

nach der Salzhaltigkeit des Meeres bis hin zu Erkenntnis- und Wahrnehmungslehre widmet. Dabei geht es insbesondere darum, wie diese Ansichten mit den Grundlagen von Anaxagoras' Philosophie verknüpft sind. Hier werden vor allem Testimonien ausgewertet, darin auch Widersprüche klug aufgezeigt. Eingehend behandelt wird die Frage, ob Anaxagoras nur eine Welt, wie die antiken Testimonien angeben, oder mehrere Weltbildungsprozesse 'irgend anderswo', wie etwa B 4a nahelegt, angenommen hat. Interessant ist ihr eigener Lösungsvorschlag, der davon ausgeht, daß sich neben dem kosmogonischen Hauptwirbel, von ihm angeregt, kleinere Strudel bilden, die sich auch zu – allerdings kleineren – Welten neben der größeren zentralen formieren (218). Freilich sollte man dann annehmen, daß solche Nebenwirbel recht rasch von dem sich ausweitenden Zentralwirbel aufgesogen würden, andernfalls könnte sich der Zentralwirbel nicht mehr weiter ausdehnen – was aber Anaxagoras ausdrücklich voraussetzt. Auch mit der Rolle des *Nous* scheinen solche unbeabsichtigten Kosmogonien als Nebenphänomene nicht so ohne weiteres vereinbar.

Insgesamt vermittelt das Buch ein aufschlußreiches und weitgehend konsistentes Gesamtbild von der Philosophie des Anaxagoras, es entfaltet dessen Gedankenwelt aus einer wohltuenden Souveränität heraus, die sich in der auktorialen Dominanz soweit einschränkt, daß dem Leser stets genügend Spielraum für eigenständiges Weiterdenken bleibt. Vor allem geht es der Verf. darum, eine Sichtweise auf die anaxagoreische Philosophie zu entwickeln, die diese im Sinne eines funktionierenden Systems begreifbar macht, ohne dabei überschließende Sinn-elemente hineinzukonstruieren. Die Probleme werden jeweils in gut nachvollziehbarer Weise vom *status quaestionis* aus entfaltet und im Horizont der verschiedenen Forschungsansätze debattiert, um dann auf einen Lösungsvorschlag hinausgeführt zu werden, den man jedenfalls immer als wohl begründet, wenn auch nicht in jedem Fall als vollkommen plausibel akzeptieren wird.

Regensburg

Georg Rechenauer

\*

Michele Napolitano: *I Kolakes di Eupoli*. Introduzione, traduzione, commento. Mainz: Verlag Antike 2012. 342 S. (Studia Comica. 4.).

For *Kolakes* we do not have major remains on papyrus (cf. Fr. 99 *Demoi*) or extensive fragments of ancient commentaries (cf. Fr. 172, *Marikas*) or a plot-summary (as with Kratinos' *Dionysalexandros*), but the 35 fragments (55 lines), coupled with substantial *testimonia* (nine entries in Kassel-Austin)<sup>1</sup> and the likelihood that *Kolakes* has influenced Plato's *Protagoras* and *Symposium*, make it possible to reconstruct the comedy to some degree. Napolitano has done a thorough and admirable job of just such a project for Eupolis' lost comedy which won first prize at the Dionysia of 421.

In his introduction (15–58) he admits that although we are in the dark about both details of the comedy's larger theme and plot-line and also its *personae*, some scenes can be identified. He suggests an opening dialogue between two slaves where the necessary information is given. Here he plausibly locates Fr.

<sup>1</sup> R. Kassel & C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vol. V (Berlin 1985), 380–99.

156–8, but also the inventory and preparations for the banquet (Fr. 160–1, 163–4). Not impossible, but the last could also belong to a later cook-as-expert scene, like those so common in New Comedy. I suspect that one of these two characters may be a door-keeper, like that at *Protagoras* 314, where scholars have long suspected the influence of Eupolis' comedy. Napolitano concludes that the comedy ended with Kallias' ruin at the hands of his 'guests', and sees in Fr. 162, 166, and 169 a parody of a messenger-speech from tragedy – here compare *Wealth* 627–770 – describing the plunder. He presents an attractive argument for taking Fr. 171 with Fr. 385, both in iambic tetrameter, as part of a second *agon* between Kallias and Alkibiades, resembling that between father and son at *Clouds* 1345–1451. He does well to remind us that in the late 420s Alkibiades had made a notable marriage to Kallias' sister and thus his appearance would not have been out of place in a comedy set in Kallias' home. But in dealing with possible parallels from *Clouds*, we must remember that *Kolakes* was produced between the two versions of *Clouds* and that the incomplete revision that we possess would not have been available to Eupolis in 421.

Napolitano argues that if Fr. 176 is describing Kallias – later (167–9) he rejects the suggestion that it is *Protagoras* – then Eupolis' caricature of him is meant to suggest luxury, dissolution, and possible effeminacy. But a homoerotic liaison with Autolykos does not in itself connote effeminacy and Kallias is explicitly remembered for his relationships with women (as at *Birds* 284–6). Even less likely is his attempt to relate Fr. 176.4 ('he hawks up apples') to Fr. 294 (*Marikas* – 421) and Pherekrates Fr. 138 (*Persians*) to create a Persian element in the comic picture of Kallias. Here Napolitano adduces the Peace of Kallias allegedly negotiated by Kallias' grandfather and the sobriquet *lakkoploutos* given to the same Kallias for his acquisition of Persian gold at Marathon. But as the Peace of Kallias is not known as such before the fourth century, many have questioned its existence, and I suspect that Kallias' family was made fun of for having wealth, not for the source of that wealth. Hyperbolos in *Marikas* may have had some Persian colouring, but would Eupolis have done the same thing twice in the same year?

Against those who see *Kolakes* as essentially 'social comedy' (myself included), Napolitano regards the comedy as intensely political. But what was Alkibiades' public image in 421? We look back with the benefit of hindsight on passages such as Aristophanes Fr. 205 (*Banqueters* – 426) or *Acharnians* 716 (425) or *Wasps* 44–6 (422), but would the spectators in these years have viewed him as a sinister political figure or as someone prominent for his personal and social image? Napolitano argues also that the picture of Kleon in *Knights* and *Wasps*, sucking up to Demos and surrounded by his own *kolakes*, will have guaranteed a political sense to any use of *kolax*. But there is nothing in the *kolakes'* self-description (Fr. 172) that is at all political – the *ploutax* in line 9 is merely a rich and gullible target. While the symposium at *Wasps* 1220ff, composed of Kleon and his followers, might be considered a political gathering, I have argued elsewhere that the one at *Wasps* 1299ff is not.<sup>1</sup> Rather the people there are made fun of for their social status and behaviour as 'party animals'. This where Kallias in *Kolakes* belongs.

<sup>1</sup> I.C. Storey, 'The Symposium at *Wasps* 1299ff.', *Phoenix* 39 (1985) 317–33 (not included in Napolitano's bibliography).

For Napolitano Eupolis' comedy was a satire on riches, and while Aristophanes and Kratinos (see Fr. 171 of *Wealth-Gods*) were attacking the *nouveaux-riches* demagogues of the 'left', Eupolis was satirising the traditional and excess wealth of men like Kallias and Alkibiades in contrast with more well-behaved *chrestoi* such as Nikias. He compares the inclusion of Kallias in *Demes* (Fr. 99.12) among those 'who eat better than we do', but without knowing the identity and circumstances of the chorus of that comedy, it does not seem enough to support the serious level that Napolitano suggests. In my view Kallias has more in common with the ineffectual and apolitical young men of P.G. Wodehouse. He is being made fun of because he is 'not too bright, and rich' (Fr. 172.7–8). In this respect Napolitano wonders whether the comedy ended, like the extant *Clouds* with Kallias' repentance and revenge, or with his despair, preferring the latter and seeing the comedy as displaying «le tinte certo più fosche e pessimistiche» (58).

The rest of the work is devoted to a text and commentary of the major fragments, arranged in the order which Napolitano thinks they were to be found in the original version. The translation (in Italian) is relegated to the notes; it would have been easier to consult, if elevated to the text and set in higher type. In some places Napolitano prefers a reading other than that in Kassel-Austin. These he lists on pp. 61–2, but it would perhaps have been more useful to have these highlighted at the first presentation of each text. Here I was glad to see that Napolitano reads Fr. 174 as lyric rather than as eupolideans (unlikely), although I am still suspicious that Καλλίος may be a gloss on τῷδε. He makes a good case for assigning Fr. 161, 163–4 to the opening scene, where a pair of slaves are compiling an inventory of Kallias' inheritance and then moving on to plan for the dinner (Fr. 164). Other suggestions have included a cook superintending preparations for the banquet and a creditor liquidating Kallias' possessions in a later scene.

His discussion of Fr. 157, where Protagoras is 'inside', is central to his understanding of the comedy. I agree with his conclusion (98) that the speaker (a door-keeper in the prologue?) is describing Kallias' current guests, rather than the later banquet-scene. For the meaning of *aliterios* as either 'impious' or 'scoundrel', he argues strongly for the former. But I stand by my contention<sup>1</sup> that the mention of an *aliterios* 'inside' Kallias' house must be connected to the story at Andokides 1.130–1 of a 'spirit' or 'poltergeist' which has upset the house of Hipponikos. Whether the tradition of Protagoras' 'atheism' is early or late does not really matter, although I do favour the latter. Napolitano's conclusion is very much in line with his reading of the play as a *Philosophenkomödie*, on which the *kolakes* are to be seen as «sofisti», but with Carey I would see the *kolakes* as «non molto più che rapaci parassiti» (113).<sup>2</sup> Are we to assume that all the guests *chez* Kallias are «sofisti» – of the six mentioned by name in the fragments (Fr. 172. 14–16, 177–80) only Chairephon (Fr. 180) has any philosophical association. And there is nothing in Fr. 172 that is at all intellectual in tone; the *kolakes* of Eupolis' comedy are essentially professional spongers.

<sup>1</sup> I.C. Storey, 'Four Notes on Eupolis', *Prudentia* 23.2 (1991) 1–12.

<sup>2</sup> C. Carey, 'Old Comedy and the Sophists', in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes* (London: Duckworth, 2000) 419–36 [423–5].

In his discussion of Fr. 173 (151–4) Napolitano rightly concludes that these two lines, in paeonic tetrameter, come from an *epirrhema* of a parabasis (probably a second parabasis): ‘And [but?] I say that I provide by far the most numerous and greatest benefits for mortals, and this we shall demonstrate’. But who is the ‘I’, the chorus speaking (as often) in the singular, or the poet himself? While the latter does explain more easily how ‘I’ provide benefits, is ‘mortals’ the term we want here? Surely we want something like ‘citizens’ or ‘spectators’. Also I can find no parallel in Aristophanes for the chorus-as-poet changing from ‘I’ to ‘we’ as happens here. The chorus speaking *in propria persona* can change abruptly from singular to plural (as at *Wasps* 1071–5), and the chorus-as-poet can speak as ‘I’ (as at *Acharnians* 659–64, *Clouds* 518–62, *Wasps* 1284–91, *Peace* 755–74), but nowhere in the latter mode do we get an abrupt change from ‘I’ to ‘we’.

Napolitano has much to say (229–63) about the enigmatic Fr. 171, where two speakers are discussing Alkibiades: ‘A. Let Alkibiades come out from among the women. B. What are you saying? Won’t you go home and exercise your own wife?’ (translation of the text as printed in Kassel-Austin.). First, against those who see these lines as illustrating Alkibiades’ effeminacy (*euryproktos* at *Acharnians* 716) he rightly supports Athenaeus’ explanation that it has to do with Alkibiades as *akolastos pros gynaikas*. After all, Alkibiades was now thirty years of age and married to Kallias’ sister. Here ‘from among the women’ means ‘from the women’s quarters’, where the lustful Alkibiades is imagined as emerging. Napolitano argues that *tí ληρεῖς* usually occurs as an interjection, followed by the first speaker’s continuation and thus re-punctuates these lines to read ‘A. Let Alkibiades come out from among the women. B. What are you saying? A. Won’t you go home and exercise your own wife?’, identifying the two speakers as Kallias (A) and Alkibiades (B) and the scene as a second *agon*. Napolitano also follows Gelzer in assigning Fr. 385, where one speaker is known to be Alkibiades, to the same scene of *Kolakes*.<sup>1</sup>

Napolitano has provided an excellent starting-point for further study of this prize-winning comedy. Each fragment is discussed in detail with careful presentation of the relevant scholarship, in places defending established views and in others advancing his own interpretations. In two areas I wanted more: some discussion of the ‘great idea’ and the nature of the principal *agon*, and more consideration of how Xenophon’s *Symposium* and Plato’s *Protagoras* and *Symposium* might contribute to reconstructing the comedy. The first two, after all, are set at the house of Kallias, and in the third Alkibiades appears in a memorable scene late in the action. To be fair, the matter of the door-keeper in *Protagoras* does get a look-in at page 93 n. 219. At times I felt that there were three simultaneous discussions going on, one in the actual text, a second (set in smaller type) expanding upon the first, and then the massive footnotes which at times were climbing up the page and tackling the text. My own preference is for fewer and leaner footnotes and that some of this secondary material should be incorporated into the main text, some collected into formal appendices, and some eliminated. But that cavil aside, Napolitano is to be congratulated on producing a fine and stimulating contribution to the study of Eupolis.

Peterborough, Ontario

Ian C. Storey

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Gelzer, *Der epirhematische Agon bei Aristophanes* (Munich 1960) 279.