

obwohl sie sich hinsichtlich des Verteidigungskampfes viel zurückhaltender äußert als die gleichnamige Gestalt in den *Troerinnen*, anders als bei Euripides auf den heftigen Widerspruch der Chorfrauen. Erst durch derartige Veränderungen wird aus den *Troerinnen* ein pazifistisches Stück im modernen Sinne.

Düsseldorf

Bernd Manuwald

THE 'BLAMELESS SHIELD' OF KLEONYMOS¹⁾

I. Introduction

After Euripides and Kleon, Kleonymos is the individual most frequently ridiculed by Aristophanes. In the extant comedies he is made fun of seventeen times, at least once in each surviving play from 425 to 414; it would seem that during those years at least one jibe at Kleonymos was to be expected whenever Aristophanes was producing. Most attention has fastened on Kleonymos' infamous shield, the supposed abandonment of which is the substance of ten of these allusions. The most usual and literal interpretation of the shield-jokes is that Kleonymos abandoned his shield on the field of battle and that Aristophanes never wearied of amusing his audience by tormenting Kleonymos with various jests at his inglorious behaviour. A selection of recent opinion will illustrate the orthodox view: "In particular there was a notorious occasion on which he was said to have discarded his shield in a battle"²⁾, "a

1) This paper was first presented to the Classical Association of Canada at the University of Ottawa in June 1982. I should acknowledge with gratitude support from a Research Grant of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and also the comments and corrections from my colleagues, Professors K. H. Kinzl and D. F. R. Page who have read this paper in its various drafts.

2) D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps*, (Oxford 1971) 130 (cited hereafter as "MacDowell").

certain Kleonymos was believed to have discarded his shield in order to run away faster³), and “he is satirized by Ar. . . . later mainly for having run away in battle discarding his shield”⁴). In this paper I propose to examine closely the caricature of Kleonymos by Aristophanes, to investigate the literal truth of his ῥιψασπία, and to suggest an alternative explanation of the jokes.

One may raise at the outset two objections to a literal explanation of the shield-jokes. First, in interpreting the personal jokes in Aristophanes one must always be wary of the too serious or too literal explanation of the text. The scholia are full of sober statements about *κωμωδοῦμενοι* which are in all probability false and clearly the result of an ill considered deduction from the text⁵). One may look at the obviously fanciful account of the origins of the war at Peace 603 ff. which would enter later history as sober ‘fact’⁶). We need only compare the maliciously distorted portrait of Kleophon as presented in comedy and accepted by later writers, but essentially false⁷). One may examine the large-scale caricatures of Kleon, Sokrates, and Euripides and observe how distortion and exaggeration are the order of the day⁸). Similarly then with Kleonymos, we shall not be surprised if the real truth behind the comic caricature turns out to be something other than ῥιψασπία.

Second, ῥιψασπία was a serious offence in Athenian law. According to Andokides (1.74) a man convicted of throwing away his shield was liable to ἀτιμία, and as we shall find Kleonymos to have been still active in politics in 415, with civic status presumably unimpaired, we may on these grounds also question the literal truth of his ῥιψασπία⁹).

3) K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, (London 1978) 144.

4) A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes*: vol. 1, *Acharnians*, (Warminster 1980) 162 (cited as “Sommerstein (Ach.)”).

5) See S. Halliwell, *CR* 34 (1984) 83–8.

6) See *FGrHist* III b I 484–96 and G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, (London 1972) 236–7.

7) E. Vanderpool, *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 114–5, *Hesperia* 35 (1968) 120; see also W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*, (Princeton 1971) 153, 158.

8) About Sokrates’ caricature see K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds*, (Oxford 1968) xxxii–lvii (cited as “Dover”) and W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 3, (Cambridge 1969) 355–74. On Kleon see T. A. Dorey, *G & R* 3 (1956) 132–9, and Connor (n. 7) 151 ff. On Euripides see C. Prato, *Euripide nella critica di Aristofane*, (Galatina 1955) 21–41, and K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy*, (London 1972) 183–9.

9) See below (n. 44) for the relationship between the law and τὸ ὄνομαστί κωμωδεῖν.

II. Kleonymos' caricature in comedy

The first mention of Kleonymos in comedy is in 425 at Ach. 88–90. Here the ambassadors recount how during a meal in Persia they were served a marvellous bird τριπλάσιον Κλεωνύμου whose name was φέναξ. This leads via a not very inspired pun on φέναξ/φοίνιξ to the verb φενακίζειν¹⁰). Both φέναξ and φενακίζειν are part of the comic vocabulary of deceit and falsehood, and are used of Paphlagon/Kleon at Kn. 633 and of Hierokles the oracle-monger at Peace 1087. The principal thrust of the joke here is at Kleonymos' size, but by implication he may be tarred with the brushes of gluttony and political duplicity (both themes will be found later expressed more fully). There is no hint of δειλία.

The allusion at Ach. 844 is less clear. The ἀγορά of Dikaiopolis will be fortunate in its lack of certain unsavoury creatures who, we assume, are fixtures of the Athenian ἀγορά. Kleonymos appears in company with Hyperbolos and Prepis, both of whom seem to be political personalities. The former is surely the well-known demagogue¹¹), while the latter is very likely the secretary to the βουλή in 421/0¹²). What "nor will you be jostled by Kleonymos" should mean apart from a weak jest at his size is not immediately apparent. In the previous line Prepis is made fun of as an εὐρύπρωκτος whose perversion will not infect one in Dikaiopolis' ἀγορά; thus one might expect a similar sort of indecency to be lurking here, but ὥστίξεσθαι does not seem to have this sense in comedy¹³). Thus in Ach. there is no mention of his shield or his cowardice.

Kn. 951–8, the first of the three allusions to him in that comedy, describes the signet-ring of Demos in the possession of Paphlagon. The seal is not what it ought to be; rather it is a λάρος κεχηνῶς ἐπὶ πέτρας δημηγορῶν, which, it is exclaimed, belongs more properly to the seal of Kleonymos. Again he is represented as a bird, this time as a λάρος, a greedy cormorant, a suitable bird indeed for a demagogue. In Aristophanes the λάρος is used of Kleon himself at Cl. 591, and at Birds 561 it is the bird appropriate

10) The English "gull/gulled" or "roc/rooked" has been used to render this pun in translation.

11) PA 13910. For his appearance and caricature in comedy see Dover 169–70, MacDowell 260–1, and Sommerstein (Ach.) 198.

12) PA 12184.

13) The word occurs five times in extant Aristophanes, always of crowded places, three times in the context of the crowds at the ἐκκλησία.

to the worship of Herakles, the great glutton of comedy. The rock on which the bird is perched has been regarded as the entire Pnyx or more reasonably as the βῆμα or λίθος from which one speaking in the ἐκκλησία would orate; in either case the connexion with the demagogues is clearly made by the participle δημιουργῶν. The image of the bird on the rock reminds one of the striking description of Kleon earlier in the play (313): κατὰ τῶν πετρῶν ἄνωθεν τοὺς φόρους θυννοσκοπῶν. The attribute κεχηνώς might refer just to the voracious maw of the λάρος, but Henderson has shown how frequently this word is used in comedy to allude to homosexual perversion¹⁴); there may well be a similar hint here¹⁵). This passage then repeats the bird imagery of Ach. 88–90 with his attendant theme of gluttony, and also establishes the political caricature of Kleonymos as a demagogue in the style of Kleon¹⁶).

Kn. 1290–9, the antode of the second parabasis, forms a pair with the ode (1264–73) in which two of comedy's starvelings, Lysistratos and Thoumantis, are ridiculed. In the antode Kleonymos is made fun of for his enormous appetite and gross manners; he is thus the natural complement to Lysistratos and Thoumantis. That these lines are parodic is clear; there are certain easily detected reminiscences of high style, and the song as a whole may be an allusion to a well-known fable in poetry¹⁷). The business with the σιπύη may well be an allusion to a real incident, as the mention of Thoumantis and Apollo at Delphi in the ode (1270–3) obviously reflects some real situation, although the use of ἄν in 1296–7 may suggest that a habitual practice of Kleonymos is at issue¹⁸).

To the implications of Kn. 1369–72 I shall return. For the moment I shall consider whether the passage refers to the same incident as the shield-jokes. Most commentators regard Kn. 1369–72 as the first variation on the theme of Kleonymos' shield,

14) J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, (New Haven 1975) 211 (cited as "Henderson").

15) See Kn. 78, 380, 758 where the word is used of Paphlagon/Kleon. Henderson 214 does include Kleonymos in his collection of *pathic κωμωδοῦμενοι* on the basis of Cl. 675 but does not adduce this passage.

16) J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane*, (2nd ed. Paris 1965) 417 curiously relates the details of the seal not to Kleonymos, but to Kleon.

17) In particular the forms ἀνέρων and ἄνα are representative of the high style. See R. A. Neil, *The Knights of Aristophanes*, (Cambridge 1901) 168, also A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes: vol. 2, Knights*, (Warminster 1982) 212.

18) See J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Equites*, (Leiden 1900) 221.

although the first actual statement of ῥιψασπία is reserved until Cl. 353–4. Some, however, deny that Kn. 1369–72 is part of the corpus of shield-jokes and regard Cl. 353–4 as the first mention of this theme¹⁹). This assumption allows them to date the incident behind the shield-jokes as happening in 424/3 – the defeat at Delion in late 424 being the obvious candidate, when Athens sustained a defeat on land and the retreat is recorded at Plat. Symp. 220 e–221 a and Thucydides 4.96.6–8. However, the arguments for excluding Kn. 1369–72 are not compelling. Van Leeuwen appears to dodge the issue, while Rogers suggests that by 424 Kleonymos had assumed the *persona* of one who would rather feast than fight. Sommerstein conjectures some notorious incident at a parade-ground to explain the allusion to the πόρπαξ. All these arguments are weak and do not dispel the obvious conclusion, that Kn. 1369–72 are in fact part of the same shield-theme as the later and more explicit jokes. Surely it is uneconomical and indeed unnecessary to assume one incident in 425/4 to explain Kn. 1369–72 and yet another in 424/3 to explain Cl. 353–4 etc. Does it not pass credibility to suppose that Aristophanes, having launched a shield-joke through the mention of Kleonymos' πόρπαξ, was fortuitously presented with Kleonymos' behaviour at Delion? It will be argued later that Kn. 1369–72 is the first shield-joke at Kleonymos and that all the other allusions are variations on a theme struck here for the first time.

As we have seen, Cl. 353–4 is the first overt mention of Kleonymos' ῥιψασπία. It forms part of the well-known explanation of why the clouds assume the shapes they do. The sight of Kleonymos has turned them into deer, the most timid of creatures (cf. Iliad 2.225). We may observe that Aristophanes explains the joke twice, once at τὸν ῥιψασπιν . . . ἰδοῦσαι and again in much the same words at ὅτι δειλότατον ἔώρων. May we infer that Aristophanes is here presenting the shield-joke in full form for the first time and that he is ensuring that the audience get the point of his joke²⁰? The comedian (or indeed popular gossip) has expanded the πόρπαξ-joke of Kn. 1369–72 and has twisted it maliciously into ῥιψασπία.

19) J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Nubes*, (Leiden 1898) 66, also (n. 18) 233; B. B. Rogers, *The Knights of Aristophanes*, (London 1910) 192, *The Thes-mophoriazusae of Aristophanes*, (London 1904) 65–6; Sommerstein (Ach.) 162.

20) This assumes that Cl. 348–56 are part of the original edition of the comedy. This does appear to be the case as both Simon and the son of Xenophantos are κωμωδούμενοι of the late 420s and not the 410s.

The allusion at Cl. 399–400 is straightforward. The company here kept by Kleonymos is Theoros and Simon (the latter also part of the theriomorphic jokes at 348 ff.). Both are known political figures, and very likely of the same stamp as Kleon²¹). Here it is the political Kleonymos who is made fun of as an ἐπίορκος.

Cl. 672–80, however, is a much less easy passage to understand. The exchange concerning Kleonymos and the κάρδοπος is often assumed to refer to the same incident which lies behind Κν. 1290–9²²). As before it is very likely that a jest at his very large size and appetite is meant. But what is the point of ἀλλ' ἐν θυεῖα στρογγύλη γ' ἀνεμάττετο? Dover assumes an obscene allusion to masturbation and adduces evidence from vases of satyrs employing “the two-handed technique”²³), while Henderson prefers the earlier explanation of homosexual anal intercourse²⁴). Van Leeuwen, following the lead of the scholiast who explains the passage in terms of Kleonymos' penury, sees the joke as having to do with φάρμακα, that Kleonymos was forced to grind his medicines in the same bowl from which he ate²⁵). The explanation of Henderson fits best, especially as it accords well with the use of the feminine Κλεωνύμη at 680 and with the hints of a similar homosexual theme at Ach. 844 and Κν. 956.

Wasps 15–27 is a splendid example of a developed caricature. The dreams of the two slaves are expressed in theriomorphic images in which the various demagogues become animals and the humour is generated by the appropriateness of the comparison. In the first dream an eagle swoops down into the ἀγορά (cf. Ach. 840 ff.), a large eagle (μέγας will be used of Kleonymos again), and seizes (ἀναρπάζειν is an especially appropriate word for gluttons²⁶), in its talons an ἀσπίς. In retrospect the pun on ἀσπίς = shield and ἀσπίς = asp is clear; an obvious hint is afforded by ἐπίχαλκον. The climax and final revelation of the joke is provided

21) Simon (PA 12686); Theoros (PA 7223) – he is specifically connected with Kleon at Wasps 599, 1220.

22) Dover 183, A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes*: vol. 3, *Clouds*, (Warminster 1982) 196.

23) Dover *ibid.*; in this he is followed by Sommerstein *ibid.*

24) Henderson 200; see his n. 27 on the same page for earlier explanations of this sort. Sommerstein (*ibid.*) follows the scholiast's lead, “Cleonymos was so poor that he could not afford a tray to knead barley-cakes, i. e. could not prepare his own food”.

25) Van Leeuwen (n. 19) 114.

26) ἀναρπάζειν – Κν. 52 (Paphlagon), Peace 624; see also ἀρπάζειν – Κν. 778, 802; Peace 1118; Birds 1111, 1624; Plut. 800.

by the very last word Κλεώνυμον. Aristophanes manages to get one last jibe in at his target by commenting how terrible it is for a man to have cast away his ὄπλα, slang of course for the male genitals²⁷). This suits well the effeminate Kleonyme of Cl. 680 and Henderson's interpretation of Cl. 675. Here too we have the third metamorphosis of Kleonymos into a bird.

Wasps 590–3 provide the clearest statement of Kleonymos' political activities. Here he is associated with Theoros, Euathlos, and Kleon in a markedly demagogic context. Observe again the epithet μέγας and the inclusion of the shield-joke in the coinage ἀσπιδαποβλής. Wasps 820–3 are unclear. Bdelykleon points to a statue of Lykos to be used in the courtroom scene. Philokleon exclaims, "How χαλεπός you were to see!"; his son responds, "Just as Kleonymos is to us". The adjective χαλεπός could mean both "stern" and "difficult"²⁸); v. 822 shows that Bdelykleon is understanding it in the latter sense. MacDowell explains the joke by assuming that a grotesquely padded actor appeared to represent Lykos and that 822 is an ironic joke at the actor's (and Kleonymos') bulk. The next line repeats the earlier joke about the ὄπλα. Sommerstein suggests that the actor representing Lykos was not costumed with a φαλλός; this accords very well with the sexual innuendo elsewhere²⁹).

Peace 444–6 means literally that any aspiring taxiarch should suffer the same fate as Kleonymos, presumably to lose his ὄπλα in both senses of the word. Other inferences to be drawn from this passage will be discussed later. At Peace 670–8 we have a witty development of the theme that Kleonymos, who runs away from battles, must be the best friend of Peace at Athens. This leads into a pun on ὑποβολιμαῖος/ἀποβολιμαῖος, the former being the technical term for a suppositious child, hence the statement, "but he wasn't the child of whom he said he was". Finally at Peace 1295–1304 the son of Lamachos has just performed to Trygaios' disgust a passage from Homer full of the sound of war. The son of Kleonymos is summoned who recites, inevitably, the famous lines from Archilochos ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαίων κτλ. This is perhaps the friend-

27) See Henderson 123.

28) MacDowell 242 prefers the latter meaning, while W. J. M. Starkie, *The Wasps of Aristophanes*, (London 1897) 281, and B. B. Rogers, *The Wasps of Aristophanes*, (London 1915) 125, favour the former. A. H. Sommerstein, *The Comedies of Aristophanes: vol. 4, Wasps*, (Warminster 1983) 207, sees both meanings as present.

29) Sommerstein (*ibid.*).

liest tone in which Aristophanes mentions Kleonymos; in the context of war and peace a *θύψασπις*, after all, is on the right side.

At *Birds* 288–90 we again meet Kleonymos in bird form, this time as the imaginary *κατωφαγάς*, a most appropriate bird for a glutton such as Kleonymos. A triple pun on *λόφος* follows, i. e. crest (of a hill, on which a bird would perch), crest of a helmet, and crest of a bird. It is usually assumed that by 414 any allusion to Kleonymos and armour will do. Lastly at *Birds* 1470–81 we find one of the finest pieces of comic caricature, the justly celebrated Kleonymos-tree. With the exception of the sexual innuendo all the elements of the caricature of Kleonymos can be found: his size (*μέγα* – 1477), his politics (*συκοφαντεῖ* – 1479), and his cowardice (*δειλόν* – 1477). But the passage is dominated by the excellent depiction of Kleonymos as an exotic tree, concluding with the observation that this tree, however, sheds in winter not its leaves, but rather its shields³⁰).

The reference at *Thesm.* 605 to the first woman as “the wife of Kleonymos” is ambiguous. Kleonymos is not heard of after *Birds* and the allusion to his wife only may indicate that he was dead by this time³¹). Presumably the first woman was a large and impressive figure, just the sort to have been the wife of Kleonymos³²).

There are then in the caricature of Kleonymos four separate elements:

- (1) his size and appetite: *Ach.* 88–90, 844; *Kn.* 956, 1290–9; *Wasps* 16–7, 592, 822; *Birds* 288–9, 1477.
- (2) his political activities: *Ach.* 88–90, 844 (?); *Kn.* 956, 1370; *Cl.* 398–400; *Wasps* 15–27, 590–3; *Birds* 1479.
- (3) a sexual innuendo: *Ach.* 844 (?); *Kn.* 956 (?); *Cl.* 672–80; *Wasps* 27, 823; *Peace* 678.
- (4) *θύψασπία*: (in fact the last facet of the caricature to emerge)

30) For the most recent discussions of this passage see M. Silk, *YCS* 26 (1980) 125–6, and C. Moulton, *Aristophanic Poetry, Hypomnemata* 68, (Göttingen 1981) 28–46.

31) It would be ironic, yet somehow not inappropriate, if Kleonymos were one of the many casualties of the disaster in Sicily.

32) See Rogers (n. 19). Fritzsche (*apud* Rogers) considers it an intentional irony that the wife of the Kleonymos called Kleonyme (*Cl.* 680) is suspected of being the male in disguise. J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusae*, (Leiden 1904) 79 regards the joke as the appropriateness of the gluttonous Kleonymos being a *mulier bibula*.

Kn. 1369–72; Cl. 353–4; Wasps 15–27, 592, 823; Peace 444–6, 679–80, 1295–1304; Birds 290, 1470–81; plus Eupolis 352 Kassel–Austin.

The other significant feature of the Aristophanic portrait of Kleonymos is the frequency with which the κωμωδοῦμενος is transformed into some sort of creature, four times as a bird and once as the splendid tree. The scope and imagination of the treatment makes Kleonymos one of the most developed characters in Old Comedy.

III. The historical Kleonymos

The name is not common in Attic prosopography. One man from the fifth century and four from the fourth are known. In the year 426/5 occur three epigraphical allusions to a Kleonymos. These are IG I³ 61 (the second Methone decree of which Kleonymos was the proposer and by which Methone was allowed to import grain from Byzantion and a promise was made to consider Methone's complaints against Macedon), IG I³ 68 (like the Methone decree from the first prytany of 426/5, by which the collection of the φόρος was tightened up)³³, and IG I³ 69 (a proxeny decree)³⁴. The coincidence of dates (inscriptions – 426/5, Ach. – 425) and the rarity of the name make it virtually certain that these men are the same. We may thus note his interest in foreign affairs, the allies, and the tribute; this aids in understanding Kn. 951–8 and Wasps 590–3 in their proper contexts.

Andokides (1.27) records that in 415 a Kleonymos proposed a reward of a thousand drachmai for information concerning the profanation of the Mysteries. To postulate two Kleonymoi active in politics at this time is unnecessary, and Birds reveals that the famous Kleonymos was still prominent in 414. This is certainly the same man. That the demagogues were prime movers in the investi-

33) See R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, (Oxford 1969) 176–80, 184–8.

34) M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxenies in the Fifth Century B.C.*, (Toronto 1978) no. 19, pp. 123–9 dates this decree to the late 440s on the basis of the letter-forms, and would see another Kleonymos as the proposer of this decree. Two other proxeny-decrees (his numbers 40, 42) he regards as proposed by our Kleonymos and restores that name in his text. The latter, dated on strong grounds to the first prytany of 426/5, has . . . υμος εἶπεν in the text; thus his restoration is tempting. The former document is far less securely attributed to Kleonymos.

gations and prosecutions of 415/4 is well documented³⁵), and we may with Sommerstein conclude, “this [the decree of 415] links him with the popular leaders of that time, as his tribute decree of 426/5 links him with Cleon”³⁶). He is not the rather Falstaffian figure of amusement that at least one earlier critic had created, but a serious political leader whose importance has been generally underestimated³⁷).

IV. ῥησασπία and ἀστρατεία

In order to assess the real situation behind the jokes at Kleonymos’ shield I should consider certain passages from Aristophanes which perhaps have not received due attention. First Κν. 1369–72, which as I have argued above is the first instance of this theme:

- ΔΗ. ἔπειθ’ ὀπλίτης ἐντεθεὶς ἐν καταλόγῳ
οὐδεὶς κατὰ σπουδὰς μετεγγραφήσεται,
ἀλλ’ οὐπερ ἦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐγγεγράψεται.
ΑΛ. τοῦτ’ ἔδακε τὸν πόρπακα τὸν Κλεωνύμου.

That there were irregularities in the κατάλογος of enrolment for active service is clear from the comments of Lysias *et al.*³⁸) and the natural interpretation of this passage is surely that Kleonymos through personal and political influence had managed to have his military registration changed from hoplite service. The significance of the πόρπαξ may be gathered from Κν. 843 ff., where we see that the affixing of the πόρπαξ to the shield signified that the shield (and its bearer) were ready for combat. Thus we may conclude that Kleonymos after the posting of the κατάλογος had been able to arrange κατὰ σπουδὰς a change in that status. The first mention of Kleonymos’ shield in comedy then has nothing to do with actual desertion or δειλία, but rather with the avoidance of military service.

35) Thuc. 6.28; And. 1.27. On the politics of the year 415/4 see D. M. MacDowell, *Andocides: On the Mysteries*, (Oxford 1962), and A. W. Gomme *et al.*, *HCT IV* 276 ff.

36) Sommerstein (Ach.) 162.

37) See Th. Kock, *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, *Die Ritter*, (Berlin 1892) 146, and Starkie (n. 28) 102; see also Meiggs and Lewis (n. 33) 188.

38) Lys. 14.7, 15.5, 16.13, 30.29; Aisch. 2.133, 168; also Aelian, *VH* 13.12 and Lucian, *Timon* 51.

We may next examine the *antepirrhemata* of the second parabasis of *Peace* (1172–87), in which the chorus of countryfolk complain first of the taxiarch who (in the style of Lamachos in *Acharnians*) presents a fine display before the battle, but who is the first to depart the fray, leaving the common man to bear the brunt of the attack (1172–8). Back home such men tamper with the *κατάλογος*, enrolling some men and deleting others, usually for the benefit of the citydwellers. The verb ἐγγράφειν found at Kn. 1371, recurs here at 1180. These men, says the chorus, are in the sight of gods and men ὀψάσπιδες, although they may not be so in actuality. Thus we have here a clear connexion between tampering with the *κατάλογος* and an accusation of ὀψασπία. This must have a bearing on the case of Kleonymos as I have argued it. The passage has begun with a description of the rather Gilbertian taxiarch, who “led his regiment from behind – he found it less exciting”. One recalls *Peace* 444–6 where Kleonymos is associated with a taxiarch who aspires to make a good show. Some commentators have in fact seen Kleonymos as the taxiarch meant in 1172 ff., and van Leeuwen assumes that Kleonymos was a taxiarch at the time of the incident which lies behind the shield-joke³⁹). However, Kleonymos would make an odd taxiarch, and the force of Kn. 1369–72 is that he had his own transfer arranged, not that he arranged changes for others. Aristophanes has no reason to be indirect, and I should feel happier if a definite article or some other demonstrative stood in the text of *Peace* 1172 to denote a specific individual. The switch from the singular to the plural at 1178 likewise suggests that Aristophanes has a type in mind and not a particular person.

Finally we may look at *Wasps* 1112–21 where the chorus deprecates the fact that an ὀστράτευτος can share in the benefits of the φόρος. Such benefits in the chorus' opinion belong to “those with a sting”, not to the “drones” who are clearly the demagogues. While it would be stretching the implications of this passage to see Kleonymos explicitly meant here as a drone without a sting, still his attested connexion with the φόρος and the demagogues and the

39) Van Leeuwen (nn. 18, 19). So also P. Mazon, *Aristophane. La Paix*, (Paris 1904) 102, and Taillardat (n. 16) 135–7. The latter examines the curious description at 1177 ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρῶων, and explains it as an allusion to the long flowing χλαμὺς worn by the dandy. He cites Mazon's “taxiarque . . . aux ailes ouvertes”. Taillardat observes that this description occurs twice elsewhere in extant Aristophanes, at *Birds* 800 of the military officer Dieitrephe, and at *Frogs* 932 of Eryxis; of the latter he hypothesizes, “Eryxis n'aurait-il pas été, lui aussi, officier?”

implications of ἀστρατεία are useful in appreciating the sort of comic *topos* being created.

It will now be clear how I interpret the shield-jokes. The first allusion appears in a context which suggests avoidance of military duty and it is in that light that we should regard this aspect of Kleonymos' caricature. We may suppose that in 425 Kleonymos in celebrated fashion had his military registration changed and that Aristophanes had made this part of his jokes at Kleonymos in *Knights*⁴⁰). In *Clouds*, *Wasps*, and *Peace* he develops this into the full-fledged statement of ῥησασπία; the frequency of the joke surely reflects its popularity with the audience and the comedian's own fondness for tormenting a favourite victim. Once established the allusion might as well be fact as far as the comic poet and his audience were concerned, and it was available for all sorts of imaginative variations. We may notice that the joke moves from just the shield to include a general mention of ὄπλα (*Wasps* 15–27 etc.) and the pun on λόφος (*Birds* 290). If the whole business arose out of ἀστρατεία, we can see why the allusions need not be restricted to the shield but can refer to the panoply in general. The prominence of the shield would be due first to the significance of the πόρπαξ, the affixing of which would render a hoplite ready for battle, and secondly to the appearance of the shield in the law on ῥησασπία, in the third provision of the δίκη κακηγορίας, in the poetic tradition (*vid. infra*), and in the popular folklore such as the story of the Spartan mother's advice on leaving for battle.

There does exist in the ancient literature a definite tradition concerning ῥησασπία. The best-known example is the famous passage from Archilochos cited above⁴¹), but it turns up also in the poetry of Anakreon and Alkaios⁴²). There is much to be said for MacDowell's conclusion, "Discarding one's shield in order to run away from battle is most often mentioned playfully, as an action inviting laughter rather than as one requiring serious punishment"⁴³). At the same time it must be conceded that in law ῥησασ-

40) It has been suggested to me that the origins of the shield-joke lie in the Athenian campaigns in the Northwest in 426/5, that Kleonymos was a staff-officer entrusted with the shipment of captured enemy shields to Athens. This shipment went astray (*Thuc.* 3.114), and we can see how a maliciously minded comedian could have distorted this affair into ῥησασπία. This explanation, however, does not take into account the natural interpretation of *Kn.* 1369–72.

41) Archilochos fr. 5 (West).

42) Alkaios 428 LP = 401 B Voigt; Anakreon 381 b PMG.

43) MacDowell (n. 35) 112.

πία was no laughing matter. We have already cited Andokides on the penalty for conviction for throwing one's shield away. From Lysias 10 it is evident that to say of a man τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀποβαλεῖν was one of the three ἀπόρρητα of the δίκη κακηγορίας⁴⁴). Apart from Kleonymos no κωμωδούμενος is ever called a ῥίψασπις; unlike other forms of abuse ῥίψασπία did not become a comic τόπος. Aside from the brief allusion at Eupolis 352 Kassel-Austin to the ῥιψάσπιδόν τε χεῖρα τὴν Κλεωνύμου, it was Aristophanes alone who made jokes about ῥίψασπία and without exception these jokes were aimed at Kleonymos. The single allusion by Eupolis I should regard as a reflection of this theme established by Aristophanes (cf. Eupolis' "plagiarism" of *Knights* – Cl. 554). What I find significant is that Kleonymos' caricature was for the most part avoided by the other comedians. There was, I infer, something *risqué* about this theme, a sense of treading on forbidden ground or of violating a *tabu*.

The shield-jokes are derived from ἀστρατεία, and we may usefully compare the best-known target of these jokes, Amynias son of Pronapes. At Cl. 689–92 we hear:

- ΣΩ. πῶς ἂν καλέσειας ἐντυχὼν Ἀμυνία;
 ΣΤ. ὅπως ἄν; ὦδέ “δεῦρο δεῦρ’, Ἀμυνία”.
 ΣΩ. ὀρθῶς; γυναῖκα τὴν Ἀμυνίαν καλεῖς.
 ΣΤ. οὐκ οὐν δικαίως, ἦτις οὐ στρατεύεται;

44) The problem of the relationship between comedy and the law (particularly the δίκη κακηγορίας) is beyond the scope of this paper. Briefly stated, I believe that the δίκη κακηγορίας as we know it with three provisions (at least) from Lysias 10 was in effect during the career of Aristophanes and that (*pace* Cic. de Rep. 4.10, fr. 11) comedy enjoyed no official exemption from that law. Assuming that Kleonymos was not guilty of ῥίψασπία, we may conclude that technically the comedian was guilty of slandering Kleonymos. However, to resort to prosecution under this δίκη appears not to have been “sporting” (Lys. 10.2; Dem. 18.123), and Kleonymos may have chosen to ignore the whole business (so MacDowell 130 and Dover ad 353). The allusions in Lucian and Plutarch to the carnival spirit of comedy (Luc. Anab. 14, 25; Plut. Mor. 10c) suggest that it was preferable to take a joke than to take comedy seriously, and Kleon's actions after *Babylonioi* seem not to have been typical. The comedian's defence may be found at Frogs 368: κωμωδηθεῖς ἐν ταῖς πατρίοις τελεταῖς ταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου; personal humour bears the twin sanctity of religion and tradition. M. Radin (AJP 48 [1927] 215–30) attempted to identify the shadowy ‘decree of Syrakosios’ (Birds 1290) as the δίκη κακηγορίας, allegedly introduced in 415/4 by that demagogue, but his theory does not stand up to scrutiny from the comic evidence. The only documented law on comedy is that attested in Ach. 67, introduced in 440/39 and repealed in 437/6. The Athenians, it would seem, preferred their comedy unregulated.

It is surely no coincidence that these lines come only ten verses after the feminizing of Kleonymos at 680. The treatment of the ἀστράτευτος as a woman suits well the ὄπλα-jokes at Kleonymos at Wasps 27 etc. and the possible homosexual innuendos elsewhere. A lost comedy of this period by Eupolis, his *Astratentoï*, had the alternative title in antiquity of *Androgynoi*; we can see how this comedian dealt with the ἀστράτευτοι. Eupolis fr. 37 Kassel-Austin (from *Astratentoï*) contained the word ἐγγράφειν which has occurred twice in the context of ἀστρατεία and Kleonymos. In the case of Amynias it has been argued that he used his ambassadorial duties in Thessaly to avoid active service⁴⁵); in Kleonymos' it appears that he used his influence to have his registration altered. Both κωμωδούμενοι are part of the comic tradition concerning the ἀστράτευτος.

V. Conclusion

I suggest that the literal interpretation of Kleonymos' ὄψασπία as found in the commentaries is not the only possible explanation, nor in fact is it the logical one to be had from Kn. 1369–72, the first appearance of the joke. A more likely explanation is that Kleonymos' 'offence' was a flagrant case of avoidance of hoplite service, which was distorted either by the comedian himself or by popular gossip (cf. the κληδών at And. 1.130 concerning Hipponikos) into the form in which we find it at Cl. 353–4 etc. The original joke had to do with his πόρπαξ, the handle which readied the shield for active use; the step to the actual abandonment of the whole ἀσπίς is not a long one. We may wonder why Kleonymos was singled out for such treatment, as ὄψασπία is not a common sort of joke. Perhaps we need some actual incident involving Kleonymos' shield. Did Kleonymos in a dramatic gesture upon gaining his transfer of service cast away the shield or at least its handle or make some notable comment to that effect? Personal

45) L. L. Forman, *Aristophanes Clouds*, (New York 1915) 155. On Amynias see Dover 185, MacDowell 139 f. Earlier studies include those of G. Kaibel, *Hermes* 30 (1895) 441–5, who regards Amynias as a general in this year, but who had not yet seen active service, and D. M. MacDowell, *CQ* 15 (1965) 50, who also sees Amynias as a general. See also J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, (Oxford 1971) 471.

motives may also be at issue⁴⁶), or the comedian may just be following the trend of popular talk. In any case it is my contention that a literal explanation is not the natural one and that ἀσφατεία is the real situation behind the jokes. Unlike the case of Archilochos, both owner and shield are in fact 'blameless'.

Trent University, Peterborough
Ontario (Canada)

Ian C. Storey

46) One had hoped that among the known demotics for men called Kleonimos (Aphidnaios, Epikēphios, Epieikides) there might have been a Kydathenaieus.

EIN TEXTEINSCHUB IN DE SUPERFETATIONE KAP. 29 = DE STERILIBUS KAP. 217

Die beiden in der Überschrift genannten Kapitel bieten ein und dieselbe Krankheitsbeschreibung; einige wenige Abweichungen sind für die hier zu erörternde Frage ohne Bedeutung. Die folgenden Zitate und Übersetzungen stützen sich auf die Ausgabe der Schrift *De Superfetatione* (Superf.) von Lienau¹), jedoch ist die Lienausche Übersetzung an mehreren Stellen verändert worden.

Es geht in diesem Kapitel um an sich fruchtbare Frauen, die augenblicklich unter Kinderlosigkeit leiden. Die Begründung dieses Leidens ist organpathologisch und bezieht sich primär auf den Muttermund, der sich in vielfältiger Weise verlagern oder selbst verändern kann. Das daraus resultierende Krankheitsbild ist eine Unregelmäßigkeit der Menstruation, die ganz ausbleiben kann

1) Lienau, Cay: Hippokrates. Über Nachempfängnis, Geburtshilfe und Schwangerschaftsleiden. Hrsg., übersetzt und erläutert. Berlin 1973 (= CMG I 2,2).