying the promise which Cleon had made to the Assembly and his abuse of the generals there, or by ridiculing the significance of the whole episode. The Paphlagonian, on the other hand, is represented as recalling and boasting of his

1 On 75-6, see above, p. 216. At 393-4 and 465-70 there are allusions to the Spartan prisoners and these passages are discussed below, pp. 370, 381.

2 54-7.

3 391-2, 744-5, 1056-7, 1062, 1201. The Paphlagonian admits this at 764-6. The Sausage-seller seems to be making the same point rather more subtly at 443 when he threatens to prosecute him for astrateia. Cf. 389-90, where the chorus describes the Paphlagonian as deilos; on this passage, see also above, p. 197.

4 1054.

5 1079. The schol. ad loc. sees here only an allusion to the soldiers' rations.

6 392. Cf. Thuc. iv.27.5.

7 1060, 1062; cf. 847-57, 1007-1010.
exploit at every possible turn,¹ often in a ludicrous context.

It is apparent that Aristophanes' sole purpose here was to belittle Cleon's achievement. He shows some of his customary ingenuity in this,² but generally his treatment of the episode seems rather heavy-handed to the modern reader. This is partly due to his fondness for repeating the same joke,³ but also because he concentrates almost exclusively on parodying the frequency with which Cleon has recalled his success and on emphasizing that it was Demosthenes who was really responsible for the victory. Little can be said about the first point except that Cleon must in fact have extracted a fair amount of credit from

¹ 353-5, 702, 742-3, 763-6, 844-6, 1005-6, 1051-3, 1058-9, 1166-7, 1172. The reading in 742 is controversial; see Neil ad loc. If Meineke's suggestion, ἦσθιος ἄνθρωπον, is correct, the Paphlagonian is alluding to the behavior of the Athenian generals. In any case, it is unwise to assume that the conduct of Nicias in the meeting of the Assembly which voted the command to Cleon is completely passed over in the Knights. If the second slave of the prologue did represent Nicias, the audience must have appreciated his timorousness; cf. fr. 100 from the Georgoi.

² See especially the word play at 55 and 1172; the 'harvest metaphor' at 392-4 (on this, see E.K. Borthwick, CQ xix 1969, 243-L); the spurious oracle at 1051-3, and the parodies at 1156-9.

³ The pun on puelos is made at 55, 1060 and 1062, and apparently recalled with the references to balaneia and balanes at 1401-3. Neil, n. ad loc., observes that a public bath was 'the last place for heroic adventure in Athenian street-wit', and he suggests that the pun was common enough at the time. Alternatively, Aristophanes may have coined the joke to cheapen Cleon's success. Rogers, n. ad 1059, points out that the effect of Cleon's 'constant appeals' to the victory would be considerably diminished if his audiences remembered puelos.
his success. Aristophanes' representation of him would be pointless if this were not so, and the scholiast on 1058 refers to ὁ Ἰονέων τῆς Πύλου μνήμηθαι ἐπὶ Κλείων. It is the second charge, however, which was potentially damaging and this requires further examination.

Thucydides' version of the events surrounding the captives of the Spartans on Sphacteria is well known. According to the historian, Cleon was involved at three stages: he persuaded the Athenians not to accept the Spartan peace-proposals after their men had been cut off on the island; he claimed in the Assembly that the reports about the difficulties of blockading Sphacteria were false and after a bitter exchange with Nicias he was voted command of an expedition which sailed there; together with Demosthenes he defeated the Spartans in battle and brought the survivors home to Athens. The part which Cleon played in obtaining the rejection of the Spartan peace terms is considered below, and attention must be focused here on

1 Invention ex nihilo would simply not be funny to the audience here; at 84L-6 the Paphlagonian boasts of his ascendancy 'while anything remains of the shields from Pylos', and much later Pausanias (1.15.5) saw these shields covered with pitch in the Stoa Poecile.

2 iv.2-6, 8-23, 26-41.
3 21-2.
4 27-30.
5 31-9.
the other aspects of the episode.1

According to Thucydides, it was Demosthenes who planned and executed the successful attack upon Sphacteria after Cleon had joined him,2 and there is no reason to doubt this; it is reasonable enough that Cleon should have ceded control of Athenian tactics to Demosthenes. The latter had made his plans before Cleon arrived and he was well qualified to deal with the particular problem confronting them, because of his recent experiences in Aetolia.3 Demosthenes then had conceived the idea of

---

1 No ancient source supplements Thucydides' account in a way which has a bearing on Cleon's conduct; see Gorme, HCT iii.486-7.

2 At 32.3 Thucydides relates how he divided the light-armed troops into groups which occupied the highest points on the island, and at 32.4 he emphasizes that it was Demosthenes who had devised the Athenian strategy and who put it into effect. Gorme, HCT iii.475, notes that the light-armed were well handled in the attack and he concludes that 'they must have been trained, as well as competently led by Demosthenes.' The reinforcements which Cleon brought with him, however, could not have received much 'training' at Pylos. At 36.1, the Messenian general approached both Cleon and Demosthenes with his plan of taking the Spartans from the rear, and Thucydides says (37.1) that both men realized the necessity of halting the battle so that they might take the Spartan survivors as hostages to Athens.

3 Cf. Thuc. iv.30.1. Cleon's probable lack of military experience has been discussed above.
fortifying Pylos,\footnote{1} carried it through despite the indifference and opposition of Sophocles and Eurymedon,\footnote{2} and inspired his outnumbered troops to repel the first Lacedaemonian assault on the position.\footnote{3} It was an unexpected bonus that the Spartans should have made the mistake of posting men on Sphacteria, but it came about as a result of his initiative, and their eventual surrender was due to his effective leadership.

From a purely military standpoint, therefore, Aristophanes appears to be on firm enough ground in maintaining that Demosthenes was responsible for the victory, but the comic poet gives only half the picture in denying all credit to Cleon since his political contribution was decisive. Thucydides' account of the crucial meeting of the Assembly which voted the command to Cleon\footnote{4} is compressed and riddled with difficulties,\footnote{5} but there is no reason to question that the events unfolded in the sequence

\footnote{1} When he sailed with Sophocles and Eurymedon, the mandate which he had been given by the Athenians, 'to use these ships, ἡ βάληγμα, around the Peloponnese' (Thuc. iv.2.4), was vague. It may have been couched in this way to avoid forewarning the Spartans, but Gomme, HCT ii.438, notes that the expedition brought no building tools with them, and he suggests that its full implication was not understood by the Athenians. At any rate, it is clear from Thuc. iv.3.1-2 that Demosthenes had formulated his plans before he sailed.

\footnote{2} Thuc. iv.3-4.

\footnote{3} Thuc. iv.9-12.

\footnote{4} 27-8.

\footnote{5} For a good discussion of these, see Kagan, 241-4.
which he gives.

The historian relates that when the Athenians learned of the troubles which their troops at Pylos were encountering, they regretted their earlier rejection of the Spartan peace-offers. Cleon γνώστι that suspicion was directed against him because he had blocked the agreement, said that the messengers from Pylos were not speaking the truth.¹ The latter thereupon advised the Athenians to send commissioners to Pylos if they did not believe their testimony, and Cleon was elected one of these. The politician, however, γνώστι that he would be compelled either to confirm the reports of those whom he was attacking, or, if he contradicted them, that he would be exposed as a liar, and seeing the Athenians ὑπηρετεύειν το πλεύν τὴ γνώμη στρατεύειν ,² argued that sending commissioners would waste precious time. Accordingly, he urged the Assembly, if they believed the reports to be true, to send an expedition and capture the men. Turning to Nicias, one of the generals, he taunted him with cowardice, claiming that this was an easy matter and that he would have done it himself if he were in command.

Encouraged by the shouts of the Assembly, Nicias offered to relinquish the command to him, and finding himself in an untenable position, Cleon was ultimately compelled to accept the offer. His mood quickly changed

¹ 27.3.
² 27.4.
from panic to confidence and he announced that he would take to Pylos only some contingents of foreign troops. With these and the men already there, within twenty days he would either bring home the Lacedaemonians alive or kill them on the spot.\(^1\) While the Athenians laughed at his κουφολογία,\(^2\) they voted in favor of the expedition and after Cleon had chosen Demosthenes as his colleague τὴν ἀναγωγὴν διὰ τὰ δεῖξαι ἐξοικτο,\(^3\)

Thucydides' narrative can be conveniently examined in two parts, the first of which ends with Cleon's proposal that an expedition should be sent immediately to Pylos.\(^4\) If the historian's account is accepted in toto, the conclusion which follows is that Cleon eventually made a sensible proposal (which events proved to be correct), but that he made it from purely selfish motives, under pressure, and reacting to the situation rather than following any consistent policy. Here, however, there are two reasons for caution. The bias which Thucydides shows against Cleon in these chapters is widely recognized and, as Woodhead has observed, the historian shows himself to be 'a remarkable thought-reader where Cleon is concerned'.\(^5\) It is at least

\(^1\) \textit{Thuc.} 28.4.
\(^2\) \textit{Thuc.} 28.5.
\(^3\) \textit{Thuc.} 29.1.
\(^4\) \textit{Thuc.} 27.4.
\(^5\) \textit{Mmem.} xiii 1960, 313. He draws particular attention to Thucydides' extraordinary and effective use of γνώσεως.
possible that the latter's concern for his own political reputation was tempered by other considerations. ¹ Secondly, Thucydides does not provide the background to the debate and intentionally or unintentionally he presents the facts in a misleading order. It is only after his description of the debate that he states that Cleon knew that Demosthenes was already planning an assault on Sphacteria. ² This naturally must have influenced his behavior in the Assembly, but Thucydides gives no indication of it until he finally explains why Cleon chose Demosthenes as his colleague.

If Demosthenes' plans were public knowledge in Athens they must have come under discussion in the debate. If they were not, Cleon must either have had access to information which was presumably meant to be restricted to

¹ See H.D. Westlake, Individuals in Thucydides, 70-3. He emphasizes that Thucydides could scarcely have known or learned what was going on in Cleon's mind, and that he must have inferred his motives 'from what he knew, or claimed to know, about the character of Cleon'.

² 29.2.
the generals and Boule, or received private information from Pylos, probably from Demosthenes himself. The first hypothesis seems the more likely, but in any case this

1 In this case, secrecy must have been the objective; for secret meetings of the Boule in the fifth century, see Rhodes, AB 42-3. He underlines the difficulty of preserving a secret when it had been entrusted to several hundred Athenians. If Cleon was a member of the Boule in 426/5, he would probably have been well informed of the situation at Pylos, at least until his tenure of office expired. The Athenians, however, do not seem to have been overly concerned about the possibility that the Spartans would learn of their plans on this occasion, although they were in contact with their men on Spacteria. It remains a mystery why the latter did not take more stringent precautions against an attack; cf. Gomme, HCT iii.473.

2 Many scholars believe that there was a secret agreement between the two men. E.C. Woodcock, HSCP xxxix 1928, 102-4, argued that it was Cleon who initially 'got Demosthenes the permission to use the fleet round the Peloponnese' and that they continued collaborating. If this were true, it would take some of the sting out of Aristophanes' accusations, but it seems unnecessary to postulate a private agreement here.

3 The convenient presence in Athens at this exact juncture of the required type of foreign troops, which Cleon took with him to Pylos, strongly suggests that Demosthenes had requested reinforcements for his assault on the island, and that they had been brought to Athens in anticipation of the Assembly's vote; cf. Grote, vi.339, Busolt, GG iii.2.1101 n. 2. At 3C.L, Thucydides relates how Cleon sent a message to Demosthenes ος ἡγούν καὶ ἐκείνοις στρατιῶν ἂν ἄγαν ἀπονεῖναι καὶ ἰδίως άτρεπτο, and both Grote and Busolt assume that Demosthenes is the subject of ἄγαν. This would settle this question, but it is equally possible that Cleon is the subject of the verb. Demosthenes, however, was requesting troops from neighboring allies (Thuc. iv.30.3) and he had probably also requested reinforcements from Athens. While Thucydides does not say that the messengers from Pylos presented Demosthenes' plans as part of their report, the report is not given in a full or formal manner, and in the debate which followed, the feasibility of an attack was certainly considered; see below, p. 238, n. 2.
THE KNIGHTS

casts a different light upon Cleon’s initial criticism of the negative reports from Pylos. However bad the situation might be, Demosthenes believed (or hoped) that it could be resolved by a frontal attack and, knowing this, Cleon must surely have adopted the same line. It is clear at any rate that the debate which immediately followed the messengers’ reports included some discussion of the merits of an attack upon Sphacteria. When the vote on sending commissioners was taken, Cleon seems to have been temporarily outmanoeuvred, but his objections were well founded. His own proposal was designed to allow Demosthenes to proceed with his plans, or at least to ensure that an attack was made.

His attack upon Nicias which followed was characteristically violent, but in this instance desperate measures were called for if the decision to send commissioners was to be reversed. Not unnaturally, he seems to

1 He may well have concentrated his criticisms upon the conclusions which were being drawn from the situation at Pylos. It seems possible that the messengers’ report reflected a division of opinion among the three generals at Pylos; all three may have been in agreement about the seriousness of their position, but Sophocles and Euryhedon would probably have been more negative about the prospects of improving it by a direct assault on Sphacteria. It appears to be significant that these two generals seem to have dropped completely out of the picture once Cleon arrived at Pylos. The decision to send commissioners looks like an attempt to obtain an independent evaluation of the situation.

2 At 27.4, Thucydides says that Cleon saw that the Athenians were rather more eager to send an expedition. He also urged them not to let slip a favorable opportunity, and somebody presumably had pointed out that what was happening at Pylos did present the Athenians with such an opportunity.
have been flustered and guilty of some vacillation when
the latter took the extraordinary step of offering to
relinquish command to him, but he quickly regained his
composure, probably realizing that the presence of Demos-
thenes at Pylos ensured that the Athenian leadership would
be in experienced hands. His choice of specialist troops
underlines the extent of his knowledge of the military
situation at Pylos and his celebrated promise to the
Assembly was typically flamboyant. Once the Assembly had
approved his expedition, he lost no time in choosing
Demosthenes as his colleague and in setting sail.

1 Westlake, op. cit. 74, suggests that his reluctance to
accept the command may have been a pretence; he suspects
that Cleon realized that many of his opponents would have
voted against his appointment unless they could somehow
be led to believe that he was being jockeyed into it
against his will. This, however, seems far-fetched. The
behavior of Nicias (and of the sōphrones) on this occasion
(Thuc. 28.4) has been roundly condemned by most modern
commentators, but West, CP xix 1924, 212-4, has attempted
to 'rehabilitate' him. He argues that Nicias knew that if
Demosthenes was second in command, 'affairs would be well
managed'. Apart from any other considerations, it is by
no means certain from Thucydides' narrative that Nicias
knew that Demosthenes would be 'second in command' when
he made his offer. Presumably Cleon would have reflected,
however, that his own presence at Pylos would be more
helpful than that of someone who was not wholeheartedly
in favor of the enterprise.

2 Woodhead, op. cit. 315, emphasizes that Cleon showed
himself quick and firm in action: 'he had a clear sight
of what he must do and how he intended to do it.'
The importance of Cleon's actions in the Assembly can scarcely be exaggerated.\(^1\) If he had not attacked the decision to send commissioners to Pylos, at best a considerable amount of time would have been wasted. Even if the Athenians had finally decided to make a landing on Sphacteria (and there is no guarantee of this), it is by no means certain that Demosthenes would have been in command or that the attack would have succeeded.\(^2\) Neither Cleon nor Demosthenes could have anticipated what Nicias was to do in the Assembly and Demosthenes must have been astonished to learn that Cleon was personally bringing reinforcements to him. Possibly he was displeased at this, but Thucydides gives no indication of it; the two men cooperated in the negotiations with the Spartans,\(^3\) and Demosthenes was in charge of the military planning. On the political front, Cleon did everything that was

---

1 Westlake, op. cit. 69-71, maintains that the appointment of Cleon to the command at Pylos was of relatively minor importance, and that there is no reason to believe 'that any tolerably competent Athenian, if entrusted with this responsibility, would have acted very differently'. This conclusion, however, misses the point entirely, since Westlake leaves out of account what happened before the appointment was made.

2 At 26.2, Thucydides says that the blockade was erithinos for the Athenians because of lack of food and water; at 26.4 he says that the soldiers' morale was low because the siege was lasting longer than anticipated. A further delay would have exacerbated both problems. Moreover, the onset of winter would make it impossible for the Athenians to supply their men or to maintain the blockade, and there was always the danger that the Spartans might escape (27.1.).

3 30.4, 37.2, 38.1.
necessary to give Demosthenes the opportunity of using his considerable military talents to the full.

Whether Demosthenes received proper credit at Athens for the part which he had played in the triumph is another question. Like Cleon, he was elected general for 424/3, but it is not known that he too was accorded special honors, and perhaps one can infer from the Knights that he was treated relatively parsimoniously. In October 425 a sum of thirty talents was paid \( \sigma τ r a \dot{e} \gamma \dot{e} \) \( \pi e r [ ] \) \( \Pi e l o p ë \nu \nu e o v \Delta h o e d é n e \). This money was probably intended primarily for the maintenance of the garrison at Pylos and for the consolidation of the position, and Demosthenes may have remained in the Peloponnese to take care of these matters while Cleon returned to his triumphant welcome.

1 Thuc. iv.66.3.

2 Nothing can be deduced from the fact that he drops out of sight after his command of 424/3 until 421, when he took the oath to observe the Peace of Nicias and the subsequent alliance with Sparta (Thuc. v.19.2, 24.1), and was choregus for his tribe (IG ii 2.318). His eclipse must have been due to the Boeotian disaster. If (as many scholars conclude from [Plut.] x. Or. 833e and Ant. frs. 8-14) he was prosecuted, the date of his trial is unknown, but it may also have been after Delium; cf. Sealey, Essays in Greek Politics, 97. For the significance of his being chosen one of the signatories of the Peace of Nicias, see Andrewes and Lewis, JHS lxxvii 1957, 180, who suggest that his name (and that of Lamachus) was proposed from the floor of the Assembly.

3 IG ii2 324.

4 Thuc. iv.41.2.

5 Thucydides, iv.39.3, states simply that Cleon brought home the prisoners without mentioning Demosthenes; cf. Busolt, GG iii.2.1190 with n. 5.
THE KNIGHTS

Even if Demosthenes did accompany him he did not stay long in the city, and his aspirations appear to have been military rather than political. This may have allowed Cleon to bask alone in the limelight. It is dangerous, however, to deduce from the Knights that Cleon downplayed Demosthenes' contribution, or that there was a rift between the two men. What is clear is that Aristophanes unerringly seized upon the fact that from a military viewpoint Demosthenes had engineered the success. He totally leaves out of account Cleon's political contribution, but in the final analysis this was equally valuable.

1 This is strongly argued by Meritt, The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century, Cambridge, Mass., 1928, 91, from the wording of IG i2 324. He believes that since the payment was made directly to the general, rather than through the hellenotomiai, Demosthenes was in Athens to receive it. Thucydides, iv.37.1, says that both Cleon and Demosthenes realized that it was necessary to stop the battle on Sphacteria, so that they might take hostages back to Athens. Meritt thinks that after returning with Cleon, Demosthenes received the payment in October, and left immediately for Pylos with a suitable force for a permanent garrison, allowing Eurynomedon and Sophocles to resume their interrupted journey towards Sicily (Thuc. iv.46.1).

2 Westlake, op. cit. 98, notes that, apart from purely formal activities, his career as described by Thucydides is exclusively military, and there is no evidence (if one excludes the Knights) that he was a politician. It is impossible to associate him consistently with any one political group; cf. Sealey, op. cit. 98, who suggests that he had the gift 'useful to a general, of co-operating with people of different political sympathies'.

3 See Gomme, HCT iii.486.
iii. Oracles and Religion

Quite apart from the prestige which he had won at Pylos, there were naturally a number of other reasons for Cleon's dominance in Athens at the beginning of 424. Few (if any) modern commentators would rate his use of oracles and religion highly among these, but the Paphlagonian's association with and manipulation of oracles and his devotion to Athena are curiously prominent features of the Knights. They are by no means of such basic importance to his position in the city as some other elements in the play, but there seems to be reason to think that they may be connected (indirectly at least) both with each other and with the recent Athenian victory at Pylos. They will therefore be treated together in this section.

The Paphlagonian's association with oracles in the Knights is striking. At the beginning of the play it is one of his own oracles which reveals how he can be toppled from power,¹ and towards the end of the comedy another convinces him that his fate is inevitable.² At 797-8 he employs oracles to justify his own policy, and on a number of occasions he is accused of manipulating them for his own purposes by the other characters. Demosthenes complains how he reduces Demos to utter bemusement so that he can get his fellow-slaves punished,³ and says that he

¹ 109-43.
² 1229-52.
³ 61-3.
has hidden the vital ἔσον χρησάν for etelling his own downfall.¹ The Sausage-seller claims that he deceives Demos and ὄνειροπολέω about himself,² and this is borne out in the Oracle-scene which is the second stage of their contest. Three of the four oracles which the Paphlagonian selects from his κυβωτὸς πλήξ ³ are devoted to his personal glorification,⁴ while the fourth is intended to flatter Demos.⁵ When he reads the first two of these, the Sausage-seller accuses him of suppressing parts of them which are unfavorable to himself.⁶

This prominence of oracles in the Knights can be partially explained as parody of Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus. In the course of an article dealing with the date of the production of the tragedy, B.M.W. Knox noted (and somewhat exaggerated) correspondences between the two

1 116-7, 125-6.
2 809. At 818 he describes the Paphlagonian as χρησάν.
3 1000.
4 1015-20, 1037-40, 1051-3.
5 1086-7. The Paphlagonian had promised this at 965-6.
6 1025-6, 1045-7.
plays. In both works the most important man of the day falls from power when Delphian prophecies are fulfilled and the final scene of the confrontation between the Sausage-seller and the Paphlagonian in the Knights, when the latter finally realizes that his 'reign' is over, is particularly reminiscent of the climax of Sophocles' tragedy. The Paphlagonian, who refuses to accept his fate until it is confirmed by his own Delphic oracle, puts questions to the Sausage-seller about his antecedents which recall those which Oedipus asks the herdsman in his quest for the truth. The answers which he receives correspond to the oracle's specifications and his agonized reactions to them, the way he continues to cling to one slim hope, and the despair which he voices when he finally recognizes

1 AJP lxxvii 1956, 133-47. See too Landfester who unduly emphasizes the significance of the parody of the Oedipus throughout his book. It is particularly difficult to follow him, when he refers, 77, to the Paphlagonian as a 'second Sphinx'. He believes that it may be more than a coincidence that he is represented as a lion (1037) and a 'hound', and that 'die Befligelung' of the Sphinx may have inspired Aristophanes to call him a Βυσσείτος (197, 203, 209) and a ἕρας (1052). He notes that the Sphinx is Ἀρείῳσ at O.T. 1199, the Paphlagonian Χαίρεμένη at Knights 818, and he tentatively draws a comparison between Oedipus' role as the saviour of Thebes, and the Sausage-seller's as the saviour of Athens. For Landfester's interpretation of the ending of the play, see below, pp. 415-6. This identification of Cleon with the Sphinx has (apparently independently) also been advanced by E.L. Brown, JHS xciv 1974, 166-70, who suggests that he is caricatured in this way on a Corinthian cup; on this see below, p. 282, n. 2.

2 1229-52.

3 Cf. Knights 1234-47 with O.T. 1121-9. Knox, op. cit. 146, states 'the questions and answers in the Knights present an urban parodic version of the pastoral scenes conjured up by the questions and answers in the Oedipus Tyrannus.'
that the oracle has been fulfilled are all deliberately parodic of a tragic anagnorisis.\footnote{For the mock-tragic language and rhythm here, see Neil, \textit{nn. ad} 1229, 1232, 1241, 1242, 1243.} The verbal resemblances to the \textit{Oedipus} are not striking and are easily explicable as coincidence.\footnote{A possible exception occurs at \textit{Knights} 1244-5 which look like a parody of \textit{O.T.} 336. Knox, \textit{op. cit.} 145-7, compares \textit{Knights} 1240 with \textit{O.T.} 738 and \textit{Knights} 1248 with \textit{O.T.} 1182, and he also notes a number of earlier correspondences, but these are minor and do not carry much weight.} Individual lines are borrowed from Euripides,\footnote{1240, 1249, 1250-2; see schol. \textit{ad loc.}} but the scene does look like a general parody of the inexorable working-out of oracles in Sophocles' tragedy.

In making this point, Knox was primarily concerned with fixing a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the performance of the \textit{Oedipus},\footnote{He seems, however, to exaggerate the significance of the verbal resemblances in the two plays, and this perhaps militates against his argument that the \textit{Oedipus} was produced the year before the \textit{Knights} in 425.} but if Aristophanes is parodying Sophocles here, this does in part explain the Paphlagonian's association with oracles in the \textit{Knights}. Yet it cannot supply the whole answer. The oracle which Demosthenes reads in the prologue informs the audience what is destined to happen and it is important to the parody, but the other frequent allusions to oracles throughout the comedy and particularly the 'Cracle-scene', in which the Paphlagonian and the Sausage-seller compete in reciting oracles to Demos, cannot be accounted for on this basis. Something of historical
significance still remains.

There is ample evidence in Thucydides for the importance of oracles at Athens during the Archidamian War.\(^1\) Their influence on public opinion is indisputable\(^2\) and the events which preceded the decision to send the expedition to Sicily in 415 show that they could be used by interested parties in debates about national policy.\(^3\) Ehrenberg has gone so far as to say that every leading politician had to make use of them, irrespective of his personal religious beliefs,\(^4\) and while no ancient source except Aristophanes links Cleon with oracles, it is a fair inference from the *Knights* that he must have presented the comic poet with usable material here and employed them in

---

1 ii.8.2, 17.1, 21.3, 54; iii.104.1; v.26.3-4.

2 See in general M.P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*, Lund, 1951, 123-4, 130-40; H.W. Parke and D.F. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, Oxford, 1956, i.189-97; Ehrenberg, 260ff.; H.W. Parke, *Greek Oracles*, London, 1967, 107-8. A distinction should be made between the oracles received from Delphi or Dodona, and those which were anonymous or which were attributed to some mythical seer, but both types had a definite impact upon Athenian thinking and both are satirized in the *Knights*. For the significance of Athens' isolation from Delphi and for the pro-Lacedaemonian bias of the oracle during the Archidamian War, see Parke and Wormell, supra cit. 190-4.

3 Thuc. viii.1.1. The historian mentions the part played by oracles and seers only in retrospect. For a fuller account of what happened, see Plut. *Nic.* 13.1. On this occasion the Athenians consulted not only Delphi but also Dodona and Ammon; see Parke, supra cit. 110-1 with n. 8, where the ancient sources are cited.

4 *AJP* lxix 1948, 165. In this article Ehrenberg discusses the foundation of Thurii, an enterprise in which soothsayers and oracles played a prominent part.
a way which lent itself to mockery. The only alternative is to suppose that Aristophanes was exploiting Cleon's scepticism in religious matters by connecting him with oracles in a manner which was amusing because it was so far removed from reality, and this is unlikely. Oracles had a particular appeal for the lower classes and it is difficult to believe that a politician who sought their support would have presented himself publicly as a sceptic. No doubt Cleon was hard-headed and pragmatic, but given the fact that he is also represented in the Knights as an ardent devotee of Athena, it is more logical to suppose that he was a conservative, or, at the very least, that he adopted a conservative stance on religious matters.

There is no reason to conclude, however, that Cleon was especially notable among the politicians of the day for his use of oracles or that he employed them consistently throughout his career. It has been noted that the other ancient authorities are silent about his association with them, and although Aristophanes makes great fun of oracles and seers in his other plays he does not mention them in connection with Cleon. This perhaps suggests that the politician had employed them to good effect on one specific occasion shortly before the beginning of 424.

1 Cf. Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 81.

2 This would be confirmed if one could be confident that there was real substance behind the traditions that he prosecuted Anaxagoras and Euripides for asebeia, but see above, pp. 32ff.
It will be argued below that this occasion may have been a debate on the question whether work should start on the Nike temple, when Cleon possibly recalled oracles belonging to the period of the Persian Wars to support his arguments that construction should begin. First, however, it may be noted that the charges of manipulation which Aristophanes makes in the *Knights* are impossible to assess. The accusation that the Paphlagonian recites oracles which he knows will please Demos fits in well enough with the suggestion that Cleon had evoked memories of Athens' past glories to buttress his contention that the Nike temple should now be built, but essentially this is another form of the charge that he flatters the people unconscionably.¹ For the rest, one can only say that the number of oracles in circulation and their frequent ambiguity gave a politician considerable scope for selecting those which best fitted his purpose,² and for interpreting them to suit his needs.³ In these circumstances, accusations of outright chicanery were easy to make,⁴ but they have to be regarded

¹ This is considered below in the section dealing with Cleon's oratory, pp. 298-308.

² Plutarch, *Nic.* 13.1, provides a good example of this when he relates how Alcibiades countered religious opposition to the Sicilian expedition by choosing an ancient oracle which stated that the Athenians would gain great glory from Sicily.

³ For Themistocles' celebrated ingenuity in wringing a favorable implication from the second Delphic oracle given to the Athenians during Xerxes' invasion, see Parke and Wormell, op. cit. 169-71.

⁴ Cf. *Arips.* fr. 10: Ἀριωντές Χρησμοὺς αὐτοῖς ἅγιόν τε φησίν ἔχειν ἔπεμψεν τῷ παραμυθούμενῳ.
with caution.

There are a number of passages in the Knights, particularly those in which the goddess Athena figures, which seem to support the view that Cleon should be associated with her temple. Before these are analyzed, however, the few facts which are known about the date of the building and modern opinion on the subject need to be outlined.

The theory that Cleon was involved in the decision to start work on the Nike temple has already been advanced by J.S. Boersma. He has speculated that amidst the mood of general jubilation which prevailed in Athens after the success at Pylos, Cleon or one of his supporters proposed that construction should begin. The battle scenes on the west frieze of the temple depict Greeks fighting against Greeks, and Boersma had argued that these were intended to represent the Athenian success on Sphacteria. In his view, the temple commemorated the Athenian victory over the Spartans as well as their earlier defeat of the Persians.

Boersma's hypothesis about the frieze of the temple scarcely commends itself, but his theory as a whole requires careful analysis. At first sight indeed there seems to be something incongruous in associating the crude, violent Cleon of Thucydides and Aristophanes with the graceful little Ionic temple, but a closer examination of

1 Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C., Groningen, 1970, 84-8.
the facts suggests that Boersma has ignored a considerable amount of evidence (especially the passages in the Knights referred to above), which strongly supports his case.

IG i² 24, the decree which provided for the building of the temple of Athena Nike, is still generally dated in the early 440s. Yet it is now virtually certain that work actually began on the temple at some time in the 420s, and various reasons have been put forward to explain the apparent delay in construction. The precise date when the building was started is unknown, but a number of fragmentary inscriptions refer or seem to refer to the temple and the sanctuary, and these have sometimes been adduced

1 See ML 44; Meiggs, 501. The dating now depends almost entirely upon the use of the three-bar sigma in the text; H.P. Mattingly, Hist. xi 1961, 169-71, Hist. xiv 1965, 278, argues that it should be placed no earlier than 428/7, but see above, pp. 14-15.

2 For the approximate date, see Meiggs, 496-503, who traces the history of modern scholarship on the subject. Apart from the epigraphical evidence (notably IG i² 25) and stylistic factors, the decisive reason for dating the building to the Archidamian War is that the dismantling of the temple and the restoration of its bastion in the 1930s (cf. G. Velter, AA liv 1939, 1-22), showed that it was almost certainly built after work on the neighboring Propylaea was abandoned in 432. A. Orlandos completed the restoration of the temple in 1940, and in BCH lxxi 1947, 38, he concluded his observations on the structure of the building by emphasizing its similarity 'surtout au point de vue constructif' to the Erechtheum. Orlandos cited many instances where 'les constructeurs du temple de Niké et ceux de l'Erechthéion ont fait usage des mêmes procédés techniques' and noted a few stylistic differences which he attributed to the slightly earlier date of the Nike temple. It is still uncertain whether work started on the Erechtheum in 423/2 or slightly later; see below, p. 260, n. 1.

3 See below, pp. 261-3.
as evidence. Most notably, there is some degree of acceptance among modern scholars that construction began in 427/6 or shortly afterwards partly on the basis of IG i² 111.¹ This mutilated inscription seems to contain a decree which refers to a temple, an architect and a building contract. Neither the temple nor the architect is named but A.B. West has suggested that the decree should be linked with the beginning of work on the Nike temple,² and this suggestion has found considerable support. The epistates on the day when it passed was one Σκύρος and the adherents of this theory identify him with the epistates of IG i² 60,³ the decree concerning a settlement with Mytilene some time after the suppression of her revolt in 427. If one further assumes that the settlement was made soon after the revolt had been suppressed, a fairly exact date for the temple is obtained.

It is obvious that this line of reasoning is far from conclusive. Only the last three letters (Θος) of the name of the epistates of IG i² 60 survive, and the number of missing letters is unknown. Moreover, even if IG i² 111 refers to the Nike temple and the two decrees were passed

¹ See W.B. Dinsmoor, PAPhS lxxx 1939, 125; Mattingly, Hist. x 1961, 170; I.M. Shear, Hesp. xxxii 1963, 388; P. Neils Boulter, Hesp. xxxviii 1969, 133 with n. 3.


³ Tod, i.63.
on the same day, \( \text{IG } 1^2 60 \) is so fragmentary that it is impossible to reconstruct its terms or to establish its date. Its amicable tone may suggest that it was not passed immediately after the suppression of the revolt, and Gomme has argued that it belongs to 425 or 424, dates which could obviously harmonize well with Boersma's theory about Cleon's involvement with the temple.

Of the other inscriptions, \( \text{IG } 1^2 88 \) and 89 certainly refer to the Nike temple, but they cannot be dated

---

1 West, op. cit. 647-8, observed that names ending in \(-\Theta\omega\) are very rare, and he argued that the \( \Sigma\mu\kappa\omega\beta\) of \( \text{IG } 1^2 111 \) belonged to Acamantis, the prytanizing tribe when \( \text{IG } 1^2 60 \) was passed.

2 HCT ii.326-32. There are references in the decree to the Athenian cleruchs who had been sent to Mytilene and their relations with the islanders, and Gomme held that it records the restoration of the land to the latter. Since Thucydides did not mention the cleruchs in his description of the events of 424 which involved Mytilene, Gomme concluded that they had already left. P.A. Brunt, Ancient Society and Institutions, Studies presented to V. Ehrenberg, 83, has ventured the conjecture that the cleruchs 'might have been most disposed to return to Athens after the capture of the Spartans on Sphacteria in July 425 made the renewal of Peloponnesian invasions of Attica less likely'. The whole history of this cleruchy on Lesbos is, however, extremely controversial.

3 These inscriptions, cut on the front and back of the same stone, were published with photographs by A. Pogorelski, AJA xxvii 1923, 314-7, and discussed by Dinsmoor, ibid. 318-21. \( \text{IG } 1^2 89 \) contains records of building expenses and mentions the temple of Nike. \( \text{IG } 1^2 88 \) seems to refer to a decision on the material and design for a door.
except in a general way.¹ IG i² 360 may be part of a
building account dealing with the temple's acroteria,² but
again it cannot be dated with any precision. IG i² 368
is concerned with the dedication of two Golden Nikai in
426/5³ and IG ii² 403 refers to a statue of Nike which
was set up to commemorate various Athenian successes won
in 426/5 and 425/4. Dinsmoor, who believes that the temple
of Nike was built c. 427-4, thinks that these dedications
show that there was unusual activity in the precinct of
the goddess at this time,⁴ but this may be slightly mis-
leading. At least three Golden Nikai are mentioned in the
second financial decree of Callias, which is generally

---
¹ In 1923, Dinsmoor, supra cit. 320, placed IG i² 88 in
436/5 and IG i² 89, which he assumes to be the final record
for the expenses of the temple, in 433/2. Later, however,
he changed his mind and dated the temple and the inscrip-
tions c. 427-4; see FAPhS lxxx 1939, 123-5; AJA 44 1947,
111 n. 14; The Architecture of Ancient Greece, London,
1950, 185 n. 4. Meiggs, 501, has observed that the
inscriptions contain no distinctive letter forms and that
on epigraphical grounds it would be dangerous to set
narrower limits to them than 440-415.

² It has sometimes been assigned to the Erechtheum, but
see P. Neils Boulter, Hesp. xxxviii 1969, 134-40.

³ Cf. D.B. Thompson, Hesp. xiii 1944, 206-7. While it is
impossible to restore much of the text of the inscription,
the use of the dual proves that two figures are in question.

⁴ Greek Architecture, ³ 185 n. 4.
dated to 434/3.\textsuperscript{1} This is the first extant reference to these statues and it is not entirely clear why they should have been made at this date. D.B. Thompson thinks that piety, prudence and the pressure to keep in employment skilled craftsmen (who had been released from occupation when the Parthenos was dedicated) all played a part in the Athenian decision 'to convert useless bullion into works of art'\textsuperscript{2} and this may be correct. At all events, there is no reason to think that these first statues were connected in any way with the decision to erect the Nike temple, and the same is probably true of those dedicated in 426/5. Thompson has plausibly suggested that these two golden statues were associated with the two victories of Phormio in the Corinthian gulf in 429,\textsuperscript{3} and Dinsmoor does not suggest that the decision to start work on the temple was taken as early as this. The statue of Athena Nike which

\textsuperscript{1} ML 588. This dating has also been challenged by Pattingly (see especially BCH xcii 1968, 450-85), and by C.W. Fornara, GRBS xl 1970, 185-96. Both revive older views in trying to place the two Callias decrees in 422/1 and 418/7 respectively, but they have been answered by Meiggs, App. ll, 519-23, and 601. The golden Nikai are mentioned in the opening clause of the decree, and while this has not been satisfactorily restored, it seems to authorize their completion. The use of the plural not the dual form shows that at least three Victories were involved, and it is normally thought that altogether eight statues were made before 407/6, when all but one were melted down to make gold coins; cf. D.B. Thompson, op. cit. 205-8; W.E. Thompson AJP lxxxvi 1965, 159ff., and NC x 1970, 1-6.

\textsuperscript{2} op. cit. 173-4. She believes that the statues embodied the goddess' share of the money received from the Sarisians in repayment of the war-expenses after their surrender in 439.

\textsuperscript{3} op. cit. 174.
is the subject of IG ii² 403 was dedicated for the various campaigns of Demosthenes in 426/5;¹ for the victory of the Corcyraean democrats over the oligarchs which was gained with Athenian help in the summer of 425;² and for the capture of Anactorium by the Athenians and the Acarnanians from Naupactus later in the same year.³ The decisions to set up this statue and the bronze one mentioned by Pausanias which commemorated the fighting on Sphacteria⁴ must have been taken at approximately the same time. It is tempting to think that in the mood of triumph reigning in the city after Pylos the Athenians decided to start work on the goddess' temple as well as to dedicate these two statues to her, but the chronological relationship of the statues with the building cannot be regarded as certain.

A similar difficulty exists with IG i² 25, the decree moved by a Callias in 424/3, stipulating that the κωδακράτιοι should pay the priestess of Athena Nike an annual stipend of fifty drachmas each Thargelion.⁵ It is cut on the back face of the stone bearing IG i² 2L, which, besides authorizing the building of the temple, contained

¹ Thuc. iii.105-12.
² Thuc. iv.46.
³ Thuc. iv.49.
⁴ iv.36.6.
⁵ ML 71. The date is established by the name of the secretary Neocleides, who was secretary of the Boule for the tribe Aegelis in 424/3. See Wade-Gery, Essays in Greek History, 207ff.
... among its provisions that the priestess was to receive fifty drachmas a year. The later decree then specifies in detail how and when the payments are to be made,\(^1\) and its close association with \(\text{IG } i^2 24\), taken in conjunction with the other evidence cited above, would seem to fix the construction of the temple in the mid 420s. Dinsmoor believes that the fact that the decree is inscribed on the back of \(\text{IG } i^2 24\) shows that the temple was now finished,\(^2\) but this again is a highly uncertain inference. If the decision to build the temple was taken in 424/3, these provisions concerning the payment of the priestess could have been made at about the same time. Alternatively, if (in line with Boersma's theory), work had started on the temple in 425/4 and was now in progress, it would be natural enough that these details about the priestess' salary should formally be settled.

The epigraphical evidence then is simply not decisive. A reasonable case can be made that the Athenians began to build the temple in 425/4, but it can be no more

\(^1\) Meritt and Wade-Gery, \textit{JHS} liii 1963, lll, believe that the decree planned something new about the cult and that these provisions about the fifty drachmas are a preliminary recapitulation about something which will not be altered by the innovation. See, however, \(\text{IG } \textit{MII}, \text{pp. } 204-5\), who conclude either that the priestess 'for reasons we do not understand, had not yet been paid, or that she had been paid at a different time of the year'. They are sceptical whether \(\text{IG } i^2 25\) continued substantially further, noting that on the front face of the stone 'the extant text has already reached an amendment which does not seem to be of major importance.'

than this. On general historical grounds, however, the case is much stronger. It is certain that the initial Athenian decision to erect a temple to their goddess was associated in some way with the earlier fighting against Persia.\(^1\) Scenes on its south frieze depicted fighting between Greeks and Persians\(^2\) and Persian trophies were represented on the balustrade which surrounded the bastion.\(^3\) Moreover, one of the undated decrees concerning the temple mentions that proposals of both Athenians and their allies are to be given a hearing.\(^4\) This conjunction of the allies with the Athenians in a decree dealing with an

---

\(^1\) In Hist. x 1961, 170, Mattingly suggested that it was vowed for victory over Sparta, not Persia, but (apparently) revised his opinion in Hist. xiv 1965, 279-80. Here he connects the decision to build the temple with the allies' struggle against Persia.

\(^2\) These are generally interpreted as representing the battle of Marathon; see E.B. Harrison, AJA lxxvi 1972, 353-78. Since C. Blümel, JDI lxv-lxvi 1950-1, 146, it has been recognized that only fights of Greek against Greek can be identified on the north frieze but this is badly preserved. Harrison, AJA lxxvi 1972, 194-7, argues that it depicts the battle of Plataea. It has been noted earlier that Boersma's theory that the west frieze depicted the battle on Sphacteria is scarcely plausible since it is difficult to believe that a contemporary historical event was represented on an Athenian temple. E.G. Pemberton, AJA lxxvi 1972, 303-10, has argued that it depicts the victory of Myronides at Megara (Thuc. 1.105.3-106).

\(^3\) See R. Carpenter, The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet, Cambridge, 1929, pl. 11, p. 31; pl. 12, p. 33; pl. 31, p. 69; pl. 32, p. 71. Cf. pl. 3, p. 15; pl. 4, r. 17. Neils Broch, Hesp. xxviii 1969, 134-40, has suggested that Bellerophon, Pegasus and the Chimaera formed an acroterion group on the temple, and that 'in the portrayal of the Greek hero subduing the eastern Acheron there may be a subtle analogy with the theme on the frieze.'

\(^4\) IG i\(^2\) 88; see Meiggs, 501.
Athenian temple is highly unusual and it would seem to confirm that the building had a special significance for the members of the empire.\(^1\)

If, then, the temple was intended to commemorate the battles which Athens had fought against the Persians earlier in the century, it is easy enough to see why the Athenians voted to build it in the early 440s when they launched their great new building program.\(^2\) Since there was apparently a delay of some twenty years before the temple was constructed, however, some special reason seems to be needed to explain why the Athenians decided to start work on it during the Archidamian War when they were hard pressed financially.\(^3\) No other important new building

1 It may be significant too that IG \(^1\) 25 begins in Attic letters but then continues (l. 6) in Ionic with which the allies were more familiar. While it is now established that the mover of IG \(^1\) 24 cannot have been Hipponicus, son of Callias (see Dinsmoor and West, Hesp. Suppl. v 1941, 159 n. 37), those scholars who accept the historicity of the Peace of Callias find it tempting to identify the Callias who proposed IG \(^1\) 25 as the grandson of the man after whom the treaty is named.

2 The controversy over the 'Peace of Callias' is only marginally relevant in the present context. If the Athenians did sign a treaty with Artaxerxes, presumably they would have been eager to represent this as a victorious settlement by voting to erect the temple. On the other hand, if a peace was not made, in the 440s the temple would have been a natural way for them to commemorate their recent successes, particularly since there is no record that they undertook any military operations against Persia after Cimon's campaign in Cyprus.

3 Meiggs, 153-4, has sought to explain the 'missing tribute list' between 449 and 446 (for this problem, see ML, pp. 133-5), by adopting a suggestion once put forward by Meritt. He tentatively conjectures that the entire tribute for 448 may have been given as a block grant to Athena Nike in connection with the recent decision to erect her temple, but this is obviously extremely speculative.
project in the city is known to have been initiated while the fighting was in progress, and in the second Callias decree it is laid down that apart from money spent on certain projects on the Acropolis (which are previously designated), a preliminary vote of \( \delta \epsilon \) is required before any sum above ten thousand drachmas may be drawn from Athena's reserve. It is a legitimate assumption that with the approach of war the Athenians had decided to put certain public works in order before suspending building.

---

1 Since C. Austin, Recherches de Papyrologie iv, Paris, 1967, 11-69, published the third century B.C. Sortonne papyrus (P. Sorb. Inv. 232\#), it is generally recognized that Euripides' Erechtheus must be linked with the construction of the Erechtheum. Athena's closing speech in the tragedy (fr. 65, 90-1, Austin), in which she reveals to Praxithia that she is ordering the construction of a \( \sigma \kappa \) 'with enclosing walls of stone' for the dead Erechtheus makes this explicitly clear. W.M. Calder, GRBS x 1969, 147-56, has argued that Euripides' play was performed at the Dionysia of 422, but even if he is correct (and his arguments depend heavily on Plut. Nic. 9.5), it is still impossible to be sure when work actually started on the building. Austin, supra cit. 59, believes that fr. 65 shows that construction was under way when the play was performed. C.W. Clairmont, GRBS xii 1971, 490 n. 16, argues that the passage conclusively shows that the building was 'a thing of the future'. Calder, supra cit. 155ff., speculates that the decision to build was taken in L23/2, but seems to accept Paton's tentative conclusion (Paton-Stevens, 453), that work actually began c. 419 or 418, i.e. when the Athenians had accumulated sufficient funds after the heavy expenses of the Archidamian War. If the Athenians did vote to build the Erechtheum in L23, they may have been encouraged to do so by the negotiation of the one-year truce with Sparta.

2 ML 58 B. 12-19.
operations in the city.¹ The Apollo temple on Delos has been identified as an Athenian undertaking and it is usually dated to 425-17.² In this case, however, the Athenians must have had a special motive, the propitiation of Apollo because of the plague.³ It would seem that special circumstances are also required to explain the decision to begin the Nike temple. Doubtless the Athenians recognized their religious obligation to the goddess, but since there had already been such a considerable delay they could scarcely have felt unduly pressured by it. It appears highly unlikely too that there had been one specific reason for this delay which was suddenly removed, allowing work to proceed. Rhys Carpenter has suggested that Pericles caused the cancellation of the project when he came into power at Cimon's death, because it would have become an enduring memorial to the latter, his life-long

---

¹ Cf. Meritt, Hesp. xiv 1945, 91-3. It is clear that work on the Propylaea stopped shortly before the outbreak of war (see R.A. Tomlinson, Greek Sanctuaries, London, 1976, 87), and there is ample evidence (conveniently cited by Boersma, 87 with nn. 853-64) for the abandonment of various other projects.

² See F. Courby, Exploration archéologique de Delos, XII, les temples d'Apollon, Paris, 1931, 220-4. In the winter of 426/5 the Athenians purified the island and in the spring of 425 they revived the Delia festival (Thuc. iii. 104). It is generally accepted that the temple was started around this time. Like the Nike temple, the temple (and festival) of Apollo must have had definite propaganda value with relation to the Delian League, and it does not seem improbable that the decisions to begin work on the two buildings were roughly contemporaneous; see below, p. 270, n. 1.

³ See Gomme, HCT ii.414-5.
political enemy. Carpenter believes that when Pericles died unexpectedly and the Cimonian party under new leadership resumed control, one of its first acts was to resurrect the discarded project of a temple to Victory in Battle in order to honor the memory of their leader. He does not explain, however, who the new leaders of this 'Cimonian party' were, and Meiggs has emphasized the lack of evidence for a bitter feud between Pericles and Cimon. Moreover, Callicrates, who was originally commissioned to design the Nike temple, is widely thought to have been a Periclean.

Meritt and Wade-Gery have sought to explain the delay by developing arguments earlier advanced by Dinsmoor and by Meritt himself. They believe that most of the surviving text of IG i2 24 is the first amendment to a decree cut mainly upon the upper part of the stele which is now lost, and that the subject matter of this decree was 'almost surely the architectural re-organization of the western approach to the Acropolis'. The 'amendment to build a temple of Athena Nike then becomes a conservative counter-move to protect the sanctuary of the goddess, and they suggest that this conflict of interests was

2 Meiggs, 597.
3 IG i2 24.
5 AJA xxvii 1923, 319.
responsible for the delay in its execution.

Modern experts are divided as to whether the final form of the south-west wing of the Propylaea is evidence for a continuing conflict between its sponsors and those of the Nike temple.\(^1\) Meiggs, who raises a number of pertinent objections to the argument that the motion to build the temple was necessarily an amendment,\(^2\) has advanced less dramatic explanations for the postponement of the building,\(^3\) and there is no literary evidence that the construction of the temple became a controversial public issue. It is possible that Meritt and Wade-Gery are correct, but in any case it seems clear that the outbreak of the Archidamian War brought Athens' building program to a halt. The question still remains then, why and under what circumstances did the Athenians decide to start work on the Nike temple which commemorated the defeat of the Persians while the war was still in progress.

Mattingly, who thinks that work began on the temple c. 427, has suggested that the decision was closely linked with the revolt of Lesbos. He speculates that the Athenians tried to present the suppression of the revolt as 'a new blow in the struggle for Greek freedom which Athens

---

1 See Boersma, 70 with nn. 676, 677 where the different views are cited.
2 See also A.L. Boegehold in Classical Studies presented to B.E. Perry, Urbana, 1969, 175-80.
3 Meiggs, 499ff.
THE KNIGHTS

had so long maintained'.1 Alternatively, it is arguable that an event which took place in 424/3 could have inspired the Athenians to commence building. It is virtually certain that a peace with Darius was signed in this year,2 and many scholars believe that the original decision to erect the temple was connected with the Peace of Callias. Wade-Gery has stated that IG i2 25 'is doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty (sc. of 424/3), being a renewal of IG i2 24 which itself was doubtless consequent on the news of the treaty with Artaxerxes'.3 Yet neither 427 nor 424/3 would seem to have been an appropriate year for the Athenians to be thinking about the Victory Temple. In 427 Plataea surrendered and Athens was hard pressed financially, while in the winter of 424/3 the Athenians suffered terrible losses at Delium. 425/4, on the other hand, was clearly the high point of Athenian success in the war and

1 Hist. xiv 1965, 279-80. He emphasizes that the Mytileneans must have hoped for Persian support, and notes that about this time Athens baffled a Persian attempt to gain control of Notium (Thuc. iii.34).

2 The evidence for this peace has been presented by Wade-Gery, Essays, 207-11, and has won general acceptance. D. Stockton, Hist. viii 1959, 68, 74-9, rejects it but his arguments have been answered by ML, p. 203. A.E. Raubitschek, GRBS v 1964, 156ff., would date the peace shortly before the Sicilian Expedition in 415, but his case depends too much upon assumptions about Alcibiades' foreign policy. He rejects the 'good but circumstantial' evidence for a peace before the end of 424/3, because if Darius came to the throne in December 424, this does not leave much time for the negotiations to be completed. The Athenians, however, must have been eager to reach the new king before the Spartans had a chance of doing so.

3 Essays, 209.
victory now seemed to be within sight. Moreover, although Boersma ignores this point, Athenian relations with Persia seem to have taken a new turn in this year.

Below the decree ordering the tribute reassessment of 425 the cities of the empire are listed with their new assessments in four columns according to their districts: Islands, Ionia-Caria, Hellespont and Thrace. Added as an appendix to the Thracian panel are cities from the Euxine, and neither these nor a number of south-eastern cities included in the Ionia-Carian list are known to have been assessed before. Those scholars who accept the historicity of the Peace of Callias see this as a breach either of the letter or the spirit of the Peace depending upon their interpretation of its terms. For those who do not believe in the Peace, the assessment is a violation of an unwritten agreement or, at the very least, a determined attempt by Athens to extend her influence in areas which were of concern to Persia. On any reckoning, there is a mood of aggression towards Persia implicit in this assessment, and this harmonizes well with the suggestion that it was in the second half of 425 that a motion was passed that the long delayed Nike temple should finally be built.

---

1 See ATL ii.42-4.
2 For the details, see Meiggs, 328-30.
3 See ATL iii.116-7.
4 Cf. Meiggs, 330.
Since the transference of the League funds from Delos to Athens, it seems clear that the Athenians had made a determined effort to establish Athena as the patroness of the empire.¹ She received an aparchē from the annual tribute, and while this was brought to Athens at the time of the Dionysia,² the allies were encouraged to take part in the Panathenaea. It is notable too that the reassessments of tribute were normally carried out every fourth year when the festival was celebrated with special pomp.³ On the stele recording the assessment of 425, a second decree (also proposed by Thudippus), prescribes that all cities included in the assessment are to bring cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaea and are to escort their offerings in the procession. While it now seems certain that this obligation was not introduced for the first time in 425,⁴ the fact that it is the subject of a special

² Ach. 502-6 with schol; schol. ad Ach. 378.
³ See Meiggs, 239-40. Meritt and Wade-Gery, supra cit. 71, have suggested that because 454 (the year when the treasury was moved to Athens) happened to be a year of the Great Panathenaea, 'the idea was born that the League be assimilated to a system of colonies, with the four-yearly Great Panathenaia as their common feast.'

⁴ The requirement is also referred to in a decree moved by Clinias (ML 46). Meiggs and Lewis argue on epigraphical grounds that this must have been passed before the twenties, and for historical reasons they place it in the forties. Mattingly has consistently claimed that it was passed shortly after the decree of Thudippus, but in RSA lxv 1970, 131ff., he admits that Thudippus 'was perhaps merely extending established custom to the whole of the vast company of tributaries created by the Reassessment'.
decree shows that the Athenian leaders were determined that all the cities on the assessment list were to participate in the festival honoring the city's goddess. It would be consonant with this and a timely piece of propaganda, if the Athenians now also decided to start work on the Nike temple. The cult of Athena Nike seems to have had a special association with the Panathenaea,¹ while her temple would recall to the allies Athens' glorious past and symbolize both her aspirations in the current war and her determination to maintain and even to extend Greek 'freedom' against the ever-present eastern oppressor. With the increase in tribute the Athenians would be in a better position to pay for the building, and any allied rumblings on this score might be expected to be summarily dealt with, given the triumphant mood which now prevailed in the imperial city.

A short time after the tribute-assessment, Athenian-Persian relations were complicated when an

¹ When the bastion of the Nike temple was dismantled, two altars were discovered, and the earlier of these (with its inscription) has been dated to the middle of the sixth century by G. Welter, AA liv 1939, 10-13; cf. A.E. Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis, Camb. Mass., 1949, no. 328. Welter suggested that the cult of the goddess was given official recognition at that time and that this should be connected with the new emphasis given to the Panathenaea in 566. This theory has now attracted considerable support; see (e.g.) J.H. Oliver, Demokratia, the Gods and the Free World, Baltimore, 1960, 121ff.; E.B. Harrison, GRBS xii 1971, 7-9 with nn. This does not necessarily mean that there was a later change in the basic nature of the cult, since there is no apparent reason why Athena Nike should not have been recognized as goddess of victory both in war and in games from the outset.
Athenian squadron captured a Persian envoy on his way to Sparta. He bore a letter from the King asking them to clarify their earlier messages, and the Athenians eventually decided to send him back to Susa accompanied by ambassadors. The latter turned back at Ephesus after learning that Artaxerxes had died and their mandate is unclear. Obviously the Athenians must have been anxious to ensure that Persian aid did not reach the Lacedaemonians, and it is usually thought that they intended to explain the tribute-assessment to the King. Even if this is correct, however, it is not an argument against dating the Nike temple to this year. In order to stop Persia from intervening in the war on the side of the Spartans, the Athenians would probably have been quite willing to indulge in a little placatory diplomacy. Moreover, it may be pertinent to note that at Knights 478 the Paphlagonian accuses his opponents of intriguing with Persia. This may perhaps indicate that Cleon at least had advocated that a strong line should be adopted on this occasion. The Athenians' main objective in making peace with Darius in 424/3 was almost certainly to block an agreement between

1 Thuc. iv.50.1.
2 Thuc. iv.50.3.
3 Gomme, HCT iii.499, points out however that not too much should be made of this 'for the comedy lies in the fact that all Kleon's accusations are from stock, ready made, and the charge of Medism was one of the oldest and had now least meaning.' No doubt Cleon fully appreciated the advantages of keeping Persia out of the war.
Persia and Sparta. If they made any concessions at this time,¹ these can be attributed to the setbacks which they had suffered in the course of 424,² and this plainly does not militate against the theory that work started on the temple of Athena Nike in the second half of 425.

If this is correct, there is good reason to link Cleon with the temple. He was a strong imperialist, his influence in the Assembly must have been decisive after the triumph on Sphacteria, and despite obvious differences in style and character he was in many ways the natural successor of Pericles. The prospect of emulating the latter, even on a relatively minor scale, may well have fascinated

¹ This is by no means certain. Scholars who accept the authenticity of the Peace of Callias tend to believe that it was renewed perhaps with minor modifications and Athenian renunciations of the aggression implicit in the assessment of 425. Those who are sceptical about the Peace generally hold that its 'terms' belong to the treaty of 424/3. The different views are conveniently cited by Meiggs, 487-95.

² The Athenians had been heavily defeated at Delium and had failed to seize Megara, while Brasidas was active in the north.
Moreover, the passages in the Knights which have been mentioned earlier seem not only to support the argument that the decision to start work on the temple was taken in 425, but also to point to Cleon's involvement in this decision.

In the first place, it is a curious fact that the goddess Athena receives little attention in the other plays of Aristophanes, but she is extremely prominent in the Knights where the Paphlagonian, the comic caricature of Cleon, is a staunch 'Athenist'. At 652-6 the Sausage-seller relates how his adversary had proposed θέαν ἐκεῖνον βῆς τῇ θεῷ and at 763-4 the Paphlagonian prays τὴν μὲν θεόν Αθηναία τῇ τῆς πόλεως μεθείσης. Neil has observed that the goddess is invoked as 'Athena' only four times in

1 It is interesting, however, to speculate on the relationship between the Nike temple and the Athenian temple of Apollo on Delos. Both buildings seem to show that the Athenians were alive to the possibilities of 'propaganda' with respect to the empire, and it has been noted above that they seem to have been built at about the same time. Since the Apollo temple was apparently dedicated by Nicias in 417 (see Courby, op. cit. 221-4), while Plutarch, Nic. 3.5-7, records Nicias' lavish outlays at the Delia, it is natural to suppose that he played a part in the Athenian decision to build it. If work began on this temple at the same time as the revival of the Delia in the spring of 425, rivalry with Nicias, not Pericles, may have motivated Cleon. It is possible, however, that the Apollo temple was slightly later and that Nicias was prompted to action by Cleon's move, just as he may have been stung into unwonted military activity by Pylos (see Gomme, HCT iii. 489).

2 Cf. C.J. Herington, G & R x. Suppl. 1963, 72-3, who lists the references to the goddess, but somewhat exaggerates their importance and frequency.
Aristophanes' comedies, and it is striking that three of these appeals are connected in some way with Cleon.

Later in the Knights, the Paphlagonian recalls a dream in which he saw Athena pouring πλούσια in on the people, and three of the dainties which he presents to Demos in 'the gift-giving scene' are (he claims) prepared by her. Naturally he is outdone in this by the Sausage-seller, who turns his own weapons upon him. Earlier, he had told the Paphlagonian that he was under the goddess' orders to conquer him ἀλαζονεῖας, and he had obeyed this command at 1092-5 by capping the Paphlagonian's dream with his own vision: he saw Athena come down from the Acropolis and pour ambrosia on Demos, ἕκτορδαμον on his rival. Now he first offers Demos μυστίλας μεμυστηρευμένας ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ τῇ χειρὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας and then continues in the same vein.

1 n. ad 581.

2 The exception is Clouds 601. In addition to Knights 763-4, Hermes at Peace 217-8 recalls how the Athenians had invoked her when they rejected the Spartan peace-proposals after Pylos, and at 271-2 Trygaeus calls upon her when he salutes the news of Cleon's death.

3 1090-1.

4 1171-2, 1177, 1181-2.

5 903.

6 1168-9.

7 At 1173-4 he parodies Solon's lines by telling Demos that Athena ὑπερέχει σου κύριων ζωμοῖς τέλειοι; at 1178-9 he gives him victuals from the ὀορμοῦσα; at 1183-5 he offers him ἐντεφδε from the goddess, and at 1187-9 wine which ἦν ἱπποδομήσαι ἐνετηρίδων.
This unusual prominence of Athena\(^1\) and Cleon's close association with her require an explanation. The short scene leading to the climax of the play, in which the Sausage-seller and the Paphlagonian both boast that the gifts which they bestow on Demos come from Athena, looks remarkably like a parody of Cleon's actual behavior after Pylos. The Paphlagonian opens 'the duel of victuals' with a μαζίκη made ἐκ τῶν ὀλῶν τῶν ἐκ Πύλου.\(^2\) The fact that this provokes the Sausage-Seller into claiming that his gifts are from Athena, shows that the Paphlagonian's ὀλαί (or sacrificial barley) refer to an actual sacrifice which must have been offered to the goddess in thanksgiving for the victory at Pylos.\(^3\) Throughout this scene, too, the Paphlagonian emphasizes Athena's martial qualities and refers to her as Ἡ Πυλαίμαχος at 1172.\(^4\) The Sausage-seller at 1203 hails his own usurpation of the Paphlagonian's 'strategy' at Pylos with the tragic parody: τὸ μὲν νόμμα τῆς Ἡθεώ, τὸ δὲ κλέμμ' ἐμὲν. From all of this it is logical to conclude that after returning in triumph from Pylos, Cleon had been emphatic in expressing his gratitude to

---

1 In addition to the passages cited above, the goddess is also invoked by the chorus in the parabasis, but these lines are considered below.

2 1166-7.

3 For Wade-Gery's ingenious arguments that an anecdote about Cleon reported by Plutarch and Theopompos contains a reference to a thanksgiving sacrifice after Pylos, see below, 324-5.

4 She is Ἡ φόβεσιτίμη at 1177, Ἡ Γοργολόφα at 1181.
The goddess is treated with scant respect in this scene, and Herington cites the lines as unique in Attic comedy. This harmonizes well with the theory that Cleon had played a prominent part in the Athenian decision to start work on the Nike temple at this time. It must be kept in mind that if this was the case, Aristophanes was faced with something of a problem. To attempt a really direct attack upon a building which would commemorate Athens' past glories and which was dedicated to the patroness of the city was well nigh impossible, even if he was inclined to adopt this line. Yet he could not totally ignore what Cleon had done. At 266-8 the Paphlagonian claims that he had intended to propose a motion that it was just εστάναι μνημείον on the Acropolis commemorating the Knights' valor. This is funny because it is incongruous, but the lines would have more point for the audience if, as seems very probable, Cleon had proposed or supported the dedication of the bronze Nike statue on the Acropolis ες μνήμην των έν ἡ Σφακτηρία.  

1 nn. ad 1168-9, 1170.
2 op. cit. 72-3.
3 It is perhaps more than a coincidence that at 967-9 the Sausage-seller appears to mock the effeminacy of one Smicythus. This is the name of the epistates when IG i 2 111 was passed and many scholars believe that this decree authorized work to begin on the Nike temple; see above.
4 Paus. iv.36.6.
The evidence of the Knights strongly suggests that Cleon had recently been involved in the decision to erect the Nike temple and that Aristophanes successfully mocked the role which he had played by similar, somewhat indirect, allusions to it.

When the Paphlagonian tried to bribe the Boule by proposing to sacrifice a hecatomb to Athena, the Sausageseller immediately overshot him. He vowed\(^1\) (if \(\tau \iota \rho \gamma \iota \delta \varepsilon \varsigma\) dropped in price) a thousand she-goats to Artemis Agrotera, a clear parody of the annual sacrifice of five hundred yearlings in fulfillment of the vow which the Athenians had made before Marathon.\(^2\) Later in the play, the Sausage-seller bemoans the Paphlagonian's lamentable lack of concern for the comfort of Demos whose bravery at Marathon and Salamis he caricatures.\(^3\) These passages gain considerably in point, if at Cleon's urging, work was now in progress on Athena's temple on the Acropolis which commemorated these victories. The same obviously applies to the ending of the comedy when Demos comes down from the Acropolis enveloped in the glory which he had enjoyed in the days of the Persian Wars, and dismisses the unfortunate Paphlagonian with haughty contempt. Again, shortly prior to this, the Sausage-seller at 1253 had celebrated his hard won victory over the Paphlagonian with these words:

\[\]
\[\]
\[1\] 660-2.
\[2\] Xen. Anab. iii.2.12.
\[3\] 781-5.
As Neil has observed, this title of Zeus had become by the Persian Wars a symbol of Greek unity, and it is scarcely heard of except in the context of these Wars. Cleon may worship Athena and have his Victory Temple, but in Comedy it is the Sausage-seller and Pan-hellenic Zeus who have the prize of Victory.

It is noteworthy too that although Themistocles, one of the most important Athenian leaders during the Persian Wars, is not mentioned in any other Aristophanic comedy, he is referred to by name five times in the Knights. Moreover, when the Paphlagonian prays τῇ μὲν δεσπόινή Ἀθηνᾶ τῇ τῶς πάλιος μεδεύεις and the chorus invoke Pallas μεδέουσα Χύρας, they are echoing Themistocles' use of this cult title when he entrusted the city to Athena in his 'decree' ordering the evacuation of Athens and the mobilization of the Athenian forces to meet the threat of Persian invasion in 480. It seems safe to

1 n. ad loc.
2 84, 812, 813, 818, 834.
3 763-4.
4 581-5.
5 ML 23.4-5.
6 Cf. Meritt in Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, first series, Princeton U.P., 1967, 127ff. It is clear that the decree was known in Athens in 424. Its authenticity is a separate issue and cannot be discussed here; for a review of scholarly opinion on the question, see A.J. Podlecki, The Life of Themistocles, Montreal and London, 1975, 147-67.
conclude that Themistocles' name had come into public attention recently, and that the reason for this was the part which he had played in the victories over the Persians. Perhaps Cleon (like the Paphlagonian at 810-2) had gone around the city claiming that Pylos was more important than Themistocles' successes, but the echoes of the decree make it more probable that Cleon had recalled these successes and the decree, when proposing that the Nike temple should be built. It is notable that Nike is one of the deities to whom, in the Themistoclean 'decree', the Council and Generals are to make propitiatory sacrifices before the Athenians embark on their ships.

Nike is also prominent in the oracle of Bacis quoted by Herodotus. After foretelling the terrible bloodshed which will take place at Salamis, the oracle concludes:

\[
\text{τότ' ἔλευθερον Ἑλλάδος ἑμαρ ἐφώποτα Κρονίδης ἔπαιε καὶ πότνια Νίκη}
\]

It is tempting to think that Cleon had quoted this and other oracles dating from the time of the Persian Wars to bolster his arguments that work should now begin on the Nike temple. Before the Sausage-seller and the Paphlagonian compete in reciting oracles to Demos, they both assure him at 965-9 that their oracles prophesy that he will rule

1 The view of Podlecki, supra cit. 59.
2 ML 23.35-40.
3 viii.77.
like the Great King. It may be significant too that when
the Sausage-seller rebukes his rival for comparing himself
to Themistocles he describes him as \textit{χρηματιστών} at 818.
Athena was certainly mentioned in at least two of the
oracles parodied in the comedy. One of these cannot be
dated, but the other is the celebrated Delphic oracle
delivered to the Athenians before Salamis, the ambiguity
of which Themistocles turned to good account by interpr-
eting it as referring to the Athenian ships.

The last argument is admittedly speculative, but
it does at least afford an explanation why oracles are so
prominent in the play. It may be legitimate to speculate
a little further. It has been noted above that when the
bastion of the Nike temple was dismantled two altars were
found. The earlier belongs to the sixth century and since
it was broken into pieces it is generally accepted that it
was destroyed at the time of the Persian invasion. This
means that the new altar must have been built after 479,
and since Nike is one of the deities specifically mentioned
in Themistocles' 'decree', it is possible that he was
responsible for it. If Cleon had proposed that the Nike

1 Parodied at 1011-3, 1086-7. For the oracle see Parke
and Wormell, The Delphic Oracle ii. no. 121, pp. 53-4.
When the Paphlagonian 'quotes' it at 1086-7, the Sausage-
seller immediately retaliates with his 'Persian-oracle' at
1088-9.

2 Parodied at 1036ff., where it is jumbled with the dream
which, according to Herodotus (vi.131.2), Pericles' mother
had on the eve of giving birth to him. For the oracle, see
Parke and Wormell, supra cit. no. 95, pp. 41-2.

3 p. 251, n. 2.
temple should be constructed and had emphasized Themistocles' connection with the altar, this would explain the Sausage-seller's words when he abuses the Paphlagonian at 817-9 for comparing himself with Themistocles. After listing Themistocles' building achievements, he mocks the Paphlagonian for διατεί&;αν and Χρημοψίλ&;ν. The temple was indeed of greater importance than the altar and is therefore ignored, but Cleon's fortification project\(^1\) was relatively insignificant and it is therefore thrust into the picture.

This suggestion obviously cannot be proved, but in any case it is clear that there are a number of passages in the Knights which gain considerably in meaning on the assumption that Aristophanes was trying to turn to his own advantage (and against Cleon) the recent decision to build the Nike temple. Perhaps the best example of these occurs in the parabasis. In the epitthema\(^2\) the chorus first seem to make the same point which is emphasized at the end of the play: that the warriors who won the great victories in the past are far superior to men like Cleon.\(^3\) Here they sing of the valor of their fathers, fighters τῆς τῆς γῆς αξιοί καὶ τοῦ πέλαγος,\(^4\) who Πανταχών νικῶντες οὐ&;ι την&;ς

\(^1\) For this fortification project, see below, App. G.

\(^2\) 565-80.

\(^3\) That Cleon is one of the examples of modern degeneracy is shown by the references to Cleaenetus (his father) and to δῖνες and προεδρία at 574-5.

\(^4\) 566.
Then, in the antode which follows, they deliver their ringing address to Athena. They call upon her by her 'Themistoclean name' to come to them:

\[ \text{λαβοῦσα τὴν} \]
\[ \text{ἐν στρατῶι τε καὶ πόλισι} \]
\[ \text{ἡμετέρων ἰουνέργον,} \]
\[ \text{Νίκης, ἡ Χορίκων ἔστιν ἑταῖρα} \]
\[ \text{τοῖς τ' ἑλθοὺσι μεθ' ἡμῶν στασίβει.} \]

The verb στρατίζω is used particularly of political conflict. The present comedy is aimed directly at Cleon, and Aristophanes and the corps of cavalry were united in their hostility to him. It is not unreasonable to think that the audience would have included Cleon among ὁι ἑλθοῦσι, when the poet appropriates for the chorus and himself Νίκη who brings success in the choral competitions.

The evidence accumulated here may not seem conclusive, but, at the very least, it is undeniable that on general historical grounds an extremely strong case can be made that the decision to start work on the Nike temple fits best in 425/4. It is also clear that the Paphlagonian in the Knights is represented as an ardent admirer of Athena, and that the references to the Persian Wars in this comedy harmonize well with this thesis. Moreover, if it is correct, it explains the prominence of oracles and of Themistocles in the comedy. It also means that Aristophanes displayed considerable ingenuity in mocking Cleon's association with a project upon which he (presumably) deemed it unwise to make a direct attack.

1 567-8.
2 586-90.
iv. **Cleon's Social Background**

Despite the benefits which Cleon reaped from Pylos, in the *Knights* the recent Athenian victory is only the immediate reason for the Paphlagonian's ascendancy. Aristophanes emphasizes that it is the advantages which he derives from his low birth and agora-training which really equip him for political eminence, and there are abundant references to his involvement in the leather-business, particularly in the early part of the play.

His two fellow-slaves,¹ the Sausage-seller,² the Knights,³ and Demos⁴ all directly refer to or more or less subtly evoke the Paphlagonian's trade and he himself frequently employs 'leather-language' throughout his confrontation with his adversaries.⁵ He is depicted as being actively engaged in the business at a very low level,⁶ and the caricature of Cleon as 'a product of the slums' is fleshed out with some colorful personal details. In the prologue it is noted that he is snoring μηθιζόντι.⁷

---

³ 269, 389.
⁴ 891-2.
⁵ 314, 369, 371, 373, 481, 768. Cleon's style of oratory is discussed in the next section.
⁶ (E.g.) the Sausage-seller at 316 describes him as actually cutting the hides, while Demos at 892 refers to him as 'smelling most fouly of leather'.
⁷ 104.
and that μεγάλα πέρεται καὶ ρέγκεται.¹ Later (354-5) the Paphlagonian boasts

Θύνων θερμὰ καταφαγῶν, καὶ ἐπιπών ἀκράτους
οἴνου Χοδ κατασκλάσω τοὺς ἐν Πύλῳ στρατηγοὺς.

A fervent wish of the Sausage-seller implies that he has a voracious appetite² and the same character asserts that he was drunk at Pylos.³ Again, at the end of the play (1400-1), Agoracritus decrees as his punishment that he will ply the trade of a sausage-seller in the agora:

μεθύων τε τοὺς πόρνασι λοιδορήσεται,
καὶ τῶν βαλανείων πίεται τὸ λούτριον.

Demos applauds the appropriateness of this sentence and pronounces him eminently fit πόρνασι καὶ βαλανεύς διακεραφγέα 

In his recent book dealing with the obscenity in Attic comedy J. Henderson has noted that in the prologue of the Knights the two slaves 'initiate an important homosexual characterization of Cleon which continues throughout the play: specifically he is presented as both a pathic and a 'paedicator'.⁵ Henderson seems to exaggerate the intrinsic significance of this, since it is the political language of the day which is really being parodied in the scene introduced by the

¹ 115.
² 928-40; cf. 280-4 for the ὄφτως, κρέας and τέμωγος which the Paphlagonian devours in the Prytaneum.
³ 1054.
⁴ 1403.
⁵ The Maculate Muse, Yale U.P., 1975, 68; cf. 214.
Paphlagonian's claim at 732 that he is Demos' erastēs, but mockery of the Paphlagonian's sexual proclivities is also at least a minor element in the comedy.

More important than these 'personal touches', however, is the fact (noted earlier) that for most of the play it is taken for granted that the vulgar qualities associated with the market-place which are now essential

---

1 This is considered in the next section which deals with Cleon's oratory. Henderson cites 78 and 380 for Cleon as a pathic; 263, 878-80, 963-4 and the scene cited above for Cleon as a 'paedicator'. He also observes that the Sausage-seller visualizes Cleon's plundering of the islands 'in terms of forcible cunnilingus' (1032ff.), and he cites the four (mild) obscenities which the Paphlagonian uses in the play (365, 708, 876, 962ff.).

2 E.L. Brown, JHS xciv 1974, 166-70, has seen a representation of Cleon on a late fifth-century Corinthian cup (published by J. Boardman, JHS xc 1970, 194-5), on the interior of which is painted a caricature of Oedipus and the Sphinx. Here the Theban Sphinx, 'for once, in its physiognomy as well as in its anatomy obtrusively male', is apparently 'committing the nuisance of public masturbation'. Like Landfester (see above, p. 245, n. 1), Brown bases his identification of Cleon with Sphinx on the references to the Paphlagonian in the Knights as a 'hound' and a 'lion', and on his association with oracles which 'would encourage the assimilation of Cleon to the part-leonine riddler'. He also notes that anaideia 'involving conduct of everything in public' characterizes the Paphlagonian in the Knights, and suggests that the word βυσσός (like σκυλός) was 'susceptible of autossexual connotation'. Brown tentatively links 'the Sphinx's 'pestle', outsize even by satyric standards' with the references in the Peace (228-88) to Cleon as the 'pestle of war' with which he connects the mention of the doidux and torun at Knights 982. In opposition to the caricature of Creon, he sees Oedipus as perhaps representing Brasidas, the 'Saviour' and 'Liberator' of Greece just as Oedipus had been of Thebes. This whole theory, while highly ingenious, is also highly speculative and it appears to involve (among other things) the supposition that the 'comic poets' productions trickled down to Corinth even during wartime'. It need not be discussed in detail here, but it is pertinent to note that the 'evidence' which Brown cites from the Knights for Cleon's autossexual practices is negligible if not non-existent.
in politics,\textsuperscript{1} and the Paphlagonian is represented as possessing his full share of these. He is a loud-voiced scoundrel, \(\beta \delta \epsilon \lambda \nu \rho \acute{\omega} \), \(\mu i \rho \acute{\omega} \), \(\pi \alpha \nu \acute{o} \rho \acute{\gamma} \rho \acute{\omicron} \), \(\pi \omicron \nu \rho \acute{\omicron} \)\textsuperscript{5} and his \(\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\nu} \delta \varepsilon \iota \omicron \omega \) has allowed him to ride roughshod over his fellow citizens.\textsuperscript{6} It has been emphasized at the beginning of the chapter that this kind of criticism is by no means confined to the high-born cavalry and an examination of the 'source' of the derogatory epithets hurled at the Paphlagonian makes this clear. He is called \(\beta \delta \epsilon \lambda \nu \rho \acute{\omega} \) by the chorus (303) and Demos (1345); \(\mu i \rho \acute{\omega} \) by Demosthenes (125), the chorus (303), Demos (1224) and the Sausage-seller (823, 831); \(\pi \alpha \nu \acute{o} \rho \acute{\gamma} \rho \acute{\omicron} \) by the chorus (247, 249, 250, 684), the Sausage-seller (450), and Demos (45); \(\pi \omicron \nu \rho \acute{\omicron} \) by Demos (858).

The actual social position of Cleon and his connection with the family tannery have already been discussed.\textsuperscript{7} It is clear that he was in reality a man of considerable wealth and that Aristophanes has suppressed this and indeed twisted the facts to suit his own dramatic and political purposes. It is also notable that two

\begin{enumerate}
  \item See above, p. 211 with n.2.
  \item 303; at 134-5 he is \(\beta \delta \epsilon \lambda \nu \rho \acute{\omega} \acute{\epsilon} \tau \rho \acute{\omicron} \) than Lysicles.
  \item 125, 303, 1224; \(\mu i \rho \acute{\omega} \acute{\omicron} \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \) at 823, 831.
  \item 247, 249 (twice), 250, 450, 684; \(\pi \alpha \nu \omicron \rho \gamma \omicron \acute{\omicron} \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \) at 45.
  \item 858; cf. 336.
  \item 324-5, 382-5, 397, 409; cf. 277, 324-5, 1206.
  \item pp. 18ff.
\end{enumerate}
isolated passages in the *Knights* seem to attest the real size and scope of Cleon's commercial interests, and that both of these passages are introduced so that the Sausageseller may take a swipe at his rival from a different direction and accuse him of misusing his wealth. In the main, however, the Paphlagonian is a malodorous leather-peddler and there seem to have been a number of factors which gave this caricature a degree of plausibility.

Cleon's family is not known to have had any tradition of political service and it has been suggested in the first chapter that he himself entered politics comparatively late in life, presumably after becoming known in the city as a businessman. Moreover, the leather-business was not held in high repute at Athens, and there can be no doubt that Cleon's public manner was regarded as crude and offensive by the more traditional-

---

1 852-3, 868.

2 At *Knights* 2 the Paphlagonian slave is described as *νεῖτος*. At the beginning of 424, Cleon had been involved in politics for a number of years, so Neil, n. ad loc., is probably correct in suggesting that the adjective was applied to him because he was a 'novus homo'.

3 Cf. Poll. vi.128: ἐφ'οιτὶ ἦν τὸν ὄνειδισθείης, πορνεβοκός, κάσηλος, τελώνης, βυρικόδηγης, ὑλαντοτύλης. The juxtaposition of the last two occupations indicates that Polilux was influenced by the *Knights*, but a scholium to Ach. 724 states that tanneries had to be outside the city proper because of their smell. See in general, H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, 1957, 170-3.
minded of his countrymen. All of this must have increased the audience's appreciation of Aristophanes' portrait of his enemy.

A few points can be made about the poet's technique here. He naturally does not go into any detail about Cleon's parentage (which seems to have been respectable enough). Cleaenetus, his father, is mentioned once in the play at 574, but only because the chorus are singing of the valor of their fathers. More interesting is the Sausage-seller's claim at 447-9 that the Paphlagonian's was one of the of the tyrants. There is obvious humor in linking Cleon, a staunch democrat, with the tyrants and the main point in this passage is the pun on the name of Hippias' wife, Myrsine, who is called Bursinë with reference to the Paphlagonian's trade. Yet the lines also seem to give some slight support to Davies' theory that Cleon had married a daughter of Dicaeogenes. Another of the latter's daughters is generally believed to have married a member of the genos of Harmodius the

1 On the oratorical 'style' which he adopted, see below, pp. 292ff. Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 81, has observed that the difference of tone in the comic poets' treatment of Pericles and Cleon is sufficient guarantee that their manners really were different.

2 For Hippias' wife, see Thuc. vi.65.1. Neil, n. ad 447-9, believes that there is a special emphasis here upon the fact that the of 448 were foreign mercenaries, since Herodotus, 1.59.5, says that the Athenian citizens who formed Pisistratus' bodyguard were not . No doubt the word had sinister connotations.

3 APF 320. See below, App. A.
tyrannicide,\(^1\) so if Cleon was linked with Harmodius' family the lines do gain added point. The same also applies to *Knights* 786 when Demos speculates whether the Sausage-seller is a descendant of Harmodius since he shows such kindness to him.

In general, however, Aristophanes emphasizes Cleon's 'humble origins' by ringing the changes on the word *bursa* which is brought into a variety of compounds.\(^2\) He also introduces most of these references in the early part of the play before the parabasis. When the Paphlagonian enters the stage at 235, there have already been ten allusions to his connection with the leather-business. It was crucial to the theme of the comedy and the poet was obviously determined that the audience should have Cleon's background firmly in mind from the outset.

Nothing is known about the politician's life-style which corroborates or refutes the (relatively mild) allegations which are made in the *Knights* about his eating and drinking habits and his sexual proclivities. However, since the ancient sources (almost all of which are extremely hostile to the politician) do not mention these

---

1 See APF 476–7 (12267V). Davies, on chronological grounds, thinks it likely that this daughter married Harmodius not his son Proxenus, as is generally thought. He is also dubious whether these members of the family were direct descendants of the tyrannicide as the fourth-century orators imply, noting that Harmodius' presumed age in 514 makes this improbable.

2 \(\beta\upbeta\rho\sigma\delta\'\eta\nu\varsigma\) at 44; \(\beta\upbeta\rho\sigma\pi\alpha\phi\lambda\alpha\gamma\nu\nu\) at 47; \(\beta\upbeta\rho\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ell\nu\varsigma\) at 136, 139, 740; \(\beta\upbeta\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\omicron\) at 197, 203, 204. \(\beta\upbeta\rho\) alone occurs at 100, 369, 891-2; \(\beta\upbeta\rho\iota\) at 59, 469.
matters, it may be legitimate to conclude that it was unexceptionable.¹ Charges of gluttony are common in Aristophanes;² Demosthenes' fondness for wine is emphasized in the Knights far more than the Paphlagonian’s³ and the Sausage-seller's versatility in the sexual arena is much more 'impressive'.⁴ The Paphlagonian's boast at 877 (which is mocked but not denied by the Sausage-seller) indicates that Cleon was in fact stringently orthodox in his attitudes towards sexual morality;⁵ in this case there is obvious humor in his defeat by his aggressively homosexual opponent.

In placing so much emphasis upon the low background, vulgarity and coarseness of Cleon, Aristophanes

¹ The silence of Plutarch, Demetr. 11.2, may be particularly significant here. In his discussion of the career of Stratocles he says that he lived licentiously and that he seems to have imitated Cleon’s βευματολογίαν καὶ βελοφυρίαν ἃ ἐθανὰ τὸν δοκίμον εὐχερεία. It is notable that Stratocles' 'imitation' of Cleon does not extend to his licentious way of living.

² L. Van Hook, CJ xxiii 1928, 277-80, has compiled a list of the 112 'reprobates' who are attacked by name in the plays of Aristophanes. Nine of these are singled out for attention because they are 'gluttons'.

³ 65-124.

⁴ See Henderson, op. cit. 68-70, who notes that while the Paphlagonian never admits to homosexual practices, the Sausage-seller proudly proclaims his.

⁵ ἔπαινον τοῦ βιομομένου, τοῦ Γρύττον ἐξαλείψας. This must refer to some specific action, but 'Gryttus' is unknown. Neil, n. ad loc., speculates that it was a nickname and he observes that Xenophon's father and son were called Gryllus. Van Leeuwen, n. ad loc., citing Plato (Rep. 474ε) reads γρύς·εν, which, he believes, was a nickname for some dissolute youth of noble birth.
seems to the modern reader to be judging him very much by upper class standards. It should not automatically be assumed, however, that the comic poet is here espousing any aristocratic cause. As Dover has observed, 'deroga-
tory references to manufacture and commerce belong just as much to democratic political practice where the mass audience is the arbiter of issues as to comedy, and their occurrence in Aristophanes does nothing to align him with a right-wing 'party'. '1 When the Knights was performed in 424 the increasing political importance of men who did not belong to the old governing class but came from what might loosely be called 'business families' appears to have been a relatively new phenomenon.2 These men were naturally vulnerable to the charge that they lacked the breeding and supposed gentility of their predecessors,3 and at this date Cleon was certainly the most prominent of them. His business interests and general demeanor lent themselves to parody so Aristophanes had a ready-made weapon at hand with which to belabor him. Whether he used it because of a genuine disdain for the 'new style' of politics which Cleon embodied or because it was conven-
ient and he thought (rightly) that the audience would

1 AC 97.


3 Comedy in particular exploited the situation to the full. See below, pp. 426-7, where it is suggested that Aristophanes may have played a part in establishing the pattern for this because of the success of his Knights.
find it funny, it is not now easy to decide.¹

The comic poet's strictures about the current
dominance of the τῶν ἀρρητῶν in the State are obviously an
extension of the attack upon Cleon. This is not the place
for a detailed study of Greek terminology but it is clear
enough that in the late fifth century the word had a
political and social as well as an ethical sense,² parti-
cularly when it was used in opposition to the καλὸς:
kαβγαθός or χρήστος.³ Although Aristophanes employs

¹ Many of the spectators at the domestic Lenaea, on the
other hand, would have known something of Aristophanes
and his life-style, the circles which he frequented, and
the way he tended to vote in the Assembly. This point is
taken up again below, pp. 425-6.

² Cf. Neil, App. ii, 206-8; O. Reverdin, MH ii 1945,
210; Connor, NP 89 n. 2. While the normal meaning of
πονηρὸς is simply 'bad', it came to mean 'poor', 'low-
born', or 'low class' and it was used as a deprecatory
adjective of the popular leaders by the upper classes.
Neil, 207, notes that Thucydides puts the word into the
mouth of Alcibiades when he is trying to please Spartans
(vi.89.5, 92.3) or Athenian oligarchs (vii.47.2) by
caucus references to the democracy; cf. Xen. Hell.
i.3.13,14.

³ Knights 185-6; cf. 191-3, 225-8, 735-8. χρήστος is
consistently used throughout Ps. Xen. Ath. Pol. in a
political sense as an antonym of πονηρὸς. There is a
good discussion of kalos kagathos in De Ste. Croix, 371-6,
where references are given to the most important earlier
treatments of the phrase. On its origin, see now W.
the various contexts in which it is found and he observes
(correctly) that while the expression is sometimes used
in the late fifth century with a purely or primarily
moral connotation, its real force in the Knights is
social-political, and the kaloi kagathoi in the play are
a distinct group who conceived themselves superior. It
is impossible to follow him, however, when he asserts
that the references to them are never marked by sarcasm
or irony.
upper-class catchwords to denigrate Cleon, however, the significance of this must be considered within the context of the play. In the *Knights* the Paphlagonian comes third in the succession of \( \Pi \alpha \nu \rho \circ \iota \), the \(-\pi \alpha \lambda \omega i \) who have managed the affairs of state; he is replaced in turn by the more rascally \( \Delta \lambda \lambda \omega \tau o \nu \iota \lambda \lambda \iota \lambda \iota s \) who enjoys the support of the \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega i \ k \alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \circ \) , the aristocratic cavalry. The comic syllogism on which the play is constructed is that things have gone from bad to worse and will only get better when they get worse. The paradox is intentional and although the situation does miraculously improve when the Sausage-seller gets control, this is scarcely the triumph of \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \iota \iota \) over \( \Pi \omega \nu \gamma \rho i \iota \) . Both are satirized, \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \iota \iota \) to a much lesser degree (which is natural since the play is aimed at Cleon), but it prevails only by subordinating itself to the champion of \( \Pi \omega \nu \gamma \rho i \iota \) and it is not idealized. If it were, there would be better grounds for concluding

1 Strangely enough, the Paphlagonian is only explicitly called a \( \pi o \tilde{n} \epsilon o s \) once in the play at 858, but the other epithets which are hurled at him (\( \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \mu \omicron \nu \rho \circ \iota \), \( \mu \nu \rho \circ \iota \), \( \pi \omega \nu \tau \omicron \gamma \omicron \rho \circ \omicron \) ) all have lower-class connotations in their context. Neil, n. ad 134, believes that \( \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \mu \omicron \nu \circ \rho \) was specially used by conservatives of demagogues, and he notes that Plutarch employs \( \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \mu \omicron \nu \circ \rho \) or \( \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \mu \omicron \nu \circ \rho \) with reference to Cleon (Nic. 2.2, Demetr. 11.2), and to Clodius (Pomp. 46.4, Caes. 9.1).

2 125-37. The \( \sigma \tau \omega \tau \pi \varepsilon \iota \omicron \alpha \iota \lambda \lambda \iota s \) and \( \pi \rho \circ \beta \omega \tau o \nu \iota \lambda \lambda \iota s \) who precede him are Eucrates and Lysicles.

3 See above, p. 213, where the examples of the Knights' fulsome support of the Sausage-seller are cited. The absurdity of this alliance is particularly emphasized at 734-6, when the Sausage-seller speaks of himself as one of the \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega i \ te \ k \alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \iota \iota \).
that in 424 Aristophanes was not only using the terminology of the upper classes but also echoing their sentiments. As it is, it is safer to say that he savagely parodied the emergence of a 'new kind' of politician in the city and employed the language of his political opponents to do so. The Athenian people were receptive to slanderous allegations about the pedigree and background of public figures, and Aristophanes invited them (successfully) to join in the assault on Cleon who was not a 'gentleman'.

1 This is the view of De Ste. Croix, 376, who is unable to see any satire of the chorus except for a few comic touches which are 'all friendly'. He emphasizes the similarity of the language in the Knights and in the parabasis of the Frogs, but this is not in itself remarkable since Aristophanes employs the vocabulary of factional politics in both plays. It is obviously dangerous to draw any conclusions about the earlier comedy from the later one; there was a gap of nearly twenty years between them and Aristophanes' political thinking may well have changed during this period.

2 The clearest evidence for this is the frequency with which such allegations were made by the fourth-century orators. See Dover, AC 96-7, who cites the reciprocal abuse which Demosthenes and Aeschines hurl at each other about their antecedents.

3 Thus at 225-8, Demosthenes assures the Sausage-seller that the thousand ἄγαθοι Knights will help him in his struggle against the Paphlagonian; so will oi καλοὶ τε κάγαθοι of the citizens. Here the joking implication seems to be that none of the spectators are καλοὶ τε κάγαθοι, but if they are 'clever' (there may be, as Neil suggests, a pun on the political use of δέσιος) they will help to bring Cleon down.
v. Cleon's Oratory

To a very considerable degree, the Paphlagonian's style of oratory in the Knights harmonizes well with his representation as a man 'fresh from the market-place'. Throughout most of the play his approach to public speaking is violent,¹ his voice is uncommonly strident,² his vocabulary and metaphors are taken largely from the leather trade³ and his delivery is tempestuous.⁴ These 'rhetorical talents' have greatly aided his rise to power, and the ways in which he has employed them and seeks to employ them to bludgeon his fellow-citizens into submission are discussed later in the chapter.

There is, however, another quite different side to the Paphlagonian's rhetoric since the tone which he adopts towards Demos is obsequious, and he seeks to win his favor by dint of extravagant flattery. In the prologue (47-8), Demosthenes prefaces his account of how the newly-bought slave has bribed their master with these words: ὁ βουκεσπυφλαγών, ἐποπεσὼν τὸν δεσπότην

---

¹ Cf. his disdain for practice and training at 344-50, and his boasts at 353-5.

² This is particularly emphasized by the repetition of key words. Thus he is referred to as a κεκράκτης κυκλεβόρου φωνῆς εἶχον at 137 and a κεκράκτης at 303-4. κράσιμος is used by or of him at 256, 274, 487, 863, 1018, δινηράζω at 1103. βοῶν is employed at 286, 312, 728, καταβοῶν at 286, βουὰ at 275.

³ For the references, see above, p. 280, n. 5.

⁴ In addition to his name which is naturally intended to suggest παφλαγὼν (see above, p. 207, n. 1, and Neil, p. 8), cf. 626-9, 696, 830, 919-22.
The Paphlagonian makes a brief attempt to win over the chorus in this way at 266-8, but it is when Demos enters the stage that he reveals his full talent for flattery. At 725 he does summon his lord peremptorily, but he then greets him in a fulsome manner at 726 with the words

\[
\omega \Delta \mu i s i t o n \langle \omega \rangle \phi i l t o t o n .
\]

Thereafter, in the first stage of his duel with the Sausage-seller he, like his rival, repeatedly uses the verb \( \phi i l e w \) to describe his feelings towards him\(^1\) and at 732 he goes so far as to claim that he is his \( \epsilon p a s t a s \).\(^2\) This obsequiousness reaches a kind of climax at 908-11, but it continues to be an important element in the play during the oracle and gift-giving scenes which make up the remainder of their contest. It is naturally emphasized throughout that the Paphlagonian 'fawns and wheedles' to achieve his own ends and to deceive the people,\(^3\) and this is spelled out to the rejuvenated Demos by Agoracritus at the end of the comedy. He explains at 1340-4 how in the past Demos had gone into paroxysms of delight,

\[
\delta \; \epsilon o t \prime \; \epsilon i p o t i t s \; \epsilon v \; \tau \kappa \kappa l h e i a .
\]

1 732, 773, 790-1, 820-1. At 746-8 he urges Demos to decide which of the two men is \( \epsilon \nu o s t e r o s \) to him, \( \nu m \; \tau o t o n \; \phi i l e s \), and at 860-1 he urges him not to think that he will find \( \phi i l e w \; \beta e l t o t a \).

2 The Sausage-seller introduces himself to Demos at 733-4 as his \( \alpha n t e r e t a s \), \( \epsilon r o n \; \pi a l a m \; \epsilon o u \), and at 1162-3 the latter refers to the two men as his \( \epsilon r e s t a l \).

3 The verb \( \epsilon x a t a t o w \) is used to describe the effects of the Paphlagonian's flattery at 48, 633, 809, 1224 and refers to him by implication at 1117, 1345, 1357.
At 1345 he adds that the suitor

\[ εἰτ' ἔφανεν οὗτος σ' ἀντι πούτων μὴ ἔπετο. \]

On occasion, these two quite different 'aspects' of the Paphlagonian's rhetoric are cleverly united. When the Sausage-seller uses the verb καταγλυττῶμ at 352 in his description of how his rival has silenced the city, the word appears to retain something of both its sexual and its violent meanings. Yet there is a certain incongruity in this combination of violence and obsequiousness and they must be considered separately.

The 'violent Paphlagonian' seems to have been modelled upon the real Cleon; he is a comic caricature but the caricature is recognizable as the politician. Thucydides does not elaborate on Cleon's oratorical methods, but when he introduces him before the Mytilenaean debate with the words χιαῖστας and τῷ θημα τοῦθατος,¹ the first superlative may refer to his manner of speaking as well as to his policies. Cleon's violence certainly stands out in the speech which Thucydides puts into his mouth during the debate as well as in the historian's description of his behavior in the Assembly during the two debates which were concerned with the situation at

---

¹ iii.36.6. Diodorus, xii.55.8, in his brief description of the debate describes Cleon as ἀγῶν ᾧ τῶν Τράειν καὶ βίαις.
Pylos. Violence of thought is not always accompanied by violence of expression and delivery, but in Cleon's case there is no reason to doubt that it was. The allusions to his oratory in the Athenaion Politeia, Theopompus, Plutarch and a scholiast to Aeschines which have been assembled in the chapter dealing with the Banqueters, all emphasize his loudness and force. Moreover, three of these sources employ the verb ἀνακρύσω, the compound of Κρύς which is used consistently in the Knights, to describe his style of delivery. M.I. Finley, noting that Cleon's predecessors could scarcely have whispered when they addressed the vast open-air Assembly, is sceptical about the assertion in the Athenaion Politeia that Cleon ἠρωτός ἐπὶ τῷ βῆματα ἀνέκρυψεν, but his suspicions seem unfounded. There are no grounds for questioning the tradition that the politician pitched his voice considerably louder than had been the custom hitherto, and it appears quite possible that he did so to meet the new conditions of his day. D.M. Lewis has recently suggested that larger assemblies after the start of the

1 See especially iv.22.2, 27.3,5.
2 See above, p. 57.
3 Cicero, Brut. 28, also mentions the turbulence of Cleon in his discussion of the eloquence of Greek politicians; cf. Lucian, Hist. Conscr. 38.
4 A.P. 28.3; Theopomp. FGH 115F92; Plut. Nic. 8.3.
5 Past and Present xxi 1962, 16; A.P. 28.3. The same information is provided in slightly different language by Theopompus and Plutarch.
Peloponnesian War had an effect upon oratorical style.1 Because of his longstanding prestige, Pericles would presumably have been afforded a respectful hearing on most occasions, but it seems a plausible speculation that Cleon, early in his career at any rate, had to make a special effort to attract the attention of his audiences.

It is perhaps somewhat surprising that the other flamboyant techniques, which Cleon (presumably for the same purpose) is said to have adopted, escape mention in the Knights. There is no reference in the comedy to his breaking tradition by speaking 'with cloak girt up about him',2 slapping his thigh3 or δρόμω μετὰ τοῦ λέγειν ἀμα ἱροσπαίμενος,4 but these idiosyncrasies may have been emphasized by the costume and behavior of the actor who took the part of the Paphlagonian. Cleon's turbulence at any rate is attested by Aristophanes' words not only in the Knights but in the Acharnians and his later comedies. More specifically, it has been observed earlier5 that when Dicaeopolis recalls the poet's sufferings at Ach.

---

1 CR² xxv 1975, 90.
3 Plut. Nic. 8.3, Tib. Gracch. 2.2. Aeschines, 1.25, says that 'those orators of old (Pericles, Themistocles and Aristides) were so decorous that what we now do as a matter of course, τὸ τὴν κῆρα ἐὰν ἐκούσε καὶ λέγειν, τὸτε τοῦτο ἑρᾶτο τι ἐδίκας. Εἰναυ, καὶ εὐλαβέως ἀυτὸ πράττειν.
4 Plut. Nic. 8.3.
5 pp. 191-2.
377ff., the verbs κατεγλαυσάται and ἐκκλαμένη anticipate Knights 352 and 137 respectively and other close correspondences can be found in the Wasps and Peace. Philocleon at Wasps 596 refers to Cleon as ὁ κεκραγόμενος and at Peace 313-5, Trygaeus urges the chorus to beware lest the politician (now dead) should return γὰρ λύσων καὶ κεκραγόμενος ἀνάμεσα ἧνος ἐνθάδε ὑπὸ τόν. The consistency of Aristophanes' language taken in conjunction with the statements in the other sources indicates that he had a real target to aim at in the Knights.

It is extremely doubtful whether Cleon really made a practice of sprinkling his public orations with words taken from the leather trade, since it is natural to suspect that Aristophanes introduces these to emphasize his 'lowly background'. The poet seems to have sought to present his enemy in the worst possible light here by exaggeration and by repeated use of the pejorative κράζω in reference to his style of speaking. As Neil has pointed out, κράζω is more of an inhuman or inarticulate cry than βάω, employed by orators to denounce their opponents' style and by Xenophon of drunken men. In general, however, the rhetorical style of the 'violent Paphlagonian' who strides the stage in the Knights appears to have borne at least some resemblance to that of the real Cleon.

1 Neil, n. ad 287; Xen. Cyr. 1.3.10.
THE KNIGHTS

The other 'side' of the Paphlagonian's rhetoric is more problematic since there is little evidence apart from the *Knights* that Cleon actually fawned upon the people. Neither Aristophanes in his other comedies nor any other ancient authority emphasizes this. Plutarch relates how Nicias spent money lavishly since he did not believe that he could compete ἡ Κλέωνος εὐχερεία καὶ βουλομένη πρὸς ἡδονὴν μεταχειρισμένη τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, but this is a different point. Thucydides does state that Pericles' successor, vying for power, ἑτράποντο καθ' ἡδονᾶς τῷ δῆμῳ καὶ τὰ πράγματα ἐνδιόνατο, but the meaning of this is not entirely clear. Gomme maintains that the historian is saying that since no one of the politicians who followed Pericles was strong enough to carry out a consistent policy, 'the conduct of affairs was offered to the whims of the people' and policy varied from year to year. Andrewes thinks that ἐνδιόνατο should include giving in to (and appearing to lead) the masses when they are under the influence of any unworthy emotion. These interpretations must be on the right lines, but it is a long way from this to abject flattery of the people, and there is no hint of flattery in Cleon's masterful speech.

---

1 *Nic.* 3.2.
2 ii.65.10.
3 *HCT* ii.194-5.
4 *Phoenix* xvi 1962, 72.
during the Mytilenian debate\(^1\) or in his other two reported speeches in the Assembly.\(^2\) Moreover, the story that he casually asked for a meeting of the Ecclesia to be postponed,\(^3\) and his notorious message announcing the victory at Pylos when he used the style of private correspondence \(\text{κλέων Ἀθηναίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Χαῖρειν,}\)^4 both indicate a somewhat high-handed attitude towards the Assembly. The three debates in Thucydides in which Cleon appears are all concerned with 'foreign affairs', and it is just possible that he did adopt a radically different tone when he addressed the Athenians on domestic matters. Logically, however, there would appear to exist something of a contradiction in the presentation of the Paphlagonian both as the man who has deafened the whole city, whom

---

1 As Gomme, HCT ii.299, has remarked, 'from the start there is no flattery of the demos by this persuasive demagogue. Gomme notes that \(\text{ἐγγὺς}\) at iii.37.1 marks Cleon's self-assertion when he begins to speak and that he continues in the same vein throughout. During the speech he castigates the people for their fickleness, weakness, and love of empty rhetoric.

2 At iv.21.3, Thucydides describes how Cleon \(\text{μυθείσα ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθηναίας τῇ ἀνάστασε τοῦ ναοῦ,}\) the Athenians when they 'grasped for more' after the Spartans offered peace-terms in 425. Gomme, HCT iii.408, takes Thuc. iv.27.4 to mean that Cleon was responding to the mood of the Assembly when he proposed an assault on Sphacteria, but this is a far cry from pandering to the people.

3 This anecdote, recorded by Theopompus and Plutarch, is discussed in the next section.

4 This is quoted by a scholiast to Plutus 322 and parodied by Aristophanes at Clouds 609 and by Eupolis, fr. 308. Lucian, Pro Larse 3, also describes how Cleon began his letter with this formula, and adds the detail that after him Nicias in his despatches from Sicily followed the old practice and commenced immediately with the matter at hand.
THE KNIGHTS

rich and poor alike fear, and as the obsequious flatterer of the people.

If the Paphlagonian's flattery of Demos has any factual basis, the key to it would seem to lie in his use of the words ἐφασίης and φιλίν to describe his relationship with his master. W.R. Connor, like a number of earlier commentators, has suggested that Aristophanes here may well be parodying the flamboyant language of Cleon, and he develops this further by linking the words with what he terms a 'new model' of politics which emerged in the last third of the fifth century. Connor has assembled the evidence to show that at this time phrases like φιλόσφημος, μεσόσφημος, φιλόπολις, μεσόπολις and εὐνοῦς ἕτος ἰδαν were being applied with varying degrees of frequency and in some cases for the first known time to political figures. He puts forward the interesting thesis that while politicians of the mid fifth century came to the foreground mainly through family ties, marriage ties, personal largesse and their ἔταιρεια, and were thus largely dependent upon the support of what might be termed 'philia-groups' of different sorts, Cleon and men like him seem to have broken with this tradition, and the break was reflected in the political language of the day.

Connor appears to take as a turning point in his scheme of things the anecdote reported by Plutarch that when Cleon decided to enter political life he gathered

1 NP 91ff.
his friends together, renounced his friendship with them and subordinated himself to the multitude.\(^1\) This, in Connor's view, exemplified if indeed it did not initiate a new political technique. He argues that 'the politician who presented himself as *philopolis*, *eunous toi demoi*, *philodemos* or the like, implied that he was willing to accord the city the place which friends had so often enjoyed in earlier periods of Greek history, and that he was willing to transfer his 'primary loyalties' from the *philia* group to the wider circle of the *polis* or the *demos*.\(^2\) This was destined to have far-reaching effects upon Athenian political life.

Connor's central thesis here (very baldly outlined above) is stimulating and valuable, but it seems clear that he has to some extent overdramatized the way Athenian politics evolved. As J.K. Davies observes, 'things were just not as simple as this, nor was the distinction between the 'old model' and 'new model' politics so late to appear, so clear-cut and unidirectional, or telescoped into so vertiginous a rate of change as Connor maintains.\(^3\) Davies has effectively pointed out the vulnerability of several of Connor's arguments, but most of these cannot be considered here. Attention must be focused on the late fifth century and on the significance

---

1 Mor. 806F.
2 NP 106.
3 Gnomon xlvi 1975, 375.
of the part which Cleon may have played in formulating or
developing the rhetorical style of his day.

One of the flaws in Connor's reasoning is his
apparent assumption that the currency of political vogue-
words like \( \phi \lambda \delta \eta \mu \alpha \) and the rest must have started c.
the 420s, because it is then that they first occur or
occur frequently in the extant literature. Reviewers of
his book have been quick to point out the dearth of suit-
able literary texts (i.e. texts where such words might be
expected to be found) in the period before the Archidamian
War.\(^1\) This naturally weakens the case for thinking that
Cleon was the first or one of the first Athenian politi-
cians to present himself as \( \phi \lambda \delta \eta \mu \alpha \) or \( \phi \lambda \delta \sigma \lambda \gamma \),\(^2\) and
Connor himself seems to be noticeably uneasy about the
originality of Cleon in the pattern which he constructs.
The central place which he accords Plutarch's anecdote
about Cleon's renunciation of his friends, implies that
Cleon's action was the decisive step in the development
of the 'new model' of politics, and he introduces the
chapter dealing with this 'new model' by emphasizing the
importance of Cleon as an innovator.\(^3\) Yet he also points
out that Pericles had apparently anticipated Cleon in his

\(^1\) See J.K. Davies, op. cit. 377; D.M. Lewis, CR\(^2\) xxv

\(^2\) The same objection applies to Connor's arguments about
the introduction of new words for political leadership,
but these terms are not so important in the present
context.

\(^3\) NP 91 with n. 6.
casualness about his philoi, and that it is Pericles whom Thucydides represents as urging the Athenians to become ἐρασταὶ of their city and as boasting that he was φιλόπολις τε καὶ κραματικὸν κρείσσων

It is obviously impossible to determine when politicians began to proclaim themselves to be 'lovers of the city', but Connor has nevertheless put his finger on something important. The chronological line of demarcation which he draws between the old and new political 'models' is too rigid and he seems to overestimate the importance of private φιλία in the old model, while underestimating its continuing significance in the new. Yet he makes a good case that the authenticity of Plutarch's anecdote about Cleon's repudiation of his friends in favor of the multitude is supported by a passage in Thucydides

1 Plutarch, Per. 7.5, records how Pericles was dedicated to work and spurned forms of sociability and familiarity. He adds that during his long period of prominence he never dined with any of his philoi except on one occasion when he put in a brief appearance at his cousin's wedding.

2 ii.43.1.

3 ii.60.5. Connor concludes, NP 106, that some signs indicate that Pericles was responsible for the development of 'this new kind of political discourse', others point to Cleon, and that 'much may have been due to more obscure politicians.'

and by the language of Aristophanes,¹ and in connecting this anecdote with the currency of words like φιλοπολίς in the 420s.

If one were to consider only the evidence from the Knights, one might perhaps suspect that Aristophanes is simply parodying the currency of these words in a general way when he represents the Paphlagonian as professing his love for Demos. It is notable, however, that the antonyms of φιλόπολίς and φιλόφημι occur in the Wasps in contexts where Cleon is involved. Thus, at 409-11, the chorus urge that Cleon be summoned to deal with Bdelycleon, 'the city hater', and at 474 they address Bdelycleon with the words ὁ μισόφημε. This appears to be more than a coincidence, and Connor has also argued that the opening of the Wasps gains considerably in humor if it was a habit of Cleon to make effective use of words such as philopolis. He notes 'the great series of philo-compounds in the servants' speeches, lines 74-90, culminating in the diagnosis that the master is philēlastes, a law-court lover. Then in 133 it emerges that his name is Philocleon --the perfect nomenclature for a follower of the great user of philo-words.'²

¹ NP 94ff. The Aristophanic evidence is discussed below. Connor observes that at Thuc. iii.37.3-4 Cleon is represented 'as the spokesman for those Athenians without intellectual or other pretensions, for the phauloi'. He notes the striking verbal coincidence with Plutarch's anecdote and that Cleon appears here as 'a true man of the people'. On the authenticity of this anecdote, see also above,

² NP 119.n.56.
This last argument is particularly persuasive and while it is fruitless to try to determine how Cleon may have employed 'philo-words', a few further points can be made. Gomme has argued that *Knights* 1340-4 taken in conjunction with Thuc. ii.43.1 strongly indicates that Pericles had actually used the word ἐπάσχημα with reference to the Athenians' feelings for their city.¹ This links up with Pericles' claim at Thuc. ii.60.5 that he was φιλοσωλίς, and the notorious verbal echoes between Pericles and Cleon in the historian's work may indicate that Cleon consciously took over and amplified phrases and sentiments which his predecessor had employed.² Modern scholars now tend to recognize that Cleon was, according to his lights, fiercely patriotic and it appears a not unreasonable conclusion that he did make a practice of proclaiming his love for the city rather than for any narrow group of intimates.

The word φιλοσωλίς does not appear to occur outside Comedy but its antonym μησωλίς was used in

¹ Gomme, HCT ii.136-7, following Neil, points out that the lines in the *Knights* indicate that someone had made the use popular and that Pericles is the only likely candidate. The image which ἐπασχείμα conjures up is striking and Gomme does not believe that Thucydides was 'guilty' of attributing to Pericles what belonged to someone else.

² The echoes have been collected by J. de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, trans. P. Thody, Oxford, 1963, 163-6, but she denies them significance. As Gomme, *JHS* lxxi 1951, 78 with n. 24, points out, however, the echoes cannot be accidental in Thucydides' careful style. The only question is whether the historian is employing phrases which Pericles and Cleon actually used, or attributing his own words to both or either of them for his own reasons; cf. Andrewes, *Phoenix* xvi 1963, 75.
political parlance.¹ As Connor has observed, φ.λοδηκας is capable of bearing two meanings: dēmos 'can refer to the people as a whole (populus), or to the lower segments of it (plebs)'.² Everything that is known about Cleon suggests that he presented himself (with some reason) as the champion of the lower classes, whose growing importance and self-assertiveness in the second half of the fifth century was of prime political importance.³ More specifically, there is good reason to think that not long before the Knights was performed he had been responsible for raising the dicasts' fee. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that the 6,000 jurors represented the Athenian demos⁴ and it seems not impossible that Cleon had adopted the word φ.λοδηκας almost as a kind of political 'slogan'.⁵

To recapitulate, the testimony of Plutarch, Thucydides, and Aristophanes taken in conjunction with Cleon's

---

1 Connor, NP 102, cites the references.

2 NP 101, n. 19; see too the analysis by De Ste. Croix, Hist. iii 1954, 22ff.

3 Apart from the derogatory references in later sources to his association with the 'worst elements' in the state, Frogs 569-78 and Arist. Rhet. iii.8.1408B.24-6 show that Cleon retained a reputation as the champion of the humble long after his death.

4 Cleon's connection with the raise given to the dicasts and the view that the latter represented the whole people are discussed in the next section.

5 An alternative explanation is that Aristophanes was only utilizing and parodying the politician's responsibility for the recent raise, but this would not seem to account for the passages in the Wasps cited above.
known concern for and reliance upon the lower classes, indicates that he did apply the terminology of friendship to the city and perhaps also to the people. The evidence (admittedly very tenuous) also suggests that he was not the first to speak in this way, but that he imitated Pericles (who himself was probably not a total innovator here), and went beyond him.

If this is correct, Aristophanes' technique in the *Knights* is ingenious and effective. For a politician to proclaim himself \( \phi \lambda \delta \pi o l i s \) or even \( \phi \lambda \delta \eta \mu e s \) is not flattery of the people, but by having Demos on the stage and by making the Paphlagonian his ardent suitor, Aristophanes skilfully represents it as such. The comic portrayal of doddering old Demos as a young \( \dot{e}p\mu e n o r \) was doubtless appreciated by the audience, particularly if the real Cleon was strongly opposed to homosexuality,\(^1\) but it also permits Aristophanes to give another dimension to his parody of Cleon's rhetoric. De Ste. Croix, citing passages from Demosthenes, Isocrates and Aeschines, observes that the allegation that one's political opponents are mere flatterers of the demos seems to have been very common in the fourth century,\(^2\) and presumably it was equally prevalent in the fifth. As far as Cleon is concerned, the charge does not seem to have been valid, but by giving a new twist to the material which the

---

1 On the significance of *Knights* 875-8, see above, p. 287.

2 *Hist.* iii 1954, 34 n. 3.
politician offered him Aristophanes was able to level it. While the poet does not always seem to have been overly concerned with dramatic consistency in his characterization of the Paphlagonian, this harmonized nicely with the latter's penchant for 'bribing' his countrymen which is discussed in the following section.
vi. Cleon's 'Bribery' of the Athenians

In the *Knights* the attention which the Paphlagonian devotes to satisfying the material needs of Demos is one of the main reasons for his extraordinary influence over the people. This is emphasized by Demosthenes in the prologue,¹ and when the Paphlagonian appears on stage, he boasts that he is in full control of his master because he knows his weaknesses.² While the Sausage-seller ridicules the boast,³ the way in which he himself initially gains Demos' favor by making him trifling presents⁴ is a clear parody of the Paphlagonian's methods.⁵ Realizing that he is losing the battle, the latter promises Demos κρίσις and βίον καθ' ημέραν at 1100-1 and άλφα ήδη ἐσκευασμένα at 1104 but he is overshot in this by his adversary who also emerges victorious in the gift-giving scene which is the third and decisive stage of the contest.⁶ The gifts which are showered upon the receptive Demos here (once a chair and table have been brought out), take the form of victuals and those provided earlier by

---

¹ 46-60.
² 715: ἐπίστατοι γὰρ αὐτὸν διέ φυρήζουσι.
³ 716-8. The venality of which he accuses the Paphlagonian here is at least an underlying element throughout, but this is considered later in the chapter, in the section dealing with Cleon's 'corruption'.
⁴ 781-5, 871-2, 881-3. The Paphlagonian vainly tries to emulate his last success at 890-1.
⁵ Cf. 788-9, 888-9, where this is explicitly emphasized.
⁶ 1151-1223.
the Sausage-seller are personal items but on a number of occasions the allegory is dropped.

The Paphlagonian initially gained the attention and approval of the Boule (the most important administrative body of the democracy) by proposing to sacrifice a hundred cows to Athena. At 804 the Sausage-seller states that Demos is under the Paphlagonian's influence because of misthos and emphasizes this at 807 with the reference to mistophora. One of the Paphlagonian's oracles proclaims his value to the State because of the misthos which he will provide and at 904-5 he says that he will give Demos a bowl of misthos for doing nothing. The scholiast ad loc. explains this as a reference to the dikastikon, and there are four explicit allusions in the first part of the comedy to the money which the jurors receive.

In the prologue Demosthenes cites, as an example of the Paphlagonian's obsequiousness, his determination that Demos should get his three obols after trying one case. When the Paphlagonian is attacked by the chorus he appeals for help to the γέροντες ἡλιασταὶ, φατερεῖς

---

1 652-6.

2 1017-9; cf. 1090-1.

3 There are also two allusions to Demos' misthos at the end of the play, but these occur after his rejuvenation when he is no longer the Paphlagonian's tool, and they are discussed below, pp. 319-20.

4 46-51.
At 797-8 the Paphlagonian says that the oracles prophesy that Demos will be able to obtain money in Arcadia, and at 799-800 he vows that he will always find ways for Demos to obtain his three-obol payment.

When the *Knights* was performed there were many different ways in which Athenian citizens could obtain money or sustenance from the State in the form of payments and distributions. By presenting Demos as the greedy yet bemused recipient of politicians' gifts Aristophanes is clearly in part making a general point about the extent to which his countrymen were now dependent upon the public treasury and hence upon their leaders. Yet the emphasis and the slant which is given to the theme of 'mass-bribery' indicates that something more specific than this is involved, and most scholars now conclude that shortly before the production of the *Knights* Cleon had been responsible for raising the daily fee paid to the jurors.

---

1 255-7.
2 For the point of this 'increase', see below, p.316,n.1.
3 Gomme, *HCT* iii.502, is sceptical about this, and his reservations are considered below.
The introduction of jury pay is always ascribed to Pericles in the ancient sources, but these never specify its original amount. It is evident, however, that when the **Knights** was performed the jurors were receiving three obols a day and there is no reason to question the testimony of a scholiast on **Wasps** 88 that Cleon had recently raised their payment from two to three obols. This is

---

1 Arist. Pol. 1274a 8-9; A.P. 27.4; Plut. Per. 9.2-3. Cf. Plato, Gorg. 515e. Bonner and Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, i.e.226ff., argue that the institution of jury pay immediately preceded the attack upon the Areopagus in 462, but most scholars appear to believe that it was introduced shortly after 462 when much jurisdiction was transferred from the Areopagus to the popular courts; see Wade-Gery, AJP lix 1938, 131, where the different views are cited; Hignett, App. ix, 342-3. Walker, in CAH v.101, places the institution of the payment after Cimon's return from ostracism, while Wade-Gery, supra cit. 131-4, argues that it must be dated before Cimon was ostracized. The exact date is not of primary concern here since Pericles must have introduced it before Cimon left for Cyprus in 451 or 450, i.e. more than twenty-five years before the performance of the **Knights**.

2 The scholiast does not cite any authority for his statement, and J.J. Buchanan, *Theorika*, New York, 1962, 17, notes that in scholia to **Birds** 1541, **Frogs** 1666, **Plutus** 171, 330, the dikastikon is confused with the ekklesiastikon, and the tribole with the diöbelia. Accordingly, although Buchanan concludes from the **Knights** that Cleon raised the jurors' pay to three obols, he argues that the statement in the scholium to **Wasps** 88 that it was previously two obols should be ignored. It must be emphasized, however, that there is no trace of confusion in this note. W.R. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth Century Athens*, 168 n. 79, has suggested that the scholiast derived his information from the historian and while there is no evidence for this, he may well have employed a good source. Whether the jurors' pay was ever one obol is totally uncertain; G. Bubolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* ii, Munich, 1926, 898 n. 4, correctly emphasize that **Clouds** 863 and Poll. viii.113 cannot be taken as evidence for this.
the only ancient authority who expressly makes Cleon responsible for the raise,¹ but his statement is strongly supported by the dicasts' close alliance with Cleon in the *Wasps*, and especially by the repeated references to the τριώβολον in the *Knights*, the first in the extant literature. Moreover, the increase in Athens' revenue following the assessment of tribute in 425 provides an appropriate context for the increase.² It is tempting in fact to link the increase with the establishment of a special new jury-court of 1000 which was responsible for the hearing of tribute cases under the terms of the reassessment decree of Thudippus in 425.³ This court was to be in session throughout Posideion and its hearings had to be completed before the end of the month. In view of the special responsibilities of these jurors, it seems possible that the Athenians decided that they should be

---

¹ A scholium on *Wasps* 300 is less precise: ποτέ γε 
διώβολων ἐν ἐγνεντo δε ἐς Κλέωνος τριώβολον. Busolt and Swoboda, supra cit. 898 n. 4, also take a scholium on *Birds* 1540 (1541 in Dübner's edition) as evidence that the pay was raised, but this is of very little value. It is also extremely doubtful whether Ach. 657 has any relevance here as they assert. In A.P. 28.3, Cleon is introduced as the man 'who seems most of all διάθεσα. τὸν δὴν τὸς ὅρμισι' and Sandys, n. ad loc. has proposed to substitute ἰσομοίας for ὅρμισι 'which would obviously refer to Cleon's raising the μισθοῦς δίκαιοτάτος'.

² Andrewes, *Phoenix* xvi 1962, 76 n. 30, observes, however, that although the increase may have been voted after the raising of the tribute, it came into effect before the first instalment of this increased income had reached Athens.

³ ML 69.16-19.
paid at a higher rate than had been the practice for the regular dicasts hitherto, and that in future all jurors would receive this amount of money.

Gomme has expressed doubts whether there was an increase in the dicasts' pay in 425, on the grounds that 'it must surely have had definite reference in the Knights or in the Wasps,'¹ but this hesitation is unwarranted. The audience watching the Knights would have known what had happened and there was no reason for Aristophanes to spell it out for them. When the play was performed the jurors had been receiving payments for more than twenty-five years.² It is impossible to explain why the Paphlagonian should be associated so frequently with the money which they received unless he had been involved in a recent increase.

It should be noted too that in Aristophanes' comedies the jurors are always elderly.³ Since the six

---

¹ HCT iii.502.
² See above, p. 312, n. 1.
³ A client of Antiphon refers explicitly (v.71) to the younger men on a jury. In the main, however, the comic poet's picture must be correct, although few of the jurors could have been as old as he represents them; see Bonner and Smith, op. cit. i.231-3.
thousand dicasts\(^1\) represented the Athenian people,\(^2\) this
may very well be the reason why Demos in the Knights is
characterized as an old man.\(^3\) There can be little doubt
that the spectators would have seen a special reference
to the jurors' raise when he is repeatedly mentioned in
connection with gifts or misthos.

At first sight, the approach which Aristophanes
adopts towards this State-payment seems relatively simple,
since he concentrates almost exclusively upon Cleon's
motives in supporting it and upon the effect which it has
upon the people. The Paphlagonian is represented purely
and simply as bribing the Athenians in order to increase

---

1 For the six thousand dicasts in the fifth century (the
number in the fourth century is irrelevant here), see
Wasps 662, Andoc. i.17; A.P. 24.3; cf. Suid. s.v.
προτάνειμι. The figure is accepted by most scholars but
it has been called into question by Gomme, CR xliv 1930,
60ff., who believes it to be a rhetorical approximation.
He argues that the author of the A.P. took it directly
from Aristophanes where it is suspect because of its
context, and that Andocides' jurors were specially empan-
elled initiates. This, however, is clutching at straws;
239ff.

2 It is not a coincidence that 6,000 citizens were re-
garded in the late fifth century as a quorum for ostra-
cisms and certain important votes in the Assembly; cf.
Meiggs, CR lxxviii 1964, 2-3, where the references are
conveniently assembled. Bonner and Smith, op. cit. 226,
observe that Ps. Xen., Ath. Pol. i.18, states that each of
the allies is compelled τον δήμον κολακεύειν, knowing that
(sc. δὲ ) δὴν δύναι καὶ λάβειν διὰ ἐν ἀλλοις τειν
ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, δὲ ἦττο νέμαι Ἀθηναίοι. They also note
that the dicasts were not held accountable for their acts
at a euthuna (Wasps 587), and that they are addressed by
orators as ἃ γραφές Ἀθηναίοι; cf. Rhodes, AB 197-8.

3 Knights 42, 752, 1098-9.
his own political influence, while the people complacently sit back and accept the 'handouts' passively unaware of or unconcerned about their own degradation.

It is not difficult to find similar charges in other writers. Both in the Athenaion Politeia and in Plutarch, Pericles is described as having bribed the people wholesale with public money when he was unable to counter Cimon's use of his wealth from his own resources. The author of the Athenaion Politeia says that when

---

1 When the Paphlagonian holds out the prospect of Demos' receiving five obols as his jury-fee at 797-8, and promises him a bowl of mithros for doing nothing at 904-5, Aristophanes is probably only parodying by exaggeration the recent raise. The dikastikon remained at three obols for about one hundred years (A.P. 61.2), and the diêbelia (apparently a measure of poor-relief instituted by Cleophon) was not introduced until the closing years of the Peloponnesian War (A.P. 28.3; cf. ML, p. 260). At 50-1, the Paphlagonian is represented as telling Demos to receive his three obols after trying one case, and the point here is controversial. Neil, n. ad loc., supposes that the popular leaders carried the principle that one case should be regarded as a day's work, but Wasps 594-5 appear to indicate that the Assembly voted on the motion whether the courts should adjourn each time it was proposed.

2 This is particularly emphasized by the language which is used to describe the Paphlagonian's way of 'feeding' the people: ἐνίθημι occurs at 51, ἔψιμομεν at 715. Both verbs are used of feeding babies, and at 716 the Sausage-seller tells the Paphlagonian that he treats Demos ἐπιτροπ αὐτὴν τιθημεῖ . At 256, the Paphlagonian employs βοήσεω with reference to his maintaining the jurors, and this word is often used of animals.

3 It seems doubtful, however, whether Thuc. 11.65.10 has any relevance here; for the meaning of the historian's words, see above, p. 298. Throughout Ps. Xen. Ath. Pol. the material advantages which the lower classes enjoy are consistently castigated, but there is no specific emphasis upon 'bribery' as a political tool.
Damonides cynically advised him διδόμενοι τοὺς πολλοὺς τὰ
dικαστήρια, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφόρον τοῖς δικαστήριοις.¹ Plutarch,
specifically using the verb συνδεκάζω, relates how he
gained the support of the people θεωρικοὶ καὶ δικαστικοὶ
λήμμαι τὰς μὲν μισθοφορὲς καὶ Χορηγίαις.² The second
charge that State-payment had a harmful effect upon the
character of the Athenians is also found in Plutarch who,
after briefly describing Thucydides' favorable opinion of
Pericles, continues ἄλλοι δὲ πολλοὶ τρώτον ὑπ' ἐκείνου
φασὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐπὶ πληρωξίας καὶ θεωρικὰ καὶ μισθῶν
διανομὴς προσεβόναι, κακῶς ἐθεσβέτα καὶ γενόμενον
πολυτέλη καὶ ἀκόλουθον ὑπὸ τῶν τότε πολιτευμάτων ἀντὶ
σώφρονος καὶ αὐτουργοῦ.³ Earlier, Plato had made Socrates
assert that he hears that Pericles had rendered the
Athenians lazy, cowardly, garrulous and fond of money,
eἰς μισθοφορῶν τρώτον καταστήσεται.⁴

Both of these accusations must have been stock
conservative charges. Although Plutarch had consulted

¹ A.P. 27.4-5.
² Per. 9.3.
³ Per. 9.1.
⁴ Gorg. 515e.
the Athenaion Politeia here, his principal authority for
Cimon's flamboyant generosity is apparently Theopompus, and Wade-Gery has cogently argued that the historian also
provided him with the information how Pericles had bribed
his countrymen. It looks as if Theopompus and the author
of the Athenaion Politeia had employed a common source
here, and this may well have been an oligarchic pamphlet
written late in the fifth or early in the fourth century.
Plutarch does not name the people who claim that the
institution of State-benefits had ruined the Athenian
character, but only says they were numerous. In Plato's
Gorgias, however, Callicles replies to Socrates that the
complaints emanated from 'the men with the broken ears',

1 He cites 'Aristotle' for the story that Damonides had
advised Pericles to bribe the people with their own money,
and (at Cim. 10.1-3, where he describes in detail Cimon's
public generosity) he relates first that he provided a
daily meal for any Athenian who wanted it, then notes
that 'Aristotle' says that only Cimon's demesmen were
given the dinner. Both items of information are found in
A.P. 27.3-4, and Wade-Gery AJP lix 1938, 133-4, notes
that this is Plutarch's regular practice with a secondary
source.

2 Cf. Plut. Per. 9.2, Cim. 10.1-3 with Theopomp. FGH
115F89.

3 op. cit. 131-4.

4 This is indicated by the fact that Theopompus says that
any citizen could dine in Cimon's house, while in the A.P.
the privilege is restricted to his demesmen. It seems
more likely that Theopompus is exaggerating than that he
was the source for the author of the A.P. who gratuitously
changed his account. For a recent discussion of the rela-
tionship of Theopompus to the A.P., see W.R. Connor, Theo-

5 See Hignett, App. ix, 342, and 5-6; Sealey, Hermes
lxxiv 1956, 234ff. Wade-Gery, op. cit. 133 with n. 9,
suggests that it was the work of Critias.
i.e. the pro-Spartans.\textsuperscript{1} There is no reason to doubt that both of the criticisms about the \textit{\'\v{e}m\i\'re\theta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon} which Aristophanes puts into dramatic form in the \textit{Knights} were current in aristocratic circles.

Before drawing any conclusions from this, however, the ending of the play must be considered. In the rejuvenated democracy the lawcourts still have their place\textsuperscript{2} and (by implication) the dicasts still receive their money. Their \textit{misthos} is not to be their overriding concern\textsuperscript{3} and it must not influence their judgment in the courts,\textsuperscript{4} but there is no hint of any reform of the

---

\textsuperscript{1} Plato, \textit{Protag.} 342b, makes Socrates describe how some Spartan-sympathizers in other cities take up boxing, \textit{\'\iota\tau\alpha\upsilon\kappa\omega\tau\mu\alpha\gamma\nu\nu\tau\iota\mu\iota\iota\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon}.

\textsuperscript{2} Before Demos reappears after his rejuvenation, Agora-critus proclaims that the law-courts are to be closed (1315-6), and that the old man is not \textit{\'\iota\omega\iota...
structure of the legal system. The Paphlagonian (Cleon) is disgraced and will naturally lose his influence with the jurors but otherwise it is only their attitude which has (miraculously) changed.

G.E.M. de Ste. Croix has forcefully criticized the orthodox view that Aristophanes does not attack the legal system itself but only the way the courts work in practice and the power they give to the 'demagogues'; he concludes that the poet was hostile to the institution of dicastic pay which allowed the poor to serve on the juries.¹ It is certainly arguable that although Aristophanes really desired the abolition of State pay (which was actually effected by the Four Hundred² and by the Five Thousand),³ he dared not say so for fear either of legal retributions or of the disapproval of his audience, but this is obviously assuming a great deal. One would imagine that the charge which he does make that Cleon uses public payment as a form of bribery contains (at least) an element of truth. As a realistic politician Cleon could not have been unaware of the significance of six thousand potential votes in the Assembly, and he seems to have made frequent

---

¹ De Ste. Croix, 362 with n. 9. He naturally bases this conclusion on the Wasps as well as the Knights, but as Dover, AC 131, observes, the general implication of the two plays is very similar. This is tacitly accepted by de Ste. Croix who cites passages about the lawcourts from the two comedies without making any differentiation between them.

² Thuc. viii.67.3, A.P. 29.5.

³ Thuc. viii.97.2, A.P. 33.1.
use of the courts\(^1\) where a well-disposed jury would naturally be helpful. On the other hand, most scholars now recognize that the raising of the jurors' fee was a necessary measure at this time. A.H.M. Jones has pointed out that even with the extra obol their remuneration was only half a laborer's wage in the fifth century and barely enough for them to live on.\(^2\) One might perhaps surmise that Cleon had convinced himself that his own interests and those of the people coincided here.

Andrewes, while recognizing that the jurors' pay was still meager, notes that the raise was carried through at a time when the rich had recently had to pay an unaccustomed eisphora because money was so short. Accordingly, he argues that 'this must be taken as class legislation and it is easy to imagine what was said about it.'\(^3\) There must have been grumbling among the upper classes but it is noteworthy that there is little or no

---

1 See below, pp. 334ff.

2 The Athenian Democracy, 50, 135 n.1. In the Erechtheum accounts (IG i2 373-4) of the last decade of the fifth century, the standard wage for citizens, metics, and slaves is one drachma a day or occasionally one and a half drachmas.

3 Phoenix xvi 1962, 72 n. 30.
emphasis upon the cost of the raise in the Knights. Instead, Aristophanes skilfully gives the impression that for all the Paphlagonian's bribery Demos still lives in poverty and is not getting what is rightfully his. There is obviously something of a contradiction here, but it matters little in Comedy. What is clear is that Aristophanes 'touches all bases' in attempting to convince the

1 The way that the Paphlagonian extracts money from the rich is mentioned at 264-5 and 774-6, but it is not linked with Demos' misthos. It is impossible to estimate accurately how much the extra obol which the jurors now received cost the State. At Wasps 661-3 Bdeycleion computes that the six thousand dicasts get one hundred and fifty talents annually. This would mean that the raise cost fifty talents a year and that all the jurors sat for exactly three hundred days a year, but these are obviously round figures. One would have thought that it was in Bdeycleon's interests to underestimate the proportion of the State's revenues which the dicasts obtain, but scholars generally assume that one hundred and fifty talents must be a hypothetical maximum. Andreades, History of Greek Public Finance, i, Eng. trans. by C.N. Brown, Cambridge, Mass. 1933, 253, thinks that the total sum spent on jurors' pay was something less than a hundred talents annually; Harrison, The Law of Athens, ii.49n.2, puts it in the region of a hundred talents. Not enough is known about the organization of the courts in the fifth century to make these more than approximations. A.P. 63.9 can only be used as evidence for the late fourth century and although Ps. Xen., Ath. Pol. 3.6, indicates that the courts were extremely busy throughout the year, it is not known how many days they were in session or how they were empanelled. Lipsius, Das Attische Recht, 136ff., believes that there were ten panels of 500 with 1,000 supernumeraries who constituted a reserve from which vacancies might be filled. Bonner and Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, 1.235ff., believe that there were twelve panels, while Harrison, supra cit. App. F, 240, thinks that there were ten sections of six hundred jurors from whom courts of five hundred or multiples of that number could be chosen by lot.

2 This line is developed more fully in the Wasps, but see Knights 783-5, 789, 792-3, 804, 867ff.
audience that Cleon deserves no credit for what he has done.\footnote{See above, p. 319 n. 3. In the main, however, he}
he adopts conservative arguments in maintaining that his motives were bad, but this is the obvious line
to take and it is questionable how much significance can be attached to it. Because of the emphasis which is
placed upon Demos' degradation in the first part of the play, it may be legitimate to conclude that Aristophanes
genuinely believed that it was humiliating and even dangerous for the six thousand dicasts to be beholden to
politicians. Apart from getting rid of the worst of these politicians, however, he has no solution to offer.
There is moralizing at the end of the play but nothing to show that the poet was trying to advance anything like a
concrete program of reform.

Apart from the references to the jurors' pay,
little specific attention is focused in the \textit{Knights} on
the other kinds of benefits which the Athenians could receive from the State.\footnote{It is worth noting that military pay is exempt from
criticism: Demos indeed evidences a special concern about the payment of his sailors (1065-6). This is in
his 'bad days', but after his rejuvenation he vows that in future the oarsmen will be paid in full the instant
their ships put into port (1365-6).} The distribution of meat was
an important feature of public sacrifices\textsuperscript{1} and it has been noted that the Paphlagonian is represented as utilizing this in order to gain the attention of the Boule.\textsuperscript{2} His proposal that a hundred cows be sacrificed to Athena may well allude to an actual thanksgiving sacrifice which was offered to the goddess on Cleon's initiative after the Athenian success at Pylos.\textsuperscript{3} A scholiast on Lucian cites Theopompus for an anecdote illustrating Cleon's brazen effrontery.\textsuperscript{4} According to the historian, the politician entered the fall Assembly wearing a \textit{stephanos} and ordered his countrymen to adjourn the meeting as he was sacrificing and was about to entertain \textit{xenous}. Plutarch twice tells the same story in slightly different language, and adds the detail that the Athenians broke into laughter and applause and dissolved the Assembly as he had asked.\textsuperscript{5} Neither Theopompus nor Plutarch gives any indication when this incident took place, but Wade-Gery has plausibly argued that it has its perfect context in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Ps. Xen. Ath. Pol. 2.9: \textit{θύουσεν δὲν δημοσίᾳ, μὲν ἡ πόλις ἱερεῖα πολλά, ἠστ. δὲ ὁ δῆμος ὁ εὐωδόμην καὶ διωκμακότων τὰ ἱερεῖα.}
\item \textsuperscript{2} 652-7.
\item \textsuperscript{3} For the significance of the Paphlagonian's devotion to the goddess, see above, pp. 270ff.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Schol. Lucian, Timon 30; Theopomp. FGH 115 F 92.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Nic. 7.5; Mor. 799D.
\end{itemize}
425/4 after Cleon had returned in triumph from Pylos.\(^1\) The fact that the Ecclesia was apparently awaiting him\(^2\) and its amused reaction to his high-handedness strongly suggests that 'his behavior is the licensed effrontery of the hero of the hour.' It appears extremely probable then, as Wade-Gery maintains, that Cleon's 'foreign guests' were the Spartans and that his sacrifice was the thanksgiving for Pylos. If this is correct, Aristophanes could well be making a mocking reference to it at *Knights* 652-7.

It is possible too that the Paphlagonian's promise to provide Demos with *krithas* and *alphita*\(^3\) refers to a distribution of grain which was made to the citizens some time after the performance of the *Knights*. At *Wasps* 715-8 Bdelycleon bitterly describes the promises which the popular leaders make when they are under pressure:

\[\text{άλλι' οπότεν μὲν δείσωσ' αὐτῷ, τὴν Εὐβοίαν διδόμεν}
\[\text{ὑμῖν καὶ εἶτον ϊψίσταντει κατὰ πεντήκοντα μεθίμνους}
\[\text{ποριεῖν. ἔδοσαν δ' υπωπώτερ' σοι πλὴν πρώην πάντε μεθίμνους,}
\[\text{καὶ ταύτῳ μόλις γενίκες φεύγων ἐλαβες κατὰ Χοινίκη κριθῶν.}\]

---

1 *AJP* lxx 1938, 129-31. His main thesis in this article, that the adjournment of the Assembly caused Thudippus' decree ordering the tribute-assessment to be postponed until the next prytany is not convincing; see below, p. 388, n. 1.

2 This is implied by Theopompus; Plutarch, *Nic.* 7.5, specifically states that the people had sat for a long time and that Cleon entered late.

3 1100-4.
The reference to Euboea is controversial but the passage shows that a distribution of barley had been made recently. MacDowell insists that the word πρώην proves that it took place in 423/2 but this is being overly precise.

It is quite possible that the distribution which is mocked

---

1 Probably Euboea is simply equivalent here to 'huge amounts of grain', since the island was an important source of imported grain; cf. Thuc. viii.95.2. This seems more likely than the assumption that there was talk at this date of settling new cleruchies on Euboea and there is a reference to this here. A scholium to Wasps 718 says that Philochorus recorded an Athenian expedition against Euboea in 424/3 (FGH 328 F 130), but it is not mentioned by Thucydides. If it took place, it was apparently not of major importance. Meiggs, 569, has suggested that it was a demonstration of strength and that it quelled Euboean dissatisfaction over the recent tribute increase which had perhaps been stoked by the Athenian disaster at Delium. The right of taking up land in the Empire was one of the more valuable privileges of Athenian citizenship and Plutarch, Per. 9.1, says that cleruchies were one of the instruments of 'bribery' which Pericles was accused of employing. 2,700 settlers were sent to Lesbos under the eventual settlement in 427 (Thuc. iii.50.2), and Andrewes, Phoenix xvi 1962, 76 n. 30, has observed that if Cleon's original motion had not been reversed, presumably it would have meant greater benefits to the Athenians. It is not known, however, if Cleon was responsible for the final settlement, apart from the decision to execute the ringleaders of the revolt (Thuc. iii.50.1). It is not cited in the Knights as one of the ways he had bribed the people, but this may be because it was no longer topical.

2 n. ad Wasps 717. He is surely correct, however, to emphasize that the lines in the Wasps cannot have any connection with the distribution of Egyptian grain in 445/4 which is recorded by Philochorus (FGH 328 F 119), and by Plutarch (Per. 37.3-4).
here is already referred to at *Knights* 1100-4.¹

Both of these passages then may be of some historical significance, and, if this is so, they further illustrate Aristophanes' readiness to represent Cleon's acts as bribery. It is the 'inducement' which the politician has offered the dicasts, however, to which he pays special attention and he concentrates upon 'exposing' Cleon's motives and its deleterious effects upon the jurymen. It has been noted that this is connected (in Aristophanes' eyes at least) with Cleon's propensity for litigation and this is considered in the course of the following section.

¹ In the *Wasps* it is derided because the grain was totally insufficient, difficult to obtain, doled out, and (above all) barley not wheat; see L.A. Moritz, *CQ* v 1955, 135-41, who has shown that *sitōs* (promised at 716) was a general word in the fifth century and might be barley or wheat. Barley is explicitly promised by the Paphlagonian in the *Knights*, and this is another apparent example of the meanness of his 'bribes'. 
vii. Cleon's Treatment of Individual Citizens

It has been observed that towards Demos, the Athenian people collectively, the Paphlagonian is essentially placatory and that he makes wholesale use of flattery and bribery. Towards individual citizens, however, he is uncompromisingly violent and harsh, and his behavior during his confrontation with the Sausage-seller and the latter's supporters provides a vivid illustration of the combative politician in action.

The two weapons upon which he places most reliance are threats and accusations. Many of the former are vague or concerned with physical violence which is consonant with his characterization as a brawler from the market place; the rest, like his accusations, often constitute or portend various forms of harassment, usually legal and/or financial, and the Paphlagonian's readiness to employ both requires closer examination.

In his opening speech at 235-9 he vows that his two fellow-slaves will be punished for conspiring ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, and when he is attacked by the chorus he retaliates by labelling them ἄναγκασμένοι at 257 and 452. At 278-9 he charges the Sausage-seller with delivering 'forbidden exports' to the Peloponnesians and at 288 he says that he will slander him if he becomes a general. At 300-2 he declares his intention of denouncing the Sausage-seller

---

for possessing ἀδεκατεύτως τῶν θεῶν ἱέρως κονιάς, and he accuses his rival at 435-6 of having stolen τάλαντα πολλά from the Athenians. He threatens to bring γραφός ἐκατονταλάτως τέταρας against him at 442 and at 445-6 he states that his enemy is descended ἐκ τῶν ὀλισθείων.

At 475-9 the Paphlagonian returns to his earlier theme, declaring his intention of denouncing his opponents as conspirators, and the Sausage-seller reports at 626-9 that he did indeed level this charge 'most persuasively' against the Knights in the Council-chamber. At 710 he vows to take the Sausage-seller before the people to be punished, and at 828-9 he promises that he will convict him of stealing τρεῖς μυρίας. Finally, he says at 912-8 that he will make him a trierarch, using his influence to ensure that his expenses will be as heavy as possible, and at 923-6 he threatens that he will make him liable τὰς ἕσφορας.

Much of this is funny because it is so blatantly ludicrous. The Sausage-seller is, by his own admission, both low-born and impecunious. The very idea that he was (e.g.) descended from the Alcmaeonidae, might aspire to the strategia, could have stolen on a grand scale or be eligible for liturgies and the eisphora is patently absurd. The absurdity, however, extends to the Paphlagonian who formulates these notions and there seems little doubt that Aristophanes is parodying what he claims to be Cleon's actual behavior towards different sections of the population. Here a certain pattern emerges. Through the conduct
of the Paphlagonian towards the Sausage-seller and his allies, the chief objects of Cleon's attention are represented as being rival politicians, office holders, and the rich; the charges which he employs most frequently, those of 'conspiracy' and public corruption.

This 'pattern' is confirmed and emphasized by the references which the other characters in the play make to the Paphlagonian's 'modus operandi', and by the latter's own words even when he is not engaged in explicitly accusing or threatening his tormentors. Thus, in the prologue, the two slaves bitterly complain how the Paphlagonian gets the other ὀικέται in Demos' household beaten, and generally uses his position to terrorize his fellows, i.e. the other politicians who would serve the Athenian people. He is also described here as ἐπισύνετα λέγησε δημοσφατά and the chorus, who refer to him in their opening words as τάραττε πολοκράτες, accuse him of particularly oppressing τῶν ὑπευθύνων and the rich,

1 The Paphlagonian's treatment of the Sausage-seller illustrates Cleon's attitude to political rivals. It is argued below that at this date 'conspiracy' could only have been imputed to the wealthy.
2 4-5.
3 58-60.
4 63-70.
5 103.
6 247.
timid, and harmless among the citizens as well as the wealthy foreigners. The Paphlagonian himself boasts how he will do violence to the generals and Council at 355 and 363 respectively, and when he fondly recalls his harassment of individual Athenians at 774-6 he must be referring to his treatment of the wealthy since he claims that his actions yielded much money for the State. Another of his proud boasts occurs at 861-2: 

\[ \text{Eis \ wv \ ep\'anisa \ tou \ gev

Analysis of this side of the Paphlagonian's behavior is considerably hindered by the fact that the internal scene at Athens during the Archidamian War is not well documented. This often makes it impossible to determine what (if any) historical significance there is to the attacks which have been cited above. To a certain extent one can only try to resurrect the real Cleon and to assess the extent and nature of the distortion here by employing 'arguments from probability', and, where motives are concerned, to attempt even this is sometimes pointless. This is obviously not very satisfactory but it seems inevitable, and to facilitate examination of the Paphlagonian's conduct the comic character's favorite victims are considered in

---

1 259-65.

2 326. This looks like a reference to Cleon's treatment of members of the Empire which is considered later in the chapter.

3 This is probably a reference to the eisphora; see below, App. B.
two groups, the rich and office holders-politicians. It should be emphasized, however, that this division is somewhat artificial since most Athenians holding office or engaged in politics at this date were wealthy. It is adopted here purely for the sake of convenience so that the Paphlagonian's attacks can be sifted separately.

One aspect of the Paphlagonian's harassment of the rich, his apparent determination to see that the eisphora was rigidly levied, is generally taken by modern commentators as a reflection of Cleon's actual behavior.¹ With this should perhaps be linked the Paphlagonian's threat at 912-8 to make the Sausage-seller a trierarch. Unless one supposes that the only point here is the very high cost of this particular liturgy,² it would seem to furnish another indication that Cleon did take steps to ensure that the rich met their obligations to the State.

The late fifth-century and fourth-century evidence shows that while many Athenians liked to make a display of their wealth and were proud of their civic loyalty,³ complaints about and attempts to evade the various

¹ There is, however, no real evidence for the view that he had been responsible for the institution of the tax; see App. B.
² For the cost, see Davies, APF xxix-xxi; citing the sources he observes that the known costs range from 8,000 dr. for three trierarchies (which may have been syntrierarchies), through 4,000 dr., 4,800 dr., and 5,142 dr. to 6,000 dr. for a trierarchy leased out to contractors.
³ See (e.g.) Lys. xix-57-9, xxix.1-5, xxv.12-13.
financial impositions were by no means infrequent. Presumably this was especially true when the Knights was performed since the landed proprietors at least had suffered considerably from the invasions while the trierarchy (on the richest citizens) and the eisphora had been for some time regularly recurring burdens. Plutarch's description of Cleon as ῥαχυσ and βαρυσ towards the ἐπιεκεσ fits in well enough with the implication in the Knights that the politician had been active in his pursuit of defaulters, and, if this is correct, two things about Aristophanes' treatment of his conduct stand out. The poet naturally disguises (and some modern commentators have tended to overlook) the fact that Cleon himself belonged to the class on whom the eisphora and liturgies fell. One might even surmise that he must have been scrupulous in fulfilling his own obligations if his attacks upon 'backsliders' were to carry any conviction. Secondly, it is notable that Aristophanes represents Cleon here and indeed consistently throughout the play as attacking others for entirely personal ends. How much truth there is in

1 The best known complaints are perhaps those of Isocrates (viii.128, xv.159-60). At Frogs 1065-6, Aeschylus criticises the rich who currently attempt to evade the trierarchy. For further examples see G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, CM xiv 1953, 34 n. 17.

2 Thuc. iii.65.2. G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, Hist. iii 1954, 28 n. 1, observes that the wealthiest landowners would have been found on the best land which must have suffered most from the Spartan ravaging (Thuc. ii.19.2).

3 Mor. 807a; cf. Nic. 2.2-3.
this accusation, it is (unfortunately) impossible to say.

A further complaint voiced by the well-to-do at Athens in the fourth century is that they faced the danger of being condemned on trumped up charges and having their property confiscated. As A.H.M. Jones has observed, there is reason to think that this abuse of the law courts did occur in the fourth century and earlier, but there is no way of knowing how common it was during the Archidamian War. It is clear, however, that Aristophanes claims that Cleon had been involved in this. At Knights 103 the Paphlagonian is described as ἐπίπαιτα λείψας ἡμιώπατος, and the fact that he is here referred to as a βδέκανας shows that he is being identified as a sycophant.

The activities of these professional informers who received a share of the confiscated goods following certain successful prosecutions are well known and need not be detailed here, but it seems significant that at 264-5 the chorus refer to the Paphlagonian's eager search for a


2 Athenian Democracy, 58ff.

3 Even if one ignores the imputations against Cleon, Knights 1358-61 would seem to indicate that it was not unheard of.

4 See Neil, n. ad loc., who cites passages from Demosthenes, Strabo and a scholiast on Plato to show that the word βδέκανας was especially associated with the malignity of the sycophants.

5 For sycophants and their behavior, see Bonner and Smith, The Administration of Justice, ii.ch. 3.
citizen who is ἀμυντικός, πλούσιος καὶ μῆ πονηρὸς καὶ τρέμων ἔτω πρόγνωσο. Apparently, one of the more lucrative lines of business plied by the informers was the blackmailing of prosperous men with the threat of prosecutions which, for one reason or another, they were anxious to avoid. This passage in the Knights then reinforces the impression given in the prologue that Cleon was a common sycophant,¹ and it seems clear that these informers were generally unpopular in the city. Aristophanes is evidently trying in the Knights to take advantage of Cleon's frequent use of the law courts to represent him as one of them.² Again, however, the question whether the prospect of material gains for themselves or for the State was ever a factor in motivating Cleon or his supporters to initiate prosecutions against the rich (as Plutarch implies)³ cannot be answered.

One of the most common charges which the Paphlagonian is depicted as levelling in the Knights is that of

---

¹ This would be made clear to the audience by the use of the verb ἀνασκόμισαν at 259. For this play on words, see J. Taillardat, Les Images d'Aristophane, Paris, 1962, 432-4. He cites examples to show that it was 'traditional in Comedy'.

² At Peace 653 Trygaeus explicitly calls Cleon a sycophant. Taillardat, supra cit. 408, notes that Comedy does not always distinguish between the sycophant and demagogue: 'plusieurs images qui s'appliquent à l'un s'appliquent à l'autre', and it is uncertain whether Aristophanes initiated this. For further references to Cleon's 'sycophancy' in the Knights, see below, p. 339.

³ Mor. 818c. In Lucian, Timon 30, Wealth is afraid of encountering Cleon or Hyperbolus, but the exact significance of this cannot be determined. For Cleon's supporters, see below, pp. 352-4.
'conspiracy'. De Ste. Croix has emphasized as a 'fundamental truth' that throughout the different cities of fifth-century Greece those who favored oligarchy were in general the propertied classes, while the democrats were the poor. As far as Athens is concerned, the first part of this generalization at any rate is not seriously open to question, and the Paphlagonian's remarkable ability to see conspiracy everywhere can logically be treated in the context of his assaults upon the wealthy.

Exactly what lies behind these references to conspiracy, however, is quite uncertain. Presumably there must have been discontented oligarchs in Athens in 424, and although there is no evidence (outside Aristophanes)

1 In addition to the explicit references, Knights 279-80 belongs to this category; the forbidden θυμεύματα which the Sausage-seller is accused of exporting are destined for Peloponnesian triremes.

2 Hist. iii 1954, 21.

3 The Paphlagonian's claim at 445-6 that the Sausage-seller is descended ἐκ τῶν ἀλτηρίων is a derogatory reference to the upper-class Alcmaeonidae, but 'conspiracy' is not involved here. The charge had recently been used by the Spartans against Pericles (Thuc. 1.127.1), and Neil, n. ad. 445-6, suspects that it may have been revived against Alcibiades. The Spartans obviously felt that it might still have some impact in Athens, and Cleon may have used it. At least Wasps 1229-30 seem to point in this direction, but both references are too vague to be really helpful.

4 It seems doubtful whether the exact date of the Ath. Pol. of Ps. Xen. will ever be satisfactorily established. The controversy cannot be discussed here, but for recent (light-hearted) arguments that it was written in 424 (August), see W.G. Forrest, TCS xxiv 1975, 37-52. In Klio lii 1970, 107-16, he argues for a date between 431 and 424, and favors 425/4.
that they were politically active or that they were regarded as a serious threat at this date, there must be some substance to the Paphlagonian's repeated charges.¹

Plutarch records the mutual antipathy which existed between Cleon and the aristocrats;² his feud with the noble young cavalrymen is attested by Theopompus,³ and it has been observed earlier that there is reason to think that he presented himself publicly as a champion of the demos. Comic inversion of the truth can plainly be ruled out here and invention ex nihilo is very unlikely.⁴ Andrewes believes that Cleon must have claimed credit for unmasking conspiracies some time before the Knights was performed,⁵ but the manifestations of his 'witch-hunting' in the play

¹ See too the references to 'conspiracy' or 'tyranny' at Wasps 343-5, 482-502, 953, 1041. It remains a mystery why Thucydides in his account of the Mytilenean debate should make Cleon remark upon 'the freedom from fear and intrigue' which the Athenians enjoyed in their daily dealings with each other.

² See (e.g.) Nic. 2.2, Mor. 807a.

³ The details of this are discussed below, App. B.

⁴ Knox, AJP lxxvii 1956, 145, suggests that Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus is being parodied here and notes that Oedipus rages against Tiresias and Creon as being conspirators, but this is very far-fetched.

⁵ Phoenix xvi 1962.81.
are nearly all general or comically incongruous, and they provide no help for determining how he may have denounced the 'city's enemies'.

One can only speculate, but it seems possible that while Cleon may have enjoyed some success in alerting his fellow citizens to the dangers within, he had suffered a setback in the course of his recent abortive attack upon the corps of cavalry when he possibly questioned their loyalty to the city. In this case, the presence of the Knights in the orchestra and his allusions to them as conspirators would directly recall his failure to the audience. The fact too that he levels the charge not only against the chorus but against the other characters in the play (all highly unlikely participants in this type of

1 In view of the democratic intrigues carried on by Demosthenes and Hippocrates with certain Boeotian cities later this year (Thuc. iv.76), it is interesting but apparently coincidental that the Paphlagonian should suspect oligarchic plotting with Boeotia at Knights 479. He uses the verb συντροφίσκω to describe the intrigue, and Neil aptly notes that 'the rich pastoral country of Boeotia was famous for its cheese.' At 235-9, the sight of Demosthenes' drinking cup (apparently from Chalcis) seems to be enough to convince the Paphlagonian that revolt was being fomented in Chalcidice; cf. Van Leeuwen, n. ad loc. For the significance of the intrigue with Persia mentioned at 475-8, see above, p. 267-9.

2 For the readiness of the Athenians to suspect a conspiracy aimed at oligarchy and tyranny approximately a decade later, see Thuc. vi.60.1.

3 It is argued below (App. B) that Cleon had attacked the cavalry while he was a Councillor in 426/5, and it may be significant that it is before the Boule that the Paphlagonian accuses the Knights of conspiracy (475-9, 626-9).
plotting) would underline its preposterousness.\(^1\) This is plainly unprovable, but it seems clear at any rate that Aristophanes is parodying by exaggeration some recent activity of Cleon which had been directed against some member or members of the wealthy classes in the city. Nothing can be deduced from these passages about Aristophanes' own political thinking beyond the fact that (as Sealey has pointed out)\(^2\) the poet did not take the rumors of oligarchic plotting seriously.

In his attacks upon fellow politicians and office holders, the Paphlagonian is also represented as following the path of common sycophancy. This is emphasized by Demosthenes at 65-70 when he recalls how his enemy has extorted money from his peers by threatening to get them beaten, and at 437 the same character asserts that \(\sigmaυκοφαντίας πρε\). Moreover, throughout his duel with the Sausage-seller the comic Cleon shows a certain familiarity with the various Athenian legal processes which is consistent with the expertise of a professional informer.\(^3\)

Yet it is frequently uncertain whether it is Cleon's behavior in the law courts or in the Assembly which

---

1 The chorus are accused at 257, 452, 626-9; Nicias and Demosthenes at 235-9, the Sausage-seller at 278-9, and all the Paphlagonian's tormentors at 475-9.

2 Essays in Greek Politics, 101 n. 42.

3 Thus, in addition to his threat of bringing \(γράψαι\) at 442, he seems to proceed by \(ἐνδύσασθαι\) at 278, by \(Φίλος\) at 300. On these, see Harrison, The Law of Athens, ii.218-21, 229-31.
is being parodied in the *Knights*,¹ and in most of these cases it would be fruitless to attempt to make a forced distinction between the two. The courts were often an arena for political conflict, and it is natural to suppose that when Cleon was prosecuting he adopted much the same bullying methods as he employed in the Assembly. These are vividly represented and described by Thucydides.

The historian introduces him prior to the Mytilenaean debate as the 'most violent of the citizens',² and during the speech which Cleon delivers here and his reported speech in the debate about Pylos, he clearly displays the propensity for attacking rival politicians and officials which is parodied in the *Knights*.³ When he urges the Assembly to show no mercy to the Mytilenaeans, he tries three times to silence 'opposition-speakers' in advance by implying that anyone who made a more lenient proposal must have been bribed.⁴ As Diodotus points out, this is a

¹ This naturally also applies to his treatment of the wealthy.

² iii.36.6.

³ Andrewes, *Phoenix* xvi 1962, 77 with n. 31, observes that Thucydides does not represent Cleon as accusing 'the friends of Mytilene' of oligarchic plotting and of hostility to the democracy, 'which the real Cleon is only too likely to have done'. He speculates that this may be because the Syracusan Athenagoras used this weapon in a speech (vi.36-40) which was probably composed earlier, and it was not Thucydides' practice to repeat himself in this way. It would be a highly unlikely tack for Cleon to choose in the Mytilenaean debate, however, since his opponents were attempting to save the demos of Mytilene.

⁴ iii.38.2, 40.1,3. Gomme, *HCT* ii.303, 310, is characteristically cautious about the precise meaning of Cleon's words but the implication is clear.
blatant attempt at intimidation. In the course of the celebrated debate which led to his command on Spacteria, Cleon first attacks the messengers from Pylos for lying and then the generals, specifically Nicias, for their pusillanimity. Moreover, the verb diaballein, frequently used by or of the Paphlagonian in the *Knights*, is employed with reference to Cleon in the course of both debates, and in his final epitaph on the politician Thucydides states that he wanted the war to continue, thinking that in peace-time he would be ἀνισοτέρως διαβάλλων.

Thucydidus' testimony is particularly valuable here in that it corroborates Aristophanes' general picture as far as the methods which Cleon employed are concerned. The details, however, are another matter. It is very likely that the historian is thinking especially of Cleon's use of the courts when he delivers his final verdict upon

---

1 iii.42.2-6.
2 iv.27.3.
3 iv.27.5.
4 64, 262, 288, 486; cf. 7, 45, 491.
5 iii.42.2, iv.27-8. Although the historian says (iv.22. 2) that Cleon violently denounced the earlier Spartan request for secret negotiations, he is not presented here in competition with any other Athenian orator.
6 v.16.1.
7 The unanimity of historian and playwright about Cleon's character and motives is obviously less significant; see Woodhead, Νmem. xiii 1960, 293.
the politician, but there is no compelling reason to link
the latter with any known trial in Athens before the
Knights was performed at the beginning of 424.

Throughout the Greek world, military leaders seem
always to have been vulnerable to the wrath of their
countrymen and W.K. Pritchett has recently compiled a list
of 69 trials of ἥγεμονες attested in the ancient sources
which took place before 354 B.C. Of these 34 were held
in Athens, 7 during the Archidamian War. Pritchett sup-
plies the following table: Pericles was tried in 430;
Xenophon (and two colleagues) in 429; Phormio in 428;
Paches in 427; Laches(?) in 426; Eurymedon, Pythodorus
and Sophocles in 424; Thucydides in 424.

This list cannot be regarded as definitive which
illustrates the uncertainties surrounding Athenian domestic
affairs during this period even in an area where, because
of Thucydides' great work, controversy might be expected
to be minimal. Many scholars would argue (e.g.) that
Laches' name should be removed from the table and Demos-
thenes' inserted. The important question in the present
context, however, is the possible involvement of Cleon in
any pre-424 trial and Pritchett's list serves a convenient

---

1 Perhaps in particular of his own condemnation; see
Gomme, HCT iii.661, and below, p. 350, n. 1.

2 The Greek State at War, Part ii, Berkeley and Los
Angeles, 1974, 5-10.

3 The question mark is Pritchett's.
Some of the evidence for these trials has already been analyzed. It has been argued above that little confidence can be placed in Idomeneus' assertion that it was Cleon who prosecuted Pericles in 430, and that although he may well have joined in (if indeed he did not initiate) the attacks upon the Potidaean generals in 429, these attacks were probably confined to the Assembly. There remain to be discussed the possible prosecutions of Phormio, Paches and Laches.

The first of these can be dealt with very briefly. At some point in his career Phormio is reported to have been tried and condemned to pay a fine of a hundred minae. He was unable to pay this, suffered atimia and went into retirement. When Acarnanian envoys asked that he be sent to their aid, the Athenians resorted to a legal fiction to enable him to pay his fine and to leave for Acarnania. This episode has been variously dated between 430 and 428.

1 Pritchett, supra cit. 5, is fully sensible to the controversy about a number of these trials. His objective is to record the prosecutions recorded in the ancient sources without taking 'modern theorizing' into account. If Demosthenes was prosecuted, his trial probably took place after Delium and there is nothing to connect Cleon with it; see above, p. 241, n. 2.


3 See above, p. 38.

4 Androt. FGH 324 F 8; Paus. 1.23.10.
by modern commentators, but there is no need to enter into this controversy here since there is nothing to suggest that Cleon was involved in Phormio's (temporary) fall from grace.

The case of Paches has recently been capably discussed by H.D. Westlake. Unlike most scholars, he argues that Plutarch's sensational story of his suicide in court following conviction at his εὐθυνα after the suppression of the Mytilenaean revolt should be rejected. The even more sensational story that Paches met his fate following the denunciations of two women from Mytilene whom he had violated (after killing their husbands) is now generally believed to be apocryphal and Westlake naturally dismisses this too. Even if Plutarch's tale is suspect, however, (as Westlake notes) 'it could scarcely have come into existence if Paches had not been subjected to public

---

1 See Ehrenberg, AJP lvi 1945, 122-7; Jacoby PGG ii 116 Suppl. 1.125-37; Gomme, HCT ii.234-7.

2 Phoenix xxix 1975, 107-16.

3 Nic. 6.1, Arist. 26.5.

4 The second story is related in an epigram composed by Agathias of the fifth century A.D. (Anth. Pal. vii.614). Gomme, HCT ii.332, is inclined to accept it, on the grounds that 'the improbability of Paches' name surviving for nine centuries unless in memory of some such incident, is some argument in favor of its truth.'

5 Westlake argues that suicide by Greeks at this time was very rare, and that the public suicide of a prominent general would have undoubtedly attracted considerable attention. He considers the argument ex silentio to be unusually strong and thinks that Plutarch's anecdote is ultimately derived from Comedy.
censure for some alleged misdemeanor relating to his military command,' and his abrupt disappearance from the pages of Thucydides supports the view that he was condemned.

Although Paches seems to have tried to be careful not to overstep the powers which had been given to him, he was (necessarily) compelled to make some important decisions without consulting the Assembly.1 His discharge of his duties on Lesbos could have given a potential accuser ammunition to draw upon,2 but Westlake has suggested that his downfall came about through his failure to capture or destroy the Peloponnesian fleet when it fled for home.

His theory is ingenious and plausible,3 but in any case, whatever the charge may have been, the crucial question here is the identity of Paches' accuser(s). Westlake tentatively links Cleon with the prosecution, suggesting

---

1 Thuc. iii.28.3, 35.2.

2 Cf. Busolt, GG iii.2.1034 n.2.

3 Thucydides, iii.33.3, states that Paches pursued Alcidas and the Peloponnesian fleet as far as Patmus but then turned back when there seemed to be no prospect of catching them. The historian then adds that Paches considered it fortunate since he had not overtaken the enemy fleet in the open sea that he had not been compelled to blockade it. Westlake notes that Thucydides seldom attributes undisclosed motives or feelings (except to a few major figures) and that the sentiments attributed here are self-justificatory. He suggests that Paches expressed them in court when rebutting charges of culpable negligence.
that Paches may have been a novus homo\(^1\) who obtained his command through the influence of 'new politicians' such as Cleon. He theorizes that Paches incurred their displeasure by his failure to put the enemy fleet out of action, inciting them to bring charges against him, and he notes that even if he was acquitted he would presumably have lost their support. Westlake suggests that if Paches had no other political backing, this might explain his permanent eclipse. The more common view is that Paches' trial was politically inspired; according to this scenario, he was a 'moderate' who fell victim to the 'radical forces' in Athens, i.e. Cleon and his friends.\(^2\) Either reconstruction is possible, but there is no real evidence here, and if Cleon did prosecute Paches there is no mention of the fact in Aristophanes.

The case for thinking that Cleon took Laches to court, on the other hand, rests almost entirely upon the testimony of the comic poet. In a well-known scene in the Wasps, the dog Labes (Laches) is prosecuted by the \(Ku\nu\delta\theta\gamma\nu\epsilon\iota\upsilon\) (Cleon) on a charge of stealing Sicilian cheese.\(^3\) From this many scholars have concluded that the

---

1 He notes that both Paches and his father Epicurus (Thuc. iii.18.3) bore names which were unusual in the fifth and early fourth centuries; this 'suggests, though it does not prove, that Paches did not belong to one of the few families from which even under the extreme democracy the Athenians recruited most of their military leaders'.


3 Wasps 891-1008; cf. 240-4, 835-43.
politician prosecuted Laches for πλοττεύσει because of his conduct on the expedition which he commanded in Sicily from the autumn of 427 to the winter of 426/5. Yet there are grave difficulties in supposing that the general came to court either in 426/5 or in 423, i.e. shortly before the production of the Wasps. Thucydides states simply that he was replaced by Pythodorus in 426/5, and he does not give any hint that he faced trouble on his return. Some scholars have found significance in his early recall from Sicily, but the Athenians had just decided to undertake a new initiative on the island at the urging of their allies there, and a change of leadership could well have been intended to mark this. It is difficult to think that something which had happened in 426/5 could have inspired parody on the scale found in the Wasps nearly three years later. An actual prosecution in 423, on the other hand, seems unlikely, at least if the charge was based upon Laches' conduct in Sicily, since this would presumably have been scrutinized and approved at his εὔθυμα in 425.

1 Thuc. iii.86.-115.2.
2 Thuc. iii.115.2.
3 See (eg.) Meyer, GdA iv.2.79.
4 Thuc. iii.115.3-5.
5 The scholiast to Wasps 240 only speculates that Laches had been recalled to Athens to face a trial. He does not quote Philochorus (FGH 328F127) for Laches' prosecution which is his own inference from the text of Aristophanes.
6 See Jacoby, FGH iiib Suppl. 1, 500-1, MacDowell, 164.
Laches apparently fought at Delium in 424, and in 423 he moved the Athenian decree making a truce for one year with Sparta. In 421 he and Nicias are mentioned by Thucydides as the Athenians who negotiated the peace, so he may already have been prominent among those who favored an end to the fighting in 423. In this case, he could well have incurred Cleon's hostility, and if the latter had raked up old charges in asserting that he has been guilty of dishonesty in Sicily (perhaps threatening prosecution), this may have been enough to inspire Aristophanes' satire in the Wasps. Prosecutions connected with Sicily would have had a certain topicality in view of the condemnation of Eurymedon, Pythodorus and Sophocles in 424.

It is impossible to be sure of the underlying historical facts here, but even if one takes a more 'generous' approach to the evidence, this is the only military trial which could have taken place in 425, and none of those referred to above can possibly be dated to 426. It seems probable that the apparent references to Cleon as a

---

1 Plat. Symp. 221a, La. 181b.
2 Thuc. iv.118.11.
3 v.43.2.
4 See, however, the caution of Gomme, HCT 111.605.
5 See MacDowell, 164, who believes that the future tense used at Wasps 240 proves that Laches had not yet been tried when the play was performed. He thinks it probable that 'the satire of the trial scene in the Wasps persuaded Kleon not to prosecute.'
6 Thuc. iv.65.3.
'scourge of the military' at \textit{Knights} 288 and 355 were intended to recall to the audience his recent behavior during the Pylian debate.

Apart from the scattered assertions (discussed in Ch. IV) that Cleon prosecuted Aristophanes after the Babylonians, the only other trials with which the politician appears to be explicitly connected in the ancient sources are those of Anaxagoras and Euripides. It has already been noted that Cleon is reported to have prosecuted both men for impiety, but in neither instance does the testimony inspire much confidence,\footnote{See above, pp. 32ff.} and Satyrus gives no indication when the 'trial' of Euripides may have taken place. In any case, while it is implied in the \textit{Knights} that Cleon is a thorough illiterate,\footnote{188-92; cf. 985-96.} no emphasis is given in the play to attacks upon 'intellectuals'. If these trials ever took place, they clearly did not inspire Aristophanes to put the litigious Paphlagonian on the stage.

There is precious little real evidence then for Cleon's activity in the courts in the years before the
Knights was performed, and yet there is every reason to believe that Aristophanes' picture of him is firmly based upon reality. It is clearly a caricature, but Cleon's attack upon Aristophanes after the Babylonians, his well-known feud with the cavalry, Thucydides' description of his conduct in the Assembly and the references to his violence in Plutarch and the comic fragments all indicate that the poet was working from a real-life model here. When this evidence for his temperament and methods is taken in conjunction with the fact that Cleon's 'fondness for litigation' is extensively parodied not only in the Knights but also in the Wasps, there are no grounds for doubting

1 The other two military trials which took place after 424 are only important here for the evidence which they may supply for Cleon's tendency to prosecute, and in neither case is it decisive. Eurymedon, Pythodorus and Sophocles were convicted of ἄρρωστος in the summer of 424 (Thuc. iv.65.3), when his influence must still have been considerable, and Thucydides attributes their conviction to the unreasonable optimism prevailing in Athens (65.4). Yet there may have been a general (perhaps justifiable) feeling in the city that their expedition could have accomplished more (see Kagan, 268-70), and it is doubtful whether Cleon was especially involved in the Sicilian venture (see above, pp.65ff). There is perhaps more reason to link Cleon with the condemnation of Thucydides (Thuc. v.26.5) than with any other of these trials in the war. The testimony of the two Lives of Thucydides that he prosecuted him for prodosia is worthless in itself, but Thucydides' well-known bias towards Cleon and the latter's own expedition to the north suggest that it should not be dismissed here; see Comme, HCT ii.585.

2 Mor. 805c-d, 807a, 818c, Nic. 2.2; cf. Lucian, Hist. 38.

3 Herrmipp. fr. 46; Plato Com. fr. 216: One would like to know the context of the mockery of Cleon as being 'mad' in Cratinus (fr. 217B).
that Cleon did make frequent appearances in the courts as a prosecutor.¹

Part of the answer why these are not better documented seems indeed to be supplied by the parody of his litigation in the Knights. In the nature of things the ancient sources were mainly concerned with trials of the famous and it would appear that in recent years Cleon had been busy with more 'mundane' prosecutions. The explicit references to the Paphlagonian's harassment of the ἀρχαγόνος at 259, the chorus' recollection of the way that he had dragged back some ἀρχαγόνος from the Chersonese at 261-2 (probably a reference to some recent case), and the Sausage-seller's description of his 'gulping down' τῶν καυλών τῶν εἰθονῶν at 824-5 all indicate that Cleon had been keeping a strict watch on the various Athenian officials.

At the end of the year each of these was obliged to undergo an examination of his conduct in office. If he had had any dealings in public funds or property, his accounts were checked by the public auditors assisted by the advocates;² if they were deemed unsatisfactory he

---

¹ See too Frogs 569-78 which indicate that Cleon's fame (or notoriety) as a prosecutor lived on long after his death.

² A.P. 48.3. See in general, Harrison, The Law of Athens ii.28-31, 208-11; MacDowell, 145, who notes that the ἀρχαγόνος are the defendants most frequently mentioned in the Wasps.
could be prosecuted for embezzlement (κλοπή).\(^1\) It seems virtually certain that Cleon's activity in this field is the point behind the Paphlagonian's frequent accusations that the Sausage-seller had been guilty of larceny on a grand scale. Aristophanes' representation of Cleon here as motivated purely by the prospect of personal gain, or of getting rid of a potential rival should again plainly be regarded with the proverbial grain of salt, but certainly in this area is once more impossible.

If this is correct, the Knights affords valuable evidence for the behavior of Cleon, and Aristophanes provides further indications that he may not have been alone in trying to exercise control over the conduct of the magistrates. At Knights 1256 the chorus, after hailing the rejuvenated Demos, ask that ἐσχατοὶ φίλαις ὑπογραφές δικαίος. A Phanus is also mentioned at Wasps 1220 where he is apparently a friend of Cleon, and since the name is unusual, this is probably the same man.\(^2\) The exact meaning of ὑπογραφές δικαίος is obscure, but the natural implication of the line in the Knights is that he helped Cleon with his prosecutions.\(^3\) Theorus, Aescines and Acestor are also

---

1. A.P. 54.2. The other possible charges were corruption (δομικά) or 'malefaction' (σοών); see Harrison, supra cit. 28-31. He notes, 209-10, that 'we are not informed who received the penalties imposed, but analogy would suggest that, if a private prosecutor acted, he would have received at least some part of the penalty.'

2. This is assumed by Neil, n. ad Knights 1256, and MacDowell, 289.

3. See Neil, n. ad Knights 1256.
mentioned along with Phanus at *Wasps* 1220-1 as companions of Cleon, and a Thuphanes is mocked at *Knights* 1103, apparently as an associate of the politician. W.R. Connor has suggested that all of these men along with Thudippus may have been Cleon's allies and associates who looked after his interests in the law courts, and he links them with the 'hundred heads κόλακων' that surrounded Cleon at *Wasps* 1033 and *Peace* 756-7.¹

The evidence about these men is very unsatisfactory, but there is some reason to think that Phanus, Theorus and Thuphanes at any rate may have been Cleon's 'allies in the courts'.² Theorus is mocked in connection with Cleon for the attention which he pays the jurors at *Wasps* 599; he is a companion of Cleon at *Wasps* 42, 1236-7, a champion of the jurors at 418-9, a κόλας at *Wasps* 45,

---

¹ NP 128-31. He notes that Cleon's gesture in renouncing his friends (discussed above in connection with his 'oratory') 'did not preclude the future accumulation of new allies and assistants'.

² For Aeschines, see PA 337. The allusions to him in Comedy provide no special reason for linking him with the courts. The same is true of Acestor: for the references see PA 474. He was a writer of tragedies who is often mocked in Comedy for his foreign birth. MacDowell reads Ἀκέσταφης at *Wasps* 1221, and believes that the reference is to an unknown son of this man. Thudippus is never mentioned by Aristophanes and there is no evidence that he helped Cleon with his prosecutions although it is very probable that he was his political associate; see below, p. 388.
419, and a perjurer at *Clouds* 400.\(^1\) Thuphanes, whom Demos accuses along with the Paphlagonian of having cheated him at *Knights* 1103, is referred to by the scholiast *ad loc.* as a κόλασις and ἔταγματέως of Cleon.\(^2\) Presumably the chorus are exaggerating at *Peace* 756-7 when they refer to the hundred κόλασις who 'attended' the politician, but there are plainly indications that he did use other men in carrying out his 'legal business', and perhaps particularly in overseeing the expenditures of Athenian officials.\(^3\)

Throughout this analysis some attempt has been made to identify the factual element in the ubiquitous allusions to the Paphlagonian's harassment of his fellow citizens. This is fraught with difficulties but it has been argued that there is reason to believe that the real Cleon had attempted to ensure that the upper classes did

\(^1\) D.W. Bradeen, *Hesp.* xxxiii 1964, 48-49, identifies him with a commander of the fleet whose name appears on a late fifth century casualty inscription. He offers no reason for this identification, however, and, as he notes, Theorus is not mentioned by Aristophanes after the *Wasps*. This fits in well with the view that he was an associate of Cleon who lost his influence after the latter's death.

\(^2\) On this 'title', see Connor, *NP* 131 n. 81.

\(^3\) Sealey, *Essays in Greek Politics*, 98, argues that since Theorus, a supporter of Cleon, could address him as hetaire (Wasps 1218), the supporters of Cleon could be called a hetaireia. He believes further that since Theorus is a flatterer (Wasps 44-5), the hundred flatterers of Wasps 1033, *Peace* 756 are members of Cleon's hetaireia. This logic is questionable, but Sealey may well be right in thinking that one of Cleon's strengths lay in 'the mechanics of politics, the organizing of his supporters'. For further references to these supporters in the *Knights*, see 472-4, 852-7.
not evade their financial obligations, and that he had been (probably unnecessarily) quick to see a danger of oligarchic conspiracy, perhaps particularly from the corps of cavalry. Moreover, he appears to have concentrated his efforts in the courts on making sure that Athenian office holders were held strictly accountable for the State-money over which they had exercised control, and it seems that he may have been aided by other much less prominent citizens.

In his discussion of the 'real Cleon', Andrewes has emphasized that 'Comedy does not aim to give accurate proportions', and although Aristophanes supplies important 'pointers' to the way the politician operated, the extent of the exaggeration here cannot be ascertained. What is clear is that Aristophanes employs every imaginable means to belittle his enemy: (among other things) he is a common sycophant, motivated only by thoughts of profit and of narrow political advantage, and his charges are ludicrous. The poet also apparently takes advantage of Cleon's natural truculence and violence to emphasize the deleterious effect which his actions have had upon the life of the city. At 308-10 the chorus address the Paphlagonian as ἄρρητος and they describe him as ἀνατυρφάκις all of Athens. The Sausage-seller too likens him at 864-7 to eel-fishers who are successful whenever κυκων the mud; the Paphlagonian also unearths conspiracy if he disturbs and upsets

---

1 Phoenix xvi 1962, 82.
Athens.\(^1\) Joyfully anticipating his fall, the chorus at 984 recall that they have heard his partisans, the fierce old jurors, claim that he does the work of a δούλος and τρόφης in the city.\(^2\)

The Paphlagonian himself employs another metaphor. One of his oracles bids Demos σιμόκεβαι ierôn κύρια καθαρότητα and he informs his bemused master that he himself is the dog which Apollo has in mind.\(^3\) Popular leaders sometimes designated themselves the 'watchdogs of the State'\(^4\) and it is quite possible that Cleon had done this.\(^5\) It is perfectly reasonable to speculate that he genuinely believed that he was performing an essential service for the people,

---

1 The verbs ταράττω and κυκάω recur constantly throughout the play. ταράττω is also used of the Paphlagonian at 66, 431, 692, 867, while the chorus refer to him as ταράττεσσατον at 247. When advising the Sausage-seller how to embark upon a political career, Demosthenes and the chorus employ it at 214 and 840 respectively. κυκάω is also used by the Paphlagonian at 362, of him at 692; cf. Peace 270. On these and similar verbs employed to describe the activities of demagogues and sycophants, see J. Taillardat, Les Images d'Aristophane, 409-11.

2 Cf. Peace 654.

3 1015-24.

4 [Dem] xxv. 40; Theoph. Char. 29; Plut. Dem. 23. 4. See in general Neil, n. ad 1017; Taillardat, op. cit. 403.

5 The alternative appears to be to suppose that the Athenians bestowed the sobriquet κύων upon him, and, if so, they were no doubt prompted in part by 'the kling-klang of Κάλως-Κύων'; see E.L. Brown, JHS xciv 1974, 167, who sees a similar point in the comic Cleon's identifying himself with the λέω at 1037-43. It seems unlikely that Aristophanes invented the pun in the Knights since the references to Cleon's 'dog-like qualities' occurring before 1015-24 could scarcely have been picked up by the audience if this were the case.
particularly by protecting them from conspiracy and corrupt officials. Yet while many dogs have a number of admirable qualities some of them fawn, or are vicious or greedy, and these are the characteristics which Aristophanes (justifiably or otherwise) saw, or claimed that he saw, in Cleon and which he certainly emphasized. It has been noted earlier that he uses canine imagery to describe the way the Paphlagonian fawns upon Demos, his master, and he employs it particularly to depict his ferocity towards his fellow citizens. The 'greedy Cleon' is considered in the next section.

1 47-8, 1018, 1031; cf. Taillardat, op. cit. 403-4.
2 1017ff. At 415-6 the Paphlagonian refers to himself as κυνοκέφαλος, and the Sausage-seller seems to treat him as a hound at 706-7. At 1030 he becomes Cerberus, a joke which Aristophanes repeats at Peace 313, and which was apparently picked up by Plato Com. (fr. 216). For other references to Cleon as a fierce dog see especially Wasps 891-1008, 1031, Peace 754.
viii. Cleon's 'Corruption'

Throughout the Knights remarkable emphasis is laid upon the dishonesty of the Paphlagonian in financial matters. A number of the allusions to this are quite general. Thus, at 315-21 he is revealed to be a crooked cobbler; the Sausage-seller jests at 706-7 that his favorite food is a βαλλάντιον, and at 956 the device on his ring turns out to be a greedy λάφος, the metaphorical equivalent of the modern cormorant. Those references which are more specific are mainly concerned with his practice of accepting bribes and of stealing particularly from the State, and passages belonging to each group are detailed below.

In the prologue Demosthenes vividly describes how the Paphlagonian διέτεκα τῷ ἑτέρῳ, δωροδοκεῖ, in Demos' household. The chorus depict him at 403 as δωροδόκαιον ἐστι ζων and at 994-6 as only able to play Δωροδοκιστή on his lyre when he was a boy at school. The Sausage-seller is more down to earth. He claims at 801-3 that the Paphlagonian rejects peace negotiations so that the confusion of war may hide the fact that he is taking bribes from the allies, and at 832-5 that he received a bribe of more than forty minae from Mytilene. Again, at 927-40 he visualizes a situation in which the Paphlagonian will gain a talent if a speech which he is about to make

---

1 This is neatly summed up by Demosthenes at 79:

τῷ Χειρὶ ἐν Αἰτωλῶν, ὃ νῦν ὤν Κλωπαῖον.

2 65-6. At 1082-3 the Sausage-seller claims that he uses the beggar's phrase, ἔμβολε κολλή.
'about the Milesians' is successful. The meaning at 438 is controversial. The Sausage-seller states that he is well aware that his opponent has taken ten talents from Potidæa, but it is not clear whether the charge is venality or peculation.¹ In either case, the Paphlagonian's immediate enquiry whether he will keep silent for a talent bears out the Sausage-seller's implication at 471-4 that his rival is capable of using bribery for his own ends.

The references in the comedy to the Paphlagonian's thieving are equally frequent. Early in the play at 296 he frankly admits that he steals, and after being dismissed from power he enlarges on this by parodying lines from Euripides' Alcestis and claiming at 1250-2 that his successor could not be more of a thief. Shortly prior to this at 1226 he had defended himself by maintaining that he stole for the good of the city and at 444 the Sausage-seller threatens to bring more than a thousand indictments κλέψεις against him. Tampering with public money is first imputed at 258 when the chorus refer to his devouring τὰ κόμα, while the Sausage-seller at 824-7 says that τῶν καυλῶν τῶν εὐθείῶν ἐκκαυλήσων καταβροχῆσθε, and that μυστικαί τῶν δημοσίων with both hands. A hint of a more unusual kind of theft of 'public property' appears to emerge at 393-4 when the Sausage-seller says that the Paphlagonian wants to sell the Spartan prisoners, and at 792-4 he accuses him of keeping the Athenians cooped up in

¹ See below, pp. 362-4.
the city so that he can 'steal their honey'. The Sausage-seller's charge at 716-8 that his rival has kept three times as much 'food' for himself as he gives to Demos, is eventually substantiated with the examination of his K得意 at 1211-25. At 1030-4 (where canine imagery is used to good effect) one of the Sausage-seller's oracles warns Demos against the κύων Κέρβερος who will stealthily clean out his plates and the islands.

Despite the number of references which have been cited above, it is notable that only three of them seem to be at all specific: the Sausage-seller's claims that the comic Cleon has received ten talents from Potidaea (438) and more than forty minae from Mytilene (832-5), and his reference to the talent which his opponent may obtain if a speech 'about the Milesians' is successful (927-40). Before the validity of Aristophanes' general picture can be discussed, these need to be examined separately.

A major difficulty here is that throughout the first part of the play the Sausage-seller's behavior is a parody of his opponent's. Particularly in the case of the money which the Paphlagonian is accused of obtaining from Mytilene, it is entirely conceivable that Aristophanes is simply mocking the kind of wild charge which he represents Cleon as making. As G.E.M. de Ste. Croix has observed, 'the essence of the joke, indeed, may be that Cleon who only three years earlier had spoken in favor of the mass execution of all adult male Mytileneans, was the last
person likely to do a favor for Mytilene.\footnote{De Ste. Croix, 234.} If, on the other hand, the Sausage-seller is repeating a current accusation, its context is quite uncertain. One may reasonably surmise that the Mytilenaean envoys at Athens did everything in their power to persuade the Athenians to re-open the debate after the adverse decision had been taken on the first day,\footnote{Thuc. iii.36.5.} and they may also have approached leading politicians with a view to influencing their conduct in the second meeting of the Assembly.\footnote{Cf. Cleon's implications of bribery at Thuc. iii.38.2, 40.1,3. For a reference to the way that the Mytilenaans had earlier courted Athenian political leaders, see their admission to the Peloponnesians at Thuc. iii.11.5.} If Cleon was contacted, however, it is apparent that he did not succumb to any 'inducements' which may have been held out to him, or, if he did, that he reneged on his promises.\footnote{A peculiar anecdote is related by the scholiast to Lucian (Timon 30), who says that during the night between the two debates, men of Lesbos who were resident in Athens approached Cleon. He states that they gave him ten talents to persuade the Assembly to reverse its decision, and to send the second trireme to Lesbos, and he cites Thucydides for this remarkable piece of information. This same scholiast also refers to a mysterious letter, which Cleon had (apparently earlier) written to the Mytilenaans, as proof of his ἐποδέχομαι.}

Gomme has noted that the 'more than forty minae' which the Paphlagonian is accused of pocketing is an odd sum; he tentatively suggests that there may be a direct or indirect reference not to the events surrounding the
debate, but to the settlement that the Athenians made some time later with the Mytilenaean which is the subject of a very fragmentary inscription. He observes that the forty minae "might be the rent of twenty χρυσοί" about which there had been some scandal or rumor, and he notes that if Cleon had made some proposal favorable to Mytilene which led to this settlement, this could have given rise to allegations about bribery. This is possible but one can only admit to uncertainty here.

The accusation that the Paphlagonian had taken ten talents from Potidaea is equally mysterious. It has been observed earlier that the city surrendered to the Athenians in the winter of 430/29 after a long siege which had cost at least 2,000 talents. Thucydides states that the Athenians ἐπηκαθαντο their generals, Xenophon, Hestiodorus and Phanomachus, ὡς αὐτῶν ἴθνην ἐρνέβησαν, and it has been suggested above that a formal trial did not take place, but that the conduct of the generals was roundly criticized (probably by Cleon among others) in the Assembly. After the Potidaeans had left the city under the terms of their agreement with the generals, the Athenians sent out

---

1 HCT ii.328-32; for the inscription (IG i2 60 = ATL ii.522), see above, pp. 251-3.
2 Thuc. iii.50.2.
3 Thuc. ii.70.2. Isocrates (xv.113) gives the figure of 2,400 talents for the total cost.
4 ii.70.4.
5 See p. 38.
of their own,\(^1\) and it is just possible that some incident concerning these men had recently occurred which provoked the Sausage-seller's statement.\(^2\)

In view of the amount of money which the Paphlagonian is accused of having pocketed, however, it is far more likely that reference is being made to the events of 430/29. Busolt, who believes that the three generals were prosecuted but acquitted, associates Cleon with the prosecution on the strength of this line in the *Knights*, and he suggests that the implication may be that he had been bribed to undertake a weak accusation.\(^3\) This, however, is obviously very speculative. Comic inversion of the facts may again be suspected here. It seems quite possible that Cleon had claimed that the generals had accepted bribes when they offered their 'lenient' terms to the Potidaeans without consulting the Assembly.\(^4\) The alternative appears to be that, because of the enormous cost of the siege, suspicions had arisen that some of the money had been siphoned off by individuals. In this case Cleon stands

---

1 Thuc. ii.70.4; Diod. xii.46.7.

2 For arguments that this garrison at Potidaea served as the new center for 'a complex defensive system for the Thraceward area', see Mattingly, *CQ* lvi 1961, 161ff.

3 *GG* iii.2.962n.1.

4 The editors of the *O.C.T.* have reversed the MSS. distribution of persons at 438-9, and there is something to be said for Neil's view that it should be retained. In this case the Paphlagonian at 438 accuses his rival of having made money from Potidaea, and Cleon is 'the man' at 440 who would gladly accept a smaller bribe to keep quiet about it.
accused of peculation but there is no evidence to support the charge.

The last of these 'specific' allusions, the reference to Miletus completely defies analysis. Because the Paphlagonian had earlier threatened the Sausage-seller with a reference to his treatment of the Milesians, one may suspect that there is something of substance here, but nothing is known about Athenian relations with Miletus at this period which would help to explain what it might be. Mattingly has cited these two passages in the Knights to support his theory that the Athenian decree laying down regulations for the control of Miletus (IG i2 22 = ATL ii. Dll) should be dated to 426/5. He argues that the decree leaves open the possibility of further Athenian intervention and that the Milesians effectively are being put on probation. In his opinion, if the decree was passed in 425 under Cleon's auspices, Aristophanes' gibes are readily explicable: the poet is losing no time 'in hinting that Cleon will change his tune for Miletus for a price'.

If Cleon really had been responsible for the passage of this decree, Knights 927-40 could perhaps better be explained as yet another instance of 'comic inversion', but Mattingly's case here is especially weak, and there

1 361.

is no good reason to move the decree from 450/49. Unless the Sausage-seller is making some allusion to the Milesian hoplites who served under Nicias in 425, it seems probable that there is a reference here to the tribute reassessment of this year. There is no evidence, however, for the amount of money which the Milesians contributed between 438 and 421. In 439 they paid five talents and in 420 they were assessed at ten talents, but there is no way of knowing the date of the increase or whether there had been a subsequent reduction. If (for some unknown reason) they had been assessed at a lower rate than expected in 425 Cleon may have been suspected of influence-peddling, but this is entering into the realm of total conjecture.

It is impossible then to establish the exact point behind any of these three accusations, let alone to find a 'concrete' instance of venality. Yet while there is

---

1 Epigraphical considerations aside, the silence of Thucydides seems decisive. See Meritt and Wade-Gery JHS lxxxiii 1963, 100-2 who point out that Mattingly's new context for the decree 'has little intrinsic plausibility, since the quota-lists give clear evidence of Milesian defection before 450, whereas Thucydides in his narrative of the Archidamian War gives none at all'. Cf. Meiggs, JHS lxxxvi 1966, 95. The 'conventional' date 450/49 is obtained from the name of the archon, Euthynus in the inscription. This supposes an error by Diodorus who calls the archon of the year Euthydemus (xii.3.1), but he makes the error for 426/5 (xii.58.1) when a Euthynus is known to have been archon.

2 Thuc. iv.42.1. Andrian and Carystian contingents also invaded the territory of Corinth on this occasion. Gomme, HCT iii.489, thinks that there is an obscure allusion to the activity of the Milesian forces at Knights 361.

3 See the convenient lists provided by Meiggs, 540-1.
plainly reason to suspect that one or more of them may be purposely ludicrous, there can be no doubt about Aristophanes' intention of presenting Cleon as a man who raked in bribes. The other 'general' allusions to his δροσοσκία which recur throughout the play make this certain. If Cleon was guilty of δροσοσκία this would not necessarily prove that he also embezzled State-money. Ideally, the two principal ways in which he is accused of lining his own pockets should be examined separately, but other evidence for Cleon's behavior here is not plentiful. Once again one is compelled to analyze arguments from probability in trying to establish how much truth there is in Aristophanes' picture, and it is convenient to consider the two main sides of it together.

It is not easy to substantiate Aristophanes' caricature of Cleon as a 'monster of corruption' with credible testimony from other sources. Aelian, citing Critias as his authority, says that while Cleon entered politics in debt he died worth fifty talents,¹ but little confidence can be placed in the implication that he amassed a fortune from politics. The first part of this statement is suspicious in view of the known wealth of Cleaenetus, and Critias can scarcely be regarded as an objective source. The scholiast on Lucian (Timon 30), states that Cleon was δροσόκος εἰς ἑπέρβαλήν, but then illustrates this with the absurd story that he was (successfully) bribed by

¹ V.H. x.17.
Lesbian residents in Athens to persuade the Assembly to rescind their decision concerning the punishment of the Mytileneans. It is argued below too that there is good reason to distrust the testimony of a scholiast to Ach. who cites Theopompus as his authority for the tale that the cavalry compelled Cleon to return a bribe of five talents which he had taken 'from the islanders'.

Moreover, although Thucydides, the author of the Athenaion Politeia, and Plutarch were all hostile to the politician, none of them explicitly accuse him of or peculation. Thucydides states that he wanted the war to continue because he thought that if it ended he would be more easily detected and Plutarch also says that the war gave Cleon opportunities but neither authority specifies exactly what he means.

Plutarch, it is true, praises Thucydides for being too dignified a historian to give a full account of Cleon's many misdeeds, and he once alludes to the of the politician, but it is the latter's vulgarity and violence which occupy most of the biographer's attention.

---
1 See above, p. 361.
2 See App. B.
3 v.16.1.
4 Nic. 9.2. With both of these statements, cf. Knights 801-3.
5 For Thucydides' statement, see below, pp. 410-11.
6 De malign. Herod. 3.855c.
7 Nic. 2.3.
Some of Plutarch's statements about Cleon are plainly derived from the *Athenaion Politeia*, and it is notable too that although the author of this treatise castigates him for the impact which he had upon Athenian politics,\(^1\) and (a little earlier) Anytus for introducing bribery into Athenian public life,\(^2\) he does not connect the two or accuse Cleon of resorting to corrupt practices.

One is left then in something of an impasse. Aristophanes' picture of Cleon cannot be corroborated by reliable external evidence and it is (at least to a modern reader) disturbingly vague. On the other hand, whatever one may think of the later authorities, even if full allowance is made for Thucydides' evident bias it is difficult to ignore totally his final judgment upon the politician when it is taken together with Aristophanes' satire.

In recent times, some scholars have tended to assume that Cleon did make money out of politics, while emphasizing that here at least special standards prevailed in ancient Athens.\(^3\) Thus Andrewes writes 'no doubt he (Cleon) took money for political services-- the politicians who refrained are the ones who made themselves conspicuous, Aristeides, Ephialtes and Perikles.'\(^4\) The difficulty with

---

1 A.P. 28.3.
2 A.P. 27.5.
3 On these 'standards', see most recently S. Perlman, *GRBS* xvii 1976, 223ff.
this, however, is that because of Aristophanes it is
doubtful whether Cleon could have made himself 'conspicu-
ous' for his financial probity whatever his actual behavior
may have been. Other modern commentators have argued that
there is no proof that Cleon was in any way venal or
corrupt. In support of this view may be adduced his
apparent immunity from prosecution, the fact that he felt
free to take others to court without fear of legal reprisal,
and his apparent willingness to pursue policies which he
thought correct in situations where opportunities for
personal gain probably existed.

The problem here seems insoluble. All that one
can say with certainty is that Cleon was born into a com-
paratively wealthy family and that its wealth survived the
Peloponnesian War. As far as the Knights is concerned,
however, most people (presumably) would agree that Aristo-
phanes is (at least) exaggerating the extent of the
politician's greed, and the different approaches which the
comic poet takes are interesting. With respect to the
Paphlagonian's practice of extorting bribes from his fellow
citizens, little can be added to what was said about 'Cleon
the sycophant' in the last section. It is impossible to

1 This is argued most strongly by T.A. Dorey, G+R iii

2 The best example of this would appear to be his conduct
during the Mytilenaean debate; see above, p. 361.

3 The second part of this statement is proved by the
liturgy undertaken by Cleomedon, his son (IG ii² 1138.23-
6).
be sure whether the politician actually resorted to this, but it seems plain enough that Aristophanes takes advantage of his zeal as a prosecutor to represent him as doing so. He also seems to turn the tables upon his enemy in other ways since there is evident incongruity in depicting Cleon, the man who unearths conspiracy everywhere, as privately negotiating with the Lacedaemonians to sell the prisoners from Sphacteria.¹ Moreover, by placing so much emphasis upon the bribes which the politician receives and his misappropriation of public funds, Aristophanes seems in part to be mocking his treatment of ἰτελοθυνοι. It has been noted that two of the specific offences with which magistrates could be charged when their terms of office expired were διπά and κλοεή.² If Cleon had recently initiated a number of such prosecutions, there was obvious humor to be gained from claiming that the politician who kept a vigilant eye upon others was guilty of abusing his own position

---

¹ See below, p. 381.
² A.P. 54.2.
by committing precisely these offences upon a grand scale.¹

However this may be, the vagueness of most of the charges which are levelled against Cleon in the Knights appears to show that Aristophanes was trying to exploit his current position in Athens and particularly his involvement with fiscal matters. In his important article (perhaps too modestly entitled The Mytilenaean Debate) Andrewes devoted considerable attention to an analysis of Cleon and men like him.² He emphasizes that the running of the Athenian Empire presented a large administrative problem with which

¹ The fact that the comic Cleon resorts to bribing others also seems intended to underline his hypocrisy. Not too much should be made of the point developed above, however, at least as an argument that the references to Cleon's δυραντία were not meant to be taken seriously. It is obvious that these were the main ways in which a corrupt politician or official might be expected to enrich himself. Davies, APF 133-4, has observed that Demosthenes' reputed accumulation of extraordinary wealth seems to have depended very largely on speech-writing and δυραντία. He suggests that the many references to his δυραντία, if cautiously employed, 'may serve as a paradigm for expanding the much less explicit and detailed statements made about, for example, Themistokles and Cleon'. Davies classifies Demosthenes' known political profits into three broad groups: bribes accepted mainly as private blackmail or for the compounding of private suits; bribes accepted for individual items of political business; moneys offered and accepted with a view to influencing Demosthenes' course of action in the long term. In the case of the Paphlagonian, the references to his δυραντία are not explicit enough to allow one to make a serviceable distinction between Davies' last two groups, but it is plain that most of them fall into two main categories: allusions to bribes which he has received by threats of prosecution and (much more importantly) allusions to bribes which he has taken for political services, especially from foreigners. This naturally in itself proves nothing and disproves nothing about the venality of the real Cleon, but it does show that Aristophanes is tailoring his attacks upon the politician to the realities of Athenian public life.

² Phoenix xvi 1962, 79-85.
the first generation of democracy had not been confronted. When Athens began to interfere extensively in her allies' affairs, more administrative talent was needed than could be found in the upper classes, whose 'traditional habits of life and education were not geared to these new needs'. Hence (in part), the inevitable influx of new men from business families to fill this gap.

The sheer bulk of the city's business (by no means confined to imperial matters)¹ at this period is important. As Andrewes points out, 'Kleon and his like were not simply the people's leaders on the comparatively narrow political front which Thucydides examines: a large part of the point is their mastery of finance and administration.'² This estimate of the politician cannot be supported by the testimony of any ancient authority (outside Comedy), but this is scarcely surprising. Apart from his bias towards Cleon, Thucydides does not emphasize the executive ability of any politician (even Pericles). Andrewes has argued that the evidence suggests that he thought of statesmanship 'too much in terms of intellectual insight alone'.³ Plutarch does describe the long hours which Nicias (as well as Pericles) spent on his official duties,⁴ but he too is

¹ See Connor, MP 122-7, who amplifies some of Andrewes' points and emphasizes that the growth of Athens created a new situation and demanded a new kind of political leadership.

² op. cit. 83.

³ op. cit. 84.

⁴ Nic. 5.1-2.
biased against Cleon. It is perhaps doubtful whether he would have reported anecdotes illustrating the attention which the latter devoted to the affairs of Athens even if he had access to them. No inscription recording a decree moved by Cleon has survived either, but this may very well be a matter of chance;¹ there is at least reason to think that he was associated with Cleonymus' decree tightening up the collection of tribute,² as well as being the 'guiding spirit' behind the reassessment decree of 425.³

The decisive point here, however, is that Cleon had in recent years won the confidence of the Assembly. Despite the derogatory statements in hostile sources about the methods he had employed to achieve this, the burdens of public life during the Archidamian War were extremely heavy, involving hard work and close attention to detail. Politics demanded from its practitioners 'a comprehensive grasp of the resources and interests of their own and other cities' and 'a constant readiness to advise on all manner

1 Two decrees of Hyperbolus (one moved, the other amended by him) have survived (IG i² 84, IG i² 95). He is often regarded as the 'successor' of Cleon, and Connor, NP 126, argues that the decrees reveal his competence as a Legislator and his mastery of details. He maintains that this should remind us that Hyperbolus and (by inference) Cleon 'devoted themselves to the minutiae of politics as well as to the great issues and the occasions for spectacular oratory'.

2 ML 68. See below, pp. 383ff.

3 This is discussed in the next section.
of questions". ¹ There can be no doubt that Cleon was regarded in many quarters as well qualified to direct the city's business, and (paradoxically enough) Aristophanes' attacks upon him show that he took a very active part in doing so. In addition to his association with the tribute reassessment of 425, it has been argued earlier that (among other things) Cleon had recently been responsible for the raising of the dicasts' fees, and that he had been prominent in making sure that the _eisphora_ was levied and in 'supervising' the conduct of magistrates. If more evidence for this period survived it would doubtless show that he spent a considerable portion of his time involved in other, more routine aspects of politics and administration.

Because politics had become virtually a full-time occupation, however, and because of the growing complexity of the problems with which the city was confronted, it would seem that the Athenian leaders had come to be thought of almost as a 'separate breed'. Andrewes has emphasized that 'financial and administrative skill depend heavily on the capacity to master, and not to be confused by, a mass of detail which is too much for the ordinary man, who is apt to find the whole business mysterious and distasteful. Hence a distance between the man in the street and the men who mostly ran Athens and the empire, on which Aristophanes

---

¹ P.A. Brunt, CR² xi 1961, 144. He cites Aristot. _Rhet._ i.4 and Aeschin. 111.20 to support his statements. As Connor, NP 125, observes 'the burdens of public life are not likely to have been less in the fifth century than they were in the fourth.'
can play in curiously modern terms, as though the trouble were a remote parliament and bureaucracy. This is surely the key to the comic poet's exaggerated attacks upon Cleon here. Dover has asserted that the essential spirit of Old Comedy is the ordinary man's protest 'against all who were in some way stronger or better than he: gods, politicians, generals, artists and intellectuals'. He argues that (Cleon excepted) the way Aristophanes treats politicians 'does not differ significantly from the way 'we' treat 'them' nowadays'. As a generalization this may be going too far, but in the limited area which is under consideration here it seems very relevant. No doubt there were (at least) mutterings and grumblings in the street-conversations at Athens that the 'professional politicians' were doing very handsomely for themselves. Cleon was one of the most important of these politicians. He was wealthy; he took a particular interest in the financial affairs of the city and he was influential enough to attract bribery-attempts. It seems apparent that Aristophanes in the Knights attempts to give voice to, and to exploit and foment suspicions which may have been rife or which were perhaps lingering below the surface. Whether Cleon's

1 op. cit. 84. *Wasps* 655-724 is the clearest illustration of this.

2 *OCD* 270.

3 *ibid.* 113.

4 See de Ste. Croix, 359-60.
conduct afforded any grounds for suspicion, it is now impossible to say, but the attention which he had given to the administration of the city gave Aristophanes' charges a certain plausibility.
ix. Foreign Affairs

In the field of foreign affairs some emphasis is laid in the \textit{Knights} upon three topics: (a) Cleon's negotiations with Argos; (b) his treatment of the Empire; and (c) his attitude towards peace.

(a) Argos

The first of these topics can be dealt with relatively briefly since there are only two explicit allusions to Argos in the comedy. At 465-7 the Sausage-seller answers the Paphlagonian's accusations with a counter-charge:

\begin{quote}
\begin{rcl}
\text{οὐκούν} \ μὲν \ Ἀργεῖ, \ γὰρ οาะ \ πράττεις \ λαμβάνει.
\text{πρὸφασι} \ μὲν \ Ἀργείους \ φίλους \ ἡμῖν \ ποιεῖ,
\text{ἰδίᾳ} \ δὲ \ ἐπεὶ \ Λακεδαίμονίοις \ ἔγειρα τεκνών.
\end{rcl}
\end{quote}

The riposte itself is plainly of limited significance, but these lines are important in that they show that Cleon had recently taken steps to try to win over Argos to the Athenian alliance. Argos had benefited from her neutrality during the Archidamian War, and her Thirty Years' Treaty with Sparta was due to expire in a few years. This was a matter of grave concern to the Spartans and Thucydides states that it was one of the reasons why they were eager to sign the Peace of Nicias. They feared that if the war continued and their treaty with Argos was not renewed, they

1 Thuc. v.28.2.

2 Thucydides, v.14.4, says that in the winter of 422/1 this treaty was on the point of ending. For the treaty, see ATL iii.304.

3 v.14.4.
might have to face an Athenian-Argive coalition, and they suspected (with good reason) that some other cities in the Peloponnese would revolt to the Argives.

To establish friendly relations with Argos was clearly a promising line for the Athenians to take in 425/4 and _Knights_ 465-7 provides a valuable indication that Cleon was involved in the negotiations.¹ A.G. Woodhead indeed has linked these negotiations with the later Athenian enterprise headed by Alcibiades.² He argues that 'Cleon's pour-parlers with Argos were later to bear fruit in the most far-reaching move to overthrow Sparta that the Athenians made,' and that they suggest Cleon's mastery of long-term political strategy. This may seem to be reading rather a lot into three lines of comedy, since it is impossible to determine how ambitious the Athenian plans were at this date. Yet the second reference to Argos in the _Knights_ and other passages in the comedy perhaps give some support to the view that Cleon did in fact anticipate and may have inspired Alcibiades.

At 813 the Sausage-seller prefaces his diatribe against the Paphlagonian for daring to compare himself favorably to Themistocles with the words, Ἐνῆργες Ἀγριος.  

¹ Thucydides makes no mention of this approach to Argos. J. de Romilly, _Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism_, 193, believes that the reason for this omission is that the historian 'leaves on one side anything which could encourage the Athenians in their ambition and turn them away from concluding peace'.

² Mnem. xiii 1960, 303.
κλόεθος ἤς λέγει. The scholiast ad loc. states that the mocking appeal Ἡ πάλιν Ἀργος is a quotation from Euripides' Telephus, and since it occurs again, apparently for no special reason, at Plutus 601, it may well be that it has no particular significance here. However, given the fact that Themistocles took up residence in Argos after his ostracism, it seems not improbable that the Sausage-seller (and Aristophanes) have in mind Cleon's stay(s) in Argos to which allusion had already been made. It has been plausibly conjectured that the purpose of Themistocles' journeys around the Peloponnese was to stir up opposition to Sparta,¹ and this would give further point to the Sausage-seller's words if Cleon was attempting the same thing by making overtures to Argos' neighbors. Of all of Sparta's allies Mantinea was the most likely to defect from her,² and it is perhaps significant that shortly before the second allusion to Argos at Knights 813 there is a reference to Arcadia. At 797-9 the Paphlagonian had claimed that he wants the war to continue so that the Athenians may rule over all the Greeks; his oracles decree that if the Athenian people persist they will sit in Arcadia as dicasts receiving five obols a day. His 'motive' are laughed out of court by the Sausage-seller,

1 See A. Andrewes, Phoenix vi 1952, 1-5; W.G. Forrest, CQ x 1960, 221-41.

2 See Kagan, 334-5. After the Peace of Nicias the Mantineans quarrelled with Sparta and joined the Argive alliance (Thuc. v.29ff.).
but, as Neil has observed, these lines and the apparent association of the Arcadian mountain Cyllene with the Paphlagonian at 1080-5 may indicate that Cleon had schemes of Athenian influence in Mantinea.\textsuperscript{1}

The comic evidence is tantalizingly elusive, but it should be noted that the unusually large expedition which Nicias led against Corinthian territory and Methana shortly after Pylos,\textsuperscript{2} also suggests that the Athenians were to a certain extent concentrating their efforts on the northern Peloponnese at this time.\textsuperscript{3} It is quite possible that the one immediate and unfortunate result of Cleon's presence in Argos was Argive betrayal of Nicias' plans to the Corinthians;\textsuperscript{4} the Argives seem to have decided that while the war was in progress their best interests lay in taking advantage of their neutrality and in playing off one side against the other.\textsuperscript{5} Yet even granted that the scope of this Athenian initiative is uncertain and

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] nn \textit{ad.} 797-8, 1081.
\item[2] Thuc. iv.42.5.
\item[3] See Kagan, 255, who believes that the planting of a fort at Methana must have been the major purpose of Nicias' campaign. He suggests that the ensuing raids upon the territory of Troezen, Halieis, and Epidaurus (Thuc. iv. 45.2) were designed to bring these places and, ultimately, Argos to the Athenian side.
\item[4] Thuc. iv.42.3. It is difficult to see how the Argives could have received their information from any other source.
\item[5] See \textbf{Peace} 475-7 which may reflect a fairly widespread Athenian attitude towards Argos in 422/1; cf. Pherecrates, fr. 19. The lines in the \textbf{Peace} seem to indicate that Athenian overtures to Argos were still continuing.
\end{itemize}
that it does not appear to have had any real impact upon the course of the fighting, the potential advantages to be derived from making approaches to Argos at this time can scarcely be denied. The Athenian dealings with the city certainly appear to have been a factor in making the Spartans eager for peace.

Aristophanes' treatment of the negotiations is mocking but cursory, perhaps because he did not think them to be of major importance or because they were not controversial. The Sausage-seller's accusation at 467 that the Paphlagonian is conducting private negotiations with the Spartans is appropriately ludicrous, particularly since it was Cleon who had caused the peace negotiations with Sparta to be broken off. Here too the Sausage-seller seems to be parodying the Paphlagonian's charges of 'conspiracy' and embezzlement. At 468-9 he maintains that the negotiations at Argos are concerned with the Spartan prisoners and since he had claimed at 393-4 that his adversary is keeping the men from Sphacteria locked up because he wants to sell them, the implication is clear.

1 A number of scholars have queried the wisdom and feasibility of Alcibiades' plans to isolate Sparta after the Peace of Nicias; see E. Bloedow, Alcibiades Re-examined, Wiesbaden, 1973, 4ff., where their different views are cited and discussed. The situation was quite different in 425/4, however, when the war with Sparta was still in progress.

2 The Sausage-seller similarly emphasizes the Paphlagonian's dishonesty in his two references to Arcadia at 801ff. and 1081ff.
(b) Cleon's Treatment of the Empire

In addition to the explicit references to Potidaea, Miletus and Mytilene which have been discussed in the previous section, there are a number of other allusions in the Knights to the Paphlagonian's connection with imperial matters.\(^1\) Virtually all of these also deal with his concern for the money which can be made from the Empire.\(^2\) At 313 the chorus describe him as Τοὺς φόρους θυσσακεμίν and at 326-7 they accuse him of 'milking' Τῶν γέννων τοὺς καρπύνως. It has been noted in the last section too that the Sausage-seller accuses him of refusing peace negotiations with Sparta so that he may plunder and obtain bribes from the allied cities,\(^3\) and that one of his oracles warns Demos about the Paphlagonian who will cheat him Τὰς νῆσους δαλαίκυν.\(^4\) The Sausage-seller interprets another oracle at 1070-1 to refer to his request for νῆσίς ἀργυρολόγος, and he tricks the Paphlagonian at 1196-7 with the arrival of his fictitious ambassadors bearing 'bags of money'.

These references to the Empire must be considered against the background of Thudippus' decree of 425/4.

---

1 It has been suggested above (p. 106) that there may be a reference at 1030 to his treatment of the Mytileneans after the suppression of their revolt. On the significance of the last line in the play, see above, pp. 79-80.
2 The 'innocent' whom the Paphlagonian has brought back from the Chersonese and whose fate the chorus lament at 261-3 must be an Athenian since he is ὑπενθοῦς.
3 801-2.
4 1030-4.
ordering a new assessment of tribute and setting up the machinery to carry it out.\(^1\) In order to put this assessment into some kind of perspective, however, it is necessary to backtrack a little and to recall something of what is known or has been deduced about the tribute a little earlier in the war.

The question here is whether there had been an earlier extraordinary assessment in 428,\(^2\) and there are a number of reasons for thinking that an affirmative answer should be given. Thucydides states that the Athenians needed funds to finance the siege of Mytilene and he mentions a squadron of tribute-collecting ships which were sent to collect money from the allies in 428/7.\(^3\) Moreover, Plutarch records a tradition that there were gradual increases in the assessments, not a sudden escalation,\(^4\) and a very fragmentary quota list has also been cited as evidence that the tribute was raised in 428.\(^5\) The relevant list cannot be analyzed in detail here, but strong

---

1 ML 69.

2 This has already been briefly referred to (in connection with the Babylonians), above, p. 91.

3 iii.19.1. Gomme, HCT ii.202-3, appears sceptical whether these ships had any particular connection with the assessments of tribute, but see Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century Ann Arbor, 1932, 17-25; ATL iii.69; Neiggs, 533. All emphasize that unusually strong forces were probably sent out in years of new assessment, and that they are only mentioned by Thucydides in 430, 428 and 425.

4 Aristid. 24.3.

5 IKG i\(^2\) 214/15 (ATL List 27).
arguments have been advanced by a number of scholars that it reflected a new assessment which should be dated to this year.\(^1\) Too little remains of this list to allow firm conclusions to be drawn from it, but if (as seems very probable) the allies' contributions were raised in 428 this might also help to explain why there was (apparently) no further increase in the Great Panathenaic year of 426.

It has been suggested earlier that political divisions in Athens over the question of an assessment in 426 may have been relevant both for the plot of the Babylonians and for Cleon's reaction to the play.\(^2\) The case for thinking that it was a controversial issue has been well put by Meiggs.\(^3\) One clause in Thudippus' decree of 425 insists in very strong terms that in future there shall be a reassessment every four years at the time of the Great Panathenaia. If this is not done, the prytaneis in office

\(^1\) Because the tribute lists from 430 to 425 were cut on separate stelae, there has been a certain amount of controversy over their dating. Meritt, op. cit. 3-35, and Meiggs, 531ff., believe that two lists survive from an assessment of 430: IG i\(^2\) 218 (ATL List 25) which they date in 429, and IG i\(^2\) 216/17 & 231 (ATL List 26) which they date in 428. They argue that the new names and changes in quota in IG i\(^2\) 214/5 (ATL List 27) show that it is based on an assessment which was quite different in character and they place it in 428. Mattingly, CQ lv 1961, 154-65, considers 428/7 a 'virtually unassailable' date for IG i\(^2\) 214/5, but he believes that it belongs to the same assessment period as IG i\(^2\) 216 which he puts in 427/6, and he places IG i\(^2\) 218 in 426/5. However, his arguments (which allow him to place the first Methone decree (ML 65.1-32) in 427/6) have been well answered by Meiggs.

\(^2\) See above, p. 103.

\(^3\) Meiggs, 322-3.
at the time will be subject to heavy fines, and anyone who proposes that an assessment should not be held will be deprived of his civic rights and have his property confiscated.\(^1\) As Meiggs has observed, 'the natural inference from the polemical tone is that there was no new assessment in 426, and it is at least a possible inference that there had been some support for one.' He suggests that those who had wished to raise the tribute again 'had been successfully opposed by Nicias and his group who consistently followed a more moderate policy towards the empire'. The decree moved by Cleonymus (almost certainly early in 426/5), which attempted to ensure that all the assessed tribute should be collected in the allied cities,\(^2\) then becomes 'something of a compromise'. The 'radicals' who had failed to secure a new assessment were at least determined that the current assessment was fully realized, and some twelve months later they were able to gain their primary goal.

This reconstruction is coherent and plausible.\(^3\) If it is correct the important question is the extent of Cleon's involvement in these events, and there are grounds for thinking that he played a prominent part in them.

---

1 ML 69.26-33.
2 ML 68.
3 It has been observed that it is not accepted by Mattingly, op. cit. 154-65, who puts TG i\(^2\) 218 in 426/5 and believes that it shows that there was an assessment in 426.
Thucydides' testimony makes it certain that from at least 427 onwards he was vigorously urging that Athens should adopt a hard political line towards the allies, and it is improbable that his views were different on the economic front. Plutarch states that after Pericles' death it was the 'demagogues' who raised the tribute little by little until it reached 1,300 talents, and \textit{Wasps} 592ff. seem to indicate that Cleonymus' politics were similar to Cleon's.

The strongest reason for linking Cleon with the raising of the tribute in 428 and an abortive attempt to do so two years later, however, is his evident involvement with the assessment of 425. The crucial point here is that 425 was not a Great Panathenaic year and that the assessment was introduced so late that representatives from the allied cities could not be expected to come to Athens until Maimacterion (November-December). As Meiggs and Lewis say, some special explanation is required and it is natural to associate the decree with Cleon's ascendancy in the city after Pylos.

The precise chronological relationship between the Athenian victory on Sphacteria and the passage of the decree must remain controversial since it is impossible to establish beyond question the exact date of either. The

\begin{footnotes}
1 \textit{Aristid.} 24.3. The actual total of the assessment was something over 1,460 talents, but Meiggs, 332, thinks that Plutarch may be recording the total actually collected (plus other imperial revenues).

2 ML, p. 194.
\end{footnotes}
earliest possible date for Cleon's triumphant return to the city, however, appears to be the beginning of August.\(^1\) As Wade-Gery and Meritt have emphasized, the decree must have been voted upon long enough before Maimacterion to allow time for the Athenian heralds to make their journeys to the different districts of the Empire, and for the allied representatives to reach Athens in this month.\(^2\) Consequently, the proximity of Cleon's success with the Assembly's approval of the (unusually timed) Assessment-decree provides a very strong reason for concluding that

---

1 Gomme, HCT iii.478, estimates that the date of the final victory was c. August 5 to 10. Wade-Gery and Meritt, AJP lvii 1936, 377-94, put it at September 5. The main reason for the difference is uncertainty over the date of the Peloponnesian invasion of 425. Thucydides states that the invading army stayed in Attica for fifteen days (iv.6.2) and left hurriedly when they learned of the seizure of Pylos (iv.6.1). He also says that the Peloponnesians invaded 'before the grain was ripe' (iv.2.1), and that a contributory reason for their departure was that they were short of food since they had made the invasion \(\pi\nu\omicron\) and 'the grain was still green' (iv.6.1). Gomme, HCT iii.437, takes this to mean that the Spartans invaded earlier than usual, about the beginning of May. Wade-Gery and Meritt think that \(\pi\nu\omicron\) 'is to be taken with reference to the condition of the grain, rather than with reference to dates by civil calendar or Julian reckoning', and that the invasion took place at about the normal date. Gomme's interpretation is the more natural and Meiggs and Lewis, 196, point out that it is supported by a comparison of Thuc. iv.2.1 with iv.1.1. Yet it is not easy to see why the Spartans should have made what seems to have been an elementary blunder.

2 supra cit. 384.
he was involved in it.1

There are other arguments too which point in the same direction. The explicit purpose of the decree was to raise money for the war and Cleon had recently played an important role in rebuffing the Spartan peace-proposals.2 The suggestion advanced by Wade Gery and Meritt that Thudippus, the mover of the decree, was a son-in-law of Cleon is very attractive,3 and the violent tone of the decree in which 'the executive is threatened with penalties at every turn'4 accords well with the politician's manner

1 Wade-Gery and Meritt have argued that the assessment should be regarded as the immediate consequence of the victory on Sphacteria. One clause (34-5) specifies that the business of the decree is to be brought before the Assembly two days after the return of the 'expedition', and they believe that the reference is to Cleon's army. According to this reconstruction, the probouleuma was drafted immediately after news of the victory reached Athens, but Cleon's return was unexpectedly delayed by a few days, and Thudippus, who wanted him present during the debate, inserted this clause calling for an extraordinary session of the Ecclesia. The difficulties involved in this have been analyzed by Meiggs and Lewis, and can not be discussed here. It should be pointed out, however, that if Gomme is correct and Cleon returned in August the reference at lines 34-5 is probably to the force which Nicias led against Corinth. McGregor, TAPA lxvi 1935, 146-64, has argued for this in some detail; he thinks that the decree was not passed 'on the wave of enthusiasm' which followed Cleon's victory, but that 'it was preceded by the failure of Nikias to accomplish in the Korinthia what Kleon had done on the west coast of the Peloponnese.' Yet the important point is that the decree was certainly approved within three months of Cleon's victory, when his influence in Athens was decisive.

2 This is discussed in the next part of this section.

3 op. cit. 392 n. 36. See Davies APF 288.

4 ML, p. 197.
of dealing with his fellow citizens. Plutarch may be an unreliable authority in matters of this kind, but Eupolis, a contemporary writer, also alludes to the power which Cleon exercises over the cities of the Empire,¹ and it seems highly unlikely that the biographer can be wrong here.

The vast majority of modern scholars, recognizing this, have concluded that Cleon and his supporters must have been behind the increase of 425.² Gomme, on the other hand, stresses that there is no really positive evidence here and he is sceptical whether Cleon bore any 'special responsibility' for it.³ He notes the silence of Thucydides and especially of Aristophanes in the Knights and he concludes that the raising of the tribute 'was not regarded as an exceptional measure', nor was it 'a startling increase'; it was 'a policy generally acceptable in Athens, defended and perhaps defensible, by the depletion of the reserve funds and the consequent need for financing the war as much as possible from current revenue'.

Here (for once) Gomme's analysis of the situation and the evidence appears unreasonable. No doubt the new assessment did meet with the approval of most Athenians; the situation had changed dramatically with their success

---

¹ Fr. 290.

² See (e.g.) Beloch, Attische Politik 40; Meyer, GdA iv.2.107-8; Busolt, GG iii.2.1117; Woodhead, Mnem. xiii 1960, 301-2; Meiggs, 325ff.

³ HCT iii.500-2.
at Pylos. The Athenian rejection of the Spartan peace-proposals shows that they were committed to continue fighting and there seemed a real prospect of winning a decisive victory. For this more money was necessary, and there must have seemed little danger of inciting allied revolts given the prestige which they currently enjoyed. The wording of Thudippus' decree, however, proves that there were some at Athens who opposed the imposition of new burdens upon the allies. As Meiggs and Lewis have observed, 'the polemical tone of most of the clauses presupposes opposition, and a strong determination to override it.'

As far as Cleon is concerned, the conclusions which Gomme draws from Thucydides and Aristophanes simply seem untenable. The silence of Thucydides cannot be relevant here one way or the other. Kagan has rightly noted that the historian's 'failure' to connect Cleon with the decree 'is only part of the mystery of his larger failure to mention the decree and ought not to be taken as negative evidence'. The 'silence' of Aristophanes presents a more complicated problem but here too there are good grounds for thinking that Gomme has misinterpreted the comic poet's satire.

It is now clear that the total of the new assessment was more than 1,460 talents and that it included more

1 ML, p. 197.
than 380 cities. While the assessment of 428 may have aimed not only at getting more money from cities already paying tribute but at extending significantly the number of payers, it seems certain that this assessment in 425 went far beyond it. In view of the importance of Thudippus' decree, if Cleon had had a hand in it one might 'logically' expect (as Gomme argues) some clear reference to the fact in the Knights. It is true that the final assessment was not meant to be completed before the end of Posideion, i.e. a matter of weeks before the performance of the play at the Lenaea of 424. Yet Thudippus' decree, ordering that no city should have its payments reduced unless it is manifestly unable to pay more, must have been voted upon by October 425. There was plainly time for Aristophanes (at least) to have inserted some direct criticism of it into his comedy if he had been so inclined.

Before drawing any conclusions from this, however, it is necessary to recall what Aristophanes does say about

---

1 For the details, see ML pp. 193ff. The assessment appears to have been unrealistic and Meiggs, 332, estimates that the short-fall may have been as much as 400 talents, but this is irrelevant here.

2 Meiggs, 325, suggests that the assessment of 428 aimed at 800 talents, but this seems very speculative. It is hard to follow Gomme, HCT iii.502, when he argues that the assessment of 425 did not represent a 'startling increase'. He points out that prior to 425 the allies who contributed ships might have complained that their burden had been greatly increased since 431 while the rest of the members of the Empire were as well-off as in peace-time. This may be true but the argument is relevant only for the equity of the increase, not its size.

3 KL 69.19-22.
Cleon and the Empire in the play. It is scarcely true (as Gomme maintains) that Thudippus' 'measure finds no echo in the Knights'. Even if one omits the two references to Miletus, it has been noted earlier that there are six passages in the play which deal with Cleon's obsession with the money to be made from the Empire.¹ Meiggs, citing only Knights 312 and 1070-1, observes that 'neither passage requires a new assessment to give it point,'² but here (like Gomme) he seems to be looking at Aristophanes from the wrong angle.

In a perceptive analysis of the value of Aristophanes as a historical source, G.E.M. de Ste. Croix has made the cardinal point that, whenever possible, the other evidence should be examined first; that (if it is good) care should be taken 'to interpret the comic poet in the light of the remaining evidence, instead of going to work the other way round, as people so often do'.³ The assessment certainly took place and there is good (non-Comic) evidence that Cleon was associated with it. If this is taken as a starting-point and the principle enunciated by de Ste. Croix is kept firmly in mind, a number of interesting points emerge from the Knights.

In the first place, it appears legitimate to regard the six references in the play as providing some

---

¹ p. 382.
² Meiggs, 326.
³ de Ste. Croix, 232.
corroboration for the view that Thudippus was the mouth-piece of Cleon and his group, rather than as an argument that Cleon had nothing to do with the assessment. Otherwise, unless one assumes that the increase was totally non-controversial (which seems impossible), it is very hard to see how Aristophanes could have laid any stress upon the tribute and the money which Cleon was making from the Empire. Because the assessment was a recent spectacular fact, these allusions in the play would have been banal unless the audience would have associated the politician with the recent measure.

Secondly, the thrust of the comic playwright's approach here seems to provide a good illustration of the technique (discussed in the last section) which he employs to emphasize Cleon's ἄφροδοκία and 'peculation'. The complicated procedure (established by Thudippus' decree) for determining the quota of each city, and the amount of money involved would (presumably) have given some credibility to the charge that a prominent politician who was closely involved with the new assessment could have done extremely well for himself in the past few months.¹

Thirdly, the very fact that Aristophanes does not criticize the assessment itself is significant. The reason for this may naturally have been that he was not opposed to it or that he recalled what had happened after

¹ The Paphlagonian is accused of ἄφροδοκία at 801-2; he is accused of taking or intending to take imperial money for himself at 801-2, 1030-4, 1070-1 (with 1067-8).
the Babylonians.\textsuperscript{1} It seems (at least) equally likely, however, that he avoided making a direct attack upon the recent increase because he knew that it was popular with most of his countrymen. In short, a good case can be made here that the comic poet carefully tailors his attack upon Cleon to fit the current mood in the city. It will be argued in the next part of this section that he charted a somewhat similar course in his treatment of the Athenian decision not to make peace in 425.

\textsuperscript{1} This is suggested by Meiggs, 326. See above, pp. 95-6.
Apart from the frequent references to Pylos, there are comparatively few references in the *Knights* to either war or peace, but the Paphlagonian is firmly associated with the vigorous prosecution of the war. At 792-6 the Sausage-seller recalls how his opponent has allowed Demos to suffer during the invasions, rejected the peace-proposals and driven away the Spartan ambassadors. He claims here that having cooped Demos up in the city the Paphlagonian 'takes his honey', and he amplifies this charge at 801-4. In these lines he maintains that his rival wants the war to continue so that he may make money and because he believes that the confusion of war will hide his wrongdoing and make the people more dependent upon him. At 946 Demos complains that the Paphlagonian had primed him with garlic to make him fight, and when Agoracritus presents his grateful master with the Thirty Years' Treaties at the end of the play he informs him at 1392-3 that the Paphlagonian had previously hidden them away.

The basic charge that Cleon had played a prominent part in rebuffing the Spartan ambassadors and in prolonging the war into 424 is confirmed by Thucydides' description

---

1 At 667-9 the Sausage-seller relates how the Paphlagonian had attempted to gain the attention of the Boule by saying that the Spartan herald had arrived concerning peace, but this simply prepares the way for ridicule of the priorities of the Councillors who are more concerned about their stomachs than anything else.
of the events surrounding the engagement on Sphacteria. The historian twice relates how the Spartans unsuccessfully sued for peace: they sent envoys to Athens both after their men had been cut off on the island and when the latter surrendered. The first abortive negotiations are described in some detail, and the Spartan ambassadors are given a long speech in which they do not mention any territorial adjustments if they recover their troops, but moralize on the vicissitudes of war, offer friendship and propose an alliance between Sparta and Athens.¹ According to Thucydides, it was Cleon who persuaded his countrymen to make a counter-proposal: the soldiers on Sphacteria should first surrender and the Lacedaemonians should give up Nisaea and Pegae (the ports of Megara), and also Troezen and Achaea; then restitution of their men would follow and a treaty could be signed.² When the Spartans asked that Athenian commissioners be chosen to negotiate with them in private, Cleon violently denounced the proposal.³ He bade them, if they had honest intentions, to speak before the whole Assembly. The Lacedaemonians realized that it was impossible at a bargaining stage in the negotiations to discuss publicly any concessions which they might be prepared to make involving the interests of their allies. They saw that the Athenians would not accept their

¹ iv.17-20.  
² iv.21.3.  
³ iv.22.2.
proposals ἐνὶ μετρίοις, and withdrew from the city ἀπρωτός. 1

Although Thucydides gives no indication that the Athenians were divided as to the response which they should make to the Spartan offers, the testimony of a scholiast on Peace 665 appears to show that there was disagreement in the Assembly. He cites Philochorus as his authority and indicates that some Athenians voted to make peace with the Lacedaemonians or at least to enter into secret negotiations. 2 It is generally supposed that this group had at least one prestigious member in the person of Nicias; this view is based not only on the latter's subsequent career but on the fact that Plutarch relates that Cleon opposed the peace-negotiations especially because of Nicias. For being his enemy and seeing him eagerly collaborating with the Lacedaemonians, he persuaded the people to reject peace. 3 The evidence is far from conclusive, but the

1 iv.22.3.

2 FGH 328 Fl28a. After briefly summarizing some of the events described by Thucydides, the scholiast continues Κλέανος δὲ ὁ αὐτοῦτος τὰς διμυγές ἀπαίτειας λέγεται τὴν ἑκκλησίαν ἔρωτήσε. δὲ εὐφράτην θ' ἐπιστάταν, ἐνίκησεν δὲ ὁ πολέμειν βουλήμενος. Jacoby understands λέγεται to indicate that Philochorus 'added to the report, which he (or Androtion) may mainly have taken over from Thucydides, a detail from another source which he did not wish to guarantee'. J. de Romilly, Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism, 172 n.3 deduces from Philochorus' testimony that Cleon just managed to obtain the approval of the people, but this seems unjustified.

3 Nic. 7.2. For Nicias' later ἐλαφρῶπις towards the Spartan prisoners, see Nic. 9.4.
testimony of Philochorus and Plutarch taken in conjunction with the prominence which Thucydides accords Cleon in his account of this episode suggests that the Athenians and Spartans might have come to terms before the end of 426/5 had it not been for his interventions.

It is true that before Thucydides describes the part which Cleon played at this meeting of the Ecclesia, he explains that Spartan confidence that the Athenians would accept their proposals was misplaced, since the latter believed that the isolation of the men on Sphacteria ensured that they could have peace whenever they chose, \( \tau \delta \varepsilon \pi \lambda \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \varsigma \omega \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \). It is only after this that he states that it was Cleon who \( \mu \alpha \lambda \iota \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \delta \omega \tau \omega \omicron \varepsilon \nu \nu \gamma \varepsilon \). If the historian's word order is strictly followed, presumably this means that a majority of the Athenians wanted something more substantial than Spartan promises in return for allowing them to recover their troops, and that Cleon only

---

1 Philochorus, FGH 328 F 128b (from a scholium on Lucian, Timon 30), states that Cleon opposed peace with the Lacedaemonians in the archonship of Euthynus (426/5).


3 iv.21.3.
encouraged them in this at the outset of the debate.\textsuperscript{1} Perhaps the terms of the Athenian counter-proposal indicate that he persuaded his fellow citizens to raise their sights higher than they would otherwise have done,\textsuperscript{2} but in any case it was his second intervention in the debate which was crucial.\textsuperscript{3} The possibility that the Athenians would have agreed to elect commissioners to negotiate in private if Cleon had not vigorously attacked the proposal, and that some agreement might have been reached, clearly cannot be discounted. Thucydides at least makes it clear that when their situation at Pylos began to deteriorate, the Athenians blamed him \textit{περὶ τῆς καλύμνου τῆς ἧμισίως}.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Westlake, \textit{Individuals in Thucydides}, 66, believes, however, that Thucydides employs the phrase τοῦ πλεονεκρὸς ὑπέγγυτο at this point only to contrast the Spartan and Athenian attitudes towards the conclusion of peace, and that he is not implying that the Athenians had already made up their minds.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} See Woodhead, \textit{Mnem.} xiii 1960, 310 n. 1, who observes that the only inconsistency in this section of Thucydides' narrative is perhaps the use of πείθων with regard to Cleon (Thuc. iv.21.3), when we have already been told that the people were disposed to stick out for high terms; but he could of course have 'persuaded' them as to the details of the exaggerated price they were inclined to demand.'
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Gomme, \textit{HCT} iii.462, has argued that it was the Athenian demand that the men on Sphacteria surrender which was decisive in the sense that Sparta was bound to refuse it. He notes that 'it was, one might almost say, expressly to avoid such a dishonor that they had proposed discussing peace.' Yet this point, like the others contained in the Athenian counter-proposal, would presumably have been negotiable and private talks were under way. It was Cleon's refusal to let them start which appears to have been critical.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} iv.27.3.
\end{itemize}
The historian devotes comparatively little attention to the later Spartan peace-offers. He simply says that when the prisoners had been brought to Athens, the Lacedaemonians, although they were reluctant to betray their alarm to the Athenians, ἔπρεπε βεβαιώντο παρ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐξελέγοντο τὴν τε Πύλον καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας κομίζεσθαι. οἱ δὲ μείζόνων τῇ ὠρέγοντο καὶ πολλὰς φοιτῶν τῶν αὐτῶς ἀρμάτως ἀπέέμηκαν. Here Thucydides does not specifically link Cleon with the Athenian stance, but the words μείζόνων τῇ ὠρέγοντο inevitably recall his statement τοῦ δὲ πλεόνος ὠρέγοντο in reference to the attitude of his countrymen when they rebuffed the earliest ambassadors. It is logical to conclude that if these proposals were given serious consideration in the Assembly, it must have been Cleon's

1 J. de Romilly, op. cit. 177, is probably correct in thinking that he gives a speech only to the members of the first embassy, because he believed that the most propitious time for making peace was before the Spartans were humiliated by the surrender of the troops on Sphacteria; cf. the words he puts into the mouths of the first ambassadors at iv.29-30.2.

2 iv.41.3-4.
arguments which again carried the day.  

A passage in the Peace may perhaps be relevant here. At 665-7 Hermes explains to Trygaeus that Eirene is angry with the Athenians because she says that although she came to them αὐτοκράτη μετὰ τῶν Πύλων, bearing a chest full of treaties, she was rejected by vote Τρύγε  ἐν ἡρκλήσιφ. Trygaeus humbly apologizes and asks for forgiveness:

οὐ τῶν γὰρ ἡμῶν ἦν τὸτ’ ἐν τῶι σκύτεσιν.  

If Τρύγε is taken literally, these lines must mean that on at least two occasions after the capture of the Spartans on Sphacteria the Athenians debated the merits of

1 Since the imperfect ὄργαστο is used in both passages Thucydides' description of the Athenian response to the later ambassadors cannot be taken to imply that Athenian demands escalated as the Spartans indicated that they were willing to make concessions. Yet this is not impossible. With the men from Sphacteria in safe custody at Athens the Athenians were in a stronger position, and it may be significant that Thucydides at v.14.2 relates how they regretted that μετὰ τῶν εἰς Πύλων παρεσκέψαν οὐ ἴσησέναι. The phrase μετὰ τῶν εἰς Πύλων should mean 'when the episode was finished', i.e. 'after the capture of the men', and since the Athenians in the winter of 422/1 would naturally regret the most favorable opportunity which they had let slip, it is possible that the Spartans did make more concrete offers then.

2 Peace 669.
peace,¹ and the most plausible interpretation of the phrase ἐν τῇ σκότεις is that Trygaeus is pleading Cleon's dominance as an excuse for continuing the war.² Possibly he is thinking mainly of the debate in the first Assembly (which would have imprinted itself in the minds of the audience), but the lines do offer some slight support for the view that Cleon also spoke out against the ambassadors who came to Athens after his return from Pylos.³ Even if this is correct, however, the Athenians, elated by their victory, would probably not have needed much incitement to continue fighting.

1 McGregor, TAPA lxvi 1935, 157 n. 48, rightly argues that μετά τῆς ἐπιτίθεσις in Peace 665 should mean after the final victory, and he believes that all three negative votes in the Assembly refer to the abortive negotiations after the surrender of the men. One does not expect the same precision from Aristophanes as from Thucydides, however, and it is difficult to believe that the comic poet would not also have included here the initial rejection of peace. It might be argued that two rebuffals do not square with Thucydides' statement at iv.41.4 that the Spartans came to Athens ἐπιτίθεσις after the surrender of their men, but the historian does not purport to say how many times they were granted a hearing in the Assembly. Envoys from other states were brought initially before the Boule, and Rhodes, AB 57-8, citing the known instances, has observed that it must often have happened that the Council decided that there was no need for a debate in the Ecclesia.

2 An alternative explanation, suggested in the schol. ad loc., that there is a reference to cowardice and to the idiom σκότη ὑλή (cf. Wasps 643) does not make sense.

3 It should be noted too that when the Sausage-seller in the Knights berates his opponent for his treatment of the Spartan emissaries, he uses the plural τὰς πρεσβείας at 795. Thucydides does not provide any time indication for these later negotiations, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Spartans would have sent at least one further embassy to Athens before the Knights was produced.
The question whether Cleon was right to urge the rejection of the peace-proposals (particularly when the first Spartan ambassadors arrived) has long exercised the minds of commentators. Until comparatively recently the consensus of opinion was against him, but Gomme, Woodhead, and Kagan have forcibly argued that he was fully alive to the reality of the situation in which Athens found herself. The terms which were offered to the Spartans at Cleon's prompting were undoubtedly rigorous. The territorial demands meant a return to the situation which had existed prior to the Thirty Years' Peace, and for the Spartans to have accepted the initial condition that they surrender the men on Sphacteria would have been an act of total self-abasement. Most importantly, by denouncing the Spartan request for secret negotiations Cleon made it clear that no compromise was possible. Either the Spartans would be publicly humiliated and the terms of the peace would not only be highly advantageous to Athens, but also, as far as possible, guarantee her security or the war must continue.

The difficulty in assessing the wisdom of this policy lies in the fact that there are so many imponderables. If the Athenians had simply accepted the initial Spartan proposal and made peace without asking for any

---

1 See Busolt, 9.3 1097-9; Adcock, CAH v.233-4; Hignett, 265.
2 MEGH 105-7; Knem. xvi 1960, 310-11; Kagan, 231ff.
quid pro quo, nothing would have really been changed; as Andrewes has succinctly put it, this would have 'left intact the causes of war operative in 432 according to the analysis in [Thuc.] 1.23.6'. It is at least debatable whether there were any grounds for believing that Spartan gratitude would have been durable and that the Athenians would indeed have received honor from the rest of the Greek world. On the other hand, if secret negotiations had begun, there is no way of knowing what kind of private concessions the Spartans may have been prepared to make, how their allies would have reacted to these, and in what spirit the Athenians and Spartans would have come to regard the terms of the settlement.

Andrewes has observed that whatever one's view of the Spartan offer, it is still possible to think poorly of Cleon's manner of dealing with it, and Grote has labelled his refusal to countenance secret negotiations 'decidedly mischievous'. Grote argues that even if the Athenian commissioners were unable to wrest any important concessions from the Spartans, they 'would have been able to effect some agreement which would have widened the breach and destroyed the confidence between Sparta and her allies; a point of great moment for them to accomplish'.

1 Phoenix xvi 1962, 80 n. 39.
2 The claims of the Spartan ambassadors at Thuc. iv.17-20.
3 Phoenix xvi 1962, 80 n. 39.
4 A History of Greece, vi.332.
statement implies that the Athenians had nothing to lose and much to gain from meeting the Spartans in private, but from Cleon's viewpoint this could scarcely have been the case. He probably feared that it would be the Athenians who would make (what he believed to be) 'important concessions', and that these might well be accepted by the Assembly, once the initial Athenian elation at seeing the Lacedaemonians come to them as suppliants had subsided. Moreover, although Thucydides gives no hint that Cleon or any other Athenian realized the danger at this stage, there was always the possibility that the Spartans on Sphacteria might escape, or even that the onset of winter would make the blockade of the island impossible if the negotiations were protracted.

An argument frequently advanced to support the view that Cleon and the Athenians were wrong not to make peace at this juncture is that in 422/1 they negotiated from a weaker position and regretted their earlier decision. Before this, not much more than a year after the production

1 Kagan, 236-7, who develops this line of thought, goes too far in assuming that 'given the political situation in Athens' Nicias and his friends would have been elected commissioners to negotiate with the Spartans.

2 The Spartan ambassadors mention the first possibility at iv.19.1, but the Athenians are entirely confident that they have the men at their mercy at 21.2. As the blockade continued and they ran into difficulties, they realized what might happen (27.1), but previously they had expected that they could reduce the enemy in a few days (26.4).

of the **Knights**, they had agreed to a one year truce with Sparta with the prospect of negotiating a more lasting peace.¹ Their willingness to make this truce, which ultimately did lead to the Peace of Nicias, was largely the result of their failures at Megara and (especially) Delium, and of Brasidas' impressive success in the north.² Yet these setbacks which the Athenians experienced in the course of 424 are not proof that Athens did not have the resources to take the offensive on the scale which they attempted,³ still less that Cleon's policy in rejecting a negotiated settlement therefore automatically stands condemned.

In the first place, a reasonably strong case can be made that the three failures were, to a varying degree, due to bad luck or bad execution or a combination of both, rather than to any basic miscalculation of the resources

---

1 Thuc. v.14.1.

2 At iv.117.1. Thucydides states that the Athenians concluded the armistice thinking that this would prevent Brasidas from inciting any more of their allies to revolt. At v.14.1 and 15.2, however, he also emphasizes the importance of Delium.

3 The Athenians plainly did not take the offensive in the north, but if they had not been preoccupied with Boeotia, they might have reacted more quickly and effectively to the threat which Brasidas posed; see Gomme, HCT iii.540. There is an obvious link between Pylos (and its aftermath) and Brasidas' enterprise. The Spartans were initially asked to send an army to Thrace because the northern allies of Athens and, to a certain extent, Perdiccas, feared the consequences of the recent Athenian successes (Thuc. iv. 79), and the Lacedaemonians approved the expedition partly because they hoped that it would divert the Athenians from harassing the Peloponnese (Thuc. iv.80.1).
of the city. Alternatively, even if one accepts that the costly attempt against Boeotia, the most important of these failures and the one most vulnerable to criticism, was a mistake, this venture was by no means the inevitable consequence of the decision to refuse peace, and it should be judged separately. There is no apparent reason why the Athenians should not have continued to concentrate their efforts on the Peloponnese where, despite the setback at Megara, they were meeting with considerable success. It should be noted too that although the Boeotian enterprise shows the mood of confidence which prevailed in Athens in 424, there is no evidence to link Cleon with it. He was a general in 424/3, but Thucydides makes it clear that Demosthenes and Hippocrates took the initiative in this campaign, and there is nothing to indicate that Cleon had a hand in its planning or execution. In short, it is doubtful whether the wisdom of a policy or of its proponent

1 The individual campaigns cannot be considered here, but see Kagan, 260-304, 361, who basically adopts this line. He argues that the attack on Megara failed because of extremely bad luck and that luck and errors in planning and execution played a crucial part in the Boeotian fiasco. Whatever the extent of Thucydides' culpability may have been when Amphipolis surrendered, the emergence of such an 'untypical Spartan' as Brasidas (Thuc. iv.81) at this precise time was itself both critical and unforeseeable.

2 The Athenians of course were under no compulsion to make the expedition against Megara either, but it is difficult to fault this attempt to take advantage of Megarian overtures (Thuc. iv.66.3).

3 iv.76-77, 89.

4 See Gomme, MEGHL 103-4.
can legitimately be criticized if the policy misfires either because of ill-luck or on account of mistakes for which the proponent cannot be held responsible. This would appear to be especially the case when there is reason to doubt that the alternative to the policy would have been, in the long term, any more successful.

From a purely military standpoint, it is certainly arguable that Cleon was on solid ground in urging the Athenians not to allow the Spartans an 'easy peace' at this time. To try to determine whether, through lack of vision, he lost a great opportunity for the whole Greek world in doing so, is to enter into the realm of almost total speculation. All that one can say is that the behavior of both sides after the signing of the Peace of Nicias does not inspire much confidence that a negotiated settlement in 425 would have been permanent.

Thucydides apparently felt that Cleon and the Athenians did make a serious mistake on this occasion, but this is of minor importance in the present context. It is the viewpoint of Aristophanes as expressed in the Knights which matters here, and it has been noted earlier that,

---

1 Most scholars agree that Thucydides believed that Athens should have accepted the Spartan offers although Gomme, HCT iii.459-60, points out that nothing can be deduced from the fact that Cleon is not given a speech in reply to the Spartan ambassadors since Thucydides varied his method in such situations. He thinks that it is impossible to know the historian's opinion, but Woodhead, Mnem. xiii 1960, 310-3, has well argued that the bias in Thucydides' language shows that he intended to convey the impression that the Athenians acted foolishly.
Pylos excepted, there are only four passages in the comedy which deal directly with Cleon's involvement with the war.

The initial accusation that Cleon is responsible for the crowding of the country people into Athens during the invasions and for the suffering which this causes\(^1\) is plainly anachronistic. Cleon's (and Demosthenes') success at Pylos meant that the Peloponnesian invasions were now a thing of the past.\(^2\) It is possible that this passage should be regarded as a comical example of the Sausage-seller's exaggerated rhetoric rather than as a (weak) attempt by the poet to recall to his audience what the war had cost Athens in the past.\(^3\)

The charges that the comic Cleon profits financially from the war and wants it to continue so that the people may not be aware of his bribe-taking and rapacity\(^4\) have been (in part) considered in the last section. It was argued there that it is impossible to know whether Cleon was corrupt and it was noted that the Sausage-seller's second accusation is similar to Thucydides' final judgment upon the politician.\(^5\) The historian observes that the

---

1 Knights 792-4. The reference to Cleon's harsh treatment of the Spartan ambassadors follows at 794-6.
2 Thuc. iv.41.1.
3 The lines look as if they were written before the surrender of the men on Sphacteria, but this is impossible to prove.
4 Levelled by the Sausage-seller at 794 and 801-2.
5 v.16.1.
deaths of Brasidas and Cleon meant the disappearance of the most determined opponent of peace on either side. The brief summary of Cleon's motives follows: ó de γενομένης ἡσυχίας καταφανέτερος νομίζων ἣν εἶναι κακουργῶν καὶ ὀπισθέτερος διαβάλλων. Andrewes has observed that the verdict, while harsh enough, is 'not self-contradictory or evidently false', but it is eminently subjective and, to an extent, a generalization. Presumably, διαβάλλων refers especially to Cleon's treatment of those in military command and perhaps to his accusations of 'conspiracy' but one might wish that the historian had allowed himself to explain more fully what he meant by κακουργῶν. Gomme, who believes that as far as Cleon's character is concerned the case for the prosecution is proved by the agreement of such disparate witnesses as Aristophanes and Thucydides, quotes with apparent approval in his note on this passage Grote's observation that war can throw up successful commanders 'who will outshine the home-keeping demagogue however much he may κακουργῆ καὶ διαβάλλῃ, at least for a time'. Gomme then typically inserts a 'sting in the tail' by adding

1 Phoenix xvi 1962, 79.

2 See Westlake, Individuals in Thucydides, 82-3, who points out that 'Thucydides cannot have possessed incontestably trustworthy evidence of the motives attributed to Cleon and must have inferred them from a subjective assessment of his character.' Westlake observes, however, that the personal tone of this whole section, where the private feelings of Nicias and Pleistoanax as well as those of Brasidas are also described, 'is abnormal, indeed almost unique in the History'.

3 HCT iii.660-1.
'hence, in part, Kleon's need for a military command', but it seems clear that before 425 Cleon could not have aspired to the stratēgia. Imputations about motives are the easiest to make, but in this instance the words of both comic poet and historian should plainly be regarded with caution.

The last two references in the play leave no doubt about Aristophanes' attitude to the fighting. Even before his rejuvenation Demos abuses the Paphlagonian for making him pugnacious, but it is his joyful acceptance of the Thirty Years' Treaties at the end of the comedy which is particularly significant. C.H. Whitman has argued that 'though the Sausage-seller does present Demos with the two spondai or Truces the gesture is perfunctory and perhaps motivated chiefly by the attraction of staging the Truces in the form of two strumpets without which the 'good old days' would be in comic terms unthinkable.' This suggestion, however, totally leaves out of account the prevailing mood in Athens when the Knights was performed.

Early in 424 the majority of Aristophanes' countrymen were united in the belief that the war must continue and that victory would soon follow. There were many ways in which the poet could have introduced a sexual element into the finale of his play, yet he chose to make his

1 946.
2 1388-95.
3 Aristophanes and the Comic Hero, 84.
idealized democracy 'embrace' peace. This was surely an extraordinary way to end a popular comedy unless Aristophanes was attempting to say something to his audience, and it is clear where his sympathies lay. Gomme's statement that 'Aristophanes shows us in the Knights a whole city on the tide of victory' could scarcely be wider of the mark. The comedy contains no exultation at the disaster which had befallen Sparta nor any joyous anticipation of the final victory which was widely believed to be at hand. Apart from the Paphlagonian's blustering, the only remotely martial sentiments are expressed by the chorus. Aristophanes gently mocks the cavalry by making them rhapsodize over a minor engagement in which they had participated in Corinthian territory, when they claim that their success was due to their horses. They also sing of the valor of their fathers in wars of the past, and briefly proclaim their own loyalty in defending the city and her gods, but this looks very much like a response to

1 The sexual element is not in fact overly emphasized. The grateful Demos describes the Treaties as καλά at 1390, and at 1391 he enquires whether it is permissible κατατριακοστούτικα! them.

2 HCT iii.527.

3 595-610. Thucydides describes the expedition which was led by Nicias shortly after Pylos at iv.42-45. At iv.44.1 he briefly mentions the effectiveness of the cavalry.

4 565-7ff. For the possible connection of the epirrhema and perhaps of the strophe (551-64) where Poseidon is invoked with the Nike temple, see above, pp. 275ff.

5 576-7.
Cleon's actual attack upon the corps. Since the politician had accused the cavalry of irrelevance, incompetence, or worse, it was dramatically necessary that the chorus, who, despite their foibles, are at least 'on the right side' in the comedy in that they oppose the Paphlagonian, should, however briefly, refute the charge. In any case, they too end this song by looking forward to the day when peace will come and they will be freed from their toils.

The infrequency of the references in the comedy to the momentous events which had recently taken place shows two things: Aristophanes disapproved of the Athenian decision to reject peace, and here again he tailors his attack upon Cleon to what he believed his audience would like. At the beginning of 424 most Athenians thought that Cleon was correct to oppose peace so, apart from criticizing the politician's motives, Aristophanes does not belabor the point. His silence, however, is eloquent, and at the end of the Knights he explicitly makes his own position clear. The Thirty-Years' treaties which Agoracritus gives to Demos would recall to the audience the Thirty Years' treaties which Dicaeopolis had chosen in the comedy of the

1 See below, App. B.
2 579-80.
3 Forrest, Phoenix xvii 1963, 10 n. 22, argues that if Aristophanes really had a 'pacifist' outlook, he should have been pressing furiously for peace in the Knights. As de Ste. Croix, 367 n. 21, points out, this statement totally ignores the atmosphere in Athens early in 424 when the spirits of the Athenians had suddenly been sent soaring by their great success at Pylos.
previous year. It cannot be a coincidence that in both plays the comic poet harks back to the Peace of 445. Despite the Athenian success at Pylos, he remained convinced that the Archidamian War should never have started.

Concluding Observations

It is impossible to give any sort of comprehensive summary of the various ways in which Aristophanes attacks Cleon in the Knights. These have been detailed throughout the sections which occupy the main body of this chapter, where it has been shown that Aristophanes takes the politician's actual position in Athens as his starting point and employs virtually every imaginable weapon in belaboring him. Some assessment of what the nature of the attack indicates about Aristophanes' own political thinking can be more conveniently attempted at the end of the thesis. It remains here to examine what the playwright was trying to do in the last scene of his comedy when he presented his rejuvenated Demos to the audience, and to consider very briefly his objectives in writing the Knights.

At the beginning of this chapter it was noted that the exodus of the Knights after the Paphlagonian has disappeared from the stage is open to different interpretations. Its apparent lack of connection with earlier events has caused a certain amount of trouble to modern commentators. Some have criticized the play for its disunity,

1 Ach. 194ff.
others have advanced more or less ingenious interpretations of the ending which are designed to show that it harmonizes well enough with what has happened before. The latter course has been adopted fairly recently by Landfester who gives a good survey of modern opinion on the subject and attempts to show that the main theme of the comedy is the sovereignty of Demos, which is actually realized at its conclusion.¹

He argues that when Demos is addressed as μόναρχος (1330) and βασιλεύς (1333) in the closing scene, the terms are not being used ironically as similar words were earlier. In the first part of the comedy the incongruity of Demos' claims to sovereignty is illustrated by his wish (1011-13) to hear his favorite oracle in which 'he soars like an eagle in the clouds,' when he is really a captive of the politicians. At the end he takes control of affairs, and this change is symbolized by a metamorphosis in his sexual role. Earlier he had been the ἐρωμένος and easily seduced; now he takes for himself the πάτης and σευδαί. This marks his change from passivity to activity as (with Cleon's fall) he himself gains control of the household-State.

Landfester ties this in with the character of the Sausage-seller who up to 1263 had been πουλόργος and σωτήρ at the same time. The paradox, he argues, is intentional, and it is emphasized by the fact that while he is a total scoundrel he enjoys the support of all good citizens, the

¹ Landfester, 83-104.
Knights, and even Apollo. His dual nature is shown by his real name 'Ἀγοράκριτος' which Landfester takes to mean both 'the quarreler in the market-place' and 'the man approved by the Assembly'. In the exodos the paradox is finally resolved when he emerges clearly as the divine σωτήρ. His role as a demagogue had been designed only to gain control of Demos. Now he has put it aside with his performance of the cooking miracle with which he transforms his master. Henceforth the latter will be totally independent as he was in the days of Marathon, and free of all politicians.

Some of this is reasonably plausible although it has been noted earlier that Landfester seems to make far too much of the contradiction in the nature of the Sausage-seller. His interpretation of the significance of the latter's alliance with 'the best elements in the State' appears to rob the play of much of its humor. It seems doubtful too whether the audience watching the end of the play would have specifically recalled how Agoracritus had earlier been addressed as σωτήρ by Demosthenes at 149 and by the chorus at 458.

The crucial question here, however, is the significance of Demos' reformation. According to Landfester, the working out of the play demonstrates the need for no demagogue at all, which is scarcely a political program but (strictly speaking) just an untenable position. This may or may not be correct, but in any case because the satire of the democracy in the first part of the play is so virulent, it is important to emphasize that the change which
Demos undergoes does not contain and is not accompanied by any suggestion that the structure of the constitution should be changed. While Demos vows to improve his attitude and ways, his position as the sovereign ruler is unquestioned; the idealized Demos is to be as he was at the time of the Persian Wars, but this clearly does not mean that Aristophanes is advocating a return to a pre-democratic, oligarchic constitution.¹

If the poet did intend to give his countrymen any really constructive advice when he presented them with the rejuvenated Demos, it could only be that he was urging them (apart from making peace) to undertake a moral reformation: they should return to simpler, more honorable ways, exercise their responsibilities more firmly and fairly and

¹ As Dover, AC 33, observes, 'the inherited constitution, established in essentials even before the grandparents of Aristophanes and his friends defended Athenian freedom against the Persian invader was fully democratic; sovereign power lay in the hands of an assembly of all adult male citizens, and to this assembly all holders of judicial, military, or administrative office were accountable.' It has also been argued earlier in this chapter that the days of the Persian wars may be recalled here because of the Nike temple.
The Knights

adopt a more generous stance on public matters.1 This is fairly innocuous, however, and pace Landfester it is perhaps debatable whether the appearance of Demos, θεττηγορός, ὥρχαι ποιδείς, οὐ κοιμήσων ὀμνύν ἀλλὰ σπουδῶν, ὁμόρρυμα κατάλειπτος,2 and having ἄπιθ' ἐνόρην to carry (or to serve as) his ὀκλασίας,3 would have evoked laughter or nostalgia from a majority of the audience. Some at least of the spectators must have recalled how Aristophanes had mocked the 'famous Pindaric epithets' in the Acharnians4 when the chorus hail Demos at 1329:

The picture of a golden past was a stock theme in Comedy5 and the poet may have introduced it here primarily to provide 'a happy ending' which was consonant with the

1 This much and little more can be gleaned from the last scene of the play. Demos professes shame at being duped by the flattery of orators and caring more about his misthos than building triremes (1340-55). In the future he will not allow his judgments in the courts to be influenced by the argument that acquittal means that the jurors will not get their pay (1357-63); he will pay the oarsmen of the fleet promptly and in full and prevent hoplites from getting their names transferred from the κατάλογος by means of private influence (1366-7, 1369-71); he will stop beardless boys from loafing in the agora, making precious judgments on rhetoric, and he will make them take up hunting (1377-83).

2 1331-2.

3 1384-6.

4 Ach. 636-40.

5 See Gomme, HCT i.104-5, where the examples are cited.
traditions of his genre and, more importantly, demanded by the turn which events had taken. Whatever one's view of the end of the comedy, it is clear that the pre-condition for future Athenian happiness is the disappearance of Cleon. Exactly how matters will then improve does not seem to be Aristophanes' main concern.

Aristophanes' plain purpose in writing the Knights (apart from winning the prize) was to mock and damage Cleon. One can speculate that he had his eye upon the elections to the generalship for 424/3 (due to be held soon after the performance of the play), since Cleon was one of the candidates for office. Ehrenberg indeed has suggested that the complimentary references to Phormio in the play were perhaps intended to suggest to the members of Pandionis, the poet's and Cleon's tribe, that they would be better advised to recall 'the old gentleman' out of retirement than to vote for the upstart Cleon.\(^1\) This is perhaps possible,\(^2\) but in any case if Aristophanes was hoping that Cleon's command at Pylos would be his last, he plainly must have been disappointed since his enemy was duly elected.

Some scholars have concluded that Cleon's election, taken together with the fact that the Knights was awarded first prize at the Lenaea, proves that the Athenians did

---

1. *AJP lxxxvi 1945, 122-7.*

2. For controversy about the deme (and tribe) of Phormio, see Fornara, *The Athenian Board of Generals*, Note C, 76-8.
not take seriously political attacks or political opinions expressed in a comedy. To try to explore this subject in detail would probably require a thesis as long as this one, so it must suffice to say that as a generalization it cannot stand. It is only necessary to cite the second performance of the *Frogs* and Cleon's reaction to the *Babylonians* to show that in Aristophanes' day it was accepted that Old Comedy *could* be a vehicle for the expression of serious (or even dangerous) views.

What the success of the *Knights* so soon before Cleon's election does seem to show is that the Athenians (like most moderns) enjoyed seeing their political leaders being ridiculed or discomfited, and perhaps that their response to what they regarded as good theatre was not substantially affected by their own political views.¹ Logically, it should occasion no surprise that Cleon was apparently not damaged by the play. After what he had done at Pylos, one would think that his position must still have been virtually unassailable. The impact that the play did have upon the minds of the audience (it inevitably had some) naturally cannot be ascertained, but it is possible that the caricature of Cleon who trod the stage in the *Knights* was too much of a caricature. One can speculate that by overly exaggerating his enemy's 'multitudinous vices' Aristophanes may have lost some of the effect which he sought although he won the prize.

¹ See DFA 275.
CONCLUSION

The main course of the feud between Aristophanes and Cleon has been traced throughout the individual chapters. I have argued that in 428 when Aristophanes must have been writing his first play, Cleon (who had been involved in public life for some years) was still only one of a number of prominent politicians in the city who were hoping to take the place of Pericles. There is nothing to indicate that he was attacked in the Banqueters which was produced in 427. The theme of the play may indeed have appealed to him, although it is doubtful whether he could ever have had much in common with its young author who belonged to a different generation.

The trouble between the two men appears to have started in 426 with the production of the Babylonians. Too little remains of the play to allow secure conclusions to be drawn about its plot, but it seems certain that in this year Aristophanes satirized Athens' relationship with her allies. When the play was performed, Cleon was the most prominent of those who advocated that a hard line should be adopted towards the Empire, and he had gone further than any previous Athenian politician in advocating that the death penalty should be visited upon all the adult male citizens of an imperial rebel. This may have inspired Aristophanes to write his comedy. At least its theme, Cleon's reaction to it, and the testimony of Athenaeus strongly suggest that Aristophanes put him on the comic stage in this year.
Cleon was quick to retaliate. If the theory advanced in Chapter IV is correct, he took advantage of the fact that he belonged to the same deme as Aristophanes and that he was a member of the Boule in 426/5 to offer vigorous opposition to Aristophanes' registration as a citizen at the beginning of this year. His attack upon the poet should perhaps be seen against the background of an abortive move to increase the tribute of the allies in 426, a Great Panathenaic Year. His attempt to deny Athenian citizenship to Aristophanes must have been based upon connections which the poet had with Aegina. Presumably Cleon resorted to this because the opportunity was at hand and he could not reach Aristophanes in any other way, since it was Callistratus who bore official responsibility for the production of the Babylonians.

Aristophanes appears to have gained his citizenship by a narrow margin. The experience to which he had been subjected is often taken as the reason why he did not launch a major offensive upon Cleon in 425 when his Acharnians was performed. This may be correct or other factors could have been involved, but it has been suggested in Chapter V that for Aristophanes to have given Cleon a prominent part in the Acharnians would have had a detrimental effect upon the play. It may be for this reason that he desisted. There is ample evidence in this comedy to show that Aristophanes had been wounded by Cleon's action; and I have argued that he alluded (indirectly) to it more often than is generally realized. This first
extant comedy also shows that by the beginning of 425 there were deep political differences between the two men.

It was not until early in 424, however, that Aristophanes wreaked full revenge upon Cleon. The Knights must have been planned before Cleon's dominance in the city was assured by his spectacular success at Pylos. I have argued that Cleon had deployed his membership of the Boule in 426/5 to extend his influence and also to try to injure the cavalry. Aristophanes had referred briefly to the politician's attack upon the corps in the Acharnians and he returned to it in 424 when he placed the Knights in the orchestra as the high-born opponents of the villainous Paphlagonian. His comedy constituted a comprehensive attack upon Cleon who is assailed from every angle, and it also provides a good deal of information about the politician's activity in Athens. Yet while the play was a dramatic success and gained the first prize, Cleon's position was not visibly affected, and shortly after its performance he was elected general for 424/3.

This reconstruction seems reasonably coherent but it is obviously tentative. It would certainly have to be revised if one (or more) of Aristophanes' other lost plays was performed before the Knights, but there is no compelling reason to assume that he did bring out a fifth play in 427, 426, or 425. Geissler has argued that the Δραυτα γε Κένταυρος was produced at the Lenaea of 426 or the Dionysia
of 425 but his case could scarcely be weaker,¹ and the other three lost Aristophanic comedies which appear to belong to the Archidamian War, the Geogoi, Holkades, and Proagon, are usually dated to 424, 423 and 422 respectively.² All that one can do here is to build up the picture on the evidence which does exist.

The most difficult problem is trying to establish Aristophanes' real political views, and any estimate of the impact which Cleon's attack had upon his writing is bound to be to some extent subjective. Two basic points can be made. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Aristophanes was an oligarch, at least in the literal sense of wanting to see the franchise restricted. Comparisons which are sometimes made (even with qualifications) between Aristophanes and the Old Oligarch are unreasonable. It is clear enough too that early in his career he was opposed to the war, and that he believed that Athens should make peace. This is the burden of the plot of the Acharnians and, as I have observed, he again makes his attitude abundantly clear in the Knights. One might possibly argue that he was opposed to the war simply because Cleon was for it, but this seems highly unlikely. The question of

¹ Geissler, 33. The case depends mainly on a dubious reference in a scholium to Wasps 60 and on fr. 292 where the word β'φιαω is assumed to refer to Cleon, and to 'prove' that the play was written before his death. Since the festivals from 424 to 421 are taken up by the extant plays and the Geogoi, Holkades and Proagon, Geissler concludes that the comedy was performed before 424.

² See Geissler, 36-8.
war or peace was crucial and there are other ways in which he could have opposed Cleon more directly in 425. Given the situation in Athens after Pylos, the introduction of the Thirty Years' Treaties at the end of the Knights must also be regarded as particularly significant.

Once one gets beyond these two points, one enters into the area of real controversy. A major difficulty is that nothing pertinent is known about Aristophanes' own background. In analyzing his comedies it seems particularly important to try to put oneself (as far as possible) in the position of the spectators, but this is impossible here. Deductions have sometimes been made about Aristophanes' social class from his attitude towards the war, but quite apart from the obvious dangers in this, it seems entirely possible that his attitude may have been influenced by his connections with Aegina. It is doubtful too whether much importance can be attached to the fact that he may have known some prominent members of his deme,¹ and his (possible) political kinship with Callistratus and Eupolis early in his career is not significant here. Dover has also rightly pointed out that the fact that Aristophanes is represented as a guest in Agathon's house in Plato's Symposium is of dubious biographical relevance. He suggests that 'if we reflect that he (Aristophanes) survived two oligarchic revolutions and two democratic restorations, we may conclude that his positive political

¹ See S. Dow, AJA lxxiii 1969, 234-5.
commitment was not remarkable.¹ There must have been literally thousands of Athenians who belonged to this category, however, and by no means all of them can have been apragmones. We must simply accept the fact that our ignorance is almost total. The spectators who watched the plays would have known how Aristophanes voted and perhaps how he participated in debates in the Assembly. Some of them would have known who his friends and associates were. It is likely enough that they came to the theatre with a definite idea of the jokes which they were likely to hear, and their reaction to them may have been quite different from what we imagine.

Given these limitations, it is difficult to feel confident that one has 'pinned down' the elusive poet. I can only say that after careful study of the plays (especially the Knights), I think that early in his career at any rate Aristophanes' hostility towards Cleon (the question of peace aside) was based more on personal than on real political grounds. I do not believe that Aristophanes was opposed to the radical democracy and to the power which the demos currently exercised, or that his hatred of Cleon should ultimately be traced to 'class-bias'. He may well have objected to the methods which Cleon employed, but 'methods' should be distinguished from principles. This assessment is subjective and tentative, and I envy the confidence of (e.g.) G.E.M. de Ste. Croix

¹ Dover, xx.
who has no doubts that Aristophanes was a 'Cimonian' who had an 'essentially paternalist attitude' towards the lower classes. He may be correct, but I think that the real reason for Aristophanes' multi-faceted assault upon Cleon in the Knights was the aftermath of the Babylonians. This view gains some support from the fact that the poet's attacks come from every direction and are (at times) seemingly mutually contradictory.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to discuss the last years of the feud between Aristophanes and Cleon. The passages which have been cited from the Clouds, Wasps and Peace suggest, however, that once Aristophanes had found a (dramatically) successful formula, he adhered to it where Cleon was concerned and perhaps also employed it when attacking politicians of a similar kind. Connor has observed too that there is reason to believe that other comic playwrights may have envied his success with the Knights and imitated him.\(^1\) He suggests that throughout Old Comedy the Paphlagonian seems to have served as something of a model for other playwrights, but this would be the subject of another thesis.

\(^1\) NP 168ff.
APPENDIX A

CLEON'S FAMILY AND HIS DATE OF BIRTH

A major difficulty in making calculations of this kind is that the age at which a person married naturally varied considerably. It seems to have been normal practice in fifth-century Athens for a man to marry when he was c. 30 and for a girl to marry when she was c. 15-16, but extreme variations can be found even within the same social class.

Cleon's only definitely attested child is Cleomedon who married a daughter of Polyaratus of Cholargus. This marriage must have taken place before c. 399 since Polyaratus personally gave away his daughter, and he died very shortly after being involved in family litigation in that year. On the other hand, it could not have been much earlier than this, since Cleomedon's wife remarried after


2 Davies, APF 336-7, remarks on the marked contrast between the short generations of c. 25 years and the long generations of c. 40 years perceptible in different families which he analyzes. It will be noted below that within Cleon's own family, his daughter-in-law remarried after the death of Cleomedon, to whom she had borne four children ([Dem.] xl.6-7), and that she had two sons by her new husband c. 380 when she was presumably in her mid-thirties. On the other hand, one of these sons Mantitheus, married when he was eighteen ([Dem.] xl.4,12).

3 [Dem.] xl.6.

4 [Dem.] xl.6.

5 Isaeus v.9. He probably died in the same year.
his death and she had two sons by her second husband c. 380. If one assumes that neither Cleon nor Cleomedon married before they were thirty, c. 460 emerges as the terminus ante quem for Cleon's date of birth.

The fact that Cleomedon must have been dead by c. 381 may indicate that he married comparatively late in life, but this is obviously a dangerous assumption. He is known to have won a victory as choregus in the boys' dithyramb at the Thargelia, but this is of no help in determining when he was born. Although the choregus for a chorus of boys had to be over forty years of age in the fourth century, the date of the victory cannot be established.

It is very likely, as Meritt and Wade-Gery have suggested, that Cleon had a second child, a daughter who married Thudippus of Araphen, the proposer of the assessment decree of 425. The latter's apparent political association with Cleon added to the fact that he called his son Cleon makes it highly probable that he became the

---

1 [Dem.] xl. 6-7. For the date of birth of Mantitheus, one of these sons, see APF 366-7. The other son who was younger died in infancy.

2 IG ii² 1138, 23-6.

3 See DFA 75.n.4, where the ancient testimony for the law is cited. Davies, APF 319, notes that since this was the third such victory won by Pandionis after 403/2, it can scarcely be placed before 390 and may well be later.

4 AJP lvii 1936, 392.n.36.
politician's son-in-law.¹ Davies has argued that if this theory is correct, the marriage probably took place before Cleon's death in 422, but a political alliance between the two men could perhaps have been cemented by an official betrothal which constituted a formal pledge.² Thudippus' grandson, the son of the younger Cleon, was probably not born before 385.³ If his father was thirty then, the marriage of Thudippus need not be placed before c. 415 which would still not necessarily put Cleon's own marriage before 430.

The case for thinking that Cleon's marriage took place before 440 (and that he was thus probably born before 470) really rests upon Davies' ingenious theory that he married a daughter of his fellow-demesman Dicaeogenes, the first-known member of a rich and distinguished family.⁴ Dicaeogenes himself was killed in battle while serving as a general, almost certainly in 460 or 459,⁵ so, if Cleon did contract this marriage, it would probably have been

¹ See Davies, APF 228-9.
² Cf. Lacey, op. cit. 105. It is not known at what age betrothal agreements were normally made; Demosthenes' sister was engaged to Demophon and her dowry was paid when she was only five, but she was about to become an orphan (Dem. xxvii.4-5).
³ He is consistently referred to as ὀφρ in Isaeus ix; he was still an adolescent when the speech was delivered sometime after 371.
⁴ APF 319-20.
⁵ Isaeus v.42; see Wyse, The Speeches of Isaeus, 469, APF 145.
before 440 when his wife would have been at least eighteen.
This theory can most easily be examined with the help of
part of Cleon's genealogical chart.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dicaeogenes I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaenetus</td>
<td>Menexenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleon</td>
<td>Polyaratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleomedon</td>
<td>Dicaeogenes II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleon</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The 'evidence' for Cleon's marriage is the appearance of a
certain Cleon, son of Menexenus, apparently of Cydathe-
naeon, who is named as Councillor in a prytany list of
Pandionis which seems to belong to the 370s.¹ It can be
seen that Menexenus is the name of Dicaeogenes' son, whose
granddaughter (the daughter of Polyaratus) married Cleon's
son Cleomedon. Thus it is virtually certain that the Cleon
who served on the Boule in the 370s was related to the
fifth-century politician. His natural place in the family
stemma is with the grandsons Cleon (son of Cleomedon) and
Cleon of Araphen (son of Thudippus), and Davies has
advanced the plausible hypothesis that Menexenus, his
father, was a son of Cleon. No known member of Dicaeo-
genesis' family belongs to the right generation and Davies
has observed that if this Menexenus was a direct descendant
in the male line from Dicaeogenes I, he would have been

¹ See S.N. Koumanoudis, REG lxxiii 1960, 88ff.
the proper person for Dicaeogenes II who died childless, probably in $412/11$, to adopt. Instead, he adopted a son of his cousin Proxenus as son and part heir.\(^1\) Davies points out that if Cleon did marry one of Dicaeogenes' daughters, this would help to account for the marriage of Cleomedon to a granddaughter of Menexenus, and he postulates that Cleon commemorated this honorific family link by naming one of his sons after his brother-in-law Menexenus.

Not enough is known about the families of either Dicaeogenes or Cleon to prove that this happened. There are other possible explanations,\(^2\) but the hypothesis is attractive. It fits chronologically and, as has been noted above,\(^3\) if it is correct it gives added point to two passages in the *Knights*.

\(^1\) See Wyse, op. cit. 402ff., *APF* 145ff.

\(^2\) Menexenus I (son of Dicaeogenes) had four daughters who all married. The demes of three of their husbands are known, but one married Theopompus of unknown deme and they had a son, named Cephasodotus (Isaeus v.2,5) and at least one other child (Isaeus v.9ff.; see Wyse, op. cit. 417). If Theopompus was of Cydathenaeon, and if he named another son Menexenus after his maternal grandfather, this Menexenus may have named a son of his Cleon in honor of the politician of the Archidamian War, with whose family he was connected by Cleomedon's marriage.

\(^3\) See pp. 285-6.
APPENDIX B

CLEON'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOULE

The precise year when Cleon was a Councillor has been the subject of considerable speculation, but it is evident from the language which Aristophanes makes the Paphlagonian use in the Knights that he had held the office before 425/4, the year of that play's production:

καὶ πῶς ἀν ἐμὸν μᾶλλον σε φιλῶν ὁ Δῆμος γένοιτο πολίτης οὐ πρῶτα μὲν ἡνίκ' ἐβούλευον σοι Χρήματα πλείστ' ἀπέδειξεν ἐν τῷ κοινῷ, τοὺς μὲν στρεβλῶν τοὺς δ' ἀγγάρων τοὺς δὲ μεταγίγνου ὦ φρονίζων τῶν ἰδιώτων σοφόν, εἰ κοι ἄρισταιν

The term of office to which the comic Cleon alludes with the words ἡνίκ' ἐβούλευν must have been fairly recent or his boast would lack topicality, and his description of the ways in which he had 'raised' money from the wealthy as a bouleutēs is very probably a reference to his zeal in ensuring that the eisphora was collected. 2 This interpretation of the lines is not absolutely secure since a member of the Boule would have had other opportunities of separating the rich from their money, 3 but Knights 923-6 show that Cleon's concern with enforcing the eisphora was

1 Knights 773-6.

2 See Gilbert, Beiträge, 131; J. Beloch, Die Attische Politik, 335; G. Busolt, Hermes xxv 1890, 640; Neil, n. ad Knights 774; Mattingly, BCH xcii 1968, 452; Meiggs, 318 n. 4.

3 For the work performed by the Boule in the department of finance, see Rhodes, AB 88-113. Lysias, xxx.22, wrote that when the Boule was short of money it was more ready to receive denunciations against the rich and to confiscate their property.
Currently a matter of some notoriety, and he must have demonstrated this concern while he was a Councillor before 425/4. Accordingly, since this special property tax was levied for the first time in the war in 428/7 and continued to be levied annually until at least 425/4 (when the extra income accruing from the increase in tribute may have rendered it unnecessary), Cleon's tenure of office must be placed in one of three years, 428/7, 427/6 or 426/5. Beyond this, Cleon's association with the tax

1 It is by no means certain that Eupol. fr. 278 refers to Cleon as Gilbert, Beiträge, 131ff., assumes.

2 The eishora was assessed and collected by minor officials, probably the epigraphies and eklogeis respectively; cf. R. Thomsen, Eiphora: A Study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens, Copenhagen, 1964, 187-90. These handed over the money to the apodektai (Poll. vii.97) who received domestic dues in the presence of the Boule and noted cases of failure to pay. The records were then surrendered to the Boule and it was the responsibility of this body to take action against defaulters; see Rhodes, AB 98-9. A speech of Demosthenes (1.8) indicates that in 362 the Boule was also responsible for deciding which citizens should pay proeisphora.

3 Thuc. iii.19.1.

4 See West, TAPA lxi 1930, 220; ATL iii.345. Gomme, Hist. ii 1953, 17ff., HCT ii.279, iii.502, believes that it continued after L25/4, but see Meritt, Hesp. xxiii 1954, 223ff., Thomsen, Eiphora, 172. This question, however, is not of immediate concern here.

5 See Beloch, Die Attische Politik, 336; Busolt, Hermes xxv 1890, 640. Both scholars claim that the year L26/5 should be excluded because the words ἐν τῇ ἐποιεῖσθαι in Knights 774 would not be appropriate for the immediate past. This, however, is unreasonable. A man could only hold most other Athenian offices once in his life, but he was allowed to serve twice in the Boule (A.P. 62.2), so it is possible, although very unlikely, that Cleon was a member of the Boule in two of these years. Rhodes, AB 242-3, has compiled a list of seventeen men who are believed to have served twice in the fourth century.
does not provide any evidence for determining in which of these years he was a Councillor. He is commonly held to have been responsible for its institution but there is no real reason for thinking this, and even if he did propose the original motion that the eisphora should be introduced in L28/7, this would obviously not necessarily mean that he was also a member of the Boule in that year.

Equally, it cannot be assumed that it was Cleon's membership of the Boule which first brought him to real prominence in politics. Busolt notes that in the summer of 427 Thucydides describes him as the most influential politician in Athens and that a scholiast on Lucian states that he was the leading demagogue in Athens for seven years. By inclusive reckoning Busolt interprets this latter statement to mean that Cleon was dominant from L28/7 to L22/1 and he supposes that his period of effectiveness in Athenian politics began with his membership of the Boule in L28/7. Wilamowitz, on the other hand, has stated that Cleon's real political power commenced when

---

1 See (e.g.) Gilbert, Beiträge, 129ff.; West CP xix 1924, 139ff.; Jacoby, FGH iib [Komm.] 371; Mattingly, op. cit. 452.

2 Gomme HCT ii.279 has noted the silence of Thucydides on this matter. Thomsen, Eisphora, 170, suggests that it may just as well have been Lysicles, whom he believes to have been the 'leader of the radical war party' until his death later this year, or a third unknown party.

3 Busolt, GG iii.2.998 n. 1; Thuc. iii.36.6; schol. Lucian, Timon 30.
he was a bouleutēs in 427/6, but this method of trying to date the politician's membership of the Boule from the beginning of his political ascendancy is suspect. The office must undoubtedly have given a man of Cleon's energy and interest in financial matters considerable opportunity for self-advancement, but it is notable that Thucydidēs refers to his influence in the Assembly in 427. There is no reason why he should not have established his political reputation here by his speeches and by his attacks on other politicians before he became a Councilor.

A much more promising line of approach is through the notorious feud between Cleon and the Knights which is referred to in the Acharnians, was recorded by Theopompos, and took sufficient hold on the public imagination for Aristophanes to use it as the basis of his play of 424.

Many of the policies which Cleon advocated in the Assembly may have been inimical to the cavalry, but they could not have brought him into such direct confrontation with them. It is highly unlikely that he held any important military office at the time when the feud began so it is logical to think that only his membership of the Boule could have involved him in a personal struggle with the young aristocrats at this date.

1 Aristoteles und Athen, Berlin, 1893, i.129 n. 11.
2 Ach. 5-8, 300-1.
3 Schol. Knights 226 = FGH 115 F 93.
The Council's responsibility for the military efficiency of the cavalry is extremely well attested. The members of the corps appeared before it in their annual dokimasia during which both men and horses were subjected to a rigorous examination, and it also held other reviews of the force in the course of the year. On the basis of these examinations the Council exercised some financial control over the body with the powers (e.g.) of withholding the sitos from men who were not feeding their horses adequately, and of branding and rejecting the unfit animals. The supervisory powers of the Boule were in fact so many and various that Xenophon could scarcely have been exaggerating when he made the generalization η πάλις προσέταξε δὲ τῇ βουλῇ κυνεμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἱππικοῦ, and it is plain that Cleon's membership of the body would have afforded him ample opportunity of earning the epithet ἀραξιπποστρατος.

The first and most celebrated reference to this feud is in the prologue of the Acharnians where Dicaeopolis

---

1 For a list of the Council's functions in relation to the cavalry, see A.P. 49.1-2. Most of these are also attested by Xenophon; in general, see A. Martin, Les Cavaliers Athénèens, Paris, 1877, 326-34, Rhodes, AB 174.

2 Xenophon, Hipparch. iii.1,10,14, mentions the different places where these reviews were carried out; see Martin, supra cit. 333.

3 A.P. 49.1, Xen. Oec. ix.15.

4 Hipparch. 1.8.

5 Knights 247.
rejoices at the memory of Cleon's disgorging five talents at the instigation of the Knights:

\[ \text{ἔγυος' ἐφ' ἐς τὸ κέωρ ἦφανθην ἢδεν,} \\
\text{τὸς πέντε ταλαντούς ὅς Κλέων ἐγήμεθεν.} \\
\text{ταῦθῳ ἐγανάθην, καὶ φιλὰ τοὺς ἱσκέας} \\
\text{διὰ τὸ τοῦτο τὸ φόνον οὔτε ἔρριπεν ἐλλαδε.} \]

The incident which is referred to in these lines is obscure and a number of different explanations of them have been advanced by modern scholars. One theory is that they allude to a scene in the Babylonians (or in another comedy of the previous year) in which Cleon was literally compelled by the Knights to vomit up the money on the stage.\(^2\) The basis for this hypothesis, however, is flimsy. It is clear that no significance can be attached to the words of Gregory, the twelfth-century Metropolitan of Corinth, who comments on the citation of the opening of the Acharnians by the rhetorician Hermogenes.\(^3\) Gregory introduces his explanation of the lines with the words \( \text{ὁ Κλέων εἰς ἡθην,} \) but if this means 'Cleon was introduced on the stage' it

---

1 Ach. 5-8.

2 This was first suggested by H. Lübke, Observationes Criticae in historiae veteris Graecorum Comoediae, Berlin, 1883, 17, and it has attracted considerable support. See Van Leeuwen and Rennie, nn. ad loc; Starkie, Exc. I, 241-5; Rostagni, RFTC liii 1925, 486ff.; V. Gordziejew, Eos xxxix 1938, 321-50. Unlike most of the other adherents to this theory, Van Leeuwen argued that Aristophanes would not have praised a play of one of his rivals in this way.

3 For this passage in Gregory, see C. Walz, Rhetores Graeci, Stuttgart, 1883, vii.1345. He is commenting upon Hermogenes περὶ μεθύσκου δεινότης (Rabe, 454.9).

4 His explanation which follows is somewhat similar to that of a scholiast on Ach. 6. See below, p. 444.
could very well be a reference to the *Acharnians* or an inference from the passage of Hermogenes.¹

Those scholars who believe that Dicaeopolis is recalling a scene in a comedy point out that the other three events which he mentions in the prologue as causing him pleasure or pain are connected with dramatic or musical performances,² but this too is a singularly unconvincing argument. The audience must have been eagerly awaiting Aristophanes' response to Cleon's attack upon him in the previous year and there is no reason why Dicaeopolis should not have chosen any setback which the politician had suffered and gloated over it.³ Moreover, it is impossible to envisage a scene of this kind in a comedy unless it had included the Knights as characters, presumably as the chorus. They certainly did not form the chorus of the Babylonians and it is very difficult to believe that they were the chorus of another comedy of the previous year which has entirely escaped record.⁴ In view of the hostility which is known to have existed between Cleon and the

1 On this, see W.R. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth Century Athens*, 56.

2 *Ach.* 9-16.

3 ἔλεγα in *Ach.* 5 certainly need not imply that Dicaeopolis had seen the event which he describes in the theatre. *Knights* 402-4, 1147-50, may possibly indicate that the phrase ἰδύαν ἐφήμερεν had caught the audience's imagination, but these lines contain no dramatic implications as Rennie, n. ad *Ach.* 6, assumes.

4 The words of the cavalry at *Knights* 507-9 are virtual proof that this is the first time that they had constituted a chorus.
Knights, it is infinitely more probable that the lines refer to some actual incident in which they were both involved.

The scholia on Ach. 6 provide two entirely different explanations of the five talents: 1. ἐξημίσθη γὰρ ὁ Κλεών πέντε τάλαντα διὰ τοῦ ὑπερίζειν τοὺς ἱππεύς. 2. τὸν νησιωτῶν ἔλαβεν ἕ τάλαντον ὁ Κλεών, ἵνα πείζῃ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους κοινῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς εἰσβορᾶσις ἀνεβαίνον. δὲ οἱ ἱππεῖς ἀντέλεγον καὶ ἀπέρτησαν αὐτόν. μέρημεν Θεόπομπος. 1

Although the Vita and the second Hypothesis of the Knights also say that Cleon was fined five talents (and add that the cavalry imposed the fine), 2 the first of these explanations has been (correctly) rejected by most modern commentators. The second explanation, however, has attracted considerable support despite the apparent confusion involving phoros and eisphora in the statements ascribed to Theopompus. 3 Yet while many scholars have accepted these as factual or at least have based their own

1 It is clear that these two explanations are quite separate. In the Ravenna manuscript their order is reversed and Theopompus is cited only as the authority for the first, i.e. the second in the order in which they are given above. See Connor, Theopompus, 54.

2 Dübner, Proleg. xi.22-4, Hyp. ii.19-21. According to the Vita, Aristophanes was responsible for the fine; in the Hypothesis Cleon had been convicted of dôrodokia.

3 On this and the other difficulties in the scholiast's notice, see below, p.443 with n. 2.
theories upon them, the first course seems impossible, while the second involves very grave difficulties.

The association of Cleon with any movement towards a general reduction of tribute seems intrinsically unlikely, but it is always possible that individual cities should have attempted to bribe an influential politician, particularly at a time when tribute was high. However, even if Cleon had been approached in this way and had accepted a bribe as the scholiast states, it is impossible for the Knights to have appeared as a corps in the capacity of accusers or judges and the idea that they could use their wealth to get what they wanted done in the Assembly is effectively refuted by the career of Cleon himself. Moreover, the legal condemnation of the politician which would certainly have followed disclosure of such activity is out of the question in view of his subsequent career.

Müller-Strübing, who long ago pointed out that for these reasons the scholium cannot be taken literally, supposed that in the summer of 426 Cleon was and that he proposed a reduction of five talents in the tribute, the loss of which would be offset by the regular levying of the eisphora. According to his

1 See (e.g.) Ranke, De Vita Aristophanis (apud Meineke, i.xvi-xvii), who accepts the scholiast's statements uncritically. The theories developed by Müller-Strübing, Croiset and Connor are discussed below.


3 Clouds 591-4 show that Cleon's conviction for bribery was still merely an 'aspiration' in 423.
thesis, the aristocrats, who would have been particularly threatened by this, combined with the radical democrats to defeat the measure and the five talents were reinstated in the budget.¹ This hypothesis, however, cannot be correct. The office which Cleon is assumed to have held did not exist in the fifth century,² and it was scarcely part of Cleon's 'program' to reduce the burden on the allies.³ Moreover, the verb ἐμείω which is employed in Ach. 6 could not have been used to describe such a budgetary change.

M. Croiset has attempted to follow the scholiast more closely by suggesting that in 426 Cleon merely proposed a lightening of the tribute of certain members of the Empire, and that his proposals were defeated through the opposition of some orator who belonged to the Knights. In his view, the five talents referred to in Ach. 6 are a bribe which Cleon's opponents insinuated that he had pocketed but was compelled to return.⁴ W.R. Connor has modified this theory and linked the testimony of the scholiast with one of the re-assessments of tribute, perhaps that of 430/29. He (very tentatively) suggests that

¹ Müller-Strübing, 119-81.
² See above, p. 226.
³ Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, ATL iii.345, have gone so far as to suggest that Cleon argued for the increase in tribute in 425 partly because he wished to avoid the necessity for further eisphorai at Athens.
⁴ Croiset, 52-3.
Cleon may have received 'considerations' from 'tributary states' to see that their contributions were lightened or at least not raised. Connor argues that 'the disclosure of this influence-peddling, an attack by some prominent knights, and an assembly decision to exact higher contributions from those states might well have forced Cleon to return the fee he had collected.'¹

Again, however, the obvious drawback to these theories is that the passage in the Acharnians is much too specific to refer to opposition of this kind and to the loss of an imaginary bribe, while exposure of actual dōrodokia must also be ruled out. The testimony of this scholiast seems worthless especially in view of the apparent confusion between phoros and eisphora to which only citizens were liable,² the obscurity of his final sentence, and the impossibility of connecting the Knights as a corps with any legal or financial matters which lay outside their own constitution.

Busolt, who has noted that the scholiast's abrupt citation of Theopompus as his source is suspicious,

¹ Theopompus, 57-8. In NP 152 n. 2 he observes that the scholiast on Knights 627 says that the cavalry had disciplinary powers over their members and suggests that they used these to force Cleon to return the bribe. It is certain, however, that Cleon was not a member of the Knights during the Archidamian War; see above, p. 21.

² Jacoby, FGH 11b [Komm.], 370-1, appears to believe that somehow the eisphora was involved in this incident. Connor, Theopompus, 158 n. 16, tries to defend the use of the word eisphora with the meaning of 'tribute' by citing a 'parallel' in Plut. Dem. 17. He also argues (unconvincingly) that eisphoral in Thuc. i.141.5 may be ambiguous.
suggests that he might have recalled reading of the feud between Cleon and the Knights in the historian's work and simply quoted him as the authority for his own fanciful explanation.\footnote{GO iii.2.994 n. 6; cf. Gilbert, Beiträge, 138-40.} Connor, on the other hand, emphasizes the similarity of the phrasing in the scholium and in the passage of Gregory which has been referred to above.\footnote{Theopompus, 55-6.} The latter reads: \textit{χαίρειν ὃν ἔφη, ὦτι ὁ Κλέων εἰς ἱθῆν \ἀδιπτόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπιστημών πέντε τάλαντα, ὅπερ \ἀφείλετο απὸ τῶν νησιῶν ἵνα πείει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπικουφίσας τούτους τοὺς φόρους.} Connor points out that the similarities in the two accounts indicate a close connection between them, but even if they shared a common source as he argues, this source need not have been Theopompus, or some intervening 'authority' may have paraphrased and altered the historian's original words.\footnote{It is perhaps significant that Gregory does not cite Theopompus. Jacoby, FCH ii b [Komm.] 370-1, has observed that Themistocles is accused of taking money from the 'islanders' by Herodotus (viii.112) and that Themistocles and Cleon are coupled because of their profiteering by Critias (ap. Aelian, V.H. x.17). Connor, Theopompus, 158 n. 16, has noted that the words \textit{παρὰ τῶν νησιῶν} in the note of the scholiast to Ach. 6 are suspicious, since if bribery had taken place one would have expected an individual city or island to have resorted to it. Cleon is compared to Themistocles in the Knights and it is just possible that this is the source of confusion here.}

Busolt's suggestion is plausible and at all events it is clear that Theopompus did discuss the feud in the tenth book of his \textit{Philippica}. According to the scholiast
CLEON'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOULE

On Knights 226, he stated that the Knights hated Cleon, because of his expansion and the consequent increased power of the state. There is nothing directly connecting this with the five talents but Gilbert has based his explanation of Ach. 5-8 on the reference to the charge of lipostratia. He noted that during the fourth invasion of Attica in 428/7, which is known to have caused serious damage, Thucydides says nothing about the conduct of the Knights, the only Athenian troops capable of restricting the enemy's freedom of movement. From this Gilbert concluded that some incident may have occurred which gave Cleon the opportunity of accusing them of lipostratia. It would have been impossible for him to take the whole corps to court so Gilbert theorized that as a member of the Boule in 428/7 Cleon proceeded by means of a probouleuma, and attempted to prevent the Knights from receiving their katastasis, a sum of money which they obtained annually from the State. According to Gilbert then, the five talents referred to in

1 Beiträge, 133ff.
2 Thuc. iii.26.3.
3 For an earlier example of Pericles' use of the cavalry to try to prevent the Peloponnesians from ravaging the fields near the city, see Thuc. ii.22.2. The historian also mentions (iii.1.1) the activity of the cavalry during the invasion of 429/8 which was far less destructive than that of 428/7.
4 Busolt, GG iii.2.994 n. 6, following up this idea suggests that in 428/7 the cavalry did not defend the fertile plain near the city which was consequently ravaged.
Ach. 6 is this katastasis which Cleon as a bouleutēs tried to withhold at the Knights' dokimasia before the Council at the end of 428/7, but which he was ultimately compelled by the cavalry to hand over.

This explanation is ingenious but highly speculative¹ and there is one obvious flaw in it. The Knights' katastasis was closely connected with (and probably depended upon) their annual dokimasia before the Council,² but the purpose of this dokimasia was to reconstitute the corps each year.³ Consequently, it took place early in the year and it was after it that the Knights received the money from the State.⁴ It follows that if Gilbert is correct and the Knights' conduct early in the campaigning season in 427 did provoke Cleon into attempting to withhold this payment, he must have done so at the dokimasia

---

¹ See Gomme, HCT ii.289-90.

² A grammarian states (Bekker, Anecd. 1.270) ἐν τῷ βουλῆς τῶν ἱστέων δοκιμασία κατάστασις ἐλέγετο.

³ Martin, op. cit. 332.

⁴ Harp. s.v. κατάστασις.
of 427/6 and been a member of the Boule in that year.\(^1\)

Before one can assume this, however, Gilbert's whole thesis needs to be more closely examined. He is surely right to insist that the dispute over the five talents must have taken place while Cleon was a member of the Boule. The language which Aristophanes uses in the Acharnians clearly shows that the politician had been compelled to give up money over which he had some control under pressure from the Knights. It has been emphasized earlier that as a corps, the latter had no interest in any financial matter which lay outside their own constitution. In view of the Council's particular responsibility for the efficiency of the cavalry it is therefore virtually certain that the sum of five talents was an emolument which the Knights received from the State and which Cleon as a member of the Boule attempted to withhold.

On the other hand, Gilbert did not establish that these five talents must have been the cavalry's \textit{katastasis}, and it is far from certain that Cleon's attempt to withhold

---

\(^1\) Cf. Beloch, \textit{Die Attische Politik}, 337. Busolt, \textit{Hermes} xxv 1890, 640ff., \textit{GG} iii.2.994 n. 6, follows Gilbert in believing that Cleon was a \textit{bouleutēs} in 428/7 and that the reference in Ach. 6 should be linked with an attempt which he had made to withhold the Knights' money because of their behavior during the invasion of 428/7. He cannot accept, however, that the cavalry had not yet received their money for 428/7 when the invasion took place. Accordingly, he theorizes that in 427/6 Cleon, whom he believed to be the head of the hellenotamiai in that year, had attempted to withhold the Knights' \textit{sitos}. This hypothesis (never firmly based) that Cleon was a hellenotamias in 427/6 automatically collapsed with the re-dating of \textit{IGii} 297 to 414/3 and there is no evidence that Cleon ever held this post.
the money was the direct consequence of the invasion of 427. The whole question of payment for military service is riddled with difficulties and nothing is known about the amount of this katastasis which the Knights received annually from the state. Gilbert fixed it at thirty drachmas a man since five talents shared among the thousand cavalry gives this sum, but his whole line of reasoning may be suspect. The money seems to have been intended to defray the costs of purchasing horses and equipment, which would seem to make it unlikely that it was divided equally by the whole corps. It appears probable that only the new recruits (and perhaps those whose horses had been killed or were unfit) were eligible for the payment; this would mean that either the total sum involved or the amount which each received must have varied from year to year depending on the number of men in this category.

Apparently, in addition to their katastasis the cavalry also received misthos when on active duty, and sitos (at least for their horses) throughout the whole

---


2 Beiträge, 141ff. For the thousand cavalry, see Knights 225, Xen. Hipparch. ix.3, Dem. xiv.13. When Pericles (Thuc. ii.13.8) talks of the twelve-hundred cavalry with mounted archers, he must mean that there were two hundred of the latter; see Gomme HCT ii.40-1.
year,¹ but the distinction between these two payments does not appear to have been rigidly maintained by the ancient authors.² The total amount of money which the cavalry obtained is unknown and it probably fluctuated with the military and economic situation.³ The evidence does tend to suggest, however, that when on active service each member of the Knights normally received one drachma a day which might be called sitos or misthos. In his only explicit reference to the amount of money paid to the cavalry, Thucydides states that they each received one Aeginetan drachma daily as sitos under the terms of the agreement concluded between Athens and the Peloponnesian


² Griffiths, op. cit. 264ff., argues that unlike misthos (the pay reckoned for the specific days of active service), sitos (trophē, siteresion) was something without which the soldiers could not begin to fight, so it had to be paid in advance. He believes that it was originally provided in the form of rations, but that at some stage instead of food the soldiers received an equivalent payment in money; when the two payments were made in money the original distinction between them tended to disappear. Pritchett, op. cit. 4-5, thinks that the vocabulary drawing a sharp distinction between pay and money for rations was not developed until the rise of the large mercenary armies in the fourth century. It is clear at any rate that Thucydides does not observe the distinction: the money which Tissaphernes paid to the crews of the Peloponnesian fleet is called trophē at viii.5.5, 29.1, but misthos at viii.36.1. At vii.45.6, the two words appear to be used as synonyms in the same sentence.

³ Xenophon, Hipparch. 1.19, estimates it at forty talents a year, but it is generally thought that it must have been more during the Peloponnesian War.
states in 420. Again, a fragment of a papyrus which seems to be part of Lysias' speech against Theozotides is concerned with a proposal which the latter had apparently carried to reduce the misthos of the cavalry from one drachma to four obols a day. This certainly refers to a time of war, possibly to the Corinthian War, and when Demosthenes proposed to send troops against Philip he fixed the sitos of the cavalry at a drachma a day.

This would mean that the sum of five talents was exactly equivalent to the payment which the whole corps of a thousand Knights would receive in a month of thirty days. At first sight it is tempting to think that it may be more than a coincidence that thirty days must also have been the approximate length of the Peloponnesian invasions of Attica in 431, 428 and 427. Yet there is very good reason to conclude that Gilbert was (fortuitously) correct in theorizing that the five talents which Cleon attempted to keep from the cavalry represented their katastasis, rather than part of their regular pay.

C.W. Fornara has recently advanced an ingenious new interpretation of the fragment of Theopompus preserved by

1 Thuc. v.47.9.
3 Phil. 1.28.
4 See above, p. 181 n. 2.
the scholiast to **Knights** 226. It has been noted that this scholiast (citing Theopompus as his authority) states that Cleon 'having been insulted by the Knights, and worked up into a rage, ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ and continued planning evil against them, κατηγορεῖτο γὰρ αὐτῶν ὡς λειχοστράτουτων'. The words ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ practically defy translation in this context. Gilbert tried to explain them as referring to Cleon's entry into the Boule in order to prosecute the cavalry, but this carries little conviction. Fornara astutely observed that the words πολιτεία and καταστάσις are virtual synonyms when the latter is used in its common sense, and suggests that the scholiast made an 'easy slip' when transcribing or paraphrasing Theopompus. He has put forward the theory that Theopompus actually wrote ἐπετέθη τῇ καταστάσει, and that the scholiast, misunderstanding the term's specialized meaning with reference to the cavalry's equipment—money, consciously or unconsciously wrote what he thought was an equivalent. This theory is very plausible and it would seem to confirm that the five talents mentioned in **Ach.** 6 must have been the Knights' καταστάσις.

The crucial question in the present context, however, is when did Cleon as a member of the Boule attempt to prevent the Knights from obtaining their money. It must have been in 428/7, 427/6 or 426/5 and since 428/7

---

1 CQ xxiii 1973, 24.

2 Beiträge, 133. This explanation was accepted by Jacoby in his commentary.
must surely be excluded or Aristophanes’ reference to the incident in L25 would have been hopelessly dated,¹ Cleon’s action must be placed in L27/6 or L26/5. The point which must be emphasized here is that there are no grounds for supposing (as Gilbert thought) that Cleon’s attempt to damage the Knights financially should be linked directly with the invasion of L27.² If Fornara’s interpretation of the scholium to Knights 226 is correct, Cleon was motivated by personal differences with the cavalry not by their inadequacies in the field. Theopompus apparently recorded that his attempt to withhold their money and his attack upon their military prowess took place upon different occasions. Indeed if the historian’s words are taken literally, Cleon’s charge of lipostratia was made after his attempt to embarrass them financially.

This may be reading too much into the fragment.
One can well imagine that Theopompus would have been ready

---

¹ Beloch, Die Attische Politik, 336, advanced another argument against placing Cleon’s membership of the Boule in 428/7. He pointed out that Thucydides, iii.38.1, represents Cleon in the Mytilenean debate as complaining about the decision to bring the question before the people again. Since Thucydides had earlier described how the Mytilenean envoys had persuaded τῶι Εν τῇ λε, to re-open the debate (iii.36.5), Beloch concluded that Cleon could not have had any influence with the Boule of 428/7 since it was the prytaneis who convoked the second meeting of the Assembly. This argument is ingenious, but not in itself decisive; see Busolt, Hermes xxv 1890, 641. Gomme, HCT ii.298, believes that ὁ Εν τῇ λε are the generals who might demand that the prytaneis summon a special meeting of the Assembly.

² See Fornara, op. cit. 24 n. 6.
to cite any clear instance of his harassment of the Knights as an example of the way in which he 'planned evil' for them. The Knights, however, were involved in a number of campaigns during the Archidamian War.¹ The Peloponnesians invaded Attica five times in all,² routing the Athenian cavalry in two skirmishes in 431, while contingents from the cavalry were also sent on different expeditions outside Attica.³ Cleon could (justifiably or otherwise) have attacked their comportment during almost any of these campaigns. Even if one accepts (with Gilbert, Beloch and Busolt) that the invasion of 427 provides the most likely occasion for the charge of lipostratia, this naturally has no inevitable connection with his membership of the Boule. Cleon could well have delivered a speech in the Assembly denouncing the cavalry's conduct on this occasion.

Indeed, it is quite plausible to suppose that he did this in 427 and that he followed up his action in the following year by attempting to withhold the Knights'...

---

¹ For the activity of the cavalry in this war, see J. MacInnes, CR xxv 1911, 193-5.

² In 431, 430, 428, 427 and 425. In 429 the invasion did not take place because of the plague (Thuc. ii.71), in 426 because of earthquakes (Thuc. iii.89). After 425 the invasions ceased because the Athenians were holding the Spartan prisoners from Sphacteria as hostages.

³ Thuc. ii.56, 79, iv.42.
katastasis when he became a member of the Boule. At least, once it is realized that Theopompus indicates that Cleon's two attacks upon the Knights were quite distinct, it is evident that there are very solid grounds for concluding that he was a Councillor in 426/5 not in 427/6. Busolt indeed has argued that the scholiast to Ach. 378 proves that he could not have been a member of the Boule in 427/6. The scholiast states here that in the Babylonians Aristophanes mocked Τάς κλαρωτάς καὶ Χιμηστομήνας ῥήματας καὶ Κλεωνᾶ, and Busolt believes that this proves that Cleon did not hold any political office in the year when this comedy was performed. It is the evidence supplied by Aristophanes's two extant comedies of 425 and 424, however, which is decisive here. The fact that Aristophanes refers to the five talents at the very beginning of the Acharnians strongly suggests that Cleon and the Knights had clashed over the cavalry's money shortly before this play was performed at the beginning of 425. It is natural to conclude too that Aristophanes must have

1 It may be pertinent to note that the cavalry would have had no opportunity of 'redeeming themselves' earlier in 426 since the Peloponnesians did not invade Attica.

2 The decisive point here is Fornara's demonstration that the words ἐπτέθη τῇ θεσπεσίᾳ used by the scholiast to Knights 226 are, in all probability, a reference to the katastasis and not to Cleon's entry into the Council.

3 Hermes xxv 1890, 644. He did not observe, however, that if this scholiast's testimony is accepted as conclusive, it also proves that Cleon could not have been one of the hellenotamiai in 427/6 as he suggested.
decided to make the cavalry his chorus and to represent them as the bitter opponents of Cleon in the play of L24 because the enmity between them was topical in L25 when he was writing it.

Moreover, the Knights is based upon the premise that Cleon is the all-dominant politician in the city and Aristophanes must (at least) have sketched its plot before Cleon's success on Sphacteria brought him to unquestioned pre-eminence. It has been argued at various points throughout the chapter dealing with the Knights that a number of the allusions which it contains to the politician's wide-ranging exercise of power are more readily understandable if he had very recently been a member of the body which supervised the day-to-day affairs of the city and had used this position to good effect. Again, it is notable that on some occasions in the Knights the Paphlagonian behaves as if he were actually a member of the Boule. He boasts of his control over the Council at 395-6 and when the Sausage-seller relates how he overcame his adversary in the Council-chamber, he represents the comic Cleon as acting as if he were a regular participant in its meetings.¹ This has led a number of scholars to suppose that Cleon was actually a member of the Boule in L25/4 which is impossible.² However, it all harmonizes perfectly

¹ At 654 he relates how the Paphlagonian γνώμων ἐξῆλθεν, i.e. 'formally proposed', and how he addressed the meeting with the words διήφη not ὁ θεοῦς.

² See (e.g.) Neil, n. ad 626 who bases this opinion on the lines cited above.
with the thesis that Cleon had been a bouleūtes in the
first half of 425 when Aristophanes was writing the
Knights and that he had exerted sufficient influence over
his peers to imprint the memory of his recent tenure of
the office in the minds of the poet's audience. For these
reasons it seems safe to conclude that Cleon was a member
of the Boule of 426/5. In App. E it is also argued that
this was the body which would almost certainly have con-
ducted Aristophanes' dokimasia if he became a citizen in
426.
APPENDIX C

THE 'FASTI'

This is not the place to attempt any sort of comprehensive analysis of the various inscriptions which are concerned with the theatrical productions at Athens. Only one question is under consideration here: in the fifth century did the archon enter in the records the name of the producer or of the author when a man produced a comedy which he had not written?

This question has long aroused keen controversy, the history of which it would be superfluous to retrace. One point, however, does seem to need re-stating although it has frequently been made by those who think that in such instances it was the name of the producer which the archon registered. In the case of a number of the surviving inscriptions it is legitimate to suspect that while the compilers of the information on which they are based may have utilized the archontic records, they may also have felt free to 'edit' the latter for their own purposes. In general there is no reason to suppose that any secrecy surrounded the identity of the real playwright when, for one reason or another, he did not bring out his work.

---

1 For a convenient presentation of the important texts and a summary of their significance, see DFA 101-25. Some of the conclusions which are reached here, however, seem unacceptable.

2 For references to the different views of scholars, see DFA 85 n. 9.
himself. At the dates when the various inscriptions were cut the names of men who had acted as producers of comedies which they had not written must have been of very secondary interest. Accordingly, it should not occasion surprise if the names of the real authors were substituted for them especially when 'literary records' were being published. Conversely, it is impossible to see why the name of a producer should ever have been gratuitously substituted for that of the playwright. It appears to follow logically from this that it is the presence of the name of a 'non-writing producer' in the inscriptions which must be regarded as decisive here.

In the light of this, it is particularly difficult to understand why some modern authorities should have attached an overriding importance to certain entries in the 'Victors' Lists' (IG ii² 2325). These seem to be largely irrelevant in this context. Their purpose was to record the total number of victories won by poets and actors in tragedy and comedy at each of the two main festivals. The names are arranged without dates but in chronological order of first victories, and as the original portion of the record was not inscribed until the first quarter of the third century BC, the material on which

1 See (e.g.) Capps AJP xxviii 1907, 89ff., 187ff., Hesp. xii 1943, 3; DFA 85-6.

2 Reisch, Zeitschr. Ost. Gymnasien lviii 1907, 302ff., has suggested that IG ii² 2325 and IG ii² 2319-23 were engraved on the walls of a building which was erected as a votive offering by the agōnothētēs of 279/8. This view has now won general acceptance.
it was based must naturally have been collected from earlier sources. As well as the official records of the different contests which must have been preserved in the archives for documentary purposes, these would presumably have included the private records dedicated by the victorious choregi, and published plays bearing the names of their authors. Moreover, Aristotle had produced three books in this field: the Νίκαι Διονυσιακά, Περί τραγωδίαν, and Δισερκαλία,¹ and one would think that these must also have been (at least) an important source for establishing the facts. Very little is known about these works but there are some indications that the Δισερκαλία was not an exact transcript of older records and that Aristotle had clarified and edited his sources.² It is quite possible, although unprovable, that the 'Victors' Lists' were transferred to stone directly from Aristotle's Νίκαι Διονυσιακά,³ but in any case whoever prepared the Lists must have performed research of this kind and collated the existing material in order to establish the identity and


2 The extant references to this work have been collected by V. Rose, Aristotelis Fragmenta nos. 618-30. The scholiwm to Firds 1379 indicates that Aristotle noted the fact that there were two poets called Cinesias. See also DFA 71 with n. 3.

3 The theory of A. Körte, CP i 1906, 391-8. He points out that Hesychius of Miletus gives the title of this work as Νίκαι Διονυσιακά λεγέναι καὶ Αναφορά, which shows that it dealt with both festivals, and that Aristotle (with Callisthenes) prepared a list of Pythian victors for the temple of Apollo at Delphi. This was engraved at public expense in 327; see Tod, 187, D.M. Lewis, CR² viii 1958, 108.
number of successes of the playwrights. The 'Victors' Lists' are clearly unofficial in the sense that their interest is purely literary and histrionic; one would not expect the names of producers of plays to be recorded on them when they were bringing out the works of other men, and this is borne out by the fragments which remain. Aphareus, a comic playwright of the fourth century, figures on these lists although his only two victories were won in the name of Dionysius;\(^1\) Aristophanes' name should almost certainly be restored in the seventh line of the second column of victors at the Dionysia,\(^2\) but not Callistratus' in the ninth line of the same column.\(^3\) These facts, however, have no significance in the present context, apart from confirming that the identity of the real playwright was normally widely known when his work was produced by another man.

It also seems highly dangerous to draw any conclusions here from the fragments of an inscription which has been found in Rome.\(^4\) This contains lists of the plays

---

1 \-[Plut.\] x. Or. 839 d.

2 See Capps, *AJP* xxviii 1907, 89ff., *Hesp.* xii 1943, 3 n. 5; Geissler, \(^3\)ff. The restitution of Ari[stonenes] was favored by Wilheln, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen, Vienna, 1906, Ill.*

3 The restitution of \(\kappa \alpha \delta [v \theta apes]\) now appears to be generally accepted.

4 The relevant texts restored by W.A. Dittmer, *The fragments of Athenian comic didaskalaiæ found in Rome,* diss. Princeton, Leiden, 1923, are transcribed in *DFA* 120-2.
produced by individual poets at the two festivals, arranged in order of the places which they were awarded. One fragment (IG xiv 1093) records the places taken by the fourth-century plays of Anaxandrides, and it mentions one which was produced by [Ana]xippus or [Dio]xippus. While this inscription may possibly have been ultimately derived from the official Διαθεσις at Athens, its form shows that it was concerned primarily with the total literary output of the authors. Whoever compiled it must again have collated and organized all the evidence at his disposal and this also does not seem to have any real relevance for the present question.

IGii2 231f (the 'Fasti'), on the other hand, does appear to have been copied from the official records. Headed by the name of the archon for each year, it lists the victorious tribes and choregi in the dithyrambic competitions and the victorious choregi and poets in comedy and tragedy. The names of the successful poets are followed by the verb ἐδιακόπτει, and the main body of the inscription was cut early in the second half of the fourth

---

1 One would naturally suspect that its immediate sources were Alexandrian; see DFA 122.
2 DFA 103.
3 The name of the victorious tragic actor was added in 450/49.
In one fragment of the 'Fasti' (col. viii)\(^2\) the information is given that in the year 387 Araros ἔδιδακε. It is almost certain that Araros was competing on this occasion with a play of his father Aristophanes, probably the Cocalus. The last extant play of Aristophanes, the Plutus, was performed in the previous year 388 B.C. and its Fourth Hypothesis states, τελευτάιαι δὲ διδάσκει τὴν κομψίαν ταύτην ἐπὶ τῶν ἱδίων ὄνοματι, καὶ τῶν πιστῶν ὀνομασίᾳ Ἀραρότα [δι'/αύτῆς] τοῖς θευτήσι βουλόμενος, τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δὲ ἐκεῖνον καθῆκε (τοίς ἀριστοφάνες), Κώκυλον καὶ Αἰσολοσίκωτα. The Vita confirms that Aristophanes produced the Cocalus through his son and gives the same motive, adding that this was a turning point in the life of Araros, while the second Life gives the same information.\(^3\) One would naturally suppose that these last two plays (the Cocalus and Αἰολοσίκων) were performed.

---

1 The record goes down in a fragmentary form to 329/8. In all, parts of thirteen columns of text are extant, most of which consisted of between 140 and 142 lines. Towards the bottom of col. xi, however, the writing is crowded so that it contained approximately 153 lines. Since the entries for 346-2 fell in this space, Wilhelm, U.D.A. 7, reasonably concluded that the inscription in its original form was compiled at about this time. Reisch, op. cit. 297, has suggested a date c. 330 to coincide with the completion of the theatre by Lycurgus; he theorized that the record was inscribed on a structure in the eastern parodoς of the theatre, but see DFA 104.

2 See Wilhelm, Jahreshefte des Österr. Arch. Inst. x 1907, 38.

3 Dübner, Proleg. xi.76-7, Proleg. xii.36-8.
immediately after the *Plutus*, and the motive imputed to Aristophanes that he wished to 'introduce' or 'commend' his son to the spectators seems to make it clear that Araros brought out his father's plays before he competed with his own.\(^1\) This is supported by the description of Araros in Suidas: ΑΘηναίος, ήδος Αριστοφάνους τοῦ κωμικοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦς κωμικοὺς, διδάξας το πρῶτον Όλυμπιάς πά. Εστὶ δὲ τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐσκίμης, Καμπυλιώ, Παντώς γοναῖ, ἀγενάριος, Ἀδωνις, Παρθενίδιον.\(^2\) Suidas states here that Araros first *edidaxe* in Ol. 101, 376-2, which seems to mean that he could not have competed at the earliest until the Lenaea of 375, a date which plainly cannot stand in the face of the evidence of the *'Fasti'*. The obvious explanation of this apparent contradiction is that the meaning of *didaxas* in Suidas is controlled by its immediate context:\(^3\) Suidas has just designated Araros a *kōnikos*, i.e. a composer of original comedies, and is therefore referring to his first exhibition of his own work, not to his producing plays written by his father which he brought out earlier but which would

---

1 The scholiast on Plato’s *Apology* 19c (Dübrner, Proleg. xiii.15-7) states that Araros competed both with his own and his father’s plays.

2 Suid. *s.v.* Αραρώς.

3 See Kaibel, *RE* 11.381 (*s.v.* Araros 2).
not entitle him to the name of a Comic playwright. This is virtually proved to be the case by the fact that only the titles of his original comedies are enumerated in Suidas, which shows that he is being treated throughout the notice as an original playwright.

Araros won his victory of 387 then as didaskalos for his father Aristophanes, and this fragment of the 'Fasti' is crucial since it shows that the name of the producer of a play was entered on the official records even when he was not its author. E. Capps has denied that this could be so, arguing that this is a special case and that the relationship between Aristophanes and his son was radically different from his relationship with Callistratus. He urged that Aristophanes gave the Cocalus to Araros for him to produce as his own, insisting that if Aristophanes wanted 'to establish his son in the favor of the public before he died, this result was certainly best accomplished by giving him a comedy to bring out as his very own'. There is no evidence to support this theory; Capps believed that the statement of the Anonymous Εὐείστα

1 Cf. B.B. Rogers, The Plutus of Aristophanes, London, 1907, xxviii. The theory of R.G. Kent, CR xx 1906, 153-5, that neither the Cocalus nor the Aeolosicon can have been produced before 375 (and that Aristophanes must still have been alive then) automatically collapsed with Wilhelm's publication of this fragment of the Fasti.

2 See Wilhelm, op. cit. 38.

3 AJF xxviii 1907, 187ff. Capps emended the numeral in Suidas to fit his theory.
THE 'FASTI'

(sc. ὁ Αριστοφάνης) τῷ νῦν ἐδίδον τῷ δράματα 1 indicates that he literally gave his last plays to Araros, but the same writer also uses διώκει a few lines earlier to describe Aristophanes’ handing over his plays to Callistratus and Philonides. Moreover, if this had happened and father and son had wished to preserve the secret (as they surely would or the whole exercise would have been not only pointless but would have produced the opposite effect to that intended), it is impossible to see how the real facts could ever have emerged. Yet virtually all the ancient authorities unhesitatingly attributed the authorship of both the Cocalus and the Aeolosicon to Aristophanes. 2 It was obviously public knowledge that Araros had competed in 387 B.C. with a play which had been written by his father, but his own name is recorded on the 'Fasti'. The logical conclusion is that he was represented as the victor in the official records of the performances which were transcribed faithfully in the 'Fasti'. It follows that it was the name of the producer which was entered on these records when he brought out a play which he had not written.

---

1 Dübner, Proleg. iii.54-5.

2 See Kent, CR xx 1906, 154 n. 5, 155. He points out that only once is the Cocalus attributed to Araros, and then by a late author, Clem. Al. vi.572. All the other ancient authorities who mention the play either state or clearly imply that it is the work of Aristophanes. Similarly, the Aeolosicon is referred to over thirty times, and it is always explicitly stated or implied by the immediate context that Aristophanes wrote it.
APPENDIX D

THE AGE OF MAJORITY IN ATHENS

The ἱκμασία to which Athenian youths were subjected when they reached the age of majority has been described above.¹ It is known that the young men were examined in one annual ceremony which was held about the turn of the official year,² but there has been considerable controversy whether a youth was eligible to undergo this ἱκμασία and to become a citizen at the turn of the year following his seventeenth or his eighteenth birthday.

Before the discovery of the Athenaion Politeia there did not appear to be a serious problem; Demosthenes' first speech Against Aphobus (xxvii) seemed to prove that he came of age when he was seventeen. The orator explicitly says that he was seven years old when his father died (xxvii.4), and that Aphobus occupied the family house ἐνθοὺς μετὰ τὸν τὸν πατρὸς θανατον (xxvii.13). He also repeatedly says that his guardians 'administered' the estate for ten years,³ and throughout the speech he computes the interest which ought to have been due to him on

¹ See pp.143-8.
² On the question whether this took place at the end of the old year or at the beginning of the new, see below App. E, pp.485-90.
³ xxvii.6, 17, 24, 26, 29, 35, 36, 39, 59, 63. See also xxix.34, 59; xxxi.14.
this basis. Seven plus ten equals seventeen, so scholars generally concluded that Demosthenes (and other young Athenians) became citizens when they were seventeen years old.\(^1\)

The emergence of the *Athenaion Politeia* naturally changed the picture, since its author explains in some detail (42.1-2), how a man must be eighteen years old to be eligible for citizenship. This prompted A. Hoeck to re-examine the Demosthenic evidence and he succeeded in convincing himself that the orator was actually eighteen when he became a citizen.\(^2\) He achieved this by making two assumptions: that Demosthenes may have been nearly eight when his father died, and that the guardianship may have lasted ten years plus a few months which he ignored when referring to it, and in assessing what he was owed. If both of these assumptions were correct, Demosthenes could have been eighteen years old when he underwent his *sokipasia*. This seemed plausible, if not exactly probable, and until twenty years ago Hoeck's suppositions found general acceptance.

In 1957, however, R. Sealey re-opened the controversy by subjecting the first speech *Against Aphobus* to a

---

1 Various lexicographers and scholiasts say that the age of citizenship was eighteen (see e.g.) Harp. s.v. Εφησις; schol. *Wasps* 578; *Dem. iii.4*; Aesch. *iii.122*), but this was not sufficient to offset the testimony of Demosthenes. It now seems probable that they derived their information from the A.P., so their statements have little independent value.

2 *Hermes* xxx 1895, 347-54.
more penetrating analysis. He has shown that Demosthenes' words clearly indicate that he was only seventeen when he came of age. The orator may or may not have been nearer eight than seven when his father died, but this is immaterial in the present context. It is obviously unlikely that the guardianship lasted precisely ten years, so (as Sealey has pointed out), the fact that Demosthenes chooses to use the round figure makes it far more probable that this is an overestimate than an underestimate. Scholars have generally recognized that the orator consistently exaggerates his claims in assessing what his guardians owe him, and it was scarcely in his interests to minimize the duration of the guardianship. Moreover, at the very end of his speech Demosthenes calls the period ten years by inclusive reckoning when he laments that Aphobus is even unwilling to return his mother's dowry, χείριστών (xxvii.69). Earlier, he says that Therippides was in charge of his dead father's factory for seven years and Aphobus for two years (xxvii.19). The natural inference from these two passages is that the estate was administered by the guardians for slightly less than ten full years. This means that Demosthenes cannot have been eighteen when

1 CR² vii 1957, 195-7.

2 On the only other occasion when he refers to his age at this time, Demosthenes says that if he had been orphaned when he was one year old and under the care of his guardians six years longer, he would have recovered nothing from them (xxvii.63). This certainly does not imply that he was almost eight when his father died.
he became a citizen, even if he was almost eight when his father died.

It is difficult to escape the force of Sealey's observations. J.K. Davies, who has made a careful study of Demosthenes' early life, appears to conclude that it is impossible to be certain whether the age of majority was seventeen or eighteen.\(^1\) He has expressed definite reservations about some of Sealey's arguments, but does not really succeed in disturbing them. Davies is troubled by the fact that the seven years of Therippides' superintendence of the factory mentioned at xxvii.19 have become eight at xxvii.23, but this seems only to exemplify the way in which the nine full years of the guardianship are consistently 'ten'. It allows the orator to calculate more easily and with greater effect. There may have been (as Davies suggests from xxvii.13) some delay before Aphobus received all the dowry ceded to him in the will. This does not mean, however, that when Demosthenes complains that his adversary has not returned the dowry, 'and this in the tenth year' (xxvii.69), he is referring with nice precision only to the interval between Aphobus' receipt of the dowry in full and the end of his minority. Aphobus had taken possession of the house and five-eighths of the dowry \(\varepsilon\nu\beta\upsilon\) . It seems inconceivable that Demosthenes did not begin his calculations at this point.

\(^1\) APP 123-6.
Essentially, Davies' misgivings about Sealey's interpretation of the speech are rooted in one conviction: that if the figure of ten years, on which Demosthenes' computations of interest are based, was exaggerated, even by a month, this would have made the orator vulnerable to a telling counter-attack from Aphobus. Yet this argument is far less compelling than it first appears. On three occasions (xxvii.17,23,35), Demosthenes emphasizes his own moderation in reckoning interest at a lower rate than he was entitled by law. Moreover, he does not demand payment of the money which Aphobus owed him for the use of his property after his minority had ended. If, therefore, Aphobus were to quibble over the fact that Demosthenes was reckoning interest for ten years when the period of the guardianship had actually been slightly less, the latter had plenty of ammunition with which to retaliate. The decisive point here is that if the guardianship lasted more than ten years, it automatically follows that Demosthenes must have decided to forego the money owing to him for the last month or so. It is impossible to believe that he did this and completely neglected to mention his 'generosity' at any time in his speech. However excessive his claims may actually have been, he takes great pains to convince the jury that they are reasonable and moderate. The natural conclusion to be drawn from this speech is that the age of majority was seventeen. Demosthenes was seven when his father died and the jurors were well aware that he must have become a citizen when he was seventeen. Therefore,
naturally enough, he consistently refers to the guardianship as having lasted for ten years although it was slightly less. He does, however, leave himself plenty of room to respond to any attack which Aphobus might make on this score, and (perhaps for self-protection), he twice intimates that he was under the care of his guardians for less than ten full years.

The problem that this constitutes when the Demosthenic evidence is taken in conjunction with the Athenaión Politeía is now widely recognized. J.M. Carter has tried to resolve it by showing that the two crucial expressions employed in the Athenaión Politeía, ἐγγράφωντος δ' εἰς τοὺς δημοτῶς ὀκτωκαίσεκα ἐτη γεγονότες and καὶ τὸς δόθη νεώτερος ὀκτωκαίσεκ' ἐτὸν ἑταῖ (sc. ἡ βουλή) ζημιῶν τοὺς δημοτῶς τοὺς ἐγγράφωντας mean that the youths were registered 'in the eighteenth year of life' and not when they were 'eighteen years old'. ¹ Despite the analogies which he cites from later sources, however, his argument is inadmissable. Later in the Athenaión Politeía (53.4-5), the Σιαυτής are described as men 'in their sixtieth year' and also as belonging to the forty-second age-group. This proves that the Athenaión Politeía is not specifying ages in the same way for the new citizens and for the Σιαυτής. As P.J. Rhodes has pointed out, if a man belongs to the forty-second age group in the year in which his sixtieth birthday falls, he must have belonged

to the first age group in the year in which his nineteenth birthday fell. Consequently, he must have been registered as a citizen after his eighteenth birthday. The expressions used in the Athenaion Politeia can only be reconciled with the Demosthenic evidence if (in the words of J.K. Davies), 'the period between the birth of a child and the subsequent archon-year (or, what is the same thing, between his last birthday as a minor and his ἐφημερία) counted for official purposes as a completed year'. This is scarcely credible. It would mean that in Athenian counting a man was officially 'eighteen' when he was aged physically seventeen, and that he was in 'his sixtieth year' when he was really fifty eight years old.

If the words of Demosthenes and of the Athenaion Politeia are given their natural interpretation, there is a definite contradiction here, and modern scholars have tended to accept the testimony of one or the other. Thus Sealey states 'Mistakes in a learned enquiry do not bring such immediate consequences as mistakes in legal pleading. So the Demosthenic evidence is to be preferred.' Rhodes maintains that 'the circumstantial details of the forty-two

1 AB 172.
2 APP 125.
3 It has been noted earlier that J.K. Davies is uncommitted. A.R.W. Harrison, The Law of Athens, ii.84 with n. 2 and 205, says that a young Athenian came of age 'probably' at the end of his seventeenth year, 'conceivably' his eighteenth.
4 op. cit. 197.
age-groups suggests that the *Athenaion Politeia* should not be wrong. The point is, however, that neither should be 'wrong'. It is plainly inconceivable that either Demosthenes or the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* could have been mistaken about something so fundamental as the age of majority. In the absence of any other obvious solution to the problem, it seems worthwhile to explore the possibility that the age of citizenship was changed between Demosthenes' registration in 366 and the time when the *Athenaion Politeia* was written (i.e. between 329/8 and 323/2).

This possibility has apparently been discounted by modern scholars for two reasons: first, if the age of majority was raised from seventeen to eighteen, one might expect some reference to the fact in the ancient sources; secondly, in recent years it has become customary to think in terms of age-qualifications being lowered rather than raised. The second of these objections carries little weight, since it is obviously rash in matters of this kind to assume that the same tendency prevailed in fourth

---

1. *AB* 178.

century Athens as in modern times. *A priori*, there is no reason why the age of majority should not have been raised in a period of approximately forty years if the Athenians had good cause to enact the change. The first argument is more cogent, but here too there is reason for caution. If the age of citizenship was raised from seventeen to eighteen, it would seem natural to connect this with the major re-organization of the *ephēbia* which is widely believed to have taken place in the second half of the fourth century. ¹ From at least 334/3 onwards, the *ephēbia* constituted a rigorously supervised military training program for new Athenian citizens during the two years which followed their enrolment in their demes. ² A general re-organization of the institution shortly prior to this date would therefore appear to provide an appropriate context for the decision to raise the age of citizenship. It is perhaps particularly relevant that the description in the

---

¹ O.W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Mnem. Suppl. xiv), Leiden, 1971, 129 ff, has argued that 're-organization' is much too strong a word to apply to the changes which took place at this time. He had long believed that the organization of the *ephēbia* which is reflected in the inscriptions dating from 334/3 and described in the *Athenaion Politeia* had been in existence much earlier, and he saw confirmation of this in an ephebic inscription published by M. Th. Mitsos, *APh. E* 1965, 131-2. Reinmuth, following Mitsos, assigned this to 361/0, but D.M. Lewis, *CR* xxiii 1973, 254, has shown that it belongs to the Lycurgan period. There are no ephebic inscriptions datable before 334/3, and it is generally accepted that the *ephēbia* received its definite form in consequence of a law which was passed some little time before this.

² For a complete description of the *ephēbia* in its fully developed form, see Pēlékidis, op. cit. part ii, ch. 3.
Athenaion Politeia of the registration of young Athenians at the age of eighteen is immediately followed by a description of the ephēbia (which they then enter), in its fully developed form. Yet neither the Athenaion Politeia nor any other ancient authority provides any details about what was involved in the reorganization of the ephēbia. Consequently, if the changing of the age of majority was only one feature of a general restructuring of the institution, it would be less surprising that it has escaped notice in the extant sources.

Before speculating why the Athenians may have decided to raise the age of citizenship when they carried out their reform of the ephēbia, it is necessary to backtrack a little and to recapitulate in slightly more detail what is known or has been deduced about this 'reform'. In the fifth century there is no evidence for any elaborate organization of the newly enrolled citizens. With a few exceptions scholars therefore now agree that the ephēbia must have been essentially a fourth century creation. It is difficult, however, to accept unreservedly Wilamowitz's assertion that it was established in 335 after and as a

1 Cf. A.A. Bryant, HSCP xviii 1907, 76-88, who has conclusively shown that in the time of Aristophanes new citizens of ephelic age were free to pursue their normal activities.

2 Prominent among the exceptions is Pélekidis, op. cit. 78-9, who concludes that the establishment of the ephēbia should be dated in the fifth century, and perhaps even as early as the reforms of Cleisthenes.
result of the defeat at Chaeronea. The language of
Aeschines (11.67), ἐκ μὲν γὰρ παῖδων ἀπαλλαγές
περίπολος τῆς καρδας παίς ἐγενέτη καὶ
tούτων ὑμῖν τῶν συνεφηβῶν καὶ τῶν ἁρκουτων
ἡμῶν μάρτυρα παραστομα, taken in conjunction with
the statement in the Athenion Politeia (42.4) that the
ephēbes during their training περιπολούσι τὴν ζυραν seems
to be the decisive argument against this. It may well be
that συνεφηβω in the speech of Aeschines does not mean
'fellow-ephebes', but only 'men of the same age', but it
is still incontrovertible that newly enrolled citizens from
the time of the orator, if not before, spent two years
performing some kind of garrison duty. There clearly
existed in the 370s or in the previous decade at least
the germ of the ephēbia itself. How similar this was to
the fully developed institution which, certainly from
334/3 onwards, monopolized the time of the new citizens for
two years is debatable. Aeschines maintains that he was a
περιπολος for two years, but according to the Athenion
Politeia the ephebes spent their first year undergoing
carefully supervised training and performing guard-duty in
Munychia and Acte in common barracks. It was only in their

1 Aristoteles und Athen, i.193-4.

2 Aeschines' date of birth is normally placed in 390 on
the basis of 1.49, but see D.M. Lewis, CRvii 1958, 72,
who points out that there is reason to think that it may
have been somewhat earlier. As Lewis says, 403 is the
extreme upper limit since Aeschines never speaks of sharing
his parents' exile under the Thirty.
second year that they undertook duties in the country as 
περίπολοι, so the probable conclusion is that in Aeschines' day the preliminary training program had not yet been devised.¹ Harpocratura² has preserved the information that Lycurgus said that a bronze statue of a certain Epicrates was set up 'because of his law concerning the ephebes', and this was almost certainly the decisive step in the development of the institution. It is perhaps significant that Harpocratura also states that Epicrates is said to have amassed the enormous fortune of six hundred talents, since his juxtaposition of this with the statement about the 'ephebic law' may mean that the latter had expended some of his money on an ephebic endowment.

Nothing further is known about Epicrates and it has been noted earlier that there is no explicit evidence for the changes which were involved in the reorganization of the ἐφθήβια. F.W. Mitchel has argued that the innovations were 'state control of the election of both the new supreme officer, the κοσμητῆς, and of the older office of σοφρονιστῆς', the state subsidy, and the ἐφθήβια's becoming a necessary step in acquiring the rights of citizenship for all Athenian youths.³ The last point is particularly

¹ See H.W. Pleket, Mnem. 4 xxvii 1974, 440-1.
² s.v. Ἐπικράτης.
³ Hesp. xxxiii 1964, 344 n.34.
controversial and Mitchel omitted to mention the development of the first year training program for the young men who were now quartered together full time, as well as the probability that it was now for the first time that they were officially entitled ephebes. This would explain the freedom of movement and activity apparently enjoyed by young men of ephebic age in the first half of the fourth century, and the absence of incontestable references to the ephēbia and the ephebic officers in a technical sense before the 330s.

The important questions in the present context, however, are when and why was this reform carried out. The ephebic inscriptions of 334/3 provide a secure terminus ante quem and Isocrates' complaints (de Pace 44) about the military situation in 356 or 355 seem to show that 'Epicrates' law' had not yet been passed. Historically, the reorganization of the ephēbia fits well among the reforms of Lycurgus, and this dating is virtually proved by the inscriptions. The fact that there are no inscriptions about ephebes which can be dated before 334/3, while there are eight belonging to 334/3 or 333/2, clearly shows that

1 See D.M. Lewis, CR xxiii 1973, 255, who supports Reinmuth's belief that it was only the new citizens of hoplite status who underwent the training program described in the Athenaiion Politeia.

2 IG ii² 1156, 1189, 2970.

3 For the argumentum ex silentio in general, see Wilamowitz, op. cit. 193-4; C.A. Forbes, Greek Physical Education, New York, 1929, 113 ff.

4 Nos. 2-9 in Reinmuth, op. cit. 4-33.
THE AGE OF MAJORITY IN ATHENS

an event of major importance affecting the ephēbia had taken place shortly before 334/3. There is no reason to doubt that the institution was reorganized c. 335.

This is essentially only a modification of Wilamo- witz's thesis that the ephēbia was an entirely new creation in 335, and his suggestion that the Athenians were impelled to reform their army because of the humiliation which they had suffered at Chaeronea has won general acceptance.

There is, however, one obvious difficulty here. It is easy enough to see why the Athenians should have wanted to take steps to improve their army. The problem is why should Alexander (or Philip) have allowed them to do so when the 'new army' could easily be involved in a war against Macedonia. This was one of the most cogent arguments employed by Reinmuth against Wilamowitz's theory that the ephēbia was established in 335. He urged that 'it is too much to ask of credulity to believe that a program so hostile to Macedonia in its intent could have been undertaken at that time, and that if it had been launched, it was not forth- with quashed.' The same argument can be invoked, perhaps with slightly less force, when it is a question of a re-organization of the ephēbia on the scale described above. It is suggested here that in order to circumvent this difficulty the Athenians may have decided to raise the age qualification for the new ephēbia from seventeen to eighteen, and that the reason for this change may be found

1 TAPA lxxxiii 1952, 49.
in the career of Alexander himself.

According to Plutarch (Alex. 3.5), Alexander was born about 20 July 356 and this date is now generally accepted. The battle of Chaeronea was fought either at the very beginning of September or (more probably) in early August 338. This means that Alexander was just eighteen years old when he played a prominent part in the fighting at Chaeronea, leading his father's best troops on the left wing. After the Macedonian victory the terms which Philip offered the Athenians were (for various reasons) extraordinarily generous and it was Alexander, along with Antipater and Alcimachus, whom Philip sent to Athens with the remains of those Athenians who had died in battle. In return, the Athenians erected a statue of Philip in the agora and gave their citizenship to both Philip and Alexander. If, therefore, the reform of the ephēbia was carried out between 338 and 335, the Athenians may well have decided that in memory of this occasion the age of citizenship should be raised to eighteen. Since Alexander had become an Athenian citizen shortly after his eighteenth birthday, henceforth all new Athenian citizens should also

---


3 For the battle and its aftermath, see J.R. Hamilton, Alexander the Great, London, 1973, 36-7; P. Green, supra cit. 73 ff.
be eighteen years old. Such a gesture would have been typical of the behavior of the Athenians towards Alexander when (e.g.) he was recognized as head of the League of Corinth in 336 or after he crushed an incipient rebellion by destroying Thebes in 335. This 'gesture', however, would seem to have been different in one important respect.

The factional politics of the day cannot be discussed here, but it would appear likely that even those Athenians who were most staunchly opposed to the Macedonians could have viewed the proposal to 'honor' Alexander with a certain equanimity, if indeed they did not sponsor it themselves. The immediate effect of raising the age of majority would presumably have been a drop in the numerical strength of the army, but this was of minor importance; the purpose of the reorganization of the ephēbia must have been the long-term improvement of the military. It would have been humiliating to pay even formal obeisance to their enemy but by now they were inured to this and doubtless regarded it as a necessary concession to circumstance beyond their control. By taking the relatively simple step of raising the age of majority in honor of Alexander, the Athenians would probably have ensured Macedonian acceptance of the ephēbia in its new form, and they could look forward to fighting the wars of the future with a better-trained, more disciplined army.

The scenario which has been outlined above is obviously highly speculative. It certainly cannot be proved that the age of majority was raised when the ephēbia
was reorganized, but it must be kept in mind that to a certain extent this also applies to the other changes which are normally assumed to have taken place at the time of the reorganization. It is only by comparing the *ephebia* as it existed from 334/3 onwards (i.e. as it is described in the *Athenaion Politeia*) with earlier conditions, that one can attempt to deduce what happened. According to the *Athenaion Politeia*, the age of majority for the new ephebes was eighteen. The Demosthenic evidence clearly indicates that the age of majority in the orator's day was seventeen. The assumption that a change was made when the *ephebia* was reorganized does not in itself seem unreasonable,¹ and Alexander's career appears to furnish a possible explanation for it.

If the age of citizenship was seventeen in the first half of the fourth century,² there is no reason to doubt that it was the same in Aristophanes' day. Here it seems pertinent to add that the earlier evidence (for what it is worth) tends to indicate that the age of majority was

---

1 At A.P. 42.1 the description of the registration of new citizens is introduced with these words, Ἐνε Σφ νῦν καταστασίς τῆς πολιτείας τόνικ τόν τρόπον. This may imply that changes had recently taken place not only in the *ephebia* but also with regard to the registration process.

2 This would naturally mean that Demosthenes was born in 384/3 since he came of age at the turn of 367/6. Plutarch, Mor. 845d, reckons Demosthenes' life ἄπό Δεξιά (385/4), but since Hoeck (Hermes xxx 1895, 351-2), it has been generally recognized that he arrived at this date by combining Dm.xxx.15 with A.P. 42.1. The low chronology of the orator's life, which places his birth in 381/0, is obviously wrong; see Davies, APF 125 n.1.
seventeen in the late fifth and early fourth centuries.

Thucydides twice uses the words ὁ νεότερος to designate a particular class of soldiers who were not normally sent on service abroad.¹ It is obviously an enormous step from this to the fully developed ἐφήβια, but it may indicate that, when necessary, newly enrolled fifth century citizens were liable to serve on garrison duty for two years, an arrangement similar to that which Aeschines describes. If this was the case, the short career of Dexileos of Thoricus supports the view that the age of majority was seventeen at the turn of the fifth century. His epitaph reveals that he was born in 414/3 and killed in Corinth while serving as one τῶν τέντε ἵππείων in 394/3.² Dexileos then was twenty or almost twenty when he died. If he had completed two years of garrison duty before joining the Knights, those two years would have contained his eighteenth and nineteenth birthdays. Accordingly, he must have been enrolled as a citizen at the end of 397/6 when he was seventeen years old.³

The career of Eupolis, the comic playwright, may also be relevant here since, according to Suidas (s.v.

---

¹ i.105.4, ii.13.7. He also mentions ὁ περίκλητος twice (iv.67.2, viii.92.2), but very little is known about the latter at this date. Gomme, HCT iii.529, has suggested that they were a special mobile force.

² IG ii² 6217 = Tod 105.

³ Cf. Rhodes, AB 172 with n.8, who has shown that Pélekidis miscalculated the age of Dexileos.
The similarity of these figures is obviously suspicious, but if there is an error, it may only be in the number of plays attributed to him since nineteen titles are known. It is difficult to believe that an archon would have entrusted the privilege of competing at one of the festivals to a minor who had not attained his citizenship, even if this was allowed by law. Accordingly, if Eupolis did present his first comedy when he was seventeen, this must almost certainly have been the age of majority in the late fifth century.

1 The statement of a scholiast to Clouds 530 that a man under thirty was permitted ἐν θεάτρῳ μὴ διηγησθίναι ἐν αὑτῷ τὸ γέγονός ἐστι is certainly wrong and in any case a poet did not read his work in the theatre. There is no other evidence that there was a statutory minimum age for producing plays. Possibly the circumstance of a minor's wishing to compete had not been foreseen or was so rare that it was not deemed necessary to enact a specific prohibition against it. For the difficulty of 'obtaining a chorus', however, see A.E. Haigh, The Attic Theatre, 50.
A NEW CITIZEN'S EXAMINATION BY THE BOULE

If Aristophanes did become an Athenian citizen in 426, it is not absolutely certain whether he would have appeared before the Boule of 427/6 or that of 426/5 in the final stage of his dokimasia. The annual ceremony in which the new citizens were enrolled is known to have taken place around the turn of the Athenian year.¹ It is very probable that it was held at the beginning of the new year (which would mean that Aristophanes would have come before the Boule of 426/5), but the references to the dokimasia in the ancient literature cannot be taken to prove this as a number of scholars seem to believe.²

The passage which is commonly assumed to show that the ceremony took place at the beginning of the new year occurs in Lysias. The speaker, who is unknown, claims that he became a citizen in 411/10 and that he served as a tragic choregus in the same year.³ At first sight this statement appears decisive since one of the first duties of the new archon was to appoint choregi for the performances of tragedy at the Dionysia,⁴ but on closer scrutiny

¹ Dem. xxx.15.
² See Wyse, The Speeches of Isaeus, 570; R. Sealey, CR² vii 1957, 195; Rhodes, AB 172.
³ Lysias xxii.1.
⁴ A.P. 52.2.
its significance dwindles. The speaker says that he passed his dokimasia in the archonship of Theopompus, who did not enter office until two months of 411/10 had elapsed.\(^1\) For the first two months of the year and for the last two months of 412/11 Mnasilochus was archon,\(^2\) so if the enrollment of new citizens had proceeded normally under the Four Hundred, Lysias' client should presumably have been registered in the latter's archonship. It appears likely that the Four Hundred had discontinued the registration of (at least some) new citizens, perhaps in connection with their general policy of restricting the citizenship, and that with the restoration of democracy registrations were brought up to date. This then may very well be a special case and it gives no firm indication whether the dokimasia of Lysias' client would have taken place at the end of 412/11 or at the beginning of 411/10 if the situation had been normal.\(^3\)

Apart from this speech of Lysias, the only relevant passage in literature is Demosthenes' statement that he

---

1 A.P. 33.1.
2 A.P. 33.1.
3 The whole testimony of this speaker has been regarded with suspicion by some scholars since he further claims (xxi.3) that he acted as choregus for a chorus of boys in the archonship of Alexias (405/4). If he was enrolled as a citizen in 411/10 he must still have been in his twenties at this date, and there is good fourth-century evidence that the statutory minimum age for performing this liturgy was forty; see A.P. 56.3; Aeschin. i.11; Plato, Laws vi.746e. It is probable, however, that this rule did not apply in the fifth century; cf. DFA 75 with n. 4.
was registered as a citizen shortly after an event occurring in Scirophorion 367/6: ἐγήματο μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ Πολυζήλου ἀρχοντος σκιροφορίου τοις μηνοις. ἡ δ’ ἀπολειψις ἐγράφη ποσείδενοι τοις μηνοις ἐπὶ Τιμοκράτους: ἐγὼ δ’ εὖθεώς μετὰ τῶν γύμων Σοκιμασθεὶς ἐνεκάλουν...1 The crucial word here is εὖθεώς. If it literally means 'immediately' the registration of new citizens must have taken place in the last month of the Athenian year. On the other hand, if everybody knew that the ceremony was held early in the new year, the word would obviously not be inappropriate in its context,2 so there is no way of settling the matter on the basis of this testimony.

The literary evidence then is inconclusive, but Pélékidis has strongly argued that the beginning of Boedromion (the third month of the Attic year) was the beginning of the ephebic year in the third century and that it was probably the same in the fourth century.3 As he points out, this would mean that the dokimasiai of the

---

1 Dem. xxx.15. Certain scholars (e.g. B. Haussoulier, La vie municipale en Attique, Paris, 1884, 17-24) have taken the word ἄρχαιτες in Isaeus vii.28 to refer to the deme-elections. Since this passage shows that the registration of an adopted son (Thrasyllus) in his father’s deme took place at the same time as these elections, they have tried to fix the date of the registration of all new citizens on this basis. It is not definite, however, that the ἄρχαιτες are the deme-elections (see Wyse, op. cit. 571-2), and in any case it is far from certain that the general registration of those attaining majority belonged to the same occasion as the registration of adopted sons.

2 See Pélékidis, Histoire de l'éphébie attique, 92.

3 op. cit. 92-3, 110, 174-5.
ephebes took place in the first two months of the new year. The date of the institution of the ephēbia is controver-
sial, but, if Pélékidis is correct, this plainly provides some reason for thinking that the examination of new citizens in the fifth century was also held at the begin-
ning of the new year.

Moreover, as far as Aristophanes' registration is concerned, there is another factor involved; during the relevant period in the fifth century, the two years, the archontic and bouleutic, were not conterminous. There has been considerable controversy over the date of the insti-
tution of the independent bouleutic or concillar year, but there is no need to enter into this here. The important point is that there is general agreement that it was being employed from at least 432 until the last decade of the century. There is naturally no reason to think that it was a youth's age at the turn of the concillar year which determined whether he was eligible for citizenship since the date of the latter was variable; it would have meant that if two boys were born on the same day in different years one might be eligible for citizenship at the 'turn of the year' following his appropriate birthday but not the other. Yet the fact that there were two Athenian years at this time is of some importance for the question of

1 See above, App. D.

2 For a convenient summary of the different views on the question when the bouleutic year was introduced, see Rhodes, AR 224-5. 432 is the 'terminus ante quem'.
A NEW CITIZEN'S EXAMINATION BY THE BOULE

Aristophanes' dokimasia.

If, as seems probable, the examination of the youths by the Boule which was the final stage in the registration process took place on a fixed occasion each year, logically the occasion should have been an early meeting of the new Boule after the first of Hecatombaeon. This would at least have ensured some regularity of procedure. The (less probable) alternative to this would appear to be that the examination took place upon a fixed date around the turn of the year when the Boule which happened to be in office at the time would conduct it. Meritt has calculated that the Boule of 427/6 finished its term of office on Scir. 23,¹ so, if this is correct, in this case again Aristophanes would presumably have appeared before the Boule of 426/5 if he underwent his dokimasia in 426.

In short, it seems likely that he could only have been examined by the Boule of 427/6 if it was a tradition that the dokimasiai of new citizens should always be carried out by the outgoing Boule, and this is scarcely possible. It would mean that whenever the bouleutic year ended before the archontic, special provision would have had to be made for youths who were still minors at the time but who would reach the age of majority before the end of

Scirophorion. Strictly speaking, these would not have been eligible to take the oath of allegiance to the State. Moreover, in cases when the bouleutic year ended considerably earlier than the archontic, the preliminary examination of the young men by their demesmen would have had to be held very early indeed. Again, even if one were to assume that this was the procedure, it is quite possible that those young men who were initially rejected by their demesmen but who won their appeals in court would have undergone their examinations later than the main body of new citizens. In this case, they might well have appeared before the new Boule not the old, and it has been argued above (Ch. IV) that Aristophanes may have belonged to this category. These arguments from probability and convenience cannot be absolutely decisive, but there is every reason to think that if Aristophanes became a citizen in 426 he would have appeared before the Boule of 426/5.
With these words, Demosthenes encourages the Sausage-seller to take up the cudgels against the Paphlagonian, confident that the actor playing this role will not be masked. The exception proves the rule and it is generally concluded from these lines that portrait masks were customary in Aristophanic comedy.

K.J. Dover, however, in a stimulating article published in 1967, offered a new interpretation of the passage. He emphasizes the technical difficulties of making readily identifiable masks in a society which must have been, by modern standards, homogeneous in appearance, and suggests that there was nothing unusual about Cleon's face; that 'when the requirements of the apertures for eyes and mouth had been met, it was impossible to make a mask such that anyone in the audience could say ὁ τοῦ ἔκνως.' Noting the horrendous descriptions of Cleon's physical appearance at Wasps 1031-5 and Peace 753-8, Dover suggests that Aristophanes may have put on the Paphlagonian an exceptionally hideous mask 'which expressed visually

1 KOMOIDOTRAGEMATA 16ff. Dover repeated the main points of his argument in AC 28-9.
what he felt about Cleon', and turned it to good comic effect by pretending that it fell far short of the real man, because a realistic mask would have been too frightening for even the mask-maker to look at.

Dover's general observations about the difficulty of making realistic portrait masks are clearly timely. The hypothesis which he puts forward is ingenious, and if it is correct it changes the point of *Knights* 230-3. It seems to rest, however, upon the assumption that Cleon's features were completely regular, and Cratinus in his *Seriphians* apparently mocked the appearance of Cleon, emphasizing particularly the丑 Memphis of his eyebrows.\(^1\)

It is not easy to see how a man's eyebrows can be repulsive,\(^2\) but it seems that Aristophanes' mask-makers would have had something to work with, if they had been so inclined.

---


2 For ἀργαλέος in this sense, cf. Aesch. 1.61.
APPENDIX G

CLEON'S FORTIFICATION PROJECT

At Knights 817-9 the Sausage-seller concludes his rebuke of the Paphlagonian for comparing himself favorably to Themistocles with these words:

σὺ δ' Αθηναίον εξήγησας μικροτάτης ἀτοφήναι
διατείξαι καὶ ἱρηματίζων, ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀντιφέρεবαν.
κακεῖνος μὲν φευγει τὴν γὰρ εἰ δ' Ἔλληνεσ ἄσσατεις

Two scholia to these lines explain in slightly different language how the Athenians ἱκνεῖται τῇ τείχῃ because they were now unable to man their existing defences properly,¹ and until some forty years ago the traces of fortifications visible in the Pnyx range were usually identified as Cleon's cross-wall.² With a few exceptions scholars thought that it was built c. 425, and that this was the ἱστείχισμα which is referred to in a late fourth-century inscription.³

Excavations carried out on the Pnyx during the 1930s, however, revealed a considerable amount of new information about this part of the city, and the

1. Schol. 817: ἄφ' τὴν ἐκ τούτῳ πολέμου ἱκνεῖται καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄνδρων ἑπάνω ἱκνεῖται τῇ τείχῃ.
   Schol. 818: Συνύγων καὶ ἱκνεῖται τῷ τείχῃ. ἄφ' γὰρ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῷ ἐξεῖ τοῦ φρουροῦ ἑπάνω καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄνδρων ἑπάνω ἱκνεῖται τῷ τείχῃ.

2 See W. Judeich, Topographie von Athen², Munich, 1931, 161, where the opinions of scholars are cited.

3 IG ii² 463. On the date, see W.S. Ferguson, AJP lix 1938, 230ff.
Compartment Wall (as it is now known) was traced from the northwestern slopes of the Hill of the Nymphs to the top of Museum Hill. It cuts off a considerable area included within the Themistoclean circuit (to which it was joined at the peak of Museum Hill) and it is virtually certain that it is indeed the ἔκτεινεμα referred to in IG ii² 463. However, it is also clear that it was built about the end of the fourth century, and no trace of any fifth century fortification which might be Cleon’s work has been found in this area.

The significance of Knights 817-9 has therefore come into question. Scranton, who emphasizes the unanimity of scholars that the only place where a contraction of the Themistoclean circuit (reported in the scholia to Knights 817-8) could have been contemplated is along the Pnyx, argues that it is 'almost incontrovertible that Cleon did not build a διατείχισμα'. The verb ἔκτεινεμα which Aristophanes employs in Knights 818 was sometimes used metaphorically with the meaning 'to divide as if by a wall', and a number of other scholars believe that the Sausage-seller is only accusing the Paphlagonian of

3 Cf. Scranton, supra cit. 333-40.
4 supra cit. 335-6.
5 Cf. Xen. Symn. v.6: ἡ διατείχισις τὰ ὀρματα.
splitting the Athenian people by setting class against class.\(^1\) Yet while this is a possible interpretation of the lines, their context in the *Knights* indicates that something more specific is involved\(^2\) and that Cleon had at least given his support to some new building operation.\(^3\)

If this work was not completed\(^4\) a number of possible explanations can be envisaged. Perhaps the most likely is that the capture of the Spartans on Sphacteria which had removed the threat of invasion also caused this defensive project which Cleon had sponsored to be abandoned since it no longer seemed necessary.\(^5\) This would naturally

---

1 See (e.g.) MacDowell, *n. ad* *Wasp* 41, where Xanthias punning on δημοσία and δημοκρία says that Cleon wants δημοκρία the people. MacDowell believes that this line and *Knights* 817-8 show that Cleon was regarded by some Athenians as a cause of disunity 'presumably because he encouraged one social class to regard another as opponents'.

2 Earlier in the same speech (813-5), the Sausage-seller emphasized the part which Themistocles had played in rebuilding the walls of the city and in fortifying the Piraeus.

3 It seems quite possible that he had done this as a member of the Boule in 426/5; see above, App. B. For the Council's concern with public works, see Rhodes, AB 122-7.

4 The Sausage-seller's use of the verb ἔζημοςας at 817 may possibly indicate that for one reason or another the scheme had not been carried through.

5 Scranton, *op. cit.* 310, describes a well-dressed, rock-cut bedding which extends along a ridge behind the Compart-ment Wall. Noting that this has every indication of having been intended for a fortification, he assumed that it was a false move on the part of the Compart Wall builders, but admits that this is an unsatisfactory expla-nation. It is just possible, as he has suggested, that the bedding and some other unexplained cuttings could be associated with a scheme of Cleon which never got beyond the initial stages.
mean that the testimony of the two scholia to the Knihn would have to be dismissed as an inference from the text. It seems dangerous, however, to assume that the fortification-work was never completed on the grounds that no identifiable remains survive, and the initial assumption that it could only have been planned for the area of the Pnyx becomes more questionable if the testimony of the scholia is discarded.

The most natural interpretation of Knights 817-9 is that Cleon had advocated the strengthening of Athens' fortifications, perhaps somewhere in the neighborhood of the city. Anything more than this is speculation, but since the passage in the Knights is the sole extant reference to the project, it is probably safe to conclude that it was not of major importance.

1 Scranton himself, op. cit. 301, emphasizes the paucity of the remains of Athens' fortifications and recognizes that in many places it is impossible to discover the line of the Themistoclean circuit in its various periods.

2 It depends largely on the words Συνέστελειν τῷ τέλει in the two scholia.

3 At 817 the Sausage-seller claims that the Paphlagonian had sought (ex. Θησεέως) μικροπολίτης ἀποφήναι. The word μικροπολίτης appears to be used in its primary sense which implies that some restriction of the city area was involved in the building operation. It is worth noting, however, that in Plutarch Themistocles is twice represented as boasting that he was capable of making a city great (Them. 2.3, Cim. 9.2). If this claim was widely associated with Themistocles at this date, Aristophanes may have used the word only to emphasize Cleon's inferiority to his predecessor.