Four Notes on Eupolis

Notus est omnibus Eupolis. Macrobius' confident assertion (Sat. 7.5.8) is hardly true today. To the average classicist Eupolis might be known as one of the "Big Three" of Old Comedy (with Kratinos and Aristophanes, e.g. at Hor. Sat. 1.4.1 or Persius 1.122-3), as the alleged plagiarist of Aristophanes' Knights (Cl. 553-6), and as the author of Demoi, his best-known comedy, of which 120 lines survive on a papyrus published in 1911 (fr. 99) and which occasioned a flurry of interest in the 1910s and 1920s. But for the most part he has languished badly in the shadow of Aristophanes. From my ongoing re-examination of the fragments of this unsung comic poet come the following four noticulae.

I. The Date of Taxiarchoi.

Elsewhere for the date of this lost comedy I have favoured the minority view (that of Handley) of c.415 against the much more commonly accepted one of 429-427. The latter depends on the date for Eupolis' debut in 429 (anon. π.κ. III [Koster] 33-5) and the disappearance of Phormion, who was a major character in the comedy (Σ Peace 348e, Poll. 9.102), from the pages of Thucydides' histories in 429/8 (3.7). But Phormion does not vanish from comedy after 428; there are six allusions to him in the years 426-422 — Ar. fr.

---

1 A full bibliography of this fragment can be found in C. Austin, Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in papyris reperta (Berlin and New York, 1973), p. 84 and at R. Lassel & C. Austin, Poetae Comici Graeci V (Berlin and New York, 1986), p. 344. All fragments of Old Comedy are quoted from the edition of Kassel-Austin ('K-A').

2 The first part of this re-examination can be found as 'Dating and Re-dating Eupolis', Phoenix 44 (1990): 1-30; a further study of Eupolis as known to the ancients and of his relationship with Aristophanes will appear as 'Notus est omnibus Eupolis', in the papers of the conference 'Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis', held at the University of Nottingham in July 1990.

3 See Storey (n. 2), 22-23; nn. 86-7 for the bibliography.
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88 (Babyloniai — 426), Kn. 562 (424), fr. 397 (Clouds¹ — 423), Peace 347 (421), Lysist. 804 (411), Eupolis fr. 44 (Astrateutoi) — and Westlake sums up well the weakness of the traditional date, 'The date accepted without question by many scholars, namely 428, appears to rest only on the unwarranted assumption that the play was produced soon after Phormio returned from Naupactus'.

Supporting the later date (i.e. c.415) is the one komodoumenos among the fragments, Opountios — fr. 282 (cf. his mention at Birds 153 [414-D]), the reference to Sophokles' Tereus in fr. 268.10-11 (cf. Birds 100), and the evidence of a vase with two comic figures, labelled ΦΟΡ[ and ]ΟΝΥCOC, found in the context of ostraka from what must be the ostracism of c.416. On the later date the theme of the comedy with its attested presence of Dionysos μανθάνων παρά τφ Φορμίων τους των στρατηγών καὶ πολέμων νόμους (Σ Peace 348e) could be, I have suggested, 'Dionysos goes to Sicily'.

Another small piece of evidence may support the later date. In fr. 280 the speaker, clearly Dionysos (cf. his ποτίκλος robe at Kratinos fr. 40), complains of his wretched state, the result no doubt of his military service (cf. frrs. 270-1, 274-5):

\[
\text{άντι ποτίκλου}
\text{πιναρόν ἥχοντ ' ἀλουτίῳ}
\text{κάρα τε καὶ τρίβονα.}
\]

The interesting word here is πιναρόν, found in classical Greek poetry only here, at Kratinos fr. 388 (ἐρίων πιναρῶν πόκον — the most common use of this adjective in later Greek is of filthy wool or clothes), and at Eur. El. 183-4:

\[
\text{σκέψα μου πιναρῶν κόμαν}
\text{καὶ τρύχη τῳ ἐμῶν πέπλων.}
\]


⁶ See for instance Hippiatrix 1.26.16, 34.20.11; Lucian Gall. 14, Somn, 8, 13; Synesios 1.44.
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I suggest that Euripides has taken a common or vulgar word, normally used of wool, and applied it to the hair of his tragic heroine, part of his deliberate attempt to lower the tone of this 'anti-tragedy', and that Eupolis in Taxiarchoi has Dionysos echo Elektra's plight and the unusual word πιναρόν. Both passages apply the word to unwashed human hair, and both reflect the state of the character's dress.

Now under the traditional dates of c.428 for Taxiarchoi and 413 for Elektra, such an influence is of course impossible. If there were any connexion between the two passages, it would be only Euripides' use of a vulgar word proper to comedy. But the date of the Euripidean Elektra is now more plausibly set in the early 410s, and if Taxiarchoi belongs c.415, as I have argued earlier, then fr. 280 could have had Euripides' recent (and unconventional) portrayal of Elektra in mind, as Dionysos gives voice to his own complaint. The metres are of course different, as Elektra's lines (glyconics) are part of a lyric dialogue with the chorus, and those by Eupolis restored as iambic dimeter, a metre used by him in the antode of the parabasis of Demoi (fr. 99.1-20) and by Aristophanes twice in the parodos of Frogs (384ff., 417ff.) and as an entr'acte at Ach. 836ff. The use of the metre in an exchange between Dikaiopolis and the chorus at Ach. 930ff., 1009ff. does show that the iambic dimeter could be part of the dramatic context and not restricted to a non-dramatic context, as in the parabasis or parodos or as a choral song between episodes. It can thus be used for Dionysos complaining of the effects of military service upon his person, very probably to the chorus of taxiarchoi.

7 The even rarer word πινώδης is used by Euripides later at Or. 225-6 in a passage which recalls the earlier one in Elektra:

ο Βουστρύχων πινώδες άθλιον κάρα
ώς ήγριωσα διά μακράς άλουσίας.

8 The traditional date of 413 depends on the assumption that vv. 1278-83, 1347-8, 1350-5 allude to events at Athens in 415-413. This was denied as early as G. Zuntz, The Political Plays of Euripides, 2nd ed. (Manchester, 1963), pp. 63-71, and an earlier date which suits the metrical evidence better now enjoys more support. The most recent discussions are those of M. Cropp, Euripides Elektra (Warminster, 1988), pp. 1-li and W. Burkert, 'Ein Datum für Euripides' Elektra: Dionysia-420 v. Chr.', MH 47 (1990): 65-69.

II. Eupolis’ Heilotes.

I have discussed briefly elsewhere the question whether this is in fact a comedy by Eupolis. To that discussion I would add here the observation that among the several Old Comedies of doubtful attribution the case of Heilotes is rather unusual. The normal practice in such instances is for the ancient source to assign the play ‘to X or whomever’, ‘to X or Y’, or to describe it as ‘attributed to X’, e.g. Pherekrates frs. 134, 138-9 (Persai — Φερεκράτης ἢ δὲ πεποιηκώς τοὺς Πέρσας), Platon fr. 138 (Skeuai — Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ Πλάτων ἐν ταῖς Σκευώδεις), or Pherekrates fr. 114 (Metalles — ὁ δὲ πεποιηκὼς τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφέρομενος Μεταλλεῖς). But what we have with Heilotes are five attributions to Eupolis (fr. 147 [Ath. 138e], fr. 150 [Poll. 9.74], fr. 152 [Erot. ἦ 4]), fr. 154 [Zenob. 3.61], and fr. 155 [Poll. 10.98]), and four with a periphrasis such as ὁ τοὺς Είλωτας γράψας (fr. 148 [Ath. 638e], fr. 149 [Hdn. 917.1], fr. 151 [Hdn. 933.1], fr. 153 [Ath. 400c]). What we do not get is the option ‘Eupolis or whomever’.

There is no doubt that there was such a comedy, but it is clear that early in the ancient tradition its attribution to Eupolis was lost or strongly doubted. We are not faced with an instance like that of Noumeniai, where the play seems to have been lost by the time of the Alexandrian editors (see IV below), but for some reason Eupolis’ authorship was in doubt. If an early play, as I shall argue, it could have been produced through another person; or it may have been the product of collaboration with another comedian (Aristophanes before his own debut?). Was it never produced officially and thus absent from the formal didaskalia? Whatever the reason, Heilotes is something of a mystery among the lost comedies of Eupolis.

The nine fragments do suggest a comedy from the Old period. Fr. 148 in particular is quoted by Athenaios (638e) as one of a series of comic allusions to Gnesippos:

τὰ Στησιχόρου τε καὶ Ἀλκάμαν νος Σιμωνίδου τε ἀρχατὸν ἀείδειν, ὁ δὲ Γνήσιππος ἐστ’ ἀκούειν

10 See Storey (n. 2), 7, 30.

11 Here I include Chionides’ Ptochoi (frr. 4,7), Magnes’ Dionysos (frr. 1-2), Pherekrates’ Metalleis (fr. 114), Persai (frr. 134, 138-9), and Cheiron (frr. 157-60, 162), Telekleides’ Apeudeis (fr. 12), Kallias’ Atalantai (frr. 3-4), Platon’s Lakones (fr. 72), Mammakythoi (Σ Frogs 990), Skeuai (fr. 138), and Symmachia (frr. 164-6, 169, 172).
This is certainly reminiscent of the disagreement between Strepsiades and Pheidippides at Cl. 1355ff. where to sing a melos by Simonides is considered as archaion, and also of the scene at Ach. 9-16 where desirable artistic experiences are contrasted with much less pleasant ones. Gnesippos is a target of the comedians elsewhere — Chionides fr. 4, Telekleides fr. 36, Kratinos frr. 17, 104, 276; for the most part these would seem to be allusions earlier than the 420s, but Kratinos' Horai, to which fr. 276 belongs, is certainly from the early 420s on the basis of fr. 283 which refers to the early career of Hyperbolos. Thus there is no problem in dating Heilotes to the early years of Eupolis' career, 429 or 428.12

Such a date would accord well with the interpretation of Crusius and Sommerstein of ΣΚη. 1226 μιμείται δέ τούς Είλωτας δταν στεφανώσι τόν Ποσειδώνα, referring to v. 1226 of the Aristophanic text:

Γιγάδε τε τι εστεφάνιξα κάδωρησάμαν.13

They infer from the scholion that v. 1226 is borrowed by Aristophanes from Eupolis' Heilotes, from a scene where the helots are crowning a statue of Poseidon. If Heilotes were a play c.428, then Aristophanes' use of it in his comedy of 424 would not be out of line.

What should be the Athenian attitude toward the helots? What sort of depiction should we expect in a comic chorus of the early 420s? Would they be regarded with sympathy as the oppressed people of the Spartan enemy? In this case we might expect Heilotes to take the same line as the well-known passages from Euripides' Andromache (445-63, 590-641), where Spartans and things Spartan are pilloried with real rancour. Or would the helots be treated with derision as a conquered, and hence inferior, race? Before we confidently affirm the former, we should be careful of attributing to the Athenians any sort of public sympathy as a whole. The picture of the Megarian in Ach. should write paid to any theory of public sympathy for distressed foreigners; there is

12 It could even be his earliest play, i.e. in 429. Most scholars since the publication of fr. 259 (Prospaltioi) in 1971 have used the phrase in lines 3-4 πρός αύτοι νέ/(ον άρ]χομένοι γράφειν] κομωτίαν to indicate that Prospaltioi was his first comedy. But the words ‘beginning to write comedy’ do not preclude an earlier play, i.e. Heilotes perhaps.

also the fact that Aristophanes can joke about a ‘Melian famine’ at *Birds* 186.

There is no overt mention of the helots in extant tragedy or comedy; the nearest that Aristophanes comes is his mention of the revolt of Messenia at *Lysist.* 1141-2. Most of the fifth-century allusions to the helots are military, such as the helots on active service with the Spartans (Hdt. 9.28-9) or to the internal situation at Sparta (Thuc. 4.80), but two passages suggest a perception at Athens of helots, a perception that might appear in a comic production. First there is Hdt. 9.80, the story of the helots sent to collect the spoils of the Persians after Plataia, who kept much of what they found to sell to the Aiginetans, handing over ὅσα αὐτῶν οὐκ οἶδα τε ἦν κρύψαι. This seems to be part of a familiar ancient tradition, the cunning slaves who succeed behind their masters’ backs. Aristophanes’ Xanthias and Karion are but two individual examples of this type. We can presume that this story was reasonably well known in the fifth century, even before Herodotos recorded it formally.

The second passage is more recent and more locally Athenian. Thucydides (1.128.1) tells of the exchange of charges before the opening of the war, the Spartans commanding the Athenians to drive out those who were accursed in the matter of Kylon, while ἀντεκέλευον δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς Λακεδαμονίους τὸ ἀπὸ Ταινάρου ἄγος ἔλαυνεν οἱ γὰρ Λακεδαμόνιοι ἄναστήσαντές ποτε ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ποσειδώνος ἀπὸ Ταινάρου τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἱκέτας ἀπαγορεύοντες διέφθειραν, δι’ ὃ δὴ καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς νομίζουσι τὸν μέγαν σεισμόν γενέσθαι ἐν Σπάρτῃ. Here we can see the helots in Athenian public opinion, not so much out of sympathy for their own plight, but more as a convenient stick with which to beat the Spartans in the battle of propaganda. What it does suggest is a context in which helots might be presented in comedy, as slaves escaping from their masters, taking refuge in a sanctuary, and requiring help. This picture is not incompatible with the story from Herodotos, since such a comic chorus could be shown as cunning as well as in need of sanctuary.

I wonder also if Euripides’ recent *Herakleidai* (to be dated c.430 on the basis of vv. 1026ff.) could not have influenced Eupolis. Instead of the noble and heroic kinsmen of Herakles seeking sanctuary from their persecutors at the temple in Marathon, could we have had slaves from Messenia, likewise fleeing hostile Peloponnesians, taking refuge, perhaps at the temple of Poseidon in Sounion? Poseidon would be the obvious deity, in view of the ‘curse of Tainaros’ where his temple was involved, and also in light of *ΣΚπ.* 1226 which, if referring to Eupolis’ comedy, shows that helots crowned his statue in
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the comedy. The title *Heilotes* does not need to imply a Spartan setting any more than *Acharnians* requires a play set in Acharnai, or *Phoinissai* in Phoinikia.

III. Eupolis fr. 157 (*Kolakes*).

Eupolis' *Kolakes*, produced at 421-D with the first prize (*Hyp.* I *Peace*), seems to have been one of his more successful and better-known comedies. In it he made comic capital out of the domestic situation of Kallias, whose father Hipponikos (*πλουσιάπατος των Ἑλλήνων — And. 1.130*) had died leaving his fortune for his son to be squandered on sophists, women, and entertainment (see *Ath. 218b*, *Σ Birds* 283, Philostratos *Bioi Soph.* 2.25.3).14 Kallias would have been presented in the comedy as an extravagant young man of the same sort as Pheidippides in *Clouds*, the principal difference being that father is no longer around to object. It can be observed that Kallias' manner of life and domestic situation in the late 420s inspired not only Eupolis' comedy of 421, but three later prose treatments, Plato's *Protagoras*, Xenophon's *Symposion*, and Aischines' lost *Kallias*.

Of the three lines printed together by Kassel-Austin as fr. 157:

ένδον μὲν ἐστὶ Πρωταγόρας ὁ Τήιος
dζ ἀλαζονεύεται μὲν ἀλιτήριος
peri τῶν μετεώρων, τὰ δὲ χαμάθεν ἐσθίει

the first is cited and assigned to *Kolakes* by Diogenes Laertius (9.50) and the last two by Eustathios (*in Od.* 1547.52) to Eupolis without a particular play mentioned, but as a description of Protagoras.15 Whether we take all three lines together or with a gap between vv. 1 and 2, it does seem reasonable that they come close together in the comedy. That Protagoras was a character in *Kolakes* is strongly suggested by Athenaios' use of *εἰσάγει* (*Εύπολις τὸν Πρωταγόραν ὡς επιδημούντα εἰσάγει — 218c*); here we have a


15 The lines were taken together by Porson, *Adversaria* (Cambridge, 1812), p. 75, followed by Meineke. Several editors have assumed at least one line between the first two lines (for the details see the discussion in K-A, V, p. 383). J.C. Carrière, *Le Carnaval et la Politique* (Paris, 1979), p. 253 hesitates over whether vv. 2-3 refer to Protagoras, but the testimony of Eustathios seems decisive that Protagoras is meant.
description of his behaviour at Kallias’ house.

The force of the passage is clear, that this unworldly philosopher with his head in the clouds has a very worldly appetite for the fruits of the earth. K-

A quote Ar. fr. 691 here

\[ \delta \tau \phi \alpha \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho i m \mu \varepsilon / \tau \alpha \ \delta \varepsilon \chi \alpha \mu \alpha \theta e n \ \varepsilon \sigma \theta \eta e i \]

cited by Achilles (in Aratum 1 p. 27.1 Maass) with Sophokles fr. 737 Radt

\[ \mu i s \omega \ \mu e n \ \delta \sigma t \iota s \tau \alpha \phi \alpha \nu \eta \ \pi e r t \sigma k o p \circ \omega \nu \]

The Aristophanic comedy is not named and we cannot therefore tell which passage was the earlier. When we add Eupolis fr. 386\textsuperscript{16}

\[ \mu i s \omega \ \delta e \ \kappa a \ \tau \circ n \ \Sigma \omega k r \acute{a} t \eta n \]

\[ \tau \circ n \ \pi t o x \circ \nu \ \alpha \delta \circ l \acute{e} s \chi \eta n , \]

\[ \delta \zeta \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \ \mu e n \ \pi e f r \acute{o} \eta n \tau i k e n , \]

\[ \delta \pi \omicron \theta e n \ \delta e \ \kappa a t a f o a g e i \nu \ \epsilon \chi o i \]

\[ \tau o t o u \ \kappa a t h \mu \epsilon \lambda e k \eta e n , \]

we can detect a repeated theme, the antithesis of unworldly thinkers and their down-to-earth appetites, with a special emphasis on food. We seem also in these passages to have an outside observer (or observers) commenting unfavourably (n.b. \( \mu i s \omega \)) on this aspect of the sophist.

The point in question is the meaning of \( \alpha \lambda i \tau \theta r i o s \) in the second line. Two different interpretations have been offered. Meineke adopts the translation of Grozius, ‘superbit hic sacrilegus de caelestibus, at esse quærit interim terrestria’, on which \( \alpha \lambda i \tau \theta r i o s \) alludes to Protagoras’ alleged impiety, his famous statement \( \pi e r a \ \mu e n \ \theta e o n \ \circ \omicron \ \epsilon \chi o \ \epsilon i \delta \acute{e} n o a \ \circ o \theta \ \omega \zeta \ \epsilon i \sigma n \ \circ o \theta \ \sigma o \kappa \ \epsilon i \sigma n \ (f r. 4) \), and the tradition of his trial and expulsion from Athens for impiety.\textsuperscript{17} Meineke has been followed in this interpretation by Kock, Schmid, and Carrière.\textsuperscript{18} We can link this passage with Cl. 825-31 where the business about Dinos’ displacement of Zeus leads to the description

\textsuperscript{16} On this fragment see my discussion ‘Eupolis 352K’, 154-157, in which I suggest that this may be a fragment of Kolakes.

\textsuperscript{17} See W.K.C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy, III, p. 263, n.2.
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of Sokrates as ὁ Μῆλιος, i.e. a jibe at Diagoras the supposed arch-atheist of them all.19

Not all have followed this line, however. Pivetti objects that ‘Eupoli ...

σφάττει με, λεπτὸς γίγνομ' εὐωχούμενος

tά σκώμμαθ' óια τά σοφά καὶ στρατηγικά).

The latter in her view establishes a comic usage of ἀλιτήριος as equivalent to

alazon, i.e. ‘fraud’ or ‘charalatan’, and it is in this way that she understands the

passage, as part of an ongoing comic presentation of intellectuals as frauds (cf.

meteωροφένακες [Cl. 333], meteωροσοφισταί [Cl. 361]).

In fifth-century usage, as far as we have evidence, two certain

meanings can be demonstrated for the word. The first is applied to individuals

as ‘accursed’, the classic examples being found of those responsible for the

murder of the Kylonian conspirators at Thuc. 1.126 (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτον ἐναγείς καὶ ἀλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ) and at Κν. 445f. (ἐκ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων σὲ φημι γεγονένα τῶν τῆς θεοῦ), the only use in extant Aristophanes.21 Other instances of this usage can be found at And. 1.51, Lys. 6.52-3, 13.79. The second usage refers not to the person under a curse, but to the spirits of vengeance who bring the punishment to pass. This is the sense that the word must have at Antiphon 4.1.3-4, 4.2.8, 4.3.7. 4.4.10, also at Plato Epist. 7.336b.

---

19 On this strange figure, seen variously as serious intellectual or roguish poet, see the discussions of F. Jacoby, Διαγόρας ὁ ἄθεος (Berlin, 1959); L. Woodbury, ‘The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos’, Phoenix 19 (1965): 178-211; and most recently E. Christian Kopff, ‘The Date of Aristophanes, Nubes II’, AJPh 111 (1990): 318-329.


21 The scholiast explains ἀλιτηρίων as ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐναγών.
From this we may turn to the two instances of the word in extant Eupolis, fr. 157.2 (above) and fr. 103 (Demoi), of the orator Demostratos:

(A) δήτωρ γάρ ἦστιν νόν τις; (B) ὅν γ' ἦστιν λέγειν ὁ Βουζύγης ἀριστος ἀλιτήριος.

Pivetti prefers her interpretation of 'charlatan' in the latter passage, the point being that in comparison with the great orator Perikles (see fr. 102), the only contemporary worth mentioning is but an alazon, an imposter. But either of the other meanings could fit just as well. Demostratos as 'accursed' goes well with Aristophanes' description of him at Lysist. 397 as ὁ θεοτισιν ἔχθρος καὶ μισρὸς χολοζύγης, while in his capacity as a Bouzyges which included the pronouncement of ritual courses at the Bouphonia (Σ Soph. Ant. 225) he could conceivably be viewed as an avenger in the sense found in Antiphon 4.22 A Bouzyges (Demostratos according to Σ Lysist. 397, but the text says only 'a Bouzyges') occurs again in Demoi, at fr. 113 τί κέκραγας ὡσπερ Βουζύγης ἀδικούμενος, which should refer also to the curses of the Boyzygai and suggest that this is how fr. 103 should be interpreted. Thus this fragment of Eupolis sheds no useful light on how to take ἀλιτήριος in fr. 157.

Favouring the interpretation of ἀλιτήριος as 'accursed' in the case of Protagoras is the predominant use of the word in this fashion. Against is Pivetti's objection that concern for τὰ μετέωρα is not the same thing as impiety and the consideration that the passage is poking fun at the worldly nature of supposedly unworldly intellectuals, not commenting on Protagoras' impiety. Also to be considered is the fact the tradition of Protagoras' impiety is late and hardly so well attested as that of Diagoras and Anaxagoras, and could well have arisen from confusion with these others or an extension from them.23 It may well be the case that Protagoras was not so considered in the fifth century, and if so, the implication of impiety from ἀλιτήριος is not on in his case. Pivetti's explanation of 'charlatan' does suit the sense of the passage better (cf. fr. 352.2 of Sokrates τὸν πτωχὸν ἄδολέσχην), but there are no contemporary instances of the word used in this sense, and it does tend to make ἀλαζονευτόα and ἀλιτήριος do much the same thing.


23 See Guthrie (n. 17), p. 263.
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I wonder if another explanation can be found, from an unnoticed use of the word at And. 1.130-1, where Andokides records an old κληδών/φήμη about Kallias’ father, Hipponikos, ὡς Ἰππόνικος ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἀλιτήριον τρέφει, ὡς αὐτοῦ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀνατρέπει. Two plays on words are operating, the first on τρέφει and ἀνατρέπει, and the second on τράπεζα as ‘table’ (in a house) and ‘bank’. Here ἀλιτήριον must mean something like our ‘poltergeist’ and relate to Antiphon’s use of the word as an angry and vengeful spirit. Andokides turns this old story into an attack on his adversary Kallias ὡς ἀνατέτροφεν εκείνου τὸν πλοῦτον, τὴν σωφροσύνην, τὸν ἄλλον βίον ἀπαντα, showing how it has proven true in later days. The story, says Andokides, is an old one, going back to the glorious days of Athens when Hipponikos was the richest man in Greece. It must have been current well before the production of Kolakes in 421, and the audience hearing the word ἀλιτήριος in the context of the house of Kallias would surely take the word in this sense. Protagoras is, I suggest, being cast as the ‘spirit’ loose in Kallias’ house, leading Kallias astray on the path of expensive debauchery and upsetting (perhaps literally) the whole house.

Fr. 158 gives an example of Protagoras giving Kallias an excuse for drinking:

πίνειν γάρ αὐτὸν Πρωταγόρας ἔκέλευ’, ἵνα
πρὸ τοῦ κυνὸς τὸν πλεῦμον ἐκπλυτὸν φορῇ

and the strong evidence for a dinner party of major proportions as part of the comedy (e.g. at Max. Tyr. 14.7, Ath. 218b, Philostratos Bioi Soph. II.25.3) as well as frs. 162, 169 which imply that Kallias was robbed by his guests suggest to me a scene in which one character asks another about the riotous goings-on inside, perhaps with appropriate off-stage noises, (cf. the accounts at Wasps 1299ff. Lysist. 1216ff.), to which the reply runs as follows, ‘Protagoras the poltergeist is inside; he may have his head in the clouds, but his appetite is certainly down to earth’.24

IV. Noumeniai:

Were it not for the entry in the first hypothesis to Ach, which records the victory of Aristophanes’ play over Kratinos’ Cheimazomenoi (second) and

---

24 This is how Meineke understood the fragment; another possibility for its place in the play would be in the prologue where the background is being explained (cf. the account by the mathetes at Cl. 133ff).
Eupolis' *Noumeniai* (third) — ἠδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Εὐθύνου ἄρχοντος ἐν Ληνοάοις διὰ Καλλιστράτου καὶ πρώτος ἦν. δεύτερος Κρατίνος Χειμαζομένοις. οὐ σφζοντοα. τρίτος Εὔπολις Νουμηνίας — we would have no knowledge of this comedy by Eupolis. No fragment is cited from it, nor any discussion has arisen over the words οὐ σφζοντοα. Elmsley moved them to the end of the hypothesis and understood the plural to refer to both comedies, *Cheimazomenoi* and *Noumeniai*, as Kratinos' play shares the fate of Eupolis' comedy, unknown apart from this entry in the *didaskalia*. Kaibel and Mensching preferred to understand οὐ σφζοντοα in both places, the latter falling out at the end of the hypothesis.25

What sort of comedy is implied by the title, which following the example of other plural titles, should denote a chorus? I can see three possibilities: (1) the attested comic business in *Clouds* about debts due at the end of the month (vv. 17, 740ff., 1131ff.) — in which case Eupolis used this theme two years earlier than *Clouds*, (2) the contemporary problem with the calendar (cf. the reported complaint of the Moon at Cl. 607-26 — although it is no great step from a chorus of *Clouds* to one of New Moons, it still seems slim subject-matter for a comedy, and what would be the point (or the costume) of plural New Moons?, (3) the celebrations and observances at the time of the new moon, e.g. the rituals on the acropolis at [Dem.] 25.99, the chorus' anticipation of new-moon festivals upon the advent of Diallage at Ach. 999, and the *noumeniastai* of Lysias fr. 53. These last (*noumeniastai*) certainly suit the boisterous nature of Old Comedy, and I wonder if the actual title of Eupolis' lost comedy were not *Noumeniastai*, the word used by Lysias and paralleled by Phrynichos' *Komastai*, Poliochos' *Korinthiastes*, and of course Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai*.
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