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Appendix

Catalog of Terminology, Practitioners, and Institutions Related to Rhetoric in the Remains of Fifth-Century Comedy

This appendix collects and catalogues references to “rhetorical” language, its practitioners and its contexts in fifth-century Greek comedy. In the main text, many of the subjects of these entries are discussed in the context of a chronological progression. Here, entries group all the relevant citations by subject for ease of consultation and reference.

This catalog comprises three categories. (1) The first section catalogues terminology in comedy that designates or characterizes “proto-rhetorical” language in the fifth century, i.e., the language that later came to be reckoned as the beginnings of formal rhetoric. By “proto-rhetorical,” I mean language that comedy singles out for its unorthodoxy (and usually its ethical dimension as well), but which was not yet focalized in the discipline later known as “rhetoric” (cf. the Introduction). (2) The next section catalogues references to speakers and theoretical explorers of language, including those who later come to be reckoned the pioneers of rhetoric. These practitioners include individuals and groups, sometimes named and sometimes not, from politicians who had to deliver public speeches as part of their activity to philosophers who contributed to the debate and development of rhetorical theory. (3) The last section lists and summarizes passages that describe or dramatize institutions associated with the theory and practice of rhetoric in the political arena (the Assembly, Council, and courts), as well as training or philosophical mechanisms for transmitting and advancing the intellectual exploration that would become formalized as rhetoric. References to political and philosophical institutions focus on how comedy depicts their relationship to rhetoric, but other references to them in comedy are cited as necessary to provide context for the depictions of these institutions more generally.
The few relevant references to comedy and rhetoric from Sicily in the fifth century and its reception in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries are presented in their entirety and discussed in Chapter 1, and so are not repeated here.

**CHRONOLOGICAL LIMITS FOR OLD COMEDY AND RHETORIC**

Since antiquity, scholars have divided the history of Greek comedy into Old, Middle and New. These are not hard, fixed categories, and some fragments cannot be comfortably placed under just one of these rubrics, but the distinction remains helpful, and the historical periods underpinning these categories are meaningful for the debate about the development of rhetoric, so the nomenclature is used here. For the purposes of this book and this appendix, Old Comedy covers Athenian comedy belonging to the fifth century down to 403 B.C.E. Ancient testimony says comic productions at Athens were institutionalized in the 480s, and any history of comic performance prior to that is opaque to us now. Scarcely any fragments point to events prior to the 440s, so all the material presented here, although some of it cannot be dated, is overwhelmingly likely to belong to the second half of the century. It was during this same time frame that traditionally the first precepts of formal rhetoric were developed by the intellectuals now known as the Sophists, and the phenomenon spread through the cultural and political life of Athens.

**Terminology**

Consistent with recent research into the development of early rhetorical theory, the remains of Old Comedy do not include the word ῥητορική or any of the formal terms canonized in the curriculum of rhetoric from the late fourth century onward, such as names for parts of speech.

Listed in (Greek) alphabetical order below are entries for the terms (and clusters of related terms) attested in Old Comedy for designating or characterizing “proto-rhetorical” language in the later part of century, terms which, for purposes of comedy, took place mostly in public, political settings.

**ἀδείν**: A snatch of dialogue from Aristophanes’ *Farmers* (fr. 101) says that “singing” can mean a poor defense in court.

A. καὶ τὰς δίκας οὖν ἔλεγον ἀδοντες τότε:  
B. νῆ· Δία· φράσω δ’ ἐγώ μέγα σοι τεκμήριον.  
ἔτι γὰρ λέγουσ’ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καθήμενοι,  
ὡς κακῶς τις ἀπολογήται τὴν δίκην· ἀδείς.

A. So did they speak their cases by singing them that time?  
B. By Zeus, yes! I’ll give you real proof:  
The old men sitting (on a jury) still say,  
when a defendant presents his case poorly,  
“You’re singing!”
No other extant passage uses the phrase this way, but the term does appear in some brief jokes with forensic contexts (Wasps 100–101, 268–70, 815–17; Birds 39–41).

ἀδολεσχεῖν: This is a strong term for verbal blather. Eupolis has a line addressing a σοφιστής (see the entry for this term below), probably sarcastically or ironically, to teach ἀδολεσχεῖν (fr. 388). Eupolis also applies ἀδολεσχεῖν to Socrates (fr. 386; cf. below under “Practitioners”). A fragment of Aristophanes references Prodicus (fr. 506; cf. below under “Practitioners”) with respect to the corrupting influence of someone engaged in ἀδολεσχεῖν.1 Strepsiades uses it twice when deliberating with “Hermes” to determine his revenge on the residents of Socrates’ Phrontisterion (Clouds 1480, 1485). Hermippus fr. 21 has λεπτολογία, “refined talk,” glossed as the equivalent of ἀδολεσχεῖν.2

ἀντίθετον: This word, attested only once (Aristophanes fr. 341), comes the closest of any term to matching its meaning, if not its exact form (later ἀντίθεσις), in later technical vocabulary. Only the reference to Agathon confirms that its meaning seems the same as later (καὶ κατ’ Ἀγάθων’ ἀντίθετον ἐξυρημένον, “and a shaven antithesis in the manner of Agathon”), since antitheses were a hallmark of his style (cf. under “Practitioners”).3

βοᾶν: This is a regular word for shouting, but it frequently occurs in the context of political deliberation and thus in contexts where proto-rhetorical language also appears. Shouting can be a legitimately aggressive tactic, e.g., at Ach. 38, where Dicaeopolis will shout down anyone at the Assembly who refuses to deliberate about peace, and Ach. 711, where Thucydides son of Milesias could once have outshouted his prosecutors (cf. under “Practitioners”). More often shouting is unproductive, e.g., at Ach. 185–86 and 353 (of the hostile chorus of Acharnians), Kn. 286 (Paphlagonian will shout down the Sausage-Seller), 311 (the chorus of Knights refers to Cleon’s shouting), 728 (Demos responds to the noise of the Paphlagonian and Sausage-Seller), Wasps 471 and 750 (Bdelycleon responds to Philocleon’s cries of anguish), 921 (Philocleon says the case cries out clearly for conviction), 1228 (Bdelycleon says Philocleon will be shouted down by Cleon at a banquet), and 859 (Dionysus tries to convince Aeschylus to respond to debate, ἐλέγχου, calmly instead of shouting).4 Other nonverbal body noises can be associated with this sort of unproductive dialogue, such as farts and snores (πέρδεται and ῥέγκεται, Kn. 115) or clearing the throat (χρέμπτεται, Th. 381).5 Whereas the standard term for responding in a debate is ἀντιλέγειν and engaging in

1. See Chapter 4, 117 for this fragment.
2. Cratinus fr. 342 similarly applies ὑπολεπτολόγος to Aristophanes for resembling Euripides.
3. The fragment is problematic and the subject of some debate. Karachalios (2006) argues that it is not a fragment of the lost Thermophoriazusae at all, but a gloss reference to the extant one. If he is right, this unique instance of ἀντίθετον in the fifth century would disappear.
4. Frogs 779, where the Demos calls for a contest between Aeschylus and Euripides, plays against the stereotype of the angry Demos by having the group call for judgment (see Chapter 6).
conversation διαλέγεσθαι, a participant should also “listen back” (ἀντακούειν), but the counterpart to shouting is open-mouthed gaping, which Aristophanes repeatedly criticizes among the citizen Demos (Ach. 105, 635; Kn. 651, 755, 1119, 1263; Wasps 695, 1007; and cf. Chapter 3).

βροντᾶν: Thundering is a metaphor found in comedy to describe some speakers (most notably Pericles). O’Sullivan attempts to make a case that it is a technical term (1992, 107–10), but Willi (2003) has refuted this conclusion (cf. the Introduction).

γλῶττα: The tongue, as the organ of speech and synecdoche for language, generates its own group of metaphors.7 The comic playwright Plato offers praise of the tongue (fr. 52):

γλώττης ἀγαθῆς οὐκ ἔστ' ἄμεινον οὐδὲ ἕν
... ἢ γλώττα δύναμιν τοὺς λόγους ἐκτῆσατο,
ἐκ τῶν λόγων δ’ ἀττ’ αὐτὸς ἐπιθυμεῖς ἔχεις.

There’s not a thing better than a tongue when it’s good.
... The tongue provides power for words,
And from the words you have what you desire.

Cratinus offers a similar evaluation of the tongue (fr. 128):

ἀλλὰ μὰ Δί’ οὐκ οἶδ’ ἔγωγε γράμματ’ οὐδ’ ἐπίσταμαι,
ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ γλώττης φράσω σοι· μνημονεύω γὰρ καλῶς.

Well, by Zeus I don’t know my letters and I can’t think,
But I’ll just speak to you from the tongue, because I remember just fine.

Context is not available for either of these fragments, but in the extant plays, or where the context or tone is evident for a fragment, the tongue regularly implies negative or less-than-candid speech.8 Another passage from the comic playwright Plato (fr. 176) is typical, where a speaker says one thing in his mind while he does another with his tongue (νοεῖ μὲν ἕτερ’, ἕτερα δὲ τῇ γλώττῃ λέγει). Cratinus sarcastically

---

6. As the speaker in Crates fr. 45 commands someone to do; cf. similar commands in Euripides at Supp. 569 and Hec. 321 and adesp. 572, where λεχαίνειν is equated with διαλέγεσθαι.
7. See Rosenbloom (2009, 200–209) for a rich discussion of orators’ tongues in fifth-century literature, although he does not specifically recognize that γλώττα tilts toward the negative in drama. Fr. 233 (Banqueters) seems to use γλώττα in its later technical meaning of “gloss,” but this mostly likely reflects the usage of Galen (our source for the fragment), rather than an early attestation of this meaning.
8. The only positive compound of the tongue occurs at Knights 782, where Demos was able to provide greatness for striking up with the tongue (μεγάλως ἐγγλωττοτυπεῖν) after Marathon. More than a century later, Philemon offers this positive statement (fr. 24): πρόχειρον ἐπὶ τὴν γλώτταν εὐλόγω τρέχειν, “running to the tongue is handy for the sensible.”
refers to Pericles as “the greatest tongue of the Greeks” (μεγίστη . . γλῶττα τῶν Ἑλληνίδων, fr. 324). Another fragment of Cratinus might elaborate on what Pericles can do with his tongue (from Dionysalexandros, possibly Athena’s offer in the parody of the judgment of Paris):

γλῶττάν τε σοι
dιδώσων ἐν δήμῳ φορεῖν
καλῶν λόγων αἰείνων,
ή πάντα κινήσεις.

. . . gives you a tongue of beautiful eternally flowing words to bring to the Demos with which you will move them all. (fr. 327 = Olson B16; cf. Pericles under “Practitioners” below)

Another fragment (adesp. fr. 213) offers the compound neologism γλωσσο-κηλο-κόμπης, “charming with a noisy tongue.” Dicæopolis refers to a tongue-lashing from Cleon (Ach. 380). The Sausage-Seller’s unsavory credentials include an effective tongue (Kn. 657). He also invokes the image of the city gagged speechless by Cleon’s tongue (351–52). The Cloud chorus predicts Strepsiades will be able to fight with his tongue (Clouds 419), a talent Strepsiades himself admits he needs (792) and later relishes (1160). Kreitton Logos promises Pheidippides a small tongue (1013) but threatens that Hetton Logos would make him have a big one (1018). Hetton Logos himself endorses the tongue (1058). The Wasp chorus urges Philocleon to use his whole tongue in defense of jury service (Wasps 547). The Bird chorus sings a song of “tongue-bellies” (Birds 1694–1705), which hinges on the Athenian obsession with court drama and cites specifically Gorgias and Philippus (see the entries under “Practitioners”). Agathon’s song makes InLaw think of tongue-gagging (Th. 131).

Of course the most notorious tongue is that of Euripides’ Hippolytus (612, ἡ γλῶσσ’ ὸμώμοχ’, ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος, “My tongue swore, but my heart is unsworn”), which Aristotle reports was even used against Euripides in a court case (Rhet. 3.15.8.1416a28–34). Aristophanes turns this line on Euripides himself, in passing at Th. 176 (cf. Frogs 102), and crucially at Frogs 1471 (cf. Euripides’ invocation of the tongue at 892, the chorus’s response about wild tongues at 898 and earlier of Euripides at 828; Socrates invokes the tongue at Clouds 424). Elsewhere Aristophanes speaks of measuring the tongue Euripides used to “wipe out speeches” (ῥήματ’ ἐξεσ<ν>μήχετο, fr. 656).9

In a potentially related metaphor, licking sometimes appears, providing a variant and twist on the negative activities of the tongue. At Kn. 103 and 1094 and Wasps 904, licking is equivalent to embezzlement. Two phrases without context could belong to this cluster of metaphors. At adesp. fr. 328, ἐλλείχοντα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, “licking on the Athenians,” is glossed as referring to what incorporated citizens (πρόσγραφοι) do, on the analogy of licking honey, in order to appear as citizens. Also, adesp. fr. 438 glosses φοινικελίκτην καὶ λόγων ἀλαζόνα as a deceitful speaker.10

9. See Chapter 6 n14 for more on this fragment.
By comparison, στόμα, “mouth,” is benign. Consequently, Aristophanes uses στόμα to refer to the positive things he takes from Euripides (fr. 488), and he has sweet honey bedew the mouth of Sophocles (fr. 598). Phrynichus has the braggart Aeschines (not the famous orator) admire the mouth of Dionysus (fr. 10).

Diminutives and compounds of στόμα, however, always have negative connotations, and Euripides is usually involved. Euripides accuses Aeschylus of an ungated mouth (Frogs 838). Aeschylus calls Euripides a mouthing-collector (Frogs 841). In Frogs, the chorus says Euripides has a “mouth-working tongue” (Frogs 826–27) and that both have powerful mouths (880). For the consistently pejorative uses of στομύλλω and related words, see Ach. 429 (Dicaeopolis of Euripides), 579 (Dicaeopolis to Lamachus, a parody of Euripides?); Kn. 1376 (followers of Phaeax); Clouds 1003 (Kreitton of Hetton Logos); Peace 995 (Greeks mouthing each other in war), Th. 461 (chorus on the Garland-Seller), 1073 (Inlaw and Echo); Frogs 92 (“worse than Euripides”), 841, 1069, 1160 (Aeschylus of Euripides), 1071 (Aeschylus of punks), 1310 (Aechylus parodying Euripides), 943 (Euripides of his own writing); and adesp. fr. 115 dub. (στωμυλήθραι δαιταλεῖς, “mouthy banqueters”).

On the other hand, φωνή, “voice,” is neutral and unmarked. See, e.g., Kn. 637–38, where the Sausage-Seller need only refer to his “effective tongue” (γλῶτταν εὔπορον) for it to be awful, but he has to specify “shameless” to indicate his voice has a negative quality (φωνήν τ’ ἀναιδῆ; cf. 218 for another example).

eἰκός: This key term is associated with the “Sophistic” movement at the end of the fifth century for arguments using probability, which were a hallmark of fifth-century thinkers and speakers engaging in the new, rational means for constructing arguments. Consistent with Old Comedy’s antagonistic stance toward the new intellectuals and their distinctive language, comic idiom uses εἰκός in its value-laden, more traditional senses of “normal” or “proper.” Thus Pherecrates deploys the term in a fragment probably spoken by a young man to an elder, perhaps his father, that “it is proper [εἰκός] for me to be in love, but past your season” (fr. 77). Cratinus says the tragedian Acestor will get a beating unless he tidies up his business, where εἰκός could yield either sense, but certainly there is some hint of propriety (“he deserves it”). In the context of natural phenomena, it means activity that is natural or normal, as in the action of plants (Aristophanes fr. 572) and thunder (Clouds 393). Otherwise, propriety, not probability, is always the key. A chorus asks whether it is proper that Thucydides son of Milesias (cf. under “Practitioners”) should be hounded by prosecutors (Ach. 703), for example. Even Pheidippides after his training with Hetton Logos uses an argument of propriety, not probability (Clouds 1418), and Strepsiades concedes it in these terms as well (1439). There is no evidence of a probability argument in comedy, even in parody.

11. Plato, Theaetetus 142d illustrates the more positive στόμα: Euclides, to express that he could not recite something from memory, says: οὔκουν οὕτω γε ἀπὸ στόματος· ἀλ' ἐγραψάμην ὑπομνήματα... ἀναμιμνησόμενος ἔγραφον, “No, definitely not from memory [lit., “from the mouth”], but I wrote down what I remembered ... and drawing on my memory wrote it out.”

12. The mouth on occasion can be a potential source of trouble. The mouth does need to be restrained in situations calling for holy silence (Kn. 670, 1316; Th. 40). The mouth of the sycophant Nicarchus should be arrested (Ach. 926).

ἐλέγχειν: In Clouds, Hetton Logos announces he will “cross-examine” Kreitton Logos (1043) and later, after defending the tongue (see above), invites Kreitton Logos to “refute” him in turn (μ’ ἐξέλεγξον εἰπών, 1062). The Paphlagonian engages in questioning of Sausage-Seller (Kn. 1232), and the men’s chorus urges the Proboulos to pursue thorough cross-examination of Lysistrata (Lys. 484). The contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in Frogs is first described as a ἐλέγχον τῆς τέχνης (786). Dionysus tells Aeschylus to ἐλέγχειν instead of being angry (857). Euripides several times engages in it (894, 908 and 922) and offers that spectators of his plays could examine what he said, so he had to be honest (960–61). Despite the negative association of elenchus in the fourth century and later, in Frogs it thus seems like a more civilized process of cross-examination.14

ἐπός: This is the most precise term for an individual word, although colloquially it can refer to a saying or remark (cf. the entry for ῥῆμα below). Dionysus describes the analysis of Euripides’ prologues as προλόγων τῆς ὀρθότητος ἐπών, “the correctness of your prologue words” (Frogs 1181). The comic poet Phrynichus mentions τῇ διαθέσει τῶν ἐπῶν (“the arrangement of words,” fr. 58), but there is no context to help define the phrase precisely. Eupolis (fr. 326) sets διάθεσιν ᾠδῆς, “arrangement of song,” in opposition to the traditional form (ἀρχαῖον). Given that there was decidedly a move toward “new music” by the end of the fifth century, perhaps Phrynichus’ fragment refers to an analogous phenomenon in prose.15

καιρός: This word for “the right time” is attested to have been of great interest to Gorgias (82 B13 DK), but little detail survives. Aristophanes uses the word, but never in the context of anything philosophical, argumentative or oratorical.

κράζειν: Much like βοᾶν (above), κράζω and related words mean “to shout or scream.” This cluster of words can refer to oratory or wrangling in political debate. Cleon’s screaming is pervasive in Knights (256, 284, 487, 863, 1018), and he will continue screaming even after being cast out of the city (1403). Aristophanes invokes Cleon’s screaming two years later in the parabasis of Wasps (1287), where the chorus of Cleon’s wasp supporters also screams, but this is just as likely because they are aggressive (226) or threatened (415) as because they are associated with courts. Similarly, the chorus of Acharnians initially screams (Ach. 182), and later Thucydides son of Milesias could have outshouted his prosecutors (711; cf. under “Practitioners”). Finally, in Peace (637), generic orators rouse the people with their screaming.

λαλῆσαι: In succeeding centuries, this word becomes an ordinary one for talking, but in the fifth century it retains its sense of empty chatter or small talk. Eupolis succinctly summarizes λαλῆσαι ἄριστος, ἀδυνώτατος λέγειν, “superb at chatter, incapable of speaking” (fr. 116). This is the idea behind Paphlagonian Cleon’s dismissal of an amateur speaker who chatters (Kn. 348; cf. 295). Aristophanes does not distinguish

14. Aristophanes fr. 257 uses the term, but it lacks context.
15. See Csapo (2004) on the political dimension of the “New Music,” although he does not discuss this fragment in particular.
types of chatter, so the idea gets applied to many speakers and situations.\textsuperscript{16} Among them, a scholiast reports Aristophanes describing Gorgias and Philippus as \textit{λάλοι} (fr. 118, but there is no certainty that the scholiast uses Aristophanes’ exact wording). Aristophanes links Socrates to such chatter (\textit{Frogs} 1492). Since Euripides receives as much criticism for being a sophist (in the modern sense) as anyone in Greek comedy (see “Practitioners” below), it is unsurprising that his tragedies are not just \textit{λάλοι} but “chatter around” (περιλαλούσας, Aristophanes fr. 392) and elsewhere need more salt and less chatter (Aristophanes fr. 595; cf. fr. 158 for the salt metaphor). Euripides in \textit{Frogs} asserts that he promoted chatter (\textit{Frogs} 954), and Aeschylus is happy to agree (955, 1069, where also note the pairing of \textit{λαλία} and \textit{στομυλία}). Dionysus finds Aeschylean silence preferable to other playwrights’ chatter (917). In \textit{Clouds}, Kreiton Logos complains about young men chattering (931, 1053), and later the chorus characterizes Pheidippides’ upcoming speech as chatter (1394). In \textit{Acharnians}, people are chattering in the Agora instead of at the Assembly (21). Aristophanes’ use of the related words \textit{καταλαλεῖν} (fr. 151) and \textit{λάλησις} (fr. 949) is also recorded.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{λέγω/λόγος}: These and related terms are broad, multivalent words and concepts that the ancient Greeks themselves discussed, debated and redefined constantly for centuries, and have consequently had full-length modern studies devoted to them.\textsuperscript{18} As such they go well beyond the limits of stable, controlled technical vocabulary and beyond the reach of the catalog here.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{ληρεῖν}: This word refers more strongly to verbal nonsense than \textit{λαλεῖν}. While Euripides admits to \textit{λαλία}, he denies \textit{ληρεῖν} (945), although both he and Aeschylus accuse each other of it (923, 1136, 1197). The choruses of both \textit{Clouds} (359) and \textit{Frogs} (1497) link Socrates to this nonsense.

\textbf{λοιδορεῖν}: This word covers a range of harsh exchanges, from mean-spirited arguing, to arrogant disdain to harsh (yet righteous) advice (cf. the ironic definition at \textit{Kn.} 1274). It characterizes the bickering Logoi in \textit{Clouds} (934), the argument between Strepsia-des and Pheidippides (\textit{Clouds} 1553) and the start of trouble between Aeschylus and Euripides (\textit{Frogs} 757, along with \textit{θόρυβος} and \textit{βοᾶν}), although Dionysus will say such bickering is not appropriate for them (857). Like \textit{βοᾶν}, it can be a legitimately aggressive tactic, as at \textit{Ach.} 38, where Dicaeopolis will shout down anyone at the Assembly who refuses to deliberate about peace. It is, of course, an activity of Cleon (\textit{Peace} 656), even when he is exiled at the end of \textit{Knights} (1400).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} See Willi (2003, 168–69) for the gender associations Aristophanes links to this cluster of words.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Aristophanes otherwise uses \textit{λαλεῖν} in contexts not connected with proto-rhetoric or its usual contexts. For other instances of \textit{λαλεῖν} in comic fragments, where the context is unclear, or at least there is no indication of political or philosophical content, see Pherecrates frr. 2, 70, 138; Strattis fr. 54; adesp. 1005.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} For studies with particular relevance to Old Comedy, see O’Regan (1992), Schiappa (2003, esp. 87–116, 157–89) and Freydberg (2008).
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Chapter 3 discusses the \textit{logoi} of \textit{Clouds} and notes the unique use of \textit{legontes} as “orators” in \textit{Peace} (635).
\end{itemize}
θόρυβος is a more general word for chaos and hubbub, but no surviving comic passage uses it specifically of an angry group at assembly or deliberations.

προοίμια: Proemium, as a designation for the initial section of a formally organized speech, does not appear until the fourth century. In the fifth century, the word refers to greetings. Its single attestation in surviving fifth-century comedy (Knights 1353) conforms to standard fifth-century usage (cf. the Introduction and Chapter 3 on Knights).

ῥῆμα; This noun refers to an utterance or unit of speech, generally more than individual words. Thus Aeschylus in Frogs refers to analyzing each of Euripides’ ῥήματα “by the word” (κατ’ ἔπος, 1198; cf. entry on ἔπος above), and in the context of scales, a ῥῆμα equals a single line of verse to be weighed (Frogs 1379). It is the more common term used when the character of a speaker’s language is to be described, whether it is Ionic pronunciation (Peace 521), the bloated style of Aeschylus (Frogs 940) or “prettied up” (ῥήματα κομψά, Aristophanes fr. 719). A ῥῆσις refers to a passage or speech and does not carry any particular evaluative connotation.21 By contrast, diminutive ῥημάτια are linked in a pejorative way with creative speakers (e.g., Euripides at Ach. 447 and Peace 534; Hetton Logos at Clouds 942; fear-mongering threats at Wasps 668). Cf. the entry under “Practitioners” for ῥήτωρ.

τεκμήριον: Hubbard cites ὑποτεκμαίρῃ (Aristophanes fr. 205) as an example of technical vocabulary with regard to rhetoric, but no evidence (no pun intended) supports his assertion.22 Neither the noun nor the verb is restricted technical vocabulary, and neither is limited to forensic or rhetorical contexts (e.g, at Wasps 76, the verb τεκμαίρεται is used of a medical diagnosis).

Miscellaneous Terminology from Fragments

Even with the helpful editions of Rusten and Storey, the fragments of Old Comedy are less accessible than the complete plays of Aristophanes.23 For convenience and reference, then, I collect here the remaining notable references to speech and language in the fragments of fifth-century comedy.

A passage in Eupolis’ Marikas gave an ancient commentator reason to reference Cleon sputtering in Knights (παφλάζειν, fr. 192.135–36; cf. Knights 919 and Peace 314 for the same metaphor). In Pherecrates fr. 56, an unidentified speaker is silent, until the verbal torrent has poured out. Another voice breaks out sharply and loudly (Pherecrates fr. 153). In Phrynichus fr. 3 (= Olson J14), an old man fears younger men who scratch up

---

20. Cf. adesp. fr. 442 ψυχροκομψεύματα, “cold and prettied up,” perhaps of speech; for “cold” speaking, see Thb. 170 (of the tragedian Theognis), 848 (of Euripides’ Palamedes), and Theophilus fr. 4 (of rhetores).
21. If the gloss cited at Crates fr. 59 does belong to Old Comedy, it is the earliest use of ῥῆσις in comedy, apparently meaning a decree of some sort.
22. Hubbard (2007); cf. the Introduction.
their elders with words, although they speak sweetly (τούτοις οἷς ἡδυλογοῦσι μεγάλας ἀμυχὰς καταμύξαντες). Syracosius yaps like a puppy when he speaks at the bema (Eupolis fr. 220; cf. the barking at Wasps 904). The longest fragment from Aristophanes’ first play, Banqueters (205), hinges on the issue of orthodox language.24

Another fragment (fr. 233) features part of the same debate, but about words in older authors such as Homer and Solon, still a type of discussion associated with the new intellectualism in the idea of analyzing language.

Because many fragments derive from lexicographers hunting for rare words, a happy number of creative neologisms referring to language survive. Euripides’ skill is στρεψιμάλλος, “wool-tangled” (Aristophanes fr. 682).25 Cratinus coins λυπησιλόγος as someone who causes pain with their words (fr. 381), and describes running down someone with words like running over them with a horse (fr. 389 ἐφιππάσασθαι λόγοις). Such might be the goal of a politician engaged in knock-down politics (πολιτικοκοπεῖν in Sanyrrio fr. 7 and glossed at Plato fr. 113 as λοιδορεῖν and κωμῳδεῖν). Suetonius (adesp. fr. 930–31) collects several heavy compound creations used to characterize busybodies in the Agora, some attested from Aristophanes’ extant plays but some not known from other comic remains, including πολυκαλινδήτους, “lots of rolling.” It is important to keep in mind that these more isolated items could apply equally well to speakers or situations quite apart from those using formal rhetoric (e.g., to a lyric poet).

Practitioners

Comedy devotes at least as much time and effort to characterizing the speakers and theorists of language as to the language itself. This section on people has two parts. The first has entries for terms that label a class of speakers, including those who might not be defined by being such speakers, but who form groups typically employing such language. The second part proceeds alphabetically through the individuals cited in comedy in this connection. In comedy, proto-rhetorical language was to be found primarily in public, political environments, so this section overlaps with discussions of political leadership or creatures of the political environment.26

ἀλαζών: This is a strictly pejorative term, “faker,” which in the fifth century is applied to a range of characters employing pretentious quackery, but all of whom use decidedly verbal trickery, whereas in later periods it is used of a wider range of braggarts and fools.27 The residents of Socrates’ Phrontisterion are such fakers (102, naming Chaerephon, and see individual entry below on Socrates, and 1492; cf. 449). Eupolis uses it of Protagoras (fr. 157; see below). Other practitioners include Cleon (Kn. 269, 290, 902, the last with him on the receiving end from the Sausage-Seller). Dicaeopolis calls out several of them (63, 87, 109, all of an unnamed ambassador, 135 of Theorus),

24. See Introduction and Chapter 2 for more discussion.
25. See Chapter 6 n11 for more on this metaphor.
including a generic one who speaks δίκαια κἄδικα to swindle rural folk (371–73). Adesp. fr. 438 mentions a Λόγων ἀλαζόνα (“faker in his words”), and Cratinus might, appropriately enough, pair it with κόμπος, “noise” (fr. 375). Euripides applies the label to Aeschylus, somewhat ironically, of his silences (Frogs 919).28

ῥήτωρ: This term is etymologically related to ῥήσις (see the entry under “Terminology” above), and this origin may explain its usage, insofar as it refers to someone publicly engaged in policy debate.29 The word has a different range from English “orator” (as a professional speaker or someone especially skilled in delivering speeches), often corresponding more to “politician” in the sense of someone whose occupation involves regular debate in public, political institutions. Aristophanes places them in the courts (Ach. 680) and in the Assembly (Ach. 38; Kn. 1360). A passage from Banqueters (fr. 205) links them directly with strange, new phrasing. Otherwise, they come in for general abuse as politicians (Kn. 358, 423–26; Th. 530; Frogs 367). Similarly, references to ῥήτορες in fragments of Old Comedy do not mention them in the act but refer to them more as a species.30

Although the word ῥήτορική derives directly from this term, there is no reference to it or to any technical skill or training for rhetores.31

σοφιστής: Studies have established that, by the fifth century, this word refers broadly to performers and to those who have some prestige for their wisdom. In Old Comedy it never refers to the intellectuals now known as the Sophists.32 For example, Cratinus calls a group of poets a swarm of σοφισταί (fr. 2). Eupolis applies it to a rhapsode (fr. 483). Plato the comic poet wrote a play titled Σοφισταί, in which he identifies Bacchylides (a flute-player, not the choral poet) as a σοφιστής (fr. 149). A σοφιστής is addressed in Eupolis, but given parallel usage, this is most likely someone who in modern terms would be identified as a poet or performer (fr. 388). In the complete comedies, the word appears only in Clouds. According to Socrates, the Clouds nourish “sophists” (331), probably meant in the most general way. Hetton Logos promises to make Pheidippides a sophist (1111), i.e., to make him smart and accomplished. Later, the chorus uses the term ironically of Strepsiades (1309). Athenaeus records that the term was also a widespread one for comic performers (14.621d–e), but it is not clear to what time period he refers.

συνήγορος: A few passages use the term συνήγορος, a legal advocate in the courts. In comedy, there seems to be little difference between a ῥήτωρ and a συνήγορος, except that συνήγοροι are more specifically aggressive prosecutors. Indeed, one fragment mentions both ῥήτορες and συνήγοροι, without any indication that they are meaningfully different groups (Aristophanes fr. 205.6–9). The συνήγορος at this time was associated with young, aggressive prosecutors, a group likely, as comedy

28. In a nonrhetorical, but still verbal, sense, it is used of deceit through oracles (Peace 1045, 1069 and 1121 of Hierocles; Birds 983) and of Meton (Birds 1016).
30. See Chapter 2 for more references and discussion.
31. For the public, political ramifications of the training in Clouds, see Chapter 3.
depicts them, to use the new dubious style of speaking to achieve their ends. The chorus at *Acharnians* 703–18 describes a chattering (cf. άλαλείν under terminology) prosecutor of this sort, and one more fragment (Aristophanes fr. 424) assumes the idea. In *Knights*, Agoranacritus asks the rejuvenated Demos how he will handle a bomolochic prosecutor, and Demos responds that he would hurl one to his death (1358–63).

Below is an alphabetical list of historical individuals either (1) linked to the history and development of rhetoric and mentioned in fifth-century comedy or (2) mentioned in comedy in connection with the new intellectualism or because their speech characterized them in some fashion. In general, the entries focus on references germane to these areas, so that passages without any discernible connection to language are omitted. This list also does not include poets mentioned in connection with their poetry unless they also are linked to progressive, proto-rhetorical language.

- Aeschines (PA 337, PAA 114830; not the famous orator): Aeschines is linked to hyperbolic speech at Phrynichus fr. 10; *Wasps* 459 and 1243 (cf. *Wasps* 325, 1220; and *Birds* 823).

- Agathon (PA 83, PAA 105185): Like Euripides, this tragic poet was mocked for his novel and experimental work on the tragic stage. A long scene in Aristophanes’ extant *Thesmophoriazusae* satirizes his effeminacy and creative process (1–294). A fragment from Aristophanes’ other *Thesmophoriazusae* (fr. 341) mentions κατ’ Αγάθων’ ἀντίθετον ἐξυρημένον, “a shaven antithesis in the manner of Agathon,” referring both to the tragedian’s effeminacy and his verbal style influenced by Gorgias.

---

33. See Chapter 3, 97–98 for details.
34. The chorus of *Wasps* makes a passing mention of a συνήγορος as an aggressive prosecutor (482). The position of συνήγορος changed in the coming years, but a fragment from the third century suggests their reputation only worsened:

_μόνῳ δ’ ἵατρῳ τούτῳ καὶ συνήγορῳ
ἐξεστίν, ἀποκτείνειν μὲν, ἀποθνῄσκειν δὲ μή._

It’s possible only for a doctor and a συνήγορος to commit murder and not die for it. (Philemon Jr. fr. 3)

35. Where applicable, for each name I include PAA numbers, cross-references to Diels-Kranz (DK) and to Radermacher’s *Artium scriptores* (AS). Of those who could have overlapped with the period being surveyed, the following have left no trace in comedy: Antisthenes (AS 19), Cephalus (AS 18), Critias (DK 88, AS 17), Corax and Tisias (AS 2), Empedocles (AS 1), Erginus (AS 5), Evenus (AS 20), Hippias (DK 86, AS 11), Lycymnius (AS 16), Nicias of Syracuse (AS 4), Polus (AS 14) and Theodorus (AS 12). The remains of Greek Old Comedy are far too sparse to make any substantive claims from the silence about these individuals, a number of whom are shadowy figures even in broader contexts.

36. For more comprehensive references, see Sommerstein (1996) and Storey (2011, 3: 453–58). On the other hand, I have endeavored to be as thorough as possible about references in fragments, since these are more difficult to research.

37. For discussion and debate about broader issues with respect to the way Aristophanes makes comedy of historical individuals, see Ercolani (2002) and Saetta Cottone (2005).

38. See Given (2007) for a careful analysis of this scene and its role in the play as a whole.

39. This fragment is problematic and part of recent debate about the date of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* and how it fits into the career of Agathon. See Butrica (2001, 2004), Austin and Olson...
• Alcibiades (PA 600, PAA 121630): The notorious and charismatic Alcibiades represented much of what was upsetting to comic poets (and others) about the young generation of intelligent but unusual speakers. He was known for, apparently in a positive way, a distinct lisp when he spoke (mocked at Wasps 42–45). One fragment mocks Alcibiades’ son (also named Alcibiades) for emulating his father, including his lisp (Archippus fr. 48). Much earlier, in 427 B.C.E., Aristophanes (fr. 205, cf. pp. 40–41) includes Alcibiades among the notorious speakers emulated by a young delinquent. Plutarch states generally that Alcibiades was an able speaker and that comic poets testified to his being a very powerful one among the rhetores (adesp. fr. 695, δυνατὸς ἦν εἶπεῖν . . . τῶν ῥητόρων ὁ δυνατώτατος). The reference to him as an aggressive synegoros in Acharnians (716) fits this generalization, but most extant references to him in comedy focus on other aspects of his reputation.40 One fragment (Eupolis fr. 385) blends Alcibiades’ excesses with the boldness of his speech and assertions:

(AΛκ.) . . . ὃς δὲ πρῶτος ἐξήνυρον τὸ πρῶ τ’πιπίνειν.
(A.) πολλὴν γε λακκοπρωκτίαν ἡμῖν ἐπίστασ’ εὐρὼν.
(ΑΛκ.) εἰεν’ τὶς εἶπεν “ἀμίδα, παι” πρῶτος μεταξ’ πίνων;
(B.) Παλαμηδικόν γε τοῦτο τούξεύρημα καὶ σοφὸν σου.

Alcibiades: . . . and who was the first to invent drinking in the morning?
B: You sure set up a lot of ass-hollowing for us when you invented that.
Alcibiades: OK. Who was the first to say “Boy! Pisspot!” right in the middle of drinking?
B: That invention is just like Palamedes, so clever of you.

Whereas in Aristophanes fr. 205 an unusual word is linked to Alcibiades, here a drunken Alcibiades on stage himself lays claim to innovation, both in action and in a new saying. The respondent’s citation of Palamedes provides an indirect link to the new intellectualism.41

(2003–4) and Karachalios (2006). Athenaeus comments that Plato also mocked Agathon’s balanced clauses and antitheses: χλευάζει τε τὰ ἰσόκωλα τὰ Ἀγάθωνος καὶ τὰ ἀντίθετα (187c). See Dover (1980, 123–24) for analysis of the way Plato represents these traits, with parallels from Gorgias’ funeral oration (B6 DK), in Agathon’s speech at Symp. 194e–97e. An unattributed fragment of Aristophanes, but possibly also belonging to the other Thermophoriazoeae, attributes the phrase “light-bringing fir torches” to Agathon (πεύκας . . . φωσφόρους, fr. 592.35 = TrGF 39 15).

40. See Gribble (1999, 74–79) for a survey of the depiction of Alcibiades in comedy. Some scholars have hunted for a number of further allusions to Alcibiades in comedy, but see the cautionary notes of Storey (2003, 194), Dover (2004) and Olson (2007, 218).

41. Palamedes has some associations with the new thinkers through Gorgias’ speech on Palamedes, and Euripides’ play about him seems to have portrayed him as a condemned intellectual (frs. 578–89, esp. 578 on his inventions) and was staged in 415 (cf. Chapter 6). If Eupolis fr. 385 belongs to Baptai, it could belong to near or after the time Euripides’ play was staged; cf. Storey (2003, 108–10, 355). In the next century, the trope of “inventor” appears often in comic fragments, on which, see Hunter (1983, 162).
Appendix

- Antiphon (PA 1304, PAA 138625; R 10; cf. DK 87): Antiphon the Rhamnusian, the first orator whose works survive, and leader of the oligarchic Four Hundred who briefly ruled Athens in 411, was mentioned by the comic playwright Plato in his *Pisander* for his greed (φιλαργυρία, fr. 110). Philostratus (*Lives of the Sophists* 1.15.2) adds that comedy attacked Antiphon as a devious legal expert who provided, at great cost, speeches composed contrary to justice, especially for those with risky cases (τοῦ Ἀντιφῶντος ὡς δεινοῦ τὰ δικανικὰ καὶ λόγους κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου ξυνγκειμένου ἀποδιδομένου πολλῶν χρημάτων αὐτοῖς μάλιστα τοῖς κινδυνεύονσιν). 42

- Callias (PA 7826, PAA 554500): Callias, son of Hipponicus, in comedy was notorious for wasting the resources of his very wealthy family. This image played some role in Aristophanes’ *Horai* (fr. 583) but probably not a central one. Eupolis’ *Kolakes* was set at Callias’ house and dramatized the decadence at length. Later sources testify also to Callias’ reputation for supporting and housing the famous intellectuals of his day. The fragments of Eupolis’ *Kolakes* (421 b.c.e.) are consistent with these accounts, naming Protagoras, Alcibiades, Chaerephon and possibly Socrates among the guests. 43

- Cleon (PA 8674, PAA 579130): Cleon dominated politics in Athens from the death of Pericles (the earliest reference to him, Hermippus fr. 47, cites Cleon’s opposition to Pericles during the first two seasons of the Peloponnesian War) until his own death in 422 b.c.e. (Eupolis fr. 211 and *Peace* 269–70 note his death; adesp. 846 notes this and the subsequent rise of Hyperbolus to prominence). Aristophanes pursued him relentlessly on stage, devoting virtually all of *Knights* and much of *Wasps* to him. Jokes about him turn on everything from his appearance (Cratinus fr. 228 on his face, eyebrows and μανία, “madness”) to his profession of tanner (adesp. fr. 297). His harsh manner of speaking was another regular target. Aristophanes literally makes him a barking dog in *Wasps*, and this idea probably lies behind the comic playwright Plato calling him Cerberus (fr. 236). One fragment ridicules him for publicly hailing χαίρε, “Hello! Rejoice!” while he was actually hurting the city (Eupolis fr. 331 = Olson E17). Another criticizes the lack of free speech (ἰσογορία) under him (Eupolis fr. 316 = Olson E18). 44

- Cleophon (PA 8638, PAA 578250): A difficult passage in *Frogs* (676–85) satirizes Cleophon as a foreigner, perhaps including a characterization of his speaking style (see Chapter 6 for discussion).

- Demostratus (PA 3611, PAA 319245): Aristophanes in *Lysistrata* (391–97) depicts him as a raving speaker, possibly reckoned as “Bouyzges,” who helped

42. Scholars remain divided about whether this Antiphon is Antiphon “the Sophist” (DK 87). Gagarin (2002) and Pendrick (2002) each summarize the position of the two camps. Cratinus mentions an Antiphon son of Lyconides (fr. 212), certainly different from the Rhamnusian, but who cannot be securely identified with any other “Antiphon.” 43. Storey (1985 and 2003, 179–97).

44. The fragmentary commentary on Eupolis’ *Marikas* mentions Cleon παφλάζειν, “sputtering” (fr. 192.135–36, probably citing the parallel at *Knights* 919). For a reconstruction of the feud between Aristophanes and Cleon, along with helpful surveys of relevant bibliography, see Storey (1995) and Olson (2007, 210–13).
lead Athens into the disastrous Sicilian expedition. Two fragments of Eupolis’ 
Demes mention a speaker as “Bouzyges,” one (fr. 103) of someone sarcastically 
identified as the best speaker after Pericles, and another (fr. 113) as shouting 
like Bouzyges. These two fragments may refer to Demostratus, but the identi-
cation is uncertain.45

• Diopeithes (PA 4309, PAA 363105): This man, known from a reference in 
Plutarch’s biography of Pericles as a prosecutor of atheists and intellectu-
als, is cited by a scholiast to Birds 988 as a ύπομανιώδης ρήτωρ, “slightly 
mad rhetor,” in Telecleides (fr. 7) and likewise παραμαινομένω, “raving,” in 
Amipsias (fr. 10), with a couplet from Phrynichus (fr. 9) describing him as a 
frantic runner with a tambourine. Most references also link him to oracles, 
but Wasps 380 urges the jury-addicted Philocleon to inhale the spirit of Dio-
peithes, suggesting that he was a vigorous prosecutor, so perhaps his frantic 
activity was notable in court.46

• Euathlos (PA 5238, PAA 425665; R 6): A scholiast says that this aggressive 
prosecutor, known from Aristophanes’ Acharnians (703–12), Wasps (590–93) 
and Holkades (fr. 424), was also cited in Cratinus’ Thrattai (fr. 82) and Plato’s 
Peisander (fr. 109), but gives no further information. His nickname of “ar-
cher” would seem to place him with those using aggressive new language (with 
words as his arrows), but the available references do not elaborate.

• Euripides: Chapter 6 discusses Euripides, but included here are a few comic 
references of a more technical nature. Cratinus charges Aristophanes himself 
with writing like Euripides, using the charged vocabulary associated with the 
new intellectual speech (fr. 342 = Olson B41):47

> τίς δὲ σύ; κομψός τις ἔροιτο θεατής.
> ύπολεπτολόγος, γνωμιδιώκτης, εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζειν.

> “And who are you?” some shrewd spectator may ask.
> A rather pretty-worded, platitude-pursuing Euripidaristoph-
nizer.

Aristophanes himself responds to the comparison (fr. 488):

> χρώμαι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ στόματος τῷ στρογγύλῳ,
> τοὺς νοῦς δ’ ἁγοραίους ἔπτατον ἢ ἱένος ποιῶ.

> I employ the smooth roundness of his style,
> But I have less crude ideas than he does.

46. On Diopeithes’ political career, see Connor (1963, 115–18); and on the hyperbehavior of a 
prosecutor at court, cf. Syracosius running around the bema like a puppy in Eupolis fr. 220.
Note that Aristophanes uses στόμα, “mouth,” here for what he appropriates, rather than the more abusive “tongue” (see the entry above in “Terminology”). The στόματος . . . στρογγύλῳ may also pick up on a running joke about Euripides’ fondness for sigma sounds. The comic Plato parodies a very sigmatic line from Euripides’ Medea (ἔσωσά σ,’ ὡς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι, “I saved you, as all the Greeks know,” 476) by saying, ἔσωσας ἐκ τῶν σίγμα τῶν Εὐριπίδου, “You saved us from the sigmas of Euripides” (fr. 29). Elsewhere Aristophanes economizes the connection between Euripides’ tragedies and the new intellectualism by having Socrates ghostwrite them (fr. 392), again using vocabulary associated with the new slippery style (for περιλαλούσας, see on λαλεῖν above in “Terminology”).

Εὐριπίδη δ’ ὁ τὰς τραγῳδίας ποιῶν τὰς περιλαλούσας οὗτός ἐστι, τὰς σοφάς.

Composing tragedies for Euripides that are clever and chatter around.

- Gorgias (DK 82; R 7): The famous speaker is linked with Philippus at Wasps 421 and Birds 1701, where a scholiast says Aristophanes also mentioned Gorgias as a babbling rhetor (λαλὸς ρήτωρ) in Farmers (fr. 118), but offers no details.

- Hyperbolus (PA 13910, PAA 902050): Apparently entering politics at a relatively young age (Cratinus fr. 283 and Eupolis fr. 252), Hyperbolus was perceived as the immediate successor to Cleon (adesp. 846) in 422 B.C.E. until his ostracism in 415. Hyperbolus was a popular target in comedy, being the principal target of at least three plays, Eupolis’ Marikas, Hermippus’ Artopolides and Plato’s Hyperbolus. Unlike slippery, sophisticated speakers, Hyperbolus was mocked for not sounding like an Athenian and thus immediately as a non-Greek (e.g., a Phrygian in Polyzelus fr. 5). Rather than unusual phrasing or vocabulary (such as is cited in Aristophanes fr. 205), attacks focus on specific quirks of pronunciation: a stuttering δοκικῶ for δοκῶ (Hermippus fr. 12), loss of “i” in διητόμην for διῃτόμην and loss of “g” in ὀλίον for ὀλίγου (Plato fr. 183 = Olson E24).
• Lysistratus (PA 9630, PAA 618290): Lysistratus is cited among the speakers linked to unorthodox language in Aristophanes fr. 205. There may be multiple men named Lysistratus referred to by Aristophanes in various plays and by Antiphon and Andocides in speeches, but there is no definitive way to separate them or establish them under a single identity.\(^\text{53}\) None of the other references play on his manner of oratory or speaking.

• Pandeletus (PA 763615): Named at Clouds 924, where Kreitton Logos characterizes Hetton Logos as “munching Pandeletian platitudes from a little bag” (ἐκ πηριδίου γνώμας τρώων Πανδελετείους), Pandeletus, according to the Suda, was in Cratinus’ Cheirones (fr. 260), but there are no details. He is also characterized in the Suda entry as an active prosecutor, perhaps a hint at Cratinus’ characterization.

• Pericles: See the section on Pericles in Chapter 2 for comic references to Pericles during his lifetime, and Chapter 4 on Eupolis’ Demes for the famous lines praising him (fr. 102).

• Phaeax (PA 13921, PAA 911410; R 13): At Knights 1377–80, the followers of Phaeax are characterized by a half-dozen newly coined adjectives in -ικός:\(^\text{54}\)

σοφός γ’ ὁ Φαίαξ δεξιῶς τ’ οὐκ ἀπέθανεν.
συνερτικός γὰρ ἐστι καὶ περαντικός,
καὶ γνωμοτυπικός καὶ σαφῆς καὶ κρουστικός,
καταληπτικός τ’ ἄριστα τοῦ θορυβητικοῦ.

That really wise Phaeax avoids death so cleverly.
because he’s cooperative, conclusive, idea-impressitive, clear, strikitive, and most repressative of the provocative.

Whether this characterization was meant to reflect the speaking style of Phaeax himself is uncertain. Plutarch says that Phaeax was inferior to Alcibiades as a speaker and explains: ἐντευκτικός γὰρ ἰδίᾳ καὶ πιθανός ἐδόκει μᾶλλον ἢ φέρειν ἀγώνας ἐνδήμῳ δυνατός, “for he seemed affable and persuasive in private more than capable in public debate” (Alc. 13.1–2). He then quotes a succinct line from Eupolis (fr. 116, quoted above with regard to λαλεῖν) that implies Phaeax was better at small talk than speech making.

• Philippus: A scholiast says Aristophanes mentioned this babbling rhetor (λαλοῦσιν ῥήτωρ) in Georgoi (fr. 118; linked with Gorgias at Wasps 421 and Birds 1701), but offers no details, and this may not be the exact wording used by Aristophanes.

• Prodicus (DK 84, R 8): In Aristophanes fr. 506 (quoted above), either a book or Prodicus or someone of the ἀδολεσχῶν has ruined someone. Storey sug-

---

53. MacDowell (1971, 238).
54. See discussion Chapter 3, 81.
gests the teacher of grammar and music (fr. 17) in Eupolis’ *Aiges*, Prodamus, could be meant to evoke Prodicus. Papageorgiou (2004b) argues that the moral dimension of the two Logoi in *Clouds* is derived from Prodicus’ parable of Virtue and Vice.

- Protagoras (DK 80, R 3): Like Plato’s dialogue about him, the one comedy in which we know Protagoras had some importance, Eupolis’ Kolakes, has him at the house of Callias (see above). Two fragments mention him (frr. 157–58):

  ἔνδον μὲν ἔστι Πρωταγόρας ὁ Τήιος,
  ὃς ἄλαζονεύεται μὲν ἁλιτῆρος
  περὶ τῶν μετεώρων, τὰ δὲ χαμάθεν ἔσθιει.

  Inside is Protagoras of Teos,
  who is an accursed faker
  about cosmic matters but eats earthly things.

  πίνειν γὰρ αὐτὸν Πρωταγόρας ἐκέλευ’, ὅταν
  πρὸ τοῦ κυνὸς τὸν πλεύμον’ ἐκπλυτὸν φορῇ.

  For Protagoras ordered him to drink, so that
  he would have his lungs washed out before the Dog [i.e., before the star Sirius rose].

Other than referring to his being an ἄλαζών, these two fragments do not address Protagoras’ importance for the development of rhetoric. An indirect link between Protagoras and comedy is found in Plato, who has his caricature of Protagoras cite Pherecrates’ *Savages* in arguing about the teachability of ἀρετή, “excellence” (*Prot.* 327c = T2 in PCG). This Protagoras says that even the most unjust person, raised among laws and fellow humans (νόμοις καὶ ἄνθρωποις), is more civilized than those lacking in education, courts and laws (μὴ τε παιδεία μὴ δικηστήρια μὴ νόμοι), such as the savage chorus of Pherecrates’ play. It is possible that Plato makes this link because the play made some association with Protagoras’ anthropological theories, but there is no specific evidence. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the importance of Kreitton and Hetton Logos for understanding Aristophanes’ reaction to Protagoras.

- Socrates: Athens’ most famous and notorious intellectual seems to have been a relatively popular target on the comic stage. As far as his language or proto-rhetoric, the most blunt criticism of him in comedy comes from Eupolis (fr. 386 = Olson F1), but the context is unknown:

---

55. Storey (2003, 70–74).
μισῶ δὲ καὶ <τὸν> Σωκράτην τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέσχην,
ὃς τἆλλα μὲν πεφρόντικεν,
ὁπόθεν δὲ καταφαγεῖν ἔχοι,
tούτου κατημέληκεν.

And I hate Socrates,
the blathering beggar,
who’s thought about various things,
but to where to get something to eat,
he’s paid no attention.

The criticism here targets the disjunction between Socrates’ intellectual interests, expressed verbally through ἀδολεσχία (see “Terminology” above), and basic nutritional needs, much as do Eupolis’ references to Protagoras (frs. 157–58; see the entry above). As with Pericles, the posthumous tradition seems different, in this case with a reference to one of his accusers (adesp. 940, probably Meletus, cited in the fifth century by Sannyrio fr. 2 for being as emaciated as a corpse):

κεῖται δ’ ὁ τλήμων τὸ στόμα παρεστραμμένος,
ὅ τὸν διάμορφον Σωκράτην ἀπώλεσεν.

He lies still now, the wretch, perverted in the mouth which destroyed the polymorphous Socrates.

Thus Socrates, after all his talk (or blather) is ruined by a mouth, however, rather than a type of tongue.

- Syracosius (PA 13041, PAA 853435): Scholars most often discuss Syracosius for his reputed role in censoring comic speech, but the scholiasts’ information about his supposed legislation could well derive from comedy, although even if so, it tells us little new about how comedy portrayed him.
- Teleas (PA 13500, PAA 878910): Cited for his shiftiness in Birds (168–70), in the comic playwright Plato (fr. 176), Teleas says one thing in his mind while he does another with his tongue (νοεῖ μὲν ἕτερ’, ἕτερα δὲ τῇ γλώττῃ λέγει; cf. above in “Terminology”).
- Theogenes (Theagenes? See Storey [2003, 147–49] on the multiple candidates with whom this individual might be identified): In Eupolis (fr. 135), a Theogenes is noted to have the nickname καπνός, “smoke,” because he promised much but did not deliver. At Aristophanes fr. 582 and Eupolis fr. 99.5–10, he

58. See the entry on Euripides for his collaboration with Socrates (Aristophanes fr. 392; Callias fr. 15; Telecleides frs. 41–42).
is satirized for excessive farting, which for other speakers can designate fatuous oratory. \(^{60}\)

- **Theramenes (PA 7234, PAA 513930):** Theramenes is targeted in *Frogs* (533–41, 967–70) for his slippery political activities, where Euripides claims him as a student. In later antiquity (e.g., Cicero, *De or.*, 2.93), rhetorical works were attributed to Theramenes, but these are of doubtful authenticity. \(^{61}\)

- **Thrasymachus (R 9):** Thrasymachus is cited for an unusual phrase (Aristophanes fr. 205), but Storey (1988) argues that this is not the famous Sophist.

- **Thucydides son of Milesias (PAA 515450):** Aristophanes twice cites Thucydides on the occasion of his failed defense in court late in life (*Ach.* 703–12; *Wasps* 946–48). The passage in *Acharnians* makes explicit that he had been a powerful speaker in court (cf. the entries for shouting and screaming above), but there is no more information about his style. Since Aristophanes is using him as an example of the good old days, it is unlikely he would have been linked to the progressive “proto-rhetorical” language. \(^{62}\)

### Institutions

Aristophanes dramatizes directly or reports explicitly on the three main institutions of the Athenian democracy—the Assembly, the Council and the courts—and projects an anxiety about the role of the new style of speech in each of them. This final section outlines the dramatizations of activity in these areas and collects comic fragments that provide hints that other comedies dramatized the proceedings in these institutions as well.

#### Assembly

- **Acharnians:** The play opens with a failed meeting of the Assembly (1–173), including examples of public language (not so much proto-rhetorical as political humbug). The policy speech that Dicaeopolis could not deliver at the meeting, he delivers to the hostile chorus of *Acharnians* (496–555).

- **Knights:** As the play begins, Cleon (as Paphlagonian) dominates the Assembly (305). Later, Demos presides over an Assembly debate between Cleon and the Sausage-Seller (752–972). \(^{63}\)

- **Wasps:** In the prologue, the slave Sosias has a satirical dream about the Assembly, which he and Xanthias interpret (31–51). It includes references to the speaking styles of Cleon and Alcibiades.

---

60. Major (2002).
62. See Olson (2002, 252) for a survey of what is known of Thucydides’ life.
63. Rhodes (2010) analyzes how these scenes match up to historical information about the proceedings of the Assembly.
• **Eupolis’ Demes:** One section of the lengthy papyrus fragment (99.23–34) refers to action in the Assembly, but interpretation is difficult.\(^6^4\)

• **Birds:** The birds hold something of an assembly to hear Peisetaerus’ proposal (431–637), which is the most ambitious and successful bit of persuasive deliberation in extant comedy.

• **Lysistrata:** The Proboulos briefly recalls an incident in the Assembly from a few years earlier, when Demostratus supported the Scilian expedition, while women shrieked inauspiciously during a celebration of the Adonia (388–97). Lysistrata later refers to failed activity in the Assembly as motivation for the women’s activism (507–25).

• **Thesmophoriazusae:** This play features an extensive and detailed dramatization of the Assembly.\(^6^5\) The women hold an assembly, complete with the longest continuous speeches in extant comedy (295–573).

• **Frogs:** The Demos in the underworld calls for judgment on Aeschylus and Euripides, perhaps in a manner suggesting Assembly trials (779–80).

### Council

• **Knights:** In this play, control of the Athenian democracy by demagogues involves dominating both the Assembly and the Council (166–67, 363, 395–96, 475–79, 774–76). The Sausage-Seller reports the dysfunctional debate before the Council between himself and the Paphlagonian (624–82), which features much of the shouting typical of comedy’s characterization of the language and deliberations of public debate.

• **Peace:** Since the play celebrates the return of success and prosperity, it does not dramatize a dysfunctional Council but indicates its future in a peaceful Athens (894–908). Trygeaus is to return the divine *Theoria* to the Council (713–18), which he does in extraordinary fashion by presenting her to the *Bouletrikon* in the theater, where the real-life Prytaneis were seated (887, 905).

• **Lysistrata:** The central antagonist in the play is the Proboulos, whose very office represented a restriction on the Council’s authority. He is routed by Lysistrata and the women (387–610), and later in the play a representative of the Council is to be chosen for the peace negotiations (1011–12).

• **Thesmophoriazusae:** The Council is closed (79), but the women’s assembly receives its proposal from the Council (372–75). Later, a Prytanis arrives to arrest Inlaw for invading the assembly, acting on the authority of the Council (943).

---

\(^6^4\) Storey (2003, 149–60).

\(^6^5\) Haldane (1965) analyzes how these scenes match up to historical information about the proceedings of the Assembly.
Courts

- *Acharnians*: In the *parabasis*, the chorus laments the situation in the courts where aggressive young prosecutors pummel venerable citizens (676–718). The metaphors of the youths’ language as weaponry indicate a link of the new, proto-rhetorical language with this sort of prosecution.

- *Knights*: Control of the Athenian democracy by demagogues involves dominating the courts (307, 973–84), but Demos will liberate the courts when he is rejuvenated (1316–18).

- *Wasps*: The bulk of this play turns on jurors and courts (1–1002) and includes a satirical domestic trial of a dog (764–997), whose mock proceedings include fragmented speeches by the prosecution and defense. Scholars’ attempts to make these speeches conform to structural principles of the fourth century do not hold up (see Chapter 3), but the proceedings do give a sense of comedy’s ridicule of forensic practice.

- *Peace*: Euripides is briefly linked with courts (532–34).

- *Birds*: The chorus sings a song that hinges on the Athenian obsession with court drama (1694–1705). The song’s “tongue-bellies” indicate language and speech are central to this obsession (cf. the entry on the tongue under “Terminology”).

References to the Courts in Comic Fragments

As it happens, virtually all the references among comic fragments that pertain to proto-rhetorical speech making, and for which some context is evident, pertain to the courts. Chapter 2 surveys these brief references.