Appendix 1

Argumenta

Ὑπόθεσις Α΄ [Dover VII]

Τὸ δρᾶμα (τὸ τῶν Νεφέλων) κατὰ Σωκράτους γέγραπται τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐπίτηδες ὡς κακοδιδασκαλοῦντος τοὺς νέους Ἀθήνησι, τῶν κωμικῶν πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσόφους ἐχόντων τινὰ ἀντιλογίαν· οὐχ ὥς τινες δι' Ἀρχέλαον τὸν Μακεδόνων βασιλέα, ὅτι προὔκρινεν αὐτὸν Ἀριστοφάνους.

"*The play was written as a studied attack on Sokrates the philosopher and his pernicious teaching of the young men at Athens, in that comic-poets had an axe to grind with regards the philosophers <and> not, as some <maintain>, because the king of the Macedonians, Archelaos preferred him* [*Sokrates*] *to Aristophanes*."

This ancient reviewer claims that the comic-poets were taking issue with 'philosophers' or those we might term 'intellectuals'. But, this is to misconstrue ancient satire and disregards the fact that the comic-poets would have considered themselves pre-eminently 'philosophers'.
Archelaos became king in 413 B.C. and was assassinated in a hunting *accident* in 399, the same year that Sokrates was tried and executed. His court had provided a retreat for the tragic-poet, Euripides, who is said to have died there a few years earlier. There is a comment to the effect that Sokrates had refused to visit the Macedonian court or accept money from the king (cf. Diogenes Laërtios II. 25)

Ὑπόθεσις Β΄ [Dover V]

Φασὶ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην γράψαι τὰς «*Νεφέλας*» ἀναγκασθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀνύτου καὶ Μελήτου, ἵνα προδιασκέψαιντο ποῖοί τινες εἶεν Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ Σωκράτους ἀκούοντες. ηὐλαβοῦντο γὰρ, ὅτι πολλοὺς εἶχεν ἐραστὰς καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην, οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δράματος τούτου μηδὲ νικῆσαι ἐποίησαν τὸν ποιητήν. ὁ δὲ πρόλογός ἐστι τῶν «*Νεφελῶν*» ἁρμοδιώτατα καὶ δεξιώτατα συγκείμενος. πρεσβύτης γάρ ἐστιν ἄγροικος ἀχθόμενος παιδὶ ἀστικοῦ φρονήματος γέμοντι καὶ τῆς εὐγενείας εἰς πολυτέλειαν ἀπελελαυκότι. ἡ γὰρ τῶν Ἀλκμαιωνιδῶν οἰκία, ὅθεν ἦν τὸ πρὸς μητρὸς γένος ὁ μειραρίσκος, ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὥς φησιν Ἡρόδοτος, τεθριπποτρόφος ἦν καὶ πολλὰς ἀνῃρημένη νίκας, τὰς μὲν Ὀλυμπίασι τὰς δὲ Πυθοῖ ἐνίας δὲ Ἰσθμιοῖ καὶ Νεμέᾳ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἀγῶσιν. εὐδοκιμοῦσαν οὖν ὁρῶν ὁ νεανίσκος ἀπέκλινε πρὸς τὸ ἦθος τῶν πρὸς μητρὸς προγόνων.

"*They say that Aristophanes wrote the 'Clouds' under pressure from Anytos and Meletos, in order that they might make a thorough prior assessment of which Athenians would be anti-Sokratic when they heard <it>. They were worried, you see, because he had many admirers and particularly those of Alkibiades' circle, and it was these men who ensured that the poet did not win at the performance of this play.*
The prologue of the 'Clouds' has been put together in a very appropriate and witty style. There is an old peasant-farmer driven to distraction by his son's bourgeois attitude and enjoyment of upper-class luxuries. This is due to the young man's lineage on his mother's side from the Alkmaionid family which was involved in chariot-racing, as Herodotos tells us, and had carried off a great many victories, at Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia, Nemea and a good many other contests. The youth was influenced by their magnificence into following the behaviour of his mother's family."

This commentator does not seem to have read past the prologue. He does, however, focus attention on the likely correlation that Aristophanes intended between Pheidippides and the young Alkibiades by their family connections, their shared passion for horses and (later in the play) their aristocratic drawl. Although the suggestion that Anytos and Meletos, the chief prosecutors of Sokrates, might have urged the poet to target their political opponent is an anachronistic fancy, there is something to be said for the fact that Alkibiades had been a protégée of Anytos.

Ὑπόθεσις Γ΄ [Dover III]

Πρεσβύτης τις Στρεψιάδης ὑπὸ δανείων καταπονούμενος διὰ τὴν ἱπποτροφίαν τοῦ παιδὸς δεῖται τούτου, φοιτήσαντος ὡς τὸν Σωκράτη μαθεῖν τὸν ἥττονα λόγον, εἴ πως δύναιτο τὰ ἄδικα λέγων ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ τοὺς χρήστας νικᾶν καὶ μηδενὶ τῶν δανειστῶν μηδὲν ἀποδοῦναι. οὐ βουλομένου δὲ τοῦ μειρακίσκου διαγνοὺς αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν μανθάνειν, μαθητὴν τοῦ Σωκράτους ἐκκαλέσας τινὰ διαλέγεται· ἐκκυκληθείσης δὲ τῆς διατριβῆς, οἵ τε μαθηταὶ κύκλῳ καθήμενοι πιναροὶ συνορῶνται καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Σωκράτης ἐπὶ κρεμάθρας αἰωρούμενος καὶ ἀποσκοπῶν τὰ μετέωρα θεωρεῖται. μετὰ ταῦτα τελεῖ παραλαβὼν τὸν πρεσβύτην, καὶ τοὺς νομιζομένους παρ' αὐτῷ θεούς, Ἀέρα προσέτι δὲ καὶ Αἰθέρα καὶ Νεφέλας κατακαλεῖται. πρὸς δὲ τὴν εὐχὴν εἰσέρχονται νεφέλαι ἐν σχήματι χοροῦ καὶ φυσιολογήσαντος οὐκ ἀπιθάνως τοῦ Σωκράτους ἀποκαταστᾶσαι πρὸς τοὺς θεατὰς περὶ πλειόνων διαλέγονται. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτης διδασκόμενος ἐν τῷ φανερῷ τινὰ τῶν μαθημάτων γελωτοποιεῖ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ διὰ τὴν ἀμαθίαν ἐκ τοῦ φροντιστηρίου ἐκβάλλεται, ἄγων πρὸς βίαν τὸν υἱὸν συνίστησι τῷ Σωκράτει. τούτου δὲ ἐξαγαγόντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸν ἄδικον καὶ τὸν δίκαιον λόγον, διαγωνισθεὶς ὁ ἄδικος πρὸς τὸν δίκαιον λόγον, καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ὁ ἄδικος λόγος ἐκδιδάσκει. κομισάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἐκπεπονημένον ἐπηρεάζει τοῖς χρήσταις καὶ ὡς κατωρθωκὼς εὐωχεῖ παραλαβών. γενομένης δὲ περὶ τὴν εὐωχίαν ἀντιλογίας πληγὰς λαβὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς βοὴν ἵστησι, καὶ προσκαταλαλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ὅτι δίκαιον τοὺς πατέρας ὑπὸ τῶν υἱῶν ἀντιτύπτεσθαι, ὑπεραλγῶν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σύγκρουσιν ὁ γέρων κατασκάπτει καὶ ἐμπίπρησι τὸ φροντιστήριον τῶν Σωκρατικῶν. τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν πάνυ δυνατῶς πεποιημένων.

"*Strepsiades, an old man weighed down by loans taken out by his son for maintaining horses, wants this <young man> to become a pupil of Sokrates in order to learn the weaker side of the argument in the hope of being able to defeat his creditors in the courtroom by arguing unjustly and not <have to> repay a thing to the lenders. But, since the youth is not willing, he makes up his mind to go and study for himself and summons one of Sokrates' students to discuss it. Then, the* '*School*' *is wheeled out; both the unwashed students, who can be observed seated together in a circle, and Sokrates himself, seen airborne in a basket observing celestial phenomena. After that, <Sokrates> ritually admits the old man and calls down those entities which he holds to be divine, Atmosphere as well as Space and Clouds. In answer to his prayer clouds enter in the form of a chorus and when Sokrates has given a persuasive account of the natural phenomena they detach themselves from the drama and converse with the audience about further matters. Afterwards, while the old man is being taught he openly makes fun of some of the lessons and, when he is ejected from the* '*Thinking-shop*' *due to his inability to learn, he brings his son under duress and introduces him to Sokrates. He brings out into the actual theatre the Unjust and the Just sides of the argument; the Unjust wins the contest against the Just and takes the son on as his pupil.*

When he has been fully educated his father brings him home, treats his creditors with disdain and thinking that he has succeeded celebrates his son's return. An argument breaks out in the course of the celebrations and he starts yelling when he gets beaten by his son. And when the son brings an argument against him to the effect that it is morally right that fathers be beaten in their turn by their sons, and in great pain from the run-in with his son, the old fellow starts demolishing and setting fire to the Sokratics' School. The play is among the most powerfully-written of his dramas."

If this drama had been lost, like its predecessor, we would be grateful for this workmanlike précis of its plot. But, as it is, it can serve only to summarize what we can see for ourselves. It does, however, show us how certain assumptions made long ago can cling on through centuries of scholarship. It is the origin of the notion that the door of the school is opened for Strepsiades by one of the pupils and also for the use of the ἐκκύκλημα. The reference to "*the students sitting around in a circle*" may be a justification for reading ἐνταῦθα θακοῦσι ἄνδρες (cf. 95 note), since, to judge from the attitude of the students in our text, the commentator ought to have written καθιστάμενοι.

Ὑπόθεσις Δ΄ [Dover IV]

Πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν σωκρατίζειν *βούλεται·*
καὶ τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ψυχρολογίας διατριβὴ
ἱκανή, λόγων *ἀπόνοια* πρὸς τοὐναντίον,
χορὸν δὲ Νεφελῶν ὡς *ἐπωφελῆ λέγων,*
καὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν Σωκράτους διεξιών.
† ἄλλαι θ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς <ἔτι> † κατηγορίαι πικραί,
καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν *εἷς* πατραλοίας ἐκτόπως.
εἶτ' ἐμπυρισμὸς τῆς σχολῆς τοῦ Σωκράτους.
τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τοῦτο τῆς ὅλης ποιήσεως
κάλλιστον εἶναί φησι καὶ τεχνικώτατον.

"*A father wants his son to become a Sokratic, and* <there is> *an adequate review of the foolish talk which goes on in his* [Sokrates'] *milieu and of contrary arguments ad absurdum. He describes how the chorus of Clouds confers benefits and explains at length Sokrates' lack of piety. But, harsh new accusations are laid <against him> and* <his son having become> *one of the students turns into a father-beater paradoxically. Thereupon Sokrates' School is set on fire. This play is the finest and the most technically-accomplished of his entire dramatic oeuvre, says* <the comic-poet himself>."

With the exception of *Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι*, all Aristophanes' extant plays are prefaced with a ten-line ὑπόθεσις in iambic metre. These versicles are traditionally attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantion, the celebrated Hellenistic scholar (γραμματικός) who became librarian at Alexandria. But, there is nothing to corroborate the attribution, and the diction does not strike one as particularly antique (the use of the word ἐμπυρισμὸς, for instance, instead of the Attic ἐμπρησμός, would suit the chronology but is not so *scholarly*.

Lines 6-7 are obscure and may be corrupt. The codex Venetus reads θ' ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς which Wagner emended to θ' ὑπὲρ τἀνδρὸς to scan, while Dover has suggested reading τε τἀνθρώπου, or τ' ἐπὶ τἀνθρώπου. The accusations most probably relate to the appearance of the two creditors who, after getting the brush off from the old farmer, are left with no choice but to sue. The use of ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς in the singular may derive from the same mistaken tradition that claimed only one creditor appeared (cf. Dover pp. xxx-xxxi). In any case, Hermann has had to insert a makeweight ἔτι into the text to make the trimeter scan. My own solution is to borrow from Strepsiades' nonchalant use of the verb ὕπαγε (1298) to read, ἄλλαι δὲ ὑπάγουν αὐτὸν κατηγορίαι πικραί (though δὲ ποιοῦνται would have been sufficient). If ἄλλαι is correct, the commentator does not recognize that the two creditors are the same ones introduced earlier.

The final couplet doubtless refers to the poet's claim in the revised παράβασις, and seems to me to support emending the text of 522-3 to, καὶ ταύτην σαφέστατα ἔχειν τῶν ἐμῶν κωμῳδιῶν πρωτεῖα.

Ὑπόθεσις Ε΄ [Dover II]

Αἱ πρῶται «*Νεφέλαι*» ἐδιδάχθησαν ἐν ἄστει ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἰσάρχου, ὅτε Κρατῖνος μὲν ἐνίκα «*Πυτ-ίνῃ*», Ἀμειψίας δὲ «*Κόννῳ*». διόπερ Ἀριστοφάνης ἀπορριφθεὶς παραλόγως ᾠήθη δεῖν ἀναδιδάξαι τὰς δευτέρας <καὶ> ἀπομέμφεσθαι τὸ θέατρον. ἀπὸτυχὼν δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα οὐκέτι τὴν διασκευὴν εἰσήγαγεν. αἱ δὲ δεύτεραι «*Νεφέλαι*» ἐπὶ Ἀμεινίου ἄρχοντος.

"*The first version of 'Clouds' was produced at the City-Dionysia in the archonship of Isarchos, on which occasion Kratinos won with* '*Wine-flask*' *and Ameipsias <came second> with* '*Konnos*'. *Because Aristophanes considered that he had been rejected unreasonably, he felt compelled to produce a second revised version of 'Clouds' to prove his audience <had been> wrong. But, he had even less success and subsequently failed to get the revised version put on. The second version of 'Clouds' <was auditioned> in the archonship of Ameinias*."

The ancient commentator provides us with the year (423 B.C.) and occasion of the play's original production. He assumes that the disappointing (for Aristophanes) third prize, behind works by two distinguished, older comic-poets, impelled him to revise *Νεφέλαι* and resubmit it in competition the following year. As we know that he entered *Σφῆκες* in the Lenaia of 422 (and possibly *Προαγών* as well under the name of Philonides), it is clear that the revision (for which the rewritten παράβασις must have been completed around 418-7) was not intended for dramatic competition. The statement that the poet "*considered that he had been rejected unreasonably*" derives from his complaint in the παράβασις of *Σφῆκες* that his audience had utterly failed him the previous year (1044, πέρυσιν καταπροὐδοτε). See further Appendix 3.

Ὑπόθεσις Ζ΄ [Dover I]

Τοῦτο ταὐτόν ἐστι τῷ προτέρῳ. διεσκεύασται δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους ὡς ἂν δὴ ἀναδιδάξαι μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ προθυμηθέντος, οὐκέτι δὲ τοῦτο δι' ἥν ποτε αἰτίαν ποιήσαντος. καθόλου μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν παρὰ πᾶν μέρος γεγενημένη διόρθωσις. τὰ μὲν γὰρ περιῄρηται, τὰ δὲ παραπέπλεκται καὶ ἐν τῇ τάξει καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν προσώπων διαλλαγῇ μετεσχημάτισται. *τὰ* δὲ ὁλοσχερῆ τῆς διασκευῆς τοιαῦτα ὄντα τετύχηκεν, αὐτίκα ἡ μὲν παράβασις τοῦ χοροῦ ἤμειπται, καὶ ὅπου ὁ δίκαιος λόγος πρὸς τὸν ἄδικον λαλεῖ, καὶ τελευταῖον ὅπου καίεται ἡ διατριβὴ Σωκράτους.

"*This version of the play is identical with the first, except that it has been revised in part, as if the poet had the intention of producing it again, but did not do so, for whatever reason*. *There has been a recension of the whole play, throughout almost every scene; some have been removed entirely, others have been reworked and there have been changes made in their sequence as well as in the dialogue between the characters. Some parts of the revised version, it turns out, have been entirely altered in such ways, for example the excursus of the chorus has been changed and the scene where the Righteous man prattles to the Scoundrel and the last scene where Sokrates' school is burned*."

This looks like the work of a literature student, tasked with comparing the current revised text with some significant evidence for the original production. The writer seems to have substantial material from the original, although not necessarily a complete text. He may have had a synopsis which cited certain pertinent verses or he may simply be repeating assumptions made by earlier commentators. The writer is clear that we are dealing with a rewrite of the original drama intended for performance in competition, not a different play on the same subject. But, at the same time, he seems confused as to the extent of the revision. Dover (introduction lxxxii-lxxxiv) discusses this *argumentum* in detail. Sommerstein (p. 4) offers a translation and a brief discussion. See further Appendix 3.

Ὑπόθεσις Η΄ [Dover VI]

Τὴν κωμῳδίαν καθῆκε κατὰ Σωκράτους ὡς τοιαῦτα νομίζοντος, καὶ νεφέλας καὶ αέρα καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλ' ἢ ξένους εἰσάγοντος δαίμονας. χορῷ δὲ ἐχρήσατο νεφελῶν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κατηγορίαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ἐπεγράφη. διτταὶ δὲ φέρονται «*Νεφέλαι*». οἱ δὲ κατηγορήσαντες Σωκράτους Μέλητος καὶ Ἄνυτος.

"*He submitted the comedy <as a satire> against Sokrates for holding such beliefs, and importing Clouds and Atmosphere and all manner of foreign deities. He used a chorus of clouds as a means of accusing the man and it is for this reason that <the play> has been cited in witness. 'Clouds' is in circulation in two versions. Meletos and Anytos brought the accusations against Sokrates*."

The syntax indicates a rather hastily compiled series of notes which (like Β΄) seek to align the play with the prosecution's case at Sokrates' trial in 399. The writer does not say τῷ χορῷ...«*Νεφελῶν*», "*the chorus of 'Clouds'*", although Dover seems to take it like that.

Appendix 2

Fragments attributed to the original version

The fragments of Aristophanes' work quoted in ancient sources were collected and edited by Kock (1880-8). His numbering was followed by Edmonds (1957-61). But, the standard numbering of the fragments is now that introduced by Kassel and Austin (1984). The fragments have been published with a parallel English translation by Jeffrey Henderson (2007) in the Loeb Classical Library series.

Edmonds, John Maxwell. – 'The Fragments of Attic Comedy' (Leiden, 1957-61)
Henderson, Jeffrey – 'Aristophanes – Fragments' (Harvard University Press, 2007)
Kassel, Rudolph and Austin, Colin – 'Poetae Comici Graeci', vol. III² (Berlin & New York, 1984)
Kock, Theodor – 'Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta' (Leipzig, 1880-8)

* * *

I. [frg. 392] Diogenes Laërtios (2.18), ἐδόκει δὲ συμποιεῖν Εὐριπίδῃ,
« Εὐριπίδῃ δ' ὁ τὰς τραγῳδίας ποιῶν
τὰς περιλαλούσας οὗτός ἐστι, τὰς σοφάς ».
In his collection of anecdotes concerning famous, ancient philosophers Diogenes Laërtios states that "*apparently <Sokrates> helped Euripides to write <his plays>*", and quotes the evidence of certain unrecorded lines from Aristophanes' *Νεφέλαι*:
"*This is the fellow who writes those verbose, intellectual tragic-dramas with Euripides*."
This quotation suggests that Euripides' sophisticated treatment of moral dilemmas in his plays owed more than a little to the ambivalence in Sokratic teaching. Sokrates is not known to have written any treatises, either ethical or theological, but in this quoted couplet Aristophanes implies that Euripides introduced some of the sage's well-known apothegms into his dramas. Similarly, he claims that the celebrated actor Kephisophon contributed to the tragic-poet's dramas, because he extemporized on Euripides' text (cf. *Βάτραχοι* 1452-3). Eupolis' claim (frg. 89, from *Βάπται*) that he had contributed to Aristophanes' drama *Ἱππεῖς* should probably be taken as a veiled accusation of plagiarism, just as Aristophanes accused others of imitating his own work (cf. 554).
However, the only connection made between the Sokratics and Euripidean drama in our text comes in lines 1369-72 when Pheidippides is asked to recite a typical sample of the clever sort of modern poetry (τῶν νεωτέρων...τὰ σοφά) and selects one of the poet's prologues. Otherwise, the play makes no direct link between the two. We might assume that the lines cited by Diogenes Laërtios belonged to the original version of the play and were sacrificed when the play was reissued, although Dindorf made the credible suggestion that the couplet may have come from a play by Aristophanes' comic-rival Telekleides, who discerned a Sokratic influence on Euripides in two extant fragments (41, 42).

II. [frg. 393] *Σοῦδα* – π 1531, πηνίον. ζῷον ὅμοιον κώνωπι· Ἀριστοφάνης *Νεφέλαις*·
« *κείσεσθον ὥσπερ πηνίω βινουμένω* ».
ἀντὶ τοῦ ξηροί· σκώπτει γὰρ τοὺς περὶ Χαιρεφῶντα εἰς ξηρότητα καὶ ἀσθένειαν.
"*Daddy longlegs: a creature similar to a mosquito. Aristophanes in Νεφέλαι*:
"*They lay like two daddy longlegs copulating*."
He means that he's '*desiccated*'*, in that he is making fun of those in Chairephon's circle for being dried up and feeble*."
Chairephon was tall and skinny with beetling eyebrows. He is usually mocked as cadaverous due to his skeletal figure and unhealthy, pale complexion. Evidently, in the original version the intellectual and his companions were compared to an insect 'resembling a mosquito' because of his appearance and possibly his biting wit. The word πηνίον here is usually translated 'moth', which would suit the philosopher's nocturnal habits, but cannot be said to resemble a mosquito very closely. Therefore, it

is likely that Aristophanes was forging a composite simile like that of the grasshopper / cricket used in *Σφῆκες* (1311-2).

III. [frg. 394] Photios 398.11.

« ἐς τὴν Πάρνηθ' ὀργισθεῖσαι φροῦδαι κατὰ τὸν Λυκαβηττόν ».

"*The* <females> *are gone in a huff, headed for Parnes by way of Lykabettos*."

The reference to Mount Parnes (modern Παρνιθα) is doubtless a call-back to the entry of the chorus of Clouds, when they are spotted πρὸς τὴν Πάρνηθ' (323), but if this line refers to their departure, it raises an intriguing question. Normally, the chorus are the last to leave the orchestra, but someone is telling the audience here that they have now departed, so he remains on the stage. Is it Strepsiades, happily waving goodbye to the 'goddesses' who played him false? Has he done something that so incensed them that they went off in a rage (tumbling against each other in thunderous dudgeon)?

If it is the 'Clouds' who are referred to in this line, then, in order for them to be taking a route past Lykabettos to reach Parnes, one may presume that they had first been gathering over the Lykeion, the area used as a military muster ground, just to the south of the hill. According to Plato, Sokrates frequented the gymnasium of the Lykeion (cf. *Εὐθύδημος* 271α and *Εὐθύφρων* 2α, τὰς ἐν Λυκείῳ καταλιπὼν διατριβὰς), which may account for them massing there.

If the protagonist had sent the chorus packing at the original performance, and our revised version is only a toned-down account of the relationship, then there is further reason to emend the last line of *Σφῆκες*. There, the chorus of Wasps claim that "*a comic-actor has never before got rid of a dancing rival*" – οὐδείς πω πάρος δέδρακεν ὀρχούμενον ὅστις ἀπήλλαξ(ε) ἐχθρὸν τρυγῳδῶν. The reading of the codices ἀπήλλαξεν χορὸν cannot stand, if Strepsiades had seen off the Clouds the previous year.

Another perplexity here is the metre. The last use of anapaestic tetrameters in our version comes in the speech of the Righteous man (1008), so the context of the line is a mystery.

IV. [frg. 395a] Athenaios *Δειπνοσοφισταί* 11.479 γ,

«κοτυλίσκος» δὲ καλεῖται ὁ ἱερὸς τοῦ Διονύσου κρατηρίσκος, καὶ οἷς χρῶνται οἱ μύσται.

"*The small bowl <for mixing wine and water> sacred to Dionysos, as well as those which initiates use, is known as a chalice*."

[n.b. Georg Kaibel proposed emending καὶ οἷς to ᾧ, which identifies the *initiates* as devotees of Dionysos. But, if so, he does not explain why the simpler ᾧ would have been deliberately altered.]

[frg. 395b] Atheniaos *Δειπνοσοφισταί* 11.496 α,

πλημοχόη: σκεῦος κεραμεοῦν βεμβικῶδες ἑδραῖον ἡσυχῇ, ὃ κοτυλίσκον ἔνιοι προσαγορεύουσιν, ὥς φησι Πάμφιλος. χρῶνται δὲ αὐτῷ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τῇ τελευταίᾳ τῶν μυστηρίων ἡμέρᾳ, ἣν καὶ ἀπ'αὐτοῦ προσαγορεύουσιν «*Πλημοχόας*».

« μηδὲ στέψω κοτυλίσκον ».

According to Pamphilos, a '*liberal-pourer*' *was a stand-alone, pottery jar, shaped somewhat like a spinning-top, what some people refer to as a chalice. They* (*i.e. the initiates*) *use it at Eleusis on the final day of the secret rites, which due to this they refer to as <the ceremony> of liberal outpouring. <Aristophanes wrote>,*

...and lest I put a garland on a chalice."

This three-word citation tells us very little. It could have served to reinforce Strepsiades' promise to abandon traditional religion (cf. 425-6), since the negative form μηδὲ implies, 'you can be sure that I will not even garland a chalice <for Dionysos>'. But the two extracts combine to provide us with a possible clarification of how the old farmer understood the news that a δῖνος had supplanted Zeus in the heavens. Together they describe the size, shape, fabric and religious use of a bowl specific to the rites of Dionysos. The fact that it served a sacred function in the Mysteries may have meant that its mention in the staged version had been criticized by the initiated and had to be suppressed when the second version was written.

The bowl was *a small mixing-bowl* (κρατηρίσκος), *made of pottery* (σκεῦος κεραμεοῦν) and it was *free-standing*, having either a flat-bottom or a foot (ἑδραῖον). In shape, it *rather resembled a top* (βεμβικῶδες ἡσυχῇ).
[The word-order is misleading. A copyist assumed that ἡσυχῇ (which he thought meant 'quietly' or 'stilly') should be read together with ἑδραῖον, but it actually qualifies βεμβικῶδες with the sense of 'slightly' or 'somewhat'. We should probably reorder the text to read ἑδραῖον, βεμβικῶδες ἡσυχῇ.]
The usual name for a bowl of this type was a chalice (κοτυλίσκος); a smaller version of a κοτύλη, a small cup of perhaps half-pint capacity. Although *chalice* was the word used to refer to the bowl in relation to Dionysos, there was also (as Pamphilos explained) a ritual name *liberal-pourer* when it served certain ceremonies which were carried out on the final day of the Eleusinian rites. The word πλημοχόη contains the idea of pouring (χέω) in copious amounts (πλήμω) and so we might construe it as 'the cup that overfloweth'.
The information is particularly intriguing. The vessel (σκεῦος) is made of pottery (κεραμεοῦν) and is shaped like a spinning-top (βεμβικῶδες), which brings to mind the enigmatic δῖνος...χυτρεοῦ(ς) to which Strepsiades alludes (1473-4). It raises the possibility that, because the words βέμβιξ and δῖνος are both analogous to the swirling motion of a 'vortex' or 'whirlpool' (cf. *Σφῆκες* 1530), the poet chose δῖνος as the commonplace term used by the unsophisticated old farmer for the Dionysian κοτυλίσκος.

V. [frg.396] *Σοῦδα* – ο 918, « οὐ μετὸν αὐτῷ » ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἐξόν.
"*Not being his to…is tantamount to <saying> not being possible to…"*
According to this entry in the Byzantine compendium, Aristophanes used οὐ μετὸν in preference to οὐκ ἐξόν. Without knowing the context, one can only speculate why, but it may have been a poetic periphrasis meant to convey a supercilious tone in the speaker. One might imagine, for instance, a disdainful 'Sokrates' despairing of his elderly student by saying οὐ μετὸν αὐτῷ, "*it is not within his capabilities*". It is not a phrase which the poet would use normally, and that may be why it has been singled out for comment in this instance. [The usage seems akin to Tennyson's, "*Ours not to reason why*" etc.]

VI. [frg.397] scholion to Aristophanes *Εἰρήνη* 348e.
Φορμίων...αὐτοῦ μέμνηται ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν...«*Νεφέλαις*».
"*<The Athenian commander> Phormion…the comic-poet mentions him in Νεφέλαι*."
Phormion, son of Asopios, was a daring and successful Athenian commander in the early years of the Peloponnesian war. As he is not mentioned after his victorious action off Naupaktos in 428 B.C., he probably died soon after (cf. Thucydides 3.7).
In *Εἰρήνη* (347-8), the chorus of Attic farmers recollects the hardships they had to endure when they campaigned under Phormion's command, in particular the makeshift beds of straw and dried leaves.

πολλὰ γὰρ ἀνεσχόμην
πράγματα τε καὶ στιβάδας
ἃς ἔλαχε Φορμίων.

"*I've had to put up with a good deal of privation along with those makeshift bivouacs that I got with Phormion*."
But the same scholion which mentions the reference to Phormion in *Νεφέλαι* also claims that he was mentioned in *Βαβυλώνιοι* (426 B.C.). As Plato highlights the endurance of Sokrates on campaigns in Chalkidike early in the war, perhaps some casual comment in the earlier play about the need to have *Sokratic* fortitude under Phormion's command had been accidentally attributed to the *Νεφέλαι*.

VII. [frg.398] Antiatticist 98.1.
ζυμήσασθαι – "*to leaven*".
The addition of a fermenting agent such as yeast makes dough 'rise' and so the verb may have been used metaphorically of male sexual arousal. If the mention of Kleonymos 'kneading himself' in line

676 (ἀνεμάττετο) refers to self-arousal, then presumably 'leavening' could have applied to someone else assisting in the process, or perhaps the effect of wine in stimulating desire.

VIII. [frg.399] scholion on *Σφῆκες* 1038a

ἠπίαλος· τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ κρῦος – "*fits of shivering which precede a fever*".

The word ἠπίαλος is defined in the *Σοῦδα* (η 433) as, ὁ ῥιγοπύρετος ('feverish shivers'), illustrated with a quotation from *Ἀχαρνεῖς* (1164-5) where Aristophanes imagines Antimachos "*shivering in a cold sweat as he walks home after exercising his horse*" (ἠπιαλῶν γὰρ οἴκαδ' ἐξ ἱππασίας βαδίζων).

The scholiast here gives a fuller account of the meaning, which explains that Antimachos's sweat is going to put him in bed with a fever ere long, if the poet's curse proves effective. The scholion is a comment on a later occurrence of the word.

In the παράβασις of *Σφῆκες* (1029-30) Aristophanes defends his use of Satire, by maintaining that he has not used the comic-stage to attack ordinary 'human beings' (οὐδ'...ἀνθρώποις...ἐπιθέσθαι), but rather, like the hero Herakles, he has only gone after 'the big beasts' (τοῖσι μεγίστοις). He cites his particular bête noire, the demagogue Kleon, whom he likens to the hundred-headed hell-hound Kerberos, before adding (1037-8),

…φησίν τε μετ' αὐτοῦ
τοῖς ἠπιάλοις ἐπιχειρῆσαι πέρυσιν καὶ τοῖς πυρετοῖσιν.

"*and <the poet> states that subsequently last year he dealt with the cold sweats and fevers*."

His sequence of thought is chronological. Having first mentioned how he had mocked Kleon in his *Ἱππεῖς* (which was produced at the Lenaia of 424 B.C.), he then notes his campaign against the 'fits and fevers' in the following year. He does not claim to have 'cured' these ailments, only that he had 'tackled' the anxieties which brought them on, as if they had been opponents in the wrestling ring. He is clearly using the effect to describe the cause; he means us to understand that he had taken on the people who caused some in his audience to lose their sleep. But, what exactly does he mean by the phrase and to which of his dramas is he referring?

As the context makes clear these ἠπίαλοι and πυρετοί are the after-affects of 'nightmares' (so LSJ ἠπίαλος, II). As he explains (1040-42), "*those of you who are unpracticed in law shared your beds with the night-terrors made up of a string of summonses, witness statements and the affidavits of prosecutors, enough to make many of you leap out bed in fright and go running to seek Legal Aid*" Thus, the cold sweats and fevers stand as metaphors for those litigious individuals who habitually brought lawsuits against their fellow-citizens. Scholars have taken his words to be an indictment of 'sycophants' (συκοφάνται) who used the law courts for personal or political advantage, maliciously applying the threat of legal action to intimidate others. Also, some suggest that the poet's pointed use of the words μετ' αὐτοῦ…πέρυσιν must mean that his assault on the συκοφάνται had come in a work, now lost, which they assign to the previous year's Lenaia. Meineke put forward the view that the work in question was *Ὀλκάδες* and his opinion was supported by Platnauer (in *Classical Review* 63 [1949] 7). While Alphonse Willems suggested that the *Γεωργοί*, which has been thought to have been produced at the Lenaia of 424, may actually have been staged in 423. Douglas MacDowell has discussed these hypotheses in his commentary on *Σφῆκες*, concluding that there is no real evidence to support either supposition and that therefore the drama which 'grappled with the night-terrors' "*may have been some other play*".

In fact, the likely source of the reference in *Σφῆκες* is perhaps a little too obvious for some to agree, for the 'lost work' must surely be the original version of *Νεφέλαι*. Indeed, there is another scholion on the same line (1038c) which confirms this, πέρυσι γὰρ τὰς «*Νεφέλας*» ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν αἷς τοὺς περὶ Σωκράτην ἐκωμῴδησεν. ἠπιάλους δὲ αὐτοὺς ὠνόμασεν εἰς ὠχρότητα παρασκώπτων – "*the year before he put on his Clouds, in which he satirized Sokrates' circle. He referred to them as 'heebie-jeebies'* (ἠπιάλους), *a mocking allusion to their unhealthy pallor*". So, instead of confining himself to ridiculing the συκοφάνται who did Kleon's dirty work in the courts, Aristophanes may have been taking aim at a larger target, the dubious class of ῥήτορες. It was these practised legal professionals, who were the principal target of *Νεφέλαι*.

If corroboration were needed, the passage in *Σφῆκες* (1039) goes on to mention that these maladies, "*were also choking fathers by night*" – οἱ τοὺς πατέρας τ' ἤγχον νύκτωρ. This recalls the opening scene of *Νεφέλαι*, where the old father is anxiously pacing the floor unable to sleep because of the threat of pending law-suits.
The actual words in the original version of the play are probably those quoted by the scholiast. They are attributed, quite possibly erroneously, to a revised version of *Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι* [frg.346] ἅμα δ' ἠπίαλος πυρετοῦ πρόδρομος – "*and simultaneously a fit of the shivers which is a precursor to a fever*".

IX. [frg.400] Antiatticist 105.2.
κόλασμα – "*chastisement*".
The word does not occur in our version, but presumably was used in the scene in which Strepsiades complains that Pheidippides should not beat his father, or possibly his opening soliloquy (cf. 7)

X. [frg.401] scholion on *Εἰρήνη* 92a.
ἔφη δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς «*Νεφέλαις*» μετεωρολέσχας τοὺς φιλοσόφους, ὅτι τὰ οὐράνια περινοοῦσιν.
"*Also in his* '*Clouds*' *he talks of philosophers shooting the breeze* (μετεωρολέσχας), *because they study aerial phenomena*."

XI. scholion on line 47 (= *Σοῦδα* α 376, ἄγροικος…ἐξ ἄστεως)
Commenting on the discrepancy between the rustic Strepsiades and his city-bred wife, a scholiast says that "*she plumes herself on her family's high social-standing and her <chic> urban pleasures*" – καὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐχοῦσα τοῦ γένους καὶ τῇ ἐν ἄστει διατριβῇ. His comment on her behaviour may be just a personal inference from the extant text, but it may indicate that Aristophanes had emphasized their incongruity more fully in the original version.

XII. Diogenes Laërtios (2.27)
In our play the chorus of Clouds describe to Strepsiades the benefits that his education will confer on him, while warning him of the self-denial that he must display in order to achieve them (412-7). But Diogenes quotes an almost identical passage, transposed into an encomium on Sokrates.
τοῦτο δ' ἐνέσται καὶ παρὰ τῶν κωμῳδοποιῶν λαβεῖν, οἳ λανθάνουσιν ἑαυτοὺς δι' ὧν σκώπτουσιν ἐπαινοῦντες αὐτόν. Ἀριστοφάνης μὲν οὕτως,

ὦ τῆς μεγάλης ἐπιθυμήσας σοφίας ἄνθρωπε δικαίως,
ὡς εὐδαίμων ἐν Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησι διάξεις,
εἶ γὰρ μνήμων καὶ φροντιστής, καὶ τὸ ταλαίπωρον ἔνεστιν
ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ κοὔτε τι κάμνεις οὔθ' ἑστὼς οὔτε βαδίζων,
οὔτε ῥιγῶν ἄχθει λίαν, οὔτ' ἀρίστων ἐπιθυμεῖς,
οἴνου τ' ἀπέχει κἀδηφαγίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνοήτων.

'*This can be inferred from the comic-poets, who in spite of themselves sing his praises even as they satirize him. Aristophanes does so as follows*:

"*O man, you who have sought after the highest knowledge in a righteous fashion,*
You will live your days as one who is blessed among Athenians and <other> Greeks.
For, you are a man who thinks and stores his thoughts. You have an enduring spirit
And never tire, whether from standing still or walking about.
You do not gripe about being cold, or hunger for your morning meal;
You abstain from wine and fine-dining and suchlike nonsense."

The disparities with our present text are small and could be explained as paraphrasing, but the fact that the words are redirected toward the Master suggests that the Roman author might have found the text quoted in this form in summaries of the original play. Dover disagrees (introduction xci-ii), suggesting that some unknown, and humourless, moralist had purposely purloined the passage, but I am inclined to believe that the humour of the passage derives from the fact that airy goddesses extol

the virtues of their acolyte; the redirection in our text towards Strepsiades is rather short on comedy. My suspicion that the panegyric has been preserved from the original production was shared also by Teuffel.

Appendix 3

The revised version of *Clouds*

ἠξίωσα ἀναγεῦσαι ὑμᾶς (523)

Aristophanes' *Νεφέλαι* was originally performed in competition at the City-Dionysia of 423 B.C. and was adjudged second runner-up, behind works by the veteran Kratinos and a young contemporary, Ameipsias. Ancient commentators, however, recognized that their extant text of the drama was not the original script as performed, but a *revised* version. This is apparent from the παράβασις in which the poet himself expresses disappointment that (522-3, ταύτην σαφέστατα ἔχειν τῶν ἐμῶν κωμῳδιῶν πρωτεῖα) "*this play, manifestly the finest of my comic-dramas*" had not gained the recognition he thought it deserved, so that the poet "*went home defeated by second-rate rivals*" (524-5, ἀνεχώρουν ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν φορτικῶν ἡττηθεὶς). Clearly, Aristophanes could only have aired his grievance after the competition had been judged and, ipso facto, the παράβασις did not form part of the original script. Consequently, some ancient literary commentators took Aristophanes' remark, "*I thought you deserved to relish it again*" (523, ἠξίωσα ἀναγεῦσαι ὑμᾶς), to mean that he had intended to submit an improved version of his play in a subsequent drama-competition. A Byzantine commentator (*Ὑπόθεσις* E΄) drew the conclusion that,

"*Because Aristophanes considered that he had been rejected unreasonably, he felt compelled to produce a second, revised version of 'Clouds' to prove his audience <had been> wrong*."

However, when he goes on to state that the revised play was auditioned the following year, in the archonship of Ameinias, one has to suspect that the commentator was simply drawing an inference from the text itself, for his statement cannot be correct. Since the παράβασις refers (553) to the *Μαρικᾶς* of Eupolis, a play produced almost two years later at the Lenaia of 421 B.C., and (557) to ridicule of Hyperbolos in Hermippos's *Ἀρτοπώλιδες*, which was presented still later in 420 or 419 B.C., scholars agree that it must have been composed a few years after the original performance. These evident anachronisms had first attracted the attention of the librarians of Alexandria's Hellenistic Μουσεῖον. Kallimachos (c. 310-240 B.C.) had noted the reference to the *Μαρικᾶς* in Aristophanes' παράβασις and reasoned that the date of *Νεφέλαι* must have been wrongly recorded in the historical record of performances (διδασκαλίαι). It was his successor Eratosthenes (c. 276-194 B.C.), who first explained the discrepancy by his casual mention of the poet's later revision (ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὕστερον διασκευασθείσαις). *1 What Aristophanes purposed to do with the revision is not suggested in our fragmentary evidence from the Hellenistic scholars, but their successors had to admit that the διδασκαλίαι made no mention of a second *Νεφέλαι* and the Byzantine writer of *Ὑπόθεσις* E΄ admits that the comic-poet "*failed to get the revised version put on*" (οὐκέτι τὴν διασκευὴν εἰσήγαγεν). So, though Aristophanes makes a 'song and dance' about the poor showing of his masterpiece, there are grounds for doubting whether the revised version was made to be

performed at all. We have to imagine that his defeat rankled so much that he considered putting a revised version before the same audience just a few years later in the hope that it might receive the critical acclaim it merited. But, perhaps, if the scholiast was mistaken about the poet attempting to produce the second version in 422 B.C., his claim that it was meant to be performed should be scrutinized more closely.

The poet's disappointment over the reception of *Νεφέλαι* had already been expressed publicly the following year at the Lenaia competition of 422 B.C. In *Σφῆκες*, he makes a fuss about his previous production having been poorly received and complains that in spite of having sown brand-new varieties of humour – "*nobody ever heard better quality*" – his audience had failed to make the effort to appreciate his clever wit, betraying his high hopes of finding discerning spectators (1044-7). Such complaints, however, have to be taken in the context of convention. The poet was not averse to jury-tampering; as when his chorus of 'heavenly clouds' threaten the judges with too-much or too-little rain, if they fail to favour his play with the prize (1115-30). These protests formed part of the teasing relationship which the poet sought to establish with his audience and were not intended to carry any weight with the judges. One should view his indignation over his 'inferior' rivals in the same false light, for Kratinos was considered to be master of the genre and Ameipsias's 'mediocre' talent evidently met with public approval, since his *Κωμασταί* would triumph over Aristophanes *Ὄρνιθες* in 414 B.C.

For Aristophanes to have rewritten *Νεφέλαι* with the intention of having it produced again in competition does not square with another part of the παράβασις, where he expressly declares his pride in the freshness of his material.

"*I don't put on* (*h*)*airs, nor do I attempt to cheat you by introducing the same gags two and three times over, instead I am clever enough to be continually presenting innovative comic styles, completely different from one another, but always brilliant*" (545-8).

κἀγὼ μὲν τοιοῦτος ἀνὴρ ὢν ποιητὴς οὐ κομῶ,
οὐδ' ὑμᾶς ζητῶ 'ξαπατᾶν δὶς καὶ τρὶς ταὔτ' εἰσάγων,
ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καινὰς ἰδέας ἐσφέρων σοφίζομαι,
οὐδὲν ἀλλήλαισιν ὁμοίας καὶ πάσας δεξιάς·

So, any attempt to recycle a revised version of a drama would only have exposed him to fresh criticism for inconsistency, He does, of course, recycle jokes and scenes which went well; his audience expected no less. But, the idea of presenting the same play after it had been re-jigged in a rather cursory fashion would have required finding the Athenian audience in a singularly lenient mood, rather than facing the usual truculent crowd, whose readiness to find fault (528, οἷς ἡδὺ καὶ ψέγειν – "*men, to whom criticising comes just as easily*") is bitterly acknowledged in the new παράβασις.

In any case, is it likely that any impresario (χορηγός) would have been overly-eager to fund a revival of a play that had 'bombed' once? And even if there were others who shared the view that the competition had been a stitch-up and that *Νεφέλαι* deserved a second chance, then surely other poets would have been clamouring for their failed plays to be re-staged as well?

The fact that the new παράβασις must have been composed some four or more years after the original production militates against the supposition that the revision was made with a view to a fresh production of the drama. In the intervening period the political scene had undergone some notable changes and fresh circumstances had arisen, which craved a satirist's attention. As Old Comedy fed on contemporary political figures and topical events, any later production of the same drama would have required more than just sending the costumes to the cleaners and a hastily revised script. But, not only has the poet failed to up-date his 'revised version' in any discernible detail, but a major change in the political landscape, the death in battle of the populist leader Kleon, was entirely overlooked. Although Aristophanes acknowledges that his successor Hyperbolos has assumed his crown (of thorns), our supposedly revised version still contains a choral ἐπίρρημα, which dwells on Kleon's election to the στρατηγία despite omens of the gods' displeasure and the Athenians are urged to repair their relations with the celestial powers by punishing his blatant

corruption (595-4). Such a glaring anachronism would surely have been excised, if the drama had been intended for a further public staging?

Modern scholars, however, take this merely as evidence that the poet was careless in revising the play, Dover (xcviii), for instance, speaks of an "*incompletely revised version*" of the play, as if the poet had intended to remodel the drama, but never found the time to make a proper job of it. Dover is certainly right about the incompleteness of the 'revision'. Eratosthenes had realized that the criticism of Kleon must have been part of the original play, performed at the date listed in the historical records. But, in commenting that the παράβασις had to have been written later to replace or to supplement the original speech of the chorus-leader, he may have been responsible for postulating the 'second-version' theory in the first place. It is a perfectly reasonable hypothesis, to begin with, but it has little in the way of supporting evidence and it leaves us to find our own answer to the question, 'what constituted a revision'?

* * *

The idea that Aristophanes' revised παράβασις formed part of a more comprehensive rewrite is based on perceived anomalies in our text together with odd words which are attributed to the original script by late-Roman literary sources. From these few disparate citations modern scholars assume and confidently assert that ancient commentators possessed two versions of *Νεφέλαι*, both the original script and our revised text. Dover (lxxxv) held that, "*The evidence for the survival of the first version into Hellenistic times is overwhelming*", while Henderson (p. 3) claims that, "*ancient editors had both the original festival version and the incomplete revision at their disposal*". The evidence for this, however, is not compelling; little more than the statement by the author of the seventh synopsis that, διτταὶ δὲ φέρονται «*Νεφέλαι*». This should mean, "*Two* '*Clouds*' *are recorded* <*in the* διδασκαλίαι>", but as we know this to be false, it has been interpreted to mean that, "*Two* '*Clouds*' *are in circulation*", but strictly need mean no more than that, "*Two* <versions of> '*Clouds*' *are mentioned*".

Those fragments which are considered to belong in the original script are so insubstantial and lacking in context that we cannot form any clear picture of the supposed first version beyond what we have in the second. One has to surmise that the revised version was intended to oust the performance script and that since very little trace remains of the original there is a distinct possibility that ancient commentators possessed no more of the 'first version' than what they have passed down to us. If the performed version of *Νεφέλαι* had been radically different from what we have and if its text circulated later, then we might expect to find some echoes in later works, especially those of Plato and of Xenophon. Long before the vague talk of two versions surfaced in Byzantine commentaries, someone would have pointed out how the two differed.

It would only have needed some enthusiastic playgoer who, remembering the theatre-version, might have found himself smiling as he recalled for visitors from out of town that particularly urbane passage, the one that went "*tum-ti-tum-tum*…" adding the proviso, "*Ah, but you had to be there*".

To these doubts about the 'first' version, one can add the more intractable question of what a 'second' version was in the minds of later literary commentators. It is far from clear how one is to go about answering this. Our own use of the term *revision* is not precise. We may speak of revision as a process of correction, recension, amendment or redaction, but the alteration to any given text often has to be clarified further in practice. *2 Thus, the terminology might be the source of similar misunderstanding. The verb which Eratosthenes appears to have used is διασκευάζομαι. It crops up again in a comment of another Byzantine scholiast (*Ὑπόθεσις* Ζ΄) who gives it as his opinion that, "*This version of the play is identical with the first, except that it has been revised in part*".

The pertinent phrase is διεσκεύασται δὲ ἐπὶ μέρους, which Dover insists (lxxxii) can only be interpreted as "*in details*", but is usually understood to mean 'with regard to part'. Certainly, the opening statement that the second version is substantially the same as the original leaves little room for assuming a thorough rewrite. Yet, the scholiast goes on to state that,

"*There has been a recension* (διόρθωσις) *of the whole play, throughout almost every scene, some have been removed entirely, others have been reworked and there have been changes made in their sequence as well as in the dialogue between the characters.*"
This confident statement seems to be at variance with the initial statement, for it suggests that the poet has not merely altered part of the text, but actually rewritten much of the drama. The writer gives the impression, moreover, that he is drawing on a reliable source of information. But he then back-pedals somewhat and ends by stating that,
"*Some parts of the revised version, as it turns out, have been entirely altered in such ways, for example the excursus of the chorus has been changed and the scene where the Righteous man prattles to the Scoundrel and the last scene where Sokrates' school is burned*."
Although Dover goes to some lengths to maintain the consistency of the *Ὑπόθεσις*, the often obscure syntax does nothing to dispel the suspicion that the writer was trying to reconcile two distinct sources regarding the extent of the revision. Van Leeuwen actually suggested that the scholion is combined from the comments of two grammarians. It certainly leaves room to ask whether Byzantine scholars really knew how to interpret the play's 'revision'. If, as I believe, the later commentators had only the opinion of Eratosthenes that Aristophanes had prepared a second version without an 'original version' to back it up, his choice of words might have left them some latitude in their interpretation?
We may be able to seek some guidance from an explanatory note by the prolific Greek writer Claudius Galenos (c. 129-210 A.D.), in which he gives a definition of the term ἐπιδιασκευή. *3
"*The second version of a text, which has been made on the basis of one previously written, is said to have been re-edited, when it has the same subject-matter and substantially the same phraseology. It may lack some elements of the original; it may contain additional elements, while others may be altered*." (1.4)
Galen has in mind a new edition of a medical work, which is recognizably a corrected version of a pre-existing text. His use of an additional prefix (ἐπι-), however, suggests that there has been a sufficiently thorough redaction of the original text in order for the revised version to be considered, in some sense, a new work. Could this be what Eratosthenes was referring to with his talk of a 'second version'? Any subsequent scholar seeking to understand the meaning of διασκεύασθαι would find all the encouragement he needed to interpret Aristophanes' second version of *Νεφέλαι* as a rewrite of the original. His supposition would have been confirmed by reading what Galen goes on to say.
"*For the sake of clarity, take as an example if you like, Eupolis's second* '*Αὐτόλυκος*', *which is a* '*revision*' *of the original*." *4
Later scholars acquainted with Galen's comments would have had little trouble in concluding that Aristophanes 'revision' must have been carried out to the same degree as that of Eupolis, which Galen informs us was a complete rewrite of the original. The Byzantine commentator would appear to be fully justified, therefore, in his assumption.
We now have two works which have undergone rewrites to some extent, though we know too little about Eupolis's play to reconstruct a plot, let alone attempt to speculate what perceived faults might have necessitated a 'revision'. It is one more reason to lament the vicissitudes of our literary tradition which have left so little trace of his oeuvre. The few surviving fragments of Eupolis's play are no help in understanding his revision. Only one, contained in a scholion by the scholar Arethas (tenth-century A.D.), is assigned to one or other of the two 'versions'.
"*Eupolis mocked Lykon the father of Autolykos as a foreigner in his first* '*Αὐτόλυκος*'." *5 This scholion raises a number of questions, none of which we can answer. Are we to presume that Lykon is mocked in the original, but not in the revision? If he was mocked in the revision too, why mention the first version? Did Arethas believe that his text (if he had one at all) was the play as performed? Or was he, in all likelihood, repeating something some commentator had written in the intervening thirteen centuries?

It would appear, then, that Galen, in his effort to clarify the literary term, has complicated the issue, because we have no evidence that *Αὐτόλυκος* failed badly in competition nor do we hear of a second performance. All we can say is that, if Galen's information is correct, two comic-poets had thoroughly rewritten their plays for reasons as yet unclear. But, in fact, there seems to be a slight but significant mismatch between his definition and the example he provides us.

In citing Eupolis's play as his example, Galen speaks of the work simply as a '*revision*' *of the original* (ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου διεσκευασμένον), using the same verb found in the reference to the revision of Aristophanes' play attributed to Eratosthenes (ἐν ταῖς ὕστερον διασκευασθείσαις). Yet the verb he seeks to define is the compound ἐπιδιεσκευάσθαι which, if one takes account of the force of the prefix, should probably have served to signify a *thorough* revision. While the latter verb appears an apt term to describe the second edition of Hippokrates' treatise, its application to Eupolis's play may have been an unjustified assumption. Thus, he has given us further cause to suspect that the plays may not have undergone extensive reworking for their second versions.

There is, however, some material evidence which can be gleaned from Galen's example, since we know when it was performed. Xenophon chose to set his imaginary *Συμπόσιον* at the pan-Athenaia of 422 B.C., which drew the following comment from Athenaios,

"*This is the time when Aristion was archon, for it was in this period that Eupolis produced his Αὐτόλυκος through Demostratos, deriding the victory of Autolykos*." *6

As we know that Aristion served as eponymous archon for the year 421/20 B.C., we can place the performance in competition of the *Αὐτόλυκος* of Eupolis three years after the *Νεφέλαι* and thus his revised version might well have preceded the 'second version' of Aristophanes' play. The date is corroborated by references to Aristophanes' *Σφηκες* (frg. 65) and *Εἰρήνη* (frg. 62).

But, we do not know how Eupolis had fared in the drama-competition, so we cannot surmise whether he had been impelled to rewrite his play out of disappointment, as we have been told Aristophanes did. The likelihood, however, is that it failed to win first prize, since the literary records do not mention it among the winning plays. His previous contender *Κόλακες* had won at the City-Dionysia of 421 B.C., so perhaps we should view *Αὐτόλυκος* as a 'disappointment'.

If one supposes that Eupolis's comic-drama had not enjoyed the same success as his *Κόλακες*, then there may be some basis for believing the ancient interpretation, but it is noteworthy that the two plays said to have been revised follow closely upon a third. The play which was 'first runner-up' to Eupolis's *Κόλακες* was none other than Aristophanes' *Εἰρήνη*. By an intriguing coincidence this too was said by Byzantine scholars to be a 'revised version'.

"*Similarly, Aristophanes is mentioned in the literary records as having staged another Peace. Yet, it is unclear, according to Eratosthenes, whether he restaged the same play or entered a different <version> which is no longer extant. Krates, however, knows of two dramas, writing as follows*: "*But, at all events, in Acharnians or Babylonians or the second Peace*." *Also, he occasionally cites certain verses which are not in the work under discussion*." *7

The three 'revised versions' are closely contemporary, *Εἰρήνη* (421), *Αὐτόλυκος* (420) and our copy of *Νεφέλαι* (419/8). So perhaps there is some other factor at play. If the original versions had come down to us, we would be able to appreciate what it was that had caused the poets to rework their dramas at this particular period. But, in fact, the lack of any meaningful sampling from the original scripts, added to the knowledge that confusion between the originals and the revised versions had existed even in Eratosthenes' time, combine to suggest that we may have been seeking to clarify a distinction which ultimately is illusory.

* * *

The rewritten παράβασις of *Νεφέλαι* does not of itself lead one to conclude that Aristophanes wanted to win over his detractors with a freshly-imagined comic-drama. He states that he put a great deal of effort into composing the play and that he himself was satisfied that it was as good as anything he had ever produced. Why then would he "*paint the lily*"? If the critics had failed to discern his brilliance, that was due to their own failure, not to any fault in his play!

When he remarks, "*I thought you deserved to relish it again*", he does not imply in any way that he is offering his former audience anything but the same brilliant comic-drama which had been shown in the theatre of Dionysos a few years before. He does not say that he considered that they deserved to enjoy 'a closely-similar, reworked and somewhat improved, though only partially-revised version' of the originally-staged play.

Once Eratosthenes had use the term 'revision' to explain that the παράβασις of *Νεφέλαι* could not have been part of the original performance, it would be natural for subsequent scholars to start talking about first and second versions. Galen understood that Hippokrates had issued a second edition of one of his treatises to meet specific criticisms of the original and supposed that other fifth-century *revisions* involved similarly comprehensive rewrites. He was perhaps too hasty in his assumption. We cannot judge from the *Αὐτόλυκος* but as far as the *Νεφέλαι* is concerned, the only section of the play of which we can be certain that it was not performed in the theatre is the παράβασις. Nothing prevents us from believing that the rest of our extant text is substantially the version originally performed.

Should the sands of Egypt in years to come yield up a papyrus scroll inscribed 'A completely reworked version of the comic-drama *Αὐτόλυκος* by Eupolis son of Sosipolis, dedicated to his dear friend Lykon in expiation of the scandalous libel of him contained in the original play', one might have to rethink the hypothesis. But, failing such manna from heaven, one can only judge from the facts before us and the most likely hypothesis one can form is that the revised version of each play was not a new version of the play, but the original version presented in a new format.

The ancient comic-poet was an artist of many talents. His work combined skills in music and dance; in phonics and mime; in special effects and costume as well as composition of verbal humour. He had to expend a great deal of effort on a theatrical work that would be performed once only (if it passed the initial audition). It was a problem common to comedians down the ages, which was met with different solutions. In later times when theatres proliferated, it was possible to tour, though transporting a θίασος complete with sets and costumes was always a complex operation. Nowadays even a one-man-show is exhausting to tour so that comedians, ever resourceful folk, have supplemented their stage-appearances first with vinyl records and latterly with DVDs. Aristophanes appears to have come up with his own expedient; the book.

When one reads his new παράβασις, the most striking feature is that he addresses the audience not as chorus-leader, but in his own voice as poet, so that his declamation becomes, in effect, the *preface* to a written text.

The working hypothesis is aided by the coincidence in time of the three *revised* works. When a temporary peace was forged between the Athens and her enemies, the fighting men returned home and overseas trade with Egypt was re-established. The comic-poets saw the commercial opportunity of capturing a lost audience (those who had been besieging Skione throughout the winter, for instance) by issuing their 'successes' in manuscript on papyrus rolls. In doing so, they perhaps took the opportunity to *improve* their texts in certain minor respects, but there were other, fresher fish to fry and they would have wanted to serve their customers speedily before the dish lost its savour. The first was probably *Εἰρήνη*, which had triumphed as first runner-up only days before the Peace of Nikias was officially ratified. When this triumphed again with the literati as a book, Aristophanes was prevailed upon to reheat the 'failure' that he thought his *Νεφέλαι* had been.

When referring to winners and losers in the drama competitions, we should bear in mind that we do not know what criteria were used to judge the comic-dramas. The prize went to the best *chorus*, so perhaps then, it was the quality of the singing and dancing which decided the issue. Nobody tries to predict the winner of the Eurovision Song (and dance) Contest by reference to the lyrics of the songs. It may be that Aristophanes felt that the performance had undermined his witty drama and that on the page the same basic text would yet win over the audience.

* * *

The supposition that the poet revised his original script in order to produce a more successful *theatrical* drama has led scholars to believe that his revised version differed significantly from the original. But, if we surmise that it was intended to entertain *readers* rather than spectators, then there need not have been any major alterations to the play–script. He might have chosen to dispense with features of the staged drama which had relied upon visual humour and could not be effectively communicated by the written word, so that he emphasized sparkling, verbal conceits at the expense of knockabout fun. Moreover, liberated from the physical limitations of the theatre, the poet might have been able to expand some scenes on the page which could not be easily performed on stage. But having in mind Dover's stricture over the "*incompletely revised version*", one has to recognize that the poet made hardly any concession to the reader. Our text is substantially that of the drama as originally performed.

The ancient literary commentators can be forgiven for assuming that their extant text was the revised version intended for the stage when the new παράβασις opens with an address to the audience, ὦ θεώμενοι (518). What is more, there is no attempt to explain actions that relied on visual perception. It is left to the reader's imagination to recognize what Strepsiades is poking (1237, οὑτοσί) and handing over (1146, τουτονὶ...λαβέ). Moreover, the reader is left to assign the dialogue for himself, while comings and goings are not indicated any more than the usual actors' cues for the stage. Beyond the παράβασις it is difficult to pinpoint any new material.

If we look back at the somewhat confusing comments of *Ὑπόθεσις* Z′ and leave aside the mid-section, which seems that it might have been influenced by a general definition of revisions of the kind offered by Galen, the rest of the scholion starts to look more credible.

"*This version of the play is identical with the first, except that it has been revised in part*"… and the altered parts are said to be three: the παράβασις, the opening speech of the debate and the fiery finale.

It is quite possible that the poet altered his text in some way and that the revision of the drama was confined to these three sections, because these are the parts which have drawn comments independently.

a) The παράβασις has obviously undergone quite radical rewriting. This much was understood by the Hellenistic commentators and alerted Eratosthenes to the 'second version' originally. Clearly, much of it was composed after 420, but it may incorporate some elements retained from the original.

b) The likelihood that a choral song, the normal prelude to the ἀγών, has been omitted at 889 ("*a sign of the incomplete revision of the play*" Dover p. 208) was noted in antiquity. Besides the fact that the chorus habitually set the scene at this point in extant dramas, there is the need to buy time for a costume change. The omission is unlikely to have been accidental, as Dover implies. It is more probable that the poet deliberately chose to omit lines which were not only surplus to requirement, since the actor's character-change was no longer relevant, but because they referred to a visual spectacle which was not specifically echoed elsewhere in the debate. The scholion on 889 which describes the two combative teachers as δίκην ὀρνίθων may well, as Dover suggests, derive from comments by Hellenistic scholars and has likely been passed down via Heliodoros (1st century A.D.). We can safely discount the possibility that the actors were costumed as 'fighting cocks', but it would be entirely appropriate for the poet to have brought each on stage in turn in the same wicker basket used earlier for their master Sokrates. We can surmise that smaller cages had been brought on earlier by a slave to exhibit the two fowls (847) and so contributed to a visual running-joke.

c) The Byzantine scholiast would have been able to deduce the changes to the παράβασις and the opening scene of the ἀγών with just a little help from earlier commentators. For the finale, however, there were two pieces of evidence which would have prompted him to suspect that the poet might have recast the play's ending. One was a verse attributed to the original which suggests that the chorus depart before the School's destruction and the other is comment from the revised παράβασις. No less a light than Photios (c. 810-93 A.D.) claimed that the following words belonged to the 'first' *Νεφέλαι* (see Appendix 2.III),

ἐς τὴν Πάρνηθ’ ὀργισθεῖσαι φροῦδαι κατὰ τὸν Λυκαβηττόν.

The line is in the marching rhythm of anapaestic tetrameters and although the metre might be used in the ἔξοδος (cf. *Σφῆκες* 1516-7), it would be spoken *by* the chorus rather than of them.

The words give the impression that the chorus has left the stage before the old farmer exacts vengeance on the school. Perhaps, in this case, the destruction of the Φροντιστήριον had been threatened but not yet acted upon in the staged version? The assault would have been easier to describe on the page than to perform on the stage. But despite the weight of authority behind the name of Photios (‘saint-patriarch Photios the great’ as he is known to some), I believe that the line properly belongs with the ἀδέσποτα. Dunbar is not alone in noting that other females are capable of becoming incensed and heading for the mountains. At any rate, our text gives no reason for the Clouds to hang around Mount Lykavittos on their way out of town.

The other clue adduced as evidence for the rewriting of the final scene is drawn from the new παράβασις itself. The poet defends his comic creation from any charge of lewdness or banal buffoonery (537-42) before emphasizing that, “<*my comic-muse*> *didn’t dash onto the stage waving torches or crying* “*goodness gracious me*!”

οὐδὲ εἰσῇξε δᾷδας ἔχουσα οὐδὲ «ἰοὺ ἰού» βοᾷ (543)

It is all very well for the poet to maintain that he has not resorted to cheap theatricals up to the παράβασις. There are no confused cries of dismay or milling crowds of people waving torches in the first part of the play. But, when he introduces clamour and pyrotechnics in the finale of his drama, he seems to have thrown caution to the wind in order to gain sensational effect. A scholion on this line (Σ 543α) draws the conclusion that, because a slave rushes on bringing a lighted torch in our present text (1490), and because cries of ἰοὺ ἰού are heard straight away coming from the residents of the School (1493), this scene of shock and awe was absent from the original. The scholiast seems in two minds how to interpret the poet’s boast, because it is hard to know why he would have rewritten the closing scene in a more spectacular style only to criticize himself for doing so in a rewritten παράβασις. One has to presume that the writer of the scholion took line 543 to be part of the original choral digression which Aristophanes overlooked in his revision, unless one explains the non sequitur by supposing that the phrase beginning τοῦτο οὐ πεποίηκε was tacked on by a later hand.

Of course, Aristophanes was perfectly capable of misleading his audience on purpose. He had no compunction about making immoderate claims for his talents with a straight face, or brazenly portraying himself as Herakles and striking heroic poses after suffering defeat. In *Σφῆκες*, for instance, he promises not ‘to grind to a pulp again’ the demagogue Kleon (62-3), only to take every opportunity to do just that in the rest of the play. One may note too, incidentally, that in the later play a slave girl was introduced holding a lit torch to accompany the late-night return of PhiloKleon. So, here, his audience would probably have been expecting some shouting and torchlight to follow on from this outright denial.

In conclusion, it seems to me unlikely that the final scene of the play performed was radically different from that of the extant text. The only significant anomaly is suggested by a practical consideration. Our text includes the desperate cries of two characters from within the burning building. Whether we identify them as the owners of the school, Chairephon and Sokrates, or as I prefer, their two proxy teachers, one of them at least would have been voiced by the same actor who plays Strepsiades. This is no problem on the page, of course, but would have meant that a voice-double was needed on stage.

* * *

It may be no accident that works by Eupolis and Aristophanes were esteemed by the likes of Horace and Juvenal, if the ‘revisions’ of these works competing in the 420’s were published as books rather than archived. The availability of these so-called ‘second versions’ in private hands would perhaps help to explain why Plato was able to claim that the ‘trial’ of Sokrates was influenced by Aristophanes’ *Νεφέλαι* nearly a quarter of a century after the original satire had been performed on

stage and how Xenophon drew inspiration from the *Αὐτόλυκος* of Eupolis, originally staged when he was still in junior school.

Notes

1. A scholion inserted in the fourteenth-century codex Estensis by a learned commentator (in reference to line 553) draws ultimately on Eratosthenes' study of Old Comedy and has been assigned to him in Bernhardy, Godfrey – 'Eratosthenica' (Berlin, 1822) 212, and Kallimachos in Pfeiffer, Rudolf – 'Callimachus: volume 1, Fragments' (Oxford, 1949) frg. 454. The former can be found online in a barely legible Google-copy, while the latter may sometimes be found in a library near you.

δῆλον δέ, ὅτι πρότερος ὁ *Μαρικᾶς* ἐδιδάχθη τῶν δευτέρων *Νεφελῶν*. Ἐρατοσθένης δέ φησι Καλλίμαχον ἐγκαλεῖν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ὅτι φέρουσιν ὕστερον τρίτῳ ἔτει τὸν *Μαρικᾶν* τῶν *Νεφελῶν* σαφῶς ἐνταῦθα εἰρημένου ὅτι πρότερον παθεῖται. λανθάνει δ' αὐτόν, φησίν ὅτι ἐν ταῖς διαδαχθείσαις οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον εἴρηκεν. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὕστερον διασκευασθείσαις εἰ λέγεται οὐδὲν ἄτοπον. αἱ διδασκαλίαι δὲ δῆλον ὅτι τὰς διδαχθείσας φέρουσι. πῶς δ' οὐ συνεῖδεν ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῷ *Μαρικᾷ* προτετελεύτηκε Κλέων ἐν ταῖς *Νεφέλαις* λέγεται « εἶτα τὸν θεοῖσιν ἐχθρὸν βυρσοδέψην...».

2. If one considers two compositions of Peter Greenbaum, which have been 'covered', Carlos Santana's '*Black Magic Woman*' is a fresh version of the original, but recognizably the same, whereas Fleetwood Mac's '*World Turning*' is a thorough recension of his '*World Keeps on Turning*', a new song based loosely on elements of the previous one. Does that help?

3. Commenting on Hippokrates' polemical treatise *περὶ τῆς διαίτης ἐπὶ τῶν ὀξέων νοσημάτων*, in which the Koan doctor offers a 'second opinion' on certain views of the Knidian School of medicine.

«ἐπιδιεσκευάσθαι» λέγεται βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ γεγραμμένῳ τὸ δεύτερον γραφέν, ὅταν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν ῥήσεων τὰς αὐτὰς. τινὰ μὲν ἀφῃρημένα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου συγγράμματος ἔχῃ, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δ' ὑπηλλαγμένα.

4. παράδειγμα δ' εἰ βούλει τούτου σαφηνείας ἕνεκα, τὸν δεύτερον *Αὐτολυκον* Εὐπόλιδος ἔχεις ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου διεσκευασμένον.

5. frg. 61, κωμῳδεῖ αὐτόν ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ *Αὐτολύκῳ* εἰς ξένον.

6. (216 δ) ἐστὶν δὲ οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς καθ' ὃν Ἀριστίων ἄρχων ἦν. ἐπὶ τούτου γὰρ Εὔπολις τὸν «*Αὐτόλυκον*» διδάξας διὰ Δημοστράτου χλευάζει τὴν νίκην τοῦ Αὐτολύκου.

7. Ὑπόθεσις Γ΄- φέρεται ἐν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις δεδιδαχὼς <καὶ ἑτέραν> Εἰρήνην ὁμοίως ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης. ἄδηλον οὖν, φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης πότερον τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνεδίδαξεν ἢ ἑτέραν καθῆκεν, ἥτις οὐ σώζεται. Κράτης μέντοι δύο οἶδε δράματα, γράφων οὕτως, « ἀλλ' οὖν γε ἐν τοῖς *Ἀχαρνεῦσιν* ἢ *Βαβυλωνίοις* ἢ ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ *Εἰρήνῃ* ». καὶ σποράδην δέ τινα ποιήματα παρατίθεται, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ νῦν φερομένῃ οὐκ ἐστίν.

Post script.

This essay, to echo Aristophanes (523-4, παρέσχε μοι ἔργον πλεῖστον), has never seemed to me to be 'finished' and has consequently undergone numerous 'revisions', which our modern word-processing programmes facilitate. To those who suffer this addiction to tweaking texts, which are already polished to a high degree of opacity, I recommend the wise words of Gaius Plinius Caecilius (Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* ix. 35) to a correspondent named Atrius,

Diligentiam tuam in retractandis operibus valde probo. Est tamen aliquis modus, primum quod nimia cura deterit magis quam emendat, deinde quod nos a recentioribus revocat simulque nec absolvit priora et incohare posteriora non patitur.

"*I heartily approve of the care with which you revise your literary work, but there is a limit. In the first place, because too much attention to detail does more harm than good and then again, because it draws us away from current business and simultaneously prevents us from drawing a line under our previous endeavours and making a start on the next ones*."

Appendix 4

The ‘School of Thought’

ψυχῶν σοφῶν τοῦτο ἐστὶ φροντιστήριον (94)

It has sometimes been said that Aristophanes’ *Νεφέλαι* is the earliest extant ‘comedy of ideas’ in European literature, but as all his comedies belong on this rung of the comedic-ladder, one might better call it the first extended satire of *intellectuals*. In such case, however, it has to be borne in mind that the contemporary concept of an ‘intellectual’ is generally more narrowly-defined than the targets for Aristophanes’ satire. His class of ‘intellectual’ comprises not only the high-brow sage (σοφός), to whom we would probably accord the title ‘scientist’, but also the intelligent, thinking man (φροντιστής), who tries to understand the world he inhabits, and the person for whom knowledge is the means to an end (σοφιστής), who parlays his expertise into a professional career to gain wealth or status.

Intellectuals made an obvious target for Old Comedy. The sage was a revered figure in Greek society, since his capacity for abstract speculation about cosmic matters set him on an almost mystical plane above that of the average man. Just as we acknowledge the recondite nature of astrophysics with the commonly-heard phrase, “It’s not rocket-science”, so the ancients were in awe of men like Thales (cf. 180). Aristophanes portrays his ‘Sokrates’ as an absent-minded professor whose astronomical observations were interrupted by a gecko (cf. 169-74), a scene which has its corollary in Plato’s anecdote about Thales falling into a well while studying the heavens (another scene doubtless lifted from a comic context).

The broader category of those with an inquiring mind accommodates ‘Sokrates’ himself (266) and his *students* (101) in whose number Strepsiades aspires to be enrolled (414). It is possible that the word φροντιστής originated with Aristophanes, but the fact that it is first used in this play as part of a compound suggests that it was a component of Attic vocabulary beforehand. Likewise, I do not see good grounds for doubting that Ameipsias had referred to his chorus in *Κόννος* as φροντισταί (pace Dover, Introduction li). In any case, the poets of Old Comedy do not seem to have found the word φιλόσοφος apt for their metres, otherwise they would surely have utilized it for this *philosophical* type.

The third category of intellectual targeted by Aristophanes is easily misunderstood nowadays, because of the primarily pejorative connotations attached to the word ‘sophist’. Although it is clear from this play that a σοφιστής might have been viewed with suspicion, the word was not an automatic invitation to derision. Its basic meaning was akin to ‘expert’ and it was typically used to describe proficiency in the use of instruments or voice, or a facility with words, which the ancients classified together under the heading of μουσική. But, one can understand that, in Comedy at least, the meaning of sophist was readily traduced. For this the sophists themselves were much to blame, seeing that they were responsible for the ‘sophistry’ of the Ἄδικος λόγος and (lest we forget) that of the Δίκαιος λόγος as well. When ‘Sokrates’ gives a representative sample of such σοφισταί (331-9), he avoids naming names, so as to allow the members of the audience to decide at whom they would wish to point the finger.

One should not overlook the fact that some in the audience at the play’s original performance would have been content to see themselves represented in one or more of these categories of intellectual. So, they would have been relieved to have Sokrates and Chairephon serve as their lightning-rods. But, if anyone was rash enough to think himself a cut above his fellow-citizens in intellect and was hoping to return home unscathed by the comic-poet’s sharp-edged tongue, he was likely to be disillusioned and find himself squirming self-consciously in his seat soon enough. When, in the next year’s *Σφῆκες*, Aristophanes returned to the theme of political and forensic flummery, he picked certain self-important grandees of Athenian public life to be led onto the comic-stage to have their inflated egos punctured. These ‘sons of Sellos’ were taken as representatives of the intellectual

elite; Aischines, "*an intelligent and knowledgeable man*" (1244, ἀνὴρ σοφὸς καὶ μουσικὸς) and Ameinias, who thought himself to be "*innately clever*" (1265, δεξιὸς πεφυκέναι).
These intellectual types were by no means mutually-exclusive categories. The wisdom of the sage who studied natural phenomena was shared by the studious types who lounged about and argued in the public spaces of the Agora. It was committed to memory or to papyrus in verse, just as the ancestral wisdom of Homer and Hesiod had been in the past, and mined by forensic orators and tragic-dramatists alike for the nuggets of wit contained therein.*1 The latter, along with their brothers in song, the dithyrambic-poets, were the most frequent butt of Old Comedy and Aristophanes, having already brought the ever-irascible Euripides on stage in *Ἀχαρνεῖς*, his earliest extant work, is still pillorying him some twenty years later in *Βάτραχοι*, after his death. Although Euripides is not the sole target of the comic-poets, he was clearly considered one of the more cerebral of tragic-dramatists. His intellectual credentials are emphasized by the suggestion (Appendix 2.I) that Sokrates must have had a hand in composing his *difficult* dramas (τραγῳδίας… τὰς σοφάς).
In *Νεφέλαι*, however, the tragic-poets take a back seat to the cyclic-poets, whose ecstatic and obscure ramblings aligned more closely with the airy mumbo-jumbo of the philosopher-sage. The high-flown verse of tragic-drama was regularly reduced to farcical parody by the comic-poets, but perhaps Aristophanes felt that on this occasion plundering such high-brow works to provide scenes of bathos might strike too close to home and divert the spectators' attention to those arch-intellectuals, the comic-poets themselves!

* * *

If, as it appears, Aristophanes is intent on poking fun at the pretentious intellectuals of his age whose fractious disputes and never-ending quibbling caused amusement in the public stoas of the Agora, he also kept an eye on those who examined moral dilemmas in their tragic-dramas and others who stirred passions in law-courts and assemblies. But how did he come to portray the 'Athenian Thales' as the principal source of so much of this hot air?
His 'Sokrates' seems to be all things to all men. As one scholar once put it, "*The Socrates of the Clouds…is a generalized representation in which the philosopher is more of a type than an individual*."*2 Others have noted that much of the comic character's 'teaching' appears to be second-hand knowledge from some well-known 'sophists'. Are we, then, to assume that, much as Dikaiopolis has borrowed the rags of Euripides, 'Sokrates' has served as a tailor's-dummy to be costumed by Aristophanes as 'the hollow-man' of the Athenian intelligentsia? Moreover, while Aristophanes' lead-character shares certain similarities with the 'Sokrates' portrayed in the works of Xenophon and Plato, there are obvious disparities in his professed interests and views, which often lead us to question the comic-poet's intentions.
The assertion of Plato's 'Sokrates' (*Ἀπολογία τοῦ Σωκράτους* 18 β-δ) that the charges brought against him in the court of law rest upon calumnies made against him in the court of Comedy, hangs like a pall of smoke over Aristophanes' drama hindering our attempts to understand the man and his place in the intellectual life of ancient Athens.
κατηγόρουν ἐμοῦ μᾶλλον οὐδὲν ἀληθές, ὡς ἔστιν τίς Σωκράτης *σοφὸς* ἀνήρ, τά τε μετέωρα *φροντιστὴς* καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς πάντα ἀνεζητηκὼς καὶ τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν.
"*My <original> accusers no more say anything that is true about me < than what Anytos and co., have said >. They maintain that there is some 'Sokrates', a wise man, a thinker who has studied everything both above and below the Earth and is able to make the weaker side of the argument prevail*."
Strangely enough Plato does not mention Aristophanes by name, instead 'Sokrates' goes on to claim that his "*accusers are numerous…and no-one except a comic-poet could possibly know who they are and name them* (οἱ κατήγοροι πολλοὶ...οὐδὲ τὰ ὀνόματα οἷόν τε αὐτῶν εἰδέναι καὶ εἰπεῖν, πλὴν εἴ τις κωμῳδοποιὸς τυγχάνει ὤν)."

These statements are arch, even for Plato, but are usually taken at face value, because Plato is the corner-stone of Western Philosophy (particularly its metaphysical aspect). But, one is free to question whether *Νεφέλαι* (the only comic portrayal we have) actually misrepresented 'the Master' in all respects, as Plato would have us believe. The claim of Plato's 'Sokrates' that comic-dramatists had misrepresented him on stage has to be set against the fact that Plato's account of Sokrates' trial is itself a literary fiction and the not-unreasonable assumption that most of Aristophanes' audience were capable of discerning the real man beneath the comic persona. Plato's οὐδὲν ἀληθές is merely bluster, but it rests on the plain fact that the central comedic artifice of Aristophanes' comic-drama was the portrayal of Sokrates as the head of a school for intellectuals.

It is, perhaps, too easy for us moderns to slip into the fantastic notion. For a start, we are used to the concept of 'philosophic schools'. When we look at how particular ideas developed over time, it is natural for us to compartmentalize and group together certain thinkers with similar views. If one ancient 'philosopher' has clearly been influenced by an earlier thinker, we have no hesitation in calling the later one a 'pupil' of the other, as if the ideas had been transmitted formally one-on-one. This sleight of mind is assisted by the habit of Roman commentators of providing certain 'philosophic schools' with a common location. But, one is surely entitled to question whether Plato restricted his discourses to the area of the Ἀκαδήμεια, Aristotle to the Λυκεῖον, Antisthenes to the gymnasium at Κυνόσαργες and Zeno to the Ποικίλη Stoa. So the fact that Aristophanes portrays Sokrates and Chairephon as operating a teaching academy out of a particular building, cannot be taken to show that there was ever any actual Φροντιστήριον at a specific location in central Athens.

In this respect, at least, Plato is probably right to blame the comic-poet for 'misleading' public opinion, since the Φροντιστήριον is an unlikely institution for fifth-century Athens. There are two considerations which lead us to doubt its feasibility. In the first place, living-space was at a premium in wartime Athens. While the gods were provided with grand residences, even the wealthiest Athenian lived in comparatively confined quarters. Strepsiades reveals his envy of his wife's family, whose residence is sufficiently spacious to have public rooms with internal columns (815). But, the Alkmaionids were not your average Athenian family, and there were few wealthy individuals with dwellings roomy enough to accommodate those symposia which represented the acme of Attic social life.

It will be observed, in any case, that in comic-dramas the action has to be brought outside in order to be represented on stage. The comedians' resources did not stretch to employing the rotating platform of tragic-drama, so that if it was inconvenient to bring out a character, then the interior scene had to be narrated. Strepsiades leaves his house whenever he has to address the audience and although there is talk of the students sharing their meals (or at least forgoing them together), they are brought out into the courtyard for us to witness them pursuing their various studies. They take their rest on make-shift beds although their nocturnal studies leave little time (and the bed-bugs leave little opportunity) for sleep. In passing, one notes that the comic-poet has made the most of his stage-furniture, for the pallet-bed on which Strepsiades is called upon to cogitate is the same as that on which his son had passed the night. It is such practical considerations which often appear to decide the course of the drama. In *Σφῆκες*, for instance, it is a dramatic necessity that PhiloKleon's private court be established in his court-yard, but a lack of space would have precluded its being set up indoors. So, although it is easy for us to imagine that Sokrates did keep an open house for his *students*, it is more likely that, in common with most of his fellow-citizens, he lived modestly at home with his family and only occasionally entertained visitors, when clement weather permitted him to welcome them in his yard.

Indeed, Aristophanes seems to admit that Sokrates actually spent a good deal of time outdoors in the public spaces, when his chorus of Clouds portray him, like a meticulous bird, "*strutting about in the streets*" (362, βρενθύει τε ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς). Also, he lets slip the fact that Sokrates hangs out at the wrestling-schools, although the alleged reason for this is not his love of sport or physical recreation (179). This is certainly the picture of him passed down by later writers. Plato picks up the mention of his bird-like curiosity in his *Συμπόσιον* (221 β) and refers to his regular presence at the

wrestling-schools (e.g. *Εὐθύδημος* 271 α) and Xenophon describes the Master's daily routine, "*He was continually in the public eye, for, from the early morning he frequented the exercise grounds and the walks around them, when the market place was busy he was there to be seen, and he spent the rest of the day wherever he was likely to fall in with a crowd.*"
ἐκεῖνός γε ἀεὶ μὲν ἦν ἐν τῷ φανερῷ· πρωί τε γὰρ εἰς τοὺς περιπάτους καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια ᾔει καὶ πληθούσης Ἀγορᾶς ἐκεῖ φανερὸς ἦν καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἦν ὅπου πλείστοις μέλλοι συνέσεσθαι (*Ἀπομνημονεύματα* 1.1.10).

* * *

If, then, the depiction of Sokrates and Chairephon operating a teaching academy was merely a comic flight of fancy, what led the poet to the notion in the first place and how did he prompt the audience to accept the idea? The answer to the first question is straightforward. It offered a dramatic solution to the practical problem of how to reveal intellectual spheres of study to a theatre audience by accommodating them in a fixed (fictional) location. In this 'school' those of an enquiring mind, with time on their hands, and a private income could share the results of their observations of physical phenomena and debate their findings.
But the answer to the second question is more complicated. There can be no doubt (at least in my mind) that Sokrates the Athenian was a public figure, whom the majority of the audience (except for a few who seldom left their farms in the outlying demes) would be able pick out in a crowd. The fact that he shared the views of some of the leading sophists and expatiated on them publicly would be common knowledge, even though some of his views were not always well understood. From this common knowledge Aristophanes was able to find three hooks on which to hang his depiction of the archetypal, comedic intellectual.
The most distinctive attribute of Sokrates and Chairephon was their appearance. Their sallow complexions showed that they had little time for the healthy, outdoor life of the horse-loving gentleman and instead had come to resemble the pale-faced Moon, whose celestial motions they devote long nights to following (102, τοὺς ὠχριῶντας, 120, τὸ χρῶμα διακεκναισμένος). There are hints that, unlike the idle youth of eupatrid families, they rarely see the inside of a barber's shop or bath-house, so that they roam the streets like stray mongrels, hirsute and flea-infested (146-7). Pheidippides shudders to recall their shabby footwear and observes that, by comparison with the sturdy Λακωνικαὶ (*Σφῆκες* 1162) worn by gentlemen, the plain sandals they put on their feet seem little better than going barefoot (102, τοὺς ἀνυποδήτους) and their casual dress code is further evidenced by the thin cloaks, worn threadbare by constant use all the year round, leaving them all-but naked to the elements.
Sokrates' companions spent little time in bath-houses, which allowed Aristophanes to suggest that their personal cleanliness was little better than that of a farm labourer. Their standards of dress fell far short of the fashionable man about town, like Morychos (cf. *Σφῆκες* 506, 1142). But they shared a common reason for this apparent indifference to the usual lifestyle of upper-class Athenians. The Clouds themselves point out that the route to intellectual dominance lies along a difficult course of self-discipline (415-17), so that the real reason for the Sokratic pale complexion and careless dress was a studied asceticism and indifference to diet.
This ascetic lifestyle also provided the second hook for the comic-poet. It evidently lent an air of detachment, an aloofness derived from their aerial 'divas' according to Aristophanes (363, ἐφ' ἡμῖν σεμνοπροσωπεῖς). Their demeanour, however, was not a mere academic abstraction cultivated in the ivory tower they inhabited, but sprang rather from the rigorous self-discipline they practised. It was this shared attitude of being 'in the world but not of it' which provided Aristophanes with the opportunity to portray Sokrates' *students* like Spartan ephebes, sharing a common mess-hall, free of personal possessions, forced to resort to theft to survive. But, it was self-denial, not poverty, which gave Sokrates the fortitude to endure the hard winters on campaign in Macedonia.
The third facet of Sokrates' public persona which proved catalytic for Aristophanes' alchemy probably contributed more to his celebrity in his lifetime than either his intellectual hauteur or his

bohemian appearance. To Plato ‘Sokrates’ is a rather enigmatic, comical character who is glimpsed on occasion pottering about the streets or haunting the shaded paths of the wrestling -schools. His intellectual ramblings are largely confined to intimate meetings away from the public gaze such as the exclusive soirees in rich men’s houses. But, for Aristophanes’ drama, he represents the modern νεφελο-γερέτης, who can conjure up either side of the argument at will. This, after all, is why Strepsiades seeks enrolment in his ‘school’ in the first place. It is Sokrates’ ability to argue a hopeless case that assures the old farmer of his almost mythical powers of persuasion. In spite of ‘Sokrates’ reluctance to involve himself directly in the old man’s case, there are hints throughout the play that while his ‘teaching’ might be free, he was not averse to accepting logographic commissions, if the money was right.

* * *

In order for a caricature to be funny, it has to depict the salient features of the subject so as to be recognizable. Satire, similarly, must be largely true to life or it loses its sting. Aristophanes appears to have based his satire on the public perception of the group of intellectuals around Sokrates and Chairephon to suggest that they formed a ‘school’, which propagated the moral ambiguity used by scoundrels to escape their just desserts at law. Was he misrepresenting the group by exaggerating their unsocial behaviour and interpreting their ‘philosophy’ in his own picaresque form? There would certainly have been impressionable members of the audience to whom Sokrates’ political views were suspect. They would take his ‘otherworldliness’ to heart and see his asceticism, abstemiousness and aloof deportment as evidence of a Spartan spirit and if, as I suggest, he had resisted the pathological war-mongering of the demagogues, their comic portrayal could have seen the group branded as ‘Lakonizing peaceniks’. Although Aristophanes was alert to the populist conspiracy theories (e.g. *Σφῆκες* 488-90) that were two -a-penny in the street markets (the social media of his day), there was always the risk that some in his audience would take his satirical sallies at face value.

Those of a nervous disposition might have been alarmed at one particular aspect of Sokrates’ portrayal. Even sensible spectators who had heard him speak might have wondered whether Aristophanes knew something they did not, because from the moment that Strepsiades knocks upon the door of the ‘school’ ‘Sokrates’ students are treated as if they were swamis of a guru. They belong to a secretive, religious order, worshipping strange new deities and holding their teacher ‘Sokrates’ in awe. He is introduced while in the act of meditation, levitating in the air. The new student is not merely enrolled, he undergoes ‘initiation’ and the process is compared to the Mystery rites of Eleusis and the chthonic cult of the hero Trophonios. As high priest of the Clouds ‘Sokrates’ calls upon them to appear like a hierophant (269-74) and calls forth his ashen-faced (ἡμιθνής) student like a necromancer (632-3).

Why does the poet insist that the teachings of the ‘School’ be regarded as μυστήρια (140-3)? To Dover, the answer is obviously that Aristophanes “*is not caricaturing here but presenting a metaphor in concrete form*” (Introduction, xli); the same explanation he advances (xliii) for the use of the phrase “*you aborted an idea*” (137, φροντίδα ἐξήμβλωκας). But, in such case, the metaphor has been extended to a very significant degree. As so often, the real explanation is within his grasp, but Dover lacks the conviction to embrace it. The problem is chronology. As he himself noted, the metaphor of philosophic learning as a ‘mystery’ finds no echo in the language of the sophists. The only comparable case of Master and students forming a spiritual community devoted to self-improvement and acquiring *revealed knowledge* was the school of Pythagoras in Crotone. But very little was known about them or their beliefs, since they were a secret society, supposedly active a century before. Nevertheless, there is reason enough to conclude that Aristophanes saw comic mileage in drawing a parallel with the Pythogoreans because throughout *Νεφέλαι* we are given constant hints. The secrecy of the school’s scientific teaching, obscure even to the slave on the door, is emphasized at the outset. The frugality of the students, verging on asceticism, is extolled by the Clouds. The process of initiation which involved sacrifice and rebirth is equated with the Mystery

cults. Even some arcane apothegms said to have dropped from the lips of Pythagoras seem to be sent up in the rules propounded by the Δίκαιος Λόγος (cf. 975, 981-2). Above all, the particular reverence shown towards the Master is apparent from the slave's demeanour as soon as 'Sokrates' makes his entrance and his use of 'Himself' (219, αὐτός) may be meant to echo the respectful tone of the acolyte of Pythagoras when referring to the adages of his spiritual lord. The manner in which 'Sokrates' himself swears by Air has also been taken to be a parallel with Pythagoras's own oaths.
But, the clearest indication that Aristophanes intended his audience to draw a parallel between his school and the South Italian Taliban is the fiery finale of his comic-drama. This was noted already in the nineteenth century by the distinguished scholar of Plato, George Grote, but has not been emphasized latterly. *3 As recorded by Diogenes Laërtios:
"*Pythagoras met his end in the following manner. He was holding court in his usual company at the house of Milon, when it happened that the building was set on fire by one of those who had not been considered deserving of admittance, out of pique. But others maintain that the citizens of Kroton did it to preempt him establishing a tyranny. Pythagoras was apprehended as he tried to escape.*
ἐτελεύτα δ' ὁ Πυθαγόρας τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον. συνεδρεύοντος μετὰ τῶν συνήθων ἐν τῇ Μίλωνος οἰκίᾳ, ὑπό τινος τῶν μὴ παραδοχῆς ἀξιωθέντων διὰ φθόνον ὑποπρησθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν συνέβη. τινὲς δ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς Κροτωνιάτας τοῦτο πρᾶξαι, τυραννίδος ἐπίθεσιν εὐλαβουμένους. τὸν δὴ Πυθαγόραν καταληφθῆναι διεξιόντα. (8.1.39)
The distance in time is not really an obstacle because, in common with other *historical* figures of religious traditions, the life and opinions of the founding fathers is usually the work of the succeeding generations. In the case of Pythagoras, his teaching was 'preserved' by an acolyte named Philolaos around the mid-fifth century, so that Aristophanes would not have needed to delve into the history of distant Crotone for his depiction of Sokrates. The destruction of the Pythagorean 'school' there was dated by some as recently as 456 B.C.
The problem for us, literary students and philosophy buffs alike, is whether Aristophanes was merely being mischievous in equating Sokrates and his friends to the mystic fraternity, who claimed Pythagoras as their spirit-guide, or whether they were actually considered by some to form a Pythagorean cell. It is likely that there were adherents in Athens by this date, because Herodotos can casually allude to Pythagoreans. One might even wonder, given that discussion of the beliefs of Pythagoras only really surfaces in the fourth century B.C. and Plato reportedly sought written texts, whether the 'School of Pythagoras' might have been constructed in part out of the ruins of the Φροντιστήριον?

Notes
1. The rhythms of verse were mnemonic, but already by the end of the sixth century there are ideas being expressed directly as oral γνώμαι in prose by thinkers like Herakleitos.
2. Lane Cooper – 'An Aristotelian theory of Comedy' (New York, 1922) p. 75
3. Grote, a fellow-Sennockian, wrote a useful account of the Pythagorean order in volume IV of his monumental '*History of Greece*' (London, 1846-7), in which he drew attention to their "*feeling of haughty exclusiveness against the public without*" (xxxvii, p.405) and noted that, "*Aristophanês introduces Strepsiadês, at the close of the Nubes, as setting fire to the meeting-house* (*φροντιστήριον*) *of Sokratês and his disciples possibly the Pythagorean conflagration may have suggested this*." (xxxvii, p. 410 note 745).

Appendix 5

Flying Horses

τοὺς φασιανοὺς οὓς τρέφει Λεαγόρας (109)

Leogoras was a wealthy aristocrat, related by marriage to Perikles and the Alkmaionid clan. His son, the orator Andokides, would later claim (*περὶ τῶν Μυστηρίων* 147) that their family was the oldest in Athens (οἰκία δὲ πασῶν ἀρχαιοτάτη). As a man of means, Leogoras would have wished to display his social status by keeping a stable of race-horses and some ancient commentators assert that he was a ἱπποτρόφος, like the unfortunate Philides, mentioned by Plutarch (*Θεμιστοκλῆς* 5.2), who had unwisely refused to part with a colt demanded of him by Themistokles. The ancient scholiasts claim that Pheidippides' φασιανοί, were a special breed of horse and some suppose that Leogoras had bred horses which had come originally from the shores of the Black Sea. After all, the mythical Amazons were said to have ridden the coastal plain of the river Thermodon. But, as Sommerstein says, "*there is no actual evidence that any such breed existed*". There were, however, horses native to the region, for Xenophon refers to the horses of Armenia in his account of the Greeks' homeward march toward the Black Sea. He actually mentions them when the Greek army is not much more than a hundred miles from the river Phasis. But, his mention of them shows that the particular breed of horse would not have been known in Athens when *Νεφέλαι* was performed and in any case it does not appear especially suited to the Athenians' purpose, since it was small and high-spirited (*Ἀνάβασις* 4. 5.36, ἦσαν δ᾽ οἱ ταύτῃ ἵπποι μείονες μὲν τῶν Περσικῶν, θυμοειδέστεροι δὲ πολύ). Therefore, most modern editors have followed Aristarchos and rejected the notion that Leogoras was a horse-breeder. Instead, they consider him to have been a breeder of game birds, not unlike his contemporary Pyrilampes, who according to Plutarch (*Περικλῆς* 13.10) bred peacocks, which he used as a means to procure women for Perikles! Henderson translates accordingly, "*those fancy pheasants that Leogoras breeds*". So, one might assume that these birds were raised for the table; the sort of luxurious fare that Ameinias might have enjoyed as the guest of Leogoras in *Σφῆκες* (1269, ἀντὶ μήλου καὶ ῥοᾶς δειπνοῦντα μετὰ Λεωγόρου) and one might conclude that Pheidippides is insisting that not even the promise of a tasty meal would induce him to go back to school, though Dover prefers to see them as exotic birds which might attract the envy of his fellows.

Thus, modern commentators have agreed, albeit reluctantly, with Aristarchos of Samothrace that Leogoras had been breeding 'pheasants'. Dindorf tried unconvincingly, to argue that the bird should be φασιανικός rather than φασιανός. Rogers alone held out for a breed of horse. Yet, interpreting the young man's imagined inducement as birds raises difficulties of its own. First of all, Pheidippides' one *overriding* passion is horses, not food, nor even social cachet. Secondly, it disregards the sex-life of the pheasant; a particularly surprising oversight in the case of Dover (considered as "*one of the best birders in Britain*"). The common pheasant (ὁ Φασιανὸς ὄρνις) originated in Central Asia and was not native to Greece. One may infer from the name that in Athens, its best-known breeding ground lay around the river Phasis (now the western part of Georgia) and it may have become established in the wild through trade with the Black Sea (cf. 273) rather than migration. Supposing that some enterprising merchant had brought a few birds back he would have had to release them, since your typical pheasant, just like the panda, shows an understandable reluctance to breed in captivity. Consequently, they have always been considered game birds, rather than domesticated fowl. This salient fact was recognized by the Romans for whom the pheasant was a wild bird – 'non pastus' (cf. *Edictum Diocletiani* 4.18, φασιανὸς βοσκός, edited Mommsen and Blümner, Berlin 1893). Only since late-medieval times has it been possible to breed *poults* for release into protected areas, so that still today, the bird is only 'semi-domesticated'. Aristarchos, however, felt that there was no special breed of Phasian horses, and he was also aware that the pheasant was a game bird that could not be reared for the table. But, being a resident of Alexandria, he knew that the current ruler of Egypt, Ptolemaios VI (Φιλομήτωρ), had imported

pheasants into his menagerie in the grounds of the royal palace. So, the librarian could be forgiven for supposing that two and a half centuries earlier a wealthy Athenian aristocrat might have tried to breed the birds on his country estate.

But, the source of our information about the birds comes from a prejudiced source, the king's successor Ptolemaios VIII whose *Ὑπομνήματα* (cited by Athenaios 14.654 β-δ) were intended to emphasize the ostentatious luxury of his predecessor. His assertion that, ἐποίησε πλῆθος, ὥστε καὶ σιτεῖσθαι – "*he produced a flock <of the captive birds>, enough to eat*", should be viewed with suspicion, especially as he actually refers to one of the two varieties as, νομάδας ὄρνιθας, i.e. 'migratory'.

Consequently, it is safe to conclude that Dindorf (albeit for the wrong reason), Rogers and the anonymous ancient commentators were correct to suppose that Pheidippides is referring to the 'horses' of Leogoras. Their basic error was in supposing that φασιανοὺς referred to a specific *Phasian* breed, whereas in fact it signified a particular type of 'bird'. What has confused us is that the bird is used to describe the horse.

The Athenians valued horses for their strength and speed. It was horse-power which drove the economy. The horse could bear heavier loads than any man and carry him faster than his own feet. But the Athenian aristocrat kept thoroughbred horses in order to feel the exhilaration of speed, for mounted on horseback or astride the footboard of a racing-chariot he came nearer to the experience of flight than the short-lived expedient of jumping from a height. True flight was restricted to the realm of supernatural beings like Iris and Hermes, or the imaginary world of superhuman myth represented by Ikaros and Bellerophon, or their comic-hero counterparts like Trygaios. But, it required only a small leap of imagination for the speeding horse to break the flight barrier and to compete with the birds as Pegasos had done.

Herodotos observed simply that "*birds resemble horses*" (4.131.1, ὄρνις...οἶκε ἵππῳ), without having to specify that their point of resemblance was their speed. Anyone acquainted with the stories of the Trojan War would remember that, while the horses which competed in the races at the funeral-games for Patroklos were 'fleet-footed' (*Ἰλιάς* 23. 262, ἱππεῦσιν...ποδώκεσιν), those of Eumelos of Thessaly were the fastest horses in the Greek army, since they were "*as swift as birds*" (*Ἰλιάς* 2.764, ποδώκεας ὄρνιθας ὥς – not, of course, 'like swift-footed birds'!).

Therefore, one can appreciate that Pheidippides is here referring to Leogoras's champion colts as *pheasants*, because, as a keen horseman, he saw that they possessed the swiftness of, let us say, *swifts*, but also because he recognized in them a particular characteristic of the wild bird. He saw that they were 'fast out of the starting-stalls', or, to use a modern metaphor, they were "*<Phasian> rockets*".

This interpretation seems validated by Aristophanes' use of the word elsewhere. In neither instance does he refer directly to the bird. Instead, he describes something else in terms of the bird's characteristics. In *Ἀχαρνεῖς* (726) he refers to an undesirable kind of person as a Φασιανὸς ἀνήρ, while in *Ὄρνιθες* (68) he mentions an imaginary bird said to be pheasant-like (φασιανικός). In both cases, he seems to be alluding to 'syco-ph(eas)ants' and he is apparently mocking those litigious pests for resembling the wild birds in some respect; perhaps for their elusiveness, or perhaps even for their plaintive call.

Appendix 6

Enter ‘Sokrates’ *ex machina*

The manner in which comic characters entered and left the stage was handled with care by the comic-poets in order to exploit every opportunity for humour and keep the audience engaged. One device was to bring on a leading character in ‘heroic’ style. Old PhiloKleon, for instance, is carried on like Odysseus clinging to the underbelly of a…donkey, while the brave Trygaios is launched into the air like Bellerophon on the back of a winged…dung-beetle!
Aristophanes introduces his ‘Sokrates’ with the same abruptness that a tragedian would bring on a divine being *ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*. One minute the two stock characters of Comedy, the old slave and the old farmer, are chatting away nonchalantly, the next moment they turn around and see the Master hovering in mid-air like a divine being who can defy the very universal laws which he studies so assiduously. The poet seems to set him alongside such luminaries of the political firmament as Perikles and Kleon, who were mockingly equated with gods on the comic-stage (as Zeus and Apollo respectively) as if to remind them of their mortal frailty, lest the real gods were to take exception to their posturing. Our text indicates that ‘Sokrates’ appears like a θεός on high and from this we deduce that probably some kind of stage-machinery was employed to achieve the theatrical effect. But we know little about such machinery and it is not obvious precisely how ‘Sokrates’ enters, or why he enters as he does.

* * *

It is important to keep in mind that the phrase *deus ex machina* was used by literary critics to describe the unanticipated intervention of divine beings in tragic-drama to draw a theatrically-convenient line under a sequence of human actions and so resolve the drama. It was employed as a metaphor for what we would term a ‘plot-device’. One should remember that, when used in this sense, there was not necessarily any stage-machinery involved, or even any deity. The original Greek phrase appears to have been used first by Aristotle, when he objected to those poets who casually resorted to such arbitrary interventions.
φανερὸν οὖν ὅτι καὶ τὰ λύσεις τῶν μύθων ἐξ αὐτοῦ δεῖ τοῦ μύθου συμβαίνειν, καὶ μὴ ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ *Μηδείᾳ* ἀπὸ μηχανῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ *Ἰλιάδι* τὰ περὶ τὸν ἀπόπλουν. ἀλλὰ μηχανῇ χρηστέον ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω τοῦ δράματος, ἢ ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ γέγονεν ἃ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἄνθρωπον εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ὕστερον, ἃ δεῖται προαγορεύσεως καὶ ἀγγελίας· (*Περὶ Ποιητικῆς* 1454 α-β)
“*Thus, it is obvious that the plot-resolution ought to spring from the story itself and not from a gimmick, as in* <Euripides’> *Μηδεία and the* <feigned> *embarkation in the Ἰλιάς. But a device should only be used to explain what falls outside the action of the play*; *either prior events of a kind that could not be known to man, or events yet to occur that have to be told or heralded in advance*.”
An example of a μηχανή which might have proved acceptable to the literary critic in Aristotle is the appearance of the goddess Artemis at the end of Euripides’ *Ἱππόλυτος*. The actor taking her role needed no stage-machinery, since ‘she’ could simply step out from behind the effigy already on stage or even speak through it, so her appearance is purely a ‘plot-device’. But the reference to the astounding arrival of the witch Medeia in a flying chariot, apparently on loan from the Sun, her paternal grandfather, (cf. *Μηδεία* 1321, τοιόνδ’ ὄχημα πατρὸς Ἥλιος πατὴρ δίδωσιν ἡμῖν) has suggested to ancient commentators that the metaphor of a μηχανή may have derived from a physical mechanism that was used in fifth-century tragic-drama to simulate the witch’s flight. This inference is a possibility, but by no means certain. Depictions of the scene in later vase-paintings, which show a chariot drawn by huge serpents, may be just imaginative visualizations, since Euripides’ text gives no hint of serpents, nor is there any mention even of the usual horses of Helios. So, for all the talk of a *vehicle*, we only need to picture the heroine herself rising above the παρασκήνιον in a hoop of flame (although strictly speaking she would have risen above or next to the σκνηνή, since as far as we can tell the παρασκήνιον was only introduced in 425 B.C., six years after the first production of Euripides’ *Μηδεία*). Moreover, the daughters of Okeanos in Aischylos’s *Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης* also

claim to have reached the Scythian crag in 'a winged chariot' (135, σύθην δ' ἀπέδιλος ὄχῳ πτερωτῷ), but a vehicle that could have accommodated twelve chorus-members (representing no less than three thousand Okeanides) would have been a considerable challenge to represent. On the other hand, their mention of their bare feet (ἀπέδιλος) and earlier reference to "*swiftly-competing wings*" (129, πτερύγων θοαῖς ἀμίλλαις) allows one to assume that they probably 'flew' into the orchestra on dancing feet "*harnessed with wings*", in similar style to the Clouds in fact. This is not to deny that μηχαναί in the sense of mechanical devices were employed in tragic-drama (their use is proven by the comic-poets' desire to mock such theatrical effects), but to urge caution when imagining that anything more elaborate than a basic fly-system was employed in fifth-century dramatic festivals.

However impressive the theatrical illusions of tragic-drama may have been, comic-drama did not seek to emulate them. Comedy's aim was rather to send them up and it did so by breaking the fourth wall and eschewing any attempt at illusion. On three occasions, characters in plays of Aristophanes refer *audibly* to a stage-hand whom they call a μηχανοποιός.

When Trygaios's beetle is hoisted into the air in *Εἰρήνη*, its rider calls out to the mechanic to pay attention so that he does not come a cropper (174),

ὦ, μηχανοποιέ, πρόσεχε τὸν νοῦν.

In *Δαίδαλος* (frg. 192, Herodianos α 24), someone mentions the stage-hand (perhaps while he is giving Ikaros his final instructions for take-off) telling him,

ὁ μηχανοποιός· ὁπότε βούλει τὸν τροχὸν
† ἐᾶν κανεκας † λέγε « χαῖρε, φέγγος Ἡλίου ».

[The obelised words may have read something like, σε ἀναβᾶν' ἔκας…]

"*The crane-operator* <is standing by ready>. *When you want the pulley-wheel* to <hoist you up and away> *say, Hello Sunshine*!"

The third instance, a fragment from Oxyrynchus Papyrus 2742, quotes from *Γηρυτάδης* (160), περιάγειν ἐχρῆν τὸν μηχανοποιὸν ὡς τάχιστα τὴν κράδην – "*the operator should have swung the crane around with all speed*".

Now, although the term μηχανοποιός is customarily translated as 'mechanic / crane-operator', the original meaning of the word ought to be 'one who constructs devices'; in short, someone like πολυμήχανος Odysseus who was full of 'engine-uity'. Along with making and operating hoists, his job probably also involved creating various stage-effects, like the thunder-claps in *Νεφέλαι*, and constructing stage-properties, like Trygaios's dung-beetle or the statue of Peace in *Εἰρήνη* and PhiloKleon's donkey in *Σφῆκες*.

Furthermore, although the word κράδη can fairly be translated as 'crane' in the comic context, it was probably not the technical term for the apparatus employed to lift actors in tragic-drama where a rigid arm that could be swung out horizontally supported a pulley-block with tackle.

The term κράδη suggests a less carefully-engineered contraption than the crane. It is properly-speaking a pliant branch, especially of a fig-tree (and so possibly more akin to a bungee rope). In fact, two passages from the comic-poet Strattis (frgs. 4 and 46) quoted in the same papyrus appear to confirm this image,

ἀπο τῆς κράδης, ἤδη γὰρ ἰσχὰς γίν[ομαι
ὁ μηχανοποιός μ' ὡς τάχιστα καθελέτω.

"*May the operator lower me down from the branch as quickly as possible, 'cause I'm about to turn into a fig*."

ἥκω κρεμάμενος ὥσπερ ἰσχὰς ἐπὶ κράδης.
"*I have arrived hanging onto a branch like a fig*."

Incidentally, the latter passage is an example of a true *deus ex machina*, since the speaker is the god 'Dionysos' himself.

So, one may deduce that, in Old Comedy at least, the actor was required to 'go out on a limb' and would expect the audience to appreciate and sympathize with his precarious position. The anxious prayer of PhiloKleon as he is about to launch himself from an upstairs window (along with the

doubtful encouragement of the Chorus) suggest that the old man was about to entrust himself to the new-fangled stage-device (*Σφῆκες* 396-7). Although the text leads us to believe that he just fastens a rope around his waist and abseils down, the fact that he is left suspended over the heads of the other characters on stage suggests that he too is dangling like a fig from the 'branch'.

* * *

None of the eleven extant plays by Aristophanes has survived complete. Certainly their texts are in remarkably good shape after so many centuries of copying and recopying, but essential features of the original performances have been lost. Though they still read well on the page, despite the sparsity of our knowledge regarding the political figures mocked in them and our imperfect understanding of the social and political themes underlying them, we cannot really appreciate how the action (τὸ δρᾶμα) came across in the Attic performance area. Without the music, choreography, costumes, scenery, lighting effects etc, modern recreations are forced to rely heavily on the artistic imagination. Some inspiration may be drawn from the literary and archaeological evidence for later fourth-century dramatic performance, but we cannot yet tell whether this information is relevant to performances of Old Comedy. It is certainly worth our while to try to visualize the comings and goings of the actors, because in doing so we may be able to understand something not implicit in the text. But it is still mostly the text itself which will best alert us to the possibilities of the performance.

The initial entrance of 'Sokrates' in *Νεφέλαι* was clearly intended to be a coup de théâtre. The self-absorbed characters on stage are suddenly alerted to an 'ethereal' presence; one presumes that the audience's reaction made them look round. Strepsiades suddenly realizes that there is a person suspended in a basket (218, οὗτος οὐπὶ τῆς κρεμάθρας ἀνήρ) and asks his companion to shout *up* to him (220, ἀναβόησον). The figure of 'Sokrates' then claims to be, "*walking on air*" (225, αἐροβατῶ) and, "*looking down*" on the rising sun. So, we understand that the actor in the role of 'Sokrates' has been lowered from the top of the παρασκήνιον in a wicker basket like a window-cleaner of a high-rise building in a hoist and, though I have chosen to interpret his hanging basket as the gondola of a hot-air balloon, a sharp-witted student will have noted that this is in fact anachronistic. However plausible the notion that the philosopher floated his ideas in balloons filled with the hot-air generated in the Φροντιστήριον, it must be admitted that so far no corroborating evidence has been found in South-Italian vase-paintings.

Currently, scholarly opinion seems to have coalesced around the notion that he appears seated or standing upon a wooden rack like the one of which Homer sings, used for drying cheeses in the cave of Polyphemos. But though a 'wooden cheese-rack' is certainly a comical idea which might serve to puncture the inflated ego of a leading intellectual, it sets up no reverberation in the text. Indeed, apart from a reference much later in the play to things being hung up (cf. 869 -70), the poet does not appear to build on the idea of the Master's *elevated* thinking. The only reason for placing him on a ταρσός would seem to be the implication of μεταρσιολεσχία. Yet, there is one hint that Aristophanes had brought on his intellectual Superman on more than just a flat rack.

The first words spoken by 'Sokrates' are an irritable question, "*Why doest thou call upon me, thou creature of the day*?" – τί με καλεῖς, ὦ ἐφήμερε (223). The air-borne intellectual appears to adopt the tones of a vice-chancellor or other superior being addressing a mere mortal. This may be meant to suggest his godlike qualities or it may simply serve to remind us that he is a natural 'night owl' himself. To an ancient commentator, however, the phrase ὦ ἐφήμερε was reminiscent of the words spoken by 'Silenos' in an ode of Pindar (frg. 157, ὦ τάλας ἐφάμερε). At first sight this seems a "*far-fetched*" idea based on a half-remembered phrase, because one would have expected the Doric ἐπάμερε (cf. ἐπάμεροι in the conclusion to the eighth Pythian ode). It would not be unusual, however, for the comic-poet to be reminding his audience of a familiar Pindaric phrase, as he does for instance in a hymn (597, frg. 325) and in *Σφῆκες* (308, quoting Pindar frg. 189). He also adopts the rhythmic form of some of Pindar's odes for some of his own lyric dialogues (e.g. *Νεφέλαι* 275-90). However, in this case, the comic-poet does not quote the actual phrase from the lyric ode and,

lacking context, Pindar's fragment gives us no grounds for associating 'Sokrates' hoisted aloft on a cheese-rack with the elderly Silenos, who is said by the scholiast to have been addressing the musician Olympos.

There may, however, be more to the scholion than meets the eye and the commentator might have had more information at his fingertips than the available space allowed him to give. Let us suppose that Aristophanes was alluding to Pindar's poetic figure of Silenos *indirectly*, and drawing upon a comic source, which in turn had parodied the language of the lyric poet. In his *Παρηγορία τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον* Plutarch quotes a passage from an Aristotelian study (*περὶ Ψυχῆς* or *Εὔδημος*) in which Silenos, held prisoner by the Phrygian king Midas, is being interrogated by his captor, who wants to benefit from his store of wisdom. The old satyr is reluctant to give away his secrets and addresses him scathingly as τύχης χαλεπῆς ἐφήμερον σπέρμα (115 δ). If we assume that this interview was derived from a scene in a satyr-play, where Midas kept his prisoner in a cage, it would explain why the scholiast considered that Pindar's use of ἐφάμερε might have inspired Aristophanes and also what prompted the comic-poet to hoist the learned teacher into the air to begin with.*1

If Aristophanes was parodying such a scene where the wise Silenos is being interrogated by a mere mortal, it would be make sense for 'Sokrates' to be held suspended like an animal caged in a wicker-work basket, so that Sommerstein's original translation of the ταρσός as a "*wicker cage*" may be closer to what Aristophanes intended. But, on the other hand, one would have to account for the fact that the Master appeared to have submitted to voluntary imprisonment. The simplest way to reconcile the different situations of Silenos and 'Sokrates' is to consider what points of resemblance a cheese-rack might have with an animal's cage, for although they do not appear to have much in common at first sight, they serve a similar purpose. The cage is a means to confine the beast, whereas the rack serves to protect cheeses and comestibles from beasts. Consequently, we may envisage a wicker-work creel or basket in either function; only the matter of size need distinguish the one from the other.

In common with many other features of Aristophanes' Athens (unmade roads, cockerels, low-rise buildings with yards, street vendors etc.,) the ταρσός was a common element of Athenian daily life until the mid-20th century. Its name had changed, but its purpose remained the same. It was popularly known as a φανάρι ('lantern'), from its resemblance to a portable kerosene-lamp. Its purpose was to keep food free of flies and other insects, and out of the way of mice and domestic animals.*2

So, one may visualize an initial confusion among the original spectators. Some will have seen 'Sokrates' in lofty meditation like a cheese maturing in its wicker cradle, while others having heard his first words will have imagined themselves witnessing the interrogation of a Silenos.

Post script

The 'fighting cocks' scholion (cf. note on 889) speaks of the two Λόγοι making their entrance like cockerels "*in wicker cages*". Although there is no hint of this in our text, it is a possibility that the two contestants were hoisted onto the stage in similar style to their master in order to suggest that, in their case, their debating skills were on a par with sparring cockerels, with the added suggestion, perhaps, that money was riding on the outcome.

Notes

1. Xenophon *Ἀνάβασις* 1.2.13, ἐνταῦθα ἦν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κρήνη ἡ Μίδου καλουμένη τοῦ Φρυγῶν βασιλέως ἐφ᾽ ᾗ λέγεται Μίδας τὸν Σάτυρον θηρεῦσαι οἴνῳ κεράσας αὐτήν.

"*There at the roadside was the spring of Midas, named for the king of Phrygia, where they say that Midas caught the satyr* <Marsyas> *by mixing its water with wine*."

2. See Babiniotis, G.D. – Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας (Athens, 1998), Φανάρι : σκεύος από μεταλλικό ή ξύλινο σκελετό, βάση και οροφή και πυκνή σήτα στο πλάι, το οποίο κρεμούσαν από το ταβάνι και μέσα στο οποίο φύλασσαν παλαιότερα τρόφιμα, για να τα προφυλάξουν από έντομα και ζωΰφια.

Although my Athenian wife recalls seeing a φανάρι in her grandmother's kitchen, hung from a hook next to the ice-box (the forerunner of the present-day refrigerator), the only one I have seen in situ is displayed in the excellent folklore museum of Lemnos at Portiano.

Further Reading

Cunningham, Maurice P. – 'Medea *ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*' in *Classical Philology* 49: 3 (July 1954) 151–160
Halleran, Michael R. – 'Stagecraft in Euripides' (London, 1985, reprinted 2015)
Mastronarde, Donald J. – 'Actors on High: The Skene roof, the Crane and the Gods in Attic Drama' in *Classical Antiquity* 9 (University of California, October 1990) 247–294
Seale, David – 'Vision and Stagecraft in Sophocles' (Chicago, 1982)
Taplin, Oliver – 'Greek Tragedy in Action' (Oxford University Press, 1978, 2nd edition 2003)

Appendix 7

The Crown of Sacrifice

ἐπὶ τί στέφανον; οἴμοι, Σώκρατες.
ὥσπερ με τὸν Ἀθάμανθ' ὅπως μὴ θύσετε. (256-7)

In the course of his matriculation into Sokrates' higher education, Strepsiades is asked to put on a garland. This seemingly-innocent action immediately fills him with alarm, which Dover considered to be exaggerated for comic effect, since simply donning a wreath of flowers and leaves would not necessarily have suggested to the members of the audience that the old man was about to be offered as a human sacrifice. Sommerstein too, thought that the wreath gave only the slightest of justifications for the mention of Athamas. But, I believe there are sound reasons, two in fact, for accepting the old farmer's anxiety as genuine.

In the first place, the touchstone in Comedy is always Tragedy and we see that the crowning of the victim was a standard feature of dramatic portrayals of sacrificial rituals. For instance, in Euripides' *Ἰφιγένεια, ἡ ἐν Αὐλίδι* the eponymous heroine surrenders herself to her fate with the words, "*Give me a garland <of flowers>to crown <my head>*" (1477, στέφεα περίβολα δίδοτε) and before wielding the lethal knife, the officiating priest is said to have "*garlanded the girl's head*" (1567, κρᾶτά τ' ἔστεψεν κόρης). Similarly, in his *Ἡρακλεῖδαι*, Makaria offers to be the sacrificial victim saying, "*Garland me with flowers*" (528, στεμματοῦτε <με>). We are also told by the ancient commentator here that Athamas appeared on stage as a candidate for sacrifice wearing a στέφανον. It is clear, then, that myth provided ample precedent for the crowning of the victim as a ritual prerequisite. One may choose to see it as a residual symbol of sacral kingship in accordance with the credible hypothesis of J. G. Frazer, but regardless of its origin the crown or garland was seen as an integral part of the sacrificial rite. Furthermore, even after animals had supplanted human sacrifice in current cult, the religious significance of the garland persisted, as the words of the Clouds show later on, (308-9, εὐστέφανοι...θυσίαι).

* * *

It may be noted in passing that Euripides represents a current of rationalism by which religion sought to cover its less agreeable tracks. Instances of human sacrifice were depicted as part of a barbaric past and as having occurred only when prompted by the direst necessity. Iphigeneia was offered up to prevent the collapse of the expedition against Troy, Makaria's death was to preserve Attika from a Peloponnesian invasion and Chthonia, the virgin daughter of Praxithea and

Erechtheus (who must have featured in Euripides' drama *Ἐρεχθεύς* produced in 422 B.C.), was sacrificed to ensure Athens' victory in battle over the Eleusinians. In addition to these we may presume that at least one of Leos's three daughters (the eldest also named Praxithea) will have been sacrificed in tragic-drama to save the city from famine (cf. Pausanias 1.5.2).

Another plea in mitigation of the atrocious, ritual slaughter of virgin girls was the depiction of the victims as volunteers, ready to sacrifice their lives for the greater good. This suggests that the crown of flowers might have been meant to define their sacred status as brides devoted to the service of the deity, much as wedding-crowns are worn today in the Orthodox tradition. In any case, the willingness of the victim could be justified by belief in the essential benevolence of the deity. Euripides claims that, like Phrixos, Iphigeneia had in fact been rescued by divine intervention at the last moment (cf. *Ἰφιγένεια, ἡ ἐν Αὐλίδι* 1581-95, *Ἰφιγένεια, ἡ ἐν Ταύροις 28-30*).*1

But, as well as endeavouring to consign human sacrifice to the legendary past Euripides seeks to represent it as an act of barbarity practised by irrational foreigners who have misconstrued divine will (cf. *Ἰφιγένεια, ἡ ἐν Ταύροις* 389-91, and *Ἑλένη 155*). For this, he has some support from Herodotos's colourful tale about the Persian king Cyrus who intended to make sacrifice to the Sun of his prisoner Kroisos, the king of Lydia (560-46 B.C.), along with fourteen boys, by burning them alive on a pyre. The torches had been set to the pyre before he had a change of heart, but by then it was too late to extinguish the flames. Luckily, Apollo intervened in the nick of time, sending *clouds* to douse the fire with a heavy downpour. The preparation for the sacrifice is depicted on an amphora in Paris, which shows the Lydian king enthroned upon the pyre wearing a sacrificial crown.*2

Conversely, however, Phanias of Lesbos had claimed that Themistokles had acquiesced to the suggestion of a seer and the urging of the mob to sacrifice three youths, members of the royal family of Persia, to Dionysos in order to ensure the god's help at Salamis.*3 So, perhaps, the attempts of tragic-poets to civilize the Olympian pantheon had come not a moment too soon.

* * *

The second reason for taking Strepsiades' agitation seriously is 'Sokrates' insistence that this formal enrolment into *higher* education is required of "*all <our> initiates*", in order to present his pupils as a kind of mystical fraternity.

οὐκ, ἀλλὰ πάντας ταῦτα τοὺς τελουμένους
ἡμεῖς ποθοῦμεν (258-9).

As a result, the fact that Strepsiades equates his initiation with human sacrifice can be taken to indicate something of the procedure involved in the actual mystery rites and although we have little direct evidence of these rituals at this period, which is understandable given the penalties for profaning the secret rites, his fear of being sacrificed tells us that initiation in the *mysteries* almost certainly involved the mock death and rebirth of the initiate. This conclusion seems to me to be supported by the evidence presented by the Christian apologist Tertullianus for rites of initiation into the Persian cult of Mithras.

"ab aliquo Mithrae milite, qui cum initiatur in *spelaeo*, in castris vere tenebrarum (perhaps we might read, in castrorum vere tenebris), coronam interposito gladio sibi oblatam quasi mimum martyrii, dehinc capiti suo accomodatam monetur obuia manu a capite pellere et in humerum, si forte, transferre dicens Mithran esse coronam suam." (*De corona militis* 15.3)

"*…by some soldier <devoted to> Mithras, who during his initiation in the σπήλαιον* *4*, which was actually in the dark depths of his military camp - when the garland is presented to him at the point of a sword in a mock sacrifice and then laid upon his head, is told to push it away from his head with his hand and to move it onto the back of his neck, as if by accident, while saying Mithras is his <true> crown.*"

It is interesting, incidentally, to note how Tertullianus provides the verbal connection between the garland of pagan initiation and the martyr's crown of Christian hagiography. Nor will it go unnoticed that Jesus of Nazareth is portrayed as wearing a crown of thorns at his mock trial.*5

Notes

1. The Hebrew tradition (*Γένεσις 22*, 1-19) evidently remained untouched by any rationalizing tendency, for the child-sacrifice of Isaac is commanded simply to test Abraham's faith and the unwilling victim has to be duped and tied up. Medieval apologists attempted to reinterpret the tale by suggesting that Abraham had misunderstood the divine ordinance and by stressing that the animal surrogate was intended all along, but this came only after the Christian and Muslim myths had insisted upon the victim's voluntary submission to their human sacrifice (Jesus and Ishmael).
2. Louvre (G197) dated c. 500-490 B.C.
3. Cited by Plutarch, *Θεμιστοκλῆς* 13.2.
4. Tertullianus knew Greek and here transliterates the word for an 'underground chamber' or 'cave'.
5. The first Christian 'martyr' was actually named Στέφανος (*Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων* 22.20) and it can hardly be a coincidence that Lazaros (like Jesus of Nazareth) was 're-born' out of a *σπήλαιον* (*Εὐαγγέλιον Ἰωάνν*. 11.38). But, then, sacred texts show no respect to copyright law.

Appendix 8

Sokrates the 'Atheist'

According to Plato, Sokrates was put on trial to answer two charges, "*that he was corrupting young men and that he did not believe in those gods which his fellow-citizens believed in, but different, novel spirits*" (*Ἀπολογία τοῦ Σωκράτους* 24 γ, τούς τε νέους διαφθείροντα καὶ θεοὺς οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει οὐ νομίζοντα, ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινά). We have to take these charges on trust, as we are not offered any speeches for the prosecution. All we have to go on is a partial cross-examination of a witness for the prosecution named Meletos. Plato's '*memoir*' does not present the prosecution arguments; he merely implies that the accusations had been expressed adequately by the comic-poets over the years. Thus, lacking the legal case for the prosecution, we have no way of ascertaining whether the charges were substantive. Moreover, the Platonic 'Sokrates' complains that he should not be expected to defend himself against years of comic smears and innuendo and consequently we have no proper forensic rebuttal, and we have no way of knowing what Sokrates himself actually believed. Considering that accusations such as τὸ διαφθείρειν τοὺς νέους and τὸ νομίζειν καινὰ δαιμόνια are the sort of vague charges that might be better made in the court of Comedy, before an audience of θεατές rather than a jury of δικαστές, one begins to suspect that perhaps Plato might have simply fabricated the charge-sheet against 'Sokrates' to suit his own literary ends.

Prima facie, the charge of 'corrupting the young' was easy to make, but hard to prove, since it depended on the prosecutor's ability to enlist the prejudices of the jury. The debate in *Νεφέλαι* between the two sides of the argument portrays a theatrical trial in which the corrupting effect of traditional education in regard to sexual morality is matched against that of contemporary, scientific education which tramples on the '*moral*' principles advanced by religion. Both sides of the debate, of course, are products of the Sokratic School according to Aristophanes' satire. But, the fact that

the defender of traditional religion admits his defeat, suggests that, thanks to Sokrates' scepticism, an otherwise 'immoral' viewpoint could sometimes be justified by some devious rationale and triumph over the 'righteous' position. In his concession he points out, if my reconstruction of the passage is accepted, that he had been accustomed to winning the moral argument in the past (1102).
The *Νεφέλαι* also makes a clear case for the School's 'introduction of new deities'. As well as the Clouds themselves, Sokrates invokes Ἀήρ (264), Αἰθήρ (265) and Ἀναπνοή - Χάος - Ἀήρ (627). These universal elements were unquestionably eternal, but unlike the anthropomorphic powers of Olympos were not considered entities that were open to human influence. Therein lay a crucial distinction. But the comic-poet treats them as if they ought to be, and so lays the School open to the charge that it seeks to replace Athens' tutelary gods with new powers that demand attention and respect in return for their favours (1115-31), like flighty 'divas'. This is certainly treading on dangerous ground, but the Athenians were open to recognizing imported deities alongside their own pantheon. The Mother-goddess Kybele and Dionysos's alter-ego Sabazios were both introduced around this time from Phrygia. Their cults probably originated among the slave population (cf. *Σφῆκες* 8-9), but the cult of Asklepios, brought from Aigina at the outbreak of the war in 431, was introduced officially in 421. If the Dorian cult had been supported by the reputedly Lakonizing Sokratic school, it would help to explain the enigmatic reference by Plato's 'Sokrates' to offering a cock to Asklepios (*Φαίδων* 118 α, τῷ Ἀσκληπίῳ ὀφείλομεν ἀλεκτρυόνα).

* * *

The *Νεφέλαι* of Aristophanes was not by any means the only comic-drama to deride the public persona of Sokrates, but it is the only play to which Plato himself alludes (*Συμπόσιον* 221 β).
Although it is hard to believe that a comic-drama originally performed in 423 B.C. could have played a significant part in a political trial in 399 B.C. one may presume that the reconstructed version, circulated in book form, might have proved influential on less-perceptive members of the jury. In its revised version, at least, the drama provides ample evidence to substantiate the charges. Indeed, the prosecution's case is so convincingly demonstrated that 'there is no need for the jury to retire'. The play, in fact, serves as both prosecutor and jury for those ostensible charges laid against him.
But, as for the more serious imputation of atheism made by Meletos, the *Νεφέλαι* is much less convincing. After all, the charge laid against Sokrates is that of having introduced new deities to replace the state religion, which does not square with total denial of supernatural powers. It is clear, for instance, that 'Sokrates' newly-recognized deities acknowledge Olympian Zeus as suzerain from the fact that the Clouds call upon him (along with Poseidon, Ether and Helios) to join their dance in a hymn of obsequious adoration (563-5),

ὑψιμέδοντα μὲν θεῶν
Ζῆνα τύραννον εἰς χορὸν
πρῶτα μέγαν κικλήσκω.

Even the Master himself is heard to call upon the name of Zeus at one point (694), although it is perhaps just an involuntary expostulation. It seems, therefore, that they have taken the deist position that Zeus exists but is not really involved with the day to day business of running the cosmos. As 'Sokrates' puts it, only the Clouds should be treated as potent goddesses, "*all the rest are so much hot air*" (365, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἐστι φλύαρος). So Strepsiades agrees that those other gods do not matter. He would not so much as give them the time of day, if he happened upon them when going about his business (425),

οὐδ' ἂν διαλεχθείην γ' ἀτεχνῶς τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐδ' ἂν ἁπαντῶν

It seems evident that these new deities promoted by 'Sokrates' are to be viewed as substitutes. For instance, when Strepsiades endeavours to pass on what he has learned from his teacher to his son, he discovers not only that 'corrupting youth' is far harder than one might imagine, but also that he has been doing his best to discard traditional belief and become scientific simply by adopting the new technical terms. Even the statements which appear to deny the existence of the nation's

supreme deity turn out to be ambivalent on closer examination. If one takes his explanation of the new cosmological theory to his son for instance (826-8), it appears initially that he denies the existence of the Father of the gods, but this may be due to our misreading of his thoughts. The text leaves room for doubt.

Strepsiades *Do you see the benefits of an education, Pheidippides*? *Zeus does not exist*!
Pheidippides *Then who does*?
Strepsiades *Heavenly Flow rules, having expelled Zeus*.

Something is amiss here. If Strepsiades is actually saying to his son that "*Zeus does not exist*", or *"There is no Zeus*", one does not expect Pheidippides to respond as he does with a demand to know, "*Then, who does*?", or "*who is there*?" So, it is clear that the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν…Ζεύς is to be understood as οὐ βασιλεύει Ζεύς and that far from denying the god's existence the old man is only side-lining him in order to bring on the new signing, or else he sees the τύραννος and his wife now confined to the royal palace on a cloud-obscured Olympos (cf. 270).

The same misleading impression had been given earlier in the play. Strepsiades is heard to say "*Zeus is not <around>*; *Heavenly Flow is now king in his place*" – ὁ Ζεὺς οὐκ ὤν, ἀλλ' ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Δῖνος νυνὶ βασιλεύων (381). It is the sort of situation which can create confusion in the minds of the faithful. The point being made is that one should place one's faith in αἰθέριος Δῖνος (380) rather than the former Father of the gods (τοῦ αἰθρίου Διός). To this, one might object that on the basis of our text Strepsiades does deny the existence of Zeus, since this is what 'Sokrates' had initially taught him (366-7).

Strepsiades *Now really, in Earth's name, is Olympian Zeus not a god for you people*?
ὁ Ζεὺς δ' ὑμῖν, φέρε, πρὸς τῆς Γῆς, οὐλύμπιος οὐ θεός ἐστιν;
Sokrates *Zeus*? *pah*! *Don't talk nonsense. Zeus does not even exist*.
ποῖος Ζεύς; οὐ μὴ ληρήσεις. οὐδ' ἐστὶ Ζεύς.

Here, 'Sokrates' is not referring to divine sovereignty and, prima facie, he seems to be making an outright denial of the god's existence, for the phrase οὐδ' ἐστὶ Ζεύς in isolation can only be interpreted in this way. But, the use of οὐδὲ is awkward and requires us to understand that γὰρ (or some similar conjunction) has been omitted (cf. 902, οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶναι). The simplest remedy would be to assume that a scribe miscopied οὐκ ἔστι Ζεύς, though such an error would surely have been quickly spotted. Alternatively, as I suggest in the commentary, the letter miscopied by the scribe could have been νυ, so that he wrote οὐδ' ἐστὶ instead of οὐδέν τι. In this case it is easier to accept the ellipse of the verb *to be* rather than a conjunctive. Thus, the meaning of the original text **οὐδέν τι** Ζεύς would be, "*Zeus is of no consequence at all*".

The same sensitivity is seen at work in Aischylos's *Ἱκέτιδες*. When the barbarous herald of the Egyptians threatens to use force to violate the precinct of the gods where Danaos's daughters have sought sanctuary, he is confronted by the Argive king who remonstrates with him (923), οἱ δὲ <θεοὶ> ἐνθάδε οὐδέν <εἰσιν>; – "*Do the gods of this land count for nothing*?" Even the wicked foreigner does not attempt to deny the existence of the Greek gods (chief among them, of course, being Zeus, the protector of suppliants), but he feels compelled to give precedence to his native spirits (τοὺς ἀμφὶ Νεῖλον δαίμονας σεβίζομαι).

By reinterpreting the statement of 'Sokrates' in this way, we can absolve Aristophanes of any intent to portray of him as an out-and-out atheist, although Strepsiades' understanding of his master's words may still be taken ambiguously. This is only to be expected, after all, since he has muddled every other aspect of his education. In fact, if Strepsiades were to show that he had understood something aright, then we would probably have misunderstood it ourselves.

* * *

But, even though Strepsiades' intellectual inadequacy may account for the perceived atheism of 'Sokrates', Aristophanes has put into his mouth one phrase, which seems unequivocally an indictment of 'Sokrates' as an atheist, for in his confused account of the new theology, the old

fraudster attributes the concept of a celestial jet-stream to Chairephon (the flea-expert) and to "*Sokrates of Melos*" (830, Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος). Yet, as we know that Sokrates was Athenian born and bred, we have to wonder why Strepsiades would have considered 'Sokrates' to be in any sense a *Melian*.

Melos (later Milo, mod: Milos) is a rather modest island in the Cyclades, of geological interest, but now chiefly famed for the incomplete, second-century B.C. statue of Aphrodite which adorns the Louvre in Paris. It was never able to support a large population on its export trade in terra-cotta figurines and obsidian, but in the fifth century it boasted two intellectuals of renown; an acclaimed lyric poet named Melanippides and a dithyrambic poet, Diagoras son of Teleklytos, (while a scholion which mentions a dithyrambic poet named Aristagoras of Melos is probably just an unfocused reflection of the latter). Later writers believed that this Diagoras had been a religious skeptic and he was accounted an 'atheist', the first intellectual in history to be given this accolade. So, for ancient commentators, Aristophanes' choice of the epithet 'Melian' was intended to confuse 'Sokrates' questioning of the traditional divine order with the purportedly atheistic views of one of Melos's most famous sons. This interpretation has satisfied commentators, given the context, but it is not without problems of its own.

In the first place, Strepsiades has not previously revealed any close acquaintance with current cosmological or theological theory. The citations from dithyrambic poetry would not really be credible from him (cf. 335-9). He is content to accept Chairephon's vortex-theory on the basis of his knowledge of entomology, so one need not expect 'Sokrates' support for the idea to be derived from sophisticated metaphysics. Aristophanes himself was certainly well-informed on contemporary thinking and, as we have seen from his reference to Prodikos, he would expect his audience to be up to speed as well. But, for the elderly, uneducated farmer to volunteer the information out of the blue that 'Sokrates' belonged to the Melian school of Atheism stretches credibility.

A second reason to doubt the traditional interpretation of «ὁ Μήλιος» is the consideration that Diagoras does not appear to have been a well-known figure at Athens at the time the *Νεφέλαι* was presented. Unlike Prodikos or Gorgias, he is not known to have taught there. In fact, it is highly unlikely, given his background, that he ever set foot in the city. But, for the audience to recognize Diagoras as 'the Melian' behind this vague mention, we would expect his notoriety at Athens to have been vouched for by others. As it is, he only appears in the written record a decade later when Aristophanes refers to him by name in *Ὄρνιθες* (1072).

Admittedly Hermippos makes a passing reference to a certain "Diagoras, son of Terthreus" in *Μοῖραι* (frg. 43, a scholion on *Βάτραχοι* 320), but he does not establish a firm connection with the island of Melos so as to identify the man securely.

μείζων γὰρ ἢ νῦν δή 'στι, καὶ δοκεῖ γ' ἐμοί,
ἐὰν τοσοῦτον ἐπιδιδῷ τῆς ἡμέρας,
μείζων ἔσεσθαι Διαγόρου τοῦ Τερθρέως.

"*Greater than he is now, you see, and in my humble opinion, if in the course of today he increases to the same extent, he will be greater than Diagoras, son of Nitpicker*."

Aristophanes' later reference to him as someone with an enormous bounty of one talent on his head is a clear indication of his absence and inaccessibility, if one may compare the similarly generous rewards which were promised for the deaths of Pancho Villa and Osama bin Laden. Whether or not the bounty was real, the mention of it presumably reflects the fact of his being perceived as an enemy of the state. The explanation given that he had derided the Mysteries in his poetry and that this might have motivated 'the desecration of the Herms' cannot be proven either way. But, if there is truth to the tale, then his blasphemous verse most likely post-dated the original performance of *Νεφέλαι*. Consequently, it is generally thought that, as Henderson (1998) says, "*Diagoras was outlawed by the Athenian Assembly around the time Aristophanes was revising 'Clouds'*", so that this allusion to Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος is a later insertion which was added when Aristophanes re-issued *Νεφέλαι*, perhaps five or more years after its original performance in competition. But, if the

epithet had formed part of the first version, it would be the only evidence of Diagoras's notoriety in the late 420's and it must cause one to wonder why a pariah like him was not mentioned by any other writer at the time.

There is, I surmise, another explanation for Strepsiades' use of the epithet which better suits the political topography of the period and agrees with the conventions of Old Comedy. In the first place, one can recognize a common, comedic trope in describing an eminent Athenian as a foreigner. This does not strike us as particularly amusing now, since we are taught to think of such jibes as politically-incorrect (though the French, of course, are an exception). But the Athenian audience found such mockery hilarious and literal-minded historians, who should have been aware of their source, have sometimes taken the claims at face-value. Usually, the joke is little more than word-play, e.g. the mockery of Kleon 'the Paphlagonian', which was justified by his 'huffing and puffing' (παφλάζειν) in the Assembly. Presumably, "*that other foreigner* (ξένος τις ἕτερος), *the son of Akestor*" (*Σφῆκες* 1220-1), is derided because of his father's commercial connections with the Mysians. Even the great Themistokles is scorned as a half-breed for having a Thracian mother, when in fact she was an Athenian noblewoman. In Old Comedy, an upper-class Athenian could be ridiculed for his supposed foreignness simply because such jibes were patently untrue.

So, in the case of Sokrates, the audience were well aware of his pedigree. No one thought that his ancestors hailed from the island of Melos. But, there could have been some real event that justified a comic-poet trying to make out that he was 'a Melian'. In this play, the old farmer is concerned with the speaking skills that 'Sokrates' can impart to his son and so, although he is talking about 'Sokrates' theological tenets, what concerns him most and what drew attention to his 'school' was the ability to make the most of a poor argument. Consequently, it seems to me more likely that Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος alludes to a recent display of Sokratic eloquence in a public forum.

Kleon and men like him would have taken an early interest in Melos. The islanders were one of the few Dorian settlements in the Cyclades and natural allies of the Peloponnesians. But, since they lacked numbers and had no naval strength to speak of, they took a strictly neutral stance. This did not fit well with the expansionist policy promoted by the Periklean faction and plans were laid to take control of the island's large, natural harbour. Three years before *Νεφέλαι* was presented to the public, their plans to subjugate Melos would have been debated in the Assembly. Thucydides (3.91) records the result, but not the debate before the assault. It is not known whether anyone dared to speak openly against the imperialists' tactics of 'shock and awe' (an Athenian fleet of sixty warships carrying two thousand marines showed up at Melos and demanded submission), but given Sokrates' later record for facing up to injustice, his rhetorical skills and his Lakonian sympathies it would not be unreasonable to suppose that he might have spoken in defence of the Melians' neutrality, or that public opinion at any rate perceived his hand behind the speech. Therefore, Strepsiades could be alluding to a debate in the Assembly some three years before, one in which that pesky gadfly had sought to sting the collective conscience into resisting a barbarous policy. But the sage words which might have enthralled a group of educated symposiasts could not sway the raucous masses over which the booming voice of Kleon had ruled. This seems to be the deduction to be drawn from the lines of Ameipsias (frg. 9, cited by Diogenes Laërtios),

Σώκρατες, ἀνδρῶν βέλτιστε ὀλίγων, πολλῶν δὲ ματαιότατε – "*Sokrates, you paragon among men when the company is small, but so very ineffective in a crowd*."

One may surmise, at any rate, that his plea to the people might have touched a nerve, so that despite running counter to popular feeling at the time, it had nonetheless left its sting in their memory.

Appendix 9

The Apple of his Eye?

μήλῳ βληθεὶς ὑπὸ πορνιδίου τῆς εὐκλείας ἀποθραυσθῇς (997)

The Δίκαιος Λόγος warns young men to guard their reputation by resisting the allure of those female Sirens who try to sell them sexual gratification. As Sommerstein translates, "*you may be struck by an apple thrown at you by a little whore and so have your good name shattered*". If one wonders why the girl is tossing fruit about, Dover explains, "*Throwing fruit at a man was a means by which a girl could suggest to him…that she would let him try to seduce her*". But was this really the case? The girl is a prostitute; would she need to throw the young man an apple in order for him to understand that she was available? Dover maintains that the girl used the apple as a symbol of her availability, not wishing to put it into words. So she was a demure prostitute? Perhaps she feared arrest for soliciting? But, if 'tossing an apple' was the recognized symbolic gesture, then that would have rendered her just as culpable in any case. Although Dover likens the use of an apple to a modern miss sending smoke-signals from her cigarette, I cannot help but feel that he was letting wishful thinking get the upper hand, or that perhaps he had watched one too many film noir.

Yet, commentators are agreed that 'tossing an apple' was indeed an accepted courting custom, so that the gesture has passed into popular culture as a result. *Millennials* may recall the scene in Walt Disney's animated version of the tale of '*Aladdin*' (released in 1992), in which, to the strains of '*A whole new world*' (vide the video on YouTube), the hero invites his love Jasmine on a magic-carpet ride. While they soar above the temples of Ancient Greece, he manages to snatch a red apple from a tree and deftly flick it back to his princess. This, surely, is adequate proof; even if Aladdin does reverse Aristophanes' gender-roles.

The Romans appear to have thought so, at any rate; Catullus wrote (carmen lxv, 19-24),

ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum
procurrit casto virginis e gremio,
quod miserae oblitae molli sub veste locatum,
dum adventu matris prosilit, excutitur,
atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,
huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor

"*…like an apple, a secret gift sent by a lover, rolls from the lap of a chaste maid, because the poor girl had forgotten that it was secreted under the soft folds of her garment and it's shaken out when she jumps at her mother's approach, and it suddenly falls to the ground, as a blush of embarrassment suffuses her dismayed face*."

In similar vein Propertius would write of returning late one night after a bout of drinking with his friends to find his beloved 'Cynthia' asleep. Enraptured by the vision of her loveliness, he wants to scoop her up in his arms, but contents himself with laying his party-crown of flowers by her head and tenderly brushing a stray lock of hair from her face. Then, he remembers that he has brought home a gift for her (carmen 1. iii, 24-6),

nunc furtiva cavis poma dabam manibus;
omniaque ingrato largibar munera somno,
munera de prono saepe voluta sinu.

"*Then, cupping my hands I started to give her the apples I had stolen*; *but received no thanks from her sleeping for all the lavished gifts, for one after another they all rolled down from her sloping bosom*."

Now, it would not be surprising to find that Catullus's playful coda to his poetic letter, and the younger poet's unlucky attempt to mollify his lover had been inspired by Alexandrian models. Propertius certainly acknowledged Kallimachos as a particular source of inspiration. But, it is to the idylls of Theokritos that scholars have pointed for the image of apples as love-token (cf. C. J.

Fordyce in 'Catullus', Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968). They mention his fifth εἰδύλλιον (88-9) especially, where the goatherd Komatas is heard to brag,

βάλλει καὶ μάλοισι τὸν αἰπόλον ἁ Κλεαρίστα
τὰς αἶγας παρελᾶντα καὶ ἀδύ τι ποππυλιάσδει.

"*Kleäriste hits her goatherd with apples as he leads his goats by and blows him sweet kisses*."

This idyllic scene is reminiscent of the situation described by the 'Righteous man' in which a girl *tosses* fruit at her admirer, although in this case the female is a shepherdess of blameless reputation.

There are, however, two disparities between this precursor and its Latin heirs, which appear to have been ignored for the benefit of the comparison. Firstly, in the Greek idyll as in the comic -poet's imaginary scene, the apples are being thrown rather than simply presented as gifts and secondly, they are directed at a boy by a girl, rather than vice versa. Perhaps, one may adduce the natural impetuosity of the feminine temperament to account for the first difference, but to deign to observe that it is a female doing what a male would normally do might be construed nowadays as inappropriate sexism?

Yet the disparities are highlighted when one considers another Theokritean idyll which offers a better parallel with the games of Latin lovers. In the third εἰδύλλιον (11-2), another goatherd promises his lady-love,

ἠνίδε τοι δέκα μᾶλα φέρω· τηνῶθε καθεῖλον
ὦ μ' ἐκέλευ' καθελεῖν τύ· καὶ αὔριον ἄλλα τοι οἰσῶ.

"*See here, I bring you ten apples. I fetched them from where you told me. Tomorrow I'll bring you more*."

Like the Latin elegies, the original Greek elegy pictures a young man presenting his girlfriend with fruit in token of his affection. The goatherd is perhaps a little too overwhelming with his offer (a clear indication that he is suffering a case of *swain-fever*), but at least he is not tossing the apples at her. Later in the idyll he provides a mythical precedent for his behaviour (40-2).

Ἱππομένης, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένον ἤθελε γᾶμαι
μᾶλ' ἐν χέρσιν ἐλὼν δρόμον ἄνυεν· ἁ δ' Ἀταλάντα
ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἅλατ' ἔρωτα.

"*When he wanted to wed the maid, Hippomenes won a race by taking apples in his hand and when Atalante saw <them>, she so lost her composure that she fell deeply in love*."

The myth of the maid Atalante, as told by later Roman writers, differs somewhat from the tale told by the Theokritean goatherd. To begin with, the successful suitor is named Melanion and he wins the race with fleet-footed Atalante by trickery, distracting her attention with the three golden apples given to him by the goddess of Love. So, in this case, if not actually tossed, the fruit was at least being dropped.

In the Greek idyll, however, the role played by the apples is less clearly-defined. The goatherd does not hint that they were golden, nor is it clear whether the girl was captivated by the sight of the apples held by Hippomenes or by the vision of the young athlete himself. As the tale is told by the Roman mythographers, the girl's weakness for golden baubles defeats her athletic superiority, but the Greek poem implies that Atalante may just have set aside her reluctance to wed and let Hippomenes win, overcome by desire for him. Certainly, the goatherd hopes that his tokens of love will work the same magic on his admired Amaryllis, but (spoiler alert)…, it was not to be.

It appears, then, that the elegists have adequate precedent for the quaint custom of young men declaring their devotion by giving apples to their girlfriends, but there is no tossing involved; the dropping of 'golden apples' by Melanion / Hippomenes seems to be a later embellishment by Roman writers. On the other hand, they do not imitate the more aggressive female wooing technique represented by the cheeky Kleäriste of Theokritos, or Aristophanes' young slut, and they would not know at all what to make of Galateia in Theokritos's sixth εἰδύλλιον (6-7).

βάλλει τοι, ὦ Πολύφαμε, τὸ ποίμνιον ἁ Γαλάτεια
μάλοισιν, δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῦσα.

"*Galateia is showering <your> herd <of goats> with <her> apples, Polyphemos, calling you a man <good only>for herding goats not for lovemaking*."
Apparently, the cowherd Daphnis is mocking his rival, the goatherd Damoitas, in the guise of the one-eyed Polyphemos, for failing to notice the alluring sea-nymph Galateia (who likes her men monstrous). In a fit of pique she is bombarding his goats with apples instead of him. The use of apples for this purpose does not seem to have kindled the same romantic flame in Latin elegists. In fact, they do not seem to recognize reciprocity. Perhaps, they found such forward behaviour unbefitting the delicate ladies they courted? At any rate, 'Lesbia' and 'Cynthia' are never seen to give apples as love-tokens and they certainly do not fling them at young men in bars, or at goatherds, much less their goats. Nevertheless, in Greek poetry there does seem to be a clear distinction between a man offering apples to his beloved as a token of his devotion and those 'apples' flung by women at any passing goatherd or his goat. Sommerstein confuses the issue when he states (addenda xxiv), "*the apple is virtually always thrown at the woman… not by her*", because the evidence of Theokritos is to the contrary. He may perhaps have been influenced by two epigrams which are quoted by Diogenes Laërtios in his biographical notes on the philosopher Plato (see post script below).
The male behaviour can be seen to derive from mythical precedent. The goatherd in the third idyll of Theokritos is inspired by the success of Hippomenes, but he could have reached back further to the earlier parallel of another goatherd, the Trojan Paris, who presented an apple to the goddess Aphrodite as the prize for her surpassing beauty. But, in this instance, Theokritos probably preferred to associate the young man's action with a successful outcome rather than introduce thoughts of what befell Paris as result of his gift of the μῆλον τῆς Ἔριδος.
But, then, how is one to explain the *apple-tossing* women, especially Galateia's mistreatment of the unlucky goats? It is one thing to feed a goat an apple; quite another to hurl the fruit at it. We might also ask ourselves where a sea-nymph came by apples in the first place. There does not appear to be any precedent in epic myth for these women's wanton behaviour.

* * *

I suspect that the explanation is to be found in the lyric poetry of an earlier age, for among the fragments of Anakreon's love elegies we meet these lines (frg. 358),

σφαίρῃ δὴ ’ὔτε με πορφυρῇ
βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως
νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλῳ
συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται.

"*Yes, when golden-haired Love bombards me with a rounded purple thing, he is daring me to have some fun with the cute girl in the embroidered slippers*."
Although it is unclear what the poet means by a πορφυρῆ σφαῖρα, he uses the phrase πορφυρῆ τε Ἀφροδίτη elsewhere (frg. 357) and appears to be saying that he feels a sexual attraction as a result of being 'struck by Cupid's dart'.
If, in fact, the 'rounded purple thing' is the fruit being flung by meretricious bar-girls and free-spirited shepherdesses, then one can appreciate why their aim seemed so unerringly accurate; they were not the ones actually directing the bombardment. Anakreon realizes that Eros is the one responsible, because in the case of the girl with the pretty footwear the attraction which is stirred in him is accidental. Due to their age difference, and her preference for members of her own sex, she actually exhibits no interest in him. She has not intentionally thrown any item of her 'fruit' to tempt him; rather it was Eros, embodying an arbitrary and indiscriminate sexual appeal, who had cast temptation in his way.
The girl with the elegant slippers is said to have been Sappho, the original Lesbian. It was not Anakreon's fault that she caught his eye, since he was just a man being struck by haphazardly flung fruit. In his case, the *purple* (or crimson) *ball* which leaves him '*Love*-struck' might be interpreted

as her parted, painted lips. A fragment of Simonidean elegy (Athenaios 13.604 β) sings of a girl whose voice issues "*from bright red lips*",

πορφυρέου ἀπὸ στόματος
ἰεῖσα φωνὰν παρθένος.

But the use of the plural for some of the other young women suggests that their attractiveness is multifaceted. The rustic Kleäriste probably has sun-burnt cheeks, a natural ruddiness which a city-girl could only simulate with rouge. It is a healthy glow that would normally be found on the skin of young men, as Pheidippides reminds us (cf. 120), and which could turn a shade brighter with a youthful blush. It is this glow of ardour on a young man's cheeks to which the tragic-poet Phrynichos referred (frg. 13, in Athenaios 13.604 α), "*The light of love glows on crimson cheeks*".

λάμπει δ' ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρῇσι φῶς ἔρωτος.

The 'apples' flung by Galateia could be from her cheeks too, but she is a sea-nymph after all and does not have to bother with a swimsuit, so the goats are probably being treated to a view of her round, roseate breasts. This is how Aristophanes usually pictures young women's μῆλα, as e.g. *Ἐκκλησιάζουσαι* 903-4, ἐπὶ τοῖς μήλοις ἐπανθεῖ. But the single apple which might have hit the young man in the 'Righteous Man's' imagination is once again the bar-girl's florid and luscious, open mouth, which would arouse in him passions already inflamed by the lascivious gyrations of the dancing-girl.

In either case, it seems to me that the fruit being 'tossed' is actually a metaphor for a woman's sex-appeal, and it is simply a bolder poetic form of the simile which we can find sometimes in English verse, e.g. in Edmund Spenser's *Epithalamion* (173),

"Her cheekes lyke apples which the sun hath rudded,
Her lips like cherryes charming men to byte."

* * *

Any poet knows that Love enters through the eyes and when Anakreon wanted a metaphor to convey the speed of light with which the alluring image of the beloved is transferred onto the lover's retina, he could have simply alluded to the swift flight of Love's arrow. But instead he portrayed the rapidity of Love's assault by picturing a figurative purple or crimson ball, which represented the specific image of her cheek or reddened lips, caught in his eyeball. The reason for this ambitious, poetic portrayal would have become apparent if we had been given the rest of the poem by Chamaileon. The probability is that the lyric poet visualizes Sappho dancing; her dancing-shoes have caught his attention. But, it is the hot glow of her lips and cheeks that have melted him. He imagines that *they* have struck him, instead of the actual purple ball that she has been tossing in the air as she dances.

This can be deduced from Homer's description of dancers entertaining Odysseus at the court of the Phaiacian king (*Ὀδύσσεια* 8. 372-3).

οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν σφαῖραν καλὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔλοντο
πορφυρέην, τήν σφιν Πόλυβος ποίησε δαΐφρων.

The two young princes "*took in their hands a fine purple ball, which had been expertly made for them by Polybos*". They maintain their dance-rhythm while keeping the ball in the air and tossing it back and forth between them. This time, the ball is not a metaphor, since we are told that it has been made for the purpose of demonstrating the young men's dancing skills and, of course, it is purple because they are royal princes, sons of king Alkinoüs.

Thus it appears that, in his imagination, Anakreon has taken the ball of royal purple out of the hands of the young men and given it to Sappho and her friend to sport with. But, Aphrodite is playing him false and the dancing girl has struck him accidentally with a different *purple ball*.

So, the solid purple ball used as an accessory to the dance in Homeric epic has been changed into the intangible image which strikes Anakreon in the eye. It is left to the comic-poet to turn the metaphysical image back into something physical in his own salacious way, by choosing a metaphor of something round, red and succulent.

* * *

Post script.

Among his biographical anecdotes of the philosopher Plato, Diogenes Laërtios includes some poems, said to have been composed by him and are quoted as evidence of his personal love-life. They have been copied into the Palatine Anthology. We do not know their source or their purpose, but they have the appearance of literary exercises. If they are indeed works of Plato himself, they must have belonged to a work which was a fanciful reimagining of the past, like his *Συμπόσιον*, because one of them references the tragic-poet Agathon, as if the speaker was his lover Pausanias.

τὴν ψυχὴν Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν ἐπὶ χείλεσιν εἶχον:
ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὡς διαβησομένη.

"*While kissing Agathon, my life hung upon his lips, because my long-suffering soul went there as though about to cross over*." (D. Laërtios 3.32 / *Palatine Anthology* 5.78)

Another is addressed to a certain Xanthippe. We do not know who is supposed to be speaking. The speaker could be male or female. But it is certainly a female who is being assailed by the *apple*, and though we do not know who the woman is, her name belonged to Sokrates' wife.

μῆλον ἐγώ· βάλλει με φιλῶν σε τις· ἀλλ' ἐπινεύσον,
Ξανθίππη, κἀγὼ καὶ σὺ μαραινόμεθα.

"*I am an apple: one who loves you is throwing me. Only nod your assent, Xanthippe: we are wasting away both you and I*." (*Palatine Anthology* 5.80)

A third epigrammatic poem leaves no doubt that the person being apple-struck is female.

τῷ μήλῳ βάλλω σε· σὺ δ' εἰ μὲν ἑκοῦσα φιλεῖς με,
δεξαμένη τῆς σῆς παρθενίης μετάδος
εἰ δ' ἄρ' ὃ μὴ γίγνοιτο νοεῖς, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ λαβοῦσα
σκέψαι τὴν ὥρην ὡς ὀλιγοχρόνιος.

(reading ει δ' ἄλλ' - ὃ μὴ γίγνοιτο - νοεῖς in the third line)

"*I am hitting you with my apple. If in your heart you love me, receive it and yield me your virginity in exchange. But, if you feel differently (which I hope you do not), take this self-same fruit and think about how soon its season passes*." (*Palatine Anthology* 5.79)

Again, we cannot be certain who is supposed to be speaking, but, if we assume that it is Plato in propria persona, then these two poems provide a metaphor for masculine allure directed at a female and Plato is taking upon himself the poetic mantle of 'seductress'. Human sexuality is nothing if not ποικιλομήχανος.

Appendix 10

Ameinias

In his opening soliloquy Strepsiades informs us that he owes money to two creditors. The first is a man named Pasias, who has loaned him twelve minas for the purchase of a thoroughbred horse (21). The second, Ameinias, has loaned his son Pheidippides the sum of three minas to buy a new set of wheels and a foot-board for his racing-chariot (31).

τρεῖς μναῖ διφρίσκου καὶ τροχοῖν Ἀμεινίᾳ.

We may presume that both were well-known figures in Athenian public life for Aristophanes to have pilloried them on stage.

Later in the play, 'on the thirtieth of the month', two creditors come knocking at Strepsiades' door demanding the monies owed to them. Although they are not named, there is no reason to doubt that they are the same two men introduced at the outset. Why else would the poet have named them? Besides, he drops heavy hints which the audience would have been able to pick up. The first is identified by his deme and mocked for his 'beer belly'. The amount of money owed to him is twelve minas and, though it is not specifically stated that the horse purchased was a thoroughbred, the creditor can recognize it by its colour. No sooner has the first creditor been sent packing than cries of pain are heard off-stage, heralding the arrival of a second man, who informs us that he has recently suffered a chariot-accident. Coincidentally, this is exactly the kind of mishap that might have accounted for Pheidippides needing replacement parts for his chariot, so that this might explain why the specific details given in line 31 were expected to get a laugh.

Evidently, this second creditor could be readily identified from his injuries alone. But there is no doubt about his status, for he is accorded (dis)honourable mention elsewhere in the play as well as in *Σφῆκες* the following year. In *Νεφέλαι*, the basis of ridicule seems to be uncertainty over Ameinias's gender, for in the course of 'Sokrates' futile attempts to educate Strepsiades in rudimentary grammar, it is speciously claimed that 'Ameinias' ought grammatically to be a woman's name (686-92).

Sokrates

ἄρρενα δὲ ποῖα τῶν ὀνομάτων;
And which are masculine names?

Strepsiades

μυρία. Φιλόξενος...Μελησίας...Ἀμυνίας.
Loads and loads! *Philoxenos, Melesias, Ameinias*.

Sokrates

ἀλλ', ὦ πόνηρ', ταῦτα γ' ἐστ' οὐκ ἄρρενα.
But, these are not masculine, you dim wit!

Strepsiades

οὐκ ἄρρεν' ἡμῖν ἐστιν;
Do we not consider them masculine?

Sokrates

οὐδαμῶς γ', ἐπεὶ πῶς γ' ἂν καλέσειας ἐντυχὼν Ἀμυνίᾳ;
We certainly do not! *Think about it.*
If you came across Ameinias, how would you catch his attention?

Strepsiades

ὅπως ἄν; ὠδί, « δεῦρο δεῦρ' Ἀμυνία ».
How? Like this, "*This way, Ameinia, over here*!"

Sokrates

ὁρᾷς; γυναῖκα τὴν *Ἀμυνίαν* καλεῖς.
Don't you see? You are calling Ameinias just as you would call a woman.

Strepsiades

οὔκουν δικαίως, ἥτις οὐ στρατεύεται;
Quite appropriate really for one who doesn't take part in military campaigns.

His 'mature' student is easily impressed by the argument, since he reasons to himself that the *man*'s gender is proven by the fact that he does not serve in the armed forces. This is a joke of the kind we meet in the running-gag of Kleonymos 'discarder of shields', where an exemption from military service is taken to indicate a typically-feminine nature (c.f. *Σφῆκες* Appendix 2, 'The Cowardly Hero').

On the basis of his appearances in *Νεφέλαι* alone, one would have little notion of why the poet had picked on Ameinias, but the following year he set his sights on him again. From this fact, we can be sure that he held high office in the years 423/2 B.C. and there is confirmation of this in a reference to him having served as a state ambassador to the Thessalians in *Σφῆκες* 1265-74,

πολλάκις δὴ 'δοξ' ἐμαυτῳ δεξιὸς πεφυκέναι
καὶ σκαιὸς οὐδεπώποτε,
ἀλλ' Ἀμεινίας ὁ Σέλλου μᾶλλον, οὐκ τῶν Κρωβύλων,
οὗτος ὅν γ' ἐγώ ποτ' εἶδον ἀντὶ μήλου καὶ ῥοᾶς δειπ-
νοῦντα μετὰ Λεωγόρου·
πεινῇ γὰρ ᾗπερ Ἀντιφῶν.
ἀλλὰ πρεσβεύων γὰρ ἐς Φάρσαλον ᾤχετ'·
εἶτ' ἐκεῖ μόνος μόνοις
τοῖς Πενέσταισι ξυνῆν τοῖς
Θετταλῶν, αὐτὸς πενέστης ὢν ἐλάττων οὐδενός.

"*Many's the time I've thought that I've been born clever* (*and never yet slow-witted*), *but the son of Fart, Ameinias, who is top-knotch, has an even higher opinion of himself. It is he, at any rate, whom I once saw dining with Leogoras* (*instead of eating apples and pomegranates, for he starves himself on the Antiphon diet*!). *He went, you see to Phartalot as an ambassador and there he was on his own with only the Thessalian Peneus-ists* (*he being as* '*penniless*' *as anyone*)."

The choral-ode opens the second parabasis of the play, in which the poet seems at times to be delivering the lines himself *in persona*. He (or his chorus-leader, at least) begins by claiming that, though he has a high opinion of his own innate abilities, 'Ameinias' exhibits much more confidence in his. It should be noted that the epithets δεξιὸς / σκαιὸς, which the poet applies to himself would naturally refer to intellectual abilities, but in the case of the archon might as easily be taken to mean physical *dexterity* and *clumsiness*, which may be more relevant to his recent misadventure (cf. 655).

The poet goes on to mention his role in the embassy to the Thessalians. Although he is said to be *starving* as well as *impoverished*, he managed to feast along with Leogoras and Antiphon, who were both wealthy aristocrats and presumably his fellow-emissaries. But then, his *hunger* turns out to be mere avarice for gain, since he is starving in the same way as Antiphon and his alleged *poverty* shows the poet to be playing with words. In fact, it is apparent that he is every bit as high-born as his colleagues, to judge by certain heavy hints provided in the ode, both of which are echoed elsewhere in the drama.

Firstly, he is referred to as the 'son of Sellos', a fabricated patronymic, which had been used earlier in the play (459, τὸν Σελλ-αρτίου) of Aischines, son of Lysanias. It suggests that these nobles held honorary priesthoods. Secondly, Ameinias is said to be 'one of those who pins his hair up' (1267, ὁ ἐκ τῶν Κρωβύλων) in imitation of the older aristocrats. The physical feature had already been alluded to when the Chorus criticized the 'Son' for wearing his hair long in the manner of Ameinias (466, εἰ σύ γ', ὦ πόνῳ πόνηρε καὶ κομητ-Ἀμεινία) and might explain why Hermippos described him as "*a female who has been enslaved by the Spartans*" (*Ἰάμβοι* 5, εἰλωτισμένην).

Given these clues, it should be no surprise to learn from the hypothesis to *Σφῆκες* (Appendix 1, note 7) that a man named Ameinias was the presiding archon in the winter of 422 B.C. The correct spelling of his name is found in the texts of Athenaios and Diodoros. The same form of the name is used of a younger brother of the poet Aischylos who is said to have taken part in the battle off

Salamis (*Αἰσχύλου βίος*), although, according to Herodotos, the Ameinias who distinguished himself as a trierarch in that battle hailed from the deme Pallene (8.84 and 93). It is possible that the archon was related in some way to one of these two namesakes. We do not know his patronymic. Although he is called 'son of Pronapes' (*Σφῆκες* 74, Ἀμεινίας μὲν ὁ Προνάπους), the name seems fabricated. It suggests that his father lived 'at the entrance to a wooded valley', implying that, since like Pasias he came from a country deme, he could have had peasant origins. This is the charge levelled at him by Eupolis in *Πόλεις*, when he portrays him loitering near the perfumers' (frg. 222),

χἀμυνίας ἐκεῖνος ἀμέλει κλαύσεται
ὅτι <ὢν> ἄγροικος ἵσταται πρὸς τῷ μύρῳ.

"*Ameinias over there will regret it too, you can be sure, because he stands by the perfume-sellers, despite being a country yokel*…"

For what it is worth, the deme Pallene, situated in the current Mesogeia, is not far from the presumed location of Kikynna.

So, in all likelihood, there was ample motive for Aristophanes to pick the haughty Ameinias as a target for his satire. His priestly office and his elitist hair-style were predictable handles. In *Σφῆκες*, the archon's participation in a recent state-mission to shore up Athens' traditional ties with the Thessalians was justification for a choral ode. But, in *Νεφέλαι*, he was able to use another topical event, the horseman's recent misadventure in a chariot-race. This is why he is brought on stage for Strepsiades to poke fun at his misfortune. The old farmer jokes that he is out of his mind to think that he can recover his loan (ἀπὸ νοῦ) but since he has brought along a donkey as a witness (κλητήρ), the audience are encouraged to believe that his injuries are the result of his tumbling from his mount (1273, ἀπ' ὄνου).

In spite of his best efforts at negotiating a deal, Ameinias is left with no choice but to issue a summons. Strepsiades remains unconcerned and continues to deride the aristocrat's chariot-driving skills as well as his pedigree, by referring to him as branded thoroughbred (σαμφόρα) and his four-footed witness as a misbegotten trace-horse (1300, σειραφόρον).

Evidently, this particular comic-scene was appreciated by the audience of *Νεφέλαι*, for in the following year's performance the poet revived it, bringing on another injured man and his ass to be ridiculed and mistreated by PhiloKleon. But, together with rehashing his own past jokes, Aristophanes also makes two passing allusions to Ameinias's race-course crash. One is made directly attributing the accident to rash miscalculation (*Σφῆκες* 74-6),

Sosias

Ἀμεινίας μὲν ὁ Προνάπους φήσ' οὑτοσὶ
εἶναι φιλόκυβον αὐτόν.

Ameinias there, son of Pronapes, says that the man's got appen-dice-itis, gambler's fever.

Xanthias

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν λέγει,
μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ἀφ' αὑτοῦ τὴν νόσον τεκμαίρεται.
No, he's way off base. But, I'll admit, he's living proof that such a disease exists.

The other is less obvious. When the poet comes forward to address the audience, he points out that, since his comic creations are more innovative than the dramas of his less-talented rivals, the judges should make some allowance and appreciate that he is taking risks. He represents himself in the guise of a charioteer, "*who smashes his hub-caps in an effort to surpass his competitors*" (*Σφῆκες* 1050),

εἰ παρελαύνων τοὺς ἀντιπάλους τὴν ἐπίνοιαν ξυνέτριψεν.

Whether Ameinias got the coded message and whether, if he did, he was able to influence the judging, we cannot know, but *Σφῆκες* did in fact *place* higher in the competition than *Νεφέλαι* had done the year before.