CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

THE KNIGHTS

OF

ARISTOPHANES.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

THE KNIGHTS

OF

ARISTOPHANES

EDITED BY

ROBERT ALEXANDER NEIL,
M.A., LL.D. (ABERDEEN)
LATE FELLOW AND TUTOR OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
UNIVERSITY LECTURER IN SANSKRIT.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1901

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107461024

© Cambridge University Press 1901

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1901
First paperback edition 2014

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-46102-4 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following edition of the *Knights*, which had been in the press for some years, was almost completed at the time of the sudden death of the Editor last June. The commentary up to page 144 had been printed off: the rest of the commentary, the appendixes and the introduction were already in type. The pages which had not received final revision have been carefully read; references have been verified; and small corrections, which seemed to be beyond question, have been made. It is difficult to say how far the introduction might have been expanded: it is certain that it was not regarded as complete. In the note to ll. 1288—9, as originally printed, reference was made to the introduction concerning the supposed collaboration of Eupolis in the authorship of the *Knights*, but the introduction contains no allusion to the subject. No doubt it was intended that this and other topics bearing on the play should be discussed, and an account of the manuscripts (of which those at Ravenna and Milan at least had been collated by the Editor) and some estimate of their relative value would certainly have been included.

In other respects the book is complete, and remains the only direct memorial of Neil's work as a classical scholar, which his scanty leisure and fastidious pen permitted him to leave. The twenty-five years since he took his degree at Cambridge were devoted to College and University teaching: and however regrettable the sacrifice may seem, it is justified by the influence he exerted on the many scholars that he taught. For if Neil wrote but little, he never had a pupil whom he did not impress by the depth of his knowledge and the breadth of his interests. Greek and Latin, as he taught them, were a means of literary education: a fine sense of the humanities informed his method, and supplied a complement to the more strictly linguistic training which the conditions of the Tripos required. His mastery of the Classics was aided by a gift of simple exposition, while a wealth of illustration from the languages and records of modern times made it easy for

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

him to show that the phenomena of language and of history never stand alone or unparalleled. Moreover he was reconciled to the drudgery inevitable in his work by a quick intellectual sympathy, which while it afforded him compensation could not but stimulate and develope the talents of his pupils.

Yet despite the many hours devoted to tuition Neil never ceased to learn. The energy of his research was unremitting: he read and re-read the Classical authors with the fullest sense of their manifold interest: he was familiar with the work accomplished by scholars, both in the present and in the past, on every side of Classical life and thought and language. The knowledge thus rapidly assimilated and ever at the command of a wonderful memory was placed fully and generously at the service of others, as is abundantly testified by the works of the many scholars who record grateful acknowledgment of his help in inspiring, suggesting and amending. His learning, moreover, unrestricted in its range, was catholic in its comprehension. Thus he escaped the possible dangers of specialism, and thus became an intellectual force of the greatest moment in the University.

The qualities of scholarship which characterised him as a teacher are manifest in his own work. A wiser commentator could not be found, for his delicate sense of language enabled him to discriminate meanings and usages, to detect the particular associations of words, to discover instances of parody and imitation, in fact, to give the fullest and the most subtle interpretation to the original text. While there is no part of Classical life or thought which he did not explain and illuminate, he sought parallels, illustration or comment from the whole range of literature. Indeed, of the many admirable qualities revealed briefly and modestly in this commentary upon a single play, none is more intimately characteristic than the universal interest in the life and literature of all ages, which marked the genius of Robert Alexander Neil.

W. S. H.
L. W.

PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
October, 1901.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

CONTENTS.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

CODICES HUIUSCE FABULAE.

A	Par. Bibl. Reg. 2712
B	,, ,, ,, 2715
C	,, ,, ,, 2717
M	Mediol. Bibl. Ambros. L 39
N	,, ,, ,, L 41
P	Vaticano-Palatinus
R	Ravennas
V	Ven. Bibl. Marc. 474
Γ	Flor. Bibl. Laur. 31, 15
Δ	,, ,, ,, 31, 16
Θ	Flor. Abbat. 2779

Dindorf's numbering is followed in the references to the Fragments of Aristophanes and Kock's numbering in the references to the Fragments of the other Comic Poets.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

p. 9 At end of note on l. **19** *add* So Rousseau *Confess.* 9 speaks of 'la vapeur d'une bonne omelette au cerfeuil' as characteristic of the country)(town luxury.

p. 15 l. **61** *add* critical note *εἶθ'* ὁ MSS. except R.

p. 22 At end of note on l. **120** *add* In the Athenian hymn at Delphi 3 *προφαίνεις λόγια* is only a conjecture of Weil's: Crusius has *προφαίνεις, σε καλαδήσομεν.*

p. 33 Note on l. **197** (3 lines from the foot of column 1) *after* mythical serpents *add* (of real snakes in artificial poetry, e.g. *Anth. Pal.* vi 331. 1).

p. 43 Note on ll. **269—70** (last line of column 1) *for* mentioned in 255 *read* mentioned on 255.

p. 52 At end of note on l. **327** *add* Cp. fr. 514 *ηὐαινόμην θεώμενος.*

p. 53 Note on ll. **333—4** (line 3 of column 1) *for* is regular *read* are regular.

p. 81 Note on l. **537** (line 10) *for* the innovation as Vahlen says, *read* the innovation. As Vahlen says,

p. 84 Note on l. **552** (line 6) *for ὠκοπόδων read ὠκυπόδων.*

p. 93 Note on l. **626** (line 16) for *Att. Pol.* 355—6 read *Att. Pol.* 335—6.

p. 120 Note on l. **823** (line 12) *for* Ἀττικίων *read* 'Ἀττικίων.

p. 123 Note on l. **851** *for ἐγγένεσθαι, ἐκγένεσθαι read ἐγγενέσθαι, ἐκγενέσθαι.*

In all cases where Demus occurs in the notes the form Demos should be substituted.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

INTRODUCTION.

THE comedy of the *Knights* was produced in Athens at the Lenaea in the year when Stratocles was eponymous archon. This date[1] corresponds to the early part (probably February or March) of the year 424 B.C. Aristophanes for the first time appeared frankly as an author: the three plays he had already written had all been produced as by his friend Callistratus[2].

Aristophanes had two objects of attack throughout his plays produced in the period of the Old Comedy: these were the newer intellectual movements of the day and the politics, home and foreign, of the advanced democrats of Athens. The two were not really connected: Euripides and Socrates, with their coteries, seem to have held political opinions almost identical with Aristophanes' own. If Aristophanes had shared the views they held on subjects other than politics, he might have shared their fate. As it was, he suffered nothing worse than a prosecution by Cleon: we do not know whether he was attacked in this

[1] Since Böckh's treatise on the Dionysia (published in 1816) it has been generally held that the Lenaea were held in the month Gamelion (Jan.-Feb.) about a month before the Anthesteria. The old theory that the Lenaea and Anthesteria were, at least for a long time, the same festival has been revived by O. Gilbert, and is held by Dörpfeld (*Griech. Theater* 9) and Miss Harrison (*Journ. Hell. Studies* xx p. 111).

[2] We know neither the reason nor the exact effect of the poet's habitual avoidance of producing plays in his own name. He may have been under legal age when the first play was produced (as he seems to imply *Nub.* 530): but this reason would soon disappear. It is suggested by Kaibel (in Pauly-Wissowa's *Encyclop.* s.v. *Aristophanes*) and by Murray, that he was well to do, did not care for the money prize, and merely wished to save himself the trouble of training his chorus. The *Wasps* was produced under the name of Philonides, but Aristophanes speaks plainly in the parabasis of that play (1015—1050).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

way as a politician directly by a charge of disloyalty to the state, or indirectly by a charge of alien birth[1].

His first play, the Δαιταλῆς B.C. 427, was directed against the first of the two movements above mentioned: the next three, *Babylonians* (426), *Acharnians* (425), *Knights*, against the second. The chorus in each play was typical: the *Babylonians* are the subject-allies of Athens, treated by her as foreigners and slaves; the *Acharnians* are bigoted villagers, full of a narrow Attic patriotism and hate for Sparta; the *Knights* are the young flower of Athenian life, ready for enterprise and proud of their city, but tired of the political notions and leaders that prevailed.

The Peloponnesian war was raised against Athens. Her imperialism deeply offended the Greek faith in the independence even of small states. Her allies pleaded that they had joined her in the belief that the confederacy, of which she was so much the absolute head, was against Persia and for no other purpose: they found themselves deluded and humiliated into tributaries[2]. Her democracy set an example to the commons of every state in Greece, inciting them to take power from the noble and the rich, to harass and overtax the classes, to irritate established authority by rhetoric and public discussion and litigation. She had too much commercial prosperity and wanted more: this had ruined Aegina and might ruin Corinth and other busy ports. Her amazing intellectual brilliancy had come after the fall of Miletus and the other Ionian cities which might have been as brilliant as Athens if they had remained free. Her active and successful democracy roused the slow jealousy of the great aristocracies—Thebes, Sparta, Corinth, each with its own reasons for enmity—into a readiness for war.

The war seemed to Thucydides the most important event in human history. Probably, like Plato and Aristotle, he thought that the great political question was what might be the best form for a small Greek republic, and that the contest between

[1] Gilbert, *Inn. Geschichte* 154. Kaibel (*Aristophanes* in Pauly-Wissowa *Encyclopädie* &c.) thinks the γραφὴ ξενίας came later than 425, if at all.

[2] This is the strong point made by the Mytileneans in their speech at Olympia (Thucyd. iii 10. 3): ξύμμαχοι ἐγενόμεθα οὐκ ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει τῶν Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηναίοις, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐλευθερώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ Μήδου τοῖς Ἕλλησι.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

democracy and oligarchy would settle the future of humanity[1]. When the *Knights* appeared, the war had lasted for more than six years. The blows dealt had exasperated, rather than exhausted, the combatants. Athens had recovered from the plague. The conflict between states and between classes in each state was more keen and bitter than ever: Corcyra had just shown that the People and the Few could hate each other more fiercely than members of different countries; the Spartans were using their system of espionage with the result that soon afterwards they made away with many of the best Helots. The rage of class against class is nowhere more clearly expressed than in the bitter taunt addressed by an ally of Athens to a Spartiate prisoner taken at Sphacteria, "were the killed on your side gentlemen[2]?" Whatever the causes of this class-hatred, it was natural for thinking men to hope that it might be reduced to a point short of bloodshed.

Victor Cousin's brilliant theory of Nations and War teaches that every people exists in order to represent one idea, which it works out in its industry, art, government, religion and philosophy: that idea is incomplete and exclusive, but seems to its people the whole truth: this pretension brings collision with other ideas embodied in other nations: and hence "the indestructible root of war[3]." History recognises that all the ideas which nations have represented have only a partial and relative truth: the nation's great man best expresses its idea as absolute and complete[4], in its finest form and at the right time. No nation has ever had its 'idea' so splendidly expressed as Athens had in Pericles' funeral oration: enlightened democracy there finds a voice, probably for the first time, and in words that can

[1] It has been noted that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, from his point of view as a Greek not ill-content to be under the power of Rome, holds Thucydides profoundly unfortunate and mistaken in his subject: *πόλεμον ἔνα γράφων, καὶ τοῦτον οὔτε καλόν, οὔτ' εὐτυχῆ· ὃς μάλιστα μὲν ὤφειλε μὴ γενέσθαι· εἰ δὲ μή, σιωπῇ καὶ λήθῃ παραδοθείς, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων ἠγνοῆσθαι* (*epist. ad Pomp. de praecip. histor.* 3. p. 767 Reiske).

[2] Thucyd. iv 40. 2: the translation 'brave men' for *καλοὶ κἀγαθοί* quite misses the mark.

[3] *Introd. à l'histoire de la philosophie, neuvième leçon.*

[4] *Ib. dixième leçon.*

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

never fail to have an echo in the aspirations of freedom[1]. In the background are the subjection of women and a great population of slaves: neither of these drawbacks could rouse much indignation then; but the assertion of Athenian Empire over other states, though not obtrusively made in the funeral speech, gave an excuse for the haters of democracy[2]. Brasidas tells the Acanthians[3] that Sparta will not interfere in party politics: she will not ignore the history of each state and enslave either the majority to the Few or the minority to the mass: he is protesting for independence merely. But when Alcibiades at Sparta speaks of democracy as essentially opposed to all sound reason, he is only giving lively expression to his hearers' opinions: and Cousin's theory finds no better instance of an inevitable conflict. When and how the conflict might have come had Athens not entered on a policy of imperialism, is hard to say.

There were men in Greece who could see no sufficient reason for the war, who hated it above everything, and who thought it might be brought to an end but for extremists. In Athens there may have been men in 424 B.C. (there certainly were later), who were much more Spartan and oligarchic at heart than Athenian. But there were also a very considerable number of moderates. Moderates in Athens were almost outlaws: the famous law of Solon, himself a moderate, forbade any citizen to abstain from party contests. Pericles and Cleon both, as Thucydides reports them, sneer at these *ἀπράγμονες*[4] as deserving of a harder name and as quite condemned by public

[1] Pericles may well have thought that before the Athenian democracy, set as an example for all men to emulate, teaching the equal opportunity of citizens, the self-respect of the poor, the mental culture of all free men as the work of the state, any political constitution depending on privilege or exclusiveness of birth or wealth would have sunk abashed. If so, he imagined as vain a thing as Napoleon did: but we cannot find in his speech that he had failed to foresee the war that came. Political and social ideas are hard to force on peoples that do not comprehend them: the force is more obvious than the ideas behind it.

[2] The Boeotians in Thucyd. iii 62. 2 actually say that Athens attacked the Greeks 'in the same way' as Persia did.

[3] Thucyd. iv 86. 4.

[4] Pericles in the funeral oration Thucyd. ii 40. 2 *μόνοι γὰρ τὸν μηδὲν τῶνδε μετέχοντα οὐκ ἀπράγμονα, ἀλλ' ἀχρεῖον νομίζομεν.*

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

feeling: they may call themselves the 'gentlemen,' but their *ἀνδραγαθία* is inconsistent with Athenian Empire[1].

The Periclean ideal had to contend with another. This was the ideal of Panhellenism, sinking minor differences of social and political arrangements, and aiming at peace at home, war, if anywhere, abroad with the barbarian. Cimon had been the champion of this ideal: his brilliant victories on the Strymon and the Eurymedon showed that Greece might still hope for success even in aggressive war against Persia; his bringing back the bones of Theseus from Scyros to Athens had given him a hold on the peculiar religious pride of Greek cities; and his personal qualities were such as to kindle enthusiasm on his side[2]. That enthusiasm was expressed not only in battlefield and ordinary social gathering, but by two poets of distinction—Ion of Chios and Cratinus of Athens[3]. But Lacedaemonian jealousy baffled his ideal of Athens and Sparta as yoke-fellows in the procession of Hellenic glory, and his countrymen ostracised him as a philo-Laconian. After his recall in circumstances most honourable to himself, he still worked for peace with Sparta and war with Persia: and when he died besieging Citium in Cyprus, he may have believed that his policy would govern the affairs of Greece.

Soon after Cimon's death, Athens made peace with Persia on conditions which will probably never be made quite clear: but to make peace between Greek and Persian was the way to bring on war between Greek and Greek. We know too little of Thucydides, son of Melesias, to say whether he upheld

[1] See Appendix ii p. 202.

[2] If the head on Dexamenus' well-known gem is really a portrait of Cimon, his great inferiority in presence to Pericles must plainly be allowed.

[3] We have no proof that Ion possessed the first quality of a great poet—an original view of human life—but in charm of fancy and language his few fragments stand high in Greek literature. For his praise of Cimon cf. Plut. *Per.* 5. In Cratinus, fr. 1, the government clerk Metrobius gives fine expression to an admiration for Cimon which must have been common at the time. It is possible that Aeschylus should be added to the list: the *Eumenides* is the triumphal hymn of Athens in the Cimonian period, of the brilliant *πόλις* not forgetful of the rock from which she was hewn, willing to retain all that was good in the old ways, but needing to be warned against too rapid change.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

Cimon's ideal; but his ostracism removed the one Athenian capable of making any head against Pericles.

Pericles made the edifice of democracy complete. No high or constructive statesmanship was shown by any Athenian after him: it is not clear that such statesmanship was possible. The one side was forced to be violent and warlike in its imperialism: the other, when not confined to a policy of clean and folded hands, was driven to a policy against which the cries of 'treasonable' and 'unpatriotic' were ready and loud.

The spirit of Attic literature is in the main that of moderate, not extreme, democracy[1]. Though Aristotle[2] pointedly omits Pericles from his list of first-rate Athenian statesmen, there is no lack of admiration for him in the great writers of earlier days. He lay exposed at several points to the shafts of Comedy: in his relations with Aspasia[3] he was a "fantastical duke of dark corners," his generalship was of doubtful merit[4], and Cratinus' frank attack[5] was no doubt thought by many to hit the mark:

> Στάσις δὲ καὶ πρεσβυγενὴς Κρόνος ἀλλήλοισι μιγέντε
> μέγιστον τίκτετον τύραννον,
> ὃν δὴ νεφεληγερέταν Θεοὶ καλοῦσιν.

[1] It sometimes surprises us by its want of what we expect in democratic literature. For instance, it shows hardly any sign of a sympathetic and respectful attitude towards the lives and feelings of the independent poor. Such a sentiment was not characteristic of any epoch in literature before the French Revolution: Burns and Wordsworth of course asserted it, and it forms an essential element in the great and humane genius of Scott.

[2] *Pol. Ath.* 28 δοκοῦσι δὲ βέλτιστοι γεγονέναι τῶν Ἀθήνησι πολιτευσαμένων μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους Νικίας καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης.

[3] But I cannot agree with Wilamowitz (*Aristot. und Athen* ii 100) in his depreciation of that remarkable woman (see note on *Eq.* 132), or in his general judgment, finely expressed though it is, "es ist kein kleines zeichen von der würde der attischen geschichte, dass nur ein weib in ihr vorkommt, das aber beherrscht sie: die jungfrau von der burg." The absence of female influence in Attic history is of course undeniable: Plutarch *de virtute mulier.* mentions no Attic women.

[4] Hermippus 46

> Βασιλεῦ Σατύρων, τί ποτ' οὐκ ἐθέλεις
> δόρυ βαστάζειν, ἀλλὰ λόγους μὲν
> περὶ τοῦ πολέμου δεινοὺς παρέχει
> ψυχὴν δὲ Τέλητος ὑπέστης;

[5] 240.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

But even that attack recognises him as the Olympian, a figure more than human. A self-contained and peaceful democracy without demagogues might have escaped censure: but a democracy of aggressive imperialism under Pericles' successors is a fair mark. And here lies the justification of the moderate party in Athens and of the literature that embodies its feelings. It was not that grumbling aristocrats might call Pericles a *τύραννος* at home, but that he had made Athens' rule a *τυραννίς* over other Greek cities. He makes no secret of this, though he adds a phrase of some regret or apology, *ὡς τυραννίδα ἤδη ἔχετε αὐτὴν* (*τὴν ἀρχήν*), *ἣν λαβεῖν μὲν ἄδικον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἀφεῖναι δὲ ἐπικίνδυνον* (Thucyd. ii 63. 2). In Cleon's mouth the apology disappears and the tyranny of Athens over unwilling subjects is avowed: these subjects cannot be expected to show good-will; they are to be kept obedient not by favours, but by force (iii 37. 2): and the commons are to be held guilty of the sin of revolt as well as the Few (39. 6).

Cleon has naturally found defenders who believe that he was carrying out Pericles' policy, home and foreign, only with an inferior air. It is the great service of Pericles to have shown that a state where equality is the corner-stone and privilege is banished may be beyond all other states humane, and splendid with all mental gifts: in such a state a political leader who lacks that humanity and culture may have less weight than if he possessed them, but he is a surer mark for censure. It is unfortunate that Thucydides probably had personal grounds for being unfair to Cleon[1]: but no reason can be drawn from ancient writers for any disbelief in Thucydides' picture[2]. It is true that they speak chiefly of Cleon's defects in style and manner, of the want of *τὸ πρέπον* in his oratory[3]: he was careful

[1] Plutarch *de Herodoti malign.* 3. 855 C praises Thucydides for being too much of the dignified historian to give a full account of Cleon's abounding misdeeds.

[2] I do not mean to defend, as a fair or full statement, Thucydides' black account of Cleon's motives for pressing the war (*γενομένης ἡσυχίας καταφανέστερος νομίζων ἂν εἶναι κακουργῶν καὶ ἀπιστότερος διαβάλλων*, v 16. 1).

[3] Aristot. *Pol. Ath.* 28 (Κλέων), *ὃς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων*, Plut. *de commun. notit.* 13. 1065 C *ἡ* Κλέωνος *ἀναγωγία πρὸς τὴν* Περικλέους *καλοκἀγαθίαν*, *Nicias* 8, *Demetrius* 11, *Tib. Gracch.* 2 &c.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

not to allow private friendships to influence his public conduct[1], and he seems to have borne himself with at least as much haughtiness as servility towards the multitude[2]. But he has been fairly placed in history as the typical demagogue, and that in the typical democracy.

The exception to the rule that Attic literature is on the side of the moderates, in favour somewhat vaguely of a restricted franchise and clearly of a Panhellenic peace, against extreme democracy, is of course found in some of the orators[3]: and almost the only reference to Cleon as a creditable figure occurs in Demosthenes[4]. But men like Cleon were condemned by a continuous literary tradition, historical, dramatic, and philosophical[5]: the Isocratean school of historical writers probably made the condemnation more definite than before[6]: and in Plutarch and Lucian Cleon is an evil genius of his country. Aristophanes' attacks on Socrates and Euripides may have been stupidly wrong: this may rouse, but it does not justify, a suspicion that he was wrong in attacking Cleon.

The Old Comedy handled subjects of public interest only: a passion for the πόλις is its inspiration. The plots would have no point but for what Mommsen calls the "republican agony," the strain of patriotism, and the hate and fear of bad citizenship. Even in the enchanted land of the *Birds*, there is no "fleeting the time carelessly, as they did in the golden

[1] Plut. *praec. ger. reip.* 13. 806 F.

[2] The tone of his speech in Thucydides is very masterful. Plutarch gives an anecdote (*praec. ger. reip.* 3. 799 D) that he once asked to have a meeting of the ecclesia postponed because he was going to entertain friends at a sacrificial banquet: the request was granted with hilarious acclamation. It was thought a somewhat insolent innovation on his part to begin a despatch with χαίρειν, Eupolis *fr.* 308,

πρῶτος γὰρ ἡμᾶς, ὦ Κλέων,
χαίρειν προσεῖπας πολλὰ λυπῶν τὴν πόλιν.

Cf. Lucian *pro lapsu inter salut.* 3.

[3] Wilamowitz *Arist. und Athen* i 182 calls Hermippus a radical and thinks Eupolis was clearly more democratic than Aristophanes.

[4] *Boeot. de dote* § 25.

[5] Most, if not all, the Socratics agree here: for the Cynics, ὁ πολιτικὸς αὐτοῦ (Ἀντισθένους) διάλογος ἁπάντων καταδρομὴν περιέχει τῶν Ἀθήνησιν δημαγωγῶν Athen. v 220 D.

[6] Theopompus περὶ δημαγωγῶν &c.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

world": the quest of a *τόπος ἀπράγμων* only lands the adventurers in a new sphere of civic activity.

The two essential elements of the Old Comedy are the Agon or altercation and the Chorus[1]. There can be little doubt that the former developed out of that form of entertainment, so natural, and still apparently so common, among southern nations, which consists in watching two persons improvising abuse and insults against each other.

This form of entertainment developed in Italy, as Horace's[2] admirable sketch makes so clear, into libels which the police prevented from going further: in Attica the state encouraged it in due time and the result was the Old Comedy. Dionysus was no patron of privilege or aristocratic priesthoods: freedom of speech was in his province a form of religion[3], and under his name it was raised from a coarse personal encounter[4] to a splendid picture of the contest between great principles embodied in striking, though grotesque, figures[5]. Tragedy was practically debarred from handling contemporary events; Comedy had a certain underlying seriousness naturally connected with its wide sweep of subject. Herein lies the distinctive character of the Old Comedy. The struggle depicted in it is between great tendencies or parties in a state. In later Comedy, this has been displaced by the "duel of sex": and the conclusion is not the

[1] Lucian *non lev. aud. calumn.* 6 *τριῶν ὄντων προσώπων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδίαις, τοῦ διαβάλλοντος καὶ τοῦ διαβαλλομένου καὶ τοῦ πρὸς ὃν ἡ διαβολὴ γίνεται.*

The word 'Agon' was used in this technical sense by Bergk in *Philologus* xiv (1859) p. 182: it is now the recognised term, mainly owing to Zieliński's *Gliederung der Altatt. Komödie.*

[2] *Epist.* i 2. 139.

[3] Hence Cleon was shown in the *Babylonians* as harassing the god, Aristoph. *fr.* 48 Kock.

[4] The various forms of this entertainment in other literatures, Arabic, Celtic, Italian, Provençal, Scottish, do not seem to have risen above personality. It apparently died away with the Renaissance, after appearing in great men's hands with amazing vigour and coarse humour of imagination and language in such pieces as the *Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedy*, and *How a great scholar of England would have argued against Pantagruel and was overcome by Panurge.*

[5] This was probably due mainly to the genius of Cratinus: if we had some plays of his (and I would rather have the next great papyrus-find bring back him than anyone else but Sappho), we might recognise in him the Aeschylus of Comedy, the first and greatest of his kind; many of the ancients regarded him in that light.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-46102-4 - The Knights of Aristophanes
Edited by Robert Alexander Neil
Frontmatter
More information

triumph of the public weal in the victory of one side, but the happiness of two individuals by union of the two sides in marriage. It is interesting to observe that this manner of comedy owes its existence above all men to Menander—the friend and follower of Epicurus—and that the Epicurean school, bound up as it was with so much abandonment of high ideals, should be credited with this enormous contribution, through comedy and its descendant the novel, to the general feeling and conduct of society.

Yet in Menander's hands the individualising of female character and the freeing of the female will[1] have gone but a little way: women were emerging from a state hardly above slavery, and his women are mentally without distinction. His art has taken but the first step towards the charm of Rosalind or Beatrice. In a further development of that character lies the possibility of advance in comedy, as well as in other respects, in happier times to come.

In Aristophanes the very few maiden figures that appear are dumb. His women are generally types of the whole sex, banded together to use all their powers for patriotic or public ends[2]. Where public spirit gave the law for literature, its conditions would make a single love-plot appear as trivial as to us it seems essential[3].

[1] The importance of this for the best comedy need hardly be insisted on after Mr George Meredith's *Essay on Comedy*.

[2] In one passage of the *Lysistrata* (588—597) we are for a few lines in the grip of a powerful appeal to human sympathy for mother and maiden: the *σίγα, μὴ μνησικακήσῃς*, one of the very rare touches of pathos in Aristophanes, is almost worthy of Dante; yet even there the phrase used was mainly one of public life.

[3] Marcus Aurelius (xi 6) gives what was no doubt the accepted view, that the Old Comedy was for public edification (*παιδαγωγικὴν παρρησίαν ἔχουσα, καὶ τῆς ἀτυφίας οὐκ ἀχρήσεως δι' αὐτῆς τῆς εὐθυρρημοσύνης ὑπομιμνήσκουσα· πρὸς οἷόν τι καὶ Διογένης ταυτὶ παρελάμβανε*), while the New tended to art for art's sake (*κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκ μιμήσεως φιλοτεχνίαν ὑπερρύη*).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org