Kent Academic Repository

May, Gina (2012) *Aristophanes and Euripides : a palimpsestuous relationship.* Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent.

Downloaded from
https://kar.kent.ac.uk/86521/ The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from
https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.86521

This document version
UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version
CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information
This thesis has been digitised by EThOS, the British Library digitisation service, for purposes of preservation and dissemination. It was uploaded to KAR on 09 February 2021 in order to hold its content and record within University of Kent systems. It is available Open Access using a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-commercial, No Derivatives (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) licence so that the thesis and its author, can benefit from opportunities for increased readership and citation. This was done in line with University of Kent policies (https://www.kent.ac.uk/is/strategy/docs/Kent%20Open%20Access%20policy.pdf). If y...

Versions of research works

Versions of Record
If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts
If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal* , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries
If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies).

University of Kent at Canterbury

ARISTOPHANES AND EURIPIDES:
A PALIMPSESTUOUS RELATIONSHIP

Supervisors
Dr. Anne Alwis
Dr. Arthur Keaveney
Professor Ray Laurence

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF Ph.D.

GINA MAY

Department of Classics & Archaeology
2012

τίς δὲ σύ κομψός τις ἔροιτο θεατής
ὑπολεπτολόγος γνωμιώκτης εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων.

Cratinus, *fr.* 342

ABSTRACT

The Palimpsest

Aristophanes allows Euripides to interrupt constantly. In Athenian comedy of the fifth century they are on stage together, both literally and figuratively. Despite Aristophanes' comedies having a meaning of their own, Euripides' lines are so clearly visible underneath them that they can only be described as the verbal equivalent of a palimpsest. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a palimpsest as a manuscript or piece of writing on which later writing has superimposed or effaced earlier writing, or something reused or altered but still bearing visible traces of its earlier form.[1] It is clear that a palimpsest is the product of layering that results in something as new, whilst still bearing traces of the original. Dillon describes the palimpsest as "...an involuted phenomenon where otherwise unrelated texts are involved and entangled, intricately interwoven, interrupting and inhabiting each other".[2] Aristophanes takes texts, particularly those of Euripides, which may otherwise have been unrelated, and weaves them together to form something new.

I will show that in a number of cases Aristophanes offers scenes that have already been performed in Euripides' plays but lays his own plot over the tragedian's, whilst at the same time drawing the audiences' attention to the original. The nature of this borrowing overwrites Kristeva's theory of 'intertextuality' and provides a new and more apposite name for the permutation of texts in which the geno-text corresponds to infinite possibilities of palimpsestuous textuality (and the pheno-text to a singular text, which contains echoes of what it could have been).

[1] *OED,* (2010:685)
[2] Dillon (2007:4)

The plurality of Euripides' texts, whilst engendering those of Aristophanes, constantly interrupts them. Through the consideration of ancient and modern literary theory and by a close analysis of Aristophanes' and Euripides' plays, this thesis sets out to offer a new reading of the relationship between these two poets. It shows that they were engaged in a dialogue of reciprocal influence that came to a head at the end of the Peloponnesian War.

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due, first of all, to my supervisor Dr. Anne Alwis who unleashed the beast that became this thesis by setting me an essay in the third year of my undergraduate studies: "'For all his criticisms, Aristophanes respects and admires Euripides.' Discuss." Three years later, I am honoured to present to her, a somewhat fuller answer than I did then. My gratitude to her is beyond measure. She has inspired and encouraged, provoked and instructed me throughout my undergraduate and postgraduate studies. Her patience and support has never wavered even during the weeks before and after she brought a brand new baby scholar into the world. For giving me the gift of this question, I will be eternally grateful.

Particular thanks are also due to my colleague Dr. Paul March-Russell, who gave me the 'palimpsest'; to Trish Barton-Ancliffe and Jim Hastings for encouragement and proofreading; to Ruth Auger for endless cups of coffee and chocolate brownies and to Lynne Bennett for secret lunchtime chips. The Euripidou family of Limassol have provided me with love, support and tzatziki at the beach for as long as I can remember. So for Julie and Andreas, I kept it in the family!

I would also like to thank my students at the University of Kent and the Open University whose enthusiasm and searching questions have taught me as much as I hope I have taught them. I am particularly grateful to the students and staff from across the University of Kent who supported my idea to produce the *Thesmophoriazusae* at the Gulbenkian Theatre in March 2012. Their insight into the characters, costume and set design, combined with impromptu ad-libs, brought the text to life in a way none of us could ever have imagined. The memory of time spent in rehearsals laughing until we could not breathe will stay with me always.

Unreserved love and appreciation goes to my mother, my husband, my children and my grandchildren who loved, cuddled, supported and encouraged me throughout the writing of this thesis and its many black moments.

My final and greatest debt is to my late father who taught me life's most precious lesson: "Never give up the conviction that if you open all the doors - one of them will be the *'Door into Summer'*". I did it for you and because of you.

Gina May – August 2012

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

CHAPTER ONE
Introduction 1

CHAPTER TWO
Literary Borrowing:
Plagiarism and Intertextuality

2.1	Introduction	6
2.2	Notions of Literary Borrowing in the Ancient World	8
2.3	Literary Theft in Ptolemaic Egypt	11
2.4	Authorial Respect and Referencing in the Roman World	14
2.5	*Translatio studii* and *Renovatio* during the French Renaissance	19
2.6	Saussure and the Relational Theory of Texts	21
2.7	Kristeva, Barthes and the Pheno-Text	23
2.8	Genette and Transtextuality	28
2.9	Against Intertextuality	29
2.10	Visual Vocabulary	31
2.11	Verbal Vocabulary	33
2.12	Aristophanes and the Tragedians	36
2.13	Aristophanes and Aeschylus	36
2.14	Aristophanes and Sophocles	41
2.15	Conclusions – Aristophanes, Sophocles and Aeschylus	43
2.16	Aristophanes and Euripides	44
2.17	Conclusions	48

CHAPTER THREE
Old for New:
The Peritectic Transformation of Texts

3.1	Introduction	51
3.2	Tragedy Versus Comedy as a Source of Parody	52
3.3	Ancient Perspectives on Parody	54
3.4	'Modern' Parody	59
3.5	Material Imitation	67
3.6	Contemporary Attitudes to Borrowing in the Fifth Century	70
3.7	Audience Recognition of Plot and the re-use of *topoi*	78

3.8 Recognition/reception of parody in *Frogs* 81
3.9 Aristophanes' Qualitative Selection of Texts 86
3.10 Conclusions 90

CHAPTER FOUR
Mind Games:
Aristophanes and the Recognition of Audience Competence

4.1 Introduction 93
4.2 Education and Competence 96
4.3 Manipulating Audience Response 99
4.4 Authorial Expectation and Audience Reaction 105
4.5 Self-conscious Reflection and a Test of Competence 106
4.6 Moulding the Audience 109
4.7 Shaping the Words to Fit 113
4.8 Joining the Dots and Drawing out the Audience 116
4.9 Conclusions 126

CHAPTER FIVE
Mythic Novelty:
Theatrical Manipulation in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*

5.1 Introduction 129
5.2 Euripides Warns Athens Against Alcibiades – 416BC 135
5.3 Euripides Condemns Alcibiades – 415BC 137
5.4 Euripides Vacillates – 414BC 138
5.5 An Outright Plea for Forgiveness – 412BC 139
5.6 A Response to Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae* 146
5.7 Part Three – Theatrical Innovation in *Frogs* 155
5.8 Euripides' *Andromeda* as a *topos* 157
5.9 The End of an Era. Aristophanes and the Final Throes of Comedy 162
5.10 Conclusions 164

CHAPTER SIX
Aristophanes and Euripides - A *Synkrisis*?

6.1 Introduction 167
6.2 Genre Theory 172
6.3 Aristotle on Comedy 174
6.4 Horace, Hermogenes, Pollux and Donatus on Comedy & Tragedy 179
6.5 The Divine Comedy 180
6.6 Prototypical & Family Resemblance Approaches to Genre Theory 182
6.7 Audience and Allusion 184

6.8 Women in Comedy and Tragedy 186
6.9 Catharsis 187
6.10 Tragedy's Authorial Voice and Audience Address 188
6.11 Euripides and the Comedic Technique 191
6.12 Euripidean Parodies 195
6.13 Euripides' Reaction to Aristophanes' *parodia* 199
6.14 Changing Styles of the Poets 206
6.15 Conclusions 208

CHAPTER SEVEN
Conclusions – Moving Forward, Looking Back 210

BIBLIOGRAPHY 213

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Aristophanes and Aeschylus (excl. *Frogs*) 231
Appendix 2 - Aristophanes and Aeschylus in *Frogs*. 235
Appendix 3 - Aristophanes and Sophocles. 237
Appendix 4 - Aristophanes and Euripides 240
Appendix 5- Euripides in *Acharnians* 243
Appendix 6 - Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae* 244
Appendix 7 - Euripides in *Frogs* 247
Appendix 8 – Euripides' political plays 250

Chapter One

Introduction

τρέφεται δέ, ὦ Σώκρατες, ψυχὴ τίνι;
μαθήμασιν δήπου, ἦν δ' ἐγώ.[1]

The relationship between Aristophanes' and Euripides' texts has claimed the attention of many scholars and students but to date there has been no systematic deconstruction of the particular literary techniques involved. This thesis sets out to explore and catalogue the way in which Aristophanes made use of Euripides' words and how the tragedian responded in kind. My investigation has led to the discovery of a dialogue played out through the lines, plots and staging of the poets' plays, which ultimately led to a blurring of genres. The poets commented upon and criticised each other's literary techniques, political allegiances and social attitudes. From behind the words of one poet comes the echo of the other. Behind the actors of one performance, moved the ghosts of another. The game was finally over in 405BC when Euripides died. Athens was falling and Aristophanes lost the will to carry on. In Aristophanes' final two plays, Euripides' silence is deafening.

This thesis sets out, first of all, to interrogate ancient and modern literary theories and question their application to Aristophanic texts. The term 'intertextuality' is most popularly used when discussing tragic intrusion into Aristophanes' plays but, as my investigation will reveal, this description is too wide and, therefore, inaccurate. It fails to take into account the complexity of form Aristophanes demonstrates. Hence, in Chapter Two, I reconsider the concept of

[1] "And what, Socrates, is the food of the soul? Surely, I said, knowledge is the food of the soul." Plato, *Protagoras* 313c

‘intertextuality’ and offer new classifications that I believe are more pertinent to fifth-century texts. These are: Variation, Polygenic, Specific, Fundamental, Gradation, Visuality, Repetition and Genre Diversity. I also consider theories of semiotics and semantics, showing that these ideas were anticipated by the ancients who, untroubled by political or academic ambition, wrote in a more precise and less pretentious fashion. Chapter Two ends with an analysis of when and where Aristophanes places the lines he borrows from the tragedians. This reveals that Aristophanes’ use of Euripides’ lines is more prolific than those of other poets and that the signifiers Aristophanes attaches to them are more demonstrably prominent. Appendices 1-7 document the lines Aristophanes borrowed from the three major tragedians and gives each one a category in accordance with the new definitions of intertextuality offered in the Chapter.

Chapter Three considers the term ‘parody’ and challenges its meaning in relation to Aristophanic texts. Ancient and modern definitions are examined before applying them to a range of passages. Particular consideration is given to why Aristophanes chooses to re-use specific lines, actions, costumes or *topoi* from Euripides’ texts and how they function in their new role. Aristophanes’ stage management of myth and exploitation of the social charter is also examined to show how Aristophanes blends these elements together to stimulate the poetic memory of the audience in order to communicate his political, social or personal messages.[2]

Having considered where and how Aristophanes places borrowed lines, Chapter Four considers: ‘Why?’ Here, the question of audience competence is raised. The structure of the texts reveal that Aristophanes was constantly in control, moulding the audiences’ perception and reception of his lines in order to retain

[2] I define the social charter as a belief system which authorised and validated social norms and institutions. In this context, its basis is in myth and religion and is reflected in the theatre from its beginnings as a form of religious custom.

ownership of the text. Using examples detailed in the Appendices, this Chapter deconstructs a number of passages to show why they were included in specific parts of the plot and the effect Aristophanes insisted they had. The metatheatricality of the *parabasis* is also examined. The layering of jokes reveals that the poet was intimately acquainted with Euripides' plays and made sure that the audience recognised the significance of their presence. It is possible to see how Aristophanes adapts his writing style for the various factions within the audience from the way he uses literary and visual language. He needs the variety because, as he tells us, some spectators are educated and clever but sometimes miss the point, some need help from their contemporaries to understand the plot, whilst others laugh at anything and everything, whether they get the joke or not.

Aristophanes' use of intra-textuality is also considered in this Chapter to demonstrate how the poet re-uses his own lines to test the competence of his audience, to add fibre to his scenes and to foreshadow what is to come. The Chapter ends with the deconstruction of the luggage-scene from the beginning of *Frogs*, which reveals how the poet hones his skill to the point of being able to lead the audience step by step towards the realisation of his intended meaning.

The first part of Chapter Five focuses on the *Thesmophoriazusae* and challenges the well-worn assumption that it is the least political of Aristophanes' plays. A close reading of the text provides evidence to the contrary. I hypothesise that, in fact, it is the *most* political of all the poet's texts. The discussion begins by looking at Euripides' political affiliations between 416BC and 412BC, further details of which are provided in Appendix 8. An examination of these plays reveals that the tragedian articulated his political vacillation in regard to Alcibiades. As a keen political observer and commentator, Aristophanes recognised these fluctuations of

support and took Euripides to task in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* in which he has Euripides act as himself and uses the character of the In-Law to represent Alcibiades. The Euripidean plays Aristophanes chooses to parody are those where the tragedian had demonstrated his political views in the preceding years. The double impact of Euripides' primary messages combined with the twist of Aristophanes' humour leaves the tragedian looking a fool.

The second part of Chapter Five goes on to answer the question scholars so often ask of *Frogs* and, until now, has remained unanswered: 'Why does Dionysus change his mind and bring back Aeschylus instead of Euripides?' Here, I offer the hypothesis that *Frogs* is a reflection of the message concerning Euripides' support of Alcibiades, which was first transmitted in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. In *Frogs,* the image is inverted, the tables have turned, and Euripides has died. This leaves no one to champion Alcibiades on the tragic stage.

In *Frogs* Aristophanes uses Dionysus to represent Alcibiades and has him descend into Hades to rescue Euripides, his erstwhile supporter. Alcibiades' (Dionysus') intention is to rescue Euripides from death so that he can resume his writing career. The reinstatement of Euripides will accomplish two things. Firstly, it will save the state of Tragedy. Secondly, because Euripides' plays will advocate the recall of Alcibiades, the State of Athens will be saved. However, the plan unravels when Euripides is beaten by Aeschylus in the literary competition so Alcibiades (Dionysus) has to find another reason to make him the winner. By doing this, Aristophanes has the last laugh on his recently deceased sparring partner and the last word in their on-going dialogue. Euripides has, once again, changed his political mind and now votes against the return of Alcibiades. Both the politician and the tragedian are left looking foolish and Aeschylus is returned to Athens in triumph.

The final Chapter of the thesis contends that the genres of ‘comedy and tragedy’ allotted to some fifth-century texts are too rigid. The discussion begins with a consideration of genre theory and how these classifications evolved in modernity. By bringing together all the lessons learned about Aristophanes’ and Euripides’ narrative techniques, various texts from each poet are checked against the new criteria and are found wanting in the old classification. Both poets wrote about war, women, money, politics, religion and philosophy and as the war progressed, the way the two poets chose to discuss these began to change. As Euripides became more light-hearted and wrote in a ‘keep calm and carry on’ style, Aristophanes became more serious and gloomy. The tone, mood and structure of their plays are transposed until they met somewhere in the middle. The result was that neither ‘comedy’ nor ‘tragedy’ belonged to their traditional genre any longer.

I end the argument with the proposition that had Euripides not died when he did, and had Athens not fallen when she did, these two poets would together have gone on to create a third genre, one that was special and unique to Athens, and one that represented the best that both poets had to offer.

The Appendices represent a catalogue of Aristophanes’ borrowing from the three major tragedians, details of the original source line and how the poet has encorporated them into his plays. The examples chosen for closer examination within the thesis itself come mainly from the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* as the tragedian features a prominent character within these two plays. In order to show the depth of meaning embedded within the texts, some lines are considered more than once, from different angles. Doing so allows us to see the way in which Aristophanes adapted the signifiers he attached to each usage in order to communicate with the wide range of competences he imagined within his audiences.

Chapter Two

Literary Borrowing, Plagiarism and Intertextuality

hos ego versiculos feci: tulit alter honorem.[1]

1.1 Introduction

In discussions concerning Aristophanes' re-use of Euripides' lines, the word most commonly used is 'intertextuality'. This is a very wide term – in fact anything in literature that is vaguely reminiscent of another text is called 'intertextual'. However, there are other terms which might be applied to this practice such as literary borrowing and plagiarism. Aesthetically speaking, intertextuality and literary borrowing suggest artistry and admiration whilst plagiarism implies theft and disgrace. But how can these terms be distinguished from one another and at what point in the history of literature was an attempt first made to do so? In 'modernity' it is not tolerable to share ideas and phrases without acknowledging their source but writing 'after the style of' another author is accepted. When considering Aristophanes' texts, it is clear that the extent to which he incorporates ideas, plots and phrases taken from the tragedians goes far beyond writing 'after the style of'. However, as my analysis will show, the poet includes signifiers which alert the audience to the original source of the line which, in effect, acts as a reference which absolves him of plagiarism.

In order to understand how and why Aristophanes re-uses Euripides' lines, characters and *topoi* and establish terms applicable to this phenomenon, this Chapter will question the nature of 'intertextuality', starting with an examination of ancient principles of imitation, attitudes to poetic borrowing and plagiarism, and the way in

[1] "I made the verses, another has stolen the honour." Attributed to Virgil by Donatus. Shackleton-Bailey (1982:*AL* 251.1)

which these ideas were influential in the Renaissance. The second part of the Chapter will look at the legacy of these ideas and how they influenced the structuralist and postmodern theories of Kristeva, Barthes and Genette. Part three will argue against their assertions and consider the political ideas that shaped them. In part four of the Chapter there will be a discussion of visual language and how Aristophanes uses it as a form of semiotics in theatrical presentations.

It is important to consider the history of intertextuality because the theories are all products of their time and whilst useful in the consideration of contemporary literature may not be appropriate when applied to texts from another time period. A thorough understanding of these theories, and the way in which they each developed within their own time-period, has led to a new set of definitions being offered here which I believe are more pertinent when examining the 'intertextuality' of Aristophanes.

Finally, there will be a discussion concerning the way in which Aristophanes makes use of tragic texts in accordance with these new classifications. I conclude that whilst Aristophanes drew upon the words of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, from an analysis of his extant comedies, he was engaged in a distinct and unique literary dialogue with the latter.

An analysis of Aristophanes' allusions to, and borrowings from, the tragedians shows that whilst Euripides' work was consistently re-used from the earliest part of Aristophanes' career, 405BC marks the last reference either to him as a person, or the re-use of his lines.[2] This is not the case with Aeschylus and Sophocles, which suggests that there must have been an extraordinary relationship between Aristophanes and Euripides, which culminated in Aristophanes' final

[2] The final mention of Euripides or use of his lines is seen in *Frogs*, produced in 405, shortly after the tragedian's death.

recognition of Euripides' brilliance being showcased in *Frogs,* which compared the loss of Euripides to the loss of Athens.

The conclusions from this Chapter will be expounded upon in the remainder of the thesis with an in-depth examination of some of the diverse ways in which Aristophanes used Euripides' texts (with specific reference to the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*) to create an ongoing dialogue between comedy and tragedy.

1.2 Notions of Literary Borrowing in the Ancient World

Plato's *Theory of Art* discusses how texts function. His theory of imitation has elements common to some modern theories of 'intertextuality'.[3] He states that the poet always copies an earlier act of creation, which is itself a copy.[4] In saying this, he notes that all imitations, although third hand, are, in fact, the same thing. They merely *look* different because they are being viewed from a different angle. This is consistent with the re-use of tragic lines in comedy. For instance Euripides' line from the *Hecuba*: ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ, δυστανοτάτας ματέρος ἔξελθ' οἴκων ἄιε ματέρος αὐδάν[5] (where Hecuba is calling to Polyxena to tell her of her fate) reappears in *Clouds* when Strepsiades calls for his son to exit Socrates' school: ὦ τέκνον ὦ παῖ ἔξελθ' οἴκων, ἄιε σοῦ πατρός. ὅδ' ἐκεῖνος ἀνήρ.[6] The lines are similar both in the way that they are phrased and in terms of context, with a distressed parent

[3] Plato, *Republic* X, 317-21

[4] Worton and Still (1990:3), following Plato's analogy of the artist who paints a bed, which the carpenter has created by imitating the form of a bed, which is the product of divine artistry.

[5] "My child, daughter of a most wretched woman, come forth; listen to your mother's voice." Euripides *Hecuba,* 171-4. *Hecuba* was produced in 424BC with the first version of *Clouds* coming a year later in 423BC and the revised version between 420BC and 417BC. Thus, it is likely that Aristophanes' audience would be familiar with the tragedy, be expecting to hear something of Euripides within it and, therefore, recognise the line in its new context.

[6] "My child, my son, come forth from the house; hearken to thy father." *Clouds* 1165-6 (All subsequent translations of lines from Aristophanes' extant plays are from Sommerstein).

calling to their adult offspring as if they were still a child but, as Plato says, they *look* different. This is because one is in a tragic situation and the other, comedic.

Plato goes on to say that it is not possible to understand what the copies are, or mean, without knowledge of the original.[7] This raises the question of audience competence. For some spectators, there would have been the recognition that the line was very similar to one from Euripides but this acknowledgment was not necessary for a deep understanding of the new context. Aristophanes' re-creations were constructed in such a way that they could stand alone, but that if the origin of the line was recognised by the audience, the effect was enhanced. In the *Thesmophoriazusae* a member of the Chorus lists the vices Euripides attributes to women ending with τὰς μέγ' ἀνδράσιν κακόν.[8] As a stand-alone line, this is a source of humour. Despite the fact that the women are attacking Euripides for his unflattering portrayal of them, they later admit to doing all that he accuses them of, and more.[9] Euripides had used the line in a similar way in the *Medea*, with both men and women calling womankind a 'curse upon men'. Jason says: κακὸν μέγα, πατρός τε καὶ γῆς προδότιν ἥ σ' ἐθρέψατο. Clytemnestra speaks of Helen's affair with Paris saying: νῦν δ' οὕνεχ' Ἑλένη μάργος ἦν ὅ τ' αὖ λαβὼν ἄλοχον κολάζειν προδότιν οὐκ ἠπίστατο whilst Peleus calls her: προδότιν κύνα. Andromache and Hermione describe women in general as: κακόν, and κακά and Hippolytus asserts that even fathers cannot wait to be rid of their daughters: τούτῳ δὲ δῆλον ὡς γυνὴ κακὸν μέγα: προσθεὶς γὰρ ὁ σπείρας τε καὶ θρέψας πατὴρ φερνὰς ἀπῴκισ', ὡς ἀπαλλαχθῇ

[7] *Republic,* X, 402.b-c

[8] "Men's great curse." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 395. This comes at the end of a list of vices: τί γὰρ οὗτος ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἐπισμῇ τῶν κακῶν; ποῦ δ' οὐχὶ διαβέβληχ', ὅπουπερ ἔμβραχυ εἰσὶν θεαταὶ καὶ τραγῳδοὶ καὶ χοροί, τὰς μοιχοτρόπους, τὰς ἀνδρεραστίας καλῶν, τὰς οἰνοπότιδας, τὰς προδότιδας, τὰς λάλους, τὰς οὐδὲν ὑγιές. ("What kind of abuse has that man not plastered us with? Where is there, in all the places where there are tragic performers and Choruses and spectators, that he has not slandered us, calling us whore-wives, man-chasers, wine-bibbers, betrayers, chatterboxes, no-goods.") 389-394

[9] Such as hiding a lover in the house, breaking another man's pot for luck and smuggling in children when unable to conceive. 396-410

κακοῦ.[10] Those who recalled these lines from Euripides' earlier plays would have recognised the women's accusation as legitimate, and thus had a deeper understanding of the new text.

Aristotle comments on this type of recognition in his discussion on the theory of poetry, but goes further, observing that acknowledgment also brings pleasure: "…what happens is that as they view them they come to understand and work out what each thing is. If no one has seen the thing before, it will not give pleasure as an imitation, but because of its execution, or for some other reason".[11] Here we can see a difference in the argument presented by Plato with the acknowledgement that whilst a text can be seen as an imitation of those that precede it, if there is no such recognition, it might be understood as a new text. I believe Aristotle is aware of the possibility of polysemy and synonymy in texts and advises against complications in style.[12] He notes that the act of recognition also involves the capacity for cognition, (awareness, perception or intuition), the exercise of which is, in itself, pleasurable.[13] This highlights the notion of audience competence and an acknowledgement that not all readers/spectators will know that the new text is an imitation.

---

[10] "A great curse you were even then, betrayer of father and of the land that nourished you." *Medea* 1332; "But, because Helen was lustful and the one who had her as a wife did not know how to punish the betrayer." *Electra,* 1208; "Betrayer, bitch." *Andromache* 630 "...evil." 353; "...trouble" 952; "The clear proof that woman is a great bane is this: her father, who begat her and raised her, adds a dowry to her and thus sends her off in order to be quit of a trouble." *Hippolytus,* 627

[11] Aristotle *Poetics,* 3.1

[12] Aristotle advises that metaphorical terms should be used with care in order to avoid misunderstandings and decries the misuse of compound words, long or frequent epithets and inappropriate metaphors. *Rhetoric,* III.1405b-1406b

[13] *Nicomachean Ethics,* 1174b14-5a21

1.3 Literary Theft in Ptolemaic Egypt

The use of others' texts was recognised and has been commented upon since at least the fifth century. An anecdote recounted in the *Suda* tells of an accusation of plagiarism made by Diagoras:

> ἐπεκλήθη Ἄθεος διότι τοῦτο ἐδόξαζεν, ἀφ' οὗ τις ὁμότεχνος αἰτιαθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ὡς δὴ παιᾶνα ἀφελόμενος, ὃν αὐτὸς ἐπεποιήκει, ἐξωμόσατο μὴ κεκλοφέναι τοῦτον, μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιδειξάμενος αὐτὸν εὐημέρησεν. ἐντεῦθεν οὖν ὁ Διαγόρας λυπηθεὶς ἔγραψε τοὺς καλουμένους Ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἀναχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκπτωσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης.[14]

However, it is unclear whether a prosecution took place and with no extant evidence of legal action, it must be assumed that 'borrowing' was not considered an actionable offence during the time of Aristophanes and Euripides.[15] It was not until the third century BC that the concept of plagiarism had developed and was considered as theft. It was much later still that copyright was legally protected and was initially introduced to provide printers with the sole right to produce any given manuscript.[16] Even then, the term did not cover intellectual ownership of ideas, only the right to reproduce copies of them in writing. Birrell describes the intent to benefit from a protected author as an act of piracy and states that if the extraneous matter is not protected by law it should be regarded as a moral offence of plagiary.[17] Despite their separate histories, the different features of plagiarism and copyright theft are worth exploring at this point because of the ongoing debate about the

[14] "He was nicknamed the Atheist because he held this view ever since a colleague, whom he had accused of stealing a paean he had composed, swore under oath that he had not stolen it, and had a good time performing it only a little later. Frustrated, Diagoras then wrote the so-called Speeches of Tower-Defense, which contain his retreat and the expulsion of the belief in the Divine." *Suda,* Diagoras, delta 323.

[15] If it was possible to take action against another poet for plagiarism, it is likely that Aristophanes would have mentioned the 'crime' and any prosecutions he was involved in whilst addressing the audience in the *parabasis* (in the same way that he mentions the prosecution brought against him by Cleon on numerous occasions).

[16] Robinson, (1991:55). In the United Kingdom, the Statute of Anne came into force in 1710 as a result of the Stationers' Company petitioning Parliament to introduce a bill which provided for copyright. It prescribed a copyright term of fourteen years during which only the authors or the printers they chose could publish their work. (Robinson, 1991:67)

[17] Birrell, (1899:1971:172)

literary ethics of borrowing and the fact that for some, both terms are interchangeable. Putnam places the two ideas together stating:

> No such thing as literary property [defined as ownership in a specific literary form, given the right to ideas, the right to control such particular form of expression of those ideas and the right to multiply and dispose of copies of such form of expression] can be said to have come into existence in ancient times, or in fact until some considerable period had elapsed after the invention of printing.[18]

In modern terms, copyright infringement implies an economic loss whilst plagiarism suggests a moral category, entailing rights over the form of expression which highlights the distinction between *property* and *propriety*.[19] For the purposes of discovering more about the relationship between Aristophanes and Euripides, it is important to determine exactly when and why this change took place. The comments made about each other by fifth-century comic poets seem, for the most part, light-hearted. Surviving texts indicate that most poets, if not all, wrote about the same topics, in many cases re-using each other's plots and words. So what could have brought about the change to the point where sharing was no longer acceptable and was instead considered as theft?

It would seem that it started in Ptolemaic Egypt when ownership of an original manuscript was considered more desirable than possession of a copy, an attitude that led to coercive commandeering. This is particularly evident in the large number of books contained in the Ptolemaic Library, which had been gathered either through legitimate purchase or through enforced seizure from ships that came into the port of Alexandria. The originals of these manuscripts were kept and stored in the library, with the owners being forced to accept copies in return. Galen tells the

[18] Putnam, (1894:iv)
[19] Randall, (2001:76-77) Copyright of intellectual property is now recognised in international law by the 1886 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the1994 Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

story of Ptolemy tricking the Athenians into lending original Greek plays for a deposit of fifteen talents and being given copies in return, forcing them to keep the deposit as compensation.[20] Such was the importance of originals that a rival library was set up in Pergamon and the ensuing competition between the two led to a thriving trade in counterfeit manuscripts.[21] Forgeries were recognised as such and, therefore, it is possible to say that although there were probably no legal sanctions in place, the 'notion' of copyright did in fact exist in antiquity.

This desire for authenticity led to the examination of content. Zenodotus and the Alexandrian librarians were the first to enter into a systematic examination of manuscripts to verify the legitimacy of their authorship, deleting some lines and transposing others.[22] This involved a system of critical signs to mark lines believed to be spurious.[23] Aristophanes of Byzantium later expanded on this work during his time as librarian at the Ptolemaic Library and embarked upon a study of philology in an attempt to authenticate particular sections of text and seek out what he saw as literary theft. Details of this come from a lost text entitled *On Literary Theft* by Porphyry, which is cited in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica.* It is said that Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote a book on the topic in which he collected "... the parallel lines of Menander and the selected passages from which he stole them," and although he rebuked the poet, "...he did so gently because of his great fondness for him".[24] Despite proof of his crime, Menander seems to have been treated leniently due to the esteem in which he was held. It is possible, therefore, to hypothesise that

[20] Grote (2010:153)

[21] See Fraser (1972) for a discussion of Ptolemaic Alexandria and Grafton (1990) for an extremely comprehensive exploration of the links between forgery and scholarship from Classical Greece to the recent past.

[22] Zenodotus was the first superintendent of the Alexandrian library. He created an inventory of all the manuscripts held, allocating them to different rooms according to their content arranging them alphabetically according to the first letter of the author's surname. (Blum, 1991:229)

[23] Fraser (1972:i:447-58)

[24] Cited by Fraser (1970:119 n.7). See also Hermann (1991), Stemplinger (1912), Hosius (1913) and Ziegler (1950) for useful discussions of ancient plagiarism.

a similar situation also existed in the fifth century and although Aristophanes borrowed heavily for the construction of his comedies, it was tolerated due to his popularity. It is equally possible, however, to hypothesise that Aristophanes' unique form of referencing meant that he had not, in fact, transgressed any literary rule.[25]

A second anecdote concerning Aristophanes of Byzantium and an issue of plagiarism when he was librarian at Alexandria during the third century BC, suggests that status and popularity were important when deciding how to categorise poetic borrowing. Vitruvius tells the story of a poetry competition held by the Attalid kings with Aristophanes of Byzantium as one of the seven judges. Aristophanes' recommendation was to award first prize to the poet who had, in fact, been the least popular with the people, on the grounds that he was the only one who had not copied from the work of others. The point was proven by Aristophanes' recitation of the original texts whereupon he was rewarded and the poets condemned as thieves and treated with ignominy by the King.[26] Although there are inconsistencies within this account, it nevertheless gives an insight into the attitude towards literary borrowing in and around this time.[27]

1.4 Authorial Respect and Referencing in the Roman World

Vitruvius is meticulous in his acknowledgement of sources. He expresses his profound gratitude to those that have gone before and is adamant that he will not steal the work of others by "...changing the titles of other men's books and inserting my own name".[28] Further, he admonishes those who

---

[25] By alerting his audience to the presence and source of re-used lines by embedding unmistakable signifiers in his work.
[26] Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, 7 pref.4-7.
[27] Fraser (1970:115-22) points out that Ptolemy Philadelphus and Aristophanes of Byzantium were not contemporaries, and suggests that the story emanated from Varro.
[28] *On Architecture,* 7 pref. 10

> ...steal the writings of such men and publish them as their own; and those also, who depend in their writings, not on their own ideas, but who enviously do wrong to the works of others and boast of it, deserve not merely to be blamed, but to be sentenced to actual punishment for their wicked course of life.[29]

Writing at about the same time, Horace warns that in emulating the work of others, there is the difficulty of propriety. He instructs poets to be consistent if they choose to do so. He states that if a poet intends to modify, or recreate stories upon which all writers have a common claim, he should follow three basic rules:

1. Not to follow the trite, obvious round of the original work; for example, not servilely and scrupulously adhere to its plan of method.
2. Not to be translators instead of imitators, for example if it shall be thought fit to imitate more expressly any part of the original, to do it with freedom and spirit, and without a slavish attachment to the mode of expression.
3. Not to adopt any particular incident that may occur in the proposed model, which either decency or the nature of the work would reject.[30]

Pseudo-Longinus is of the same opinion and defends what he calls the "emulous imitation of the great poets and prose-writers of the past". He states that just as one might gather inspiration from the "Pythian Princess", a writer might gather inspiration from others. The process of borrowing is not, he says, plagiarism; rather the process of copying something that is beautiful or well made.[31] Cicero agrees, noting that copying of another's work is not repetition but imitation citing two forms of replication – 'paraphrase' and 'translation'. He prefers 'translation' as it allows the author to choose suitable expressions and invent analogies by which to maintain the sense.[32] In contrast, Quintilian prefers 'paraphrase', stating that it is "..a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others".[33] He goes on to note, however, that imitation on its own is not enough when producing

[29] *On Architecture*, 7 pref. 3
[30] Horace, *The Art of Poetry*, 134 n.3
[31] Pseudo-Longinus, *On the Sublime,* XIII.3. Plagiarism is more concerned to conceal or destroy its sources and does not set out to reveal its purpose. Rose, (1993:69)
[32] Cicero, *On Oratory and Orators,* I, xxxiii,154-5
[33] Quintilian, *The Institutes of Oratory*, X.2.2

new works and that writers should only use it to enhance their own ideas. He considers that "...no development is possible for those who restrict themselves" in this way.[34] This is certainly the case with Virgil whose extensive debt to Homer is noted by Macrobius but again, there is no hint of censure. In fact Macrobius points out that Virgil is a good example of how to adapt and convert that which is admirable in others' work.[35] Other critics were not so tolerant, however, and appear to have compiled a list of Virgil's 'thefts', to which he allegedly responded, "Why don't they try the same type of theft themselves? They would soon find out that it is easier to steal the club of Hercules than a verse from Homer".[36] This suggests that to some minds the skill of the appropriator distinguishes legitimate borrowing from theft.[37]

Therefore, it would seem that the most important aspect of writing in Rome was not originality of topic, but expression, which was achieved by a tripartite process: selection, reinterpretation and improvement.[38] In other words, drawing from earlier writers and improving on them was the best way to write and was also considered a way of showing appreciation. Seneca sums up this process:

> It was for me that they laid up this treasure; it was for me that they toiled. But we should play the part of a careful householder; we should increase what we have inherited. This inheritance shall pass from me to my descendants larger than before. Much still remains to do, and much will always remain, and he who shall be born a thousand ages hence will not be barred from his opportunity of adding something further.[39]

Thus, the evidence suggests that in Greece and Rome the concept of copying and re-using the work of others was recognised and accepted on the condition that "...it betrays its origin, yet nevertheless is clearly a different thing from that from

[34] *The Institutes of Oratory*, X.2.4-8
[35] Macrobius, *Saturnalia,* vi,I
[36] Aelius Donatus, *Life of Virgil,* 195
[37] Russell, (1979:11-12)
[38] White (1965:8)
[39] Seneca, *Letters,* 64.7

whence it came".[40] In other words, as long the new text contains referents to its origins.

This is exactly what Aristophanes did when using the work of Euripides. At no point did he attempt to disguise the source of the lines he re-used when creating the new text. What he did was to encourage the audience to recognise them by referring to the original poet either by name or by having him speak the lines as a character within the action.[41] When borrowing a *topos* or plot, Aristophanes creates textual signals, which invite source recognition from the more competent spectators. However, those that did not recognise the allusion to the original author may well have suspected Aristophanes of copying. As Randall points out:

> The difficulty in distinguishing plagiarism and legitimate imitation puts the critic in danger of exposing his ignorance by mistaking as plagiarism those repetitions that the insightful, from their vast warehouse of the history of letters, recognise as imitation, an act of homage directed towards one's literary ancestors, or else as a case of improvement.[42]

Roman comic writers were also overt about their reproductions of Greek comedies but claimed that their plays were new works, by which they meant that they were new 'versions' of the text. In his prologues, Terence openly admits to re-suing plays written by others. At the beginning of *The Girl from Andros* he draws the audiences' attention to the similarities between his play and Menander's *Girl from Perinthos* saying, "...know one and you know them both for the plots are much the same". At the beginning of *The Self Tormentor* Terence says "I should go on to say who wrote it and who wrote the Greek original, if I didn't think most of you know already". The *Eunuch* is attributed to Menander whilst *The Brothers*, he says, is copied from Plautus. In five of Plautus' prologues, he states that the play is a Latin rendition of a Greek original.

[40] *Letters,* 34.6-8
[41] See Appendices 1-7 for examples of specific and signposted lines.
[42] Randall, (2001:117)

This system of referencing does not mean that those who recreated the work of others were not criticised. Attacks appear to have three main motivations: jealousy, the laboriousness of commentators and the propaganda of racial or religious apologists.[43] These attempts to discredit authors appear to have been largely ineffective as the practice of imitation continued throughout, and indeed beyond, the period.[44]

Therefore, from the first century BC, acceptance appears to be confined to the use of much earlier sources with contemporaneous borrowing viewed as piracy. Martial is the first to have used *plagiarius* in relation to the 'kidnapping' of his work by another. In *Epigrams* he is scathing of the thief who has stolen from him, using venomous language:

> commendo tibi, Quintiane, nostros
> nostros dicere si tamen libellos
> possum, quos recitat tuus poeta:
> si de servitio gravi queruntur,
> adsertor venias satisque praestes,
> et, cum se dominum vocabit ille,
> dicas esse meos manuque missos.
> hoc si terque quaterque clamitaris,
> inpones plagiario pudorem. [45]

> una est in nostris tua, Fidentine, libellis
> pagina, sed certa domini signata figura,
> quae tua traducit manifesto carmina furto.
> sic interpositus villo contaminat uncto
> urbica Lingonicus Tyrianthina bardocucullus,
> sic Arretinae violant crystallina testae,
> sic niger in ripis errat cum forte Caystri,
> inter Ledaeos ridetur corvus olores,
> sic ubi multisona fervet sacer Atthide lucus,
> inproba Cecropias offendit pica querellas.
> indice non opus est nostris nec iudice libris,
> stat contra dicitque tibi tua pagina 'Fures.'[46]

---

[43] Stemplinger, (1912:6-80). In the prologue to *Girl from Andros*, Terence refers to the criticism of a "malevolent old playwright" and St Augustine accuses Terence of "Filthy morals" *Confessions*, I.16

[44] For example, Shakespeare's comedies are remarkably similar to those of Plautus.

[45] "To your charge I entrust, Quintilian, my works if, after all, I can call those mine which that poet of yours recites. If they complain of their grievous servitude, come forward as their champions and give bail for them; and when that fellow calls himself their owner, say that they are mine, sent forth from my hand. If thrice and four times you shout this, you will shame the plagiarist." Martial, *Epigrams,* 1.52

This attack confirms that whilst emulation of 'old', traditional texts was acceptable in the Roman world, contemporaneous copying, without acknowledgement, was not. The principle of literary facsimile can be neatly summarised by the idea of old texts as "public property",[47] which lend themselves to manipulation and transformation in the quest for novelty. This continued to be the case until the sixteenth century when it again became the focus of discussion between literary critics. Following the course of discussions on the topic from antiquity, forward in time, shows how ancient arguments inform modern theories of intertextuality and plagiarism.

1.5 *Translatio studii* and *Renovatio* during the French Renaissance

The notion of intertextuality, *translatio studii*, or *renovatio*, was still the subject of discussion during the French Renaissance when it became unpopular. Du Bellay was of the opinion that writers of the sixteenth century could not compete with ancient authors (Virgil or Cicero) and should instead enter into a dialogue with them.[48] Translation of ancient texts was left to the philologists whilst poets embraced both words and meaning, thus creating a form of imitation to reflect their own personal and national identity that, at the same time, maintained a link with antiquity. These poets recognised that those they were imitating were themselves imitators and as such, they were emulating not only their words, but also their

---

[46] "There is one page of yours, Fidentius, in a book of mine – a page, too, stamped by the distinct likeness of its master – which convicts your poems of palpable theft. So, when set among them, a Lingonian cowled cloak defiles with greasy wool the violet-purple robes of town; so crocks from Arrentium degrade crystal glass; so a black raven, perchance wandering among Leda's swans; so, when a sacred grove is afire with the varied notes of the Athenian nightingale, an impudent jay jars on those Attic notes of woe. My books need no title or judge to prove them; your page stares you in the face, and calls you 'thief'". *Epigrams,* 1.53

[47] *The Art of Poetry*, 131-134

[48] Carron (1998:568) after Du Bellay, *La Défense et Illustration de la Langue Françoyse.* See Chapter Five for a discussion of the dialogue between Aristophanes and Euripides. They copied, but did not compete with one another.

technique. Thus, reading, translating, commenting, interpreting and rewriting are all common practices within the *translatio studii.*[49]

The use of these methods in the creation of literature was frowned upon in some quarters and the reproductions were considered to be either plagiarism or exercises in style.[50] The first use of 'plagiarist' as an adjective comes from Fontaine[51] who makes his view clear in an anecdote about the Ptolemaic period, which must have originated from Vitruvius (as discussed above):

> Or quant à ceux qui sont si grands ennemis de toute traduction, à leur bon commandement; mais que cependant ils ne persévérant point à disrober (qu'ils appellent imiter) plusieurs vers, et periodes des anciens poètes, lesquels vers, sentences et préiodes toutes entières ils s'attribuent; car ils ne sauroient si bien se couvrir de ce qu'aucuns poètes renommez ont fait de semblable, que cependant l'on ne les puisse et l'on ne les doive à bon droit renvoyer au jugement que fait Aristophane devant le roy Ptolémée, et la punition que le dict roy fait de tels singes de poëtes plagiaires[52]

With this discussion of 'imitation' came a turning point and the idea that a text born from imitation of another, was inferior to an original. When looking at the attitudes of Greece, Rome and Ptolemaic Egypt, we saw that as long as there was a 'reference' of some kind, which alerted the reader to the presence of an earlier text, the new one was classed as an imitation or an improvement upon the first, and only became theft when it was without attribution. By the time of the Renaissance, any kind of imitation ('intertextuality') was frowned upon and had come to be thought of as inferior and an act of plagiarism.

---

[49] Carron, (1988:574)

[50] Du Bellay's *L'Olive* and *Amours* are examples of texts created by this technique which were frowned upon.

[51] Étymol. et. Hist.A. Adj. 1555 *Poëtes plagiaires* (Ch. Fontaine, *Les Ruisseaux). Trésor de la langue Française*, (1988:625)

[52] "As for those who are such great enemies of translation, let them believe what they will; but let them not, however, continue to steal (which they call imitate) verses and periods of ancient poets, such verses, sentences which they attribute wholly to themselves; for they cannot attribute to themselves things similar to the works of certain famous poets, without being referred to the judgement of Aristophanes before the king Ptolemy, and to the punishment which the king imposed upon such apelike plagiaristic poets." Fontaine (1555:93), cited in Raymond (2000:58).

With the advent of studies into semiotics and semantics at the beginning of the twentieth century, attitudes began to change once again, leading to theories of 'intertextuality'. Scholars began to look for new ways to describe the various literary techniques by which portions of old texts could legitimately appear in new ones, without having to use the 'p' word.

1.6 Saussure and the Relational Theory of Texts

Ferdinand de Saussure is generally regarded as the founding father of semiotics and structural linguistics but the importance of signs and symbols represented within the spoken word has been recognised since antiquity. The Homeric poems contain bird-signs and the description of dreams that required interpretation by the priests, as does the Hippocratic corpus, which combines astrology with the unravelling of prophetic dreams and directs physicians to interpret celestial signs that affect the body.[53] These, and many other texts, were concerned with the validity and meaning of dreams, portents and oracles as expressed in the spoken word, which are then deconstructed by the prophets.[54] Aristotle acknowledges the importance of phrasing in language:

> Spoken words are the symbols of mental experience and written words are the symbols of spoken words. Just as all men have not the same writing, so all men have not the same speech sounds, but the mental experiences, which these directly symbolize, are the same for all, as also are those things of which our experiences are the images.[55]

---

[53] The *Iliad* contains 35 bird-scenes and numerous dreams: Johansson, (2012); Hippocrates, *On Regimen,* 4.89; *Airs, Waters, Places,* 2. See Copenhaver, (1978) for a discussion on the reception of the occult tradition of Greece and Rome in Renaissance France.

[54] Particularly in the tragedies. There is an extensive body of Greek and Roman literature on the nature and meaning of signs including Plato, *Cratylus*; Aristotle, *On Interpretation*; Cicero, *Academics* and *On Divination* and Artemidorus, *On Dreams.* See also Todorov, (1984) for an overview of the development of ancient semiotics and Lewis, (1999) for the interpretation of dreams and portents in antiquity.

[55] Aristotle, *On Interpretation,* 16a.

Two thousand five hundred years later, de Saussure set out to bring order to the inchoate mass of speech acts that comprise a language.[56] His theory is a direct reflection of Aristotle's premise and makes a distinction between the system of language, *la langue* and the individual acts of realisation of that system, *la parole*.[57] This represents a structural approach by which recognition of meaning is dependent upon two elements: recognition of the word and recognition of the concept it represents. For example, the sign /cat/ consists of a signifier, the sounds 'k-a-t', and a signified, the conception of what a cat *is*. Together, the signifier and the signified comprise the sign.[58] One does not make sense without an understanding of the other. Hjelmsev describes this structure as "...an autonomous entity composed of internal dependencies ... each of which depends on certain others and could neither be conceived nor defined without those other elements."[59]

This theory is anticipated by Aristotle:

> As there are in the mind thoughts which do not involve truth or falsity, and also those which must be either true or false, so it is in speech. For truth and falsity imply combination and separation. Nouns and verbs, provided nothing is added, are like thoughts without combination or separation; 'man' and 'white', as isolated terms, are not yet either true or false. In proof of this, consider the word 'goat-stag.' It has significance, but there is no truth or falsity about it, unless 'is' or 'is not' is added, either in the present or in some other tense.[60]

This system does not differentiate between denotation and connotation: denotation indicating the literal or obvious meaning of a sign, and connotation, a socio-cultural or personal association. However, the recognition of denotational and connotational elements in Aristophanes' linguistic signposting is particularly important given that the signifiers were received aurally and probably only once.

[56] Coward and Ellis (1977:12)
[57] Gadet, (1986:28)
[58] Coward and Ellis, (1997:13)
[59] Hjelmslev, (1944) cited in Coward and Ellis (1977:13)
[60] Aristotle, *On Interpretation,* 1.

They were presented as part of a festival and the mood would not have been one in which spectators consciously sought linguistic phenomena as part of the entertainment. This meant that the poet had to be supremely aware of his audiences' literary competence. He had to create texts that worked on a variety of levels according to both his own agenda and the expectations of his listeners. It is for this reason that in Aristophanes' plays, we see different types of 'intertextuality' ranging from *contingent* to *specific*.[61] This suggests that the poet re-used lines or *topoi* from earlier texts, which may or may not have been recognisable to his audience. In addition the play had to function on the same level whether or not the audience recognised the allusion. Thirdly, at times he used lines that needed to be recognised in order to push the plot forward, create humour or convey a particular message. I have categorised the latter type of reference as *specific* because Aristophanes surrounds these with additional signifiers designed to promote their connotational elements to ensure that his audience not only understood the way allusions formed part of his new text, but also recognised the original source.

Saussure's hypotheses then, although published only in the form of student notebooks, are of vital importance in the development of later linguistic treaties, which led, eventually, to theories of intertextuality.

1.7 Kristeva, Barthes and the Pheno-Text

An understanding of Kristeva is useful when looking at the way Aristophanes re-uses Euripides' lines because she considers how new texts can be linked back to the originals from which they were adapted, through the incorporation of signifiers. Therefore, we can therefore identify scenes such as that in which Menelaus attempts

[61] A contingent reference is the non-deliberate incorporation of previously-used material that might evoke the poetic memory but to an unpredictable degree; a specific reference is one which is an explicit repetition of a previous text. These classifications will be explored in part four of this Chapter.

to rescue Helen in the *Thesmophoriazusae* as the pheno-text and through its deconstruction, identify the geno-text as the *Helen*.

Kristeva describes the pheno-text as the surface phenomenon, in other words, the new text in a concrete form. The text, once it has been recreated, then acts as the focal point for the signifying process to occur.[62] From this point, the reader, or spectator, can begin the process of understanding its meaning. Kristeva maintains that a reader may employ a variety of means in order to reference and fully understand the latent semiology, but this cannot be the case for Aristophanes' audience. For them, the process of deconstructing the pheno-text must happen instantaneously and requires a level of technical sophistication. In order to fully understand the intention of the author, it is necessary to trace the text back to its genesis, the geno-text, and identify the reciprocal relationship between the old and the new.[63] In the case of Aristophanes and Euripides, identification of the geno-text could not always be achieved without the assistance of the poet. Kristeva follows Saussure in maintaining that language is dialogical. Despite the intention of the speaker, it articulates a plurality of meanings. But again, in Old Comedy, this was not always the case as we can see from the number, and nature, of clues laid down by the poet to help his audience recognise the reference.

For Kristeva, society and history are not external to textuality, but are instead elements *inside* the textual system; in effect, elements of what I term the social charter form part of all texts. For fifth-century Athenians, the social charter had its roots firmly planted in myth as a belief system that authorised and validated social norms and institutions. In much the same way as our own social practices are governed by traditions based in religion and law, the social charter of fifth-century

[62] Kristeva, (1969: 225)
[63] Kristeva (1969:223) describes the geno-text as corresponding to the production of signification.

Athens was based in myth, which, in turn, defined the social system and its relation to the gods. This was reflected in the theatre from its beginnings as a form of religious custom. Therefore, this element of Kristeva's theory is useful when considering Aristophanes' signifiers and links directly to Old Comedy due to the nature of the community in which it grew and was performed.

Barthes is also of the opinion that no text is ever original and that it will always be a culmination of other texts that come together in the formation of another, from which the reader will draw its meaning. He describes a text as:

> ... a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations ... the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the one with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them[64]

Famously, this analysis eventually led him to announce the 'death of the author', declaring that the meaning of texts did not originate from their creator:

> ....linguistics has recently provided the destruction of the Author with a valuable analytical tool by showing that the whole of the enunciation is an empty process, functioning perfectly without there being any need for it to be filled with the person of the interlocutor.[65]

Essentially, his edict states that 'intertextuality' relies on the reader or viewer making connections with the text through the lens of their own personal experiences, which are not led, or influenced by, the author. Wilkinson takes this argument a stage further, stating: "A poem may mean very different things to different readers, and all of these meanings may be different from what the author thought he meant. The reader's interpretation may differ from the author's and be equally valid – it may even be better".[66] He makes no mention of how or why the poet might attempt to direct or influence the reader towards a particular interpretation of the text, only that

[64] Barthes (1977:146)
[65] Barthes, (1977:145)
[66] Wilkinson, (1972:5-6)

the author's unconscious mind was the creator and that a valid interpretation by the audience will then presumably be one which is self-consistent, and consistent with the text. This is not the case with Aristophanes, who makes his intentions very clear by drawing attention to his persuasions rather than leave audience interpretation to chance.

This post-structuralist notion of 'intertextuality' is therefore problematic when applied to Aristophanes' work as it implies not only that recognition of the reuse of *words* is necessary for the comprehension of the new text, but also a recognition of the external phenomena that influences the construction of those words. If Barthes' theory of intertextuality is to be accepted, it follows that the author has no part in influencing his audiences' understanding of the text and that meaning lies only in audience reception. This view is anticipated by Sextus Empiricus:

> Thus if they [the readers] know neither the underlying things nor the words, and a poem or prose work is nothing besides these, the grammarians will not have an exegetical expertise of the things said by poets and prose writers .... the best poem is the clear one ... which being clear needs no interpretation. Further, that which is undecidably [sic] disputed is unknowable, but the grammarians in their interpretations are still disputing about the author's thought with no decision; therefore the author's thought is unknowable, and for this reason, grammar is useless.[67]

He goes on to criticise the Stoics who were of the opposite opinion. They believed that words contained symbols that led to recognition of their meaning:

> [The Stoics say] that "three things are linked together, the thing signified, the thing signifying and the thing existing."[68]

Empiricus' point here seems to be that the meaning of a text is dependent upon the ability of its audience to understand and interpret the words it contains. This implies that the writer has no influence over the cognitive processes of his

[67] Sextus Impericus, *Against the Grammarians,* 318-20
[68] *Against the Logicians,* II.11-12

audience. However, this is contradicted by the importance placed upon the skill of persuasion through rhetoric which is plain from texts as early as Homer when heroes such as Hector, Achilles and Odysseus are praised for their ability to influence men by their words. Later treatises on the subject abound from both Greek and Roman times, which explain this opposition. [69]

The power of persuasion, or influence, is contained not in the written word alone, but is compounded by its delivery. The speaker is able to add nuance and intonation, which expands the meaning of the language chosen and thus creates a dialogue between the two parties – speaker and listener. In the case of Aristophanes' theatre, the connotations of his words are enhanced even more by additional verbal referents, props and physical action.

There is extensive evidence to suggest that Aristophanes recognised the polysemous nature of words and the unpredictability of his audiences' comprehension and set out to ensure that they recognised his references through the use of these unmistakable signifiers.[70] Individual spectators might recognise any or all of the signifiers and so Aristophanes' text also had its own intrinsic meaning, independent of its origins, which the poet created through his choice of constituent parts. Therefore, using the blanket term 'intertextuality' for Aristophanes' work (in accordance with Kristeva and Barthes' definitions) narrows the discussion. Several key aspects are discounted such as parts of the text that go beyond the direct repetition of a particular line; the re-use a similar phrase in a similar circumstance; the recreation of action; a nuance or a visual clue. By using any or all of these techniques, the poet overtly informs the audience what he has included and why.

[69] For example: Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*; Plato, *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*; Cicero, *On Oration* and Quintilian *Institutes of Oratory*.

[70] For example, having poets as characters say their own lines, or by explaining each of his clues as he went along.

Thus, although there are areas in Aristophanes' work that can be directly identified as 'intertextual' according to the definitions offered by Kristeva and Barthes, his borrowing goes beyond this into a far more sophisticated and varied use of signposting. By doing so, he is able to invoke the poetic memory of his audience and assist with his preferred comprehension of the text. This technique might be more accurately described as transtextuality as defined by Genette.

1.8 Genette and Transtextuality

Genette takes a structuralist approach to 'intertextuality'. His theory ties the meaning of the text to the 'meaning' of its native culture, that is to say, that literature is a product of the social charter.[71] For Genette, the meaning of a text is collectively psychological and therefore structural, in that it underlies the (limited and relative) thoughts and literature of that culture:

> Literature is a coherent whole – a homogenous space, within which works touch and penetrate one another; it is also, in turn, a part linked to other parts in the wider space of 'culture', in which its own value is a function of the whole. Thus it doubly belongs to a study of structure, internal and external.[72]

With this in mind, he redefines the notion of intertextuality and proposes the term 'transtextuality' as "..all that sets a text in relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts".[73] He suggests five subtypes: [74]

- Intertextuality: A relationship of co-presence between two or more texts, eidetically, and most often by the literal presence of one text within another. Within this category he includes quotation, plagiarism and allusion. Genette suggests that this notion is restrictive and associates it with Kristeva's notion of intertextuality.

[71] As I have noted elsewhere, the 'social charter' of fifth-century Athens was based firmly in myth, which both reflected and informed everyday life and represented the polarities of life and death, light and dark, good and evil and kinship relations.
[72] Genette, (1982:18)
[73] Genette (1992:823-84)
[74] Genette, (1997b:8-12)

- Paratextuality: This comprises devices and conventions both within the text (peritext) and outside it (epitext) that mediate the work to the reader: titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forwards, inter-titles – framing elements that influence the reader in their initial reception.

- Metatextuality: Explicit or implicit critical commentary of one text on another text. Genette remarks, "All literary critics, for centuries, have been producing metatext without knowing it."[75]

- Hypertextuality: Literature in the second degree; that is to say the relation between a text and a preceding hypotext – a text or genre on which it is based but which it transforms, modifies, elaborates or extends (including parody, spoof, sequel, translation as well as less obvious superimpositions)[76]

- Architextuality: The relationship of inclusion linking each text to the various kinds of discourse of which it is representative. In short, the designation of a text as part of a genre or genres.

This approach goes beyond the dimension suggested by Kristeva, allowing for a more detailed analysis of the core elements within and around a text that might influence its reception.[77] He also allows for citation, plagiarism and inference, which is more useful when determining the relationship between texts.

However, Genette's theory does not take into account the dialogue between genres, or their authors, that we see in Aristophanes and Euripides.

1.9 Against Intertextuality

The term 'intertextuality' is relatively modern and despite the various complicated definitions offered by theorists, the basic premise can be described as elements of one text appearing within another. This is too simplistic when considering the dialogue between Aristophanes and Euripides. Irwin sets out to reconsider the viability of the term 'intertextuality' when applied to modern texts, maintaining that it is used by many as a "stylish way of talking about allusion and

[75] Genette, (1992:82)
[76] See Rose (1993) for an analytical and historical account of parody and pastiche.
[77] Noting the relative limitations of the corpus of writings upon which any new text can draw. Genette, (1990:17-18)

inference".[78] He criticises Kristeva and Barthes' writing as obscure stating that its jargon purposely creates a lack of clarity that makes communication difficult.[79]

The political aspects of literary theory are worth noting and an examination of Barthes' use of language reveals an underlying ideology. In *Mythologies,* for example, he refers to the 'revolution' stating that under capitalism, myths would be the monopoly product of the bourgeoisie.[80] Such terminology is subjective and designed specifically to influence the reader to accept his semiotic theories. The political motivation behind the model, which creates a transference of power from the author to the reader, is meant as a model for political and social action and change, and an attempt to politicise aesthetic issues.[81] It should also be noted that Kristeva's publication of *Sémeiotike* in 1969 came shortly after, and was no doubt influenced by the Parisian 1968 Marxist anti-capitalist rebellions. Haberer remarks that the transition from structuralism to post-structuralism was a time of challenge in which the government, capitalism, the establishment, the author and the police were all challenged.[82]

The notion of the reader becoming as powerful as the author once was echoes these Marxist principles of equality, with the author acting as the capitalist, supplying meaning to its consumer/readers.[83] This is supported by the idea that if texts refer only to other texts, the power is taken away from the author and given entirely to the reader. Irwin argues, however, that this cannot be the case and that neither can be more an agent than the other. For Irwin, reports of the death of the author have been exaggerated and in an attempt to uncover why such an illogical theory has become so popular, he looks to its rebellious tone and exotic French

[78] Irwin, (2004:227)
[79] Irwin, (2004:232)
[80] Worton and Still, (1990:21)
[81] Barthes, (1972:169), suggesting that politics and the arts are intrinsically linked.
[82] Haberer, (2007:56-57)
[83] Irwin, (2004: 234)

terminology and personae. He scathingly suggests that it is simply a convenient replacement for the tired notion of 'New Criticism'.[84]

The interaction of authorial intention and audience reception can clearly be seen in Aristophanes' plays with the dialogue he creates between himself and the various levels of competence he perceives in his audience.[85] This discourse is not established by merely including parts of one text within another, but through various sophisticated methods of re-using words, scenes and the creation of nuance.

There is no blanket, simplistic term that can be used to explain how Aristophanes re-uses texts. Therefore, when analysing the relationship between the Aristophanes' and Euripides' plays, this thesis rejects the term 'intertextuality' and offers a wider discussion of why and how their texts relate to one another.

2.10 Visual Vocabulary

A theatrical performance can be subjected to semiotic analysis in the same way as a text through an examination of its visual language. Systems of the literary text and those of the performance can then be analysed.[86] Visual language may include actors' posture, physical movement, costumes and stage properties, which produce and/or react to audience participation and understanding.[87] All of these elements may then become part of the text, which is later replicated. Reproduced texts that contain elements of visual vocabulary designed to remind the audience of

---

[84] Irwin, (2004:257). New criticism developed during the 1920s and 1930s. It advocated the examination of metre, rhyme, setting, characterisation and plot of a piece in order to identify the meaning of a text. It disregarded authorial intention, reader response and historical and cultural context as a means of analysis.
[85] Aristotle recognises that the poet is not all-powerful and is non-committal about who the 'imitator' is in poetry. At *Poetics* 9.1451b.27-8 it is the poet, whilst at 6.1449b.36-7 it is the actors.
[86] Carlson, (2007:15)
[87] Aristotle (1453b3-8) insists that success of a performance should not be dependent upon visual elements and that these should be the responsibility of the *choregos* and not the poet. As modern 'readers' of the performance, it is impossible for us to recognise, or even imagine, all of the visual signals given by the poets and even if we did, we may not be able to understand their significance. See Berger (1995:80) who gives the analogy of the 1434 painting by Van Eyck in which there are a number of symbols which would not be recognised by a modern audience such as: a lighted candle for the presence of Christ; a convex mirror as the eye of God; a dog as a symbol of marital faithfulness; bride's hand on her stomach as the willingness to bear children and fruit on the table as a symbol of the Virgin Mary.

another play are, in parts, not viewed but *re*-viewed by those who have seen the original and are thus watching the scene for a second time. Even though many of these elements are specific to their performance culture, as they are socially and temporally specific, the inclusion of verbal signifiers helps draw attention to them in order to facilitate the transition between the 'old' and 'new'.

Aristophanes was aware of the importance of the visual in performance. In the *Acharnians,* Dicaeopolis tries on costumes belonging to various Euripidean heroes, finally deciding upon that belonging to Telephus so as to be appropriately attired for his appeal to the Assembly.[88] In the *Thesmophoriazusae* Agathon insists that he should dress in accordance with the style of poetry he was creating at the time.[89] In these instances, Aristophanes does not solely rely on the use of words to assist the audience with recognition of earlier plays (which in turn act as a foreshadowing of the action to come), rather he combines the words of the characters with the visual aspects of costume. Visuality within a performance text does not, therefore, have to be fully re-creative of the original; it need only be a sign designed to stimulate the poetic memory of the spectator. Umberto Eco defines a sign as:

> ...everything which can be taken as significantly substituting for something else. This 'something else' does not necessarily have to exist or to actually be somewhere at the moment in which a sign stands for it.[90]

Therefore, in terms of analogical signs in Aristophanes' plays, the choice of referent need not have been used in exactly the same way originally, but its reconstruction is sufficiently reminiscent to draw the audience back to its original

[88] Aristophanes *Acharnians,* 96-265. Here, the use of Telephus' costume alerts the audience to the forthcoming action when Dicaeopolis will have to make an appeal to the Assembly in the same way that Euripides' Telephus did in the earlier play.
[89]*Thesmophoriazusae,* 154-6. See Robson, *What You Wear is What You Are* (2005) for an excellent discussion on costume in Aristophanic comedy and Sofer (2003) on the importance of props in stagecraft. See also Varakis *Body and Mask in Aristophanic Performance* (2010) which suggests that Aristophanic masks were not fixed according to the character portrayed, but instead were changeable in accordance with the wider performance context, thus giving the audience the ability to project the innumerable expressions and faces suggested by the text.
[90] Eco, (1976:7)

appearance. Visual, instead of verbal allusions can therefore be used to form a link between two plays with "parodies of situations"[91] proving equally effective. For example, in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* the In-Law writes on votive tablets instead of oar blades.[92] The reconstruction is markedly different to Euripides' version, but the text contains sufficient signifiers that enable the audience to recall the original. Note that in this instance, the version presented by Euripides is a corruption of the original myth and so we can see that Aristophanes is specifically inviting the audience to recall Euripides' version, rather than the myth itself.

2.11 Verbal Vocabulary

As far as we know, authors in fifth-century Athens had no concept of linguistics, semiotics or intertextuality as literary theories. However, they were acutely aware of the importance of signs and symbols contained within language. The hypotheses discussed thus far have been developed with the benefit of access to a large corpus of material for analysis and, as noted above, may well have been influenced by external factors such as politics and academic ambition. In hindsight, whilst the application of these theories may be useful in the deconstruction of Aristophanes' texts for their semiotic value, the focus of this thesis is a closer examination of the emulated texts themselves in order to determine the various forms in which they reappear and the way in which they function within the new text. Therefore, the final part of this Chapter will look at Aristophanes himself and conclude that, as his main target was Euripides, he was not simply showing admiration through emulation as described by Plato, and later by Aristotle and the Roman theorists, but that he had a more specific agenda. The result of this targeted

[91] Herrington, (1963:242-3)
[92] *Thesmophoriazusae* 765-775. Here the In-Law refers to the *Telephus* and his decision to substitute oar-blades with votive tablets.

interaction resulted in a reciprocal dialogue between Aristophanes and Euripides which, for the most part, excluded other poets. This being the case, we cannot define Aristophanes' work as 'intertextual' using the pre or post modern or structuralist theories expounded during the hey-day of the literary avant-garde. A new definition is needed; one that recognises and accepts that Aristophanes' inclusion of pre-owned texts was designed to generate a specific effect upon the audience: not any audience, not the average audience, but the hypothetical audience that he envisaged as his subject. Jones, writing before the word 'intertextuality' was coined, states that:

> The artist deals wholly in signs. His signs must be valid, that is valid for him and, normally, valid for the culture that has made him. But there is a time factor affecting these signs. If a requisite now-ness is not present, the sign, valid in itself, is apt to suffer a kind of invalidation.[93]

This offers the simple concept of poet as poet and reader as reader, each aware of the place of the other and both working within a specific cultural and temporal space. This is exactly the way in which Aristophanes and his audience communicated in the fifth century. When examining his plays, I suggest that we should ignore the post-modernist idiom of the reader as all-powerful and recognise that the author also has a part to play in the manufacture of signs and the way in which his audience receives them.

Modern theories of intertextuality focus on the detection of texts within each other but this does not help to define the relationship between Aristophanes and Euripides; it merely serves as a way of cataloguing them. The terms proposed below allow for a more specific examination of the dialogue between the poets, which in turn focuses the discussion on how various manifestations of the references influence audience reception of the texts. In short, it is not the intention of this thesis to

[93] Jones, (1952:15)

merely show *where* Aristophanes used Euripides' words, but to show *why* and *how* he did so. I propose to reconsider those elements previously coined simply 'intertextual' under the following categories:

- Contingent: The incorporation of previously-used material that might evoke the poetic memory but to an unpredictable degree. For instance the repetition of proverbs; idioms; well known myths or rituals that may have appeared in previous texts but that also form part of the social charter. Given the general form of contingent references, there may be cases in which neither the author nor the audience are conscious of the link.

- Variation: The variation/adaptation of a source in order to make it a conscious replication of a previous treatment.

- Polygenic: A text that occurs in the work of more than one previous author.

- Specific: The explicit repetition of a previous text, for instance, a direct quotation (attributed or otherwise) with or without signposting

- Fundamental: The inclusion of an element that recalls the structure of a previous text and works as a key element in the structure of the second

- Gradation: The overall extent to which one text contains elements of one or more other texts.

- Visuality: The use of visual imagery (set, props, costumes or actions) designed to evoke poetic memory of characters in previous texts/performances

- Repetition: The poet's re-use of his own dialogue or plot elements within either the same, or another of his plays

- Genre diversity: The incorporation of elements from other genres, for instance, the use of tragic language in comedy, or comic motifs in tragedy.

Any or all of these elements may be apparent in a text and will invariably blend into each other at times, but an interrogation of the references will help to define them.

2.12 Aristophanes and the Tragedians

The way Aristophanes combines lines borrowed from other poets to make a new text is commented upon in an anonymous fragment: ἐπιχέας δὲ Σοφοκλέα, λαβὼν παρ' Αἰσχύλου γ' ὓδωρ ὅσον δεῦ σ' ἐσθ' ὅλον Εὐριπίδην, πρὸς τοισίδ' ἐμβαλεῖν ἅλας, μεμνημένος δ' ὅπως ἅλας καὶ μὴ λάλας.[94] As we shall see from the final part of this Chapter, the ancient commentator was correct in his accusation. There will follow a consideration of the way in which Aristophanes makes use of tragic texts in accordance with the new classifications listed above. A full breakdown of the references can be seen in Appendices 1-7. The relationship between Aristophanes and the three tragedians will be considered separately in order to ascertain how they differ. The discussion will conclude that Aristophanes did not use extracts from tragic texts in a uniform manner, but that for the most part, lines and *topoi* from Aeschylus and Sophocles reappear on a *contingent* or *polygenic* basis whereas Euripides' work is given a variety of different signposts designed to alert the audience to their presence, which classifies them as *specific*.

2.13 Aristophanes and Aeschylus

Aeschylus is characterised as a respectable poet in one extant, and two fragmentary plays. The source of the first fragment is uncertain but in it, Aeschylus says τοῖσι χοροῖς αὐτὸς τὰ σχήματ' ἐποίουν.[95] In the *Triphales* he appears to be commenting on the nature of comedy: ὑπὸ τοῦ γέλωτος εἰς Γέλαν ἀφίξομαι.[96] In *Frogs* Aeschylus speaks many of his own lines in defence of his literary technique in the *agon*. In each of the extant references, Aeschylus appears to be making comment

[94] "Heap Sophocles up, and taking without waste water enough from Aeschylus to make dough, of all Euripides, add salt to taste- from the salt-box, not the chatterbox, you know." *fr.* 5c

[95] "And as far as my Chorus, I made up their dances myself" Aristophanes *fr.* 677. It is also possible that Euripides appeared as a character in this play in which it is thought that a number of dead poets gather in Hades. (Edmonds: 1957:617-619) All subsequent translations of Aristophanes' fragments are from this edition.

[96] "Because of laughter I'll go to Laughington". Aristophanes *Triphales fr.* 618

on either his own, or another poet's literary style. Other than in his role as *dramatis persona,* Aeschylus is mentioned by name five times in Aristophanes' extant plays and twice in the fragments. It is important to separate these references from those where he appears as a contestant against Euripides for the chair of tragedy in *Frogs* as they are more likely to be representative of Aristophanes' personal opinion and not clouded by the need to produce humour within the plot.

In *Acharnians,* Dicaeopolis makes reference to Aeschylus whilst discussing the *Dionysia.* There is no hint of personal insult, merely an acknowledgement that his plays were being produced posthumously, which was a great honour.[97] In *Gerytades* there are two references: Iphigenia (possibly) remarks: σκότος γάρ ἐστιν Αἰσχύλου τεθνηκότος and: ἐν τοῖσι συνδείπνοις ἐπαινῶν Αἰσχύλον, both of which appear to be complimentary.[98] The quality of the tragedian's work is mentioned again in *Clouds* when Strepsiades recounts the criticisms laid against Aeschylus by Socrates and defends him against 'modern poets' such as Euripides.[99]

Other than the literary debate in *Frogs,* there are three more *specific* instances when Aristophanes uses lines taken from Aeschylus. On each occasion, signifiers are included in the text so that the audience recognises the source of the line. In *Birds* Aristophanes draws the audiences' attention to the fact that he is quoting from Aeschylus when Peisetaerus says, ταυτὶ μὲν ᾐκάσμεσθα κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον: τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτῶν πτεροῖς.[100] This invites the audience to recall Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* when Achilles blames himself for the death of Patroclus and tells the story of an eagle, who was killed with an arrow, whose flight was made

[97] Aristophanes *Acharnians,*10
[98] "...it has been dark since Aeschylus died" Aristophanes *Gerytades fr.*643; "praised at (our) dinner parties". *Gerytades fr.*153
[99] Aristophanes *Clouds*, 1365-7
[100] "We have been subjected to these comparisons, in the words of Aeschylus, 'not at the hand of another, but by our own feathers!" Aristophanes *Birds,* 807

from the feathers of an eagle.[101] The meaning of the new scene is therefore enhanced by recognition of the first and Aristophanes wanted to ensure that his audience received the full effect.

In the *Thesmophoriazusae,* the In-Law speaks to Agathon in the tragic style of Aeschylus. This again is a *specific* reference as Aristophanes makes the audience aware that it is Aeschylus who is being emulated. The In-Law says to Agathon: καί σ᾽ ὦ νεανίσχ᾽ ὅστις εἶ, κατ᾽ Αἰσχύλον ἐκ τῆς Λυκουργείας ἐρέσθαι βούλομαι. ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; τίς πάτρα; τίς ἡ στολή;[102] The thematic link between these plays and the *Thesmophoriazusae* is that in *Edonians* Dionysus was arrested, taunted and brought before the king, Lycurgus; in Aristophanes, Euripides is in danger from the women at the Thesmophoria, but it is the In-Law himself who is brought before the women and taunted. Source recognition is important here because in Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia,* Dionysus is arrested and taunted by the king. The juxtaposition of such a serious situation and such a ridiculous one would, no doubt, have enhanced the humour considerably.

There is another *specific* reference to Aeschylus' style in the *Lysistrata*: the women make an oath by pouring 'blood' into a shield: ὅντινα; εἰς ἀσπίδ᾽, ὥσπερ φάσ᾽ ἐν Αἰσχύλῳ ποτέ, μηλοσφαγούσας.[103] Aeschylus' scene has warriors about to go into battle swearing an oath to the god of war: ἄνδρες γὰρ ἑπτά, θούριοι λοχαγέται, ταυροσφαγοῦντες ἐς μελάνδετον σάκος καὶ θιγγάνοντες χερσὶ ταυρείου φόνου, Ἄρη τ᾽ Ἐνυώ, καὶ φιλαίματον Φόβον ὡρκωμότησαν ἢ πόλει κατασκαφὰς

---

[101] Aeschylus *fr.* 139.4 Sommerstein, (1987:250 n.807)
[102] "And now, young sir, I want to ask you in the style of Aeschylus, in words from the Lycurgus plays, what manner of woman are you?" Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 134. This is a reference to Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia,* a tetralogy made up of *Edonians, Bassarae, Youths* and the satyr play *Lycurgus*. Sommerstein (2001:166 n.134-5).
[103] "What is it? The same way they say Aeschylus once made people swear: cutting a beast's throat for the blood to run into a shield." Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 188. At 195-7, the shield is modified into a cup.

θέντες λαπάξειν ἄστυ Καδμείων βίᾳ.[104] Recognition that women were making such an oath with wine instead of blood would no doubt have added to the humour. There is also the added touch of irony in that in *Seven Against Thebes*, the men swore the oath to go to war. Here, the women are swearing to stop the war. In these instances, the references are *specific* to Aeschylus, and clearly signposted, to assist the audience with recognition because doing so enhances the meaning and mood of the second scene.

It is evident from the different ways in which Aristophanes recreates particular lines that he was conscious of the effects that could be produced. Of all the connections shown in Appendices 1 and 2, only one is positively identified by a scholiast as coming from Aeschylus.[105] Some are *polygenic* in that they could have been taken from more than one potential source. For instance, at *Wealth* 935 the line "...ah, yet another" is taken either from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1345 or Sophocles' *Electra* 1415. In its new situation, the line is said as the Informer has his cloak and shoes stolen. There is no signposting to alert the audience to its original setting, which indicates that the source is unimportant and that in this instance, the meaning of the new scene is not enhanced by audience recognition of the first.

However, when the same phrase appears again in *Frogs* 1214, Aristophanes ensures that the audience recognises its source by adding a signifier. Dionysus speaks the line during an argument between Aeschylus and Euripides, making it a *specific* reference. Here, audience recognition is important because it recalls the dying words of Agamemnon as he is being attacked by Clytemnestra in the

---

[104] "Seven warriors, fierce regiment-commanders, slaughtered a bull over a black shield and then touching the bull's gore with their hands they swore an oath by Ares, by Enyo and by Rout who delights in blood, that either they will level the city and sack the Cadmeans' town by force, or will in death smear this soil with their blood." Aeschylus, *Seven Against Thebes,* 42-48

[105] *Birds* 276

Agamemnon. In its new context, it refers quite literally, to a similar fight to the death, this time between the Aeschylus, the author of the line, and Euripides.

The other Aeschylean lines are not signposted and although there are 'echoes' of tragic style in the other examples shown in the Appendices, they are not drawn exclusively from a particular source. This makes them *contingent* references, which would have been recognisable as part of everyday life, that is to say, the social charter. For instance, at *Birds* 1538 the Princess is referred to as "custodian of the thunderbolt of Zeus"; the same line appears in the *Eumenides* at line 827-8 where the context is entirely different. The lack of signposting, fundamental or visual allusions indicates that Aristophanes did not anticipate any particular form of recognition from the audience, nor did the new scene require it.

In *Frogs* Aeschylus is presented as fearsome, shaggy-haired and blustering in contrast to Euripides who is a 'master-craftsman'; his anger at Euripides is described as 'bull-like' and he is not prepared to accept the Athenians as judges.[106] Despite this unflattering physical image, Dionysus refers to Aeschylus as honourable and Sophocles defers to his skill as a poet, conceding the chair of tragedy. It is taken for granted that the 'decent people' will side with Aeschylus, and the 'criminals' with Euripides.[107] Aeschylus' work is also treated respectfully in *Acharnians* and *Clouds,* where there is no hint of personal insult.[108]

An examination of Aeschylean lines used by Aristophanes in *Frogs* (see Appendix 2) shows that in the majority of cases Aristophanes makes it abundantly clear when he is quoting from Aeschylus when the line is spoken either by, or to, the tragedian. Although there are eight instances when the line may also have come

[106] *Frogs,* 814-829, 803-4; 807-810. It is possible that this is representative of the alleged hostilities between Aeschylus and the Athenian people, but as this anecdote is non contemporaneous, it may hold little value. See Sommerstein (1996:22-26), Lefkowitz (1981:71-73,158)

[107] *Frogs,* 777-780

[108] *Acharnians*, 10; *Clouds,* 1365-7

from another source or as part of the social charter (I have categorised these as *polygenic*), given their placement in the text, it is highly likely that the audiences' first recognition would be of their Aeschylean origin.

2.14 Aristophanes and Sophocles

Sophocles is mentioned by name six times in Aristophanes' extant plays and once in the fragments. At no time is he subjected to personal or professional insult; on the contrary, the scholiast states that Aristophanes praised the tragedian's work as being 'wonderfully pleasing and dignified' and better than those of Euripides: κηρὸς γὰρ ἐπεκαθέζετ' ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν and ὁδ' αὖ Σοφοκλέους τοῦ μέλιτι κεχριμένου ὥσπερ καδίσκου περιέλειχε τὸ στόμα.[109] In *Peace* he is referred to twice: his songs are mentioned without comment within an olfactory description of Peace and later, when enquires are made about his health, we hear that he is getting old.[110] *Birds* has the only overt reference to the work of Sophocles when Tereus complains that Sophocles treated him with the same indignity in another play, which centred on his downfall.[111] This reference does not form part of the plot or move the action forward in any way and therefore cannot be considered anything other than a humorous interjection. It may be that Sophocles was in the audience at the time, or that his version of *Tereus* had recently been performed, and was therefore topical. References to Sophocles as an individual do not appear in Aristophanes' plays again

[109] "For honeycombs were made upon his lips"; "But Sophocles' honied lip might just have been a jampot rim, the way *he* licked it clean". *frs.* 580a; 581. It is likely that *he* refers to Euripides. (Edmonds, 1957:731)
[110] Aristophanes *Peace,* 531, 695-99
[111] Aristophanes *Birds,* 100-1. His complaint is that although he is now a bird, he was once a great man. He refers to his transformation from a king to a hoopoe following his infidelity and inadvertent ingestion of his son. Tereus is also mentioned in *Lysistrata* 770-1 but here there is no signposting to link the reference to Sophocles. Therefore, it can only be assumed that in this instance the image of transformation and punishment provides additional humour to the scene. Note that the myth also appears in Aeschylus' *Suppliants* 62, where Tereus has become a hawk.

until after Sophocles' death when *Frogs* was performed in 405.[112] Here, he is mentioned by name three times, again with no hint of personal insult.[113] On the contrary, he is portrayed as mild mannered and cooperative.

Scholia to *Wealth* note the inclusion of a line from Sophocles' *Electra* but the text does not contain any signposting that would assist the audience with its recognition. The Informer, attacked by Carion, cries out, οἴμοι μάλ᾽ αὖθις.[114] Clytemnestra uses exactly the same words when she is attacked by Orestes.[115] However, this particular line also occurs in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*; ὤμοι μάλ᾽ αὖθις, δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.[116] This being the case, it is unlikely that Aristophanes was using it as a deliberate point of reference to Sophocles. It is more likely that he sought to emulate a tragic action within a comic scene and thus enhance the humour through *genre diversity*.

Appendix 3 gives a full list of Aristophanic lines that are similar in some way to Sophocles'. Of the instances shown, there are two that can be classified as *specific* as they are direct reproductions of lines from Sophocles. In *Clouds* the line βροντὴ δ᾽ ἐρράγη δι᾽ ἀστραπῆς[117] is very similar to: οὐρανοῦ δ᾽ ἄπο ἤστραψε βροντὴ δ᾽ ἐρράγη δι᾽ ἀστραπῆς.[118] The full text of *Teucer* is missing but the plot does not indicate a similar context, and there is no indication in Aristophanes' text that the line comes from Sophocles. The same can be said of the other line: νὴ Δί᾽ ἕτερος δῆτα χοὖτος ἔξεδρον χρόανἔχων,[119] which is similar to Sophocles': τίς ὄρνις

---

[112] Believed to be late in 406 BC.
[113] Aristophanes *Frogs*, 76-82 where it is explained that although Sophocles is better than Euripides, he is content to stay in the Underworld and therefore will not be brought back; 786-93 explains that he withdrew his claim to the Chair of Tragedy in favour of Aeschylus; 1516-19 Aeschylus hands the Chair of Tragedy over to Sophocles in order to ensure that Euripides does not take it in his absence.
[114] "Ah, yet another!" Aristophanes *Wealth*, 935
[115] Sophocles' *Electra* 1415
[116] "And once again, alas! I am struck by a second blow." Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1345
[117] " ..amid the lightning came the burst of thunder." Aristophanes *Clouds* 583
[118] "..and from heaven came lightning and through its flash burst thunder." *Teucer fr.* 587.
[119] "By Zeus, there is another, and he too is aberrantly located." Aristophanes *Birds* 275

οὗτος ἔξεδρον χώραν ἔχων;[120] Here again, there is not enough extant material to tell if the situation of Sophocles' line was in any way similar to that of Aristophanes'.

The similarity of two other lines, both from *Frogs,* is commented upon by *scholia* and have therefore been classed as *variations.* Aristophanes' line: ὃς Αἰγαίου πρῶνας ἢ γλαυκᾶς μέδεις ἁλὸς ἐν βένθεσιν[121] is said by the scholia to resemble Sophocles' line: Πόσειδον, ὃς Αἰγίου νέμεις πρῶνας ἢ γλαυκᾶς μέδεις ἁλὸς ἐν βένθεσιν εὐανέμου λίμνας ἐφ' ὑψηλαῖς σπιλάδεσσι στομάτων [122] and Aristophanes' οἴμοι πεπλήγμεθ' αὖθις[123] is said to be similar to Sophocles' ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις.[124] Despite the similarity between the lines, Aristophanes does not supply any additional verbal signifiers and there are no fundamental or visual allusions to Sophocles. This suggests that in these instances, Aristophanes was not seeking any particular form of recognition from his audience. The others are all *contingent* references that contain elements which would have been familiar to the audience as part of their own lives (social charter), or which may or may not have been reminiscent of other texts.

2.15 Conclusions – Aristophanes, Sophocles and Aeschylus

All of Aristophanes' extant plays contain either *specific* or *contingent* references to the works of Sophocles and Aeschylus. A small number of plays name specific tragedies, or comment on the literary styles of the poets, but these instances do not move the plot forward and seem to be almost asides. Therefore, it is not possible to be entirely sure why they appear, but it may be that they were of some

[120] "What is this bird in an unaccustomed quarter?" Sophocles *Tyro fr. 654.*
[121] ".. who holdest sway over the cape of Aegae or in the depths of the blue-grey sea.." *Frogs,* 664-5
[122] "Poseidon, you who range over the capes of the Aegean or in the depths of the gray sea rule over the windswept waters above lofty cliffs." Sophocles *Laocoon fr.* 371.
[123] "Alack we are struck again.." *Frogs* 1214
[124] "Ah, wounded again!" *Electra,* 1417. Note that the same line, ὤμοι μάλ' αὖθις, can also be found verbatim in Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1345 and *Wealth* 935.

particular relevance to the audience at that time, topical in some way, or merely a show of erudition. It is only in *Frogs,* where Aeschylus appears as a character, that we see clear signposting intended to alert the spectator to the origin of the texts. Aristophanes creates signifiers when either Aeschylus speaks his own words, or has them spoken to him as part of the *agon*. Thus, for audience members who were not familiar with the texts, Aristophanes was able to create a humorous scene, and for those who were more competent, show an extremely complex demonstration of his in-depth knowledge of earlier works. There is no evidence to suggest that Aristophanes draws upon the plots or *topoi* used by Sophocles or Aeschylus in order to create a new design. Instead, as in the case of *Frogs*, Aristophanes makes clever use of Aeschylus' own words to create what is probably the first literary critique of tragedy and comedy.

2.16 Aristophanes and Euripides

An examination of Aristophanes' work shows that his use of Euripides' scripts is more wide-ranging than his use of Aeschylus' and Sophocles'. The number of references far exceeds those from the other tragedians and he borrows plot lines and tragic *topoi* to create a new style of writing. (see Appendix 4)[125] The poet recognises this and makes no apology: χρῶμαι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ στόματος τῷ στρογγύλῳ, τοὺς νοῦς δ᾽ἀγοραίους ἧττον ἢ 'κεῖνος ποῖω.[126] Euripides and his work featured heavily in Aristophanes' from the very beginning of this career:

> εὐλαβὴς δὲ σφόδρα γενόμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἄλλως τε καὶ εὐφυής,
> τὰ μὲν πρῶτα διὰ Καλλισράτου καὶ Φιλωνίδου καθίει δράματα ...
> ἐδίδαξε δὲ πρῶτος ἐπ᾽ ἀρχοντος Διοτιμου διὰ Καλλιστράτου.

[125] Later Chapters in this thesis examine the specific ways in which Aristophanes absorbs and transforms Euripides' plays in order to create a stylistic innovation, which mirrored the innovative changes in the style of Euripides.
[126] "The terseness of my style on his is based, but my ideas are not in such bad taste." *Fair Place Grabbers, fr.* 471.

> τὰ μὲν γὰρ πολιτικὰ τούτῳ φασὶν αὐτον διδόναι,
> τὰ δὲ κατ᾽ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σωκράτους Φιλωνίδῃ.[127]

The poet's work reached the point where the audience obviously expected either to see Euripides, or hear his lines reproduced. In *Wasps* Xanthias explains the plot to the audience, noting: ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ᾽ οὔτε κάρυ᾽ ἐκ φορμίδος δούλω διαρριπτοῦντε τοῖς θεωμένοις, οὔθ᾽ Ἡρακλῆς τὸ δεῖπνον ἐξαπατώμενος, οὐδ᾽ αὖθις ἀνασελγαινόμενος Εὐριπίδης.[128]

Euripides appears as a character in three extant plays that comment on his literary skills. In *Acharnians* the tragedian appears as a cantankerous old man whose heroes are always dressed in rags;[129] in the *Thesmophoriazusae* he is a poet desperate to save himself from the wrath of Athenian women offended by his portrayal of them,[130] and in *Frogs* he is depicted as a recently deceased poet without whose continued work, Tragedy will perish.

The fragments suggest at least two appearances of Euripides as part of the cast, but given that he appears in roughly a third of the extant plays, it is likely to have been more. In *Kallias* – (*Men in Fetters*) he is disguised as an old woman[131] and in *Gerytades* as one of a group of dead poets gathering in Hades.[132]

As well as lines taken verbatim from Euripides' plays for comic effect, Aristophanes also uses the mythic novelty that underlies the tragedian's plots in the creation of his own. The audience are made aware of the original source to ensure that the full effect of the 'palimpsest' is achieved.

---

[127] "Being remarkably cautious as well as a man of genius he at first produced plays through Callistratus and Philonides... He first brought out a play in the archonship of Diotimus through Callistratus; for he assigned, it is said, his political plays to him and his attacks on Euripides and Socrates to Philonides." *Life of Aristophanes,* cited in Edmonds (1957:567)

[128] "...we haven't got Heracles being cheated of his dinner, not yet Euripides being wantonly abused once more..." *Wasps* 61

[129] *Acharnians*, 410-480. Note, however, that in all of Euripides' extant plays, only Menelaus is dressed in rags in the *Helen,* which was not written until 412.

[130] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 80-85

[131] Euripides *fr.* 15

[132] Euripides *fr.* 154. Note the similarity to the plot of *Frogs* whose plot revolves around a comparable gathering.

In some instances, Aristophanes recreates Euripides' words as part of the plot because by making the audience bring to mind the original scene, the new context has more depth. For example, Nicias is afraid to say what he must in *Knights* and implores Demosthenes to say it for him: ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔνι μοι τὸ θρέττε. πῶς ἂν οὖν ποτε εἴποιμ᾽ ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευριπικῶς;[133] A line from Euripides' *Hippolytus* follows. Phaedra is trying to convey her love for her stepson without actually saying the words: πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξειας ἁμὲ χρὴ λέγειν;[134] Here, Aristophanes reproduces Euripides' lines in a scene that is reminiscent of the original: where one person is reluctant to speak. The scene would have worked without the reference to *Hippolytus,* but placing Nicias and Demosthenes (the burly politicians) in a similar situation to Phaedra and her nurse, increases the humour.

Another example appears in *Clouds* when Strepsiades has asked Socrates to recite something from the works of Aeschylus but instead he quotes from Euripides: ὁ δ᾽ εὐθὺς ᾖσ᾽ Εὐριπίδου ῥῆσίν τιν᾽, ὡς ἐκίνει ἀδελφὸς ὦλεξίκακε τὴν ὁμομητρίαν ἀδελφήν.[135] This is a *specific* reference where the audience are alerted to the origin of the lines with the source choice intended to show Socrates' immorality and the influence it had on Euripides. In *Wasps* Chaerophon is compared to Euripides: καὶ σὺ δή μοι Χαιρεφῶν γυναικὶ κλητεύειν ἐοικὼς θαψίνῃ, Ἰνοῖ κρεμαμένῃ πρὸς ποδῶν Εὐριπίδου;[136] to demonstrate that as an effeminate man, he would have no sway as a witness. These examples show that Aristophanes chooses lines that draw the

[133] "I've not got the guts in me. Now how can I possibly express that in a smart Euripidean way?" *Knights*, 16

[134] "Couldst thou but say for me what I must say?" *Knights*, 17-18

[135] "...he immediately loosed off a speech of Euripides, about how a brother, heaven forfend, was having it off with his sister by the same mother." *Clouds* 1369-72. In Euripides' *Aeolus* Macareus and Canace (the children of Aeolus) commit incest and have a child. In the first *Clouds* (423 BC) it is said that Socrates supplies Euripides with plot lines, "...it's this man who supplies Euripides with those smart gossipy tragedies of his." Aristophanes *fr.*376)

[136] "And do I really see you, Chaerephon, witnessing a summons for a woman, when you look like a yellow-faced Ino hanging on to the feet of Euripides?" *Wasps* 1412-14. Ino features as a character in the *Bacchae* as one of the women who tore Pentheus apart but in myth, she was responsible for the death of Themisto's children through trickery. When discovered, she fell at the feet of her husband and begged for mercy. In this instance, Aristophanes substitutes Athamas' feet for those of Euripides to demonstrate that in a play, the characters are at the mercy of the poet. (Sommerstein, 1983:242)

spectator back to their original context, as a way of enhancing the new scenario. (See Appendix 4 for a full breakdown of Euripides' lines as used by Aristophanes)

Aristophanes' plays also contain references to Euripides as a poet, without presenting him as a character. In *Peace* there are two occurrences. In the first, the Daughter warns Trygaeus not to become lame by slipping and, εἶτα χωλὸς ὢν Εὐριπίδῃ λόγον παράσχῃς καὶ τραγῳδία γένῃ.[137] In this instance, the association is with Bellerophon's attempted flight to heaven, which resulted in his disfigurement and the intention of Trygaeus to fly to heaven on a dung-beetle.[138] The comparison of a hero riding a sacred horse fed on ambrosia with a farmer riding a dung-beetle fed on manure would have enhanced the ridiculous nature of the scene and raised the level of humour. The metatheatrical reference to the deus ex machina would also have drawn attention to the original tragic context.

The second mention of Euripides as a poet comes in the same olfactory description of Peace in which Sophocles is mentioned, which includes ἐπυλλίων Εὐριπίδου.[139] The comparison is complementary and his lines are said to smell of spring and the fruit harvest. In the *Lysistrata* Euripides is called wise: οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἀνὴρ Εὐριπίδου σοφώτερος ποιητής[140] and the Men's Leader confirms the women as his enemy: τασδὶ δὲ τὰς Εὐριπίδῃ θεοῖς τε πᾶσιν ἐχθρὰς ἐγὼ οὐκ ἄρα σχήσω παρὼν τολμήματος τοσούτου;[141] This concept is expanded upon to form the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae.* On the whole then, it seems that there was no personal

[137] "...provide Euripides with a plot and get turned into a tragedy." *Peace* 146-8

[138] ἄγ᾽, ὦ φίλον μοι Πηγάσου ταχὺ πτερόν ("Come, my dear swift-winged Pegasus"); ἴθι χρυσοχάλιν αἴρων πτέρυγας ("Go, with your golden bit, lift your wings"); τῶι δ᾽ ἐξ ὑδρηλῶν αἰθέρος προσφθεγάτων ("For him, from heaven's watery salutations.."); κομίζετ᾽ εἴσω τόνδε τὸν δυσδαίμονα ("Take this ill fated man inside."). Euripides *Bellerophon frs.*306, 307, 309a, 310.

[139] "...neat little lines by Euripides." *Peace* 532-4

[140] "There isn't a wiser poet than Euripides." *Lysistrata* 368

[141] "And shall I not help put a stop to such audacity as this from these women, enemies of Euripides and all the gods?" *Lysistrata* 283

animosity between the poets, quite the contrary in fact, with Aristophanes praising the tragedian's lines and refraining from making offensive personal comments.

In the *Acharnians,* the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs,* Euripides is given a character role and the texts contain numerous re-created lines that had previously been used by the tragedian. In *Acharnians* Euripides appears on stage as himself with Dicaeopolis asking to borrow a costume in which to approach the Assembly. The *topos* of the scene is taken from Euripides' *Telephus* and after some wrangling, it is this costume that Dicaeopolis borrows. By including the poet and naming the play, Aristophanes is able to draw the audiences' attention to his parody and at the same time, supply signposting for the numerous tragic lines that he reproduces which categorises them as *specific* and *signposted* (see Appendix 5).

In the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* Euripides has a much larger character part and the tragic lines that Aristophanes reproduces are again *specific* and *signposted* as they are either spoken to, by, or about Euripides (see Appendices 6 and 7). The *Thesmophoriazusae* contains scenes that are largely reproduced from the *Helen,* the *Andromeda* and *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Frogs* has an *agon* in which Aeschylus and Euripides debate the content of their plays. Given the appearance of the poets as characters and the reproduction of tragic scenes in a comedic situation, it is made abundantly clear that Aristophanes is reproducing Euripides' lines.[142]

2.17 Conclusions

Having looked at the ways in which Aristophanes re-uses lines from the tragic poets, it is clear that the term 'intertextuality' is too wide. It does not allow for the variety of ways in which the poet places lines or *topoi* in a new scenario. Plato discussed the way that texts function and was of the opinion that poets always copy

[142] For a full discussion of the way in which Aristophanes reuses Euripides lines in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* see Chapter Five.

an earlier act of creation. To an extent, this is true of Aristophanes' work in that he often takes a line, or perhaps just an idea, from a previous text. However, although it is usually possible to see elements of the original, the new work is entirely different and stands alone. This is more in keeping with Aristotle's theory, which states that although lines may be the same, they *look* different according to their new situation.

Aristophanes of Byzantium was against theft of other author's lines unless acknowledged, as was Vitruvius and other Roman authors. Applying their views to Aristophanes' work, we can see that although he borrows extensively, he makes a point of drawing the audiences' attention to the original source of the line. This is more in keeping with the notion put forward by Du Bellay who encouraged a dialogue between contemporary and ancient authors.

'Modern' theories of semiotics are extremely useful in the deconstruction of Aristophanic texts and allow us to see how Aristophanes used both verbal and visual language to stimulate the poetic memory of his audience so that they received the text in the way he intended. The way in which he uses the geno-texts in the creation of the pheno-texts shows that he was aware of his audiences' competence. Kristeva, Bathes and Genette all developed theories of 'intertextuality' which, although not wholly applicable to Aristophanic texts, inform the creation of a new definition and new theories to describe the dialogue between ancient poets in relation to their specific cultural and temporal contexts.

The breakdown of all references to Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean references shows that not all lines were attached to signifiers. However, when the reproduction of a line added to, or created, part of the action, Aristophanes ensured that the audience were aware of the source of the original line so that they had the action of the first in mind as they watched the second. For some members of

audience, this required a number of clues, which Aristophanes laid down through verbal and visual means. The different ways in which he used lines and *topoi* shows that the poet knew his audience well and was acutely aware of how to stimulate their different competences.

The most important point to come out of the interrogation of Aristophanes' borrowings is that he used Euripides' lines more extensively and more imaginatively than the other tragedians. Remarkably, although Aristophanes continued to use lines from Aeschylus and Sophocles after their deaths, *Frogs* marks the last occurrence of any Euripidean parody in an extant play. This is further evidence of the particular relationship between the two poets and the dialogue played out in their work throughout their lifetimes.

The remaining Chapters of this thesis will take the examination of Aristophanic 'borrowing' a stage further and apply the information contained within the Appendices to produce new readings of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs.* Semiology and semiotic theories will be applied to particular examples in order to discover how Aristophanes viewed his audience and how he wrote in order to manipulate their reception of the texts. Consideration will also be given to the way in which the poet used tragic lines to create and maintain a dialogue with Euripides, one that ultimately resulted in the creation of a new genre of drama.

Chapter Three

Old for New – The Peritectic Transformation of Texts

Comme, dans le système terminologique courant, le terme *parodie* se trouve,
implicitement et donc confusément, ... il conviendrait
peut-être de tenter de reformer ce système.[1]

3.1 Introduction

Chapter One of this thesis explored the concept of literary borrowing (often termed intertextuality) and noted the many and varied ways in which Aristophanes placed lines from tragedy in his comedies. It concluded that the term 'intertextuality' was inadequate to describe these instances and that they could be categorised as contingent, variation, polygenic, specific, fundamental, visual, repetition or genre diversity, depending on the degree of the changes made to the original. Having established the extent to which the lines are modified, the next step is to look at the effect created by these transformations once they have been embedded in their new context. This Chapter will therefore consider the nature and purpose behind Aristophanes' choice of particular lines, the technique the poet employed when presenting them, and the way in which he created a balance between the original and secondary presentation of the material.

Initially there will be a discussion concerning why Aristophanes chose to re-use lines from tragedy more often than from comedy.[2] The history and use of the

[1] "Since the term parody is, in the current terminological system, implicitly and therefore confusedly invested with two structurally discordant meanings, it would be useful perhaps to reform the entire system." Genette (1982:33)

[2] The paucity of extant fifth-century comic texts makes it impossible to say whether all comic poets re-used texts in the same way and to the same extent as Aristophanes but evidence suggests that they 'stole' from each other's work. Some of the accusations concerning this practice will be considered later in this Chapter in an attempt to ascertain contemporary attitudes towards Aristophanes' literary 'borrowing'. There is evidence to suggest that there was a certain amount of animosity, but a full examination of all the comic fragments to determine exactly how widespread this practice was amongst the poets is beyond the scope of this thesis. Therefore the discussion will centre mainly upon Aristophanes. It is interesting to note that Aristophanes signposts his use of tragic texts, in effect, referencing them. If further research shows that he used comic texts to the same extent, he does so

term 'parody', which is so often applied to Aristophanes' work, from ancient to modern times will then be considered. This will show a shift in the word's etymology, which, I believe, is misleading when seeking to uncover the relationship between the poet and those he parodied, particularly Aristophanes' use of Euripides' lines.[3] I will show that the ancient definition(s) are more accurate when applied to Aristophanes' plays. His replication of earlier words, scenes, characters and *topoi* are varied and diverse according to the reaction he hoped to evoke in his audience. Therefore, this range of intentions and effects cannot adequately be classified by a single word even if that word has a variety of meanings.

The reaction of contemporary poets in regard to each other's propensity towards borrowing is then discussed in order to establish whether this 'imitation' of another's work was accepted or frowned upon during the fifth century. Finally, the way in which Aristophanes stimulated audience recognition and reception of pre-owned lines in new scenes through the re-use of *topoi* will be examined. I conclude that the term 'parody', with its lack of universal characteristics and its various literary and critical functions, is too simplistic for Aristophanes' work. Throughout the discussion, specific sections of Aristophanes' work (particularly scenes from *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*) will be held up as examples of his various parodic techniques and the effect they have upon the plot.

3.2 Tragedy versus Comedy as a source of parody

Aristophanes loved all poetry; he loved perverting it and laughing at it[4] and

without acknowledgement of his sources and this would, consequently, substantiate contemporary accusations of literary theft, that which we now call plagiarism, and reinforce the thesis that he had a particular and distinct relationship with Euripides.

[3] Note also that the term parody can be applied to any semiotic system of the arts within which double-coding is possible. For Hutcheon (1985) this includes painting, film, music and architecture. This makes the term so wide that it is almost impossible to use it for a particular type of work within a particular time frame.

[4] Murray, (1965:19,106)

in order to communicate with his audience, he took from, added to and re-presented texts to provoke the cultural and poetic memory of the spectator, encouraging them to recognise the original text as well as the innovative aspects of his re-creation. By incorporating a new version of a mythological tale previously presented in tragedy,[5] often together with freshly created political stereotypes,[6] he was able to feed into the subconscious memory and underlying attitudes of the fifth-century Athenian audience, inviting them to recognise, interpret and react to the messages he conveyed from behind the mask of comedy.

Through the use of carefully chosen extracts, the poet was, for some audience members, able to draw attention to underlying serious, political points whilst at the same time maintain overall enjoyment of the episode on a superficial comic level.[7] *Re*-presentation of particular 'tragic' scenes allowed Aristophanes to highlight elements that were invisible, or potentially unrealised, in the plays and which otherwise may have gone unnoticed. For example, the *Thesmophoriazusae,* as an individual text, is often seen simply as a humorous criticism of Euripides' portrayal of women. However, when the components of the individual *re*-presentations of older texts are isolated and the way in which they are modified and incorporated within the structure of the plot is examined, it quickly becomes clear that Aristophanes is, in fact, highlighting the fickleness of Euripides' political views and the treachery of Alcibiades. Here, the underlying, potentially unrealised or unrecognised message is that both Euripides and Alcibiades were unreliable in their politics.[8]

[5] For example, Euripides uses the Andromeda myth in his *Andromeda*, and Aristophanes uses both the myth itself and the version created by Euripides, in *Frogs* and *Thesmophoriazusae.*
[6] Such as the representation of Cleon as the Sausage-Seller in the *Knights.*
[7] See Goldhill (1991:167-222) for a comprehensive discussion of the way in which Aristophanes uses parody as a way of promoting a political message.
[8] There will be a discussion in Chapter Five of the way in which Aristophanes' re-use of extracts concerning particular myths originally portrayed in Euripides' tragedies makes *Thesmophoriazusae* his most political play.

Aristophanes recognised that human communication is a social contract that rests on a body of subliminal laws. For the theatre of fifth-century Athens, this semantic jurisprudence lay in myth.[9] Therefore, he choose to reuse lines from tragedy rather than comedy because all extant fifth-century Athenian tragedies, (bar one), use mythological characters and *topoi*.[10] Aristophanes used these mythological adaptations in order to create a new meaning and a new text.

The meaning of a secondary text as received by the audience is not entirely the work of the poet however. Certainly he uses his technical prowess to guide the audience towards his desired effect but, to some extent, the connotations received by the audience are influenced by and dependent upon, their knowledge of the source. The poet must, therefore, by necessity, make assumptions about the audiences' competence, politics and prejudices as these affect the way in which they relate to the text. Essentially, he is writing for a hypothetical audience of his own creation, one which he recognises as diverse and contradictory given the variety of competences that can be identified within it. Therefore, the choice of lines to be modified is vitally important since it is through these that the poet supplies signposting. Aristophanes' intention was to trigger audience recognition of both the original myth and the adaptation created by the previous author. In this way, he was able to convey his message by a variety of means – by using the inherent lessons of the myth itself, the additional elements incorporated by other poets and then adding his own twist in order to promote his views about both the former representation and its author, whilst simultaneously creating humour. Thus, Aristophanes developed

[9] Maranda (1972:16). Plato first explains the theory of the 'social-contract' in *Crito*. Socrates, although free to leave Athens and escape his punishment, chooses to stay arguing that being part of a society implies an agreement to abide by its rules. The same theory is applied here to the content of theatrical representations.
[10] The only extant exception to this is Aeschylus' *Persians*.

the most advanced functions of parody by selecting and illuminating the special characteristics of the material and the poet whose work he employed.[11]

3.3 Ancient Perspectives on Parody

The blanket term for the re-presentation of scenes from one situation into another is 'parody' but this definition is too broad and does not allow for the complex and subtle ways in which Aristophanes used congruent transformations in his plays. The modern understanding of parody implies an element of ridicule but originally παραδηλόω could simply mean to imitate or insinuate.[12] At some point between the fourth century BC and the first-century AD, the term parody changed from Aristotle's definition of representing a genre of writing and expanded to become a literary technique that could take the form of the verbatim or modified transplantation of words, or simply a new piece that resembled an older one by merit of allusion, similarity of action and/or imitation of style.

For the ancient grammarians, the notion of humour was not essentially present in the word and when ridicule was to be implied, another word was needed.[13] The effect of Aristophanes' parody may have been humorous at times but given the lack of insults aimed at the work of contemporary tragedians, it would seem that his primary aim was not to ridicule the original lines but to amuse the audience by the way in which they were incorporated into the new scene. The definition of parody as ridicule has mistakenly been attached to the *effect* of the re-creation. Thus, it is important to make the distinction between the structure and the effect of the parody in order to avoid the intentional fallacy of ascribing a particular intention to an

[11] Lelièvre, (1954:81). See Appendices 1-7 for a list of examples.
[12] *LSJ*, (1889:595). The motive and desired outcome of any parody depends on the writer who designs it and therefore, inevitably, there must be different ways of constructing the reference.
[13] Householder, (1944:8n.27). Householder cites a number of examples including: Sch. Lucian. *Timon* and Sch. Aristophanes *Acharnians*. 119.

author from the effect of his text.[14] Thus, I believe that although Aristophanes' reproductions may contain elements of persiflage, their main function was not to mock, but to remain within the social charter specific to the culture in which he was writing in order to create and maintain a dialogue with his audience and, in some cases, Euripides. Such charters contained various thinking processes, stereotypes and attitudes that are interpreted by the audience in accordance with their individual recognition of each, or at least some, of the processes.[15] Since semiology is the art of recognising signs and what they mean within a given context and culture, for Aristophanes to stimulate the desired reaction and thereby convey his various messages, serious or comic, he needed to be sure that the signs he created were recognisable in some respect or capacity.

The scholiasts' descriptions of passages from one text inserted into another are not restricted to those that originated from tragedy, but also include the re-use of lines from lyric and epic. They comment that lines can be re-used in the following ways: the inclusion of substantially unchanged passages; the substitution of one or more words; texts in paraphrased form; and lines changed so as to be little more than an imitation of the grammar and rhythm of the original.[16] This set of descriptions is not exhaustive and the etymology of the word παρῳδή leaves the possibility of a certain synthesis within the technique: ῳδή - from to sing (ἀείδειν) and παρὰ, which could include such ideas as nearness, consonance and derivation as well as transgression, opposition or difference. Therefore, the word would seem to mean something that is, in essence, sung in accord with an original, but with a difference.[17]

---

[14] Gilman, (1974:2). Intentional fallacy theory states that the meaning of a text is created at the point of reception and may vary; because of this, it is impossible to determine authorial intent. In Aristophanes, the effect of the parody is laughter, but it is impossible to say that the poet intended that laughter to be at the expense of the author who wrote the original text.
[15] Maranda, (1980:184)
[16] Householder, (1944:5, 9)
[17] Lelièvre, (1954:66)

Despite the variant possibilities, as a whole, the term indicates the creative expansion of one text into something new.

Aristotle recognised *parodia* as an independent literary genre and cited Hegemon of Thasos as the first to use it.[18] His use of this term suggests that Hegemon created a burlesque whereby his work took on the form of a whole class of works, for instance, the production of a mock-epic in the style of Homer, *Gigantomachia*, a mock heroic satyr play similar in form to Euripides' *Cyclops*, and *Philoinne*, written in the style of Eupolis and Cratinus.[19] The noun, ἡ παρῳδίαι meant a song or poem in which serious words became burlesque; but again, there is nothing here that necessitates the inclusion of ridicule.[20]

The term Aristotle uses for Aristophanes' work is μιμοῦνται,[21] which differs from παρῳδίαι in that the former is based on particular works whereas the latter (burlesque) is based on a whole class of works.[22] This indicates that he was aware that Aristophanes was working differently from Hegemon. He recognised that Aristophanes only represented or imitated particular *parts* of other's work, keeping these sections in their original mode, and writing the rest of the text in a style of his own. In contrast, Hegemon was writing 'after the style of' another poet and grossly over-exaggerating particular elements in order to produce humour and/or ridicule the original author. Over time, this distinction became blurred as 'parody' took on a wider range of meanings, containing numerous, often misleading, elements.

By the fourth century, παρῳδίαι had been established as an independent form of literature and contests were held in both Athens and Eretria but it appears that this form of artistry was not well regarded and the winners were offered the lowest

[18] Aristophanes *Poetics,* 1448a 12-13
[19] Literary burlesque can be defined an extreme form of parody, creating an exaggerated incongruity between the original and its imitation.
[20] *Ibid* (611)
[21] *Poetics,* 1448a; *LSJ*, (1889:513)
[22] Cudden, (1998:99)

prizes.[23] There are no fully extant examples but fragments indicate a form of mythological burlesque, with stock characters written after the style of the great tragedians. This may well have been that which we now call Middle Comedy. In contrast to this, Aristophanes had been successful on many occasions at the dramatic festivals of the fifth-century, competing on an equal footing with the other comic poets. This perhaps suggests that incorporating several styles within one play was more difficult than mere burlesque and therefore more highly regarded.

In the first century AD, Quintillian discussed parody when offering advice on the construction of humour. He asserted that "apt verse quotations contribute to wit" and that this might apply to whole lines, being particularly successful when there is a "touch of ambiguity"; alternatively, the words might be "altered in part". He classed the third form of wit as parody: lines that are "invented resembling well-known ones".[24] However, he warns against using only imitation stating: "For one thing, only a lazy mind is content with what others have discovered... It is a disgrace too, to be content merely to attain the effect you are imitating... if we are not allowed to add to previous achievement, how can we hope for our ideal?"[25] Quintillian's definition shows that there are various forms of parody ranging from direct quotation to that which is merely reminiscent of its source. Here then, we see the term developing: in order to qualify, lines need only resemble well-known ones, and not be simply repeated or slightly altered.

Hermogenes, writing in the second century AD, also offered different ways of incorporating previously written lines into a new piece. He stated that a poet can introduce verse into prose by either direct quotation or through parody, which he

[23] Polemo in *Atheneas.* XV.699a and *IG* XII,9,189.11.20
[24] Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory,* 6.3.96-98
[25] *Institutes of Oratory,* 10.2.4-8

defines as a type of wordplay.[26] His example from Old Comedy (which he terms the 'ancients') is the double meanings created by allusions to Alcibiades' speech mannerism.[27]

These examples do not suggest any negative connotation connected to parody. It appears that imitation was encouraged and the subject-matter of texts was held as common property with individual originality being demonstrated by the careful choice and reinvention of borrowed matter.[28] None of the ancient explanations implies that the original poet, or his skill in writing, is being ridiculed. Consequently, these definitions are more appropriate than those from modernity when considering Aristophanes' use of the technique and the way in which Euripides responds to it.

3.4 'Modern' Parody

Parody takes on a different meaning when applied to modern authors who may have been influenced by literature evolving over a longer period of time and from within a wide range of cultures. Modern theories of parody are fundamentally different from those in antiquity. They are considered here as they inevitably help to shape and influence the customary perception of ancient texts that is challenged in this Chapter. Today there is a vast body of scholarship on literary theory, elements of which consider the evolution of form.[29] For post-modernists, parody is a way of re-inventing and renewing the past and a method of establishing a dialogue with it.[30] This works well for texts from perhaps the Roman period onwards, but we do not

[26] Hermogenes, *On Types of Style.,* 30. (trans. Kennedy cited in Kabe 2005).
[27] *Ibid,* 34. See Chapter five of this thesis for a discussion of Aristophanes' representation of Alcibiades in *Thesmophoriazusae*, and Euripides' *Helen* where he is identifiable, in part, because of this.
[28] White, (1965:18)
[29] We have evidence, for instance, of how the *topoi* of Hellenistic love poetry influenced Latin love elegy and enough information to determine the evolution of political satire.
[30] Hutcheon, (1985:111)

have a fully extant corpus of examples of the literary techniques that influenced comedy and tragedy in the fifth-century, nor for the period directly following. The tendency has been to rely on the treatise written by Aristotle around a hundred years later. However, by carrying out a close reading of tragedy and comedy in this period, there is much to be learned about 'drama' and its development during the fifth century. Aristophanes offers the first overt exposition on the form in *Frogs* by placing Euripides and Aeschylus in competition.[31] Through consideration of the way in which Aristophanes reproduces the lines of the tragedians in this section, and the criticisms they level at each other, we can see how tragedy evolved during the limited time frame of their careers.[32]

It is important to remember that poets of the fifth-century were writing in a society where universal literacy was not fully developed and in which the definition of state culture was deeply political. The content of texts will, therefore, contain references and criticism not only to current events, but also towards the interpretation of previous events as presented by other poets. When considering sources of parody in ancient texts, there exists only a fraction of the historical events, societal tensions and contemporary attitudes towards them from which the poets could have drawn.

'Modern' theories of parody cannot be wholly germane to fifth-century texts because they are formed through the examination of texts with a wide temporal scope, but they can partially help to inform new studies in the field of imitation within texts from the fifth-century through the application of their methodology. Therefore, pertinent points of theories such as those devised by Bakhtin, Genette,

[31] *Frogs*, 1119-1145
[32] For example, the difference between the plots, characters and content of the plays as discussed by the two characters during the *agon.*

Hodge and Conte will be considered when examining the technique of 'parody' as used by Aristophanes.

In order to stimulate the poetic memory of his audience, Aristophanes needed to create a set of verbal and visual signs, based upon the conventions of their own society and level of understanding at the point of reception.[33] This semantic memory included the ideas, conventions and lessons contained in the corpus of myth and, for some, the messages conveyed by their adaptation and presentation in tragedy. In order to create a form of language through which Aristophanes could communicate with his audience, he placed familiar words and actions from tragedy amongst comedic scenes to encourage audience expectation of their meaning. This anticipates Bakhtin who suggests that all language is dialogic and therefore what is said is tied both to things that have been said before and to utterances we expect to be made in the future.[34] Thus, dialogic literature (as opposed to monologic)[35] is engaged with a continual dialogue with other works and their authors. In the case of Aristophanes and Euripides, the discourse between their texts goes a stage further and answers, extends and informs the other. Given that the content of their dialogue is necessarily culture specific, for the modern reader, some of the signs will inevitably remain obscure due to incompatibilities between ancient and modern semantic charters. However, for the contemporary spectator, Aristophanes' signposting triggered a series of associations with earlier texts that contained familiar phenomena, allowing him to offer an opinion on contemporary events and comment on the outlook of others. There would also be a secondary association to the myths

[33] Semantic memory is associated with ideas, concepts and meaning, which are not necessarily connected to personal experiences. See also Newiger, (1957:23-49) who emphasises that physical representations, in collaboration with verbal images, take on a figurative significance.
[34] Bakhtin (1981:280)
[35] Monologic literature is concerned with that which is self-contained and stands entirely alone, without the influence of other voices and represents a version of truth imposed by the author. Paryas (1993:593) cites the opening lines of *Anna Karenina* as monologic. "All happy families are like one another; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." Here the authorial voice is absolute and incontestable.

from which the plot of the original text was drawn; where culture-specific ideologies were incorporated and which would, therefore, have reinforced his message. As a whole, these associations might lead to a deeper communication between the poet and his audience.

Aristophanes combines references to other texts, genres, and discourses to form a new work. In doing so, he anticipates Conte who presents a remembered passage from another text as self-consciously re-used, participating in a literary system such as another (or the same) genre.[36] Recognition is the key issue. Without knowledge of the previous passage, the audience may simply see the retelling as a new text. For some, the phenomenological reception of characters and plot as unique allows complete acceptance, whereas for the more theatrically aware, 'poetic memory' is evoked and an internal deconstruction of the new text takes place. In this context, phenomenological acceptance applies to audience reception of the character or situation in one-dimensional terms as new, without making links to previous representations.[37] Aristophanes is aware of this possibility and it is for this reason that he provides signifiers, which include giving the author of the previous text a character role and then adding literary and visual links to the origin of the lines he chooses to re-use.

Allusions occasionally only take the form of simple semiotic markers, but may also be combined with other linguistic or visual phenomena to aid recognition. In the *Thesmophoriazusae* Euripides acts out scenes from his *Helen* and *Andromeda*, occasionally using direct quotations. Aristophanes' dramatic dialogue ensures that everyone in the audience recognises the scenes even if they had not previously seen

[36] Conte, (2007:10) for whom terms 'intertextuality', 'poetic memory' and 'allusion' are interchangeable, but are all a form of linguistic marking.
[37] Bain, (1977:6-7) describes this concept simply as: "Actors pretend to be the people they play and the audience accepts that pretence."

the plays. It is clearly stated in the text that the In-Law is taking the roles of Euripides' Helen and Andromeda, and that Euripides himself is taking the rescuers' role, first as Menelaus and then as Perseus.[38] This is particularly meta-theatrical as it refers not only to Euripides as the author of the plays that are being *re*-presented but also to his dramatic technique when the *Andromeda* was staged a year earlier.[39] This technique is common in Aristophanes' work. He deconstructs the new text, in this case the *Thesmophoriazusae,* in order to expose the joke and thus demonstrates a self-conscious awareness of his literary technique, which confirms his attempts at audience manipulation. [40]

In the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Aristophanes reconstructs Euripides' lines in order to make them part of the new text. He does this by incorporating the characters and their Euripidean situation into quite another scenario in his own text.[41] The audience is invited to enjoy this humorous re-creation on a basic level, but Aristophanes also builds in a complex set of signs that enable some audience members to interpret the choice of texts in a much more meaningful way.[42] Using this approach, Aristophanes carries out two semiotic acts: the recreation of the original act of production and a piece of writing that incorporates the text-as-read into a new text. [43] The poet has ensured that the signifiers created will not all be recognised in the same way by members of the audience and therefore, the spectators become co-creators of the meaning of the new text.

---

[38] *Thesmophoriazusae*, 850-1132

[39] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1060 where Echo states that she, personally assisted Euripides win the competition last year, in this very place. In addition, the use of the deus ex machina at line 1098 when Euripides (as Perseus) comes onto the stage to rescue the In-Law (as Andromeda) would have been reminiscent of a similar scene in Euripides' production the previous yeAristophanes

[40] Such as the 'Luggage Scene' in *Frogs,* 1-35. This 'joke' is deconstructed in Chapter Three in order to demonstrate how Aristophanes anticipated the competence of his audience.

[41] Antiphanes *fr.* 191 says that in comedy, the writer has to invent new names, new words, new deeds, the prologue, the presupposition, the action and the ending. Aristophanes does this but uses the texts of others upon which to build these new characters and plot.

[42] A deconstruction of the way in which Aristophanes attacks Euripides' politics through the choice of reconstructed texts in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is the subject of Chapter five.

[43] Hodge, (1990:110-111)

One of many possible examples is Euripides': ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώοκ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος.[44] Aristophanes reproduces this in a speech by the In-Law: μέμνεσο τονυν ταῦθ', ὅτι ἡ φρὴν ὤμοσεν ἡ γλῶττα δ' οὐκ ὀμώμοκ' οὐδ' ὥρκωσ' ἐγώ.[45] Some audience members may have recognised it from the original performance and others purely from an anecdotal perspective. Although it is spoken in a comic context, its meaning is equally serious. The In-Law is seeking reassurance from Euripides that if his disguise is uncovered by the women at the festival, he will come and rescue him. Given that at this point, Euripides is fearful for his life should the women manage to get hold of him and is sending his relative up to the Thesmophoria instead, the stakes are as high as they were for Hippolytus and Phaedra. The Euripidean context caused great controversy since it implied that Hippolytus may not stand by his oath whereas in fact, he does not break his promise and suffers greatly as a result. Aristophanes uses the line in a different context, but Euripides, like Hippolytus, keeps his promise.

Versions of the same line also appear twice in *Frogs.* The first comes at the end of a list of phrases that a 'potent poet' might say: ἢ φρένα μὲν οὐκ ἐθέλουσαν ὀμόσαι καθ' ἱερῶν, γλῶτταν δ' ἐπιορκήσασαν ἰδίᾳ τῆς φρενός.[46] In this scene, Dionysus is explaining to Heracles that the reason he wants to bring back Euripides rather than any of the other poets, is that they are mundane and that it is better to have one who is 'daring' and will give the people of Athens controversial plots. This signifies recognition of the uproar caused by the line when it first appeared in *Hippolytus.* Here though, the line has been slightly modified. It has both the heart and the tongue perjuring themselves, which indicates that in this play, the oath will be broken and Euripides will not be brought back. Therefore, we can see that

---

[44] "It was my tongue that swore, not my heart." Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 612

[45] "Just remember this, then, it was your heart that swore; it wasn't your tongue that swore, nor did I ask it to." *Thesmophoriazusae*, 275-276

[46] " ..or about a heart that doesn't want to take an oath over sacrificial victims and a tongue that perjures itself separately from the heart." *Frogs*, 101-102

through the subtle modification of the line, Aristophanes is making reference to its original meaning. He is drawing attention to the fact that he is being controversial by changing it, as well as using it as a literary device to foreshadow the eventual outcome of the plot.

As this foreshadowing comes to fruition, Aristophanes uses the line again. Here Dionysus defends the breaking of his promise to save Euripides and his decision to return Aeschylus instead: ἡ γλῶττ' ὀμώμοκ', Αἰσχύλον δ' αἱρήσομαι.[47] In this example, we can see that Aristophanes creates a paradigmatic relationship between the original line and both the new versions he presents in this play.[48] In *Hippolytus*, the hero swears with his tongue, but not his heart; the first time Dionysus says it, he swears with neither and the second time goes back to the line's original meaning in Euripides' version, claiming, as Hippolytus had done, that he too swore with his tongue but not his heart. The difference is that here, Dionysus does what the Athenian audience were so concerned that Hippolytus might do, and he breaks his oath. Aristophanes has, therefore, brought the line full circle.

In all three instances the line occurs in either a discussion about, or a conversation with, Euripides. In this way, Aristophanes not only gives added depth and humour to the line by placing it alongside its author but also, by putting it in such a context, assists the audience with its recognition. The poet requires that his audience play along with his signifying processes in order that they fully understand the depth of his skill, although there would have been those for whom no additional effort or signposting was required. For those who needed it, Aristophanes supplied the tools to comprehend the complexity of his constructions and enjoy an enhanced level of humour. The interrelationship between text and audience is created through

[47] "'Twas but my tongue that swore, I'm choosing Aeschylus." *Frogs*, 1471
[48] One in which the theme is not only concerned with what *happens* in terms of the action, but what it means.

the interpretation of the markers the poet constructs, allowing the meaning of the text to be individually formed within *this* relationship rather than in the text itself. By being so overt, Aristophanes assists with the meaning of the text. He also creates within the spectator, an awareness of the actor and the character being parodied, whilst at the same time persuading them to accept the phenomenon as new.

This phenomenological recreation of the text within which things are as they are *perceived*, as opposed to what they *are*, is a key part of the comic genre, allowing the audience to accept the character and situation whilst simultaneously being aware of the actor playing out the role and the original text from which the situation has been recreated. The key difference between comedy and tragedy is that tragedy's fourth wall enforces the suspension of disbelief. In contrast, comedic productions provide an ease of access, allowing for a physical and textual dialogue between performance and audience and, in so doing, allow greater scope for individual reception. There are more than one hundred passages representing obvious theatrical self-consciousness in Aristophanes' plays as well as hundreds of other occasions where the actors address the audience in the same way as modern stand-up comedians. In addition to this, there are hundreds more places where a gesture or movement towards the audience might have ruptured the illusion. Chapman suggests that due to the frequency in which dramatic illusion is created and then broken, the spectators of a comedy became virtually part of the cast, almost like noisy extras.[49] However, given the unpredictable nature of comedy and the likelihood of the cast ad-libbing, it is difficult to fully evaluate the phenomenon. That the poet was aware of his ability to influence the audience is evident in the

[49] Chapman, (1983:22-23)

careful construction of humour in accordance with the varying levels of audience competence.[50]

Aristophanic comedy operates on a variety of levels and therefore the pragmatic approach to its reception is the most applicable to its deconstruction in that "the text, released from its author, might be seen in semiotic and structuralist terms as a set of signs; and that the meaning of the text is created in the act of being read".[51] In addition, when considering the physical performance of a play and the various types of humour contained therein, we can hypothesise that the audience would have appreciated the play in different ways and understood the signs created by the poets in accordance with their own experience, expectation and indeed, sense of humour.[52]

Conte believes that allusion is a rhetorical figure; it is of linguistic significance and brings an added level of meaning for the reader.[53] He calls this allusion 'poetic memory'. Thus, poets actively engage with other texts recalling a poetic setting rather than individual lines. This symbiosis allows the provocation of a particular reception within the boundaries of the audiences' poetic memory.

3.5 Material Imitation

Whilst critique of ancient texts can generally only be done by examining their use of language, Aristophanes' inclusion of a description of the physical scenes he

[50] This aspect of Aristophanes' work is discussed in Chapter Four.
[51] Thompson, (1993:251). The pragmatic approach states that the meaning of the text is created in the act of being read so that different readers at the same time; the same reader at different times and different readers at different times might all understand the same text differently according to where, with what expectations, and for purposes the text is read. The reader comes to the text with experience and expectations, which means that the text is partly a function of audience themselves. Therefore, literary history must also trace the changing receptions of the audience.
[52] Aristophanes' recognition of this fact and his method of constructing humour in accordance with the competence of the audience who were going to receive it, is discussed in Chapter four.
[53] Conte, (2007:10). He goes on to state "[a genre] can be combined, reduced, amplified, transposed, and reversed; it may suffer various types of functional mutations and adaptations; the content and expression of one genre may become associated with another".

reconstructs, particularly those that involve the representation of tragic characters on stage, makes it possible to distinguish a second type of signifier, which acts as a complement. These references to material parody add another dimension to recreated scenes and urge the formation of a new methodology for the deconstruction of Old Comedy. Within this we can see the many and varied ways Aristophanes prompts the poetic memory of the audience through the use of language and tone as well as costume and stage direction.

Aristophanes' imitation is not confined to the written word. He also physically reconstructed tragic scenes, using stage machinery, costumes and props to create visual images that enhanced the action and lines whether spoken in the comic or tragic style. In *Acharnians*, Euripides is wheeled from his house on the *ekkyklema* at the request of Dicaeopolis.[54] This piece of stage machinery would normally only be seen during a tragic performance and consequently would be immediately comical in its unlikely setting.[55] In this scene Aristophanes also makes reference to Euripides' plays by dressing him in rags, a state of apparel reminiscent of Euripides' tragic heroes. By donning the guise of Telephus he is also able to assume his characteristics and addresses the Assembly in a highly articulate manner. The audience then becomes aware of Aristophanes' character having three roles: comic actor, comic character and tragic character.[56] Aristophanes not only creates simple humour by representing a famous tragedian in an improbable situation, but he compounds the joke with the additional aspects of costume, props and stage

---

[54] *Acharnians,* 408. The *ekkyklema* is also used to wheel Agathon out of his house at *Thesmophoriazusae* 96; back into the house at line 265; and in *Daedalus fr.*188 with Alcibiades as Icarus flying towards the sun.

[55] The *mechane* is seen more often than the *ekkyklema:* in *Clouds* (226) Socrates is suspended in mid-air; in *Birds* (1198) as the Chorus await the arrival of Iris: in *Thesmophoriazusae* (1015) when Euripides, disguised as Perseus, attempts to rescue the In-Law as Helen and in *Peace* (174) when Trygaeus flies to heaven on a dung-beetle. In *Peace* particular attention is drawn to the tragic nature of this piece of stage machinery: οὐκοῦν ἐχρῆν σε Πηγάσου ζεῦξαι πτερόν, ὅπως ἐφαίνου τοῖς θεοῖς τραγικώτερος. "Should you not then have harnessed the wings of Pegasus, so as to appear more like a tragic hero in the eyes of the gods?" (135) and is followed by a warning not to fall off because then he would be used by Euripides as part of a tragic plot (reference to the protagonists fall from Pegasus in Euripides' *Bellerophon*) (146-8)

[56] Muecke, (1977:63)

machinery in order to reinforce the incongruity of the character's new situation. These additional aspects resemble their referents and act as iconic shorthand to provoke the poetic memory of the audience by offering visual stimuli that reinforce and enhance the verbal. [57]

Euripides speaks in the tragic style throughout the scene. The tragedian becomes more and more exasperated until he finally explodes: λυπηρὸς ἴσθ' ὢν κἀποχώρησον δόμων.[58] In the same scene he later shouts: φθείρου λαβὼν τόδ' ἴσθ' ὀχηρὸς ὢν δόμοις.[59] His anger and exasperation, despite being delivered in high language, are made amusing because of the comic context in which the words are said.[60]

A prime example of how Aristophanes presents a combination of literary and visual parodies to enhance audience enjoyment and to transmit his message, occurs is the rescue scenes of the *Thesmophoriazusae*. Here, he creates situations where Euripides, the character, acts out sequences originally written by Euripides, the poet, alongside the fictitious character of the In-Law. In effect, the secondary characters created by the actors are palimpsestic since there is no attempt to disguise their 'first' identity. Although both actors take on the physical and verbal elements of their second role within the play, their first part is still evident. In-between the scripted lines, they come out of their secondary characters (of Helen and Menelaus) and speak to each other about the new part they are playing. When Menelaus (played by the actor portraying Euripides) is thwarted in his attempt to rescue Helen (played by the actor portraying the In-Law), he comes out of character to say: τουτὶ πονηρόν:

[57] Sofer, (2003:20-22)
[58] "Know thou annoy'st me, and depart my house." *Acharnians,* 456
[59] "Take this and go to hell! I tell thee, thou'rt a vexer of our house." *Acharnians,* 460
[60] In this way, Aristophanes modifies a tragic text without altering the style, almost as homage to the original poet.

ἀλλ᾽ ὑπαποκινητέον; to which the In-Law replies: ἐγὼ δ᾽ ὁ κακοδαίμων τί δρῶ;[61] This creates secondary and tertiary levels of discontinuous humour with the Aristophanic actors discussing the characters they are playing, who are parodies of Euripidean actors, who themselves played the roles a year earlier.

Furthermore, it is highly likely that given the way Euripides is made to hold up the costumes of each of his tragic characters in *Acharnians,*[62] Aristophanes would have copied not only Euripides' lines, but also the costumes and stage directions from his production of *Helen* the year before. In that presentation, Menelaus was surprised to see a woman who looked so much like his wife: οὐπώποτ᾽ εἶδον προσφερέστερον δέμας and the text shows that he was wearing sailcloth from the way he describes his attire: οὔτε γὰρ σῖτος πάρα οὔτ᾽ ἀμφὶ χρῶτ᾽ ἐσθῆτες: αὐτὰ δ᾽ εἰκάσαι πάρεστι ναὸς ἐκβόλοις ἃ ἀμπίσχομαι.[63] In the *Thesmophoriazusae,* Menelaus/Euripides says: Ἑλένῃ σ᾽ ὁμοίαν δὴ μάλιστ᾽ εἶδον γύναι. Helen/In-Law replies: ἐγὼ δὲ Μενελάῳ σ᾽ ὅσα γ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἰφύων.[64] The lines, actions and costumes are so similar that the scenes bring to mind Euripides' original production in a different way. Aristophanes is not merely repeating or alluding to the spoken word. The humour created stands alone and recognition is not necessary to find the action amusing, but when it is combined with the poetic memory of the original words, actions and costumes, the effect is enhanced.

3.6 Contemporary Attitudes to Borrowing in the Fifth Century

In seeking to discover if the relationship between Aristophanes and Euripides differed from other poets' interactions (tragic and comic), it is useful to consider

---

[61] "That's bad that is. I'll have to slip gently away."; "And poor me, what am I supposed to do?" *Thesmophoriazusae,* 924-5
[62] *Acharnians,* 410-470
[63] "...there is no food, nor clothing to cover me. That you can guess by the jetsam from my ship that I have on."; "I have never seen such a resemblance." *Helen* 421-2; 559.
[64] "Lady, I never saw one more like Helen."; "Nor I like Menelaus, by that sailcloth." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 909-10

contemporary opinion of Aristophanes' proclivity towards reinvention. Aristophanes' competitive success is an indication of his popularity due, no doubt in part, to his clever re-use of lines. However, there is no contemporaneous commentary that indicates how other poets reacted to this technique. Again, we are forced to look to the plays themselves to make a judgement on this matter.

Aristophanes had a thorough knowledge of earlier and contemporary comedy and tragedy. He made effective use of numerous and frequent references to both genres in the creation of his plays. Given the paucity of extant comic texts, it is not possible to establish whether other poets used tragedy to the same extent as Aristophanes, but what is certain is that they regularly borrowed from each other and referred to this habit in both the content and titles of their plays.[65] The plethora of references to Euripidean tragedies in Aristophanes' work certainly did not go unnoticed.[66] Cratinus comments: τίς δὲ σύ κομψός τις ἔροιτο θεατήςὑπολεπτολόγος γνωμιώκτης εὐριπιδαριστοφανίξων.[67] The context of these lines is unknown, but it confirms that Aristophanes' borrowing from tragic texts, particularly those of Euripides, was recognised as an integral part of his comedic technique. The scholiast's comment on Plato's *Apology of Socrates* also suggests that Aristophanes made no attempt to hide the fact that he used Euripides' work as a model:

> Ἀριστοφάνης ... ἐκωμῳδεῖτο δ'ἐπὶ τῷ σκώπτειν μὲν Εὐριπίδην,
> μιμεῖσθαι δ'αὐτόν ... καὶ αὐτος δ' ἐξομολογεῖται Σκηνὰς καταλαμβανούσαις;
> χρῶμαι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ στόματος τῷ σρογγύλῳ,
> τοὺς νοὺς δ'ἀγοραίους ἧττον ἢ 'κεῖνος ποιῶ[68]

---

[65] See Chapter Four for examples of reciprocal borrowing between comic poets. A full discussion of this habit is beyond the scope of this thesis and therefore I will concentrate on contemporary attitudes to Aristophanes' use of tragic lines and his reaction to that criticism.

[66] See also Lysippus *fr.* 4 where he inveighs against the plagiarism of his contemporaries.

[67] "Who are you? Some smart-ass-spectator might ask, over subtle when it comes to speech, eager to pick up little statements, a Euripidaristophaniser. Cratinus, *fr.* 342. See also alternative translations of this line discussed in *Aristophanes' Acharnians,* Olson, (2002:110-111)

[68] "Aristophanes … was criticised for ridiculing Euripides while at the same time imitating him … and he himself plainly admits it in *Fair Place Grabbers*; 'The terseness of my style on his is based, but my ideas are not in such bad taste.'" Aristophanes, *fr.* 471

In this fragment Aristophanes is quoted as acknowledging certain positive aspects of Euripides' style but, simultaneously, criticising it as vulgar. This is in keeping with the disparity between the constant re-use of Euripides' lines, indicating a degree of admiration, and the unpleasant treatment Euripides receives when he is represented as a character. There is no evidence to date *Fair Place Grabbers* which is mentioned here, but a similar sentiment of the admiration and veiled criticism of Euripides is also seen in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*, indicating a recurring theme.

There is also evidence to suggest that Aristophanes' contemporaries borrowed not only from each other but, at times, from the same tragedies. On at least one occasion Aristophanes and Eupolis use the same line from Euripides. The example cited below is one that the scholiast Aristarchus suggests comes from a dicing scene in the *Telephus,* which Euripides later cut out.[69] In *Frogs*, Dionysus insists: φράσω βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεὺς δύο κύβω καὶ τέτταρα.[70] Note the similarity to Eupolis' work, when Dionysus says in the *Golden Race*: ἀποφθαρεὶς δὲ δύο κύβω καὶ τέτταρα.[71] It is not clear what evidence the scholiast had for his assumption, but given that the original phrase appears in a conversation between Dionysus and Euripides, it is very likely that he was correct. Without an extant fragment, it is not possible to prove absolutely that this line is Euripidean but given that in all other instances in *Frogs* Euripidean lines appear either during a conversation about, or with, Euripides, it is highly likely that it is also the case here.[72]

---

[69] Sommerstein (1996:282 n.1400). In order for the scholiast to recognise the phrase, it must have appeared in an earlier version of the play, meaning that it may also be familiar to the audience.
[70] "I tell you: Achilles cast a pair on one spot and a four." Aristophanes, *Frogs,* 1400
[71] "Lost, ruined, by two aces and a four." Eupolis, *fr.*342
[72] Schlesinger (1937:294-305) gives a useful account of the way in which Aristophanes warns his audience that a 'parody is coming' in *Birds, Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata,* stating that the most definite marker is the name of the poet parodied with, or without, the title of the work concerned. It is highly likely, therefore, that Aristophanes used the same technique in *Frogs.*

It is not possible to establish whether all comic poets used tragedy in the same way as Aristophanes to create plots, characters and/or convey messages through their particular choice of parodied lines, but he and his contemporaries often based their plays on myth and played on each others' versions. Given this common ground, it is clear that both comic and tragic elements were formed from, and reflected, the common social charter upon which fifth-century Athenian society was based.

Not only is there evidence in Euripides' plays to suggest that he recognised and reacted to Aristophanic parodies, but Cratinus also remarks directly on Aristophanes' use of Eupolis, which suggests that whilst the practice of sharing plot and characters may have been used from time to time, Aristophanes' continual use of the technique in taking from both comedy and tragedy created a certain amount of animosity. The scholiast to *Knights* says: ταῦτα δ᾽ἀκούσας ὁ Κρατίνος ἔγραψε τὴν Πυτίνην δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐχ ἐλήρησεν ἐν ᾗ κακῶς λέγει τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ὡς τα Εὐπόλιδος λέγοντα.[73] The line he refers to is: ὅστις οὖν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα μὴ σφόδρα βδελύττεται οὔποτ' ἐκ ταύτοῦ μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν πίεται ποτηρίου.[74]

Eupolis also comments on the similarity between this speech and the parabasis of *Demes*, saying: κἀκείνους τοὺς ῾Ιππέας ξυνεποὶησα τῷ φαλακρῷ τούτῳ κἀδωρησάμην.[75] This suggests that Eupolis and Aristophanes either collaborated in the writing of this section of *Knights* and he received no acknowledgment or, as suggested by Cratinus, Aristophanes plagiarised Eupolis' work. We know that at the

[73] "After hearing this, Cratinus, by way of showing that he did not 'talk silly' wrote the *Wine Flask* in which he attacks Aristophanes for using lines which were said by Eupolis." Cratinus, *fr*. 200. Ruffell (2002:155) discusses the similarities in plot construction between *Knights* and *The Wine Flask* suggesting that the latter was written as a response to the comic caricature contained within the former.

[74] "Whoever does not utterly loathe such a man shall never drink from the same cup with me." Aristophanes, *Knights,* 1288-9.

[75] "...and then those Knights, I helped the baldhead to write 'em, and never stood on my rights." Cratinus *fr.* 78

beginning of his career, Aristophanes was writing for other poets without claiming the credit:

ἀδικεῖσθαι γάρ φησιν πρότερος πόλλ᾽ αὐτοὺς εὖ πεποιηκώς,
τὰ μὲν οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλ᾽ ἐπικουρῶν κρύβδην ἑτέροισι ποιηταῖς,
μιμησάμενος τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν καὶ διάνοιαν,
εἰς ἀλλοτρίας γαστέρας ἐνδὺς κωμῳδικὰ πολλὰ χέασθαι:
μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ φανερῶς ἤδη κινδυνεύων καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν,
οὐκ ἀλλοτρίων ἀλλ᾽ οἰκείων Μουσῶν στόμαθ᾽ ἡνιοχήσας[76]

Whatever the truth of the matter, it is evident that Cratinus considered Aristophanes' actions unacceptable. It is likely that this was part of an ongoing animosity between the two poets. A year earlier, in *Acharnians*, Aristophanes had insulted Cratinus:

οὐδ᾽ ἐντυχὼν ἐν τἀγορᾷ πρόσεισί σοι βαδίζων
Κρατῖνος ἀεὶ κεκαρμένος μοιχὸν μιᾷ μαχαίρᾳ,
ὁ περιπόνηρος Ἀρτέμων,
ὁ ταχὺς ἄγαν τὴν μουσικήν,
ὄζων κακὸν τῶν μασχαλῶν
πατρὸς Τραγασαίου.[77]

There is a level of hostility here that is not evident from Cratinus' reference to Aristophanes as a *Euripidaristophaniser*,[78] which suggests that whilst borrowing from tragedy may have been acceptable, borrowing from comic poets was not. This is further supported by the fact that the insults Aristophanes later throws at Cratinus do not relate to his literary prowess, or relate to plagiarism, but rather attack his morals and parentage. He encourages physical assault when the Chorus say:

ἠπιαλῶν γὰρ οἴκαδ᾽ ἐξ ἱππασίας βαδίζων,
εἶτα κατάξειέ τις αὐτοῦ μεθύων τῆς κεφαλῆς Ὀρέστης
μαινόμενος: ὁ δὲ λίθον βαλεῖν
βουλόμενος ἐν σκότῳ λάβοι

[76] "At first it was not openly but secretly, giving assistance to other poets, slipping into other people's stomachs in imitation of the method of the seer Eurycles, that he poured forth many comic words; after that he did try his luck openly on his own, holding the reins of a team of muses that were his, not someone else's." *Wasps,* 1018-1022

[77] "Nor will you be met in the market by Cratinus walking towards you, Cratinus who is always barbered with a single blade (the adulterer's cut), a literary 'Artemon the wicked', over-hasty in composition, his armpits smelling vilely of his Goatlandish father." *Acharnians,* 848-853. Identification of Artemon is problematic but it is likely that he was a disreputable painter. See Slater (1978:185-194)

[78] Cratinus, *fr.* 342

τῇ χειρὶ πέλεθον ἀρτίως κεχεσμένον:
ἐπᾴξειεν δ᾽ ἔχων
τὸν μάρμαρον, κᾄπειθ᾽ ἁμαρτὼν
βάλοι Κρατῖνον. [79]

In *Knights* Aristophanes also implies that Cratinus (by now an old man) is incontinent. The Chorus exclaim: εἴ σε μὴ μισῶ, γενοίμην ἐν Κρατίνου κῴδιον[80] and suggest that Cratinus has a propensity for debauchery:

νυνὶ δ᾽ ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν ὁρῶντες παραληροῦντ᾽ οὐκ ἐλεεῖτε,
ἐκπιπτουσῶν τῶν ἠλέκτρων καὶ τοῦ τόνου οὐκέτ᾽ ἐνόντος
τῶν θ᾽ ἁρμονιῶν διαχασκουσῶν: ἀλλὰ γέρων ὢν περιέρρει,
ὥσπερ Κοννᾶς, στέφανον μὲν ἔχων αὖον δίψῃ δ᾽ ἀπολωλώς,
ὃν χρῆν διὰ τὰς προτέρας νίκας πίνειν ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ,
καὶ μὴ ληρεῖν ἀλλὰ θεᾶσθαι λιπαρὸν παρὰ τῷ Διονύσῳ. [81]

A year later, Cratinus wrote *The Wine Flask* in which he responded to Aristophanes' verbal abuse, and satirised himself. The scholiast to *Knights* says: ἐκεῖνος καίτοι τοῦ ἀγωνίζεθαι ἀποστάς καὶ συγγράφειν πάλιν γράφει δρᾶμα τὴν Πυτίνην εἰς αὑτόν τε καὶ τὴν μέθην.[82] The insults between comic poets appear to have been far more personal than those meted out against tragedians. However, because they are couched in comedy, it is difficult to judge how acrimonious they actually were. Even in the lines from *Knights* above, where Cratinus is slighted because of his physical appearance and constant inebriation, Aristophanes writes that instead of drivelling and drinking, he should be sitting in the theatre, being honoured

---

[79] "When he is walking home with the shivers after riding-exercise, then may a drunkard break his head, even Orestes the mad and may he, intending to pick up a stone, in the darkness take in his hand a freshly dropped turd. May he rush upon the foe with his gleaming weapon, and then miss his aim and hit Cratinus." *Acharnians,* 1165-1173

[80] "If I do not hate you, may I become a blanket in the house of Cratinus." *Knights,* 400

[81] "And now you take no pity on him, though you see him drivelling, with his pegs falling out, his tuning gone, and joints gaping; in his old age he wanders about, like Connas, 'wearing a garland old and sere, and all but dead with thirst', when in honour of his former victories he ought to be drinking in the Prytaneum, and instead of spouting drivel, should be sitting sleek-faced in the audience by the side of Dionysus." *Knights,* 532-538.

[82] "Though he had given up drinking and competing and writing Cratinus wrote one more play, *The Wine Flask* on himself and drunkenness." Cratinus *fr.* 181. The plot involves Comedy as his wife wishing to divorce her husband (Cratinus) on the grounds that he no longer writes comedies but instead devotes himself to his mistress, *Methe* (drunkenness).

at the side of Dionysus. This could imply that Aristophanes admired his work and the personal attacks were in jest or perhaps a further attack in the form of sarcasm.

This duality echoes the way in which Aristophanes emulates Euripides' work throughout his career. His works suggest that he admires and respects him, yet from time to time ridicules him as a character within the plot. Finally, when he is given the chance to bring him back from the dead at the end of *Frogs,* Aristophanes changes his mind and chooses Aeschylus instead. It is likely that these are examples of Aristophanes recognising, and playing to, the diverse factions that made up his hypothetical audience and thus creating a text that allowed for a varied reception.[83] It is vital to bear in mind that the plays Aristophanes produced were intended to win competitions. He was aware that competition success rested with the audience who, given their diverse nature, might not be consistent in their allegiances.[84] By embedding both insult and praise within his re-created texts he was always able to please both those who supported and opposed his targets.

Despite Aristophanes' constant use of Euripides' lines, he responds angrily to those who take his own. In the *parabasis* of *Clouds* he says:

> Εὔπολις μὲν τὸν Μαρικᾶν πρώτιστον παρείλκυσεν
> ἐκστρέψας τοὺς ἡμετέρους Ἱππέας κακὸς κακῶς,
> προσθεὶς αὐτῷ γραῦν μεθύσην τοῦ κόρδακος οὕνεχ',
> ἣν Φρύνιχος πάλαι πεποίηχ', ἣν τὸ κῆτος ἤσθιεν.
> εἶθ' Ἕρμιππος αὖθις ἐποίησεν εἰς Ὑπέρβολον,
> ἄλλοι τ' ἤδη πάντες ἐρείδουσιν εἰς Ὑπέρβολον,
> τὰς εἰκοὺς τῶν ἐγχέλεων τὰς ἐμὰς μιμούμενοι.
> ὅστις οὖν τούτοισι γελᾷ, τοῖς ἐμοῖς μὴ χαιρέτω:
> ἢν δ' ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖσιν ἐμοῖς εὐφραίνησθ' εὑρήμασιν,
> ἐς τὰς ὥρας τὰς ἑτέρας εὖ φρονεῖν δοκήσετε.[85]

[83] The effect of a specific parody comes from the evocation of audience expectation. The poet is therefore in the role of reader and writer as both the 'decoder' of the parodied text and the 'encoder'. (Rose: 1980:10)

[84] For example, in 424 Aristophanes won first place with the *Knights*, which contains almost constant attacks on Cleon. However, the fact that the audience and/or judges enjoyed the vitriolic humour enough to vote the play the winner, does not mean that they were in agreement with its sentiments. The following year, Cleon was re-elected and must therefore have enjoyed a degree of popularity in Athens.

[85] "First of all Eupolis hauled his *Maricas* on to the stage, serving a vile rehash of my *Knights* like the vile fellow that he is, and adding on a drunken old woman for the sake of the cordax, the woman presented years ago by Phrynichus, the one the sea-monster tried to devour. Then Hermippus again wrote about Hyperbolus, and now all the others are piling into Hyperbolus, copying my similes about eels. Well, whoever laughs at them, let him

Aristophanes makes it clear that he is aware that Eupolis not only used his work, but also Phrynichus'. He goes on to accuse 'the others' of copying his similes. This is likely to be a reference to the period that Halliwell refers to as his 'ventriloquist' phase. This occurred before the production of *Babylonians* in 427 where it is thought that he contributed to the plays of others without receiving any credit.[86] His advice to members of the audience that they should not laugh at the others' work is ironic given his donation of lines to them and his own prolific use of tragic texts. This irony is deliberate because after making this series of accusations, in *Frogs* he inserts a Chorus of initiates and the rescue *topos,* both of which contain echoes of Phrynichus' *Mystai,* Euripides' *Andromeda* and Eupolis' *Demes.*

Whilst *Mystai* (*Initiates*), is not extant, it is likely to have taken its title from its Chorus. *Frogs* has two Choruses and Aristophanes could have taken its name from either one. He may have favoured the frog Chorus over the Chorus of initiates to avoid giving his play the same name as that of his rival. It is also likely that Sophocles featured as a character in *Mystai* and that the plot involved a contest between Sophocles and Euripides.[87] Demand suggests that the victory of Dionysus over the frog Chorus represents the rivalry between Aristophanes and Phrynichus, pre-empting the outcome of the competition.[88] In addition, a scholiast to Aristides confirms that the hero of the *Demes* brought up four great Athenian leaders from the dead and confirms these leaders to be Miltiades, Aristides, Solon and Pericles.[89]

Note also the parallel plots of Euripides' *Andromeda* and Aristophanes' *Frogs* with the comic analogy of Perseus/Andromeda and Dionysus/Euripides.

not enjoy my work; but if you take pleasure in me and my poetic inventions, you will be thought by future ages to have been wise." Aristophanes, *Clouds,* 554-563

[86] Halliwell, (1981:37). This period is also referred to in the *parabasis* of *Wasps* (1018-20) where he refers to putting many of his comic ideas into the mouths of others.

[87] Meineke (1839:157) cites Diogenes Laertes 4.20; schol. Sophocles *OC* 17; and Athenaeus2.44D as evidence.

[88] Demand (1970:86)

[89] Eupolis *frs.* 99.56-57 and 64-65

Perseus, inspired by the beauty of Andromeda sets out to rescue her from death whilst Dionysus, inspired by the beauty of the *Andromeda*, sets out to rescue its author from death. During the course of their missions, both heroes cross water and encounter a monster before finally entering into a bargain with the king (Perseus with Cepheus; Dionysus with Pluto). However, Aristophanes substitutes the sexual passion of Perseus for an intellectual passion in Dionysus. Here we can see that the poet's borrowing is so overt that his condemnation of the practice can only be another way of drawing attention to his craft and creating humour into the bargain.

The extract from *Clouds* cited above is more than a comment on the way in which Aristophanes' rivals copied his work. It is evidence that Aristophanes knew their texts very well and was aware of who was copying whom, and when and where it was happening. This passage gives us an insight into his use of ideas and characters from other plays and how he combined them into the plot of others, in this case, *Frogs.* It shows that Aristophanes created complicated references, both overt and obscure, in accordance with his expectation of the audience, their specific systems of codification and ability to recognise his ciphers.[90] All of these actions are forms of parody that do not fit neatly into any modern definition and therefore demand a qualification of their own.

3.7 Audience Recognition of Plot and the Re-use of *topoi*

Although it is clear that the poets knew each other's writing very well and probably had access to written copies, everyday spectators of the fifth-century theatre did not have the modern luxury of being able to review and compare texts. Their understanding was created at the time of reception and thus the poet needed to

[90] Bakhtin (1981:69) describes this type of variable relationship between texts as quotations that are sometimes openly emphasised, or that were half-hidden, completely hidden, half-conscious, unconscious, correct, intentionally distorted or deliberately reinterpreted.

make his point immediately and make it well. His best chance of doing this was to lay down a series of semiotic markers that led the audience back to previous texts in order to stimulate their semantic memory.

In the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Aristophanes uses a *topos* similar to that seen in Euripides' *Andromeda.* He recreates not only the lines, but the style, in order to formulate a rescue plot that underpins the play and allows Aristophanes the opportunity to comment on Euripides' character. This illustrates that Aristophanes' *parodia* is not confined to words, action and costume, but that he also uses *topoi* in the same way as Euripides in order to create his own plots, embellishing them with Euripidean scenes to ensure that the audience, and indeed Euripides himself, are aware of what he is doing.

Both the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* are based on a rescue *topos.* Both have Euripides as a character and both feature the repetition and reconstruction of numerous Euripidean lines. The way Aristophanes weaves these elements together allows for an underlying subtlety previously unseen in his work. In these plays, not only do we see Aristophanes' usual trend of transforming Euripidean lines and action to create a comic effect, but in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* he combines these elements with the reuse of a *topos* in order to attack the tragedian for his treatment of women and political inconsistency.

At the beginning of *Frogs*, an overt reference to Euripides' *Andromeda* is mentioned almost in passing when Xanthias reads the play on board ship: καὶ δῆτ᾽ ἐπὶ τῆς νεὼς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοιτὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἐξαίφνης πόθος τὴν

καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἴει σφόδρα.[91] It is the first of many clues Aristophanes gives the audience that the plot is going to centre on a rescue.[92] Xanthias declaims:

> μὴ σκῶπτέ μ᾽ ὦδέλφ᾽: οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ᾽ ἔχω κακῶς: τοιοῦτος ἵμερός με διαλυμαίνεται. [93]
> ἤδη ποτ᾽ ἐπεθύμησας ἐξαίφνης ἔτνους; [94]
> τοιουτοσὶ τοίνυν με δαρδάπτει πόθος Εὐριπίδου. [95]

The strength of this yearning for Euripides creates an allusion that would be obvious to most, if not all, members of the audience on the grounds that even if they did not know the details of the *Andromeda* itself, they would almost certainly know the myth and, therefore, understand that the play was going to centre on a rescue of some kind. Additional clues would come from the visual stimulus of Dionysus dressed in the lion skin of Heracles, suggesting a trip to the underworld.

However, this simple connection was not enough for Aristophanes. He ensures that the *Andromeda* is read by an Athenian sailor and thus can include a reference to the serious problems facing Athens at the time.[96] Through his reading of the *Andromeda,* the sailor, in the guise of Dionysus, is determined to find a solution to the problems facing not only the state of Tragedy but also the state of Athens. A link between the Athenian navy and dreams featuring tragic plays can be seen in Diodorus Siculus where he tells of Thrasyllus' dream, shortly before the disastrous battle against the Lacedaemonians in 406 BC.[97] In the dream, he and six other generals were in Athens playing Euripides' *Phoenician Women* against their

---

[91] *Frogs,* 54-56. On the ship I was reading *Andromeda* to myself and suddenly my heart was struck with a longing, you can't imagine how hard."
[92] It is also possible that Aristophanes was influenced by Phrynichus' *Mystai*, which was based on the same theme Phrynichus was one of the poets he accused of plagiarism in *Clouds,* 554-563, as discussed earlier. This adds an additional point of reference that the more experienced, older members of the audience may have recognised.
[93] "Don't make fun of me, brother; I really am in a bad way, such is the passion that's ravaging me." *Frogs,* 58-59.
[94] "Have you, before now, ever felt a sudden desire for pea soup?" *Frogs,* 62.
[95] "Well, that is the kind of yearning that is devouring me for – Euripides." *Frogs*, 66.
[96] By 405, Athens was facing its most serious threat from the Peloponnesians and her fall was imminent. Dionysus fell asleep reading the play and dreams of a battle (lines 49-55), probably the battle of Arginusae which is described by Diodorus Siculus at 13.100.3.
[97] *Bibliotheca Historica,* 13.97.16-29

counterparts, who were performing Aeschylus' *Suppliants*. The dream was seen as an omen and was withheld from the troops for fear of lowering morale. It is possible that Aristophanes, having heard of this, saw it as an ideal opportunity to interweave current events and gossip into his latest play and as a chance to combine the topical theme of war, his love of the city and his desire to save it.[98]

Aristophanes' habit of making references to Euripides' work was nothing new and here, within the first few lines of *Frogs,* he is able to use one of his plays in a variety of ways.[99] By a simple mention of the *Andromeda* he informs the audience that the play will once again feature Euripides in some way, that there will be a quest and a rescue and that it will have something to do with the State of Athens. Euripides was recently deceased so this, together with Dionysus disguised as Heracles, would have hinted at a trip to Hades.[100] Here we see that Aristophanes is able to re-use the *topos* of a play in order to create the plot of his own. This gives an added dimension to the concept of parody.

3.8 Recognition/reception of parody in *Frogs*

There are cases in which source recognition is not important as the new text holds a meaning of its own, independent of any recognition, which may or may not occur on the part of the spectator. This often involves the inclusion of only a line or two, transposed into a situation in order to create humour. For example, Dionysus, having just soiled his clothing in fear, laments: οἴμοι, πόθεν μοι τὰ κακὰ ταυτὶ

[98] A concern for Athens and her people runs through many of Aristophanes' extant plays, for example *Acharnians, Knights, Wasps, Peace, Lysistrata,* and even to a certain extent in *Birds.*
[99] The earliest extant example being the *Acharnians* of 425 in which Euripides not only appears as a character, but in which his literary technique is put up for scrutiny as it is in *Frogs*.
[100] In Book 13.103 of the *Bibliotheca Historica,* quoting his source as Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Chronology,* Diodorus Siculus gives the date of Euripides' death as 406 BC, the same year as Sophocles. Aristophanes parodies Euripides' work throughout his extant plays and has him appear in person on several occasions suggesting that he had either a particular like or dislike of his work.

προσέπεσεν; τίν᾽ αἰτιάσομαι θεῶν μ᾽ ἀπολλύναι;[101] This elevated linguistic style is not in keeping with the previous, or following few lines. Aristophanes would have designed this change in tone as a sign to the audience that a tragic citation was coming.[102] The more knowledgeable (and perhaps attentive) members of the audience might have recognised the line as coming from Euripides' *Medea* where the Messenger quotes Cleon saying to his daughter: δύστηνε παῖ, τίς σ᾽ ὧδ᾽ ἀτίμως δαιμόνων ἀπώλεσεν.[103] However, even without this recognition, the scene remains intact since it is Dionysus (himself a god), who has brought the troubles upon himself, in contrast to Medea whose situation is (arguably) not of her own making.

The incorporation of lines can also be used as a foreshadowing device in terms of plot. For instance when Dionysus mocks the young tragedians left behind:

> ἐπιφυλλίδες ταῦτ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ στωμύλματα,
> χελιδόνων μουσεῖα, λωβηταὶ τέχνης,
> ἃ φροῦδα θᾶττον, ἢν μόνον χορὸν λάβῃ,
> ἅπαξ προσουρήσαντα τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ.[104]

Here, Aristophanes combines wit with poetic borrowing and adds a further layer of poignancy and humour for those skilled enough to recognise it by including a line from Euripides' *Alcmene.*[105] In this instance, Aristophanes hints at the reversal of plot that will unfold at the end of the play. In Euripides' version of the myth, Eurytheus does not die at the hands of Iolaus as is traditional, but becomes a prisoner of war. He is then executed despite thinking that his life will be spared.[106] In *Frogs*, Aristophanes leads the audience to believe that Euripides will be spared and that he will be returned to his previous life in Athens as a celebrated playwright. However,

---

[101] "Ah me, from whence have these troubles fallen upon me? Which of the gods shall I hold guilty of being my ruin?" *Frogs*, 309

[102] Aristophanes plays with changes in high and low tone of language extensively in other plays, particularly *Acharnians and Thesmophoriazusae*. See Schlesinger (1937:294-305)

[103] "My girl, my poor girl, which god has brought you to this heartless end?" Euripides, *Medea,* 1208

[104] "Those are left-overs, mere chatterboxes, quires of swallows, debauchers of their art, who, if they so much as get a Chorus, disappear again pretty rapidly after pissing over Tragedy just once." *Frogs*, 92-95. Despite the scatological humour, the underlying tone is one of mourning for the loss of a great poet.

[105] Euripides, *Alcmene fr.* 88 describes an ivy-clad tree as the swallows' place of singing.

[106] Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Library*, II.8.1

the god changes his mind and leaves him in Hades, preferring to rescue Aeschylus instead.

There are some instances, however, where recognition of the source line *is* important because it forms part of the argument rather than part of the action and Aristophanes is obliged to signpost it. When Xanthias demands to know why Dionysus is so adamant that the remaining tragedians are not as good as Euripides, the god's explanation is: γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἂν οὐχ εὕροις ἔτι ζητῶν ἄν, ὅστις ῥῆμα γενναῖον λάκοι.[107] Aristophanes then goes on to give paraphrased examples of such potency. Here, the poet has forewarned the audience that they are going to hear reasons why Euripides or Aeschylus should be resurrected and so they will be expecting to hear examples of their work. However, Aristophanes is aware that whilst he might consciously create signifiers, there was no guarantee that the audience would recognise them and so he makes sure that he chooses lines which are likely to be remembered from previous performances. Dionysus says: ὡδὶ γόνιμον, ὅστις φθέγξεται τοιουτονί τι παρακεκινδυνευμένον, αἰθέρα Διὸς δωμάτιον, ἢ χρόνου πόδα, ἢ φρένα μὲν οὐκ ἐθέλουσαν ὀμόσαι καθ' ἱερῶν, γλῶτταν δ' ἐπιορκήσασαν ἰδίᾳ τῆς φρενός.[108]

This first extract is *specific* and signposted, concerning Zeus and a deliberate misquotation of Euripides' *Melanippe the Wise*, which had been produced around fifteen years earlier in c. 420BC. The line should read: ὄμνυμι δ' ἱερον αἰθέρ', οἴκησιν Διός.[109] Although the meaning is the same, the language is colloquial rather than elevated, a juxtaposition that adds to the humour, given that the line is spoken by a god. Aristophanes had already used this phrase in the *Thesmophoriazusae* six

[107] "If you looked for a really potent poet, one who can give voice to a pedigree phrase, you couldn't find one anymore." *Frogs,* 96

[108] "Potent in the sense that one can say daring things like this – 'the sky, the dossing place of Zeus', or 'the foot of time', or about a heart that doesn't want to take an oath over sacrificial victims and a tongue that perjures itself separately from the heart." *Frogs,* 98-102

[109] "I swear by holy aether, Zeus' dwelling." Euripides, *Melanippe the Wise, fr.* 487

years earlier where he was more accurate in his quotation, perhaps because it was the character of Euripides himself who says: ὄμνυμι τοίνυν αἰθέρ᾽ οἴκησιν Διός.[110] The use of this particular passage is both *specific* and intratextual in that it comes not only from a Euripidean play, but also from one of Aristophanes' own.

The 'foot of time' comes from Euripides' *Alexandros*, dating from 410BC, around ten years earlier. Here, the original says: καὶ χρόνου προὔβαινε πούς.[111] Euripides also used a similar phrase in his posthumously produced *Bacchae* in 405BC, the same year that *Frogs* was produced, perhaps making this reference more recognisable than the first: κρυπτεύουσι δὲ ποικίλως δαρὸν χρόνου πόδα καὶ θηρῶσιν τὸν ἄσεπτον.[112] Here, it is important to note that Euripides and Aristophanes both use the same line in more than one of their plays, making it a contingent reference. Its repeated use indicates the poets' conscious modification of lines and awareness of the way in which they could be used to stimulate a particular audience reaction.[113]

The final sentence is one that we have already seen Aristophanes use more than once. It originates from Euripides' *Hippolytus,* produced in 428BC, twenty-five years before *Frogs.* The original reads: ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώοκ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος".[114] Despite this being the oldest of the three citations, it is likely to have been the most recognisable.[115] It is notable, however, that in the context of this passage, the phrase ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώοκ'[116] is used whilst talking about Euripides and in the other two

[110] "Then I swear it by the Sky, the dwelling-place of Zeus." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 272
[111] "…and time's foot moved on." Euripides, *Alexandros, fr.* 42.
[112] "Though divine subtlety may hide time's creeping foot." Euripides, *Bacchae,* 889
[113] The similarities between the literary techniques of Aristophanes and Euripides, and the thin line between comedy and tragedy, will be discussed in Chapter Six.
[114] "It was my tongue that swore, not my heart." *Hippolytus,* 612
[115] See above for discussion of this line.
[116] Euripides, *Hippolytus,* 612.

instances; it is used whilst speaking to the character of Euripides, which again is an aid to its recognition.[117]

In the same way, the re-use of lines in the *agon* between Aeschylus and Euripides are clearly signposted by Aristophanes. The section is similar in form to tragedy in that tragedians are used as characters to speak tragic lines as part of a serious discussion and the audience is invited to suspend their disbelief as they become heavily involved in the argument between the poets about the quality of their plays.[118] However, it is not long before Aristophanes interrupts with an obscenity, or discontinuity such as μὴ πρῖε τοὺς ὀδόντας[119] or νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, καὶ προσπαρδεῖν γ᾽ ἐς τὸ στόμα τῷ θαλάμακι, καὶ μινθῶσαι τὸν ξύσσιτον κἀκβάς τινα λωποδυτῆσαι.[120] These break the audiences' concentration, reminding them that it is he, and not the tragedians, who is providing the entertainment.[121]

The discussion above demonstrates how Aristophanes reuses particular lines. The humour created works independent of audience recognition of the parody but nevertheless, the poet incorporates signifiers designed to highlight and enhance the complexity of the scene for the more competent spectators. This is only one way in which Aristophanes uses parody. Further discussion will show that in some cases, he creates large scenes entirely through the reproduction of others' lines and in others, subtly re-uses a play's *topos* around which to build his plot.

[117] Euripides appears in person in two other extant plays: *Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, as well as in the fragments of at least four other plays.
[118] This is an example of dramatic illusion, usually seen in tragedy. Dover, (1972:56) defines such incidents as "...the uninterrupted concentration of the fictitious personages of the play on their fictitious situation." See also Sommerstein (1996:235 n.905-991) for a discussion of metre throughout the *agon* between Euripides and Aeschylus.
[119] "Stop gnashing your teeth." *Frogs* 927
[120] "Yes, by Apollo – and also fart in the face of the bottom-bench Charlie, to smear messmate with shit, and to go ashore and nick someone's clothes." *Frogs* 1074-76
[121]Breaking the illusion in comedy could well have been funny simply by virtue of breaking the rules of tragedy Meucke (1977:59)

3.9 Aristophanes' qualitative selection of texts

It is clear that Aristophanes carefully selects and manages everything he incorporates from previous texts in order to create a desired effect. Nowhere is this more evident than in the *agon* of *Frogs* where he creates a prolonged scene by meticulously choosing lines from the works of Aeschylus and Euripides, which he then reproduces to form their discussion. The depth and complexity of the semiotics contained within this scene indicates a profound intimacy with the work of the tragedians.

In the *agon* of *Frogs,* Dionysus invites the poets to weigh their words against each other's on a literal set of scales: τοὔπος νῦν λέγετον ἐς τὸν σταθμόν.[122] It is probable that Aristophanes modelled this scene on Aeschylus' *Psychostasia*, which in turn was based on the *Iliad.*[123] Aeschylus and Euripides quote from their own plays in an effort to tip the balance of the scales and win the contest. Throughout the challenge it is made clear that they are each quoting from their own works. Aristophanes' skill, however, comes in his choice of lines. Each one not only furthers the poets' arguments in terms of their literary prowess, but also the physical weighing competition.

The first line that Euripides places in the scales is εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος which is followed by Aeschylus' Σπερχειὲ ποταμὲ βουνόμοι τ' ἐπιστροφαί.[124] The scales tip in Aeschylus' favour, which astounds Euripides. He is certain that a ship is heavier than cattle, but Dionysus explains that because Aeschylus put in a river, his words are wet, making them heavier, in the same way that a wool-seller soaks his merchandise in order to attract a higher price.

[122] "Now speak your lines into the scales." *Frogs,* 1381
[123] Plutarch (*Moralia* 17a); Homer, *Iliad,* 22.210
[124]*Frogs*, 1382-3 Euripides: "Would that the vessel *Argo* ne'er had flown between...", taken verbatim from the opening line of the *Medea*: Aeschylus: "Spercheius river, and ye haunts where cattle graze..." *Philoctetes fr.* 249, also probably the opening line. (For discussion of this point see Sommerstein, 1996:281 n.1383)

Aristophanes is making it clear to the audience how the competition is going to work and explaining the choice of lines that follow.

Euripides' next line is: οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος.[125] This is a direct citation from Euripides' *Antigone:* καὶ βωμὸς αὐτῆς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει, οὐκ ἔστι Πειθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος.[126] It is the continuation of a sentence where Antigone is making the point that whilst Persuasion does not receive cultic worship in the same way as the major gods, she is nevertheless a mighty power for human beings in word and thought. Aristophanes has particularly chosen this line to suit the point that Euripides is making: that although not the most popular playwright in regard to competition success, like Persuasion herself, he remains a mighty power through his use of words and should win the argument. Whilst the audience would be aware that the line came from one of Euripides' plays (because it was he who spoke the line), it would not be necessary for them to recognise the *precise* details of its original context in order for it to work in its new setting. Aristophanes merely needed to create sufficient signifiers to stimulate the audiences' poetic memory. Thus, Aristophanes was aware of the deictic nature of references and no doubt the more discerning members of the audience would also have recognised the subtlety of their usages.

Aeschylus responds with: μόνος θεῶν γὰρ Θάνατος οὐ δώρων ἐρᾷ,[127] which again tips the scales in his favour. Euripides is again astounded and protests, saying that he used the word persuasion and used it properly. Here Aristophanes is highlighting the precise nature by which Euripides constructs his lines as opposed to Aeschylus, whose style Euripides had earlier criticised: ἀσαφὴς γὰρ ἦν ἐν τῇ φράσει

[125]"Persuasion has no temple but the spoken word." *Frogs,* 1391

[126] "Her altar is in human nature set, Persuasion has no temple but the spoken word." Euripides, *Antigone, fr.* 170

[127] "For death, alone of all the gods, desires no gifts." Aeschylus *Niobe fr.* 161.1

τῶν πραγμάτων.[128] Dionysus explains that the competition is not about cleverness, but the physical weight of the words and that Euripides should try to put in something that will bring down his side of the scale. Again, Aristophanes is explaining to the audience exactly why he has chosen particular lines for reproduction in this section of the play.

Having finally understood that this is not a time for subtlety, Euripides tries to tip the scales in his favour by adding a quote from *Meleager*: σιδηροβριθές τ᾽ ἔλαβε δεξιᾷ ξύλον.[129] At this point, the more judicious spectators may have remembered that in myth, Meleager's usual weapon of choice was a wooden handled spear, which would have had most of its weight in the shaft. Aeschylus responds with, ἐφ᾽ ἅρματος γὰρ ἅρμα καὶ νεκρῷ νεκρός.[130] Again Euripides is thwarted by the weight of two chariots and two corpses. Note also that the deaths would have been caused by a spear such as the one introduced by Euripides, thus Aeschylus is being shown as more subtle, perhaps as a message to Euripides that he is too clever for his own good. Having made his point, Aristophanes draws a halt to the competition with Aeschylus suggesting that even if Euripides climbed into the scales along with all his books, his children, his wife and her lover, he would still be outweighed by just two of Aeschylus' lines.[131]

In this scene, we see that Aristophanes' choice of lines is deliberate in order to advance the plot as well as to create a humorous exchange between the two poets. By bringing together a carefully chosen selection of citations, he is able to generate a new text, the deeper implication of which is derived from both the individual and combined meanings of the original lines. Its entertainment value does not rely on the

---

[128] "I say he was obscure in the exposition of his situations." *Frogs,* 1120
[129] "He took in his hand his iron-weighted haft..." Euripides, *Meleager, fr.* 531
[130] "For chariot upon chariot and dead corpse on corpse..." Aeschylus *Glaucus of Potniae, fr.*38
[131] *Frogs*, 1406-1411

specific identification of the originals, but should this recognition occur, its effectiveness is considerably enhanced.

The situations Aristophanes recreates are not parasitic in any way. They stand alone and yet are clearly signposted by the inclusion of the original author as speaker or other obvious signifier. Thus, the two voices of the original line and the new scenario neither merge nor cancel each other out. They remain defined and distinct, working together to create a new text in keeping with the ancient meaning of *parodia.*

For some, this new text may become the *only* text as in order for parody to exist, the audience must know the original. Without this knowledge, the *parody* becomes the original.[132] In this instance, if the message makes sense without an understanding of the references, the poet has indeed created a new text, which enjoys a syntagmatic relationship with the first. Aristophanes takes pieces of other works and joins them together as a seamstress does a patchwork quilt. Although there is no attempt to disguise the origin of the pieces, the seams are only visible to those with knowledge of the original texts. For these people, the artistry of each component element is on display as is the overall effect of the new text. For those who do not recognise the origin of the parody, only the new text, the overall effect of the quilt, is visible. However, for everyone, the outcome is as useful and attractive as the sources from which the scraps have been taken.[133]

---

[132] Rabinowitz (1980:246)

[133] As an analogy, this can be equated to the family heirloom of a patchwork quilt. To an outsider, the quilt may be attractive and useful as a whole. To a member of the family, who recognises the origin of each square of material as coming from particular pieces of clothing or bedding and reminds them of particular people or situations, a different feeling is evoked. For them, there exists a variety of individual associations and significances, as well as an overall appreciation of the article.

3.10 Conclusions

Whilst the tragic playwright re-uses scenes from myth in order to construct his plot and comment upon contemporary political or social issues, the comic genre allows the poet a louder voice through the use of slapstick, obscenity, histrionics, discontinuity and verbal wordplay. Aristophanes takes full advantage of these comic devices in order to amuse his audience, but he also uses them as a mask behind which he can voice more serious and often controversial views. By mixing standard comic techniques with a wide range of parodic devices, he is able to comment upon the messages generated by the first use of particular lines and scenes as well as express his own. Aristophanes' semantic charter, therefore, is derived from the combination of a number of elements: myth and its manipulation in tragedy, references to contemporary persons and events, and a mixture of comic and tragic literary conventions. In the *agon* scene from *Frogs* deconstructed above, Aristophanes explains his methodology in order to ensure that the audience follow his train of thought. The overall effect is the stimulation of poetic memory designed specifically to influence the reception of his message.

Aristophanes' use of *parodia* is both subtle and overt, in varying degrees, according to context. Certainly there are places where he uses it to create humour, but he does not ridicule the texts, or their creators, as suggested by the modern interpretation of parody. As we saw above, in some cases it is used to signify the plot, and in others as a literary device to create and/or enhance the scene where it appears.

In the majority of cases, although Aristophanes also borrows from comedy at times, the genre he invites the audience to recall most often is tragedy. By its reconstruction both in the physical and the verbal form, the poet presupposes some

audience knowledge of its content. For the contemporary audience, *parodia*, intertextuality and allusion all amounted to the same thing. They are the literary devices by which the poet attempted to evoke the poetic memory of the more competent audience members by inviting them to engage with and recall previously seen productions, particularly tragedies, and enjoy his play more as a result of that engagement.

It is evident that Aristophanes chooses his quotations carefully because as we have seen, each and every one of them has an underlying meaning. Whilst the poet usually references his sources in the construction of jokes, it is important to note that his basic humour is not reliant on their recognition. In order to succeed in the competitions, he needed to ensure that each and every spectator was able to enjoy and appreciate his plays within the bounds of their competence. From the way he creates signifiers, it is clear that Aristophanes was aware of the different levels of theatrical experience present at the performances. His skill is such that he is able to construct scenes that work on a variety of levels in response.

The references created by Aristophanes range from simplistic and overt to extremely complex and subtle. They each carry a variety of meanings that cannot adequately be conveyed by the term 'parody'. Perhaps a better term for the complex and creative way in which he reused texts, particularly in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*, is imbrications, as the old and new lines necessarily overlap in order to form their new meaning.

For the modern scholar, without the benefit of contemporaneous criticism, the only way we are able to illustrate Aristophanes' palimpsestic creations is to deconstruct the texts and expose the signifiers, revealing the references and resultant

humorous layers created within. Only then is it possible to gain a deeper understanding of the poet's skill and the competence of his audience.

Chapter Four
Mind Games – Aristophanes and the Recognition of Audience Competence

As for the audience, you're quite mistaken if you think that subtle points will not be taken. Such fears are in vain[1]

4.1 Introduction

The first three Chapters of this thesis highlighted the technical sophistication of Aristophanes' plays. They revealed that the poet incorporated a series of multifaceted signifiers within a range of literary processes that were designed to create the plot, enhance the action, and amuse both audience and judges. Schlesinger is of the opinion that to a large extent, Aristophanes used parody for his own amusement without always attempting to get it across to his public.[2] The analyses provided in this Chapter disprove that statement and show that Aristophanes carefully crafted his audiences' reception, catering for all levels of competence.

This Chapter will take the study of Aristophanes' literary techniques a stage further. Through a consideration of his presentation of the material and the self-conscious comments he made I will investigate the way in which he viewed and manipulated the competence of his 'assumed' audience. There will be an exploration of how Aristophanes ensures that each audience member is able to appreciate his writing on at least one level and, if competent enough, more than one. To do this, he took the standard techniques of Old Comedy, such as slapstick, histrionics and obscenity, and incorporated literary and visual referents within them, which stimulated the spectators' poetic memory.

[1] *Frogs,* 1108-18
[2] Schlesinger, (1937:305)

It appears that he did not so much create his audience as invoke them, by using all the resources available to him: language, parody, pastiche, visuality and physical action, to establish a broad range of signifiers.

At any given performance there would have been a range of intellectual capabilities; a mixture of ages; city and country dwellers; regular and irregular theatre-goers; performers; friends; neighbours; acquaintances; colleagues; critics; past audience; Athenian and non-Athenians and other anomalous spectators.[3] Therefore, the poet had to adapt his writing to provoke and then meet their expectations by relying on his knowledge and past experience of that audience as both a poet and as an audience member himself.

In order to show that Aristophanes was aware of these factors, a number of passages will be deconstructed to highlight the way in which the poet created layers that catered for each facet of the audience. I will show that he employed a variety of 'intertextual' techniques (as described in Chapter Two) to stimulate or create a poetic memory in the spectators, according to their individual competence.

A close examination of the text will also show that Aristophanic dialogue was used not only as a way for characters to communicate but also as a method for the poet to interact with his audience and other poets.[4] This was not a simple process. The dialogue had to be designed so that the spectators engaged with the action whilst, at the same time, remaining detached enough to be able to de-code the play according to the rules of theatrical discourse. As a comedian, Aristophanes was expected to amuse his audience and he did so in a variety of ways ranging from slapstick to the creation of multi-layered wit that required a level of concentration

[3] Aristotle confirms that the audience was made up of different factions and points out that workers and tradesmen would not have had the same education as full citizens (*Politics,* 1328b.24-29a.3a). The audience will contain lower classes whose sole criterion is pleasure as well as the educated who are in a better position to judge the nobility and actions of the characters. (*Politics*, 1336b.22-23)

[4] Ingarden, (1971:531-8)

and fore-knowledge from his audience in order for the play to be fully understood and appreciated.[5]

At times, Aristophanes refers to the work of others in order to generate plot and humour and as a way of demonstrating his technical prowess whilst also criticising his peers. His comments reveal attempts to manipulate audience response during the performance, which, in turn, reveals information about the voting process and what may have influenced the judges.

This Chapter does not set out to show what the audience thought of Aristophanes' literary technique, nor to gauge their reaction to his attempts at humour. Instead, by examining particular sections of his plays, it will show what the poet imagined *they* thought.

Initially, there will be a consideration of current scholarship in this area and how this was anticipated by ancient commentaries as well as comments from the Aristophanic texts. There will be an examination of the link between audience competence and appreciation of humour, followed by an analysis of various texts to show how Aristophanes used signifiers to prompt audience recognition of some borrowed passages, and why, for others, he did not.

The final part of the Chapter will contain a close reading of a section of *Frogs* that illustrates how Aristophanes' writing became more complex towards the end of his career. In earlier plays, the poet tasked a character to give the audience an overt explanation of the action they were about to see. But in *Frogs,* he uses a complex set of verbal and visual signifiers designed to allow the various competences in the audience to uncover his plan, stage by stage, according to their individual abilities.

[5]MacDowell, (1995:17) offers a discussion of audience expectation in terms of Aristophanes' plays describing "parts of the comic tradition … which Aristophanes probably felt more or less obliged to provide".

4.2 Education and Competence

Classens and Dhoest suggest that a spectator's level of education has an influence on whether comedies are judged good or bad.[6] The data is based on interviews with two groups defined as 'highly educated' (degree or polytechnic level) and 'lower educated' (all others). The results show that the 'lower' educated group appreciate 'simple, low-brow' comedy that does not require any effort to understand the jokes. They prefer recurring types (stock characters) and lack of social criticism. Their criticism of 'high-brow comedy' was that it is complicated, contains layers that are difficult to grasp and consider it ridiculous, not funny and less relaxing.[7]

In contrast, the highly educated group criticised 'simple' comedy saying that it is too predictable, the storylines follow the same pattern, and misunderstandings are always resolved. Instead, they prefer multi-layered humour and social criticism. The attraction seems to be originality, absurdity and complexity. Baker states that the attraction of high-brow comedy is its intellectual challenge and questioning of established norms.[8]

This research is useful as its outcomes coincide with the impression Aristophanes gives concerning the 'high and low–brow' elements of comedy appreciated by different factions of his audience. Aristophanic comedy contains a similar mixture of comedy 'types' just as his audience would have included a mixture of intellectual ability. Within each play there is a range of comedy styles. 'Low-brow' humour would include slapstick: οὗτος αὐτός ἐστιν, οὗτος. βάλλε βάλλε

[6] Claessens and Dhoest, (2010:49-72)
[7] This follows the research carried out by Kuipers (2006b:376) that showed that a lack of understanding often led to aversion.
[8] Baker, (2003:19)

βάλλε βάλλε[9] and scatology: τῆς κεφαλῆς νύν μου λαβοῦ, ἵν' ἐξεμέσω.[10] 'High-brow' comedy requires the audience to respond to the poet's signifiers and, if it is a parody, recognise the source line. For example, in *Acharnians,* as well as the other two types of comedy, Aristophanes includes the line: οὐκ ἔνδον ἔνδον ἐστίν, εἰ γνώμην ἔχεις.[11] These words are spoken about Euripides by his servant, which acts as the signifier, indicating that it comes from one of his plays. Without recognition of the source, the line does not have the comedic impact of denigrating Euripides' aloof nature, and so those who were not competent enough to recognise it, are denied the humour the line offers.

Kuipers questions the nature of 'highbrow comedy' and why it excludes some audience members. She is of the opinion that it is not a question of cultural capital (that which I have termed earlier as the social charter) but the difficulties posed by the speed and ambivalence of the text, together with the ability to de-code its allusions. The inability to apply these skills render the 'joke' incomprehensible and people may not be sure if it is, or is not, funny.[12] This theory is useful when in considering fifth-century comedy because, for the most part, humour is culture specific, chiefly because it involves word-play and colloquial expressions. Therefore, the fullest appreciation of Athenian comedy requires an in-depth knowledge of the flexible nature of the language and social climate of origin. Members of Aristophanes' audience would have had a collective recognition of basic humour borne from the inclusion of myth and topical references that improved the jokes and consequently created an atmosphere of shared experience and social

[9] "That's the man! Pelt him! Pelt him! Pelt him!" *Acharnians,* 280-1
[10] "Now take hold of my head so I can vomit." *Acharnians,*586
[11] "He is at home and not at home, if you understand me." *Acharnians,* 398. The line is taken from *Ion* 251: οἴκοι δὲ τὸν νοῦν ἔσχον ἐνθάδ' οὖσά που. "I suppose that my mind was at home, though I am present here."
[12] Kuipers, (2006b:371)

inclusion. However, within this shared experience, there must have been different ways in which the texts were appreciated.

The *parabasis* is a central and integral part of Aristophanes' plays, which can be used as a way of making comment upon any number of issues. The content varies from play to play yet remains heavily inter- and intra-textual.[13] In *Ecclesiazusae,* the Chorus turn away from the action to face the spectators and address them on the subject of their intelligence in the first person voice of the poet:

> σμικρὸν δ᾽ ὑποθέσθαι τοῖς κριταῖσι βούλομαι.
> τοῖς σοφοῖς μὲν τῶν σοφῶν μεμνημένοις κρίνειν ἐμέ,
> τοῖς γελῶσι δ᾽ ἡδέως διὰ τὸν γέλων κρίνειν ἐμέ:
> σχεδὸν ἅπαντας οὖν κελεύω δηλαδὴ κρίνειν ἐμέ[14]

Here we can see that Aristophanes was aware that members of the audience might appreciate his plays on different levels. He comments on the 'intellectual bits', which are the subtle allusions to other works that would only be recognised by the more educated members of the audience. The 'laughs' mean the basic humour, which worked on a fundamental level but which, in some cases, contained additional referents that would enhance the text, adding an additional layer of wit for those that recognised it.[15] This also shows that whilst some members of the crowd may not be particularly 'intelligent', the poet nonetheless seeks their approval in the same way as he does that of the more discerning spectator.

[13] See *Knights* 503 and *Wasps* 1015 where there is a direct address to the audience asking for their attention. In *Acharnians, Wasps* and *Peace* the poet attacks Cleon, and in *Knights, Clouds and Peace*, he attacks contemporary comic poets.

[14] "But I want to give a little bit of advice to the judges: to those who are intellectual, to remember the intellectual bits and vote for me; to those who enjoy a laugh, to think of the laughs they've had and vote for me; in other words, I'm asking just about everyone to vote for me." Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae,* 1155-1157. Pherecrates adopts a different stance: τοῖς δὲ κριταῖς τοῖς νυνὶ κρίνουσι λέγω μὴ 'πιορκεῖν μηδ' ἀδίκως κρίνειν, ἢ νὴ τὸν φίλον μῦθον εἰς ὑμᾶς ἕτερον Φερεκράτης λέξει πολὺ τούτου κακηγορίστερον. "And to the judges judging today, be fair, don't perjure yourselves I say, or else by the God of Friends I swear Pherecrates will take good care to tell far worse about you." Pherecrates, *fr.* 96 Here, he threatens the judges with future ridicule if they do not vote him the winner.

[15] *Politics,* 7.17.1336b 22-23

4.3 Manipulating Audience Response

Persuasion theory is the study of reader response and states that because the audience, situation and goal will be different in every case, and it is the role of the writer to determine what messages will be successful and which will not, he must be aware of his audiences' predisposition or readiness to respond to given stimuli.[16] Modern playwrights have only a vague and general conception of who their audience might be but for the poets of fifth-century Athens, the range of potential stimuli was smaller and limited by the social contract, which allowed Aristophanes an intimate knowledge of the attitudes, beliefs and expectations of his audience. This encouraged the poet to imagine his ideal audience and write expressly for them, providing cues that helped define how he wanted the spectator to respond to the text. Plato advises the same strategy in rhetoric:

> ... it is the function of speech to lead souls by persuasion, he who is to be a rhetorician must know the various forms of soul. Now they are so, and so many, and of such and such kinds, wherefore men also are of different kinds: these we must classify. Men of a certain sort are easily persuaded by speeches of a certain sort for a certain reason to actions or beliefs of a certain sort, and men of another sort cannot be so persuaded. The student of rhetoric must, accordingly, acquire a proper knowledge of these classes and then be able to follow them accurately with his senses when he sees them in the practical affairs of life; otherwise he can never have any profit from the lectures he may have heard. But when he has learned to tell what sort of man is influenced by what sort of speech, and is able, if he comes upon such a man, to recognize him and to convince himself that this is the man and this now actually before him is the nature spoken of in a certain lecture, to which he must now make a practical application of a certain kind of speech in a certain way to persuade his hearer to a certain action or belief.[17]

Aristophanes' work is overtly meta-theatrical and aware of its own constructedness with the poet leading his audience towards the realisation he desires. Glimpses of this hypothetical audience can be seen in numerous areas of the texts when the poet overtly explains elements of the plot in some cases, and in others, lays

[16] Shelby, (1986:6-9)
[17] Plato, *Phaedrus,* 271c-272a

down a series of clues designed to be understood, one at a time, by spectators of varying competences.

Knights was the first play that Aristophanes produced on his own behalf and in it we can see evidence that he was tapping into two elements of the social contract in order to speak to his audience.[18] In the first few lines of dialogue between the two slaves, the audience learn that their new master is Paphlagon and that he is vicious and unpopular. Given the recent events in Athens where Cleon was given the highest honours because of his victory at Pylos the previous summer, the audience would have probably recognised the analogy. It is likely that the politician was also in the front row of the theatre, which would have enabled the actors to add emphasis to the lines with a gesture.[19] By introducing the character early on, Aristophanes tells the audience who the main target of the play will be. The second slave then says: πῶς ἂν οὖν ποτε εἴποιμ᾽ ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευριπικῶς; πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξειας ἁμὲ χρὴ λέγειν;[20] It is clear that Aristophanes wanted the audience to understand the message in this line because he includes a *specific* signifier that is signposted to alert them that it is Euripidean.[21] This additional information would help the audience remember that the line came from *Hippolytus*, produced four years earlier, where Phaedra was trying to tell the Nurse about her terrible secret without saying the words out loud.[22] Aristophanes is doing exactly the same thing. His characters say what he cannot say out loud about Cleon because of the laws against slander.

---

[18] 424 BC, winning first prize against Cratinus' *Satyrs* and Aristomenes' *Porters.*

[19] *Knights,* 757 and at 702-3 where the Sausage Seller says: ἀπολῶ σε νὴ τὴν προεδρίαν τὴν ἐκ Πύλου. "I'll destroy you. I swear it by the privileged seating that Pylos won for me!"

[20] "Now how can I possibly express that in a smart Euripidean way? - Couldst thou but say for me what I must say?" *Knights*, 16

[21] Defined in Chapter Two as the explicit repetition of a previous text, for instance, a direct quotation (attributed or otherwise) with or without signposting. It is also possible that the performers mimicked the stage action of the previous performance to reinforce the message using *visuality*: the use of visual imagery (set, props, costumes or actions) designed to evoke poetic memory of characters in previous texts or performances

[22] Euripides, *Hippolytus,* 345

This is an example of what Bettinghaus calls 'persuasive communication'.[23] The audience have been given information about the topic to be discussed in the reference to the Paphlagon and therefore have a well-formed frame of reference for the current situation in Athens. With this background, the effect of Aristophanes' message is likely to be stronger than if the topic had been a new one to which the audience were being asked to react, with no structured base of prior information.

Priming the audience makes it much easier for them to follow the plot and identify its players. When he imagines his spectators, Aristophanes projects an image of himself: fiercely patriotic, theatre literate, and with an eclectic sense of humour. The poet relies on the spectators to adopt the role he creates for them and so, anticipating that not everyone in the theatre was of the same competence has the first slave explain: τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῖς θεαταῖσιν.[24] Before 'explaining the situation', they decide: ἓν δ' αὐτοὺς παραιτησώμεθα, ἐπίδηλον ἡμῖν τοῖς προσώποισιν ποιεῖν, ἢν τοῖς ἔπεσι χαίρωσι καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν.[25] This is evidence of the interactive nature of comedy and the possibility of audience reaction influencing the judges. In addition, if Cleon was in the front row as was likely, references to him would add to the spectacle and banter as the play progressed.

The following year, Aristophanes produced the first version of *Clouds*, and it is possible that he adopted a different approach because the play did not win. He re-wrote it some years later and in it, as we shall see, he berated the audience for their lack of intelligence. This suggests that in this case, for whatever reason, the judges did not sympathise with his message or appreciate his humour.

[23] Bettinghaus, (1994:160-161)
[24] "..the situation to the audience." *Knights,* 36
[25] "But let us ask them one favour: to let us see it plainly in their faces, if they enjoy our dialogue and our doings." *Knights,* 38-9

A year after this failure, the poet produced *Wasps,* which once again begins with a pair of slaves on stage producing a series of 'one-liners' designed to warm up the audience. There are hints that the play will be political in some way when Sosias says: περὶ τῆς πόλεως γάρ ἐστι τοῦ σκάφους ὅλου and Alcibiades is mentioned.[26] Up to this point, however, there had been no hints as to the way the action would develop, or who the characters might be. Xanthias decides to explain the plot to the audience but adds: μηδὲν παρ᾽ ἡμῶν προσδοκᾶν λίαν μέγα.[27] However, the poet goes on to make reference to his previous plays, which he expects the audience to remember.

Here it seems that Aristophanes has developed a better understanding of his audiences' capability. He confirms: ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν ἡμῖν λογίδιον γνώμην ἔχον, ὑμῶν μὲν αὐτῶν οὐχὶ δεξιώτερον, κωμῳδίας δὲ φορτικῆς σοφώτερον.[28] This new-found attitude anticipates Hairston's notion of Contemporary Rhetoric. She states that a writer :

> ...must keep in mind the concerns and values of the people you want to reach. You should have some knowledge of their educational and social background, how old they are, what kind of work they do, and whether they are, on the whole, liberal or conservative about religion, sex, politics ... you will have to analyze your audience consciously, specify its traits, and decide what conclusions you can legitimately make about an audience with those traits.[29]

A year later, at the beginning of *Peace*, Aristophanes is more specific and lists the various groups when he predicts make up the audience:

> ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν λόγον γε τοῖσι παιδίοις
> καὶ τοῖσιν ἀνδρίοισι καὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν
> καὶ τοῖς ὑπερτάτοισιν ἀνδράσιν φράσω

---

[26] "It's political – concerning the whole ship of state." *Wasps,* 29, 44

[27] "They shouldn't expect anything too grand from us." *Wasps* 56. Aristophanes' plays of the preceding two years had dealt with serious issues: the ***Knights*** with the politics of Athens, and *Clouds* with philosophy.

[28] "No, what we've got is just a little story, but one that make sense: not more intellectual than you are yourselves, but cleverer than vulgar low comedy." *Wasps* 65

[29] Hairston, (1978:107-8)

καὶ τοῖς ὑπερηνορέουσιν ἔτι τούτοις μάλα.[30]

From this comment it is clear that by 421, Aristophanes had developed as a skilled writer and knew his audience well. The poet was able to recognise the different factions within the audience in terms of intelligence and experience, and assess the effect of these variables on their reception of his texts. He could then develop strategies to reinforce positive responses and refute the negative.

For example, he understood the interaction between members of the audience. In *Peace* the plot includes a dung-beetle flying up to heaven. On the most basic level this is funny because of its absurdity. However, Aristophanes wants the lines to mean more than this, and so adds:

> οὐκοῦν ἂν ἤδη τῶν θεατῶν τις λέγοι
> νεανίας δοκησίσοφος, 'τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα τί;
> ὁ κάνθαρος δὲ πρὸς τί;' 'κᾆτ' αὐτῷ γ' ἀνὴρ
> Ἰωνικός τίς φησι παρακαθήμενος:
> 'δοκέω μέν, ἐς Κλέωνα τοῦτ' αἰνίσσεται,
> ὡς κεῖνος ἀναιδέως τὴν σπατίλην ἐσθίει'.[31]

This imagined dialogue was probably written as a way of insulting Cleon without falling foul of the legislation against slander but nowhere in the preceding lines is there any hint that the dung-beetle is being used as an analogy for the politician, nor indeed, is it as far as we can tell.

The mock discussion also shows that at times Aristophanes relied on a level of communication between the audience members in order that everyone could understand his message. It also provides useful information about audience interaction. Aristophanes shows that he was aware that not everyone always

---

[30] "And I'm going to explain the plot to the children, and the striplings, and the men, and the men of high position and yes, even to those proud supermen there." *Peace,* 50-53. In this phrase there is also level of double-meaning. τοῖς ὑπερηνορέουσιν is usually seen in epic, and as well as meaning 'behaving in a super-human way' also bears the sense of 'arrogant'. (Sommerstein: 2005:138n53). The poet is, therefore, being derogatory towards the more prestigious members of the audience perhaps without them making the connection. These lines are also useful, if taken literally, in terms of evidence for who attended the plays. Note particularly that the various age and status of men are described, but women are not mentioned.

[31] "Well, by now some young man in the audience, who fancies himself clever, may be saying 'What's all this about? What had the beetle got to do with?' – Yes, and then an Ionian fellow sitting beside him says to him: 'My opinion is he's using it to allude to Cleon – saying that he's eating muck in Hades'." *Peace,* 44-48

understood the points he was making and at times, got them completely wrong. Later, as we shall see, he sets out to rectify this problem by offering to educate them.

In *Birds* the explanation of the plot is more subtle, with Peisetaerus addressing the audience directly, bemoaning his circumstances without discontinuity. He turns to the spectators and says: ἡμεῖς γάρ, ὦνδρες οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ νόσον νοσοῦμεν τὴν ἐναντίαν Σάκᾳ, inviting them to sympathise with their plight and become part of the action.[32] With this direct address, Aristophanes has created a dialogue between himself and the audience, which is played out in the lines delivered by the performers. Through this interaction the poet invites the audience to consider current events in Athens and the possibility of a whole new world.[33] At the apex of this triangle of communication, the poet controls the action and attempts to control the audiences' reaction to it. Aristophanes had recognised what Aristotle later described as a form of persuasive rhetoric:

> Now the proofs furnished by the speech are of three kinds. The first depends upon the moral character of the speaker, the second upon putting the hearer into a certain frame of mind, the third upon the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove.[34]

In his communication with the audience, Aristophanes does exactly this. His words are the joint result of three things: the speaker, the subject, and the spectators he addresses. He has imagined an audience "by projecting a self that he hopes the audience will try on and find agreeable".[35]

Aristophanes and Aristotle had anticipated what is now known as 'learning theory', which attempts to:

---

[32] "The thing is, you gentlemen who are listening, that we're suffering from the opposite affliction to Sacas." *Birds,* 30

[33] At the time of the play's production, the Sicilian expedition was under way and Alcibiades had been indicted for impiety and thus had fled to Sparta. The disastrous outcome was still eighteen months away and was not anticipated by the Athenians, and so they remained in buoyant mood. (see Thucydides, 6.24.3 and 6.31.6)

[34] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 1.3

[35] Dillon, (1981:163-4)

> ...explain or predict the relationship between a stimulus and a response. The stimulus may be the message source, the message itself, or the context within which the communication occurs. The response is the persuasive effect, what the message receiver thinks, feels, or does as a result of the stimulus.[36]

4.4 Authorial Expectation and Audience Reaction

The interactive nature of comedy provides evidence to judge audience reaction and see whether they live up to the poet's expectations. An examination of the texts has shown that Aristophanes was aware of the different levels of audience capability and wrote in order to please everyone. The more experienced audience members would have enjoyed the comedy not just for its own sake, but because they recognised subtle allusions in the texts. Additionally, they would almost certainly have enjoyed a feeling of superiority over those who did not fully understand the historical, social or political relevance of the lines.

Cratinus criticises the less intelligent members of the audience for laughing at inappropriate moments presumably because they too, at times, do not understand the jokes: χαῖρ' ὦ μέγ' ἀχρειόγελως ὅμιλε, ταῖς ἐπίβδαις τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας κριτὴς ἄριστε παντων.[37] Aristophanes often does the same. This suggests that knowledge precedes appreciation, and that appreciation requires the knowledge to decode something: to interpret it and to recognize its genre in order to be able to form a meaningful judgement.[38]

However, the difficulty in relating Classens and Dhoest's research regarding low- and high-brow comedy to Aristophanes' texts lies in finding an accurate definition of 'educated' or 'intelligent' when applied to a fifth-century audience whose education system was a mixture of training and pedagogy with no direct

---

[36] Shelby, (1986:10)

[37] "Greetings crowd, laughing loudly at the wrong time but nonetheless our craft's best judge of all." Cratinus *fr.*323

[38] See Kuipers (2006b:360)

correlation to the modern system of tiered learning. For the purposes of this discussion then, I intend to measure audience competence according to Aristophanes' definition, which appears to be the ability to recognise the presence of earlier texts, to de-code the messages they bring forward from their original context, the way in which these work to create or enhance the action of the new scenario and to understand his political innuendos. In short, audience competence is the ability to recognise and de-code the additional elements that Aristophanes adds above and beyond the level of basic, non-complicated humour.

4.5 Self-conscious reflection and a test of competence

In the creation of humour, Aristophanes does not simply rely on the standard forms of slapstick, innuendo and parody, nor does he only borrow from the work of others. Some of his texts are highly intra-textual, where he creates a form of εἰρωνεία, (assumed ignorance or irony).[39] This type of humour is highly regarded by Aristotle who describes it as "more gentlemanly than buffoonery". It is among one of the many kinds of jests he mentions in the lost section of *Poetics*, some of which are "becoming a gentleman, and others not".[40] However, as a type of humour, irony only works if the spectators recognise the inaccuracy of what the character is saying, as he is saying it, which, as with Aristophanes' other signifiers, requires a level of audience competence.[41]

It must be remembered that the audience did not have access to the plays before the performance and so they needed to process the information they received immediately. The modern audience has the advantage of being able to see a play or

[39] *LSJ.*
[40] Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* 3.18.7.
[41] Fowler's definition also includes this criterion: Irony is a form of utterance that postulates a double audience, consisting of one party that hearing shall hear and shall not understand, and another party that, when more is meant than meets the ear, is aware both of that more and of the outsiders' incomprehension. Fowler, (1926:295)

television programme numerous times, and even consult the script. For the Athenian audience, this was not an option and so it is likely that they developed the skill of interpreting and remembering the details of a play in minute detail. In the example that follows, the lines are a highly complex set of signifiers, designed to both remind and foreshadow Aristophanes' lines.

The first line is ironic as the poet says that his work is more modest than other poets, and that he does not need to show off:

> ὡς δὲ σώφρων ἐστὶ φύσει σκέψασθ᾽:
> ἥτις πρῶτα μὲνοὐδὲν ἦλθε ῥαψαμένη σκυτίον καθειμένον
> ἐρυθρὸν ἐξ ἄκρου παχύ, τοῖς παιδίοις ἵν᾽ ᾖ γέλως:
> οὐδ᾽ ἔσκωψε τοὺς φαλακρούς, οὐδὲ κόρδαχ᾽ εἵλκυσεν,
> οὐδὲ πρεσβύτης ὁ λέγων τἄπη τῇ βακτηρίᾳ
> τύπτει τὸν παρόντ᾽ ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ σκώμματα,
> οὐδ᾽ εἰσῆξε δᾷδας ἔχουσ᾽, οὐδ᾽ ἰοὺ ἰοὺ βοᾷ,
> ἀλλ᾽ αὑτῇ καὶ τοῖς ἔπεσιν πιστεύουσ᾽ ἐλήλυθεν.[42]

The second line concerns the standard garb of the male Chorus, a leather phallus. His plays, Aristophanes says, do not need to amuse the children by presenting one that is red due to circumcision. But in *Acharnians*, Dicaeopolis had asked, τουτὶ τί ἦν; τί τῶν Ὀδομάντωνν τὸ πέος ἀποτεθρίακεν;[43] and in *Knights* the Sausage-Seller had threatened: κἄν γε τουτῳί, ψωλὸν γενέσθαι δεῖ σε μέχρι τοῦ μυρρίνου.[44]

The next line states that his comedy never makes fun of men who are bald. Firstly, this is an acknowledgement of his rivals' use of his nickname 'baldy', which

---

[42] "Look at the modesty of her nature. First of all she hasn't come with a dangling bit of stitched leather, red at the end and thick, to give the children a laugh; nor has she made fun of men who are bald, nor danced a cordax; nor does an old man, the one with the leading part, conceal bad jokes by hitting whoever is around with his stick; nor does this comedy rush on stage with torches, nor cry 'help, help'; no, she has come trusting herself and in her script." *Clouds,* 537-544. For an in-depth discussion of this passage and a comprehensive discussion of Aristophanes' claims to originality, see Robson (2009:4-8) where he suggests that it was conventional for Old Comic poets to criticise their rivals. Here, Aristophanes is following that convention but takes it a stage further by not only criticising his rivals, but also criticising himself by using the same techniques that he criticises in others.

[43] "Here, tell me, what's this? Who's been stripping the Odomantians' cocks?" Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 158-161

[44] "Huh! If you believe him, you're destined to end up with a cock skinned back to the root." *Knights,* 964

he had played on in *Knights* the year before.[45] The Chorus Leader had asked that the audience let the poet succeed, saying: ἵν᾽ ὁ ποιητὴς ἀπίῃ χαίρωνκατὰ νοῦν πράξας, φαιδρὸς λάμποντι μετώπῳ.[46] This is not the only time Aristophanes mentions his own baldness. In *Peace* Aristophanes, appeals to a select group of the audience to support him, again through the Chorus Leader in the *parabasis*. φέρε τῷ φαλακρῷ, δὸς τῷ φαλακρῷ τῶν τρωγαλίων, καὶ μἀφαίρει γενναιοτάτου τῶν ποιητῶν ἀνδρὸς τὸ μέτωπον ἔχοντος.[47] Here, Aristophanes does not appeal to the more intelligent members of the audience as in other lines, but to those who, like him, are bald.

References to Aristophanes' own work continue in the passage when he claims that his 'play' never danced a cordax. *Acharnians,* however, ends with a party, which, no doubt, would undoubtedly have included dancing and there is specific mention of dancing at the end of *Thesmophoriazusae, Birds, Lysistrata, Peace* and *Ecclesiazusae.*[48] In addition, *Wasps* ends with a comic dancing competition between Philoclean and the sons of the tragic poet Carcinus who are dressed as crabs.[49]

Only the most competent and attentive spectators could have fully processed the information contained within each of these lines at the point of reception. Others may have recognised one or more elements as the stock elements of comedy.[50]

---

[45] An example of this is Eupolis *fr.*89 κἀκείνους τοὺς Ἱππέας ξυνεποίησα τῷ τούτῳ κἀδωρησάμην "...and then those *Knights*, I helped the baldhead to write them and never stood on my rights." On the face of it, this is a humorous request to other bald men to support him. Sidwell, (2009:25) postulates a political implication to this comment, suggesting the possibility that comic poets received monetary backing to promote particular political affiliations. He calls this a "poets' war", citing *Clouds* 545 as being a signal of both Aristophanes' and Eupolis' political bents. "I myself, because I am a poet of this sort too, am not a member of the long haired brigade." He suggests that this line is not, as was traditionally thought, a joke upon Aristophanes' own baldness, but an implication that Aristophanes was a democrat and that Eupolis (although un-named as his opponent), had long hair and therefore sympathised with the wealthy and/or Sparta.

[46] "...so that our poet may depart rejoicing and successful, radiant with gleaming forehead." *Knights,* 548-550

[47] "Offer the baldhead, give the baldhead some of the dessert, and don't withhold it from a man who has the same forehead as the noblest of poets." Aristophanes, *Peace,* 767-774

[48] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1175; *Birds,* 1759; *Lysistrata,* 1279; *Peace,* 1319; *Eccleziazusae,* 1165

[49] *Wasps,* 1485-1537

[50] There are numerous 'intra-textual' references in Aristophanes' work which suggests that irony was a standard literary technique and that the audience found it amusing. Sommerstein (2006) identifies over 200 instances where Aristophanes either repeats his own lines verbatim, refers to them in some way or uses the same comedic technique designed to remind the audience of the original.

The source of the humour, therefore, lies primarily in recognition of the ironic content. There is also the additional challenge here since the final three examples of what the poet 'will not do', have not yet happened, but will happen later in the play. Therefore, the spectator is required to store this information and later, when the actions take place, recall the lines and process the humour at that point. It is as if Aristophanes assumed that he could challenge his audience to think a little harder than they had been accustomed to.

Strepsiades will call for a goad to chase away a creditor: φέρε μοι τὸ κέντρον[51] Strepsiades and a student will both proclaim the Bacchic chant, ἰοὺ ἰού,[52] and there will be a call for a torch: ἐμοὶ δὲ δᾷδ᾽ ἐνεγκάτω τις ἡμμένην.[53]

Aristophanes uses the same technique in *Wasps* when Xanthias says that the audience should not expect some stolen laughter from Megara and ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ᾽ οὔτε κάρυ᾽ ἐκ φορμίδος δούλω διαρριπτοῦντε τοῖς θεωμένοις...[54] Once again the poet is using irony in reassuring the audience that: οὔθ᾽ Ἡρακλῆς τὸ δεῖπνον ἐξαπατώμενος, οὐδ᾽ αὖθις ἀνασελγαινόμενος Εὐριπίδης: οὐδ᾽ εἰ Κλέων γ᾽ ἔλαμψε τῆς τύχης χάριν, αὖθις τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα μυττωτεύσομεν.[55] The humour in the lines relies on the audience being proficient enough to make the association between the events mentioned in these lines, and having seen them performed either in Aristophanes' or his rivals' plays.

4.6 Moulding the Audience

The first version of *Clouds* lost in 423 and Aristophanes was furious. We cannot be sure why the play failed to do well. Perhaps he wrote on a topic that upset

[51] "Fetch me the goad!" *Clouds,* 1296
[52] *Clouds,* 1321 and 1493
[53] "And someone fetch me a lighted torch." Strepsiades, *Clouds*1490
[54] "We haven't got a pair of slaves scattering nuts from a little basket among the spectators..." *Wasps* 58-59
[55] "... and we haven't got Heracles being cheated of his dinner, nor yet Euripides being wantonly abused once more; nor again, if Cleon had made himself shine thanks to good fortune, shall we be making mincemeat of the same man a second time." *Wasps,* 60-64

the judges or perhaps he failed to take account of the various competences of the audience and created a play in which the humour too easy and vulgar. It may have been complicated, failing to provide enough signifiers to allow all the spectators to connect with the text. Aristophanes had anticipated that everyone would appreciate the intellectual content of his play and was disappointed to find that some people, presumably the judges, did not. This does not necessarily mean that they did not enjoy, only that for whatever reason, it did not appeal to their sense of what constituted a good comedy.

When he rewrote the play, he reminds the audience how disappointed he was in them the first time round:

> οὕτω νικήσαιμί τ᾽ ἐγὼ καὶ νομιζοίμην σοφός, ὡς ὑμᾶς ἡγούμενος εἶναι
> θεατὰς δεξιοὺσκαὶ ταύτην σοφώτατ᾽ ἔχειν τῶν ἐμῶν κωμῳδιῶν,
> πρώτους ἠξίωσ᾽ ἀναγεῦσ᾽ ὑμᾶς, ἣ παρέσχε μοι ἔργον πλεῖστον·
> εἶτ᾽ ἀνεχώρουν ὑπ᾽ ἀνδρῶν φορτικῶνἡττηθεὶς οὐκ ἄξιος ὤν·
> ταῦτ᾽ οὖν ὑμῖν μέμφομαιτοῖς σοφοῖς, ὧν οὕνεκ᾽ ἐγὼ ταῦτ᾽ ἐπραγματευόμην.
> ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ὣς ὑμῶν ποθ᾽ ἑκὼν προδώσω τοὺς δεξιούς. [56]

There is an egocentric trait in Aristophanes' writing. He appears to have made the mistake of assuming that the judges would appreciate the play and accuses them of not being clever enough to understand it. This was not the case with everyone in the theatre though. Aelian claims that after the performance, the audience supported Aristophanes, shouting out that he should win, which raises questions about the judging process.[57]

The poet also refers to being beaten by 'undeservedly vulgar men'. This provides an insight into the opinion he had of his rivals. This comment may also

[56] "I took you for an intelligent audience and this for the most intellectual of my comedies, and therefore saw fit to give you the first taste of it, a play that cost me a great deal of labour; and then I retired defeated undeservedly by vulgar men. For that, I hold you intelligent people to blame, for whose sake I went to all that trouble. But even so, I will never willingly desert the bright ones among you." *Clouds,* 521-527

[57] Aelian, *Varia Historia*, 2.13

have been an attempt at humour as similarly 'vulgar men' would have been competing against him once again.

Aristophanes continues, making a further appeal: νῦν οὖν Ἠλέκτραν κατ' ἐκείνην ἥδ' ἡ κωμῳδία ζητοῦσ' ἦλθ', ἤν που πιτύχῃ θεαταῖς οὕτω σοφοῖς: γνώσεται γάρ, ἤνπερ ἴδῃ, τἀδελφοῦ τὸν βόστρυχον.[58] He is appealing for the audience to be as astute as Electra, recognise that each of his lines is brilliant and declare him the winner. This is a *specific* referent to Aeschylus' Electra, who succeeds in piecing together the clues of a lock of hair, a swatch of material, and a footprint in order to identify her long-lost brother. In making this appeal, he is perhaps rectifying the mistake he made in the first version of *Clouds* and adapts himself to the competence of the audience. There are no veiled clues about the person he is referring to, her name is clearly stated, as are the actions he expects the audience to emulate.

The results of Classens and Dhoest's research confirms what Aristophanes and others had long ago anticipated in comments concerning audience intellect. Aristotle comments on what he calls the 'double-audience', which consists of two classes: free, educated men and a vulgar class composed of labourers and other such persons. He asserts that the vulgar classes only watch shows for relaxation, which is consistent with their souls being warped from the natural state.[59] Plutarch also acknowledged different levels of intellect within the audience and how this was reflected in their enjoyment of particular types of humour: τὸ φορτικόν ἐν λόγοις καὶ θυμελικὸν καὶ βάναυσον ὥς ἐστιν Ἀριστοφάνει, Μενάνδρῳ δ'οὐδαμῶς. καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἀπαίδευτος καὶ ἰδιώτης, οἷς ἐκεῖνος λέγει, ἁλίσκεται· ὁ δὲ πεπαιδευμένος

[58] "So now, like Electra of old, this comedy has come seeking and hoping somewhere to find spectators that are intelligent; for she will recognise, if she sees it, the lock of her brother's hair." *Clouds,* 534-536
[59] Aristotle, *Politics*, 8.1342a.19-20

δυσχερανεῖ,[60] suggesting that Plutarch saw all of Aristophanes' audience as uneducated because they enjoyed his 'vulgarity'. We see this in the *parabasis* of *Wasps* where Aristophanes again suggests that the audiences' inability to recognise his poetry as the best puts them to shame. But he goes on to say that this has not affected his confidence as he still thinks of himself as the most talented of the poets:

> τοιόνδ᾽ εὑρόντες ἀλεξίκακον τῆς χώρας τῆσδε καθαρτήν,
> πέρυσιν καταπροὔδοτε καινοτάταις σπείραντ᾽ αὐτὸν διανοίαις,
> ἃς ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ γνῶναι καθαρῶς ὑμεῖς ἐποιήσατ᾽ ἀναλδεῖς:
> καίτοι σπένδων πόλλ᾽ ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ὄμνυσιν τὸν Διόνυσον
> μὴ πώποτ᾽ ἀμείνον᾽ ἔπη τούτων κωμῳδικὰ μηδέν᾽ ἀκοῦσαι.
> τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἔσθ᾽ ὑμῖν αἰσχρὸν τοῖς μὴ γνοῦσιν παραχρῆμα,
> ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς οὐδὲν χείρων παρὰ τοῖσι σοφοῖς νενόμισται,
> εἰ παρελαύνων τοὺς ἀντιπάλους τὴν ἐπίνοιαν ξυνέτριψεν.[61]

As the examples of Aristophanes' disappointment show, the poet had a clear vision of what he wanted to convey in his texts and found, to his disappointment, that the audience were not always 'competent' enough to receive it. He had assumed an 'implied-spectator' whom he believed would interpret the texts as he intended them. And so, the poet offers them a solution. He sets out to rectify their lack of discernment by educating them and in so doing, create the audience he craves. He tells them that if they embrace his new ideas, they too will become wise:

> ἀλλὰ τὸ λοιπὸν τῶν ποιητῶν ὦ δαιμόνιοι τοὺς ζητοῦντας
> καινόν τι λέγειν κἀξευρίσκειν στέργετε μᾶλλον καὶ θεραπεύετε,
> καὶ τὰ νοήματα σῴζεσθ᾽ αὐτῶν,
> ἐσβάλλετέ τ᾽ ἐς τὰς κιβωτοὺς
> μετὰ τῶν μήλων. κἂν ταῦτα ποιῆθ᾽,
> ὑμῖν δι᾽ ἔτους τῶν ἱματίωνὀζήσει δεξιότητος[62]

---

[60] "Vulgarity and coarseness are found in Aristophanes but not at all in Menander. The reason is that the uneducated, ordinary person is captivated by what the former says, while the educated person will react with distaste." *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander* (epitome) 853A-D.

[61] "Such was the deliverer from evil, the cleanser of this land, who you had found; but last year you let him down, when he sowed a crop of brand-new ideas which you blighted through not understanding them clearly – though he still swears by Dionysus, over any number of libations, that no one ever heard better comic poetry than that. So that puts you to shame, for not having recognised it immediately; but our poet is none the worse thought of by the wise, if while overtaking his rivals he wrecked his new concept." *Wasps,* 1041-1050. Cicero agrees in *Laws* 2.37: "Aristophanes, facetissimus poeta veteris comoediae", ("Aristophanes, the wittiest poet of the old comedy.")

A year later in *Peace,* the poet does the same thing when Hermes says: ὦ σοφώτατοι γεωργοί, τἀμὰ δὴ ξυνίετε ῥήματ',[63] and the theme of poet as educator continues in *Frogs* when Euripides claims:

> ἔπειτα τουτουσὶ λαλεῖν ἐδίδαξα
> λεπτῶν τε κανόνων εἰσβολας ἐπῶν τε γωνιασμούς,
> νοεῖν, ὁρᾶν, ξυνέναι, στρέφειν ἕδραν, τεχνάζειν,
> κάχ' ὑποτοπεῖσθαι, περινοεῖν ἅπαντα. [64]

Aristophanes was not the only poet to complain about the spectators. Audience address of this type was not un-common and may well have been a stock part of fifth-century humour.[65] The scholiast to these lines says that Cratinus imitates it in *Pytine*: ὦ λιπερνῆτες θεαταί, τἀμὰ δὴ ξυνίετε.[66] Cratinus also makes the claim that he can make his audience wise and cure them of the nonsense they have been taught by other poets. He can do it during the course of the play: ἀφυπνίζεσθαι ... χρὴ πάντα θεατήν, ἀπὸ μὲν βλεφάρων αὐθημερινῶν ποιτῶν λῆρον ἀφέντα.[67]

---

[62] "But for the future, my dear sirs, cherish and foster more those poets who seek to find something new to say; save up their ideas and put them in your clothes-boxes along with the citrons; and if you do that, then after a year your cloaks will be scented with cleverness." *Wasps,* 1051-1059

[63] "O indigent peasants, mark well my words..." *Peace* 603-4.

[64] "Then I taught these people here how to talk" *Frogs,* 954; and " how to introduce subtle rules, and how to check that words were rightly angled; perception, vision, comprehension: twisting the hip, contriving schemes, suspecting foul dealing, think all round everything.." *Frogs*, 956-958. At 686-687 the Chorus Leader claims, τὸν ἱερὸν χορὸν δίκαιόν ἐστι χρηστὰ τῂ πόλει ξυμπαραινεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν, "It is right and proper for the sacred Chorus to take part in giving good advice and instruction to the community." Both Aeschylus and Euripides echo this sentiment at 1008-1010 and 1053-1055. The same stance is taken by the poet in *Acharnians* at 634-635, 650-651, 656-658 and in *Wasps* at 650-651.

[65] In much the same way as when filming a game show, the host often says, "You're such a fabulous audience, so much better than last week" when in fact, all episodes have been filmed on the same day, and it is the same audience.

[66] "O most desolate spectators, understand these words of mine." Cratinus *fr.*211 This comment raises a further question. *Pytine* was produced in 423 and came first, beating *Clouds* into third place. Cratinus is believed to have died shortly thereafter. The first version of *Peace* was not produced until two years later in 421. If the scholiast is correct that the line was originally Aristophanes', it cannot refer to that particular line in *Peace*, but must refer to a previous play in which Aristophanes criticised his audience in much the same way. Following this first admonishment, Cratinus must have copied it in *Pytine*, and only then, when Aristophanes re-uses his own line in *Peace,* does the scholiast recognise it. There is always the possibility however that, in fact, Aristophanes 'borrowed' the line from Cratinus in the first place, and that the scholiast is mistaken.

[67] "Chorus: Let all who have come to this play wake up and be wise after clearing their eyes of the bosh of these bards-by-the-day." Cratinus, *fr.* 306

Shaping the Words to Fit

The texts show that some of Aristophanes' ideas were more important than others, and he repeated them again and again in various plays to ensure that the audience understood. The dispute with Cleon takes up the whole of *Knights* and he is mentioned by name in *Acharnians, Clouds, Peace, Wasps* and *Frogs* and alluded to in *Lysistrata.* Alcibiades is either named or alluded to in *Acharnians, Wasps, Lysistrata, Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs.* Cleonymus, Hyperbolus and Lamachus all suffer a similar fate.

In other cases, where recognition of a second-hand line would not alter the sense of the new context, there was no need for the inclusion of referents. For example, in *Wasps,* Aristophanes repeats a line from Euripides' *Stheneboea* verbatim. Both texts say: κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρίν.[68] There is no apparent connection between the plot of the original and the new text, and recognition of the line's genesis does not add to the meaning of the scene in *Wasps*. Therefore, Aristophanes does not signpost its origin and the line is categorised as *specific,* but non-signposted. The spectator, therefore, does not need to recognise the line, but if he does, he may experience a feeling of superiority over his less astute colleagues and as such, enjoy the performance more.[69]

In other places, Aristophanes uses lines that have more than one source. For example: ἄγε νυν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς χθονίας κλῄσατε βροντὰς τάς τε πυρώδεις Διὸς ἀστεροπὰς δεινόν τ᾽ ἀργῆτα κεραυνόν.[70] The 'earth-shaking thunders of Zeus' is a *contingent* referent because it relates to the Greek proverb of Zeus creating thunder

[68] "...even though he be unlearned before." *Wasps,* 1074 and *Stheneboea fr.* 663

[69] A analogy would be the modern Classics scholar who cannot help but point out the origin of particular words, phrases or philosophical ideas as having their origin in antiquity. Knowing this additional information does not change the words or ideas themselves, but there is certainly a degree of satisfaction in being knowledgeable enough to recognise them.

[70] "Come now, glorify also his earth-shaking thunders and the fiery lightnings of Zeus and the dreadful flashing thunderbolt!" *Birds*, 1744-5

and lightning. It is also a *polygenic* reference as it occurs in *Oedipus at Colonus, Electra* and *Prometheus Bound.*[71] In this case, the line stands alone as it forms part of the social charter and recognition of its previous use in other plays does not bring forward any specific addition to the meaning of the new scene.

In contrast, in *Acharnians,* when Dicaeopolis says: κἄν γε μὴ λέγω δίκαια μηδὲ τῷ πλήθει δοκῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐπιξήνου θελήσω τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχων λέγειν, it is vital that the audience understand the significance of the line.[72] In its new context, the line adds weight to the action because it comes from Euripides' *Telephus* where the main character disguises himself as a beggar in order to go before the Achaeans and refuses to be silenced even if his head were placed on a butcher's block. The analogy is intended to show that Dicaeopolis is as serious about finding peace for Athens as Telephus was in his appeal to Agamemnon: Ἀγάμεμνον, οὐδ' εἰ πέλεκυν ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων μέλλοι τις εἰς τράχηλον ἐμβαλεῖν ἐμόν σιγήσομαι δίκαιά γ' ἀντειπεῖν ἔχων.[73] As the situation and the wording of both scenes are so alike, this is classed as a *specific* referent. Aristophanes wants the audience to recognise the source of the line because this will add weight to the meaning of the second.

As the Aristophanic scene progresses, Dicaeopolis grasps a basket of coals, threatening to tip them out if the Assembly do not listen to him.[74] This analogy represents the scene in *Telephus* when the hero captures Agamemnon's infant son and threatens to kill him. The audience have again been assisted with reconciling this action to Euripides' version when the Chorus-Leader first enquires whether it is a

---

[71] Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus,* 1606; Euripides, *Electra,* 748 and Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 993-4. See Appendices 1-7 for further examples of recycled lines and their relation to their new contexts.
[72] "And what is more, if what I say is not right and does not seem right to the people, I'm willing to speak with my head on a butcher's block." *Acharnians,* 318-9
[73] "Agamemnon, even were someone holding an axe in his hands and ready to strike it on my neck, not even then will I keep silent; for I have a just reply to make." Euripides, *Telephus, fr.* 706
[74] *Acharnians,* 326

child that he is holding.[75] There is another mention of the block before the scene moves to Euripides' home and Dicaeopolis persuades the tragedian to lend him the costume that was used for Telephus in his earlier production.[76] This encounter provides the final clue that helps the audience link the earlier lines to Euripides' version in case they had already failed to do so. In this way, Aristophanes has brought all the audience to the same level of understanding before he moves on to the next part of the action.

4.8 Joining the Dots and Drawing out the Audience

As we have seen, Aristophanes' parodies are carefully designed to lead the spectators towards a particular understanding of a particular scene. Remarks made in the *parabasis* of *Frogs* demonstrate the poet's awareness that what he says works on a variety of levels:

> εἰ δὲ τοῦτο καταφοβεῖσθον, μή τις ἀμαθία προσῇ
> τοῖς θεωμένοισιν, ὡς τὰ
> λεπτὰ μὴ γνῶναι λεγόντοιν,
> μηδὲν ὀρρωδεῖτε τοῦθ᾽: ὡς οὐκέθ᾽ οὕτω ταῦτ᾽ ἔχει.
> ἐστρατευμένοι γάρ εἰσι,
> βιβλίον τ᾽ ἔχων ἕκαστος μανθάνει τὰ δεξιά:
> αἱ φύσεις τ᾽ ἄλλως κράτισται,
> νῦν δὲ καὶ παρηκόνηνται.
> μηδὲν οὖν δείσητον, ἀλλὰ
> πάντ᾽ ἐπέξιτον θεατῶν γ᾽ οὕνεχ᾽ ὡς ὄντων σοφῶν.[77]

'Things aren't like that anymore' is a reflection of Euripides' earlier words where there is a discussion about Aeschylus' ability to hoodwink his audience:

[75] *Acharnians,* 330
[76] *Acharnians*, 410-430
[77] "If what you're frightened of is that there may be some slow-wittedness in the audience, so that they may not understand the subtle things you say, don't be apprehensive, because things aren't like that anymore. They're old campaigners, and every one of them has a book and understands intellectual ideas; and being already well endowed by nature, they have now been honed to the utmost acuteness. So have no fear, but explore everything, so far as the audience are concerned, they're smart." *Frogs,* 1109-1119

μέρους λαβὼν παρὰ Φρυνίχῳ τραφέντας.[78] This implies recognition of varying audience competence not only by Aristophanes but also by the other poets. There is also a measure of flattery when Aristophanes says that the audience are no longer 'stupid' since they have been educated by Euripides' plays.

The audience is described as 'old campaigners', which may be taken to mean that they were composed of men who had previously fought in the wars and had perhaps acted in plays themselves, or that they were 'old campaigners' of the theatre. Plato separates the more seasoned theatre goers from the rest of the audience: χαῖρε παλαιογόνων ἀνδρῶν θεατῶν ξύλλογε παντοσοφῶν.[79] This acknowledgement goes beyond a respect for age, but also acknowledges wider experience, and therefore probably a superior competence in terms of theatrical knowledge. Whatever the case, it is unlikely that every audience member owned a book or actively studied intellectual ideas since Aristophanes' plays were written to be performed, not read.[80]

The state organised the festival, which suggests that the audience would not have been a small, exclusive group of the elite, but representative of the great mass of Athenians. In the final lines of the section shown above, the Chorus relate that the audience believe themselves to be smart.[81] Again, this has a double meaning. It is an attempt by Aristophanes to flatter the less well-read members of his audience and provide amusement to the more literate at the same time.

With this attitude in mind, at the beginning of *Frogs,* Aristophanes created a different and more complicated way of signifying his intent. He creates a set of verbal and visual semiotics, incorporating various types of referents that are designed

[78] "...after they had been brought up to be stupid in the school of Phrynichus." *Frogs,* 910
[79] "Greetings, assembly of men born long ago, most sophisticated spectators." *Xantai*, *fr.*96
[80] Walcot, (1976:1). Robson, (2009:13-29) provides a comprehensive account of the festivals, their programmes, the production process and the dramatic contest as well as information about the playwright, directors, actors and audience.
[81] "So have no fear, but explore everything, so far as the audience are concerned, they're smart." *Frogs,* 1119

to lead the audience, one step at a time, towards discovering the nature of the plot and to foreshadow the action they are about to see. He begins with visual language – ‘visuality’.[82]

Dionysus enters the stage as an effeminate figure wearing saffron robes, buskins and a lion-skin cloak.[83] The juxtaposition of the gown and the cloak would, in themselves, be humorous but the scene is intended to stimulate spectator's poetic memory of previous plays in which Dionysus was presented as effeminate, or where Heracles had been shown as a buffoon.[84] The lion skin is therefore a *contingent* clue and would probably also have been recognised by most audience members as a reminder of Heracles' history of successful underworld rescues, both in myth and the theatre.[85]

Aristophanes included these initial, simple visual referents as a way of guiding the audience. There are, however, more complex reasons behind the inclusion of Dionysus' outlandish costume and un-godlike behaviour. The costume was designed to remind the audience of Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* and Eupolis' *Taxiarchoi.* Both of these plays featured successful rescue attempts carried out by an effeminate Dionysus and a realisation of this by the audience would carry the suggestion of similar action in the plot of the play unfolding before them.

In *Dionysalexandros*, Dionysus, disguised as Paris, sails to Sparta to rescue Helen and bring her back to Ida.[86] The date of *Dionysalexandros* is uncertain but

[82] Defined in Chapter Two as ‘The use of visual imagery (set, props, costumes or actions) designed to evoke poetic memory of characters in previous texts/performances’.
[83] This costume is described by Heracles at lines 45-47.
[84] In modern slapstick, the mere presence of pies can elicit laughter from the spectators; the actors do not even need to throw them at one another. (English: 2005:12 n.67)
[85] Defined in Chapter Two as ‘The incorporation of previously-used material that might evoke the poetic memory but to an unpredictable degree. For instance, the repetition of proverbs; idioms; well known myths or rituals that may have appeared in previous texts but that also form part of the social charter’.
[86] Edmonds, (1957:35). *Dionysalexandros* does not survive but the name reveals that Dionysus plays the part of Paris and this implies that he would have been represented as effeminate.

Cratinus is believed to have died in 422, meaning that spectators are being invited to recall a play that had been produced at least, seventeen years earlier.

In *Taxiarchoi*, Dionysus is also represented as effeminate and luxury-loving. Dressed as a woman, he descends into the underworld in order to bring back Phormion, the recently deceased Greek admiral.[87] Again, the date is uncertain, but believed to have been produced somewhere between twenty-one and twenty-five years earlier than *Frogs*, between 430 and 426.

In both these cases then, Aristophanes is aiming for the older members of the audience and those who may have had access to a written text to appreciate the allusion.

By presenting Dionysus in this costume, and before any of the characters have spoken, Aristophanes has created the first set of signs through the use of *visuality*. They are designed to alert the most astute audience members, perhaps only subliminally, to the plot of the play that is about to unfold. Taken as a whole, the clues give a substantial amount of information and the implication is that the play will be based on a rescue *topos* and feature a trip to Hades.

In terms of humour, the histrionic nature of the scene works on the most basic level with the god of the theatre dressed in a ridiculous costume. However, Aristophanes would have been aware that not everyone had the capacity to understand that he was using the costume to represent a particular *topos*, and so he moves on to talk about previous plays, using *repetition*.[88] The play begins:

Ξανθίας: Εἴπω τι τῶν εἰωθότων ὦ δέσποτα, ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἀεὶ
γελῶσιν οἱ θεώμενοι;

Διόνυσος: νὴ τὸν Δί᾽ ὅ τι βούλει γε, πλὴν ‘πιέζομαι,’

[87] Storey, (2003:246-260). Note also that in *Taxiarchoi,* Phormion tried to teach Dionysus to row, which is echoed by Charon teaching him to row at *Frogs,* 197ff.
[88] Defined in Chapter Two as ‘The poet’s re-use of his own dialogue or plot elements within either the same, or another of his plays’.

τοῦτο δὲ φύλαξαι: πάνυ γάρ ἐστ᾽ ἤδη χολή[89]

Here, 'πιέζομαι' refers to scenes in Aristophanes' earlier plays that featured complaints about carrying heavy weights, and possibly to the plays of other comic poets.[90] The poet has deliberately created a scene where his characters say the "usual things that the audience always laugh at". Whilst these 'usual things' are funny in themselves, Aristophanes is doing far more than seeking to amuse the audience. The argument continues until Xanthias asks:

> τί δῆτ᾽ ἔδει με ταῦτα τὰ σκεύη φέρειν,
> εἴπερ ποιήσω μηδὲν ὧνπερ Φρύνιχος[91]
> εἴωθε ποιεῖν καὶ Λύκις[92] κἀμειψίας;[93]
> σκεύη φέρουσ' ἑκάστοτ' ἐν κωμῳδιᾳ[94]

Xanthias asks this question so that Dionysus can explain the joke to create signifiers for the audience. The poet seems to be suggesting that his rivals use this stock routine because they have no imagination but, in fact, the luggage scene continues for almost half of the play and it is not until line 627 that the luggage is finally discarded.[95] Xanthias' sneers at the rival poets remind the audience that they had seen similar scenes in earlier plays, produced both by Aristophanes and his opponents. The type of 'intertextuality' is classified as *variation* and *repetition*.[96] The inclusion of the poet Phrynichus does more than refer spectators to plays in

[89] "Xanthias: Shall I say one of the usual things, master, that the audience always laugh at? Dionysus: Yes indeed, whatever you like, only not 'What a weight!' Mind out for that, because I'm thoroughly sick of it by now." *Frogs*, 1-4

[90] *Peace,* 459ff and *Acharnians,* 928ff

[91] At the Dionysia in 414, Phrynichus came third to Ameipsias' *Revellers* and Aristophanes' *Birds,* and in 405BC again came third to Aristophanes' *Frogs* and Platon's *Cleophon.*

[92] There is no extant work of Lycis, but his name is found on an Attic inscription of the mid-3rd century BC alongside those of Phrynichus, Ameipsias, Plato and Philonides in a list of victories of Comic Poets at the City Dionysia. (Edmonds, 1957:571)

[93] Aristophanes was beaten by Ameipsias in 414 when *Birds* came second to his *Revellers.*

[94] "Then what was the point of my carrying this luggage if I'm not allowed to do any of the things that Phrynichus is always doing? Lycis and Ameipsias too – they have luggage scenes every time in their comedies." *Frogs,* 13-15. Plots that centre around donkeys and the carrying of luggage appear to have been very popular because at around the same time as those mentioned here, Leucon also produced *The Bag-Laden Donkey*, and Archippus, *The Donkey's Shadow*.

[95] Aristophanes himself had twice used the luggage scene six years earlier in *Lysistrata,* 254 and 314.

[96] Variation is defined in Chapter Two as 'The variation/adaptation of a source in order to make it a conscious replication of a previous treatment'. Repetition is 'The poet's re-use of his own dialogue or plot elements within either the same, or another of his plays'.

which he too may have used the 'luggage-scene'. It is designed to remind the audience that he also borrowed from other poets. The scholiast says: Φρύνιχος ὁ κωμικός οὗ μέμνηται Ἕρμιππος ἐν Φορμοφόροις ὡς ἀλλότρια ὑποβαλλοένου ποιήματα.[97] The other relevant point is that Phrynichus produced the *Muses* at the Lenaea in the same year and came second to *Frogs*. It is possible, therefore, that *Muses* had already been seen by the audience by the time Aristophanes came on stage. Thus, the comment would have been reminded the audience of its plot, which contained a similar contest or trial of literary merit as that in *Frogs,* perhaps involving Euripides and Sophocles.[98] If this were the case, one would have to consider which poet is 'copying' from whom.[99] Russo suggests that the drafts, if not the final texts of the comedies, may have been presented to the archon the autumn of the year before.[100] If this is correct, it would mean that there must have been an element of collaboration in terms of theme as it is unlikely that two poets would have come up with the same idea independently.

The second rival poet mentioned by Xanthias is Lycis. All of his work is lost but according to scholia, the other poets satirised him as boring and trite.[101] As Aristophanes mentions him with the others, it is likely that he too used the same stock jokes, including the luggage-scene, which would be remembered by the spectators. According to Xanthias, Ameipsias, the third poet mentioned also created plays that contained luggage-scenes. We know that in 423 Ameipsias and

[97] "And there is Phrynichus the comedy-writer, who is mentioned by Hermippus in the *Porters* as bringing out other men's work as his." Scholiast at Aristophanes' *Birds* 749
[98] Demand (1970:83)
[99] In *Clouds* 555-6, Aristophanes refers to a parody of the Andromeda myth produced by Phrynichus. (Sommerstein, 1996:158n13). In 411 Euripides adapted the myth in his production, one that was further 'adapted' by Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. We can see therefore, that the poets often wrote on similar themes, which meant that when the topic came up again, the audience would be drawn back to one or more previous presentations.
[100] Russo (1966:11) uses as his source Plato's *Laws* 817d. Its application in this context, is, in my opinion, tenuous as it refers to the granting of Choruses to outsiders, and does not mention comedies specifically. Further, in the case of *Frogs*, the death of Sophocles so close to the production, necessitated a hasty re-write, which may have been hampered by such strict rules surrounding the granting of a Chorus.
[101] Sommerstein, (1996:158n14)

Aristophanes both produced plays with similar themes and characters. Aristophanes produced *Clouds*, which featured Socrates and according to Diogenes Laertius: “Ameipsias brings him [Socrates] upon the stage in a frieze cloak...”[102]

So far then, within the first fifteen lines, Aristophanes has used a number of different types of referents, including *contingent*, *visuality, variation* and *repetition.* Each one works in a different way to stimulate poetic memory. Collectively, they inform the audience that the play will contain a rescue mission to Hades, and that somehow, it is going to involve a politician or some tragic poets.

The metacomedy of the luggage scene continues prominently:

Διόνυσος:	εἶτ᾽ οὐχ ὕβρις ταῦτ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ πολλὴ τρυφή, ὅτ᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν ὢν Διόνυσος υἱὸς Σταμνίου αὐτὸς βαδίζω καὶ πονῶ, τοῦτον δ᾽ ὀχῶ, ἵνα μὴ ταλαιπωροῖτο μηδ᾽ ἄχθος φέροι;
Ξανθίας:	οὐ γὰρ φέρω 'γώ;
Διόνυσος:	πῶς φέρεις γὰρ ὅς γ᾽ ὀχεῖ;
Ξανθίας:	φέρων γε ταυτί.
Διόνυσος:	τίνα τρόπον;
Ξανθίας:	Βαρέως πάνυ.
Διόνυσος:	οὔκουν τὸ Βάρος τοῦθ᾽ ὃ σὺ φέρεις ὄνος φέρει;
Ξανθίας:	οὐ δῆθ᾽ ὅ γ᾽ ἔχω 'γὼ καὶ φέρω μὰ τὸν Δί᾽ οὔ.
Διόνυσος:	πῶς γὰρ φέρεις, ὅς γ᾽ αὐτὸς ὑφ᾽ ἑτέρου φέρει;
Ξανθίας:	οὐκ οἶδ᾽· ὁ δ᾽ ὦμος οὑτοσὶ πιέζεται.
Διόνυσος:	σὺ δ᾽ οὖν ἐπειδὴ τὸν ὄνον οὐ φῄς σ᾽ ὠφελεῖν, ἐν τῷ μέρει σὺ τὸν ὄνον ἀράμενος φέρε. [103]

Here again, the scene is amusing in its own right because of the friction between master and slave, which reflected a common situation in Athens.[104] It also contains an element of *repetition.* The scene is designed to remind the audience of

[102] *Life of Socrates* ii.28

[103] “Dionysus: Now isn’t this outrageous, the behaviour of an utterly spoilt brat, when I, Dionysus, son of Decanter, have gone to the trouble of walking myself and let this fellow ride, so that he wouldn’t have to toil or carry a heavy load? Xanthias: I am carrying one, aren’t I? Dionysus: How can you be carrying anything, when you’re riding? Xanthias: Because I am carrying this, that’s how. Dionysus: In what way? Xanthias: Very unwillingly! Dionysus: Well then, this load that you’re carrying, the donkey’s carrying that, innit? Xanthias: Not the one that I’ve got here and I’m carrying, by Zeus, it isn’t! Dionysus: Why, how can you be carrying it when something else is carrying you? Xanthias: I don’t know, but – what a weight on this shoulder! Dionysus: All right, since you say the donkey’s doing you no good, you take your turn picking up the donkey and carrying it.” *Frogs,* 21-33

[104] This inversion of roles is later reversed at 190-193, when Charon refuses to allow Xanthias to ride in the boat, telling him that he had better ‘run round the lake’, insisting that he will only take Dionysus.

the long, drawn out, pointless philosophical arguments that took place in Socrates' academy in *Clouds* when the philosopher addresses important philosophical issues such as:[105]

> ἀνήρετ᾽ ἄρτι Χαιρεφῶντα Σωκράτης
> ψύλλαν ὁπόσους ἅλλοιτο τοὺς αὑτῆς πόδας:
> δακοῦσα γὰρ τοῦ Χαιρεφῶντος τὴν ὀφρῦν
> ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τὴν Σωκράτους ἀφήλατο.[106]

and

> ἀνήρετ᾽ αὐτὸν Χαιρεφῶν ὁ Σφήττιος
> ὁπότερα τὴν γνώμην ἔχοι, τὰς ἐμπίδας
> κατὰ τὸ στόμ᾽ ᾄδειν ἢ κατὰ τοὐρροπύγιον.[107]

Those who had previously seen the play would have recognised the parody and those who had not would certainly have recognised the satirical aspects in terms of the sophists.

The luggage-scene ends with an outburst from Dionysus, which brings the spectators back to reality by referring to recent political events. Xanthias laments: οἴμοι κακοδαίμων: τί γὰρ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐναυμάχουν; ἦ τἄν σε κωκύειν ἂν ἐκέλευον μακρά.[108]

I have classified the final signifier, as *fundamental* because it includes an element that recalls the structure of a previous text and works as a key element in the structure of the second. Following the luggage- scene, Dionysus reports:

> καὶ δῆτ᾽ ἐπὶ τῆς νεὼς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοι
> τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἐξαίφνης πόθος

[105] The first version of *Clouds* was produced at the Dionysia in 423BC, coming third and was later revised.

[106] "A little while ago Socrates asked Chaerephon how many of its own feet a flea could jump; because one had bitten Chaerephon's eyebrow and jumped off onto Socrates' head." *Clouds,* 144-145

[107] "Chaerephon of Sphettus asked him whether he was of the opinion that gnats hum through their mouth or though their rump." *Clouds,* 156-158

[108] "Dash it all, why wasn't I in that naval battle? Then I could really and truly tell you to go to blazes!" *Frogs,* 33-34. Hunt, (2001:359-380) provides an in-depth discussion of these lines, together with 190-191 and 693-694, citing them as evidence (together with the scholiast's quotation of Hellanicus), of the Athenian decision to free slaves who had fought in the battle of Arginusae. The audience would have contained both those who had fought in the battle and their relatives, making this final humorous outburst into a political comment. Hooker (1960:112) points out that fun in the plays of Aristophanes is much more pointed, given that it is consistent and relevant to everyday life in Athens.

τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἴει σφόδρα.[109]

Here, Aristophanes transposes the name of a tragedy from its original setting within the tragic genre and places it in a comedy in order to inform the audience that the new play will contain a rescue *topos* of a particular kind. By doing so, he confirms the concept of Euripides' *Andromeda* as a *topos* in its own right. This is an idea that Aristophanes had used in the *Thesmophoriazusae* seven years earlier, to advocate the recall of Alcibiades.[110] Note also that in the same year as the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Eupolis wrote on a similar theme in *Demes*: the hero descended to the underworld on a rescue mission and brought up four great Athenian leaders from the dead. The scholiast to Aristides confirms these leaders to be Miltiades, Aristides, Solon and Pericles.[111] This may well have been what inspired Aristophanes' idea for the plot of *Frogs,* and perhaps served as an aide memoire to the audience.

Mention of the *Andromeda* might also have reminded those spectators who were particularly competent that in *Clouds* Aristophanes accused Eupolis of plagiarism.[112] He claimed that Eupolis had not only 'rehashed' his *Knights* in *Marcias,* but had also included a character that he had previously stolen from a play written by Phrynichus. It seems that Phrynichus had produced a play on the Andromeda *topos* but substituted 'the woman the sea-monster had tried to devour' with a drunken old woman. It is this 'drunken old woman' that Eupolis is accused of

[109] "And, anyway, on the ship I was reading Andromeda to myself, and suddenly my heart was struck with a longing, you can't imagine how hard." *Frogs,* 52-53
[110] See Chapter Five where there is an explanation of how Aristophanes creates and uses this *topos* in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and the way it is particularly echoed in *Frogs.*
[111] Eupolis *frs.* 99.56-57 and 64-65
[112] *Clouds*, 554-563

stealing. The irony here is that in *Frogs,* Aristophanes himself is doing exactly that but, in this case, he substitutes Euripides for the beautiful Andromeda.[113]

Thus, by using the Andromeda *topos,* he is 'rehashing' Eupolis' play, that was a 'rehash' of his *Knights*, that was a 'rehash' of Phrynichus' play, that was written using the rescue *topos* contained in Euripides' play. Thus, by including this *fundamental* element to his signifiers, Aristophanes brings the audience full circle, back to Euripides' original.

By line 34, therefore, Aristophanes has created signifiers of various types, which told the audience that the play was going to be about a rescue mission to Hades, with Dionysus as the rescuer aided by his unruly slave Xanthias. The journey will involve arguments and absurdity taking place between the two men on their way to rescue either tragic poets or political figures and that there will be an *agon* involving a long drawn out, pointless argument. All of this will be followed by an unexpected ending.

Frogs won first prize at both the Lenaea and the Dionysia in 405BC, so in the eyes of the judges it must have been considered the best play in the competition. Due to lack of evidence, it is impossible to hypothesise about the criteria by which they made their decisions. It may be that that the judging was based on personal preference, the literary skill of the poets, political or financial influences[114] or

[113] Note the parallel plots of *Andromeda* and *Frogs* and the comic analogy of Perseus/Andromeda and Dionysus/Euripides. Perseus, inspired by the beauty of Andromeda, sets out to rescue her from death whilst Dionysus, inspired by the beauty of the *Andromeda*, sets out to rescue its author from death. Both heroes, during the course of their quest, cross water and encounter a monster before finally entering into a bargain with the king (Perseus with Cepheus, and Dionysus with Pluto). However, Aristophanes substitutes Perseus' sexual passion of Perseus for an intellectual passion in Dionysus. Dionysus is disguised at Heracles, legendary for his successful rescue of Cerberus from Hades; he originally rescued something ugly, but here the object of rescue is Athens and beautiful. *Frogs,* 69-82. See Moorton, (1987:434-6)

[114] Sidwell, (2009:24-25) gives a full discussion of the role of politics in regard to the funding and influence upon the content of Greek comedies. Both Sidwell and de Ste Croix (1972) are in no doubt that Aristophanes used his plays as a vehicle for his political opinion. Sidwell goes further suggesting the possibility that comic poets not only had particular political affiliations but that they received monetary backing to promote these views through their work.

perhaps audience reaction.[115] Whatever the case, Aristophanes needed to please the people in order to win. Therefore, the poet relied on his insight regarding the competence of the spectators in order to create plays that would appeal to a wide and varied audience.

4.9 Conclusions

Without a fully extant corpus of comic and tragic texts or philosophical writings, it is impossible to identify all of the references that may have been incorporated in Aristophanes' plays, but judging from the number of references that exist in the few tragic texts that can be used as comparison, there must have been many more than have been documented. What we can see, however, is that when the poet decided it was important that the audience recognised the re-use of particular lines because they impacted on the plot of his text, he ensured that enough signifiers were included to allow as many of the spectators as possible to recognise them.

Aristophanes was equally determined that the audience should recognise his clever manipulation of language. Athens of the fifth century was fascinated, even infatuated, with words and their power and it is because of this that Aristophanes created such complex layers of subtlety within his plays.[116] He claims technical sophistication as the best and most renowned comic producer in the world.[117] He criticises poets less able than himself, and is not prepared to take the chance that anything he has hinted at might have been missed.[118] The poet knew his audience

[115] Robson, (2009:26-28) offers a comprehensive discussion regarding the audience and provides evidence to suggest that the audiences' reactions may have held sway over the judges when they voted. He notes that the Chorus address their comments to the judges in *Ecclesiazusae;* but in *Clouds* it is the audience who are held responsible for its failure, suggesting that the verdicts of the two groups varied less than one might have suspected.

[116] Henderson (1975:1)

[117] *Peace* 735-817

[118] He speaks of jokes that have been stolen from the Megarians (*Wasps,* 57) and the jokes that the audience always laugh at (*Frogs* 2) – thus implying criticism of those poets who are unable to either invent their own, or vary other jokes in order to make new ones.

well and after the failure of *Clouds* he set out to create texts where he could appeal to all tastes.

Some one hundred years later, Aristotle recognises this technique and gives an extended discussion of the different types of audience, exploring human dispositions and how the speaker might take advantage of them. He has the insight to detail the character traits of people according to their age and advise speakers on how to adapt their speeches according to their audience.[119] This advice is similar to that offered by modern audience analysis textbooks, which provide lists of human characteristics designed to help the author reach his audience. Amongst other areas, they include details of how to evaluate the intelligence, social status and educational level of a prospective audience to help the writer decide the most relevant way of reaching a particular target group.[120]

Aristophanes recognised the need to give his audience different types of referents according to what he wanted to convey and how he wanted the audience to receive it. He delivered these referents in a variety of forms (as detailed in Chapter Two) so that at least one of them would 'reach its target'. This method anticipates Bettinghaus' advice to orators that they ensure:

1. The use of highly affective language to describe particular situations.
2. The association of proposed ideas with other popular or unpopular ideas
3. The association of ideas with visual or other non-verbal elements that might arouse emotions.
4. The display of non-verbal emotional clues by the communicator.[121]

Aristophanes had no need to carry out research of this kind because he was intimately familiar with his audience. He lived and worked alongside them; he grew

[119] *Rhetoric,* Book II
[120] Such as McQuail, (1997) and Clevenger, (1966)
[121] Bettinghaus, (1994:160-161)

up in the same town with the same beliefs, watching the same plays. In effect, as an audience member of his rivals, he *was* a spectator in his own right.

Aristophanes toys with the audience, creating hints, echoes, allusions and parodies, each one designed differently in accordance with what he thinks they are capable of recognising. His clever supporters are promised posterity and he indulges those whom he deems incapable by deconstructing the jokes before their eyes.[122] In this way, he caters for every section of the audience, indulging his passion for words and hoping for victory.

[122] *Clouds* 560 claims that those who enjoy his work will be thought of as wise by later generations.

Chapter Five

Mythic Novelty and Theatrical Manipulation in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*

What play does not include Alcibiades among the cast of characters?
Eupolis, Aristophanes, did they not show him on stage?
It is to him that comedy owed its success.[1]

5.1 Introduction

This Chapter offers new readings of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*, and will show that 411BC marks a change in Aristophanes' literary style. There are two issues at play. The first is that Aristophanes' comedy starts to resemble tragedy in form and mood; and the second, that he created a new use for his 'borrowings', or *parodia*, by playing on the mythic novelty created by Euripides.

In the *Thesmophoriazusae,* the poet includes Euripides as a main character for the first time and the tragedian acts out various scenes from his own plays.[2] These episodes are then woven together to form the action. The episodes chosen for re-creation are those that most obviously represent Euripides' political persuasions, (see Appendix 8) which are then exposed and vilified by Aristophanes. This new form of writing is refined in *Frogs* which, as we shall see, can be seen as an intratextual allusion to Alcibiades' inclusion in the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

The main point of *Frogs* is often considered to be that it contains the first commentary on literary theory. Whilst the argument between Aeschylus and Euripides might well contain criticism, it is of *each other* and not of fifth-century literature as a whole.[3] I suggest that instead of treating the play as a literary treatise,

[1] Libanius, *fr.* 50.2.1 cited in Vickers, (2008:82)
[2] Euripides' appearance in *Acharnians* was brief and confined to him providing a tragic costume for Dicaeopolis. Here, Euripides has a major part and is present for almost the whole of the play.
[3] Demand, (1970:86) suggests that the Chorus of *Frogs* is also used as an instrument of literary criticism by Aristophanes to comment on the abilities of his rival Phrynichus, and in so doing represents a symmetry between a contest between two living poets in the first half of the play, and two dead poets in the second. She goes on to

it should be considered a political allegory. Indeed, following the performance, Aristophanes was granted a wreath made from the sacred olive in recognition of services rendered to the city by his comments in the *parabasis.*[4] It is my contention that Aristophanes created *Frogs* in order to advocate the return of Alcibiades whilst at the same time saving face, given his ferocious attack on Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae.*

Both the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* contain elements of tragic style. There is no break in the dramatic illusion in the *parabasis* of the *Thesmophoriazusae* or the *agon* in *Frogs.*[5] The audience are invited to remain engaged with the action in the same way as they would when watching a tragedy. The use of myth previously modified by Euripides adds further issues for the spectators because recognising the myth itself might not give them the 'clues' they think they are getting.[6] Instead, Aristophanes re-produces and adapts Euripides' mythic novelty to keep the audience engaged throughout the performance as they wait to see the outcome. This changes the audiences' position from knowing the conclusion of a story and watching the characters discover the truth as in tragedy, to thinking that they know the myth, but having to wait alongside the characters to discover the outcome.[7] This is because Aristophanes uses a combination of myths, which may or may not have been re-told

---

state that the contest between Dionysus and the frogs should be seen as a literary contest similar to that between Aeschylus and Euripides in the *agon.*

[4] *Life of Aristophanes*, 28.39.43

[5] Bowie (1993:224)

[6] For instance, the original myth of Helen portrays her as an adulteress, who is responsible for the death of thousands of Greeks at Troy. Euripides' version absolves her of that guilt and instead shows her as an innocent, faithful wife patiently waiting for her husband to return and rescue her from Egypt. In Aristophanes, the audience may expect the former, but instead, get the latter.

[7] With the exception of Aeschylus' *Persians*, the plots of all extant tragedies are based on mythological stories. Despite their use in promoting the poets' message, the story, for the most part, and certainly the outcome, remains constant. Therefore, although the audience would know the final conclusion of the play before it started, they would still enjoy watching the action develop.

and altered by Euripides, together with an element of fiction, in order to tell a new story.[8]

The *Thesmophoriazusae* is described as the least political of Aristophanes' plays, one of the most benign and light-hearted, with virtually no allusion to politics or current affairs.[9] Murray suggests that on the whole, Euripides should see the *Thesmophoriazusae* as a tremendous compliment as it shows immense interest in his writings.[10] It is the contention of this Chapter that this is incorrect. It will show that the *Thesmophoriazusae* is one of Aristophanes' *most* political plays. I believe that it is neither 'benign' nor light hearted, and that it contains multiple allusions to politics and current affairs. Far from being a compliment, Euripides would have seen it as a direct attack on his political integrity.

Before the production of the *Thesmophoriazusae,* each of Aristophanes' extant plays had an obvious theme. *Acharnians, Peace and Lysistrata* called for peace. *Knights, Wasps* and *Birds* commented on contemporary society and its breakdown through the actions of politicians. *Clouds* remarks on falling standards of education and the consequent behaviour of the young. Therefore, it seems incongruous, therefore, that given the obvious themes of his earlier works, Aristophanes should produce a play without any political or social message whatsoever.

The plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae* is, at first glance, simple: the women at the Thesmophoria plot to kill Euripides because he portrays them in a bad light. Euripides persuades a relative to infiltrate the meeting and discover their plan; the

[8] By this I mean the message that the audience are left with as well as the outcome of the story itself.
[9] Henderson (1975:86). MacDowell, (1995:251) and Sidwell, (2009:266) are all of the same opinion. Heath, (1987:28) argues that Aristophanic comedy "...did not and was not intended to have an effect on political reality". Sommerstein, (1977:116) asserts that the *Thesmophoriazusae* is one of Aristophanes' least political plays with only two hard political references, both in the *parabasis.*
[10] Murray (1933:117). Whilst perhaps complimentary in these terms, [the extensive re-use of his Euripides' lines] there can be little doubt of the level of personal insult implicitly contained within the play.

relative is captured; Euripides rescues him; Euripides and the women make a pact and both men go free. This plot may also be intended to play upon the controversy that came to a head after the failure of Euripides' Trojan War trilogy in 415 BC. However, later plays include *Ion, Iphigenia in Tauris,* the *Helen* and the *Andromeda*, all of which portray women in a more favourable light. Therefore, I will argue that the plot is not simplistic but is based on political comment and personal attacks on Euripides made in a way previously unseen in Aristophanes' writing. The crux of the argument lies in Aristophanes' personification of Alcibiades as the In-Law whom, I believe, Aristophanes includes in scenes recreated from Euripides' own plays, whilst copying the tragedian's literary technique.

This Chapter will therefore present a new reading of the *Thesmophoriazusae* to show that it marks a change in Aristophanes' writing. Previous Chapters have discussed the many and varied ways in which the poet re-used lines and *topoi.* Although the recreated scenes may have been humorous, they did not mock or criticise the original author on a personal level. In the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Aristophanes moves away from overt satirical attacks on prominent figures and topical events and instead, uses myth to make his point.[11] However, it is the choice of myth and primary sources on which the poet draws that is the important issue. In order to understand what it is that is so different about the *Thesmophoriazusae,* it is necessary to look more closely at the texts that Aristophanes chooses to parody and how he presents them. It then becomes evident that these are texts that Euripides had himself manipulated in order to make his own political views very clear.

The first part of this Chapter will therefore be a discussion of plays that illustrate Euripides' political views in the years prior to the production of

[11] In the *Acharnians, Birds* and *Lysistrata*, the poet used political satire to make his point.

Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae.* This will include a reconstruction of Euripides' *Andromeda* from the fragments, which will show that here, as in a number of other plays, Euripides adapted myth in order to make comment upon the politics and politicians of his time.[12]

The second part of the Chapter will show that Aristophanes wrote the *Thesmophoriazusae* specifically to comment on Euripides' political views.[13] In this play, Aristophanes demonstrates an innovative way of re-using the lines of others. He reproduces large sections of Euripides' plays and is able to highlight Euripides' political inconsistency by including the tragedian as a character within them. It is noteworthy that 411 is the only year for which we have evidence that Aristophanes produced two plays because the *Lysistrata* is written in Aristophanes' usual style of slapstick and political innuendo, with its message evident at every turn. This difference further highlights the innovative nature of the *Thesmophoriazusae.*

The final section of the Chapter will be a new reading of *Frogs,* which will show that by the end of the Peloponnesian war, Aristophanes' work had become even more subtle and refined. The plot initially focuses on a mission to rescue Euripides, who had recently died, from Hades. At the beginning of the play Dionysus is reading Euripides' *Andromeda* and is seized by a longing for its author.[14] The scholiast to this line asks: δια τί δὲ μὴ ἄλλο τι τῶν πρὸ ὀλίγου διδαχθέντων καὶ καλῶν Ὑψιπύλης Φοινισσῶν, Ἀντιόπης; and adds ἀλλ' οὐ συκοφαντὰ ἦν τὰ τοιαῦτα.[15] I would suggest that this question is indeed worth pressing. The answer is that the three plays mentioned by the scholiast all revolve

---

[12] Peterson, (1904) gives a plausible reconstruction of the plot in his attempt to discover the date of Sophocles' *Andromeda* against that of Euripides'. This Chapter does not seek to challenge that reconstruction, but offers an alternative viewpoint in order to identify elements which are indicative of political comment.

[13] *Fr.* 331, scholion on *Wasps* 61b says that Aristophanes staged the *Thesmophoriazusae* at the expense of Euripides.

[14] *Frogs,* 53

[15] "Why not another of the recently produced and beautiful dramas *Hypsipyle, Phoenissae, Antiope*?" and "after all, such points need not be unduly pressed" cited in Moorton, (1987:434)

around the story of women who are alone, in despair, and without hope of release. Parodies of these plays would not suit Aristophanes' purpose as he wanted to write an intensely political play centred upon finding a way to rescue Athens and ultimately Alcibiades, one that would also allow him the opportunity to involve his long-term sparring partner Euripides. Therefore, there could be no better choice of play than that which his favourite tragedian had previously used to advocate the return of Alcibiades and which, therefore, already contained a number of inherent links to the politician.[16]

Frogs is perhaps the most subtle of Aristophanes' plot lines. Instead of using lines or scenes from the *Andromeda,* the poet borrows only its rescue *topos* and uses it as the scaffolding around which to build the action. An analysis of the plot will show that there are layers of clues that nestle within the pretext of a mission designed to save the state of tragedy. These clues ultimately lead to Aeschylus' declaration of support for Alcibiades and a plea to the Athenians to bring him back in order to save the State of Athens. By making Euripides the original object of the rescue, and using the *topos* of the *Andromeda,* one of the plays through whose plot the tragedian had so vehemently attacked Alcibiades some years earlier in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Aristophanes can once again assail Euripides' political vacillation and at the same time express the despair felt by Athens as their downfall approached.

There has been extensive scholarship seeking to find out why, having introduced the additional question concerning Alcibiades, Aristophanes does not have Euripides vote in his favour and thus be the hailed the saviour of both tragedy and Athens. I shall offer evidence to suggest Aristophanes makes Euripides

[16] Given that Aristophanes used Euripides' lines far more than those of the other tragedians, there can be no doubt that the tragedian was his preferred source.

denounce Alcibiades as a way of getting the final word in a dialogue that had been subtly and creatively played out between the two poets over a twenty-year period.

5.1 Euripides Warns Athens Against Alcibiades – 416BC

In order to prove that Aristophanes was attacking Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* it is necessary to consider the events in Athens preceding the play and how Euripides reacted to them.

In 420 BC Alcibiades negotiated a treaty with Argos, followed by another in the summer of 417.[17] In the productions of *Suppliant Women, Heracles*, and *Electra* in the spring of 416, Euripides was voicing his concerns about the actions of some of the younger politicians and the potential consequences of breaking the alliance with Argos.[18] *Suppliant Women* warns:

> ἐς δὲ στρατείαν πάντας Ἀργείους ἄγων,
> μάντεων λεγόντων θέσφατ', εἶτ' ἀτιμάσας
> βίᾳ παρελθὼν θεοὺς ἀπώλεσας πόλιν,
> νέοις παραχθείς, οἵτινες τιμώμενοι
> χαίρουσι πολέμους τ' αὐξάνουσ' ἄνευ δίκης,
> φθείροντες ἀστούς, ὁ μὲν ὅπως στρατηλατῇ,
> ὁ δ' ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύναμιν ἐς χεῖρας λαβών,
> ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οὕνεκ', οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν
> τὸ πλῆθος εἴ τι βλάπτεται πάσχον τάδε. [19]

This is exactly the way that Thucydides speaks of Demagogues in general and of Alcibiades in particular.[20] The play shows the human cost of war and makes

[17] Thucydides, 5.47; 5.82.5

[18] Both Heracles and Electra are variously dated from 421-416, but it is my contention that 416 is the most likely date given their content. Zuntz (1963:69) places the *Electra* close to *Heracles* and *Suppliant Women* due to the occurrence, or absence, of trochaic tetrameters. However, my argument rests with the similar theme and mood of the plays. For a useful discussion on the interpretation of the *Suppliant Women* see Zuntz, (1963:3-25)

[19] "Secondly when you led all the Argives on an expedition and then scorned the prophets when they uttered the god's oracles, you used force and went against the gods and destroyed your city led astray by younger men who delight in winning honour and intensify wars with no regard for justice, destroying their citizens, one so that he can be a general, another so that he can grasp power and behave high-handedly another to make money, not considering if the ordinary people are harmed at all by such treatment." Euripides *Suppliant Women* 234-5

[20] Thucydides, 6.15

reference to the proper burial of the dead.[21] Through the words of Athena, Euripides advises Athens to make and keep an alliance with Argos.[22]

Heracles examines the fate of helpless suppliant refugees who face death at the hands of their supposed-protector. Instead of protecting and rescuing his wife and sons, Heracles brutally murders them when they are suppliants at the altar.[23] Here we have the analogy of the death of innocents as a result of the actions of those who should be protecting them. Given the parallel themes of these two plays and the events at Melos later in the year, it is likely that Euripides was reacting to discussions that were 'in the air' at the time.[24]

In the *Electra*, the murder of Clytemnestra is represented in a less admirable light than in Sophocles, with Euripides removing the heroic glamour that once surrounded the deed.[25] In contrast to Sophocles, Euripides demonstrates the horror of this tragedy, and gives the reverse side of the heroic legend.[26] This mood of foreboding is in keeping with the *Heracles* and *Suppliant Women* is a warning that killing is not glamorous and that revenge can be self-destructive. All the plays are concerned with refugees and the aftermath of war, thus implicitly advising the Athenians to support Alcibiades' negotiations.

Euripides, despite some trepidation, continued to support and promote Alcibiades, at least temporarily. Plutarch reproduces an ode by Euripides written in adulation of Alcibiades whose date is most likely the summer of 416 BC, before the

---

[21] ὤ, λισσόμεθ', ἐλθεῖν τέκνον Ἰσμηνὸν ἐμάν τ' ἐς χέρα θεῖναι νεκύων θαλερᾷ σώματ' ἀλαίνοντ' ἄταφα. ("O, we implore you, to go unto the river Ismenus, and place within my arms the bodies of the dead, slain in their prime and wandering without a tomb.") *Suppliant Women,* 60-62. Thucydides 4.97 tells of the Theban refusal to release the Athenian dead after the Delian Battle in 424BC. Euripides reminds Athens of this terrible affront through the *topos* of the *Suppliant Women.*

[22] *Suppliant Women* 1190-1

[23] Euripides *Heracles,* 965-1010

[24] Thucydides 5.84-116 outlines the Melian Dialogue.

[25] Murray (1946:78)

[26] Grube (1941:304-5)

attack on Melos, which took place later that same year.[27] The confrontation came as a result of the island refusing to pay tribute or take part in the struggle against the Spartans.[28] Alcibiades supported the decree, which stated that Melos should be attacked, the men killed, and the women and children enslaved.[29] There was a public outcry against the brutality of these actions. As a result of these actions, Euripides appears to have lost faith in Alcibiades. His concerns are reflected in the plays he produced the following spring.

5.3 Euripides Condemns Alcibiades – 415BC

In 415, Euripides wrote the *Alexandros*,[30] the *Palamedes* and the *Trojan Women*[31] with *Sisyphus* as the satyr play.[32] All express his discontent surrounding the massacre at Melos and his belief that Alcibiades was to blame. The *Alexandros* concerns an impious, arrogant man, disliked by his subordinates, who brings destruction to his city. The *Palamedes* is about treachery within one's own camp. Euripides uses Odysseus' infidelities to represent Alcibiades' alleged promiscuity and to highlight and criticise the intrigues at Samos, which concerned a betrayal within an exchange of letters between Phrynichus, Astyochus and Alcibiades.[33] The *Trojan Women* tells of the terrible suffering resulting from a war that had been brought about by the actions of the men in the first two plays. The title of the satyr play, *Sisyphus*, indicates a tale of endless suffering for deceit and trickery. The

[27] Bowra (1960:69-71). Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 11, points out that despite the doubt of some that Euripides is the author of the Epinician, the great majority of opinion does favour it.
[28] Thucydides 17
[29] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 16.5
[30] *Fr.* 61 in particular indicates this saying "I loathe a man who is clever in words but not clever at doing good service." Alcibiades was known as a skilled orator but was not, by any means, loyal in terms of political allegiance.
[31] Performed in 415BC and a reflection of the suffering caused to the people of Melos. Thucydides 5.16 describes the massacre of all men of military age and the sale of women and children into slavery.
[32] Aelian, *Varia Historia,* 2.8
[33] Thucydides *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 8.50 tells of the intrigues and betrayals that surrounded the exchange of letters between Phrynichus, Astyochus and Alcibiades during the course of the events at Samos.

mood of the audience would have been primed to accept these messages by the pre-play performances which included the parade of war-orphans in hoplite armour marching across the stage.[34] Therefore, there can be little doubt that these plays were a vehicle by which Euripides sought to condemn Alcibiades for his politics and blame him for the massacre at Melos.[35]

5.4 Euripides Vacillates – 414BC

The following year, Euripides wrote the *Ion* and *Captive Melanippe.* Both contain pleas to let bygones be bygones, showing that within only a year of his vehement condemnation of Alcibiades in *Trojan Women,* Euripides had realised that he was a necessary cog in the war-machine of Athens. He sought to show that although Alcibiades may have made mistakes, they should be forgiven. Alcibiades was an important figure in the disastrous Sicilian Expedition that took place late in 415, which led to his banishment and defection to Argos.[36] In the spring of 414 Euripides reacted to this situation and produced the *Ion* and *Captive Melanippe*, both of which dealt with human suffering brought about by the mistakes and misunderstandings of those in power.[37] The *Ion* deals with a man who learns that he is capable of piety as well as sacrilege. Faced with the threat of death if he returns to Athens, Ion must convince those around him of his legitimacy before he eventually returns in glory.

There are parallels between Alcibiades and Ion since Alcibiades was also thought to have acted impiously with regard to the matter of the Herms and he also

---

[34] Hesk, (2007:73)
[35] The views expressed in these plays are not confined to Euripides, and probably reflected those of the Athenian people. Tragedy was a vehicle for the expression of tensions within the *polis* and Euripides was well known for his function as a social critic.
[36] Thucydides 6
[37] *Captive Melanippe,* in keeping with the three plays produced the following year, contains a rescue *topos*.

faced danger should he return to Athens.[38] However, by having Ion see the error of his ways, and recognised as a good man by those around him, Euripides is saying that the same could be possible for Alcibiades.

Despite the extensive lacunae in *Captive Melanippe*, it is clear that the plot centres on the theme of wrongful accusation. It is this that links it to the situation facing Alcibiades at the time. The play contains a rescue *topos,* and the restoration of honour to a 'seduced' girl who was wrongly accused, forced to expose her two illegitimate children and then imprisoned by her father. The truth of the children's parentage is revealed whereupon she is released from captivity and honoured as the mother of Poseidon's sons.[39] The play also contains political innuendo such as, σὺν τῶι θεῶι χρὴ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἀναστρέφειν βουλεύματ' ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ χρησιμώτερον[40] and τὶ τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἐᾶις τεθνηκέναι καὶ τἀκχυθέντα συλλέγεις ἀλγήματα;[41] The same sentiments are echoed in the *Helen* a year later.

5.5 An Outright Plea for Forgiveness – 412BC

Thus, by 412, Euripides was overtly declaring his support for Alcibiades. He then wrote the *Andromeda,* the *Helen, Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Cyclops* in defence of Alcibiades and as a plea for the people to forgive, and call him back from exile, in order to save Athens.[42]

---

[38] *Lives,* 25.6

[39] Note that in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (547), Aristophanes places Melanippe alongside Phaedra as an example of a pernicious woman. This shows that he discounts Euripides' analogy of Alcibiades being innocent of any wrongdoing.

[40] "The wise should always turn back counsels toward what is more beneficial, in concord with divine influence" Euripides *fr.* 490

[41] "Why do you not let those who have died be dead? Why are you collecting griefs that are already spent?" Euripides *fr.* 507

[42] *Iphigenia at Tauris* is variously dated between 414-412BC, it is my contention that given its similarity of theme to the *Helen* and the current events in Athens, 412 is the most likely date. Both plays deal with a Greek woman held against her will in a far-off land. The Greek men who come to rescue them are initially put to death, but through a series of tricks and recognition, the situation is resolved and a homecoming achieved. There are further parallels between three plays in that in the *Andromeda,* Perseus is on his way to *Argos*, in the *Helen* at line 124, Menelaus is described as going to Argos on his way home and at line 515 in *Iphigenia at Tauris*,

In the *Andromeda,* Euripides creates a mythological scenario reminiscent of the plight of Athens, which was similarly under threat from the sea and reliant on her allies in the Delian League to ward off the enemy. Tied to a rock, Andromeda is facing unknown perils from the sea and laments: τί ποτ' Ἀνδρομέδα περίαλλα κακῶν μέρος ἐξέλαχον θανάτου τλήμων μέλλουσα τυχεῖν; ... ἐκθεῖναι κήτει φορβάν.[43] She calls upon the Chorus of friendly maidens: συνάλγησον, ὡς ὁ κάμινων δακρύων μεταδοὺς ἔιχει κουφοτῆτα μόχθιων.[44]

The scene continues with the appearance of Perseus on his way to Argos: Περσὺς πρὸς Ἄργος ναυστολῶν τὸ Γοργόνος κάρα κομίζων.[45] In Pindar, Apollodorus and Strabo, Perseus rescues Andromeda on his return to Seriphos, and only later travels to Argos.[46] Euripides breaks away from this tradition when Andromeda faces danger coming from the sea in the form of a monster and her rescuer arrives on his way to Argos, and in so doing, makes the link to Alcibiades.

Alcibiades had been banished whilst living at Argos in 415 BC as a result of his indictment on the charge of "...committing sacrilege against the goddesses of Eleusis, Demeter and Kore...".[47] These changes allow Euripides to demonstrate his support for Alcibiades who was, in his view, the rescuer of Athens.

Orestes arrives from Argos to save her. All three plays deal with a damsel in distress and her rescuer coming from across the sea.

[43] "Why ever did I, Andromeda, receive a share of troubles beyond all others? I am miserable and on the verge of death ... ... exposed as fodder for the sea monster" Euripides *fr.* 115-115a

[44] "...grieve with me, for when one who is in trouble shares his tears, he has relief from his toils." Euripides *fr.* 119-120. Thucydides *History* 8.96 describes the feeling in Athens at the time: "And what disturbed them most greatly and most nearly was the thought that the enemy, after their victory, might venture to come straight on at them and sail against Piraeus, which was now left with no navy to defend it; indeed, they expected every moment to see them coming." In Ovid's later adaptation of the Andromeda myth, he describes the monster as, "...parting the waves with the thrust of his huge breast, just as a war-galley, strongly propelled by its sweating oarsmen." (*Metamorphoses,* 4.705-707.) Although the reason for his representation of the monster as a war galley is unknown, the analogy is clear, and may well have been influenced by Euripides' *Andromeda*.

[45] "...I, Perseus, ply my winged foot, as I sail to Argos to bring the Gorgon's head." Euripides *fr.* 124

[46] Pindar, *Pythian Odes,* 10.46-48, Pseudo-Apollodorus, *The Library of Greek Mythology,* II.4.3, Strabo**,** *The Geography* 10.5.10

[47] Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 22

Andromeda (Athens) is willing to give herself at any cost in return for salvation: ἄγου δέ μ', ὦξεῖν', εἴτε πρόσπολον θέλεις εἴτ' ἄλοχον εἴτε δμωΐδ'.[48] This suggests that Euripides was in favour of finding a peace settlement, even if it meant some loss of face for Athens. It would seem that Athens was of the same view. Thucydides reports that in early 411 BC the Athenian Assembly voted to send an embassy to try to persuade Alcibiades and the Persian king to support Athens against the Peloponnesians.[49] A resolution such as this would not have been made lightly and no doubt discussions had been taking place in Athens for some time before the decision was finally made. The embassy was given the power to offer whatever terms they considered necessary, even if it meant fundamental changes to the Athenian constitution.[50] Euripides then highlights what he perceives to be Athens' lack of appreciation towards Alcibiades when Perseus expresses his concern: ὦ παρθέν', εί σώσαιμί σ', εἴσηι μοι χάριν;[51]

Alcibiades is not the only politician referred to in the remaining sections of the *Andromeda,* Pericles is also implicitly mentioned. The sea-monster is seen approaching the maiden and Perseus, having saved her, is then warned by Andromeda's father: ἐγὼ δὲ παῖδας οὐκ ἐῶ νόθους λαβεῖν· τῶν γνησίων γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄντες ἐνδεεῖς νόμωι νοσοῦσιν· ὅ σε φυλάξασθαι χρεών.[52] Whilst some versions of the myth speak of another suitor for Andromeda, there is no extant mention of her father expressing concern over the legitimacy of their offspring.[53] Therefore, this must be another addition by Euripides to comment on the Periclean marriage laws to

---

[48] "Take me stranger, whether for servant, wife or slave." Euripides *fr.* 129a

[49] Thucydides 8.81, Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 26

[50] Thucydides, 8.53-54

[51] "Maiden, if I should save you, will you show me gratitude?" Euripides *fr.* 129

[52] "I forbid the getting of bastard children. Though not at all inferior to legitimate ones, they are disadvantaged by custom or law. You must guard against this." Euripides *fr.* 141

[53] Pseudo-Apollodorus *Library* 2.4.3, Hyginus *Fabulae* 64, Ovid *Metamorphoses* 5.1-235

reinforce those he had made earlier in the *Medea*.[54] This illustrates that whilst he had changed his mind about Alcibiades, he remained constant in his criticism of Pericles.

Although there are extensive lacunae, the remaining fragments could be used to show that Euripides intended the *Andromeda* to carry a political message: a call for peace negotiations, with Alcibiades as a major player in the process. Thus by the time of the *Andromeda,* the *Helen* and *Iphigenia at Tauris* in 412BC, Euripides had, for whatever reason, come around to the idea that there really was no other way to save Athens. Indeed, given the content of the *Ion* and *Captive Melanippe*, it is likely that Euripides had begun to have a change of heart during the preceding year. Thucydides tells us that by 412, the Athenians were in despair due to the lack of naval resources.[55]

This mood of desperation is evident not only in the *Andromeda* but also in the *Helen*, where Euripides uses both Helen *and* Menelaus to represent Alcibiades in order to make the case for his forgiveness and advocate his return as the saviour of Athens. The most obvious of the many parallels that appear between Alcibiades' life and the adventures of Euripides' Helen, is that many deaths also allegedly took place in the name of Alcibiades, and Euripides is keen to absolve him of guilt, as he does Helen.

Euripides also uses Menelaus to represent the politician when, amongst other references, Menelaus shows regret, laments the dead of Troy and longs to return

[54] Euripides' *Medea* emphasises the dangerous position of illegitimate children but does not make any comment upon whether or not they are inferior. This different approach is further evidence of his changed political stance influenced by the fact that both Pericles and Alcibiades had illegitimate children whom they recognised in law. See also Delebecque (1951:338-346) on this passage for the suggestion that Euripides is representing Alcibiades as Perseus as a way of criticising his lax sexual morals, particularly regarding his affair with Timaea, the Spartan queen c. 413BC. It is my contention that the references are also political in nature given the paucity of evidence in which can be seen Euripides' criticism of sexual morality and the plethora of those within which one can see political comment.

[55] Thucydides, 8.1

home.[56] Throughout antiquity, Helen's name was synonymous with death and destruction but in Euripides' version, he shows that a signifier does not only convey meaning in and of itself, but that the meaning is created in relation to the other elements alongside which it stands. He removes the 'usual' connotations attached to Helen's name by placing her in a different situation. Thus, the tragedian's message is that whilst Alcibiades (Helen) may previously have made ill-informed decisions, he (she) is in a different situation now and should be allowed the chance of redemption. The Chorus predict that the *polis* will never be free from violence if they rely on weapons instead of words to resolve disputes.[57] This would seem to indicate that Euripides advocated the recommencement of negotiations between Athens and Sparta with Alcibiades representing Athens.

Euripides also connects Iphigenia's story with that of Alcibiades. The *Iphigenia at Tauris* is based on a rescue *topos* and an alternative version of the myth. As in the *Helen,* Euripides introduced elements of mythic novelty to show that there are two sides to every story and that one should not necessarily believe what one hears.[58] Instead of being shown as a woman spared from sacrifice, Iphigenia is portrayed as a woman scorned, jilted at the altar by Achilles: Ἰφιγένεια Θέτιδος δ᾽ ὁ τῆς Νηρῇδος ἔστι παῖς ἔτι; - Ὀρέστης: οὐκ ἔστιν: ἄλλως λέκτρ᾽ ἔγημ᾽ ἐν Αὐλίδι. - Ἰφιγένεια: δόλια γάρ, ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ πεπονθότες.[59] Like Iphigenia, Alcibiades had been forced into exile by circumstances beyond his control and was resentful.[60] Both sent letters home telling of their circumstances and expressing the desire to be

[56] Euripides *Helen*, 397-9. See Vickers, (1989:41-65) for a comprehensive deconstruction of the *Helen* and the way in which various episodes parallel the life and times of Alcibiades. Further evidence comes from Germain, (1972:268n.43) who suggests that Alcibiades was nicknamed Helen because of his beauty and lack of morals.
[57] Euripides *Helen*, 1155-60
[58] Hyginus and Pseudo-Apollodorus tell of Iphigenia's meeting with Orestes but instead of tricking the barbarians to effect an escape, they are engaged in a fight. Only after the intervention of Athena are they able to sail away to safety. *Fabulae,* 120; *Epitome,* vi.27.
[59] "Iphig: And is the Nereid Thetis' son still living? Orest: No, it was a vain marriage he made at Aulis. Iphig: And spurious, as those who experienced it know!" *Iphigenia at Tauris,* 537-40
[60] Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 38.2

reunited with their kinsmen. Here then, we can see that Euripides uses mythic novelty to connect his plots to the situation facing Alcibiades. In doing so, Euripides uses his plays as a form of propaganda encouraging the Athenian people to think again and to recall Alcibiades from exile.

The date of the *Cyclops* is uncertain; ranging from 424 to 408 it is my contention that it was performed as the satyr play after the *Andromeda,* the *Helen* and *Iphigenia at Tauris* in 412.[61] In keeping with the first three plays of that year, it features a Greek 'hero' held captive by barbarians, seeking a way to escape and return home. Similarly, in the other three plays, the protagonist effects their escape by cunning and manipulating the barbarians.

The action of the *Cyclops* takes place on Sicily, a fact emphasised by Euripides who mentions it no less than fifteen times during the course of the play. This forms a link with the events of the Sicilian expedition that had taken place in the summer of 415 and resulted in the banishment of Alcibiades. There are a number of other similarities in action between contemporary political events concerning Alcibiades and the play's action.

Following the disastrous Sicilian expedition and Alcibiades' banishment, Athenian prisoners were held captive in dire conditions and deprived of food on Sicily for a period of eight months.[62] In the *Cyclops,* Odysseus and his men arrive, asking for bread but are refused. They are held captive and some are killed by the barbarians.[63] Odysseus refuses to hide from his responsibilities in the cave, saying:

> οὐ δῆτ᾽: ἐπεί τᾶν μεγάλα γ᾽ ἡ Τροία στένοι,
> εἰ φευξόμεσθ᾽ ἕν᾽ ἄνδρα, μυρίον δ᾽ ὄχλον
> Φρυγῶν ὑπέστην πολλάκις σὺν ἀσπίδι.
> ἀλλ᾽, εἰ θανεῖν δεῖ, κατθανούμεθ᾽ εὐγενῶς

[61] See Seaford, (1982:161-72) for an in-depth discussion of the metrical features of the *Cyclops* and a discussion about its dating.
[62] Thucydides, 7.87
[63] Euripides *Cyclops,* 133; 375-381

ἢ ζῶντες αἶνον τὸν πάρος συσσώσομεν.[64]

He then refers to his regret over the war dead:

> ἅλις δὲ Πριάμου γαῖ᾽ ἐχήρωσ᾽ Ἑλλάδα,
> πολλῶν νεκρῶν πιοῦσα δοριπετῆ φόνον,
> ἀλόχους τ᾽ ἀνάνδρους γραῦς τ᾽ ἄπαιδας ὤλεσεν
> πολιούς τε πατέρας. εἰ δὲ τοὺς λελειμμένους
> σὺ συμπυρώσας δαῖτ᾽ ἀναλώσεις πικράν,
> ποῖ τρέψεταί τις; ἀλλ᾽ ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ, Κύκλωψ:
> πάρες τὸ μάργον σῆς γνάθου, τὸ δ᾽ εὐσεβὲς
> τῆς δυσσεβείας ἀνθελοῦ: πολλοῖσι γὰρ
> κέρδη πονηρὰ ζημίαν ἠμείψατο.[65]

Both of these speeches are reminiscent of Alcibiades' situation at the time the play was produced. He too had lost his reputation because of the events surrounding the Sicilian expedition and was accused of impiety following destruction of the herms, and he wanted to regain his former prestigious position.[66] The second speech indicates regret for the loss of life caused by war and advice against being impious. The play ends with Odysseus sailing home where he would eventually be met as a hero: ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀκτὰς εἶμι καὶ νεὼς σκάφος ἥσω 'πὶ πόντον Σικελὸν ἔς τ᾽ ἐμὴν πάτραν.[67] The same thing happened to Alcibiades a year later.

Throughout the *Cyclops* we see the parallel of the diverse and cunning characters of Alcibiades and Odysseus; the savage Sicilians and the uncouth Cyclopes, and the play ending with a jubilant victory over the enemy. The final connection comes in a passage from Plutarch that describes the fate of the Athenian prisoners on Sicily:

[64] "I shall not do it. Troy would groan loudly if I were to run from a single man when I stood my ground so often, shield in hand, against a throng of Trojans without number. Rather, if I must die, I will die nobly—or live on and also retain my old reputation." *Cyclops,* 199-202

[65] "Enough bereavement has Priam's land wrought on Greece, drinking down the blood of many corpses shed by the speAristophanes She has brought down wives widowed, old women and grey-beards childless to the grave. And if you mean to cook and consume those left, making a grim feast, where shall anyone turn for refuge? Listen to me, Cyclops: let go of this gluttony and choose to be godly instead of impious: for many have found that base gain brings a recompense of punishment." *Cyclops,* 304-311

[66] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 19.4

[67] "But now I shall go to the beach and launch my ship homeward over the Sicilian Sea." *Cyclops,* 701-2

> Some also were saved for the sake of Euripides. For the Sicilians, it would seem, more than any other Hellenes outside the home land, had a yearning fondness for his poetry. They were forever learning by heart the little specimens and morsels of it which visitors brought them from time to time, and imparting them to one another with fond delight.[68]

Just as Euripides had used myth to express disapproval of Alcibiades in his plays of 415, here he offers support instead of condemnation, which reflects his change in political stance.

Thus, between 416 and 412, Euripides wrote a series of plays, each of which reflected his political views at the time. In 416 the *Suppliant Women, Heracles* and *Electra* were used as a warning against breaking the treaty with Argos and a call to support Alcibiades' policies. Following the Melos affair, in the spring of 415 he wrote the *Alexandros, Palamedes, Trojan Women* and *Sisyphus,* condemning Alcibiades and the results of his policies. After the disastrous Sicilian Expedition, Alcibiades was banished and Euripides again changed his mind and wrote the *Ion* and *Captive Melanippe* in 414 as a call for forgiveness, having decided that if Athens were going to survive, she would need Alcibiades at the helm. The following year saw the *Andromeda,* the *Helen*, *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Cyclops* as overt pleas to recall Alcibiades to Athens. So we can see that in a period of only four years, Euripides goes from supporting, to condemning and back to supporting Alcibiades in the most public of fora, the theatre.

5.6 A Response to Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae*

As a keen political observer, Aristophanes cannot fail to have noticed the shift in Euripides' position. He saw an opportunity to attack his long term rival and took it. And so, in 411, a year after the *Helen* was produced, Aristophanes presented

[68] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 29.2

the *Thesmophoriazusae*. In the play, Aristophanes emphasises Euripides' use of plot as a means of alternately lampooning and supporting Alcibiades. This heralds the introduction of a new literary style for Aristophanes. Instead of overt, crude criticism through political satire, the poet's approach is more sophisticated and sees Euripides' mythic novelty duplicated and presented in a new way.

The structure of the *Thesmophoriazusae* centres on the theme of rescue. Instead of incorporating lines or short scenes from previous plays, Aristophanes patches together large sections of Euripides' rescue plays and he gives Euripides a prominent role. He is "the contriver of ingenious devices",[69] essentially, the 'ideas man', engineering and acting out scenes from his own versions of the myths of Palamedes, Helen and Andromeda in order to rescue the In-Law. By placing Euripides in this role and referring to him by name, Aristophanes signifies and signposts the source of the material he recreates.

In keeping with all of Aristophanes' plays, there are layers of clues designed to build upon the various intellectual competences of the audience until the point at which he makes his intentions clear. A close reading of the texts Aristophanes chooses to parody and the way in which he designs the new scenes, shows that the main point of the play is an attack on Euripides' political vacillation in regard to his support for Alcibiades. On another level, the *Thesmophoriazusae* mocks Euripides' lack of competition success, blaming it on his treatment of women: Εὐριπίδης: αἱ γὰρ γυναῖκες ἐπιβεβουλεύκασί μοι κἀν Θεσμοφόροιν μέλλουσι περί μου τήμερον ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπ᾽ ὀλέθρῳ. Μνησίλοχος: τιὴ τί δή; Εὐριπίδης: ὁτιὴ τραγῳδῶ καὶ κακῶς αὐτὰς λέγω.[70]

[69] Sommerstein, (1994:6)
[70] Euripides: "The women have hatched a plot against me, and today in the Thesmophorian sanctuary they're going to hold an assembly about me with a view to my liquidation." In-Law: "Why, may I ask?" Euripides: "Because I lampoon and slander them in my tragedies." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 81-86.

To make his point, Aristophanes uses the In-Law to represent Alcibiades and in order alert the audience to this, Aristophanes includes a series of verbal signifiers. Initially, he introduces the topic of politics as a major theme of the play. Crytilla warns of those who: ἢ τυραννεῖν ἐπινοεῖ ἢ τὸν τύραννον συγκατάγειν ... ἢ πεμπομένη τις ἀγγελίας ψευδεῖς φέρει,[71] and those who: ὁπόσαι δ᾽ ἐξαπατῶσιν παραβαίνουσί τε τοὺς ὅρκους τοὺς νενομισμένους κερδῶν οὕνεκ᾽ ἐπὶ βλάβῃ, ἢ ψηφίσματα καὶ νόμον ζητοῦσ᾽ ἀντιμεθιστάναι, τἀπόρρητά τε τοῖσιν ἐχθροῖς τοῖς ἡμετέροις λέγουσ᾽...[72] These comments are also designed to remind the audience of Alcibiades. It was well known at the time that Alcibiades' motives were selfish and that he considered himself to be superior to his fellow citizens, hence the reference to aspirations as a dictator. Details of his time spent in Sparta and Persia would also have been common knowledge, so comments about transgressing oaths and disclosing secrets to the enemy would also be recognisable. At the time of this production, the politician had been in exile for four years and Athens was at pains to secure a treaty with Persia.[73] The imminent recall of Alcibiades was 'in the air' and this was enough for Aristophanes to use the rumour in order to attack Euripides, as well as to add his own support for Alcibiades through his personification as the In-Law.[74]

As the play progresses, Aristophanes introduces the issue of Euripides' political caprice and sets out to criticise it. After he is captured by the women, the In-Law is isolated from the men of Athens, and is looking around for Euripides to

[71] "...aspire to rule as a dictator or to join in restoring the dictator..... or is sent on errands and brings back false information" *Thesmophoriazusae* 339-344

[72] "...deceive us and transgress the customary oaths, or seek to invert decrees and laws, or disclose secrets to our enemies." *Thesmophoriazusae* 358-364; Thucydides, 6.12.2; 6.12.2f; 6.16.6. See also 6.89.3-6 where Thucydides alleges Alcibiades' scorn for democracy and his desire to overthrow it.

[73] At the same time, he was keen to be recalled and gave Tissaphernes and the Persian King advice that would eventually be to his advantage. Thucydides, 8.47

[74] Thucydides, 8.97. Lang, (1967:176-187) offers a comprehensive day-by-day account of the negotiations that were taking place during this time.

save him. Aristophanes has designed this situation to reflect Euripides' condemnation of Alcibiades in his plays of 415. The In-Law (Alcibiades) laments: ὁ μὲν γὰρ αἴτιος κἄμ᾽ ἐσκυλίσας ἐς τοιαυτὶ πράγματα οὐ φαίνεταί πω.[75]

Here, Aristophanes is making the point that despite his earlier support (in *Suppliant Women, Heracles, Electra* and the Epinician written in 416), Euripides abandoned Alcibiades and condemned him in the plays of 415, after his part in the Melos affair was revealed. The point is reinforced when the In-Law decides that the only solution is to send a message on oars as Oeax had done in Euripides' *Palamedes*.[76] Instead of using oar blades however, the In-Law sees the votive tablets and says: τί δ᾽ ἂν εἰ ταδὶ τἀγάλματ᾽ ἀντὶ τῶν πλατῶν γράφων διαρρίπτοιμι; ξύλον γέ τοι καὶ ταῦτα κἀκεῖν᾽ ἦν ξύλον.[77] Given that the Thesmophoria is a festival in honour of Demeter and Kore, these votive tablets must have been in their honour and, therefore, this is likely to be a reference to Alcibiades' alleged sacrilege of the Eleusinian mysteries, which were also held in the goddesses' honour.[78]

The point is that when time Euripides wrote *Palamedes* in the spring of 415, he was against Alcibiades. By the time the *Thesmophoriazusae* was written in 411, he had changed his mind and offered his support. Here then, Alcibiades (the In-Law playing the part of Palamedes) is calling upon Euripides (his former critic and literary creator) to rescue him.[79] Aristophanes is making it clear that Euripides has had a change of heart, which highlights the tragedian's political inconsistency.

---

[75] "... the man who's responsible for all this, the man who pitched me into all this trouble, hasn't put in an appearance..." *Thesmophoriazusae* 766

[76] Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 765. From Euripides *fr.* 588a where Oeax, the brother of Palamedes, writes on oars to alert their father of his death. Scholiast to *Thesmophoriazusae,* 771 states that Oeax wrote messages on ships' timbers which he set adrift so that they should reach Euboea and be read by his father Nauplius.

[77] "What if I was to write on these votive tablets instead of the oar-blades and throw them around in all directions? After all, these are wood and those were wood too." *Thesmophoriazusae* 774-5

[78] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 22

[79] The implication is that Euripides had the power to influence Athenian opinion through his plays.

The message would be even stronger for audience members who knew the myth of Palamedes. One version of tells of an accusation of treachery being laid against Palamedes after the discovery of a letter from Priam in his tent at Troy.[80] This is intended to highlight and criticise Alcibiades' involvement in the intrigues and betrayals that surrounded the exchange of letters between Phrynichus, Astyochus and Alcibiades during the course of the events at Samos.[81] Another version tells of Palamedes sending messages into the enemy camp attached to spears.[82] This is intended to highlight Alcibiades' underhand contact with the enemy and to whom he eventually defected. In the third, Oeax, Palamedes' brother, sends a message to Clytemnestra relaying the news that Agamemnon is bringing Cassandra home as his mistress, an act which results in his murder.[83] Euripides' message had been clear: Alcibiades could not be trusted.

In the votive tablet scene then, we see that Aristophanes is using myth and its previous representations in tragedy in a different way than he had in his earlier productions. He is playing upon the meaning of the myths, before and after Euripides' introduction of mythic novelty, and using it against him.

The complexity of these semiotics may have been lost on some of the audience and so in order to ensure that everyone knew who the In-Law represented, the character says: οἴμοι τουτὶ τὸ ῥῶ μοχθηρόν.[84] This is an allusion to Alcibiades' speech impediment, which had already been hinted at in the first line of the play when the In-Law asks: ὦ Ζεῦ χελιδὼν ἆρά ποτε φανήσεται;[85] This choice of phrase, when in fact the festival takes place in the autumn and hence the wrong season for swallows, allows Aristophanes to create a play on words. Alcibiades is alluded to

[80] Scholiast to Euripides *Orestes*, 432; Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 105
[81] Thucydides, 8.50
[82] Alcidamas, *Odysseus,* 22
[83] Hyginus, *Fabulae,* 117
[84] "...dammit this letter *rho* is giving me trouble." *Thesmophoriazusae*, 780
[85] "...is a swallow really going to appear?" *Thesmophoriazusae* 1

again when Euripides says to the In-Law: καὶ μὴν βεβίνηκας σύ γ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἶσθ᾽ ἴσως,[86] which is a reference to allegations that Aristophanes witnessed Alcibiades' attempts to sodomise Agathon at a symposium four years earlier.[87] Cleisthenes also comments on the In-Law's sexuality when he says: ἰσθμόν τιν᾽ ἔχεις ὦνθρωπ᾽: ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τὸ πέος διέλκεις πυκνότερον Κορινθίων.[88] This, together with the deliberate use of language designed to highlight Alcibiades' speech defect, is evidence of the personification.[89]

Having established the identity of his protagonists (the In-Law as Alcibiades and Euripides as himself), Aristophanes introduces the first of four plays that the tragedian had produced the year before to show his support for Alcibiades. The numerous attempts at rescue Euripides plays out are also used as a reflection of the various times Alcibiades attempted to rescue Athens.

The poet's metacomedy is evident when the In-Law asks: τῷ δῆτ᾽ ἂν αὐτὸν προσαγαγοίμην δράματι; ἐγῷδα: τὴν καινὴν Ἑλένην μιμήσομαι. πάντως ὑπάρχει μοι γυναικεία στολή.[90] This is a reference to the newly transformed character of Helen in Euripides' play produced a year earlier. In it, her ghost went to Troy whilst she remained safe in Egypt, seemingly innocent of the deaths that took place in her

[86] "And yet you've fucked him – but perhaps you're not aware of the fact!" *Thesmophoriazusae,* 35. This, together with the deliberate use of language designed to highlight Alcibiades' speech defect, is further evidence of the personification. Vickers (1989:42) He goes on to suggest that Euripides also uses language in order to signify his representation of Alcibiades as Menelaus in the *Helen* at 1593. (1989:63). Sommerstein (1994:157 n.1) asserts that there is no reason to suppose that the In-Law represents any real-life person and describes this comment as a reference to Agathon's reputation as a male prostitute. Sidwell (2009:266) argues that the Relative [In-Law] is intended as the personification of Eupolis and that the plot relies on a reference to Cratinus' *fr.* 342 in which he criticises Aristophanes for plagiarising the work of Euripides; playing on the joke that Euripides is forced to use his own tragedies to save his characters. Given the political climate in Athens at the time, and Aristophanes' propensity for political rather than literary satire and his habit of casting prominent politicians in leading roles, I disagree with this assessment and would argue the In-Law must be the representation of Alcibiades.

[87] Plato *Symp.* 222. See Littman (1970:263-276) for a comprehensive discussion of Alcibiades' sexual exploits; and Ath. 12.534c; 13.547d, Diog. 4.49, Plut. *Alc.* 2.2-3; 16.1; 23.6, Plato *Symp.* 222 for rumours of his lax morals, effeminacy and bisexuality.

[88] "You've got an Isthmus Tramway running there, mate; you're shuttling your prick this way and that more incessantly than the Corinthians do." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 649

[89] See Vickers (1989:42). He goes on to suggest that Euripides also uses language in order to signify his representation of Alcibiades as Menelaus in the *Helen* at 1593. (1989:63)

[90] "What play can I use to entice him here? I know; I'll act his new Helen." Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 850.

name. When Aristophanes says that he is going to use his 'new' Helen, it is clear that he recognised the changes Euripides had made to the original myth in his play as well as the fact that the tragedian used this as a metaphor offering support for Alcibiades when the play was produced in 412.[91]

To attempt a rescue of the In-Law, Euripides dresses in sailcloth, pretending to be Menelaus and attempts to rescue 'Helen' from the women. Aristophanes recreates Euripides' version of their meeting, their recognition and reconciliation with husband and wife playing their part realistically.[92] However, Crytilla constantly interrupts and breaks the illusion by pointing out that 'Helen' is in fact a man, dressed as a woman, which reminds the audience that (s)he represents Alcibiades.[93]

The rescue attempt fails and Aristophanes creates another scenario, this time using Euripides' *Andromeda.* Aristophanes creates this scene to mock Euripides for his change of heart as well as to create visual humour on a basic level through slapstick.

Aristophanes then introduces Echo (probably the same actor who was playing Euripides) as coming out of character to say: Ἠχὼ λόγων ἀντῳδὸς ἐπικοκκάστρια, ἥπερ πέρυσιν ἐν τῷδε ταὐτῷ χωρίῳ Εὐριπίδῃ καὐτὴ ξυνηγωνιζόμην.[94] This is more than a verbal signifier of parody; it is designed to show Euripides' 'mimicking' the politicians with whom he formerly disagreed.[95]

---

[91] Vickers (1989:41-65). Thucydides 8.47 tells of Alcibiades' actions when he was trying to find a way to be recalled to Athens, thus indicating a longing to return home. See also Drew (1930) for a breakdown of the temporal aspects of the *Helen* and their connection to the events of the war. Further useful commentaries on the political aspects of the *Helen* appear in Delebeque (1951), Dale (1967) and Kannicht (1969).

[92] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 885-930

[93] Aristophanes uses this technique as a way of creating additional humour. The two main characters in the scene, Menelaus and Helen, are in effect, playing out a play within a play. This requires the other characters to suspend their disbelief and accept the action, whilst the audience suspend their disbelief and accept one within the other. In this way when Crytilla breaks the illusion, the audience then become part of the action as she is breaking it for them at the same time.

[94] "Echo, the mocking mimicker of words – the same who last year, in this very place, personally assisted Euripides in the competition." *Thesmophoriazusae* 1059-1061. Note that Echo was also a character in Euripides' *Andromeda.*

[95] Schlesinger (1937:294-305) gives a useful account of the way in which Aristophanes warns his audience that a 'parody is coming' in *Birds, Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata.*

In the next scene, Aristophanes introduces Euripides' *Andromeda* which had been used by the tragedian to support the recall of Alcibiades in 412. Euripides, (playing the part of Perseus) embarks on a mission to save the In-Law (Alcibiades/Andromeda). Perseus, having signalled his intention to do so, enters on a deus ex machina to release Andromeda from her bonds but is thwarted by the intervention of the Scythian Archer.[96] Although humorous at face value, this scene is, in fact, a complex set of signs. It starts with the appearance of Echo and ends with an acknowledgement that words alone are not enough to effect a rescue. Here, Aristophanes is engaging in a dialogue with Euripides to make it clear that he recognised that the *Andromeda* was a plea to allow Alcibiades to return to Athens.[97]

Up to this point in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* there have been two attempts to free the In-Law through recreated scenes from Euripides' plays, both of which fail because the women refuse to suspend their disbelief and accept the roles that are being played out in front of them.[98] The obstacle to the In-Law's release is now the Scythian Archer and the poets (Aristophanes and Euripides) realise that they must try a different tack.

Euripides says of the Archer:

> αἰαῖ: τί δράσω; πρὸς τίνας στρεφθῶ λόγους;
> ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἂν δέξαιτο βάρβαρος φύσις.
> σκαιοῖσι γάρ τοι καινὰ προσφέρων σοφὰ
> μάτην ἀναλίσκοις ἄν, ἀλλ' ἄλλην τινὰ
> τούτῳ πρέπουσαν μηχανὴν προσοιστέον.[99]

It is here that we see Aristophanes' metatheatricality at its very best. The poet demonstrates two things: that he is writing in a novel way, and that he reacts to

[96] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1105-1130
[97] Euripides' *Andromeda* has Perseus (as Alcibiades) rescue Andromeda (as Athens) in order to show his support for the politician and advocate his return as the saviour of Athens.
[98] *Telephus, Palamedes,* the *Helen* and the *Andromeda.*
[99] "Alack! What shall I do, to what words turn? But no, his barbarous mind won't take them in. To feed slow wits with novel subtleties is effort vainly spent. No, I must bring to bear some other scheme, more suited to this man." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1128-1132

the different levels of competence he sees in his audience by commenting on the character's intellectual capabilities.

Euripides is saying that he cannot expect some audience members (the Archer) to understand the complex subtleties of his writing, and so decides to take a more direct approach. He comes out of character to make a deal with the women, agreeing that he will no longer lampoon them in his tragedies if they will let the In-Law go free.[100] Scenes from Euripides' *Iphigenia at Tauris* are then brought into play but Aristophanes constructs the parodies differently this time. There are no complicated costumes, or even repetition of lines that the Archer (the audience) is expected to recognise. Euripides simply approaches the Archer, leading a young dancing girl. The girl, Fawn, is given to the Archer in place of the In-Law. When asked his name, Euripides replies, Artamouxia.[101]

For some, the scene would probably have been a reminder of the myth where Iphigenia was rescued from Aulos by Artemis who then wafts her away leaving a young deer in her place. Aristophanes also makes reference to Euripides' version with the Scythian Archer representing Thoas, whom Iphigenia tricks in order to leave the island.

The In-Law's rescue is finally effected and Fawn (a young deer) is left in place of the In-Law (Iphigenia/Alcibiades) as he and Euripides (Artamouxia/Athena) flee to safety. Finally, the Chorus send the Scythian off in the wrong direction to look for them in the same way that Chorus misled the messenger in *Iphigenia at Tauris*.[102]

[100] This is reminiscent of the scene where Iphigenia pleads with the Chorus to let her and her brother go back to their families. *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1167-70; *Iphigenia at Tauris*, 1065-8
[101] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1160-1202
[102] *Thesmophoriazusae,* 1219-1225; *Iphigenia at Tauris,* 1155-1240; 1293-1301

This final scene is also reminiscent of the closing lines of Euripides' *Cyclops,* which was produced as the satyr play to the three 'tragedies' detailed above. The *Thesmophoriazusae*, the *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Cyclops* all end with a slapstick episode of characters running this way and that, trying to find their prey.[103] In all three plays, the Choruses shout out, directing the pursuers first one way and then another, until the plays end in exasperation with the audience laughing at the foolishness of the Barbarians who are made to look stupid by the Greeks.

Thus, the In-Law/Alcibiades/Athens is saved with the blessing of Euripides and the Chorus Leader/Aristophanes. The mythic novelty introduced by Euripides in the four plays produced in 412 has been turned on its head. When Euripides make numerous attempts to save the In-Law (as Alcibiades), Aristophanes highlights and amplifies the messages contained within the tragedian's plays and, at the same time, highlights his political inconsistency.

A close reading of Aristophanes' sources shows that the poet re-uses mythic novelty as a plot device to criticise the politics of a fellow poet. This method represents an innovation for Aristophanes. The metatheatrics introduced by the poet ensures that his audience recognise this change and we can also see from this, a comment on their competence. It is likely that this change came about for three reasons. Aristophanes and Euripides were engaged in a dialogue throughout their careers and the *Thesmophoriazusae* was a reply to the incorporation of elements Aristophanes' comedies in the *Helen.*[104] Secondly, Aristophanes wanted to criticise Euripides' change in political stance, and lastly, he was making sure that the

[103] Note also the similarities in language between *Cyclops* and the *Thesmophoriazusae* in references to Bacchic worship and the ecstasy of the dance: *Cyclops*, 63-72 and *Thesmophoriazusae* 990-994; *Cyclops* 156-172 and *Thesmophoriazusae* 961

[104] The treatment of Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae* as a response to the comic elements in his *Helen* produced the previous year will be considered in Chapter Six, together with an examination of the reciprocal influence of tragedy and comedy between the works of Euripides and Aristophanes.

audience recognised that he was moving towards a more tragic style of comedy which reflected Euripides' move towards a more comic style of tragedy.

5.7 Theatrical Innovation in *Frogs*

Frogs sees the introduction of further literary innovations. Aristophanes uses a combination of referents from his own and Euripides' previous plays and mixes them in with allusions to recent and current political events. In this way, the audience sees the clues at face value whilst also having their attention drawn to the way in which the allusions were presented in previous productions. By writing in this way, Aristophanes is able to articulate what he sees as the solution to Athens' problem, and that is the recall of Alcibiades.

Euripides employed mythic novelty when writing *Andromeda* in order to support Alcibiades. It is for this reason that Aristophanes chose to make it so obvious in both the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* that he is not using the rescue *topos* from the 'original' myth, but Euripides' version, making Euripides' *Andromeda* into a *topos* in its own right. Effectively, what Aristophanes is inviting the audience to recognise is not the Euripidean version of the myth, but its Aristophanic reflection as created in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, a comically distorted image through which to interpret the action of the new play. As shown above, in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* the In-Law is Alcibiades playing opposite Euripides. In *Frogs,* Alcibiades is represented by Dionysus, who once again plays opposite Euripides, but the roles are reversed as it is now up to Alcibiades to rescue Euripides. Both the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* contain criticism of Euripides but Aristophanes has a different approach in each play. The *Thesmophoriazusae* is an extended criticism of Euripides' political vacillation with no definitive indication of Aristophanes' view of

Alcibiades. *Frogs* is again coy on this topic and Alcibiades' name is not mentioned 'out-loud' until the final few lines of the play.[105]

5.8 Euripides' *Andromeda* as a *topos*

Both Aristophanes and Euripides created texts to encourage a particular reception in their audience. Their referents were carefully constructed to ensure that the audience saw the action through the distorted lens of its previous presentations. The rescue *topos* from Euripides' *Andromeda* is a case in point as both poets used and manipulated it, each contributing to a complex idea which continued to be subject to further change according to their innovations. When considering the application of Euripides' *Andromeda* as a *topos* in its own right to *Frogs,* the most obvious analogy, and one that is perfectly plausible, is that Aristophanes considered Dionysus as Perseus and Euripides as Andromeda.[106] Note the parallels in plot between these two plays. The enamoured is seeking to rescue the object of his affection and has to undergo a series of trials. This is similar to the way in which the *topos* is used in the *Thesmophoriazusae* when Euripides sets out to rescue Alcibiades, the object of *his* affection. Dionysus crosses over the swamp, encounters

[105] *Frogs,* 1424. Alcibiades had returned from exile in 408/7 but by the time *Frogs* was produced in 405, he was once again in exile, albeit on a voluntary basis. See Halliwell, (1991:55-6) for an in-depth discussion of the legislation that was in place by 430 which forbade lampooning politicians by name. Ruffell, (2002:140) suggests, however, that portrait masks may have been used to identify rivals.

[106] Sfyroeras, (2008:302) suggests that the roles are reversed and that it is Euripides who represents Perseus and that Dionysus is Andromeda. His reasoning is that in Euripides' *Andromeda,* the Chorus say: ἄνοικτος ὃς τεκών σε τὰν πολυπονωτάταν βροτῶν μεθῆκεν Ἄιδα πάτρας ὑπερθανεῖν. "Pitiless the man who sired you, the most afflicted of mortals, and gave you over to Hades to die for your fatherland." Euripides *fr.* 120 indicates that Andromeda's death would be more advantageous to her family than her rescue. The second part of his argument is the fact that Dionysus' is dressed in an effeminate way and his longing described as πόθος which, he states, often conveys a female desire for "a man who is forever gone or dead or simply out of reach." citing Penelope's longing for Odysseus (Homer, *Od.* 1.343); the Persian women's longing for their husbands, (Aeschylus *Pers.* 133) and Deianira's longing for her husband, (Sophocles *Tr.*103). He does not dismiss the opposite analogy, saying that the hypotheses are not mutually exclusive and that they both contribute to the complexity of gender roles within *Frogs.* The important point in either case is that Aristophanes is using Euripides' version of the *Andromeda* because of the connotations it arouses.

a monster and eventually strikes a deal with the king.[107] This repetition would also be a reminder of Euripides' flexible political affiliations as highlighted in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. But, of course, this was too simplistic for Aristophanes, who wanted to continue his dialogue with the recently deceased tragedian and, in doing so, create an even more innovative use of the *Andromeda topos.*

Throughout the last twenty years of their careers, Aristophanes and Euripides had been engaged in a dialogue, a sparring match of sorts, which was played out through the content of their plays.[108] By 405, Alcibiades was once again in exile and Euripides was dead, so there was no one left to write plays in his support. Aristophanes therefore sets out to rectify the situation and has Alcibiades return the compliment by going to Hades to rescue Euripides so that he can once again canvass on his behalf. So here we see another use of the *Andromeda* topos. Dionysus, as Alcibiades, sets out to bring Euripides back from the dead because if the tragedian starts writing again, the state of tragedy will be saved; and if he writes plays that advocate the recall of Alcibiades, the State of Athens will also be saved. The plan is that Alcibiades (Dionysus) will set Euripides and Aeschylus against each other in a literary competition, which he expects Euripides to win. Unfortunately he loses and so Alcibiades (Dionysus) has to think of another way to proclaim him the winner. Then comes the question that represents the crux of the play – the tragedians are asked what they think of Alcibiades, should he be returned to power? At this point, Aristophanes interrupts the action so that he can have the final word in the sparring match between himself and Euripides. Aristophanes had already created the *Thesmophoriazusae* as a way of showing that Euripides was as fickle in his support

[107] See previous Chapter for a discussion of Moorton's parallel where Perseus, inspired by the beauty of Andromeda, sets out to rescue her from death whilst Dionysus, inspired by the beauty of the *Andromeda*, sets out to rescue its author from death.
[108] The evidence for this hypothesis will be discussed in Chapter six.

as Alcibiades was in his politics and so here, he reminds the audience of this, by holding up the mirror to his previous play, and has Euripides change his mind once again. Whilst Aeschylus votes to return Alcibiades, Euripides votes against him. Alcibiades' plan is foiled and Aristophanes has the last laugh.

At the time of writing the *Frogs,* the situation in Athens was dire and at the forefront of everyone's mind must have been the situation with Sparta and the hope of a resolution. Plutarch tells us:

> They sorrowfully rehearsed all their mistakes and follies, the greatest of which they considered to be their second outburst of wrath against Alcibiades. He had been cast aside for no fault of his own; but they got angry because a subordinate of his lost a few ships disgracefully, and then they themselves, more disgracefully still, robbed the city of its ablest and most experienced general. And yet, in spite of their present plight, a vague hope still prevailed that the cause of Athens was not wholly lost so long as Alcibiades was alive.[109]

This being the case, it would not be difficult for Aristophanes to push his audience into recognising any analogy that might be suggestive of the politician. Although Alcibiades is only mentioned once by name, his inclusion is vitally important as it is the poets' attitude towards him that defines the action and the outcome of the play.

The physical representation of Alcibiades as Dionysus in a saffron gown covered with a lion-skin is a hybrid of other characters that is reminiscent of the politician in reality, and the way he had been represented in the *Thesmophoriazusae*.[110] Dionysus is referred to as the son of Zeus, which again reminds us of Alcibiades, as the nickname of his adoptive father, Pericles, had been

---

[109] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 38.2

[110] The saffron gown was also worn by the In-Law (Alcibiades) in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and adds an effeminate touch which reminds us of Alcibiades' bi-sexuality. The lion-skin is reference to Alcibiades having been brought up in the house of Pericles which resulted in him being known as the 'Lion's whelp' (Herodotus VI.131 and Plutarch, *Pericles*, 3, tell of Pericles' mother having a dream just before she gave birth to Pericles. In it, she gave birth to a lion). Alcibiades encouraged the nick-name when, as a young man in the wrestling arena, he was accused of biting like a girl, to which he replied, 'No. Like a lion' (Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 2). Aeschylus refers to Alcibiades as the lion's whelp at *Frogs,* 1432.

the Olympian.[111] The procession of *mystai* that leads down to Hades reminds the audience of that arranged by Alcibiades when he led the initiates in triumph from Athens to Eleusis by land for the first time because the Spartan occupation of Decelea in 413 had forced the delegation to approach by sea.[112]

Alcibiades is also referred to in the *parabasis* with the Chorus Leader calling for the people to tone down their anger against those who may have erred, on the grounds that they have fought in a great many naval battles.[113]

The Chorus Leader steps forward and reminds the audience: τὸν ἱερὸν χορὸν δίκαιόν ἐστι χρηστὰ τῇ πόλει ξυμπαραινεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν.[114] Their advice is particularly important in this context because they are initiates of Demeter and Kore. Having established their importance, more advice follows. A plea is made to forgive anyone who may have fallen foul of Phrynichus and to clear the charges made against them. Phrynichus had been assassinated in 411, an event that led to the fall of the Four Hundred.[115] The inclusion of his name was deliberate in order to detract any blame from Alcibiades in the establishment of the hated oligarchic regime.[116] Here, the Chorus represents to voice of the Poet seeking to influence the views of the audience and are, in effect, the 'idealised spectator' who react to and accept the

---

[111] Plutarch, *Pericles,* 6.3 says that this is because he was responsible for the construction of the Acropolis complex and because when speaking in public, he spoke with thunder and lightning, wielding a dreadful thunderbolt in his tongue.
[112] Rehm, (2002:213). Note that Alcibiades had earlier been accused of sacrilege against the Herms and impiety towards the goddesses of Kore and Demeter. Having him lead the procession here reminds the audience that he has been acquitted of the charge.
[113] *Frogs,* 686-705.
[114] "It is right and proper for the sacred Chorus to take part in giving good advice and instruction to the community." *Frogs,* 686. The same claim is made by both Aeschylus and Euripides later in the play. (1008-10; 1053-5). Similarly, Aristophanes himself puts himself forward as a teacher of the people in *Acharnians,* 634-5; 650-1; 656-8 and *Wasps,* 650-1.
[115] Thucydides, 8.92.2
[116] Moorton, (1988:358n.40)

message contained within the scene, and who then translate that message to the audience, urging them to accept it.[117]

The speech that follows describes the kind of man who had been insulted by the Athenians: well-born, virtuous, honest, fine, upstanding, reared in wrestling schools and the sponsor of Choruses.[118] This description is again reminiscent of Alcibiades. He was aristocratic; his tutor was Socrates who instilled such virtues into the young. Alcibiades was also a talented musician, notorious for visiting wrestling schools, and had sponsored various Choruses.[119]

The obstacles that Dionysus has to face on his journey to Hades are also evocative of Alcibiades' career. Both have encounters with initiates (in the form of processions), they cross the water (Dionysus the river, and Alcibiades the sea) and encounter a king (Dionysus, Pluto and Alcibiades, the kings of Persia and Sparta).

Once in Hades, the literary contest begins between Aeschylus and Euripides with Dionysus as referee. Each adds words to a metaphorical set of scales to see whose are heavier. Euripides is thwarted time and time again with Dionysus having to explain where he is going wrong. Eventually, the contest is over and although it is clear that Aeschylus has the heaviest words and is therefore the winner, Dionysus refuses to make a decision.[120] At the beginning of the play, it had been made clear that Euripides was the object of the rescue, but here, Aristophanes changes his mind and introduces another topic. Here we have come back full circle to the relationship between the two poets.

For Aristophanes, the object of the play was twofold. He wanted to remind the audience of the relationship between Euripides and Alcibiades that he had

[117] Calame (1999:126-127) goes on to discuss the effect of choral action upon the civic community and on their shared values and social and institutional practices in tragedy. The same principle applies to comedy, particularly given the interactive nature of the genre.
[118] *Frogs,* 718-737
[119] Plutarch, *Alcibiades,* 1.21,16.4,; Xenophon, *Memorabilia,* 1.2.24
[120] *Frogs,* 1410

previously demonstrated in the *Thesmophoriazusae*¸ as well as find a way to advocate Alcibiades' return. In order to do this, Alcibiades goes to Hades to seek Euripides so that the tragedian can return to Athens and write more plays about him but Euripides denounces the politician, Aeschylus wins the prize of salvation[121] and Aristophanes has made his point.

5.9 The end of an era – Aristophanes and the final throes of comedy

The examination of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* has shown that Aristophanes' literary style changed towards the end of his career. His allusions and criticisms became less overt, and more in the style of Euripides. This must have been influenced by the mood in Athens as the end of the war approached.

The Peloponnesian War had been raging for almost all Aristophanes' adult life and so it is little wonder that his plays were littered with references to its effects. Together with his contemporary, Euripides, he wrote plays that commented on the events and personages concerned with the war. They discussed the decisions made by politicians and the suffering that resulted from them. Both playwrights called for peace and stability of government whilst concealing messages behind the masks of comedy or tragedy. Both poets also borrowed from each other in terms of style and language and enjoyed a lifetime of banter in the theatre.[122] However, by 405BC when *Frogs* was produced, things had changed. Euripides and the other great tragedians were dead. Athens was on the brink of defeat. Never before had the city

[121] *Frogs,* 1472. Athens needed a strong, fearless leader to save her and at 1432 Aeschylus refers to Alcibiades as a lion, the strongest and most fearless of all animals. Aristophanes had earlier referred to Cleophon as a swallow (680-1) and Cleigenes as a monkey (708) showing that in his opinion, they were not up to the job of defending Athens. Aeschylus had been dead for at least six years before Alcibiades was born, and therefore, the view he expresses can only be that of Aristophanes. Aeschylus was the poet of the generation that fought against the Persians and created the Athenian Empire five years before Alcibiades was born. Dover, (1972:183). Xenophon *Hellenica* 2.1.25-6 states that Alcibiades' advice might have saved Athens but that it was rejected by the generals, especially Tydeus and Menander. For details of the actual events, see Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 35f.

[122] The ways in which Aristophanes' comedies and Euripides' tragedies overlapped is discussed in Chapter Six.

been in such peril and this downturn in her fortune was reflected in Aristophanes' dramatic change in style.

Whilst slapstick and scatology remain among the comic elements employed to amuse the audience, the literary contest between Euripides and Aeschylus, as well as the subtle political commentary, take the humorous elements in this play to an unprecedented level of sophistication. This, together with the intricate plot design, is evidence that Aristophanes' style evolved towards the end of his working life, becoming more mature.[123] Gone are the satirical jibes at contemporary politicians, poets and their families. Now Aristophanes presents a plot that is designed in an entirely different way. Between the standard comedic devices are layers of subtlety, which reveal clue after clue about the dire situation facing Athens for those astute enough to recognise them. These finally culminate in Aristophanes' plea to bring back Alcibiades[124] as the city's only saviour.[125]

The successful outcome of the rescue will mean the appearance of a ghost in Athens during this time of crisis. Here again we can see that Aristophanes' style is changing since ghosts only usually appear in tragedy and even then, at times of intense crisis.[126] The audience are reminded of the appearance of Darius in Aeschylus' *Persians* at a time when the Persian Empire had suffered a catastrophic

---

[123] Schlesinger (1937:305) states, "...parody bubbles up everywhere in the earlier plays and becomes less frequent later: parody is to a large extent a young man's game."

[124] The plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae* is constructed around Aristophanes' support for Alcibiades, but aside from this and other veiled references, (see Sidwell 2009 for a full discussion of these instances and their significance), he is only mentioned by name specifically in three plays. In the fragments of the *Banqueters* (427BC), the significance is impossible to ascertain, in *Wasps* (44-6) Alcibiades' speech impediment is referred to but in *Frogs,* Dionysus overtly seeks the opinions of Aeschylus and Euripides upon his policies. *Acharnians* has an implicit reference at 716 where he is referred to as "a wide-arsed fast talker, the son of Cleinias".

[125] Delebecque (1967:358) is of the opinion that Aristophanes advocates the return of Alcibiades in order to alleviate the lack of military leadership in Athens after the Arginusae trial.

[126] Green (1996:17-18), provides a discussion of the *topos* of raising a hero from the dead in tragedy and states, "One may speculate that behind the actual staging [of tragedy] there lies quite a primitive element in which the heroes or successful leaders of the past are summoned by those in need of leadership and direction in the present". Eupolis also uses this *topos* in the *Demes* in which he raises Solon, Aristides, Miltiades and Pericles from the dead in order to restore stability to Athens, again at a time of crisis.

collapse.[127] The people of Athens were aware that they too, were facing imminent defeat.

This change in mood is reflected in Aristophanes' writing. *Frogs* is similar to earlier plays in terms of scatological and obscene humour, but only in the first half. The light-hearted banter is left behind and does not reappear in any of Aristophanes' later extant plays. Even Dionysus changes from an incompetent buffoon to a character concerned with more serious issues. The two sections are sharply separated by a parabasis dealing with political and moral questions.[128] We are alerted to the change in tone and the coming political discussion in the Chorus Leader's speech, which states that it is the role of the Chorus to instruct the community.[129] Although it is Phrynichus who is named as the one who is responsible for the oligarchic regime, it is likely that Aristophanes does this is in order to conceal the role played by Alcibiades in its establishment and thus allow him to promote Alcibiades' recall later in the play.

5.10 Conclusions

As discussed at the end of Chapter Four, in the first fifty lines of *Frogs,* Aristophanes lays down a series of clues designed to inform the audience what is to come in terms of plot. This section of the play culminates with the explicit mention of the *Andromeda* being read on Cleisthenes' ship, reiterating that the threat to Athens comes from across the sea. By having a character on a war ship reading a play, Aristophanes is placing the theatre at the centre of war and the politics that surround it. War and its politics are brought into the centre of the theatre. Aristophanes is undoubtedly making the point that although *Frogs* is, at face value, a

[127] Aeschylus, *Persians* 821-842
[128] *Frogs,* 674ff. See Henderson (1975:91) for a breakdown of the various sections of the play.
[129] *Frogs,* 687

story about the quest to bring a poet back from the dead in order to save tragedy, it is, in fact, also going to contain an intensely political message. It is not the suggestion of this Chapter that Aristophanes' use of humour to convey a political message is anything new but, instead, that his use of myth in *Frogs* in order to do so, represents a continuation of a change in style that began with the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

Unusually, *Frogs* has two Choruses: the Chorus of frogs and the Chorus of initiates of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[130] This is a stark reminder of the fear that must have been current in Athens, with its impending destruction and resultant casualties. The serious nature of the quest is only thinly disguised behind the mask of comedy and the more competent audience members would no doubt have recognised the rescue *topos,* having seen it both in tragedy and comedy. The Chorus is more than a reflection of Athens' mood however; they make comment upon the politicians that have brought them to this state, foreshadowing the play's later change in emphasis from concern about the state of tragedy, to concern for the State of Athens. [131] There is also an element of irony in having Eleusinian initiates[132] involved in a quest that ultimately promotes the policies of Alcibiades, given that he had earlier been accused of sacrilege against the goddess Eleusis and consequently having his estate confiscated, and his name publicly cursed by all priests and priestesses.[133]

---

[130] The only other extant play to have two active Choruses is *Lysistrata*, although the Chorus of *Peace* assume different roles in different parts of the play.

[131] *Frogs,* 360-355. The same sentiments are echoed by Thucydides (2.65) who blames Athens' downfall on the politicians saying "Such policies when successful, only brought credit and advantage to individuals, and when they failed, the whole war potential of the state was impaired."

[132] Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 8.34 tells of Alcibiades arranging for troops to escort the initiates to Eleusis and thereby increasing his popularity shortly after his return to Athens in 407.

[133] Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 8.22. Reference is also made to these events in the *Thesmophoriazusae* with the In-Law, as the representation of Alcibiades, violating a similar festival to Demeter and Kore at the Thesmophoria. See also Lysias *Orations* 14.1 condemning Alcibiades. Note however that in 407BC the charges against Alcibiades in this regard had been officially withdrawn and therefore their inclusion could well be seen as a comment on the injustice of the original accusation. Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 8.33

The structure of *Frogs* is also a reflection of Aristophanes' writing career. The play does not end with a party and its customary drunkenness and sex. Instead the Chorus wish for the end of "great suffering and terrible encounters in arms".[134] Both Choruses in *Frogs* are dead so too are the original and the ultimate objects of the rescue mission. The action takes place in the underworld. These elements, combined with the use of the rescue *topos* from the *Andromeda,* (rather than the actual *content* of the Andromeda), show that Aristophanes had contrived to create a comedy after the style of tragedy. This is because by the time Aristophanes wrote *Frogs* in 405 BC, Athens was facing imminent destruction and there was nothing funny about politics any more. The time for jokes was over.

The only two extant plays written after this time show no trace of Aristophanes' earlier style. In the *Ecclesiazusae,* there are signs of a move away from Old Comedy with not a single character named after a real Athenian.[135] The women's quest for equality lacks the fast paced punch of *Lysistrata* and a serious sense of purpose. *Wealth,* the final extant play, is dated to 388 BC and has a feeling of what we can now identify as New Comedy about it, with issues more concerned with the domestic than the *polis*. Poverty speaks second in the *agon*, which is usually the winning position, but her argument that hard work makes men virtuous is trampled by Chremylus.[136] Both of these plays have a feel of irony about them and lack the power of Aristophanes' earlier work. It is as if the light went out for Aristophanes at the same time that it went out for Athens. These later plays show that the mood in Athens was very different from when Aristophanes produced the witty, satiric banter of his earlier works. They continue the sombre underlying mood that is so evident in *Frogs.*

[134] *Frogs*, 1532-1532
[135] Produced c. 391BC
[136] *Wealth,* 454-625

Thus, the move towards a more tragic approach to comedy in terms of style and content had begun with the *Thesmophoriazusae* in 411. Intriguingly, at the same time that Aristophanes was becoming more serious, Euripides was becoming less so. His plays also began to show signs of New Comedy, with scenes and plot devices that were more reminiscent of comic drama than tragedy. It was as if whilst Aristophanes recognised that there was nothing left to laugh at, Euripides set out to compensate. As a result, the line between comedy and tragedy began to blur with the audience getting a series of comedies that made them think seriously and tragedies at which they could legitimately laugh.

Chapter Six

Aristophanes and Euripides - A *Synkrisis*?

πολλὰ μὲν γέλοιά μ᾽ εἰπεῖν, πολλὰ δὲ σπουδαῖα[1]

6.1 Introduction

Having looked at the ways in which Aristophanes uses Euripides' ideas, *topoi* and texts in the creation of his own, the final Chapter of this thesis takes the discussion a stage further and will argue that as the careers of the two poets progressed and their work continued to overlap, the notion of genre became blurred.

Whilst some fifth-century plays can definitively be categorised as tragedy or comedy, there are others that contain elements of both. It is this aspect of literature that I seek to address by considering how the definition of genre came into being. I will conclude that we may well have been able to see a third genre, which had evolved from the crossovers that can be seen in the later works of Aristophanes and Euripides, if politics had not intervened to bring about an end to the Golden Age of Athens. [2]

An examination of the history of genre theory starting with Aristotle and moving forward into the twenty-first century will show that the changes that occurred in the styles of the poets towards the end of the fifth century marked the beginnings of what we now call 'drama'. It will also show that to classify all of Aristophanes' work as comedy and all of Euripides' as tragedy is erroneous.

[1] "I say many funny things and many serious things." Aristophanes *Frogs,* 389-90

[2] Aristotle (49a14-15) states that after undergoing many transformations, tragedy came to rest. This implies that the genre of tragedy was fully developed yet no such claim is made about comedy. Kotini maintains that war trauma defines the fate of the literary genre. (2010:134)

Therefore, this Chapter sets out to challenge the limitations of prototypical classifications placed on ancient Greek comedy and tragedy by scholars.[3] It is my contention that these definitions have been imposed without the benefit of substantive knowledge of the criteria by which competitions were judged, without contemporary commentary or, indeed, without a fully extant corpus of material for analysis.[4] The very idea of rigid interpretation is a modern one and its imposition upon 'literature' that grew out of a world whose roots lay in the fluidity of myth can only be problematic. Derrida is of the opinion that "following a classical precedent, one has deemed natural structures or typical forms whose history is hardly natural but, rather, quite to the contrary, complex and heterogeneous".[5] In a reply to the Derrida paper Cohen agrees:

> Genre concepts in theory and in practice arise, change and decline for historical reasons. And since each genre is composed of texts that accrue, the grouping is a process, not a determinate category. Genres are open categories. Each member alters the genre by adding, contradicting, or changing constituents, especially those of members most closely related to it. The process by which genres are established always involves the human need for distinction and interrelation. Since the purposes of critics who establish genres vary, it is self-evident that the same texts can belong to different groupings of genres and serve different generic purposes.[6]

Aristophanes and Euripides were writing during the Golden Age of Athens: a time of new politics, knowledge, changing ideas and innovation. Therefore, to look back and impose a framework that limits genres that were still evolving creates artificial boundaries, which distort the image. Hartley argues that genres are agents

[3] Traditional classifications that have become engendered in scholarship due to the plays' position in Athenian festivals.

[4] See Csapo and Slater, (1994:157-165) for a discussion on how the judges were 'elected'. Unfortunately, these do not tell us the criteria upon which the productions were evaluated.

[5] Derrida, (1980:60)

[6] Cohen, (1983:204). In turn, LaCapra (1986:221) comments on Cohen's paper stating that it is a stimulating combination of the genres of history and criticism. He goes on to say: "At present, many historians see these genres as radically incompatible. Certain literary critics are more open to the interbreeding of these genres and look forward to the fruits of their union." It is precisely this 'interbreeding' of genres that this Chapter seeks to address.

of ideological closure, limiting the meaning-potential of a given text.[7] This Chapter will therefore take a more fluid approach and challenge the traditional historicist philology of scholars, who insist upon the rigid classification of an ancient theatrical text as either a comedy or tragedy.

Polonius began to reconsider Aristotle's theory in Italy during the sixteenth century when the basic Aristotelian division was expanded in order to accommodate contemporary plays in the pastoral, tragicomic and other genres. The test case was tragi-comedy: whether it had existed among the ancients or was a new but legitimate (or bastard) genre and how it might include the features of both comedy and tragedy, whether separately or mixed, or not at all, and to what effect.[8] We know that comedy evolved from Old to Middle and then New; and the later plays of Aristophanes show the beginnings of Middle and New Comedy. Unfortunately, there is not enough extant evidence from tragedy to prove that it, too, went through a transitional period. However, Euripides' later works include domestic incidents and situations that anticipate those seen later in New Comedy, which suggests that his work was indeed the forerunner of a new type of drama. It is for this reason that this Chapter seeks to enlarge the taxonomy of classification to reflect the dramaturgical fluidity of Aristophanes and Euripides.

The first part of the Chapter will examine the origins of genre theory, starting with Aristotle, and go forward into the twentieth century to highlight how each time period viewed the various forms of literature. The outcome will illustrate that there are a number of similarities between comedy and tragedy. What makes a given situation either humorous or tragic will then be assessed. In order to show that

[7] Hartley, (1994:128)

[8] (Sidnell, 1991:11). Scaliger was of the same opinion stating: "It is by no means true, as has hitherto been taught, that the unhappy ending is essential to tragedy – provided it contains horrible events." (*Poetices Libri Septem*: 3.97)

comedy can be tragic, and tragedy comic, Aristophanes' and Euripides' common *topoi* such as political comment, rescues and calls for peace will be considered.

The emotions evoked by comedy and tragedy are too complex to be called merely sad or funny.[9] 'Comedy' and 'tragedy' are not simple concepts. Whilst an author may write a passage that he himself intends to be either comic or tragic, neither can exist tangibly until they are received by the audience. Emotion is shaped and the meaning of the passage created within them.[10] Hence, both comedy and tragedy are subjective according to audience experience and may contradict expectation.[11] Aristophanes takes the tragic nature of a myth and makes it humorous by placing it in a comedic situation, producing wan smiles with the audience laughing with their mouths, but not their hearts. Euripides takes the same situation and places it in a tragic setting, provoking the same wan smile, in plays that have a vein of comedy that stays just below the level of laughter. Therefore it is not the event itself that is either comic or tragic, but its reception.

The second part of this Chapter will examine the so-called 'romantic tragedies, romantic melodramas and tragic-comedies' of Euripides and suggest that they were not only a reaction to, and against, the events in Athens towards the end of the Peloponnesian War, but also to, and against, Aristophanes' use of his tragedies.[12] It is for this reason that these plays contain similar elements to Aristophanic comedy, elements that later develop into what we now call 'New Comedy'.[13]

[9] Potts, (1957:18)
[10] See previous Chapter dealing with Aristophanes and Reception Theory.
[11] Knox (1970:9) states that the only thing that puts *Iphigenia at Tauris* and the *Helen* in the tragic category is the fact that they were entries in the tragic competition at the festival of Dionysus. In these cases, the audience would probably have been expecting tragedy but instead, received a play that was contradictory in nature. Despite the elements of humour they contained, the plays were based on mythological episodes and therefore could not be included in the comic competition. They did not have the bawdy content of satyr so the only option open to Euripides at the time was to enter them in the tragic competition.
[12] Descriptions of Euripides' plays coined by Knox, (1970:68). Caldwell (1975:32) defines the tragi-comedy as that which evokes feelings of "excitement, fear, relief, more suspense, more relief".
[13] Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* states, "…towards wife, and father towards son, and servant towards master and also the whole business of vicissitudes, raping of young women, substitutions of children, recognitions by means of

Finally, there will be an examination of the way in which Aristophanes' and Euripides' styles changed according to the circumstances that faced Athens at the end of the fifth-century.[14] During these final decades, the "common ground between the genres was expanding while the distinctions between the two genres were eroding".[15] It is the contention of this thesis that this resulted in a new form of literature.[16]

A 'comic' element in the context of a tragedy is not necessarily laughable.[17] I intend to show that Euripides' use of comic elements goes further than a similarity of *topoi.* The Chapter focuses on three of Euripides' plays, the *Ion,* the *Helen* and *Iphigenia at Tauris,* all of which exhibit traits that remove them from the tragic genre. The inclusion of comic elements by Euripides acts, in some cases, as a response to Aristophanes' borrowing of the tragic style. My hypothesis therefore, is that there is a flexible dialogue between Aristophanes and Euripides and they are intrinsically linked by similarities of dramaturgical technique, with both poets using elements of comedy and tragedy.

Scholars continue to vacillate over the categorisation of Aristophanes' and Euripides' later plays but it is the contention of this Chapter that we must desist from placing frames around what was essentially a moving target and accept that there are

---

rings and necklaces. For these are of course the main elements of the New Comedy and Euripides brought them to perfection." In *Frogs* 961f, Euripides boasts of having brought everyday things on stage. The characters of Aeschylus are majestically aloof: those of Sophocles cold, hard and statuesque, but the characters of Euripides are closer to ordinary humanity just as they are in Aristophanic comedy. Mierow (1936:114). Zeitlin points out that in the *Thesmophoriazusae,* Aristophanes noted and drew attention to Euripides' "trespass of aesthetic modes" and "transgression of tragic decorum". (1981:305-306)

[14] Langer, (1953:348) calls comedy a temporary triumph over the surrounding world. With the dire events of Athens, comedy would no doubt have been a welcome release.

[15] Schraffenberger, (1995:314-315)

[16] There is no reason to assume that poets were not capable of writing in differing styles. We know that Euripides wrote both tragedy and satyr plays; it is therefore plausible that he introduced comedic *topoi* into his later plays. Plato, *Symposium,* 223d, states that fifth-century tragedians were capable of writing both comedy and tragedy and a scholiast on Aristophanes *Peace* 835 states that Ion of Chios also wrote comedies. Proclus, however, disagrees on the grounds that the descent of the soul is responsible for the impossibility, in practice, of the same poet writing in both genres. (*Comm. Plato Rep.* 52.6-53.8). He asserts that the writing of poetry requires technical knowledge and experience of life and as all poets are imitators, they can only imitate what they have experienced in life. For a full deconstruction and commentary of Proclus' argument and a discussion of his commentary on Plato's *Republic* see Sheppard, (1980:111-117).

[17] Seidensticker, (1978:305). For example, disguise, intrigue and recognition.

similarities and crossovers which would, had they been allowed to continue, eventually have led into a third genre, one that may well defy definitive classification.

6.2 Genre Theory

At this point it is useful to define exactly what is meant by 'genre' as typically, the genre of a text should provide the audience with a fundamental clue about its framework. Much work has been done on the creation of numerous classifications by which a text might be identified, but this only highlights their tautological nature.[18] Language is flexible and words can be arranged in any number of ways, which might be uttered in various circumstances. For the linguist, the identity of a sentence will not change even if it changes meaning by virtue of altered circumstances.[19]

Following Cornford's analysis of the origins of Athenian Old Comedy, Langer states that the essence of comedy is the assertion of man's irrepressible life force. What distinguishes it from tragedy is that in comedy, the threats imposed upon the hero are never internalised. In tragedy, it is the threat to the happiness of the hero gives rise to the action, causing him to re-evaluate the fundamentals of his character (that which Aristotle would call 'recognition'). In comedy, although the threat to the hero may give rise to the action, it does not involve a self-examination leading to his/her 'recognition'.[20] However, this statement cannot be applied in all cases as, for example, in Euripides' *Helen* and *Iphigenia at Tauris.* In these two

[18] Such as comedy, tragedy, sonnets, ballads, prose, poetry, epic, satire, satyr and invective amongst others.
[19] Todorov, (1990:13-26). The meaning of a sentence can be altered according to context and intonation. For example: "I hate you!" can be said in anger and be interpreted as threatening, or with laughter when a friend is perhaps playfully jealous of another's good fortune. The 'identity' of the sentence remains constant, but the meaning is vastly different.
[20] Palmer, (1994:176-77)

‘tragedies’, the threats levelled at the hero are not internalised but in Aristophanes’ *Clouds* they are.[21]

Blanchot contends that literary forms, genres, have no genuine significance; each individual work belongs to literature as a whole.[22] This Chapter does not contest the existence of comedy and tragedy as independent genres. In fact, the classification of particular texts as either comic or tragic provides a framework by which the transgression of others might be judged. It is useful to point out the perceived difference between comedy and tragedy because it proves that the difference is not one of opposites. In fact, the two forms are capable of various combinations.[23] A structuralist approach (which defines pairs of opposites) provides the exceptions that prove the rule and offers a set of rules to judge the hybrid. This is what precedes the classification of a genre and provides the forms that might be contained within. For example, the *Trojan Women* can be said to a ‘true’ tragedy and the *Lysistrata*, a ‘true’ comedy, given that they conform to the expected norms in terms of plot, structure and content.[24] However, plays such as the *Helen* and *Clouds* have elements of both comedy and tragedy, and endings that do not conform to their ‘genre’. As such, they are examples of the hybrid form.[25]

The poets of the fifth-century may not have been linguists in the modern sense (although Aristophanes loved playing with words), but they were masters of

---

[21] Helen and Menelaus’ recognition and reconciliation leads to the escape plot without either of them being shown as undergoing a fundamental change in self–perception. In *Clouds,* Strepsiades’ actions are born of his realisation that he has made mistakes with the upbringing of his son and must find a way of repairing the damage he has done. Thus, in the first example, the couple do not re-evaluate their characters, but in the latter, Strepsiades does.

[22] Blanchot, (1982:220)

[23] Langer, (1953:334)

[24] This does not deny the existence of a serious underlying message, only to the form of action played out on stage.

[25] This is in keeping with the contention made by Denard (2007:140) who describes two broad theatrical traditions in the Greek speaking world: mockery genres and serious genres, with some hybrid and extra-theatrical offshoots. He asserts that surviving theatrical genres all contain elements of these ‘lost’ genres.

their craft and acutely aware of the effect they wanted to create.[26] Euripides must have known that by placing Medea in an intolerable 'tragic' situation he would create a sombre reflective mood in his audience, and that when the servant reduces Menelaus to tears in the *Helen*, there would be a feeling of light relief.[27] Aristophanes knows that by placing the action in the Underworld and basing his plot on finding a way to save the State of Athens, he reminds the audience of the dire situation they face and in keeping with a 'tragedy', creates a sombre, reflective mood.[28]

6.3 Aristotle on Comedy

Aristotle is the oldest extant literary theorist and offers an expansive definition of 'literature'. In *Poetics* he offers a tripartite definition: dithyramb under pure narration, epic under mixed narration, and tragedy and comedy under dramatic imitation.[29] Due to the concentrated discussion on tragedy in this volume, it is widely supposed that he wrote a second treatise on the art of comedy. As this is missing, scholars are reliant on the few comments he makes in *Poetics,* which may or may not be fully representative of his views.[30] Nowhere in the extant material does he state that the elements of comedy and tragedy are mutually exclusive. On the contrary, he seems to imply that occasionally there are overlaps.[31] The

---

[26] See Chapter Four on Audience Competence

[27] Euripides *Medea*, 111-114; *Helen*, 455-457

[28] The play ends with the Chorus saying: "For thus we may truly be rid of great sufferings and of terrible encounters in arms..."

[29] Genette, (2000:212)

[30] Aristotle, *Poetics,* 49a34

[31] Kitano (2010:196) states that: "the general claim for the plot of tragedy laid in *Poetics* Chapters 7 and 8 also applies to comedy. As an imitation, it has to speak somehow of 'the universal.' Comic action should also contain a proper "beginning, middle and end' and proceed in necessary or probable sequence. As for the aesthetic claim concerning its size, although comedy should imitate the 'ridiculous' that is a part of the 'ugly,' Aristotle tells us that comic form is larger than the iambic poem. The claim for magnitude also applies to comedy. The comic plot, as well as the tragic one, must have 'a length which allows the hero to pass through a series of probable or necessary stages from bad fortune to good, or from good to bad (51a12-14) such as the nature of imitation, unity and plot."

implication is that the words and actions will appear either comic or tragic according to their consequences[32] and that it is the plot's outcome that determines the genre.

One of the elements that separates tragedy and the satyr play from comedy is that the first two take their plot from myth.[33] This cannot always have been the case as Aristotle states: "In comedy even people who are the bitterest enemies in the story, like Orestes and Aegisthus, go off reconciled in the end and no one gets killed by anybody".[34] As previously argued in Chapter Five, Aristophanes uses episodes from myth in the construction and content of his plots: the plot of *Frogs* is based on the Andromeda myth and *Thesmophoriazusae* is a pastiche of mythologically inspired scenes. The blurring between genres is evident here in that a lack of 'tragic' action (a death), mythic novelty and the presence of reconciliatory endings can also be seen in some of Euripides' so-called 'tragedies'.[35] This means that not only is myth used in both 'genres', but that the outcome of the story is not guaranteed to be tragic or reconciliatory (and therefore 'comic') in either case.

Aristotle goes on to observe that the perfect tragedy should contain recognition and reversal. He defines recognition as a "...change from ignorance to knowledge, disclosing either a close relationship or enmity, on the part of people marked out for good or bad fortune".[36] Whilst he also describes other forms of recognition, they all involve pity or fear and act as a prelude to catastrophe: such as the scene in *Oedipus* where the reconciliation between Oedipus and his mother Jocasta ends in tragedy and in *Electra* where the reconciliation between siblings

---

[32] Dunn, (1989:239). Referring to *Orestes* he states: "...license checked or punished represents the *hybris* leading to catastrophe so common in tragedy, while license unchecked or unpunished represents the audacity and the immunity from consequences typical of comedy."
[33] One of the eight principal features of the satyr play is the use of mythological plots, with mythological travesty a principal source of humour. The characters inhabit the same mythological world as gods and heroes. (Easterling and Knox, 1989:94-95)
[34] *Poetics*, 1453a36-9. This may be a reference to *Orestes* written by Alexis, a fourth-century comic poet.
[35] For example the *Ion, Iphigenia at Tauris, Helen* and *Alcestis*.
[36] *Poetics*, 6.4

leads to a double murder. This definition does not match the happy recognitions that occur in *Ion, Iphigenia at Tauris*, the *Helen* and *Alcestis,* elements of which stand side by side with the 'comic' notion of reconciliatory endings as mentioned above. Ion and his mother are reconciled, as are Iphigenia and Orestes, Helen and Menelaus and Alcestis and Admetus. In these cases, reconciliation led to the return of natural order.

Booker describes the essence of comedy as that in which "some redeeming truth has to be brought out of the shadows into the light",[37] a concept that again works for the aforementioned 'tragedies' of Euripides. Ion's recognition leads him to his true parentage; Iphigenia's survival redeems her father; Helen's sojourn in Egypt absolves her from the horrors of war suffered by the Greeks at Troy whilst Alcestis' return to life reinforces the strength of family bonds.

Aristotle defines a reversal in tragedy as "...a change to the opposite in the actions being performed ... in accordance with probability or necessity".[38] The example he gives is the good news being brought to Oedipus, which is intended to free him from his fear. However, it reveals the identity of his parents and thus brings about the opposite result. In the 'tragedies' of Euripides, reversal does not always create a negative result for the protagonists. They can occur at the same time as recognition and lead to reconciliation and a happy ending. In *Ion,* mother and son are joyfully reunited; in *Iphigenia at Tauris*, the news that Orestes is still alive leads to Iphigenia's return to the *oikos* and for Menelaus in the *Helen*, the restoration of his wife.

Therefore, it is clear that Euripides' plays did not always conform to what have been interpreted as Aristotle's tragic norms. Some of his plots were not based

[37] Booker, (2004:123)
[38] *Poetics*, 6.3.11

on the traditional form of myth; characters did not always behave as expected; there was not always death and suffering, and some had happy endings. This raises the question of genre. Aristotle's treatise was intended to be an observation on literature rather than a prescriptive manual for future poets. Halliwell, whilst observing the affinity between the *Poetics* and various Greek *technai* (didactic manuals) that were produced in a variety of fields, insists on "the difference between theoretical and practical prescription and that the *Poetics* is essentially an exercise in the former not the latter".[39] Therefore, the blind application of *Poetics* as a 'yard-stick' in the classification of ancient texts is problematic and it is important not to take Aristotle's words as face value. His literary interpretations contain a number of anomalies, which, when examined closely, allow for the possibility that he recognised a blurring of lines between comedy and tragedy. He speaks of defective plots:

> Of simple plots and actions, the episodic ones are the worst. By an episodic plot I mean one in which the sequence of episodes is neither necessary nor probable. Second-rate poets compose plots of this kind of their own accord....[40]

Aristotle's silence on the new form of drama created by Euripides, which fell into neither of the two immutable pre-established forms (as later defined by modern scholarship) does not mean that it was not recognised. He states: "This is not the place for a detailed investigation of whether or not tragedy is now sufficiently developed with respect to its formal constituents (judged both in its own right and in relation to theatrical performances)...".[41] This implies that there was some acknowledgement that the form of tragedy was changing. In fact he goes on to say:

> Poetry is more philosophical and more serious than history..... In the case of comedy, this is in fact clear. The poets construct the plot on the basis of probabilities, and supply names of their own choosing... To be sure, even in tragedy in some cases only one or two of the names are familiar, while the

[39] Halliwell, (1986:37-38)
[40] *Poetics,* 5.6.52a
[41] *Poetics,* 49a

> rest are invented, and in some, none at all... So one need not try at all costs to keep to the traditional stories which are the stories of tragedy; in fact, it would be absurd to do so, since even what is familiar is familiar only to a few, and yet gives pleasure to everyone.[42]

Here, Aristotle acknowledges that tragedy does not have to follow the traditional rules of a plot born in mythology with gods and heroes as characters. He confirms that some tragedies are not true to myth, but instead have plots and characters invented by the poet. The same principle must therefore be applicable to the content of comedy.

It must be remembered that Aristotle was writing approximately one hundred years after the production of the plays he discusses and his treatise has been translated and interpreted innumerable times since then, with scholars amending the text according to their own agenda. Genette believes that the tripartite division of genres attributed to Aristotle (lyric, epic and dramatic) impeded the development of a coherent classification of literature and an adequate theory of genre. The attribution of narrow literary genres to Plato and Aristotle is, he says, erroneous and stemmed from two distinct motives: the evocation of a nostalgic respect for orthodoxy at the end of Classicism and the renewed interest of twentieth-century scholars in a modial interpretation of the phenomenon of genre.[43] This more catholic approach to Aristotle's thesis allows for the possibility that he recognised the evolution of tragedy and supports my thesis that ancient comedy and tragedy may, in fact, be more closely related than is commonly thought.

---

[42] *Poetics,* 1451b

[43] Genette, (2000:210-11)

6.4 Horace, Hermogenes, Pollux and Donatus on Comedy and Tragedy

Genre was one of the topics debated by ancient literary critics and, in particular, the relationship between comedy and tragedy. Horace argues that although a comic theme is unsuited to tragic language and vice versa, there may be exceptions.

> A comic subject will not be handled in tragic verse... Let each peculiar species [of writing] fill with decorum its proper place. Nevertheless sometimes even comedy exalts her voice, and passionate Chremes rails in a tumid strain: and a tragic writer generally expresses grief in a prosaic style. Telephus and Peleus, when they are both in poverty and exile, throw aside their rants and gigantic expressions if they have a mind to move the heart of the spectator with their complaint.[44]

It is clear that Horace believed the elements of comedy and tragedy could be corrupted and, at times, overlap according to the storyline and intention of the poet. This may not have been the case for all tragic poets, but Pollux notes that Euripides was unique amongst the tragic playwrights in borrowing from the comic stage.[45]

Hermogenes, writing in the second-century AD, discusses types of style, asserting that it is:

> ...very difficult, nearly impossible in fact, to find among any of the ancients a style that is throughout composed of elements such as thought, approach, diction, etc., characteristic of only one kind of style; it is by the predominance of features belonging to one type that each acquires its particular quality.[46]

He goes on to say that it is not possible to find any accurate examples of where only one style is used because "it is clearly a mistake to use one and not to vary one's style". However, he qualifies this by saying that there will usually be a

[44] Horace, *Art of Poetry*, 89-98.
[45] Pollux, *Onamasticon,* 4.111. See below for discussion of Pollux's views on comedy and tragedy under 'Audience address in comedy and tragedy'.
[46] Hermogenes, *On Types of Style,* 221

predominance of characteristics that are more typical of one style than another, and it is this that leads to a definition.[47]

The *De Comoedia et Tragoedia* (attributed to Donatus in the mid-fourth century AD) offers a definition of Greek comedy that probably mediates some of the views of the Peripatetic school of philosophy, of which Theophrastus, succeeding Aristotle, became head.[48] Donatus cites Theophrastus' definition of comedy as "an episode of private affairs, which contains no danger."[49] As Aristotle's disciple, it is likely that Theophrastus developed his ideas regarding literature under his tutelage, which is useful as it offers further insight into Aristotle's views on comedy. Several of Euripides' plays can be categorised under this definition, for example, the *Helen*, *Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Ion* where the heroes are involved in domestic intrigue rather than heroic quests and tragic downfall.

Therefore, it is clear that literary critics in antiquity all share the opinion that there are areas common to comedy and tragedy. From the commentaries discussed above, there does not appear to be a definitive description of a text that can be applied solely to either genre – nor do the commentators seem surprised by this. As stated earlier, the drive for immovable definitions comes much later.

6.5 The Divine Comedy

Dante's work cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be classified as humorous. Nevertheless, he describes his masterpiece as a 'comedy' which he defines as a tale with a happy ending. In purgatory, he includes himself in the comic cannon as an act of poetic self-definition. Both structurally and stylistically the

---

[47] *On Types of Style,* 222
[48] 372 – c. 287BC
[49] Sidnell, (1991:78). Donatus, *On Comedy and Tragedy,* 5.1. Diomedes *Ars* (1.487-88), also written in the mid fourth-century AD, offers a similar definition and describes tragedy as the treatment of heroic station in misfortunes, and comedy as the treatment of private and civil station without danger to life.

Commedia's point of reference is the Bible and the 'comic' or mixed style.[50] In a letter to Cangrande I della Scala, Dante explains:

> A comedy is a certain kind of poetic narration different from all others. It differs from a tragedy in subject matter, for a tragedy at the beginning is admirable and quiet and at the end or outcome it is foul and horrible. A comedy begins with some adversity but its subject ends prosperously. Likewise they differ in the manner of speech: tragedy is elevated and sublime, comedy is careless and humble, as Horace says in his Art of Poetry, where he allows that sometimes comedians speak like tragedians and vice versa. And therefore it is evident why the present work is called a comedy, for if we look at the subject at the beginning it is horrible and foul, because it is Hell; at the end it is happy, desirable, and pleasing, because it is Paradise. If we look at the manner of speech, it is lowly and humble because it is vulgar speech [i.e. in the vernacular: Italian, not Latin] which even simple women use. And thus it is evident why it is called a comedy.[51]

'Comedy' has become synonymous with 'funny' but for the purposes of this discussion, I use the word in its technical sense, as described by Dante above, in terms of its rhythm alone, without attempting to connect it to humour.[52] A comedy has a dynamic that ends with resolution and reconciliation despite the often paradoxical nature of its content. The designation 'Divine Comedy' is made up of the comic rhythm and applies to any number of plays that involve the paradigmatic progression towards good fortune. It need not only involve mortals, but any number of triumphant gods and divine lovers reunited after various trials.[53]

The classical Sanskrit drama, *nataka*, which dates from around the first-century AD, contains high poetry, noble action and mythical themes which, whilst treated seriously, conforms to the comic pattern: it features stock characters, is

[50] Lansing, (2000:176). It is noteworthy that Dante features Antiphon, Simonides, Agathon and Euripides in *Purgatory* 22.106 as Greek poets who "wear the laurel crown". All of these poets were known for their innovative way of writing and all mentioned by Aristotle in varying degrees. (Moore, 1968:151)

[51] Trans. Howe, (1968:37)

[52] The rhythm of comedy is "a continuous balance of sheer vitality that belongs to society and is exemplified briefly in each individual" Langer, (1953:333). She goes on to describe comedy as presenting the vital rhythm of self-preservation whilst tragedy exhibits that of self-consummation. In Asia the theatre knows no 'tragic rhythm', defined as that in which characters go through a series of stations that are not repeated: growth, maturity and decline. (1953:351). See also Paltridge, (1997: 53)

[53] Langer, (1953:335)

episodic, restores lost balance, and implies a new future.[54] Lévi describes the heroic comedy of *nataka* as "the consummate type of Indian drama; all dramatic elements can find their place in it".[55] This format is similar to the later plays of Aristophanes and Euripides and offers a precedent that suggests the possibility of a third genre that could have stood alongside comedy and tragedy: one that showed men as they are, in domestic situations, facing and reacting to the highs and lows of life; one that evoked both laughter and tears – much akin to the modern-day soap opera. Scholars tend to call this New Comedy but a better term for what Aristophanes and Euripides were creating is simply the 'drama'. This is the genre that did not have time to fully evolve and receive separate classification before the Golden Age of Athens was brought to an abrupt halt at the end of the Peloponnesian War.

6.6 Prototypical and Family Resemblance Approaches to Genre Theory

The prototypical theory of genre is based on a psycholinguistic approach to language and states that a text should be regarded as more *typical* of one genre than another.[56] It describes how people categorize objects according to a particular image conditioned by socio-cultural factors.[57] In the case of Euripides' and Aristophanes' plays, we are conditioned to think of them as either tragedies or comedies. These are the prototypical classifications being challenged in this Chapter. As stated previously, we cannot be certain by what criteria plays were judged or categorised in the fifth-century, but the use of myth as plot would certainly

---

[54] *ibid*
[55] Lévi, (2001:32)
[56] A study of the way in which people acquire, process and understand words from a psychological perspective. For instance, how and why a child, or a non-native speaker, comes to identify a word with a particular object. The theory was expanded into the field of genre to consider why one might consider a text as more typical of one type than another.
[57] Swales, (1990:52). Rosch (1973:328-350) defines 'prototype' as that which takes precedence over others in the definition of a category. In layman's terms, this is the first example of a concept that comes to mind. An instance, when asked for an example of a bird, one might say robin rather than penguin, as the former is more 'prototypical' than the latter.

have made Euripides' plays more 'typical' of tragedy than comedy and would possibly account for their inclusion in the tragic competitions.

Family resemblance theory goes further. Wittgenstein's concept of family resemblance with linguistics was first adopted by genre theorists in the 1960s. His premise was that no common feature connected areas of language, rather that there were a series of overlaps.[58] He uses the analogy of the family:

> I can think of no better expression to characterize these similarities than 'family resemblance'; for the various resemblances between members of a family: build, features, color [sic] of eyes, gait, temperament, etc. etc. overlap and criss-cross in the same way.[59]

Genre theorists such as Fisher appropriated this premise:

> Representations of a genre may then be regarded as making up a family whose septs [descendants] and individual members are related in various ways, without necessarily having any single feature shared in common by all.[60]

Fowler goes further, stating that within any particular genre a text rarely, if ever, has *all* the characteristic features of that genre.[61] This is certainly the case with the later plays of Aristophanes and Euripides where we see a number of elements and scenes that relate to both comedy and tragedy.

The increasing numbers of theorists writing on genre have one thing in common: they agree that there is no clear-cut distinction between one genre and another. Gledhill observes that genres are not "...discrete systems, consisting of a fixed number of listable items"[62] and Neale argues that although a genre might have characteristic features, those features are not unique to it.[63] We can see, therefore, that even with the benefit of scholarly method and an inexhaustible supply of texts

[58] See Wittgenstein (1978) and Rosch and Mervis (1975) for further discussion of this theory.
[59] Wittgenstein, (1978:32)
[60] Fisher, (1982:41)
[61] Fowler, (1989:215)
[62] Gledhill, (1985:60)
[63] Neale, (1980:22-3)

for consideration, classification of a text as uniquely one thing or another is often impossible.

6.7 Audience and Allusion

Whilst Aristophanes might, at times, re-use myths featured in Euripides' plays to draw attention to current issues and create the additional humour that recognition of the parody might bring, Euripides created his 'tragedies' by placing action relevant to the Athenian present within the mythic past.[64] Recognition of earlier representations of the same myth by other poets did not enhance the tragic nature of the story. For instance, the *Trojan Women, Medea* and *Andromache* contain anti-war propaganda that the poet conveys by placing the action within myths known for death and suffering.

However, in his later works (those that could be classed as 'dramas' instead of tragedies) he again uses specific myths to convey political messages, but also introduces the same type of layering employed by Aristophanes in order to stimulate audience recognition and subtly create humour.[65] In these cases, Euripides uses both allusion and *parodia* to stimulate the poetic memory of the audience, inviting them to recall comic scenes and episodes. Allusion to tragedy in comedy is more frequent than vice versa and in some cases was used as a diversion from the serious aspects of the action.[66] It is this technique that brings Euripides' later work closer to Aristophanes and is indicative of the fluidity of genre between the two poets.

In comedy, the intended response is one of laughter and pleasure. In the *Helen*, I believe Euripides' intention was to provoke amusement and, therefore, an

[64] See de Romilly (1967:109) where she discusses *Phoenician Women* as example of an "...an ancient myth that has been revived and rejuvenated in light of recent experiences".
[65] See discussion of audience competence and the way in which Aristophanes responds by layering clues in Chapter four.
[66] Kirkpatrick and Dunn, (2002:38)

element of mythic novelty was required. He introduced the themes of mistaken identity and doubles when Menelaus ponders the possibility that as there was another Helen, there might be another Sparta, another Troy and another Zeus.[67] This 'doubling' was clearly a comic motif designed to highlight the absurdity of there being two Helens. Euripides portrays her as a woman who is clever and sassy and whose feminine charms are used to trick a barbarian so that she might escape and be reunited with her husband, rather than trick her husband and, as a result, cause the death of thousands.

In contrast, Euripides had also evoked the myth of Helen in *Women of Troy* and *Andromache*, but in these plays, the intention was to provoke feelings of anger and fear.[68] Here, the new texts created by Euripides were so similar to the myth that the impact was the same. It is clear, therefore, that both poets could create various receptions of a text or, in the case of Euripides, a myth, depending on its usage.

In the *Helen, Iphigenia at Tauris* and *Ion*, Euripides uses myth in order to create a happy ending. This changes the status of the plays entirely as the audience are not, as they usually are in tragedy, fully aware of what the outcome of the action will be. Therefore, they are able to bring their competence and experience to bear when interpreting the plays as they develop. Through the inclusion of this mythic novelty, the audience are invited to recognise specific *parodia* as the characters move towards a happy ending. It is for this reason that I believe these plays should be considered as drama rather than tragedy as outlined at the beginning of this Chapter.

[67] *Helen*, 483ff
[68] Both of these plays show the horror of war and the suffering of women and children as a result of Helen's actions.

6.8 Women in Comedy and Tragedy

In comedy, women also step out of the *oikos* when the situation demands it, but at no time do they kill, or display stereotypical 'male' attributes of violence or infidelity. They express no desire to remain in the dominant role on a permanent basis. They may trick and ridicule men, but only within their designated role as women. The *Lysistrata* may have women throw water upon, and dress up, old men to humiliate them, but ritual bathing and dressing were part of a woman's role.[69] At the Acropolis, they seize the Treasury, but again, looking after the household income was part of their remit.[70] At the end of the play, when they have achieved the desired outcome of peace, they return to their roles as wives and mothers, and the *polis* (and, no doubt, the sub-conscious of the male audience) breathes a sigh of relief as normality is restored. Even in comedy, there is nothing funny about women remaining outside the *oikos* long term.[71]

In Euripides' *Helen and Iphigenia at Tauris,* the same principle applies. At no time do the women kill and their actions stay within 'normative' female boundaries at all times. They trick and manipulate but when all is resolved, they resume their roles as wives and mothers and thus the *polis,* as in comedy, breathes a collective sigh of relief.[72] There is a stark contrast between the roles of Helen and Iphigenia in these plays and those of Phaedra and Medea in earlier works.[73] The

[69] Aristophanes Lysistrata, 370-382; 1019-1021

[70] *Lysistrata,* 486-495

[71] For the State of Athens to function normally there needed to be strong men and chaste women. Women outside the home disrupted the natural order, a situation that needed to be rectified in order to bring the action to a satisfactory conclusion. Note that in Aristophanes' penultimate extant play, *Eccleziazusae,* the women stay outside the *oikos.* This demonstates the dramatic change that took place in Aristophanes' writing after the fall of Athens, and shows a move towards New Comedy.

[72] The women's trickery would also have been amusing to the audience, particularly in the *Helen* when she persuades the 'barbarians' to load her ship with supplies and then allow her to sail a long way off shore in order to sacrifice for her dead husband. She was, in effect saying, 'This is how we do it in Greece. You stay here and we will be back shortly' before escaping for home with her husband and a fully laden ship. Scenes such as this cannot fail to have made the audience laugh.

[73] Medea rejects motherhood in order to gain revenge on her enemies, and as a result of her 'masculine' actions, cannot resume her former role. Phaedra's lust results in her death, and that of her stepson. Both women destroy the *oikos* by acting like men.

women in all Euripides' plays are complex and strong, but the crucial differences between them lies in the way they behave. Those who destroy their *oikoi* are unable to resume their roles as wives and mothers and must therefore be 'eliminated' from the action either by death or banishment. Those who do not, are allowed to return to their homes. This, essentially, is the difference between women in comedy and in tragedy and one of the reasons why selected Euripidean plays must therefore fall outside that definition.

6.9 Catharsis

Both Euripides and Aristophanes are shouting to their audience, *Beware!* Beware the consequences of war; ill-judged political decisions; offending the gods.[74] The mood in tragedy is sombre whilst in comedy the tone is lighter, implying that life is fun but "...the undertone suggests that life is a catastrophe".[75] Therefore, the effect is the same in that Euripides and Aristophanes both force their audience to face their innermost fears. Thus, catharsis can be provoked by both comedy and tragedy. Iamblichus warns of the danger of restrained passions becoming over-vehement and advises their release through catharsis: "That is why, when we behold the passion of others both in comedy and tragedy, we stabilise our own passions and render them more moderate and purify them".[76] Proclus, in defence of Plato disagrees, but in so doing confirms that Aristotle was of the opinion that tragedy and comedy could "satisfy the emotions in due measure".[77]

---

[74] *Trojan Women* and *Peace*; *Medea* and *Acharnians*; *Hippolytus* and *Clouds.*

[75] Bentley, (1991:312)

[76] *De Mysteriis*, (1.11).

[77] Proclus. *Commentary on Plato's Republic* 1.49. Here, Proclus agrees with Plato that tragedy and comedy arouse an unhealthy excess of emotion. The value of primary sources to this argument is that they are so much closer to the texts being discussed. For a more recent approach, see Sutton (1994) who discusses the theories of Spencer, Freud, and Menon. However, ancient sources naturally hold more sway, as the comedies and tragedies they are referring to may well be those under discussion in this thesis and are, therefore, much more valuable in terms of evidence than later theorists.

The similarity between tragic and comic catharsis is that in tragedy, the audience feels pity and relief that they are not in the same predicament as the protagonist. Given that humour is often an act of derision, symbolic aggression or belittlement, the same can be said of comic catharsis: the audience feels relief that they are not the object of the joke.[78]

The tragic catharsis is immediate and motivated by issues of death and suffering, whereas the comic catharsis is delayed until the mask of comedy is removed and the audience has time to reflect on what it has seen.[79] Even so, the effect is the same given the commonality of the day-to-day concerns raised by Euripides and Aristophanes. A better term for the emotions they stir would perhaps be *pathos*, as both playwrights rely on their audience receiving their message through an emotional and imaginative response.

6.10 Tragedy's Authorial Voice and Audience Address

I believe that Euripides used the authorial voice in order to create a dialogue with the audience and with Aristophanes. The *parabasis* has been described as an unassimilated nugget of ritual embedded in the play,[80] with the air of a piece of ritual procedure awkwardly interrupting its course.[81] This does not do justice to its diversity of form and content through which we can see the persona that the poet *wants* us to see.

Through the *parabasis* the poet becomes part of the play. He is able to comment on topical issues and contemporary poets; conduct self defence and/or self-

[78] For example, the humiliation suffered by the Chorus of Old Men in the *Lysistrata* and Menelaus in the *Helen.*
[79] "In the paramount comic writers, Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Moliere, the merry-go-round hardly halts long enough to allow the reader or auditor time to draw a philosophic inference. Not until the last laugh is delivered can we attain the mental serenity necessary for syllogism and dialectic." Feldman, (1948:393)
[80] Murray (1964:12)
[81] Cornford (1968:93)

criticism and present a form of autobiography.[82] Modern scholarship, for the most part, contends that it is reasonable for the poet to do this in comedy, but not in tragedy.[83] However, Aristides claims that the judges and spectators allowed competitors in both comedy and tragedy to step forward and speak about themselves,[84] and Pollux states that Euripides did this in many plays. He cites the example of the Chorus of the *Danae* where the female Chorus uses male grammatical terms in form, but the 'words' of women.[85] Pollux claims that in this way, Euripides was able to put his own voice forward. Unfortunately, he does not state which part of the Chorus he is referring to, but it is very likely that this is an example of metatheatricality and a way of communicating with the audience.

There are places in Euripides' plays where the voice of the poet stands out and the tragedian alerts the audience that he is creating a new type of poetry. We have seen how Aristophanes makes comments designed to ensure that the audience notice how cleverly he uses words and parodies in the creation of his jokes and plot lines and, in some cases, where they come from.

In the *Helen*, Euripides draws attention to the fact that he is doing something new in 'tragedy' when Menelaus is told that there is a certain lack of originality in his plan to hide and attack the king with a double edged sword in order to escape from Egypt.[86] Here the intention is to highlight the novelty of having a woman acting in a 'manly' way, by saving those around her, instead of the 'original' *topos* where the man is the rescuer.

---

[82] For discussion on the possibility of the poet playing the role of first actor see Nagy (1979:252) and Perusino (1986:37 n.3)

[83] Revermann, (2006:81) says: "The tragic genre tends to avoid metatheatricality and explicit reference to the socio-political context of the world and its audience." See also Taplin, (1986:368) and Bain, (1995:3) who also state that audience address in tragedy is unlikely.

[84] Aristides 28.97, cited in Roselli, (2012:213)

[85] Pollux, *Onomasticon* cited in Csapo and Slater, (1994:394-5)

[86] *Helen*, 1042-1056

Additionally, attention is drawn to a concept, which is unusual in tragedy, of having a woman, although clever and powerful, remain within her role as wife (in the same way that they do in comedy) in order that she might return to the *oikos* once the plan has been realised.

Euripides also plays with his audiences' patience when, after the servant has delivered a long speech concerning the couple's trials and tribulations, Menelaus interrupts to try to get rid of him, but to no avail. The servant continues for another fifteen lines or so before leaving the stage. At that point, Helen asks Menelaus to tell her of his journey but he says that to go through it all again would be just as bad as suffering it in the first place. Helen, no doubt reflecting the relief of the audience that they would not have to suffer another long, drawn out speech that did nothing to advance the plot, says, κάλλιον εἶπας ἤ σ᾽ ἀνηρόμην ἐγώ. ἓν δ᾽ εἰπὲ πάντα παραλιπών.[87] Here we can see that Euripides is laughing along with the audience.[88]

Euripides draws attention to the fact that he is not conforming to the 'rules' of tragedy and is creating his own, original genre of drama when in *Orestes* the Chorus refer to the invented elements of the plot. They say: καὶ μὴν ἀμείβει καινὸν ἐκ καινῶν τόδε.[89]

In *Heracles,* Euripides highlights his addition of Lycus to the original story ὁ καινὸς οὗτος τῆσδε γῆς ἄρχων Λύκος.[90] Euripides' extra-dramatic digressions and disruptions of illusion are frequently commented on in the Euripidean and Sophoclean scholia.[91] At the end of the *Bacchae, Helen, Alcestis* and *Andromache*

[87] "You have told me more than I asked; just say one thing and leave the rest aside." *Helen,* 773

[88] Euripides exploited and mocked convention with metatheatrical gags that would have been enjoyed by both the audience and the actors. See Winnington-Ingram, (1969:127-42) for a discussion of Euripides' technique of ridicule.

[89] "A novel tale and here we have fresh novelties." *Orestes*, 1503

[90] "...this new monarch Lycus." *Heracles,* 38

[91] Bain, (1975:15). See the analytical index to Schwartz's edition of the Euripidean scholia.

there is a reminder to the audience that they had experienced the unexpected: "...what men expect does not happen...and so it has turned out here today".[92]

This system of making sure that the spectator is aware of the poet's innovative style is also seen in Aristophanes when he explains what he is doing as he goes along just in case there is anyone in the audience who does not recognise how clever and different his work is from his competitors.[93] In this way, both poets show themselves as conscious of their own genre and when they cross into another.

6.11 Euripides and the Comedic Technique

Aristotle states that the language of tragedy should be high and the language of comedy low and so when, in Euripides' plays, we see the hint of low language, it is necessary to investigate further.[94] In some cases, he consciously uses parody and low language to signify humour and its source. In these plays, therefore, it is possible to see a shift in Euripides' style, from pure mythic novelty to convey a political message to the inclusion of *parodia* and elements of the comic structure to provoke humour. According to Antiphanes, it would be easier to write tragedy because everyone knows the story. In comedy, he continues, the writer has to invent names, words, deeds, the prologue, the presupposition, the action and the ending.[95]

In his later plays, Euripides anticipates Antiphanes' criteria and by incorporating mythic novelty, presents the audience with novel situations similar in style to those found in comedy. This shows a move away from tragic irony in which the audience knows the story but the characters do not, and places him in the field of comic irony. Here, the characters know what is going to unfold but the audience do

---

[92] Euripides *Bacchae,* 1389-90; *Helen,* 1689-90; *Alcestis,* 1160-61 and *Andromache,* 1284-85.
[93] See Chapter on audience competence for full discussion of Aristophanes' metacomedy and layering of jokes.
[94] Aristotle, *Poetics,* 1449a
[95] Antiphanes *fr.* 191.

not, thus the spectator can rest and enjoy the irony of double meanings.[96] In Euripides' versions of the myths, Helen is innocent and Antigone marries her Haemon.[97]

As discussed earlier, it is not entirely necessary that in comedy we laugh at all.[98] When that which Feldman calls 'cheer' is not present in proper proportion [as in tragedy] such comedy provokes wan smiles, or foolish laughter.[99] Equally important is the eventual outcome of the situation. By definition, tragedies 'should' end badly, so this eliminates Euripides' *Helen, Iphigenia at Tauris, Ion* and *Alcestis*. Comedies should end well, but Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Frogs* do not. *Ecclesiazusae* and *Wealth* show signs of world-weariness and irony instead of humour. There are far more missing plays than extant; given the overlap of *topoi* and confusion of literary technique and authorial intent can we be sure that the plays have been correctly categorised? Within this dialogue between genres the lines become blurred and we find the overlap between comedy and tragedy. Similarities include the use of meta-theatrics, audience address and comic motifs.

Euripides' *Ion* is littered with comedic scenes such as Ion singing to his broom and his warning to the birds that he will shoot them with his arrows if they foul the statues.[100] Demetrius describes the comic action that occurred on stage in this scene which, presumably, was in response to direction from the poet, and thus can be used as an indication of his intended meaning. The orator reports:

> Other aspects of the actor's art deserve attention. Take, for instance, the case of Ion in Euripides, who seizes his bow and threatens the swan which is

[96] Pippin, (1960:153)

[97] See Huddilston (1899:183-201) for a useful discussion of the archaeological evidence that traces Antigone's development.

[98] Silk, (2000:58)

[99] Feldman, (1948:393). Feldman asserts: "Some splendid comedians who cultivated scorn to excess, at the expense of cheer, have lived wretchedly and their satire frequently culminates in snarls of pain. Witnesses: Jonathan Swift of England and Ambrose Bierce of the United States. But scorn of the ugly is an absolute prerequisite in all true comedy. That is why Aristophanes was a finer comic artist than Menander."

[100] Euripides *Ion,* 112ff; 105. Here we have the hint of scatological humour.

> letting fall its droppings upon the statues. Many opportunities of movement are offered to the actor by Ion's rush for his bow and arrows, by his face upturned to the sky as he addresses the swan and by the rest of the detail contrived to aid the actor.[101]

As the play progresses, Ion and his mother Creusa then tell each other their respective stories with Creusa pretending her own history is that of ‘a friend’. This conversation is again reminiscent of scenes in *Oedipus* where the audience are on the edge of their seats as Oedipus edges towards discovering his parentage. The difference, of course, is that the outcome for Ion will be one of reconciliation rather than catastrophe and the actual untruth of Creusa’s story renders it more pathetic than tragic.[102] Here again, we see elements of the comic structure rather than the tragic.

Euripides uses the Chorus to provoke humour in two further scenes by creating misunderstandings between the characters. When Ion is told by Cruesa that Apollo raped her ‘friend’ he is shocked and intends to admonish the god. However, as treasurer of the shrine, he is more concerned about the effect on its finances if Apollo has to pay fines for rape, the same punishment as mortals: εἰ δ᾽ — οὐ γὰρ ἔσται, τῷ λόγῳ δὲ χρήσομαι — δίκας βιαίων δώσετ᾽ ἀνθρώποις γάμων, σὺ καὶ Ποσειδῶν Ζεύς θ᾽ ὃς οὐρανοῦ κρατεῖ, ναοὺς τίνοντες ἀδικίας κενώσετε.[103] The propensity of the gods towards raping mortal women was well known and therefore his feigned shock would have been amusing.

Later, when Ion finds the tokens left for him as a baby he is amazed to find that even after many years, the wrappings are not stained and the cradle is as good as

[101] Demetrius, *On Style,* 195 (350-c.280BC)
[102] Kitto, (1961:317). Pseudo-Apollodorus 1.7.3 has Xuthus as the father of Ion but instead, Euripides presents Apollo as the father, having raped Creusa at the temple when she was a young virgin. This scenario of rape, followed by recognition and reconciliation, forms one of the most popular plots of New Comedy.
[103] “If (this will not be the case; I am saying so for the sake of argument) you are going to pay the penalty to mortals for rape, I mean you and Poseidon and Zeus who rules the heavens, then in paying for your crimes you will empty your temples.” *Ion* 444-6

new.[104] When his parentage is revealed, he is hesitant and unsure whether to believe his mother, asking if he was a 'love-child' born before her marriage.[105] Even the Chorus find the whole situation ridiculous and when reading the text, it is almost possible to imagine them rolling their eyes as they comment: μηδεὶς δοκείτω μηδὲν ἀνθρώπων ποτὲ ἄελπτον εἶναι πρὸς τὰ τυγχάνοντα νῦν.[106]

There is an additional comic scene when Ion meets Creusa's husband Xuthus and assumes that he is making sexual advances towards him. Xuthus says; δὸς χερὸς φίλημά μοι σῆς σώματός τ᾽ ἀμφιπτυχάς. To which Ion replies: εὖ φρονεῖς μέν; ἤ σ᾽ ἔμηνε θεοῦ τις, ὦ ξένε, βλάβη; Ion threatens him: οὐκ ἀπαλλάξῃ, πρὶν εἴσω τόξα πλευμόνων λαβεῖν; ... οὐ φιλῶ φρενοῦν ἀμούσους καὶ μεμηνότας ξένους.[107] These two scenes are examples of characters talking at cross purposes for comedic effect, using colloquial language designed to alert the audience that it is not meant to be taken seriously.[108]

On the whole, Euripides' comedies do not constitute the same kind of continuous 'laugh out loud' humour that is found in Aristophanes (although there are certainly moments that do),[109] but they cannot have been received in the same way as his tragedies. Their inclusion within the genre of 'tragedy' appears to stem merely from the fact that they were entries in the same competition, since their plot was based (at times tenuously) in myth. It must be remembered that as far as we know, at the time Euripides was writing, there were only three categories: tragedy,

[104] *Ion,* 1390
[105] *Ion,* 1474
[106] "Let no man ever imagine that anything is beyond hope, in view of the things that are happening now." *Ion,* 1510
[107] "Give me your hand as a greeting and let me put my arms around you!"; "Are you in your senses? Has some divine inflection, stranger, sent you out of your mind?" "Won't you lay off before you get an arrow between the ribs? ... I am not in the habit of humouring gauche and deranged strangers!" *Ion,* 520-526
[108] The play is also remarkably similar to Sophocles' *Oedipus.* Both turn on the recognition of the hero's identity and exposure as a baby on the order of Apollo. After various intrigues and misunderstandings, the child is returned to its mother as a grown man.
[109] Such as when Menelaus is reduced to tears by the servant in the *Helen* at lines 436-458 and at the end of *Iphigenia at Tauris* when Iphgenia tricks Thoas into cleansing the temple while she and her fellow Greeks go off to carry out a purification ritual at sea, telling him that she will be gone a 'long time'.

myth and satyr. From the discussion above, we can see that his later plays do not fit neatly into any of those three categories and so, perhaps by default, were classified as tragedy rather than comedy. In hindsight, we can see that they represent an entirely new form of drama, one that may not have been separately categorised by the end of the fifth-century, but which had certainly been recognised by the time Aristophanes of Byzantium was writing.[110] They are far removed from the comic form, which was represented by the obscenity and scatology of Aristophanes; they do not have the bawdiness of the satyrs, nor the catastrophic form and content of tragedy. Instead, they signify a refinement of wit, a more high-brow form of light entertainment for the more 'serious' theatre-goer of fifth-century Athens.

6.12 Euripidean Parodies

Euripides' use of mythic novelty as a literary technique is akin to the use of parody in Aristophanes' comedy. The tragedian has chosen to represent a familiar story in a different way in order to project a particular message. Essentially it is parody, an imitation, a situation that is re-worked in order to form a new scenario. The modern understanding of parody implies an element of ridicule but, as mentioned previously, the original Greek *parodia* can mean *counter-song*, an imitation that is set against or received from the original. There is nothing in *parodia* to necessitate the inclusion of ridicule.[111] Euripides does not set out to dismiss the earlier versions but points out that there may be another, more realistic way of looking at the given situation. Parody's pragmatics are complex: two different texts

[110] c. 257-180BC

[111] *LSJ*. See also Householder, (1944:1-9) for a discussion of the idea of parody. He cites the earliest use of the word παρῳδία as being is found in Aristotle's *Poetics* 2.3 (1448a 12-13). "Aristotle is there discussing the classification of works of art according as the object represented is made better than, the same as, or worse than reality and he cites Hegemon as the first writer of παρῳδίαι which correspond to epics somewhat as comedy does to tragedy. The question as to whether παρῳδίαι normally implies ridicule or criticism of the passage or author parodied should, I believe, be answered in the negative"

do not cancel each other out, but remain distinct in their defining difference. It is not so much an aggressive but rather a conciliatory rhetorical strategy, building upon, rather than attacking the other.[112]

In the *Electra*,[113] Euripides develops Aeschylus' version in which the three recognition techniques had been accepted as plausible.[114] Euripides who is practical in his representation of men and situations as 'they are',[115] treats this notion as ridiculous, but the important point is how it is dismissed. Electra calls the Old Man a fool, scorning the possibility of recognising her brother through a lock of hair, similar size footprints or a piece of clothing. She states that having the same colour hair as someone means nothing; that footprints cannot be made on stone and that it is impossible for her brother to be still wearing the same clothes that she made for him as a baby.[116] This *parodia* is very much in keeping with Euripides' habit of recreating traditional scenes by using convincing characters and placing them in realistic situations; but here he brings a touch of comic irony to a charged situation. This scene exhibits generic affinities with comedy rather than tragedy[117] and in dismissing Aeschylus' version, Euripides asserts his own originality in the same way that Aristophanes does when he draws attention to his innovations of plot and style.[118]

---

[112] Hutcheon (1985: xiv). See also MacDermott, (1991) for an in depth discussion of Euripides' 'Mythic Novelty'.

[113] Euripides' *Electra* is believed to have been presented c. 413 BC, some forty five years after Aeschylus' version of 458 BC Sophocles' version remains undated and thus no useful comparison can be made. For an in-depth discussion of Euripidean parody see Marshall, (1996:81-98)

[114] Aeschylus, *Libation Bearers,* 170-234

[115] *Frogs* 959-970 has Euripides asserting that he was the most 'realistic' of the tragedians, and Aeschylus criticise him for being a bad influence on the people through his degradation of heroes at line1069-74.

[116] Euripides, *Electra,* 522-547

[117] Wright, (2010:181); Murray, (1893:91); von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, (1896:2.169); Winnington-Ingram, (1969:129); Bond, (1974); Bain, (1977); Gellie, (1981:1)

[118] Note also Aristophanes' recognition of Euripides' feelings of rivalry against Aeschylus which is played out in the agon of *Frogs.*

By subverting the traditional representations of mythic figures and the versions created by other tragedians, and placing them in a more everyday atmosphere, Euripides presents the characters in a less heroic mould.[119]

They are presented as almost comic caricatures, which is in keeping with the way that Aristophanes reduces heroes and gods to figures of ridicule in his plays. In *Orestes,* Menelaus is portrayed as weak and ineffective by his nephew, who insults him, seemingly without fear of retribution.[120] There are also other areas that cannot fail to have evoked laughter from the audience such as Electra telling the Chorus to 'shut up and go away',[121] Orestes' banter with the Phrygian Eunuch[122] and Orestes' threat to rip the tiles from the roof and throw them down onto Menelaus.[123] In addition, the play contains two direct parodies of Aeschylus' work: Orestes' claim that he will not tolerate women who bare their breasts to gain sympathy and a repetition of Aeschylus' argument that the father is the true parent.[124] In terms of form, *Orestes* moves between the tragic and the comic in that the outcome remains uncertain until the end.[125] The audience are not able to tell if the protagonists will succeed or fail.

Aristophanes of Byzantium comments on the mixed styles seen in *Orestes*: τὸ δρᾶμα κωμικωτέραν ἐχει τὴν καταστροφήν.[126] He is of the opinion that this play (and no doubt others) has a somewhat humorous element to it and refers to the

---

[119] Stevens, (1937:182)
[120] Euripides *Orestes* 715-724
[121] *Orestes,* 166-174
[122] *Orestes*, 1524-27
[123] *Orestes*, 1569-70. This is a far cry from the dramatic tension created by Medea calling from the roof in a chariot drawn by dragons, (1405-1415); the appearance of Iris and Madness in *Heracles* (815) or the tension created by the Old Servant watching for the enemy in *Phoenician Women* (90-101). It is more reminiscent of Myrrhine shouting down at her husband in *Lysistrata* (870-888), Iris in *Birds*, (1196-1261); the wife in *Acharnians*, (262-283) or Philocleon in *Wasps* (135-155). See Mastronarde, (1990:247-94) for a discussion of stage machinery in tragedy.
[124] *Orestes,* 566-70; 522-54.
[125] Dunn, (1989:239)
[126] "The drama has a more comic ending". Cited in Schwartz, (1887:93)

characters as φαῦλοι.[127] Aristotle uses the same term to describe characters from comedy in contrast to those from tragedy whom he describes as σπουδαῖοι.[128]

In the *Orestes*, Euripides undermines all that goes on in Aeschylus' *Oresteia.* In the *Iphigenia at Aulis,* he deflates the heroism of Agamemnon and Achilles, redeploying and debasing the Aeschylean motifs he features.[129] In the *Orestes,* Euripides portrays Helen as empty-headed and Electra as indignant; Orestes' defence is a mixture of those presented in the *Oresteia*; Zeus arrives to announce the apotheosis of Helen and advises Menelaus to remarry. Orestes is to marry Hermione, and Electra, Pylades.

In *Iphigenia at Aulis* we are told that Agamemnon changes his mind about the sacrifice but when he manages to persuade Menelaus to agree, he changes his mind back again and pushes ahead. Achilles initially determines to save Iphigenia from her fate, but backs down after being told it is a useless cause. Iphigenia goes to her death a hero.

The way in which Euripides presents the situations and characters in these two plays undermines Aeschylus' versions with unlikely scenarios and un-heroic actions. This artistic recycling of material is similar in style to Aristophanes'. Both poets appropriate texts, exploit certain elements for the creation of a plot, make whatever changes necessary in order to present a new version and, at times, add comic language to give it a humorous twist.[130]

---

[127] "base" (44)

[128] *Poetics,* 49a describes comedy as an imitation of inferior people whilst 48b states that tragic characters are noble.

[129] A full discussion of the way in which Euripides uses older texts and motifs in the creation of his own is beyond the remit of this thesis. Therefore, it is only the comic elements that are discussed.

[130] Sommerstein (2002:153) describes a comic feature of language as that which is common in comedy but rare in tragedy.

6.13 Euripides' reaction to Aristophanes' *parodia*

As well as the presence of potentially humorous scenes in Euripides' plays, there is evidence to suggest that he responded to Aristophanes' *parodia* by including scenes and, in some cases, lines that were reminiscent of Aristophanes' work.

Despite the unfortunate circumstances of its heroine who is wrongly accused of wantonness, *Captive Melanippe* contains a debate on misogyny. A female character, possibly Melanippe, argues that women are better than men; that not all women are bad and that they should not all be denigrated in the same way.[131] The unlikely setting of these scenes could be a response to critics who disapproved of the way Euripides portrayed women in his plays, a topic which featured in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae,* three years later. *Captive Melanippe* also contains a remark which may be aimed at Aristophanes:[132]

> ἀνδρῶν δὲ πολλοὶ τοῦ γέλωτος οὕνεκα
> ἀσκοῦσι χάριτας κερτόμους· ἐγὼ δέ πως
> μισῶ γελοίους, οἵτινες τήτηι σοφῶν
> ἀχάλιν' ἔχουσι στόματα, κείς ἀνδρῶν μὲν οὐ
> τελοῦσιν ἀριθμόν, ἐν γέλωτι δ' εὐπρεπεῖς[133]

However, it does not appear to be a serious reproach as despite Euripides' suggestion that unless Aristophanes has anything wise to say he should keep his remain silent, he acknowledges that he is a skilled comedian.

Aristophanes responds in *Thesmophoriazusae* when Euripides swears the same oath as Melanippe when protesting her innocence: ὄμνυμι τοίνυν αἰθέρ' οἴκησιν Διός.[134] He then goes on to accuse her of being one of Euripides' many

[131] Euripides *Captive Melanippe, frs.* 660m, 493 and 498 (produced in 414BC)

[132] Schmidt, (1940) and van Looy (1964) both propose that Euripides is responding to Aristophanes and other comic critics. Collard (1995:217) disagrees. I suggest that this is a direct response to Aristophanes given the poet's well known propensity for borrowing from the tragedian, which was noted and commented upon by other comic poets.

[133] "Many men practise mockery as a grace, for the sake of mirth. But I do not much like those wits who keep unbridled mouths through want of wise things to say; they do not count as real men, though they look good in moments of mirth." *Captive Melanippe fr.* 492

[134] "I swear it by the sky, the dwelling-place of Zeus." *Thesmophoriazusae,* 272. Euripides *fr.* 487 is almost identical reading: ὄμνυμι δ' ἱερὸν αἰθέρ', οἴκησιν Διός.

unchaste women: ... Μελανίππας ποιῶν Φαίδρας τε: Πηνελόπην δὲ οὐπώποτ' ἐποίησ', ὅτι γυνὴ σώφρων ἔδοξεν εἶναι.[135]

In the *Electra,* the sardonic nature of the exchange between the Old Man and Electra suggests that Euripides had in mind Aristophanes' sarcastic comment in *Clouds* that if the audience is as intelligent as Electra (since she can recognise her brother's hair), they will recognise a good play.[136] Electra says: οὐκ ἄξι' ἀνδρός, ὦ γέρον, σοφοῦ λέγεις.[137] Euripides' intimation is that Aristophanes' audience is not particularly clever as they fail to recognise that it is ridiculous to make a positive identification on the strength of such tenuous evidence and, therefore, they cannot be clever enough to recognise a good play either. This side-swipe at Aristophanes' audience is entirely in keeping with the critical banter that emerged between the two poets as their careers progressed.

In the *Helen* there is an overt allusion to Aristophanes when Helen calls upon the nightingale to sing of her lament.[138] The words Euripides uses are almost identical to those in *Birds*.[139] It is also possible that both Aristophanes and Euripides are making reference to an older text that uses this line.[140] However, given that the *Helen* was written so soon after *Birds,* it is probable that Euripides had Aristophanes' version in mind as he wrote.[141]

[135] "...[Euripides] creating Melanippes and Phaedras. He's never created a Penelope, because she was agreed to be a virtuous woman!" *Thesmophoriazusae,* 547-8

[136] Aristophanes, *Clouds,* 534, produced in 423, and Euripides' *Electra* is believed to have been produced in 413BC.

[137] "Old man, your words are unworthy of a wise man". Euripides *Electra*, 524

[138] *Helen,* 1111-13

[139] Aristophanes *Birds,* 213-14

[140] Sommerstein, (1987:212). See also Dobrow, (2001 :126-32) for a discussion of possible 'intertextual reciprocity' between Aristophanic comedy and the *Helen.*

[141] *Birds* was produced in 414BC and the *Helen* in 412BC. Dover (1972:149) notes that this is the only use of the term 'trill' in extant Greek poetry which shows that "a tragic poet was not above borrowing from a comedian". There are further elements in the *Helen* that stretch the bounds of tragedy, beginning with Menelaus appearing at the gates of the palace. *Helen,* 436-458. See Bowie, (1993:219)

The *topos* of a stranger disguised in rags, approaching the enemy, had already been used by Euripides in *Telephus*[142] and was later parodied by Aristophanes in *Acharnians*.[143] In *Telephus,* his disguise as a beggar is an invention that is later commented on by Aristophanes when, in *Acharnians,* Dicaeopolis knocks on Euripides' door asking to borrow a set of rags in order to go before the Athenians and plead his case. [144] He is met by Euripides' servant who abuses him before going through a long list of Euripidean heroes, each of whom wears rags, before finally remembering that the costume he needs is that of Telephus. Aristophanes highlights and ridicules Euripides' extensive use of this motif when Dicaeopolis forgets the name of the play from which he wants to borrow the costume and goes through a list of Euripidean tragic heroes who have been presented in rags.

Euripides responds to this gibe in the *Helen* by placing Menelaus, a king, in a similar situation. The similarity of setting and the droll exchange between Menelaus and the Servant alerts the audience and Aristophanes, to Euripides' response. [145] The scene with the Old Woman and Menelaus in the *Helen* and the interaction between Dicaeopolis and Euripides in *Acharnians* are also similar, with the stranger knocking on the door asking for help whilst the servant abuses him.[146]

Euripides uses the script to break the dramatic illusion and alert the audience to another comic parody. When Helen suggests that Menelaus should pretend to have died, he says, παλαιότης γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ γ' ἔνεστί τις.[147] This is a meta-theatrical

[142] Euripides, *frs.* 697,698, where the protagonist appears before the Achaeans dressed as a beggar in order to plead his case. *Telephus* was produced c.438BC.
[143] Aristophanes *Acharnians,* 405-465. Aristophanes uses the same *topos* later in *Thesmophoriazusae.*
[144] There is no mention of Telephus being dressed in rags in Hyginus' *Fabulae.*
[145] Euripides signifies his parodies and intertextual references by the use of low language in a serious setting. Horace *Art of Poetry*, 93-96 states that comedy may sometimes elevate its voice and often, in tragedy, an exile or beggar may lament in common prose. In short, that tragedy can lower its voice in the same way that comedy can be elevated.
[146] *Helen,* 458. Quintilian 6.3.84 describes humour created in this way as "the most elegant of devices" in which the joke depends on the inversion of audience expectation. Menelaus, the king, dressed as a beggar, is reduced to tears by the Old Woman, changing his status from a tragic hero to a comic target
[147] "There is something old fashioned about your suggestion" Euripides *Helen* 1059

allusion to previous plays in which the avenger feigns death, such as Aeschylus' *Choephori*[148] and Sophocles' *Electra*,[149] both of which are dated prior to the *Helen*. Euripides ends the play with a call for rejoicing, which again does not feature anywhere in the tragic tradition. He reminds the audience that he has created a new form of drama when the Chorus address them: καὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη, τῶν δ' ἀδοκήτων πόρον ηὗρε θεός.[150] Here again, Euripides turns the conventions of tragedy on their head.

It can be seen, therefore, that the two poets borrowed from, and reacted to, each other in a variety of ways. The fearless women of Euripides' tragedies who rail against the actions of their men, cannot fail to have had an impact on Aristophanes. The chronology is important. The *Lysistrata* appears shortly after the *Trojan Women,* which highlighted the effect of war on women and their households and shows them trying to effect a reconciliation between the two parties. In that same year, Aristophanes also produced the *Thesmophoriazusae* where Euripides was held to account for his depictions of women and the way in which he represented women in his plays. The way Euripides presents women in some of his plays, with their return to the *oikos*, mirrors the way they are represented in comedy. In effect, Aristophanes is punishing him for straying into the *topoi* of comedy where women are concerned.

The following year, Euripides reacts to this reprimand and produces the *Phoenician Women*,[151] which again contains both comic motifs (as shown above) and mythic novelty. Jocasta is still alive and has undertaken the role of trying to effect a reconciliation between two warring factions. The scene between Jocasta and

---

[148] Aeschylus *Choephori* 680-690
[149] Sophocles *Electra,* 55-60
[150] "What we expected was not fulfilled, but for what was unexpected the god found a way." *Helen,* 1691
[151] *Phoenician Women* is variously dated between 410BC and 408BC.

her sons [152] bears remarkable resemblance to Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* when Lysistrata tries to bring about a ceasefire between the Athenian and the Spartan ambassadors. In both the comic and the tragic scenes, the woman is on stage, standing between the two men, speaking first to one, then the other, as the argument continues. Here then, Euripides is again borrowing from comedy by re-using the myth. He creates a woman who acts outside her traditional remit and constructs the scene in exactly the same way as Aristophanes had done the previous year. Euripides is making it clear that he will continue to represent women 'as they really are and not as they should be' (just as he had done in *Captive Melanippe*) and in addition, he will copy Aristophanes' built in stage directions whilst doing so.[153]

Euripides' *Antiope* was produced in 410, a year after the *Thesmophoriazusae* and it too contains a response to Aristophanes. In it, Zethus berates Amphion for his effeminacy and love of music, saying that he should concentrate instead on hard work.[154] Amphion argues that singing does not stop him from being wise, and useful to the city.[155] The depiction of Amphion as effeminate with a propensity for singing does not contribute to the plot in any way, and given that the story is serious, containing danger, punishment and retribution, this scene feels strangely out of place. However, the conversation between the two brothers in *Antiope* is remarkably similar to the scene between Agathon and the In-Law in the *Thesmophoriazusae* when they, too, are faced with serious danger in the form of an attack on Euripides. Agathon is represented as effeminate due to his propensity for poetry and music[156] but unlike Amphion, does not aid the cause. Instead he uses Euripides' lines from

---

[152] Euripides, *Phoenician Women,* 300-640

[153] Whilst the extant texts do not contain specific stage directions, it is often possible to imagine the way in which the scenes might have been presented from the way in which the dialogue is written; particularly when it is a short scene involving a discussion or negotiation between two or three people.

[154] Euripides *Antiope, frs.* 185 and 187. Note that Pentheus is mocked by Dionysus in a similar way in *Bacchae* 855 and 978.

[155] *Antiope, fr.* 202

[156] Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae,* 101-129

Alcestis as an excuse: ἐποίησάς ποτε, 'χαίρεις ὁρῶν φῶς, πατέρα δ' οὐ χαίρειν δοκεῖς;'[157]

The dialogue between the poets continues in Euripides' *Bacchae*, which also shows elements of response to the criticisms levelled in *Thesmophoriazusae.*[158] The *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata* both contain scenes where there is a blurring of genders. In the *Lysistrata*, the old men are dressed up by the women in order to humiliate them and in *Thesmophoriazusae,* the In-Law is plucked and depilated before infiltrating the women-only festival to find out what they do.[159] The same scenario occurs in the *Bacchae* when Pentheus dons a disguise to discover the secrets of the women-only festival. Both impostors have a dresser; Dionysus for Pentheus and Euripides for the In-Law. The dressing scenes are remarkably similar in structure and the way in which the two sets of men engage in comic banter.[160] Both Pentheus and the In-Law are fitted with a headband, dressed in a gown and make effeminate gestures as they prepare for their new roles. Pentheus strikes the pose of a woman and asks: τί φαίνομαι δῆτ'; οὐχὶ τὴν Ἰνοῦς στάσιν ἢ τὴν Ἀγαύης ἑστάναι, μητρός γ' ἐμῆς;[161] Dionysus replies that he has a lock of hair out of place, to which Pentheus says: ἔνδον προσείων αὐτὸν ἀνασείων τ' ἐγὼ καὶ βακχιάζων ἐξ ἕδρας μεθώρμισα.[162] Pentheus implores Dionysus to rearrange his hair and having done so criticises him again: ζῶναί τέ σοι χαλῶσι κοὐχ ἑξῆς πέπλων στολίδες ὑπὸ σφυροῖσι τείνουσιν σέθεν.[163]

[157] "Did you once write: 'You rejoice to see the light of day; think you your father does not?'" Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae,* 194
[158] Euripides *Bacchae* was produced posthumously in 405BC
[159] *Lysistrata,* 1026; *Thesmophoriazusae,* 215-245
[160] *Bacchae*, 831-840, 910-944 and *Thesmophoriazusae,* 216-274
[161] "How do I look then? Am I not standing like Ino stands, or Agaue, my mother?".*Bacchae,* 925
[162] "Inside, in shaking it forward, and shaking it backward, and acting as a bacchant, I dislodged it from its place" *Bacchae,* 930
[163] "Your belt is loose and the pleats of your robe are not in order where they hang below the ankles." *Bacchae*, 935-6

The scene is very similar to the *Thesmophoriazusae* when the In-Law is dressed and styled by Euripides before commanding: ἴθι νυν κατάστειλόν με τὰ περὶ τὼ σκέλει.[164] Such are the similarities between these two scenes that Euripides could have had Aristophanes' cross-dressing scene in mind as he wrote the *Bacchae.* The more informed members of the audience would already have been alerted to the fact that a comic scene was coming with the use of colloquial language in the preceding lines.[165] Therefore, when the undeniably comic scene of a god dressing a prince in women's clothing took place, they cannot fail to have seen the humour and recognised the parody. In addition to the humour contained within the *topos* of cross-dressing is the idea of old men trying to recapture their youth. The scene between Teiresias and Kadmos appears more festive than comic in the written form, but once performed becomes humorous.[166] The men refer to themselves as an old couple wishing to dance their age away at the festival as a form of light relief for the audience before the horror of the scenes to come.[167]

For Nesselrath:

> ...parody is regarded as the single most important element in the evolution of literary forms and genres; by reacting to extant literary forms and transforming them, parody paves the way for further development of these forms.[168]

And for Aristophanes and Euripides, the use of *parodia* is a vital component in their literary dialogue and an important element in the development of their 'genres'.

[164] "...belt it up... sort me out round the legs" *Thesmophoriazusae,* 255-6
[165] See *Bacchae* 914ff for the comic banter between Pentheus and Dionysus.
[166] *Bacchae,* 170-324. The *Bacchae* was presented in translation at the Classical Association conference (2012) in Exeter with Professor Richard Seaford playing the part of Teiresias. Using his own translation of the text, he highlighted the pathos of the scene in order to bring out the 'comic' elements.
[167] *Bacchae* 205; 320
[168] Nesselrath, (1993:193-4). Here he is discussing the views of the Russian Formalists. See Erlich, (1965:194; 258f) for a more in-depth description of the Russian Formalists' theory of parody. In general, the Russian Formalists "keep the work of art itself in the centre of attention: it sharply emphasises the difference between literature and life, it rejects the usual bibliographical, psychological and sociological explanation of literature" (Erlich:1965:9) and concentrates instead on the functional role of literary devices, one of which is parody.

6.14 Changing Styles of the Poets

At the same time that Euripides' style was changing so too was Aristophanes'. Initially, Aristophanes' comedy was fast paced and rowdy and the audience did not have time to think about his serious messages until afterwards. He warns Athenians against the poor, foreigners, politicians, women and philosophers and his comedy was no less solemn than the tragedies of Euripides who was warning, for the most part, against the same things.[169] Both were responding to the situation facing Athens. When it later became clear that Athens was at serious risk of losing to Sparta, there came an astonishing reversal of styles. Aristophanes' plays became more serious, as seen particularly in *Frogs*,[170] which is severely lacking in the belly-laughs provided in his previous work whilst Euripides' style moved away from the tragic into light-entertainment. Plutarch's comments on Aristophanes' plays could just as easily be applicable to Euripides' later works, given his change in style, which again highlights their similarities:

> ...in his diction there are tragic, comic, pompous, and prosaic elements, obscurity, vagueness, dignity, and elevation [...] all these differences and dissimilarities his use of words does not give to each kind its fitting and appropriate use [...] for example, to a king his dignity, to an orator his eloquence, to a woman her artlessness, to an ordinary man his prosaic speech [...] but he assigns to his characters as if by lot such words as happen to turn up, and you could not tell whether the speaker is son or father, a rustic or a god, or an old woman or a hero.[171]

It seems that the practical concerns of the end of the fifth-century affected, at least in part, the type of humour created by the poets.[172] Aristophanes comments on Euripides' changing style: χαρίεν οὖν μὴ Σωκράτει παρακαθήμενον λαλεῖν,

[169] Plutarch remarks that: "..old comedy is unsuitable for drinkers because of its unevenness. The seriousness and outspokenness of what are called the 'parabases' are too unrelieved and intense." *Moralia* 7.8.4

[170] The opening lines of *Frogs* are evidence of Aristophanes' thoughts on this matter. The scene has Dionysus and Xanthias arguing about whether or not they should "do the usual things" that make the audience laugh. This shows Aristophanes' recognition of what was expected in a comic play and a desire to move away from these stereotypes.

[171] Plutarch, *Moralia*, 1.853

[172] Platonius *On Comedy* I.13-31 and *Vita Aristophanis* XXVII.50-8 cited in English (2007: 5n.37)

ἀποβαλόντα μουσικὴν τά τε μέγιστα παραλιπόντα τῆς τραγῳδικῆς τέχνης.[173] The death of comedy can be attributed to Euripides' 'betrayal' of the genre and this degenerate form of tragedy later re-emerges as the essence of New Comedy.[174]

The theatre *was* the *polis* and it reflected the thoughts, feelings and problems of its audience.[175] With the fifth-century backdrop of the Peloponnesian War, the concerns of the *polis* were serious. In the early part of his career, Euripides' plays contained comment on and warnings about the actions of politicians, but this changed towards the end of the war. The watershed year in Euripides' development came in 412 with the disastrous Sicilian Expedition and the audiences' hunger for happier 'comic' endings.[176] As the political situation became more serious for Athens, he continued to convey pessimism about political and military leadership, but began to write plays that contained resolutions and have happy endings. These had only ever been seen in comedy. As with comedy, the trauma of war defines the fate of the literary genre.[177]

The opposite was true of Aristophanes. The beginning of his career also saw plays that commented upon politicians and war, but did so through the use of scatology, obscenity and slapstick that created, no doubt, gales of laughter from the audience. When it became clear that Athens was on the brink of defeat, his plays became more serious with political comment no longer being presented in the same way and his style moving towards the tragic. The *Lenaea* and the *City Dionysia* festivals comprised plays in honour of Dionysus and all performances, both tragic and comic, involved actors wearing masks and had a Chorus that sang and

---

[173] "So it isn't stylish to sit beside Socrates and blabber away, discarding artistry and ignoring the most important things about the tragedian's craft." *Frogs*, 1491-1495
[174] Nietzsche, (1967:75-77)
[175] Ehrenberg, (1954:6)
[176] Segal, (2001:134-135). Thucydides (8.1.2) says that at this time Athens was overcrowded, the financial crisis meant a lack of food and there was a 'great fear and trembling' in general. Euripides' message was, essentially, 'Keep calm and carry on!'
[177] Kotini and كوت يني ڤاسيليكي, (2010, 134)

commented on the action. They contained similar *topoi*: mythological references, political comment and sociological messages which led to a catharsis designed to play upon the emotions of the audience.[178] Whilst "tragedy shows us pain and gives us pleasure thereby",[179] the same can now be said of comedy. In the *Philebus* Socrates says: "Or take again the state of soul in which we listen to a comedy. Has it struck you that there too is a blending of pain with pleasure?"[180] Looking at these most basic tenets, it seems absurd to assume that the fifth-century genres of comedy and tragedy are considered to be worlds apart.

6.15 Conclusions

This Chapter set out to challenge the traditional classifications of ancient comedy and tragedy as independent genres and show that the reciprocal influence of Aristophanes and Euripides went beyond the use of, and reaction to, each other's texts, and that by the end of the fifth-century, their genres became so similar that they should not be classified as simply either comedy or tragedy. This investigation has shown numerous similarities of theme and tone, which supports the assertion that in some cases, the plays of Aristophanes and Euripides should be labelled simply as 'drama'. By considering both ancient and modern theories of genre, it is evident that whilst the traditional definition of Aristophanes as a comedian and Euripides as a tragedian is applicable to the beginning of their careers, by the end, because of the constant, flexible dialogue between them, it is impossible to class them as opposites.

[178] See Robson (2009:18-20) for a useful discussion of the possible chronology of tragedy and comedy performances during the festivals. He proposes that the comedies took place after the tragedies either each day, or at the end of the week. This being the case, the audience would be receiving first a tragic catharsis and then a comic catharsis, both induced, in part, by similar *topoi.*

[179] Hamilton (1993:172) goes on to say that "…the greater the suffering depicted, the more terrible the events, the more intense our pleasure" Aristophanes' characters often suffer intensely both emotionally and physically but this does not prevent us from taking pleasure in the fact that it is them and not us.

[180] Plato, *Philebus* 167-9

Although writing primarily on tragedy, Aristotle highlights a number of elements that are also applicable to comedy. The works of Horace, Pollux and Donatus also indicate a number of overlapping features, particularly in regard to language. ‘Modern’ ideas of genre such as prototypical and family resemblance theory also emphasize similarities rather than differences between comedy and tragedy. Having examined both ancient and modern definitions of the two genres, it is evident that there is no clear-cut, exclusive classification that can be applied.

The correspondence between Aristophanes’ ‘comedy’ and Euripides’ ‘tragedy’ became more and more evident as the Peloponnesian War drew to a close at the end of the fifth-century. The way their work reflected current events began to change as the situation became more serious and both poets began to develop a new style of writing. Aristophanes’ response to the impending disaster was to become more sombre in his warnings whilst Euripides became more light-hearted. Their habit of parodying one another also developed as time went on until finally, their styles began to overlap. Their literary dialogue thus became more than simple *parodia* and expanded into marked reciprocal influence as they continued to relate and react to each other’s work and the situation in Athens.

The result of these changes was that a new form of literature began to develop which, given the events in Athens, did not have time to fully develop to the point of reclassification. However, with the benefit of hindsight, it is possible to see the overall picture and show that as the poets moved towards each other, they moved away from their traditional roles of comic and tragedian and instead both became dramatists.

CONCLUSIONS

Moving Forward, Looking Back

The original purpose of my research was to catalogue the 'intertextuality of Aristophanes and Euripides'. This idea fell at the first hurdle because I very quickly discovered that 'intertextuality' is a word that in trying to say too much, says nothing at all. Thus, my first task was to investigate the history of this concept from antiquity to the present day.

In beginning my research on literary theory, I, as no doubt many scholars are, was biased by treatises written by linguists of the 1960s whose ideas were influenced by popular trends in politics, and their own academic ambition. Not only was it fashionable at that time to create 'new' insights into literature, but to describe and surround them in jargon so complex that they were inaccessible to the layman in any meaningful way. So, putting them aside, I decided to go back to basics and start in the fifth-century and move forward with an open-mind.

Chapter One considered ancient and modern definitions of 'intertextuality' before offering a new set of classifications more appropriate to Aristophanes' work.

This method was then applied to all the lines Aristophanes borrowed from Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides before concluding that the poet had a unique relationship with the texts of the latter.

The second Chapter challenged the modern meaning of parody and looked for a more accurate way of describing the way in which Aristophanes recreated scenes from Euripides' in his plays. The evidence I presented showed that although all comic poets appear to have borrowed from tragedy, Aristophanes was the most

prolific user of this technique. The analysis of various sections of the text showed the many different ways new meaning was created through the incorporation of Euripides' lines, discussed in accordance with the new definition on intertextuality offered in Chapter One.

Chapter Three considered what these different techniques might tell us about the audience of fifth-century Athens. My research led me to the conclusion that Aristophanes was acutely aware of the different competences contained in the audience and wrote to stimulate their poetic memories and thus control the reception of his plays. His disappointment when the audience failed to live up to the expectations he had of his hypothetical audience was evident, and I went on to show how he adapts his technique accordingly.

Chapter Four offered a new reading of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs* claiming that the *Thesmophoriazusae* is not, as most scholars proclaim the least political of Aristophanes' plays but, in fact, the most political. A close reading of the text showed that Aristophanes created signifiers from Euripides' own plays to demonstrate the inconsistency of the tragedian's political stance in regard to Alcibiades. The *Frogs* was shown to be an inversion of this message, with Alcibiades and Euripides again at the heart of the message, but with Alcibiades seeking to rescue Euripides instead of vice-versa.

The final Chapter challenged the ancient classifications of comedy and tragedy in light of my previous discussions of Aristophanes' and Euripides' literary techniques. Ancient and modern definitions were considered before I put forward the theory that retrospective classification of fifth-century texts must be viewed with caution because they were not fully developed at their deaths.

The Chapter also showed that Aristophanes and Euripides were locked in a dialogue, played out through the words of their characters and that gradually, the lines between them began to blur to the point at that they had both become generic dramatists instead of a tragedian and a comic.

I recognise that some of the assertions offered in this thesis are radical and go against traditional academic thought. I defend this by saying that this is a field that has been studied for thousands of years, with each new set of scholars being influenced by those that came before them. What I set out to do was to look at the texts in a fresh way, and to listen between the lines for the voices of the poets and the roar of the crowd.

There is much work to be done still on Aristophanes. For the most part, his relationship with contemporary comic poets remains untouched. Fragments need to be categorised and compared against his extant plays to ascertain the extent to which he copied from them. My initial and limited investigations into this area shows that despite Aristophanes' furious condemnation at even the slightest suspicion that one of his contemporaries may have copied him in some small way, I have not found a single admission on his part, that he borrowed a single line from one of them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aelian. *Varia Historia.* Translated by N.G. Wilson. London: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Aeschylus. *Agamemnon.* Translated by Herbert Weir Smyth. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1926.

—. *Persians.* Translated by Philip Vellacott. London: Penguin Books, 1961.

—. *Seven Against Thebes.* Translated by Herbert Weir Smyth. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Apollodorus. *Library of Greek Mythology.* Translated by Robin Hard. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Aristotle. *Aristotle's Ars Poetica.* Edited by R. Kassel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

—. *Categories, On Interpretation, and On Sophistical Refutations.* Translated by E.M. Edghill and W.A. Pickard-Cambridge. Kevin Neeland, 2006.

—. *Nicomachean Ethics.* Vol. 19, translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, M.A., London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd, 1934.

—. *Poetics.* Translated by Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1996.

—. *Politics.* Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA, London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd., 1944.

—. *Rhetoric.* Translated by J. H. Freese. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd., 1926.

ATILF, Laboratoire. *Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé.* Paris: CNRS, 1988.

Austin, C., and R. Kassel. *Poetae Comici Graeci Vol. IV.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1983.

Bain, David. "[Euripides] Electra." *BICS*, no. 24 (1997): 104-16.

—. *Actors and Audience. A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama.* Oxford: OUP, 1977.

—. "Audience Address in Greek Tragedy." *The Classical Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (May 1995): 13-25.

Baker, James. *Teaching TV Sitcom.* London: British Film Industry, 2003.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barthes, Roland. *Image - Music - Texts.* London: Fontana, 1977.

—. *Mythologies.* Translated by Annette Lavers. New York: Hill & Wang, 1972.

—. "The Death of the Author." In *Death and Resurrection of the Author*, edited by William Irwin, 3-7. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002.

—. *The Pleasure of the Text.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.

Bentley, Eric. *The Life of the Drama.* New York: Applause, 1991.

Berger, Arthur Asa. *Cultural Criticism. A Primer of Key Concepts.* California, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1995.

Bergson, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic.* London: Dover Publications, 1900 (reprinted 2005).

Bettinghaus, Erwin P. *Persuasive Communication.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc., 1994.

Birrell, Augustine. *Seven Lectures on the Law and History of Copyright in Books.* New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1899, reprinted 1971.

Blanchot, Maurice. *The Space of Literature.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

Blum, R. *The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography.* Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Bond, G.W. "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus." *Hermathena*, no. 118 (1974): 1-14.

Booker, Christopher. *The Seven Basic Plots: Why We Tell Stories.* London: Continuum, 2004.

Bowie, A.M. *Aristophanes. Myth, Ritual and Comedy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bowra, C.M. "Euripides' Epinician for Alcibiades." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Vol. 9, No. 1 (1960): 68-79.

Calame, Claude. "Performative aspects of the choral voice in Greek tragedy: civic identity in performance." In *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, edited by Simon Goldhill, & Robin Osborne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 126-153.

Caldwell, R. “Romanticized: The Iphigenia Taurica.” *The Classical Journal* 70, no. 2 (Dec. 1974-Jan. 1975): 23-40.

Cameron, Alan. “Genre and Style in Callimachus.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* Vol. 122 (1992): 305-312.

Carlson, M. “Semiotics and its Heritage.” In *Critical Theory and Performance*, edited by Joseph R. Roach, Janelle G. Reinelt, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2007, 13-23..

Carron, Jean-Claude. “Imitation and Intertextuality in the Renaissance.” *New Literary History* 19, no. 3 History, Critics and Criticism: Some Inquiries (Spring 1988): 565-579.

Chapman, G.A.H. “Some Notes on Dramatic Illusion in Aristophanes.” *American Journal of Philology*, no. 104 (Spring, 1983): 1-23.

Cicero. *De Re Publica; de Legibus.* Translated by C.W. Keyes. London: William Heinemann, 1928.

—. *On Oratory and Orators.* Translated by J.S. Watson. London: Atlantic Books, 1997.

Claessens, Nathalie, and Alexander Dhoest. “Comedy Taste; Highbrow/lowbrow comedy and cultural capital.” *Participations. Journal of Audience & Reception Studies* 7, no. 1 (May 2010): 49-72.

Clevenger, Theodore. *Audience Analysis.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill, 1966.

Cohen, Ralph. “History and Genre.” *New Literary History* Vol. 17, no. 2, Interpretation and Culture (Winter, 1986): 203-218.

Collard, C., M.J. Cropp, and J. Gibert. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays. Volume II.* Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2004.

Collard, C., M.J. Cropp, and K.H. Lee. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays. Volume I.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1995.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Copenhaver, Brian P. *Symphorien Champier and the Reception of Occultist Tradition in Renaissance France.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.

Cornford, F.M. *The Origin of Attic Comedy.* Gloucester: P. Smith, 1968.

Coward, Rosalind, and John Ellis. *Language and Materialism. Developments in Semiology and the Theory of the Subject.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1977.

Csapo, Eric, and William Slater. *The Context of Greek Drama.* Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1994.

Cudden, J.A., ed. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory.* London: Penguin Books, 1988.

Dale, A.M. *Euripides' Helen.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Dante. *Purgatory.* Translated by Mark Musa. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1985.

de Marinis, M. *The Semiotics of Performance.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

de Romilly, Jacqueline. "Phoenician Women of Euripides: Topicality in Greek Tragedy." *Bucknell Review*, 15, 1967: 108-32.

de Ste Croix, G.E.M. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War.* London: Duckworth, 1972.

Delebecque, E. "Alcibiade au theâtre d'Athênes à la fin de la guerre du Péloponnèse." *Dioniso*, no. 41 (1967): 354-362.

—. *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse.* Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1951.

Demand, N. "The Identity of the Frogs." *Classical Philology* Vol. 65, no. 2 (1970): 83-87.

Demetrius. *On Style.* Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Denard, Hugh. "Lost theatre and performance traditions in Greece and Italy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, edited by Marianne McDonald, & J. Michael Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 139-160.

Dillon, George. *Constructing Texts: Elements of a Theory of Composition and Style.* Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1981.

Dillon, Sarah. *The Palimpsest.* London: Continuum, 2007.

Diodorus, Siculus. *Bibliotheca Historica.* Translated by C.H. Oldfather. London: William Heinemann, 1962.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers.* Edited by R.D. Hicks. Translated by R.D. Hicks. London: William Heinemann, 1999.

Diomedes. "Ars Grammatica." In *Grammatici Latini*, by Heinrich Keil. Leipzig: G. Teubner, 1855-1868.

Dobrov, G.W. *Figures of Play.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Donatus, Aelius. *Life of Virgil.* Trans. David Scott Wilson-Okamura 1996 www.virgil.org/vitae/a-donatus.htm (accessed March 12th, 2010).

Dover, K. *Aristophanic Comedy.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972.

Drew, D.L. "The political purpose in Euripides' Helen." *Classical Philology* Vol. 25, No. 2 (Apr. 1930): 187-189.

Du Bellay, J. *La Défense et Illustration de la Langue Françoyse.* Edited by Henri Chamard. Paris: Société des textes français modernes , 1948.

Duff, David, ed. *Modern Genre Theory.* Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2000.

Dunn, Francis M. "Comic and Tragic License in Euripides' "Orestes"." *Classical Antiquity*, 8:2, Oct. 1989: 238-251.

Easterling, P. "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985): 1-10.

Easterling, P., and B. Knox. *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Greek Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Edmonds, J.M. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk and Kock.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957.

Ehrenberg, V. *Sophocles and Pericles.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1954.

Empiricus, Sextus. *Against the Grammarians.* Translated by D.L. Blank. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

—. *Against the Logicians.* Translated by Richard Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

English, M. "The Evolution of Aristophanic Stagecraft." *Leeds International Classical Studies*, 4.03, 2005: 1-16.

Erlich, V. *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine.* Paris: Mouton, 1965.

Euripides. *Alcestis.* Translated by David Kovacs. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

—. *Andromache.* Translated by David Kovacs. Loeb Classical Library, 1995.

—. *Bacchae.* Translated by Richard Seaford. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

—. *Cyclops.* Translated by David Kovacs. London: William Heinemann Ltd. , 1994.

—. *Electra.* Edited by Eugene O'Neill Jr. and Whitney J. Oates. Translated by E.P. Coleridge. New York: Random House, 1938.

—. *Hecuba.* Translated by E.P. Coleridge. New York: Random House, 1938.

—. *Helen.* Translated by Peter Burian. Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2007.

—. *Heracles.* Translated by E. P. Coleridge. New York: Random House, 1938.

—. *Hippolytus.* Translated by David Kovacs. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

—. *Ion.* Translated by K.H. Lee. Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 1997.

—. *Iphigenia at Tauris.* Translated by M.J. Cropp. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2000.

—. *Medea.* Translated by D.J. Mastronarde. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

—. *Orestes.* Translated by John Davie. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

—. *Phoenician Women.* Translated by E. M. Craik. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988.

—. *Suppliant Women.* Translated by James Moorwood. Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2007.

Feldman, A. "The Quintessence of Comedy." *The Classical Journal*, 1948: 389-393.

Ford, A. *The Origins of Criticism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Fowler, Alastair. "Genre." In *International Encyclopedia of Communications*, edited by Erik Barnouw, 215-7. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

—. *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genre and Modes.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Fowler, H.W. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage.* Edited by David Crystal. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Fowler, Harold N., trans. *Plato in Twelve Volumes.* Vol. 9. Cambridge, MA, London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd., 1925.

Fraser, Peter M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Freud, Sigmund. *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious.* Translated by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1960.

Gadet, Françoise. *Saussure and Contemporary Culture.* Translated by Gregory Elliot. London: Century Hutchinson Ltd., 1986.

Gellie, G. “Tragedy and Euripides' Electra.” *BICS*, no. 28 (1981): 1-12.

Genette, Gérard. *Figures of Literary Discourse.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

—. *Narrative Discourse Revisited.* Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

—. *Palimpsestes: Littérature au Second Degré.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1982.

—. *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree.* Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997a.

—. *Paratexts : Thresholds of Interpretation.* Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Lincoln NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997b.

—. *The Architext: An Introduction.* Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1992.

—. “The Architext.” In *Modern Genre Theory*, edited by David Duff, 211-218. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2000.

Germain, G. "Theano: Theonoe - sur un personnage d'Euripide." in *Studi classici in honore di Quintino Cataudella.* Catania, 1972. 259-73.

Gilman, Sander J. *The Parodic Sermon in European Perspective.* Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1974.

Gledhill, Christine. “Genre.” In *The Cinema Book*, edited by Pam Cook. London: British Film Institute, 1985. 137-228.

Goldhill, Simon. “Comic inversion and inverted commas: Aristophanes and parody.” In *The Poet's Voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 167-222.

Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Green, J.R. *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Grote, George. *Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1865:2010.

Grube, G.M.A. *The Drama of Euripides.* London: Methuen, 1941.

Haberer, A. “Intertextuality in Theory and Practice.” *Literatura*, (49) 5, 2007: 54-67.

Hairston, Maxine. *A Contemporary Rhetoric.* 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Halliwell, Stephen. “Aristophanes' Apprenticeship.” *Classical Quarterly* 30, no. 1 (1981): 33-45.

—. *Aristotle's Poetics.* London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Halliwell, Stephen. “Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (111), 1991: 48-70.

Halliwell, Stephen. “Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, no. 111 (1991): 48-70.

Hamilton, E. *The Greek Way.* New York: Norton, 1993.

Heath, Malcolm. *Political Comedy in Aristophanes.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Henderson, J. *The Maculate Muse.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975.

Hermann, Peter. *Wahreit und Kunst, Gescbichtsschreibung und Plagiat im Klassischen Altertum.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1911.

Hermogenes. *On Types of Style.* Translated by Cecil W. Wooten. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Herrington, C.J. “A Study in the Prometheia (Part II: Birds and Prometheia).” *Phoenix*, 17 Winter 1963: 236-243.

Hesk, Jon. “The socio-political dimension of ancient tragedy.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, edited by Marianne McDonald, & J. Michael Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 72-91.

Hippocrates. *Works.* Translated by W.D. Smith. London: W. Heinemann, 1923.

Hjelmslev, Louis. “Linguistique structurale.” *Acta Linguistica* IV (1944).

Hodge, R. *Literature as Discourse. Textual Strategies in English and History.* Oxford: Polity Press, 1990.

Holub, Robert C. *Reception Theory.* London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984.

Hooker, G.T.W. “The Topography of the Frogs.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* Vol. 80 (1960): 112-117.

Horace. *The Art of Poetry.* Translated by C. Smart and Theodore Alois Buckley. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1963.

Hosius, Carl. “Plagiatoren und Plagiatbegriff in Altertum.” *Neue Jahrübcher für das klassiche Altertum*, no. 31 (1913): 176-93.

Householder Jnr., Fred W. “ΠΑΡΩΙΔΙΑ.” *Classical Philology* Vol. 39. No. 1 (Jan. 1944): 1-9.

Howe, Nancy. “Dante's letter to Can Grande.” In *Essays on Dante*, 32-47. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.

Huddilston, J.H. “An Archaeological Study of the Antigone of Euripides.” *Archaeological Institute of America*, 1899: 183-201.

Hume, David. *Four Dissertations.* London: Thoemmes Continuum, Facsimile of 1757 ed edition (15 Oct 1995) .

Hunt, P. “The Slaves and the Generals of Arginusae.” *The American Journal of Philology* Vol. 122, no. 3 (Autumn 2011): 359-380.

Hutcheon, L. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms.* New York: Methuen, 1985.

Hyginus. *Fabulae.* Translated by S. Trzaskoma. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2007.

Iamblichus. *De Mysteriis (Writings from the Greco-Roman World, V. 4.).* Edited by Emma C. Clarke. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Irwin, William. “Against Intertextuality.” *Philosophy and Literature*, Oct. 2004: 227-242.

Iser, Wolfgang. *How to do Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Jacques Derrida, Avital Ronell. “The Law of Genre.” *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 7, no. 1, On Narrative (Autumn 1980): 55-81.

Jerrold, Walter, and R.M. Leonard, . *A Century of Parody and Imitation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Johansson, Karin. *The birds in the Iliad. Identities, interactions and functions.* Doctoral Thesis, University of Gothenburg, 2012.

Jones, David. *Anathemata.* London: Faber, 1952.

Kabe, Hugo, ed. *Invention and method: two rhetorical treatises from the Hermogenic corpus.* Translated by George A. Kennedy. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Kannicht, R. *Euripides' Helena.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitäts, 1969.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgment* . Indianapolis: Hackett, 1790 (republished 1987).

Kassel, R., and C. Austin. *Poetae Comici Graeci Vol. V.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1986.

Keil, Heinrich, 1822-1894. *Grammati Latini.* Edited by Hermann Hagan. Lipszig: Teubner, 1859.

Kirkpatrick, John, and Francis Dunn. “Heracles, Cercopes and Paracomedy.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132, No. 1/2 (2002): 29-61.

Kitano, Masahiro. “Aristotle's Theory of Comedy: μύθος and κάθαρσις.” *Bulletin of Gunma Prefectural Women's University*, no. 22 (2001): 193-201.

Kitto, H.D.F. *Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study.* Methuen, 1961.

Knox, Bernard. “Euripidean Comedy.” In *The Rarer Action*, edited by A. Cheuse and R. Koffler, 68-96. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

Kotini, Vassiliki, and كوتـ يـني ڤاسـيـلـيـكي. “Aristophanes's Response to the Peloponnesian War and the Defeat of the Comic Hero /أريـ سـ توف انـ يس ا سـ تجابـة لـ لحرب يـ سـ يـة لـ ونـ بـلوبـ الـ واندحار الـ بطل الـ كوميديا.” *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, no. 30, Trauma and Memory (2010): 134-149.

Kristeva, J. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

—. *Sémeiotike: researches pour une sémanalyse.* Paris: Edition du Seuil, 1969.

—. *The Kristeva Reader.* Edited by Toril Moi. Translated by Léon S. Roudiez. London: Blackwell, 1986.Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

Kuipers, Giselinde. *Good Humour, Bad Taste, A Sociology of the Joke.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006a.

—. “Television and taste Hierarchy: the case of Dutch television comedy.” *Media, Culture and Society*, no. 28 (3) (2006b): 359-78.

LaCapra, Dominick. “Comment, History and Genre.” *New Literary History* Vol. 17, no. 2, Interpretation and Culture (Winter, 1986). 219-221

Lang, M. “The Revolution of the 400: Chronology and Constitutions.” *American Journal of Philology* 88 (1967): 176-187.

Langer, Suzanne K. *Feeling and Form. A Theory of Art.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Lansing, Richard. *The Dante Encyclopedia.* New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 2000.

Lefkowitz, M. *Lives of the Greek Poets.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.

Lelièvre, F. J. “The Basis of Ancient Parody.” *Greece & Rome*, Series 2, 1/2, June 1954: 66-81.

Lévi, Sylvain. *Le Théâtre Indien.* Boston: Adamant Media Corporation, 2001.

Lewis, Naphtali. *The Interpretation of Dreams and Portents in Antiquity.* Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Inc., 1999.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889.

Littman, R.J. "The Loves of Alcibiades." *Transactions of the Proceedings of the American Philological Association* Vol. 101 (1970): 263-276.

Long, Pamela O. *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship.* Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Pseudo-Longinus. *On the Sublime.* Translated by H. L. Havell. London and New York: MacMillan and Co., 1890.

Lysias. *Orations.* Translated by S. C. Todd. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000.

MacDowell, D.M. *Aristophanes and Athens.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Macrobius. *Saturnalia.* Translated by P.V. Davies. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Maranda, P., ed. *Mythology.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Inc., 1972.

Maranda, Pierre. "The Dialectic of Metaphor." In *The Reader in the Text*, edited by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, 183-204. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Marrou, H.-I. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité.* Paris: Seuil, 1965.

Marshall, C.W. "Literary Awareness in Euripides and his Audience." In *Voice into Text. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, edited by Ian Worthington. Leiden: Brill, 1996. 81-98.

Martial. *Epigrams.* Translated by W.A.C. Kerr. London: William Heinemann and Sons, 1919.

McDermott, E.A. "Double Meaning and Mythic Novelty in Euripides' Plays." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 121 1991: 123-132.

McQuail, Denis. *Audience Analysis.* London: Sage Publications, 1997.

Michelini, Ann. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1987.

Mierow, E. "Some Innovations in Euripides." *The Classical Weekly*, 1936: 113-116.

Moore, Edward. *Studies in Dante.* New York: Haskell House, 1968.

Moorton, Richard. "Euripides' Andromeda in Aristophanes' Frogs." *The American Journal of Philology* Vol. 108, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 434-436.

Muecke, F. "Playing with the play: theatrical self-consciousness in Aristophanes." *Antichthon* , no. 11 (1977): 52-67.

Muir, J.V., ed. *Alcidamas. The Works and Fragments.* Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2001.

Murray, G. *Aristophanes, A Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

—. *Euripides and His Age.* 2nd. edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946.

—. *The Electra of Euripides.* London, 1893.

Nagy, G. *The Best of the Achaeans.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Neale, Stephen. *Genre.* London: British Film Institute, 1980.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Gunther. "Parody and Later Greek Comedy." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 1993: 181-195.

Newiger, H.-J. *Metapher und Allegorie.* Munich, 1957.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy and the Case of Wagner.* Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books, 1872:1967.

Olson, S.D. *Aristophanes' Acharnians.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses.* Translated by David Raeburn. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Palmer, Jerry. *Taking Humour Seriously.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Paltridge, Brian. *Genre, Frames and Writing.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub Co., 1997.

Paryas, Phyllis Margaret. "Monologism." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, edited by Irene Rima Makaryk, 596. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Perusino, F. *Della commedia antica alla commedia di mezzo; tre studi su Aristofane.* Urbino, 1986.

Peterson, E. "Andromeda." *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* Vol. 24 (1903): 99-112.

Pindar. *Pythian Odes.* Translated by W.H. Race. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Pippin, Anne Newton. “Euripides' Helen: A Comedy of Ideas.” *Classical Philology* 55, no. 3 (Jul. 1960): 151-163.

Plato. *Philebus and Epinomis.* London: Nelson and Sons, 1956.

—. *Protagoras, Philebus, and Gorgias.* Translated by B. Jowett. New York: Prometheus Books, 1996.

—. *Republic.* Translated by G. Grube. Indianapolis : Hackett, 1992.

—. *Symposium.* Translated by Christopher Gill. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Plutarch. *Lives.* Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA., London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd. , 1916.

—. *Moralia.* Edited by G.P. Goold. Translated by F.C. Babbitt. Vol. 1. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1986.

—. *Moralia.* Translated by Harold North Fowler. Vols. X, 771e-854d. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1960.

—. *The Rise and Fall of Athens.* Translated by Ian Scott-Kilvert. London: Penguin Books, 1960.

Potts, L.J. *Comedy.* London: Hutchinson & Co., 1957.

Putnam, G.H. *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times.* New York: G.H. Putnam's Sons, 1894.

Schmidt, Joachim. *Aristophanes und Euripides.* Greifswald: Alder, 1940.

Quintillian. *The Institutes of Oratory.* Translated by H.E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library, 1920-22.

—. *The Orator's Education.* Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Translated by Donald A. Russell. Vol. III. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Rabinowitz, P.J. “What's Hecuba to Us?” In *The Reader in the Text - Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, edited by S.R. Suleiman and I. Crosman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. 241-263

Randall, Marilyn. *Pragmatic Plagiarism. Authorship, Profit and Power.* Toronto, Buffall, London: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Raymond, Marcel. *L'influence de Ronsard sur la poésie française (1550-1585).* Vol. 1. Paris: Editions Slatkine, 1965.

Rehm, Rush. *The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Revermann, M. *Comic Business.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Robinson, A.J.K. “The Evolution of Copyright, 1476-1776.” *Cambrian Law Review* (University of Wales Press), 1991: 55-77.

Robson, J. “Aristophanes on how to write tragedy, What You Wear is What You Are.” In *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens*, by J. Robson, F. McHardy and D. Harvey. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2005. 173-188.

—. *Aristophanes, an Introduction.* London: Duckworth, 2009.

Rosch E. and Mervis, C. “Family resemblances: studies in the internal structure of categories.” *Cognitive Psychology*, no. 7 (1975): 573-605.

Rosch, E.H. “Natural categories.” *Cognitive Psychology* , no. 4 (1973): 328-350.

Rose, Margaret A. *Parody, Ancient, Modern and Postmodern.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Roselli, David Kawalko. *Theater of the People: Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens* . Austin: University of Texas Press , 2012.

Ross, W.D., ed. *Aristotle.* 5th. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd, 1949.

Ruffell, I. “A Total Write-off. Aristophanes, Cratinus and the Rhetoric of Comic Competition.” *The Classical Quarterly* Vol.52, no. 1 (2002): 138-163.

Russell, D.A. *Creative Imitation in Latin Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Russo, C.F. “The Revision of Aristophanes' Frogs.” *Greece and Rome* Second Series Vol.13, no. 1 (April 1966): 1-13.

Satyrus. *Life of Euripides* . Translated by David Kovacs. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Scaliger, Julius Caesar. *Poetices Libri Septem.* Heidelberg, 1581.

Scharffenberger, Elizabeth W. “A Tragic Lysistrata? Jocasta in the 'Recognition Scene' of the Phoenician Women.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, no. 138 (1995): 312-36.

Schlesinger, C. “Identification of Parodies in Aristophanes.” *The American Journal of Philology* Vol. 58, No. 3 (1937): 294-305.

Schwartz, E., ed. *Scholia in Euripidem.* Vol. 1. Berlin, 1887.

Segal, E. “The Comic Catastrophe.” In *The Death of Comedy*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001. 124-152.

Seidensticker, B. “Comic Elements in Euripides' Bacchae.” *The American Journal of Philology*, 1978: 303-320.

Sfyroeras, Pavlos. “πόθος Εὐριπίδου: Reading Andromeda in Aristophanes' Frogs.” *American Journal of Philology* Volume 129, (2008): 299-317.

Shackleton-Bailey, D.R., ed. *Anthologia Latina I fasc. 1: Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina.* Stuttgart, 1982.

Shelby, Annette. “The Theoretical Basis of Persuasion: A Critical Introduction.” *Journal of Business Communication*, (1986): 5-29.

Sheppard, Anne D.R. *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck R. Ruprecht, 1980.

Shershow, Scott Cutler. *Laughing Matters, The Paradox of Comedy.* Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.

Sidnell, Michael J. *Sources of Dramatic Theory - Plato to Congreve.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Sidwell, K. *Aristophanes the Democrat.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Silk, M.S. *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Slater, Niall W. “Making the Aristophanic Audience.” *The American Journal of Philology* 120, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 351-368.

Slater, W.J. “Artemon and Anacreon: No Text without Context.” *Phoenix* Vol. 32, No. 3 (Autumn 1978): 185-194.

Soanes, Catherine, Sara Hawker, and Julia Elliot, . *Oxford English Dictionary.* 6th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sofer, A. *The Stage Life of Props.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Sommerstein, A. *Aeschylean Tragedy.* London: Duckworth, 1996.

Sommerstein, A. “Aristophanes and the Events of 411.” *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* Vol. 97 (1977): 187-189.

Sommerstein, A. “Comic Elements in Tragic Language.” In *The Language of Greek Comedy*, edited by Andreas Willi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. 121-168.

—. *Indexes. The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol 12.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 2002.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 1. Acharnians.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1980.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 2. Knights.* Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1981.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 3. Clouds.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol.4. Wasps.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1983.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 5. Peace.* Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2005.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 6. Birds.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1987.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 7. Lysistrata.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1990.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 8. Thesmophoriazusae.* Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1994.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 9. Frogs.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 10, Ecclesiazusae.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998.

—. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Vol. 11, Wealth.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2001.

Sophocles. *Electra.* Translated by Sir Richard Jebb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894.

—. *Fragments.* Translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Vol. 3. Ann Arbor: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Stemplinger, Eduard. *Das Plagiat in der Griechischen Literatur.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Stevens, P.T. “Colloquial Expressions in Euripides.” *The Classical Quarterly* 31, no. 3/4 (Jul.-Oct. 1937): 182-191.

Storey, I.C. *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Strabo. *Geography.* Translated by H.L. Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Sutton, Dana. *The Catharsis of Comedy* . Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1994.

Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Taplin, O. “Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1986: 163-174.

Terence. *The Comedies.* Translated by Betty Radice. London: Penguin Books, 1976.

Thompson, M. “Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning.” *History and Theory* Vol. 32, no. 3 (October 1993): 248-272.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War.* Translated by Rex Warner. London: Penguin Books, 1972.

Tim, O'Sullivan, John Hartley, Danny Saunders, Martin Montgomery, and John Fiske. *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Todorov, Tzevetan. *Genres in Discourse.* Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

—. *Theories of the Symbol.* Translated by Catherine Porter. New York: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Vakaris -Martin, A. (2010). Body and Mask in Aristophanic Performance. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 53 , 17-38.

van Looy, H. *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides.* Brussels: Paleis Der Academien, 1964.

Vellacott, P. *Euripides: Bacchae and Other Plays.* London: Penguin Books, 1973.

Vickers, M. “Alcibiades on Stage; "Thesmophoriazusae and Helen".” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* Vol. 38, No.1, no. 1st Qtr. (1989): 41-65.

—. *Sophocles and Alcibiades, Athenian Politics in Ancient Greek Literature.* Durham: Acumen Publishing Ltd, 2008.

Vitruvius. *The Ten Books on Architecture.* Translated by Morris Hicky Morgan. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1914.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. *Euripides, Herakles.* Berlin, 1896.

Walcot, P. *Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976.

Webster, T.B.L. *The Tragedies of Euripides.* London: Methuen, 1967.

Weitz, Eric. *The Cambridge Introduction to Comedy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wessner, Paul, ed. *Donatus, Quod Fertur Commentum Terenti.* Stuttgart: Teubner, 1902:1962-3.

White, H.O. *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance.* New York: Octagon Books Inc., 1965.

Whitman, C. *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Wilkinson, L. P. *Ancient Literature and Modern Literary Criticism.* London: The Classical Association, 1972.

Winnington-Ingram, R.P. "Euripides: Poiêtês Sophos." *Arethusa*, no. 2 (1969): 127-42.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations.* Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996:1978.

Worton, Michael, and Judith Still, . *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1990.

Wright, M.E. *Euripides' Escape Tragedies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Xenophon. *Hellenica.* Edited by Carleton L. Brownson. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1921.

Zeitlin, Froma. "Travesties of Gender and Genre in Aristophanes' "Thesmophoriazousae"." *Critical Inquiry, Writing and Sexual Difference* 8, No. 2 (Winter 1981): 301-327.

Ziegler, Konrat. "Plagiat." *PW 20/2*, 1950: 1956-57.

Zuntz, G. *The Political Plays of Euripides.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1963.

Appendix 1

Aristophanes' and Aeschylus' plays. (excluding *Frogs*)

Aristophanes (extant)	**Aeschylus**	**Aristophanes' line and Analysis**	**Categorisation**
Acharnians 92	*Pers.* 979	The '**King's Eye'** as Persian official. Cf. Hdt. *His.* 1.114.2	Contingent Polygenic
Acharnians 1184	*Choe.* 238	**Eye** as a term of endearment. Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 977	Contingent Genre diversity
Knights 31	*Sev.* 95-96	**...prostrate ourselves ...one of the gods.**	Contingent
Knights 156 *Wealth* 771-3	*Per.* 499	**...make obeisance to the earth and the gods.**	Contingent
Clouds 300-1	*Eum.* 1031	**...home of fine men.** Patriotic reference to Athens as the home of free men. Also seen as used by Socrates in Xen. *Mem.* 3.3.12	Contingent Polygenic
Clouds 721	*Ag.* 16-17	**Whistling in the dark** (to stave off fear)	Contingent
Clouds 903	*fr.*530.10	**She dwells with the gods.** Cf. Hes. *Works* 259; Soph. *O.C. 1382*	Contingent
Clouds 1417	*Ag.* 74-82, *Eum.* 38	**The old are in a second childhood.** Proverb. Also see in Soph. *fr.* 487.3, Cratinus *fr.* 24, Theopompus com. *Fr.* 69, Plato *Laws* 646a.	Contingent Polygenic
Wasps 29	*Sev.* 39,203;	**Ship of State.** Metaphor – Cf. Soph. *Ant.*162-3, *O.T.* 22-24 *Theogony* 667-582	Contingent Polygenic
Wasps 332	*H.F.* 1397	**Turn me to stone**	Specific
Wasps 392	*Ag.* 1072-9	**You are the only Hero...near a crying man.** Gods' dislike of humans showing grief. Cf. Eur. *Supp.* 971-6	Contingent Polygenic
Wasps 523	*Eum.* 746	**I'm going to fall on the sword.** Threatens suicide if found guilty. This theme also see in Soph. *Ajax*	Contingent
Wasps 918	*Sev.* 603	**...hot stuff.** Metaphor for wicked	Contingent

Wasps 1309	*Ag*. 1042-5	**...a recently-enriched Phrygian.** Nouveaux-riches cruel to slaves. Cf. Eur. *Supp*. 741-3 and Cratinus *fr*. 208	Contingent Polygenic
Peace 1125	*Supp*. 751-2	**...what a raven that was.** Birds taking sacrificial meats	Contingent
Birds 276	*Edonians fr*. 60	**Who may this.. the hill walker.** Substitutes original with hill walker.	Specific
Birds 686-7	*Prom*. 547-9	**Weaklings...creatures of a day...like the figures of dreams.** Concerning the weakness of creatures of who live only a day	Contingent
Birds 807	*Myrmidons fr*. 139.4	**We have been subjected to these comparisons, in the words of Aeschylus, 'not at the hand of another, but by our own feathers!**	Specific and signposted
Birds 941-4	*Prom*. 709-10	**For among the Scythian nomads ...inglorious goeth.** Reference to the Pythians living in caravans. Cf. Hdt. *His*. 4.46.3, Pind. *fr. 105b,* Hes. *fr*. 15, Hippocrates *Airs, Waters, Places* 18,	Contingent Polygenic
Birds 1182-3	*Prom*. 125-6	**The sky is awhir with the rush and whistle of wings.**	Genre diversity
Birds 1240	*Ag*. 525	**...be overthrown..with the mattock of Zeus.** The mattock of Zeus. Cf. Soph. *fr*.727	Contingent Polygenic
Birds 1246-8	*Nio*. *fr*. 160	**Did you know...with incendiary eagles.** According to scholia, adopted from *Nio*. Cf. Soph. *Ant*. 2;1155	Contingent Polygenic
Birds 1420	*Mer*. *fr*. 140	**...wings, wings I need.** Adapted from ...arms, arms I need.	Variation
Birds 1538	*Eum*. 827-8	**...custodian of the thunderbolt of Zeus.**	Contingent
Birds 1547	*Prom*. 975	**I hate all gods.**	Contingent

Birds 1706-19	*Ag.* 503ff	*Topos* of messenger asking for public welcome for his lord. Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 229ff	Contingent Polygenic
Birds 1734	*Eum.* 217	**...were united by the Fates.** Marriage under governance of destiny. Cf. Pindar *fr.*30	Contingent Polygenic
Birds 1745	*Prom.* 993-4	**...his earth shaking thunders.** Proverb – thunder comes from underworld as well as sky. Cf. Soph. *O.C.* 1606, Eur. *El.* 748	Contingent Polygenic
Lysistrata 188,	*Seven Against Thebes,* 42-48	**..for the blood to run into a shield..**	Specific and signposted
Lysistrata 299-300	*Choe.* 631-8	**...vicious.** Lemnians as a euphemism for viciousness Cf. Hdt. *His.* 6.138.4	Contingent Polygenic
Lysistrata 347	*Eum.* 292-3	**Lady of the Lake.** Epithet for Athena. Cf. Homer *Il.* 4.515, Hdt. *His.* 4.178-80	Contingent Polygenic
Lysistrata 770-1 *Birds* 10	*Supp.*62	**The swallows...fleeing the hoopoe's assault.** Mythological character Tereus. Cf. *Birds* 100 as a character of Sophocles	Contingent Polygenic
Lysistrata 1100	*Prom.* 950	**Let's have straight talking.** Necessity of being forthright. Also see in Eur. *Phoen.* 494	Contingent Polygenic
*Thesmo.*134	*Lycurgeia,*	And now, young sir, I want to ask you in the style of Aeschylus, in words from the Lycurgus plays, what manner of woman are you?	Specific and signposted
Thesmo. 136	*Edonians fr.* 61	**Whence comes ... what its garb.**	Specific
Thesmo. 765	*Sev.* 210	**What means of safety will there be?** Tragic saying Cf. Eur. *Hel.*1034, *Ph.* 890	Contingent Genre diversity Polygenic
Thesmo. 856-7	*Supp.* 559	**Egypt's white plains.** Reference to annual floods. Cf. Aesch. *fr.* 300, Eur. *fr.* 228	Contingent Polygenic

Thesmo. 991	*Eum.* 24	**Lord of the clamour.** Epithet of Dionysus as 'the noisy one'. Cf. Eur. *Bac.* 66,84,151-161; Pindar *fr.* 75.10	Contingent Polygenic
Eccleziazusae 80	*Supp.* 304	**He put on the coat of the all-seeing.** Argus as omnipotent. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1115	Contingent Polygenic
Eccleziazusae 238	*Ag.* 1636	**..women are so used to being deceivers.** Misogynistic cliché. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 422; *Hipp.* 480; *Andr.* 85, 911; *Hec.*884; *I.T.* 1032; Homer *Od.* 11.456; Hes. *Works* 375	Contingent Genre diversity Polygenic
Eccleziazusae 829	*Choe.* 267-8	**...covering Heurippides with pitch prior** to being burned. Cf. Cratinus *fr.*201	Contingent Polygenic
Wealth 21	*Ag.*493-4	**...when I've got a garland on.** Ritual – consulting the Oracle. Cf. Soph. *O.T.*82-3, *Trach.* 178	Contingent Polygenic
Wealth 771	*Ag.* 508; *Per.* 499	**...make obeisance.** Ritual – kissing soil and extending hands to sky when blessed. Also seen in *O.C.* 1654-5; Homer *Od.* 5.463	Contingent Polygenic
Wealth 935	*Ag.* 1345	**...ah, yet another.** Tragic phrase, commented upon by Scholia. Cf. Soph. *Elec.* 1415	Contingent Polygenic
Wealth 1175	*Ag.* 1386-7; *Per.* 499; *Eum.* 759-760; *Supp.* 26	**Zeus the saviour.**	Contingent Polygenic

Appendix 2 - Aristophanes and Aeschylus in *Frogs*.

Aristophanes *Frogs*	**Aeschylus**	**Aristophanes' line and Analysis**	**Categorisation**
93	*Ag.* 1050	**"quires of swallows"** Cf. Eur. *fr.* 88	Specific and Signposted
145-153	*Supp.* 701-9; *Eum.* 269-272, 538-547	Three specific sins all mentioned together in one place. (wronging the god, a parent and host/guest)	Specific and Signposted
472	*Cho.* 1054; *Eum.* 246-7	**Cocytus' roaming hounds.** Cf. Eur. *El.* 1342-3	Specific and Signposted
531	*Ag.* 1040-1	**...that you ... could be the son of Alcmene.** Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 248-253	Specific and Signposted
659	*Eum.* 292-8	**...who perchance dost dwell in Delos or in Pytho.** Cf. *Iliad* 16.514-6	Specific and Signposted
685	*Eum.* 741	**...even if it's a tie.** Reference to voting system. Cf. Eur. *El.* 1268-9	Specific and Signposted
844	*fr.* dub. 468	**...heat not thine inward parts with wrathful ire...** Dionysus to Aeschylus .The word οργή (ire)is used nearly thirty times in Aeschylus and not once in Sophocles or Euripides.	Specific and Signposted
929	*Myr. fr.* 422	...**griffin eagles.**	Specific and signposted
935	*Ag.* 1671; *Eum.* 861	**...was it proper to actually write about *poultry***	Specific and Signposted
963	*Memnon & The Weighing of Souls*	**Cynus and Memnon with bells on the cheek-plates of their horses.** Cf. Soph. *fr.* 499-504	Specific and Signposted
992	*Mer. fr.* 131	**These things thou seest, glorious Achilles.**	Specific and Signposted
1021	*Sev.*	**Seven Against Thebes.**	Specific and Signposted
1029	*Pers.* 651-681, 1067, 1070-1, 1074-5	**Iaow-oy...** discussion of specific lines from *Persians*.	Specific and Signposted

1126	*Ag*. 109, 258, 619; *Cho*. 18-19	**..watching with auspicious eye o'er the paternal realm.**	Specific and Signposted
1167-8	*Sev*. 991	**Orestes did not come home remigrant.** Also seen in *Soph. Ant.*200.	Specific and Signposted
1214	*Ag*. 1345	**Alack we are struck again.** Cf. Soph. *El.*1414-5	Specific and Signposted
1264-77	*fr*. 132; *fr*. 273; *fr*. 238, *fr*. 87, *Ag*. 104	**Phythian Achilles...to their succour; the sound of men dying...stricken; We, the folk .. Hermes our forebear; O most glorious...mark what I tell thee; Keep ye silence...Artemis' temple; Strong am I...on their journey.**	Specific and Signposted
1284-92	*Ag*. 108-111; *Eum*. 843; *fr*. 282	Passage built on lines of Aeschylus, with additional insertions.	Specific and Signposted
1289	*Ag*. 113-120	**...a bird of martial omen.**	Specific and Signposted
1291-2	*fr*.282	**...which handed them ... hounds' prey.**	Specific and Signposted
1294	*Thrac*. *fr*. 84	**...and those who gathered around Ajax.**	Specific and Signposted
1340	*Pers*. 201-2	**...that I may wash away the god-sent dream.**	Specific and Signposted
1383	*Phil*. *fr*. 249	**Spercheius river ... where cattle graze.**	Specific and Signposted
1392	*Niobe fr*.161.1	**For death ... desires no gifts.**	Specific and Signposted
1403	*Glaucus fr*. 38	**For chariot .. corpse on corpse.**	Specific and Signposted
1431	*Ag*. 717-736	**...to rear a lion's whelp.**	Specific and Signposted
1462	*Pers*. 222, *Cho*. 147-8, *Eum*. 1008-9	**...send up your blessings.**	Specific and Signposted
1525	*Eum*. 1005	**...your sacred torches.**	Specific and Signposted
1528	*Glau*. *fr*. 36.5-6	**First of all... a good and safe journey**	Specific and Signposted
1530	*Eum*. 1012-3	**...and to the City give good ideas that will bring great blessings.**	Specific and Signposted

Appendix 3 - Aristophanes and Sophocles.

Aristophanes (extant)	**Sophocles**	**Aristophanes' line and Analysis**	**Categorisation**
Acharnians 320	*Aj.* 728	**Shredding this man ...like a scarlet cloak.** Incident/proverb/metaphor – crowd turn against returning man	Contingent
Acharnians 1184	*Aj.* 997	**Eye** as a term of endearment. Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 238	Contingent
Knights 83	*fr.* 83	**Our best course is to drink bull's blood.** Ancient religious belief. Cf. Hdt. *His.* 3.15.4	Contingent
Knights 1099	*Peleus fr.* 487.2	**...to be the guide...to re-educate me.** Marginally modified here.	Variation
Clouds 583	*Teucer fr.* 578	**...amid the lightening came the burst of thunder**	Specific
Clouds 903	*O.C.* 1382	**She dwells with the gods.** Dike dwells with Zeus. Cf. Hesiod *Works* 259, Aesch. *fr.*530.10	Contingent
Clouds 1417	Soph. *fr.* 487.	**The old are in a second childhood.** Proverb. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 74-82, *Eum.* 38; Cratinus *fr.* 24, Theopompus com. *Fr.* 69, Plato *Laws* 646a.	Contingent
Wasps 29	*Ant.* 162-3 *O.T.* 22-24	**Ship of State.** Metaphor Cf. *Theogonis* 667-582 Aesch. *Sev.* 39, 203	Contingent
Wasps 1043	*Trach.* 1060-1	**...cleanser of this land.** Epithet for Heracles	Contingent
Wasps 1160	*Aj.* 665	**...the hateful soles that from our foemen come.** Metaphor – danger of taking gifts	Contingent
Birds 275	*Tyro. fr.* 654	**...is aberrantly located.** Used here to indicate the wrong location	Specific
Birds 419-20	*Ant.* 641-4	**...to overcome his enemy or to help his friends.** Proverb – Help friends and harm enemy	Contingent
Birds 605	*fr.* 354	**...no man ...has a healthy life.** Poverty as an illness	Contingent

Birds 851; *Knights* 1099, *Clouds* 1154-5; *Thesmo.* 870	*Peleus fr.* 489, 490	Song constructed from either quote or adaptation of lines	Variation
Birds 982	*Trach.*1166-8	**I wrote down ...** Ritual – Noting the oracle's words	Contingent
Birds 1240	*Chryse. fr.*727	**...be overthrown..with the mattock of Zeus.** The mattock of Zeus. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 525	Contingent
Birds 1246-8	*Ant.* 1155	**...and the halls of Amphion.** Geographic similarity	Contingent
Birds 1355-7	*Elec.* 1058-62	**When the father-stork maintain ...** Proverb- male storks/birds feed babies	Contingent
Birds 1745	*O.C.* 1606	**...his earth-shaking thunders.** Proverb – that thunder comes from underworld as well as sky. Cf. Eur. *El.* 748, Aesch. *Prom.* 993-4	Contingent/polygenic
Lysistrata 450	*Ant.* 678	**We must never let ourselves be beaten by women.** Similarity of phrase and circumstance	Contingent
Lysistrata 1173	*Ant.* 569	**...strip off now and get down to some husbandry.** Proverb – re ploughing the land and the production of legitimate children	Contingent
Frogs 294	*Elec.* 491	**A leg made of bronze.** Similar phrase – *Erinys*' bronze foot. Not exclusive to Sophocles	Contingent
Frogs 442	*Ant.* 844	**Grove.** Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 112, *Supp.* 868	Contingent
Frogs 619	*Ant.* 309	**...hang him up.** Similarity of incident – being hung up and beaten	Contingent
Frogs 665	*Laocoon fr.* 371	**...who holdest sway...the blue-grey sea.** Dionysus singing to Aeacus. Scholia comments on similarity	Variation
Frogs 951	*Aj.* 292	Similar situation – women silent in front of men	Contingent

Frogs 963	*fr.* 499-504	**Cynus and Memnon with bells on the cheek-plates of their horses.** Euripides to Aeschylus and Dionysus. Cf. Aesch. *Memnon & The Weighing of Souls*	Polygenic
Wealth 21	*O.T.*82-3, *Trach.* 178	**...when I've got a garland on.** Similar ritual – wearing a garland to consult the Oracle. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 493-4	Contingent
Wealth 134	*Elec.* 648-654	**...they pray...to become rich.** Similar sentiment	Contingent
Wealth 190	*Aj.* 1205	**Love.** Similar use of *Eros*	Contingent
Wealth 312 *Clouds* 870	*Aj.*108-10, *Ant.*308-9	**...hang you up by the balls; Hang you ...receive a good lashing.** Similar incident	Contingent
Wealth 723, 802-18	*Inachus*	Scholia links this scene to great wealth as seen in *Inachus*	Contingent
Wealth 753, *Clouds* 81, *Acharnians* 309, *Frogs* 754	*Trach.* 1181; *O.C.,* 1631-2 *Phil.* 813;	**...give him their right hands.** Proverb – giving of right hand making oath	Contingent
Wealth 771	*O.C.* 1654-5	**...make obeisance.** Similarity of action – kissing soil and extending hands to sky when blessed. Cf. Aesch. *Per.*449, *Ag.* 508 and Homer *Od.* 5.463	Contingent
Wealth 853	*Aj.* 895, *Ant.* 1311, *El.* 1485	**...what a voracious fate has swallowed me.** Similar sentiment	Contingent
Wealth 935 *Frogs* 1214	*Elec.* 1417	**...ah, yet another.** Similar phrase, commented upon by Scholia. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1345	Variation Polygenic
Wealth 1061	*Aj.* 1146	**...treating me like dirty washing.** Metaphor for being treated badly	Contingent

Appendix 4 - Aristophanes and Euripides (where the tragedian does not appear as a character).

Aristophanes	Euripides	Analysis	Categorisation
Knights 16	*Hipp.* 345	**Couldst thou ... what I must say**	Specific
Knights 813	*Tel. fr.* 713	**City of argos hark at what he says.** Verbatim	Specific
Knights 1240	*Tel. fr.* 700	**Phoebus Apollo...wilt thou do to me?** Paphlagon appealing for mercy	Specific
Knights 1249	*Bel. fr.* 310	**Roll me within, ill starred one that I am.**	Variation
Knights 1250-2	*Alc.* 177-182	**For some other man will take you and possess you – no greater thief, but haply luckier.**	Specific
Clouds 604	*Hyps. fr. 752*	**Dionysus .. the sacred dance**	Specific and signposted
Clouds 718-9	*Hec.* 159-161	**Lost my money ...lost my shoes.**	Variation
Clouds 891	*Tel.* 722	**Go wherever you like**	Specific
Clouds 1080-1	*Trojan Women 948-950*	**Zeus .. is a slave to love and women**	Specific
Clouds 1154	*Peleus fr . 623*	**Then I will shout an exceeding great shout.** Verbatim	Specific
Clouds 1165 -6	*Hec.* 171-4	**My child, my son, come forth from the house; harken to your father.**	Specific
Clouds 1415	*Alcestis* 691	**The children will howl; do you think the father shouldn't.**	Variation
Clouds 1508	*Rhesus* 675-6	**Hit them, pelt them**	Specific
Wasps 111-2	*Stheneboea fr.* 665	**So does he rave .. judge the more**	Variation
Wasps 225	*Supp.* 240-3	**A very sharp sting**	Specific
Wasps 303-16	*Theseus frs.* 385, 386	**O why .. bear me?** Verbatim	Specific
Wasps 752	*Alc.* 866-7	**There is what I yearn for, there would I be.**	Specific
Wasps 763	*Cretan Women fr.* 465	**Death will decide between us**	Specific

Wasps 1074	*Stheneboea fr.* 663	**Even though he be unlearned heretofore.** Verbatim.	Specific
Wasps 1297-8	*Hipp.* 88; *Andr.* 56, 64; *Hel.* 1193	**... it is proper to call..** Justifying a term of address	Specific
Peace 76	*Fr.* 306	**Bellerophon**	Specific and signposted
Peace 119	*Aeolus fr.* 18	**You may guess maidens, but the truth**	Specific and signposted
Peace 146	*Fr.* 286	**To ask him about the Greeks.** Ref. to episode in Eur. Bellerophon	Specific and signposted
Peace 316-7	*Herac.* 976-7	**There is no one ... in our possession**	Variation
Peace 528	*Tel. fr.* 727	**I spurn that odious man's most odious pouch**	Variation
Peace 699	*Thyestes fr.* 397; Oeneus fr. 566.2	**For profits's sake he'd go to sea upon a mat.** Ref. to Sophocles	Specific and signposted
Peace 711	*Fr.* 312	**Yoked to the car of Zeus, it bears the lightening**	Specific and signposted
Peace 1020	*Andr.*260	**Nor is her altar bloodied.**	Variation
Birds 213	*Helen* 1111-3	**Quavering .. your vibrant throat**	Specific
Birds 276	*Fr.* 60	**Who may this .. this hill walker**	Variation
Birds 349	*Or.* 1376-7	**For there is .. they escape me**	Specific
Birds 623	*Hel.* 1095-6	**With up-stretched hands.** Cf. Hom. *Iliad* 1.450, 15.371	Contingent
Birds 829-31	*Supp.* 447; *Mel. fr.* 522	**And how, pray, .. with a weaver's shuttle.**	Variation
Birds 1070-1	*El.* 17; 1181	**..beneath my wings.** Substituted from under my hand	Variation
Birds 1232	*Pleisthenes fr.* 628	**To slaughter sheep at sacrificial hearths**	Variation
Birds 1135	*Hec.* 730	**So that I was amazed**	Specific
Birds 1241-2	*Supp.* 640,	**Calcinate (reduce to ashes)**	Specific
Birds 1244	*Alc.* 675	**A Lydian or a Phrygian.** Meaning a barbarian slave	Specific

Birds 1432, 1451	*Or.* 1154; *Ion* 736-7, *I.A.* 505	**Disgrace my ancestry**	Specific
Birds 1745	*El.* 748	**...his earth-shaking thunders.** Proverb – that thunder comes from underworld as well as sky. Cf. Soph. *O.C.* 1606, Aesch. *Prom.* 993-4	Contingent/ Polygenic
Lysistrata 253	*Hipp. fr.* 429, *Oedipus fr.* 544	**..no getting the better of.**	Specific
Lysistrata 372	*Med.* 1209, *Heracl.* 167	**Old sepulchre**	Specific
Lysistrata 606	*Alc.* 252-3	**Charon is calling you.**	Variation
Lysistrata 846	*Cycl.* 169	**Stand.** Double entrendre for penile erection	Contingent
Lysistrata 865-9	*Alc.*939-949	**Because I've had...the food I eat.**	Variation
Lysistrata 891	*Andr.* 930-953, *Trojan Women* 651-21	**You poor misguided thing**	Specific
Lysistrata 1135	*Erechtheus fr.* 363	**At this point concludes one part of my argument.** Verbatim.	Specific
Lysistrata 1124	*Med.* 1081-9; *Or.* 1204; *Mel.Wise* 483	**But I have got a mind**	Specific
Lysistrata 1198	*Andr.* 950-1; *Phaethon fr.* 221-3	**Putting seals on the doors of the women's quarters**	Specific
Lysistrata 1276 *Peace* 1063	*Hec.* 506	**May the curse...fall upon you**	Specific

Appendix 5- Euripides in *Acharnians*

Aristophanes	Euripides	Analysis	Categorisation
119	*Thyestes fr.* 858	**O thou that shav'st thy hot- desiring arse**	Variation
280-3	*Rhesus 675-6*	**Hit them, pelt them**	Specific and signposted
318	*Telephus fr.* 706	**I'm willing .. on a butcher's block.**	Specific and signposted
398-9	*Ion* 251	**His mind is not at home.. but he himself is**	Specific and signposted
427	*Bell. fr.* 286	**To ask him about the Greeks.** Ref. to episode in Eur. *Bellerophon*	Specific and signposted
433	*Thyestes fr.* 396	**Thyestean rags**	Variation
440	*Telephus fr.* 698	**For I ... appear not so**	Specific and signposted
446	*Telephus fr.* 707	**And for Telephus all that I desire for him..**	Specific and signposted
454	*Telephus fr.* 717	**Why .. thou poor wretch**	Specific and signposted
472	*fr.* 568	**For ne'er thought I the kings did hate me so**	Specific and signposted
497-8	*Telephus fr.* 703	**Be not indignant .. before the Athenians.** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
540	*Telephus fr.* 708	**Says one .. they ought not..** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
541	*Telephus fr.* 708a	**Had sailed forth in his bark..**Verbatim	Specific and signposted
543	*Telephus fr.* 709	**Would you .. far from it**	Specific and signposted
555-6	*Telephus fr.* 710	**And do we think Telephus would not..** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
893-4	*Alc.* 367-8	**For even when ... I part from thee.** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
905	*Phoen.* 606; *H.F.* 29-30	**By the twin gods**	Specific and signposted

Appendix 6 - Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae*

Aristophanes	**Euripides**	**Analysis**	**Categorisation**
11ff	*Frs.* 484, 839, 877, 941, 1023; *Mel. Wise fr.* 484	**Variety of quotations**	Specific and signposted
17	*Thyestes fr.* 925	**In imitation of the solar disc**	Specific and signposted
37	*El.* 778	**A myrtle wreath.**	Specific and signposted
153	*Hipp.* 228-231	**You mount astride.** Ref to Phaedra's fantasy	Specific and signposted
177-8	*Aeolus fr.* 28	**..it is the mark .. into brief compass** verbatim	Specific and signposted
179-80	*Alcestis* 405, 856; *Heracl.* 94	...**come to you as a suppliant.**	Specific and signposted
194	*Alcestis* 691	**You enjoy looking on the light. Do you think your father does not?** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
272	*fr.* 487	**The sky, the dossing place of Zeus.** Cf. *Frogs* 100	Specific and signposted
275-6, 451	*Hipp. 612*	**It was your heart that swore ...**	Specific and signposted
392-4	*Med.* 1332; *Andr.* 353, 630, 952; *El.* 1028; *Hipp.* 627; *fr.* 493	**Calling us... men's great curse.**	Specific and signposted
406	*Aeolus fr.* 682	**I do not mislike the colour of this maiden**	Specific and signposted
413	*Phoenix fr.* 804	**Who marries old is bondslave to his wife**	Specific and signposted
414-5	*Andr.* 950-1; *Phaethon fr.* 221-3	**Putting seals on the doors of the women's quarters**	Specific and signposted
430	*Med.* 384; *Ion* 616-7; *Hec.* 878; *fr.* 464.2	**Either by poison...**	Specific and signposted
518	*Telephus fr.* 711	**And then we're angry .. we've done ourselves**	Specific and signposted
721-2	*Andr.* 257-8; *H.F.* 240ff	**with godless deeds...**	Specific and signposted

723	*H.F.* 216, *Elec.* 1147-8	**Fortune as an unstable breeze** Similar metaphor	Specific and signposted
765	*Hel.*1034	**What device could save me?**	Specific and signposted
769-770, 776-784, 848	*Palamedes*	**Mentions the name of the play and its reconstruction**	Specific and signposted
778	*I.T.* 111; *Ph.* 1179	**Smooth...** Recurring adjective used by Euripides	Specific and signposted
855-7	*Hel.* 1-3	**Waters Egypt's white plains ...**	Specific and signposted
859-860	*Hel.* 16-17	**Tyndareus is my father**	Specific and signposted
862	*Hel.* 22	**Helen is my name**	Specific and signposted
864-5	*Hel.* 52-53	**On my account many souls have perished**	Specific and signposted
866	*Hel.* 49	**Beside Scamander's stream**	Specific and signposted
868	*Hel.* 56	**Why then do I yet live?**	Specific and signposted
871	*Hel.* 68	**Who is the master of this strong-walled house?**	Specific and signposted
874	*Hel.*460	**These are the halls of Proteus**	Specific and signposted
878	*Hel.*461	**Woe is me, how far we have wandered.**	Specific and signposted
886	*Hel.*466	**This is his tomb**	Specific and signposted
904	*Hel.*549	**I am gripped by speechlessness**	Specific and signposted
905	*Hel.*72; 557	**Ye gods, what sight is this? Who art thou lady?**	Specific and signposted
906	*Hel.*558	**And who are you?**	Specific and signposted
907	*Hel.*561	**Are you a native woman or a Greek?**	Specific and signposted
908	*Hel.*562	**Greek but I fain would know the like of thee**	Specific and signposted
909	*Hel.*563	**I never saw one more like Helen**	Specific and signposted
910	*Hel.*564	**Nor I like Menelaus**	Specific and signposted
911	*Hel.*565	**Thou knowest aright this man of wretched fate**	Specific and signposted
912	*Hel.*566	**O come at long last to thy wife's fond hearth!**	Specific and signposted

936	*Hipp.* 325-335, 605; *Hec.* 753; *I.T.* 701,1068	**By your right hand**	Specific and signposted
1015	*Andr. fr.*117	**Maidens, beloved maidens**	Specific and signposted
1018-20	*Andr. fr.* 118; *Hec.*1092; *Hipp. II* 167, *Ph.* 1271, 1337, 1552	**Dost thou hear... in response to my cries**	Specific and signposted
1022-3	*Andr. fr.*120	**Pitiless he who bound me**	Specific and signposted
1029-40	*Andr. fr.* 122	**Seest thou this?**	Specific and signposted
1047	*Andr. fr.*124	**Oh gods**	Specific and signposted
1058	*Andr. fr.* 127	**And who art thou that pitiest my plight?**	Specific and signposted
1065-9	*Andr. fr.* 114	**Oh sacred night**	Specific and signposted
1070-2	*Andr. fr.* 115	**Why, why have I, Andromeda...**	Specific and signposted
1098-1100	*Andr. fr.* 124	**What barbarous land is this**	Specific and signposted
1101-2	*Andr. fr.*123	**Perseus to Argos**	Specific and signposted
1105-6	*Andr. fr.* 125	**But ah, what rock do I see?**	Specific and signposted
1106, 1130-1	*H.F.* 1094; *Andr. fr.* 125.2-4; *Med.* 298-9	**Ship like moored to it**	Specific and signposted
1107-8	*Andr. fr.*128	**Good sir, take pity on my wretched plight**	Specific and signposted
1110	*Andr. fr.* 127	**Maid, I pity thee, seeing you hanging there**	Specific and signposted
1122	Combination of *Hec.* 927; *Or.* 1050; *fr.* 2.15-16	**To fall upon the bed and nuptial couch**	Specific and signposted

Appendix 7 - Euripides in *Frogs*

Aristophanes	Euripides	Analysis	Categorisation
38	*H.F.* 181-3, 364-374	**.. just like a centaur.** Heracles has to do the same in *H.F.*	Specific and signposted
64	*Or.* 397; *Helen* 1149; *Hyps. fr.* 763	**Do I make clear sense**	Specific and signposted
72	*Oeneus fr.* 565	**For some are gone, and those that live are bad**	Specific and signposted
93	*Alcmene fr.* 88	**Quires of swallows**	Specific and signposted
100, 311, 892	*fr.* 487	**The sky, the dossing place of Zeus.** Cf. *Thesmo.* 272	Specific and signposted
100	*fr.* 42	**The foot of time**	Specific and signposted
101-2, 1471	*Hipp. 612*	**It was your heart that swore ...**	Specific and signposted
282	*Phil.* 788	**Nothing on earth's as vain as Heracles**	Specific and signposted
304	*Or.* 279	**After the stormy waves I see 'tis calm again**	Specific and signposted
343, 371, 446	*Ion* 1074-86	**All night revels**	Specific and signposted
472	*El.* 1342-3	**Cocytus' roaming hounds.** Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 1054; *El.* 243-7	Specific and signposted
587	*Hipp.* 683	**To be utterly annihilated**	Specific and signposted
604	*Ion* 515-6; *Helen* 858-860	**I hear the door creaking**	Specific and signposted
750	*Andr.* 921	**My brother blood.** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
804	*Med.* 92, 187-8	**Glowered like a bull**	Specific and signposted
850	*Cretan Women fr.* 472e	**Defiled our art with sexual monstrosities.** Ref. To Pasiphae and the bull.	Specific and signposted
863-4	*Peleus, Aeolus,*	**Names the plays**	Specific and signposted

	Meleager, Telephus		
887	*Bellerophon fr.* 286	**To ask him about the Greeks.** Ref. to episode in Eur. *Bellerophon*	Specific and signposted
930	*Hipp.* 375-6	**I .. have .. before now lain awake through the long watches of the night**	Specific and signposted
1044	*Stheneboea fr.* 665	**So does he rave .. judge the more**	Specific and signposted
1082, 1447	*Polyidus fr.* 638; *Phrixus fr.* 833	**Who knows if life is truly death**	Specific and signposted
1182	*Hipp.* 385-7*; Ant. fr.* 157;	**Oedipus was a fortunate man at first**	Specific and signposted
1192	*Phoen.* 26-7	**On two swollen feet**	Specific and signposted
1211	*Hyps. fr. 752*	**Dionysus .. the sacred dance**	Specific and signposted
1212	*Bacchae* 146,307; *fr.* 752	**Amid the pine-torch flames on Mount Parnassus' heights.** Euripides to Aeschylus	Specific and signposted
1217-9	*Stheneboea fr.* 661	**There is no man ... though he has..** Verbatim	Specific and signposted
1225-6	*Phrixus fr.* 819	**Cadmus .. left Sidon's city and ..** verbatim	Specific and signposted
1232-3	*I.T.* 1-2	**Pelops' .. swift horses**	Specific and signposted
1238-41	*Mel. frs.* 515, 516	**Once Oeneus .. the first fruits**	Specific and signposted
1305	*Hyps. fr.* 769	**The girl that plays the broken pot**	Specific and signposted
1309-12, 1383, 1400	*Andr.*1-6; *Alcestis* 1-2; *Bac.* 120-9; *Hyps. fr.* 7.5	**Ye halcyons... its watery drops**	Specific and signposted
1316	*Mel. fr. 523*	**The tuneful shuttle**	Specific and signposted
1317-8	*El.* 435-7	**Where the pipe-loving dolphin .. their deep-blue rams..** verbatim	Specific and signposted
1320	*Hyps. fr.* 765	**The vine blossom nourishes the sacred grape**	Specific and signposted

1352	*Trojan Women* 1320; *Med.* 440; *Hec.* 334-5, *H.F.* 510; *I.T.* 843	**The empyrean**	Variation and signposted
1352	*Phoen.*1018,1054; *Or.* 1373, 1381, 1390, 1395, 1415; *Hipp.* 1173	**he flew..he flew..grief, O grief.** Doubling of words occurs frequently in later Eur.plays	Variation Signposted
1382	*Med.* 1	**Would that .. flown between**	Specific and signposted
1383	*Telephus. fr.* 696;	**Spercheius river .. where cattle graze**	Specific and signposted
1391	*Ant. fr.* 170	**Persuasion hath .. spoke word**	Specific and signposted
1396	*Andr.* 252; *Bac.* 252; 271; *I.A.* 1139	**..lacks good sense.** Foreshadowing the *agon*	Variation Signposted
1402	*Meleager fr.* 531	**Iron weighted haft.** Spoken by Euripides	Specific and signposted
1475	*Aeolus*	**What's shameful if it seem not to those out there**	Specific and signposted

Appendix 8 – Euripides' political plays

DATE	EVENTS IN ATHENS	EURIPIDES WRITES	POLITICAL MESSAGE
Spring 416	Melos 'in the air'	***Suppliant Women*** ***Heracles*** ***Electra***	**WARNING** against Consequences of war but **SUPPORTING** Alcibiades
Early Summer 416	as above	***Epician to Alcibiades***	**HOPEFUL** that Alcibiades will do the right thing
Summer 416	Athens attacks Melos		
Spring 415		***Alexandros*** ***Palamedes*** ***Trojan Women*** ***Sisyphus***	**AGAINST** Alcibiades
Summer 415	Sicilian Expedition Alcibiades banished		
Spring 414		***Captive Melanippe*** ***Ion***	Plea to **FORGIVE MISTAKES** and **RECALL** Alcibiades
Spring 412		***Helen*** ***Andromeda*** ***Iphigenia at Tauris*** ***Cyclops***	**OVERT SUPPORT** for Alcibiades as the **ONLY SAVIOUR OF ATHENS**
Spring 411	Alcibiades recalled	**ARISTOPHANES WRITES** ***Thesmophoriazusae***	