

self-consciously singling out the disparate strands of mythical tradition while they are in the midst of weaving them together into what will become a new source for these myths: Euripides' *Ion*.

Euripides has Creusa foreground the instability of Attic mythic tradition yet again when she relays another Attic tale with an unexpected twist. In her plotting session with the Old Man, Creusa presents Athena as the slayer of Gorgon, a variant that may be first brought into the tradition by Euripides in these very lines (987–95):<sup>13</sup>

*Κρ. ἄκουε τοῖνυν· οἶσθα γηγενῇ μάχην;  
Πρ. οἶδ', ἣν Φλέγγραι Γίγαντες ἔστησαν θεοῖς.  
Κρ. ἐνταῦθα Γοργόν' ἔτεκε Γῆ, δεινὸν τέρας.  
Πρ. ἦ παισὶν αὐτῆς σύμμαχον, θεῶν πόνον;  
Κρ. ναί· καί νιν ἔκτειν' ἡ Διὸς Παλλὰς θεά.  
Πρ. ἄρ' οὗτός ἐσθ' ὁ μῦθος ὃν κλύω πάλαι;  
Κρ. ταύτης Ἀθάναν δέρος ἐπὶ στέρνοις ἔχειν.*

The Old Man's hesitant question about this version at 994 hints at its novelty (*ἄρ' οὗτός ἐσθ' ὁ μῦθος ὃν κλύω πάλαι*;) as does Creusa's evasive answer. His use of *μῦθος* here, along with Ion's use of the related verb at 265 (*ὥς μεμύθηνται βροτοῖς*) and the chorus member's at 196–7 expands the semantic sphere of the word in this play to encompass not only casual speech but also mythic tradition. This word therefore generates meaning at two levels when Euripides has Xuthus claim to be Ion's father with loaded language that points to Ion's conventional mythological pedigree (*οὐ· τρέχων ὁ μῦθος ἂν σοι τὰμὰ σημῆναιεν ἄν. 529*). The meta-literary resonance of *μῦθος* is even more pronounced when the Priestess starts to reveal the secrets of Ion's Apollonian lineage. Ion exclaims that a new *μῦθος* is being brought forth to explain his origins (1340): *τί φῆις; ὁ μῦθος εἰσενήνεκται νέος*. A new *μῦθος* is unveiled by the Priestess in the play just as it is being introduced into Attic mythology by the poet.

University of Minnesota

SPENCER COLE

secole@umn.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838808000268

<sup>13</sup> Lee (n. 5), ad loc.

## NOTHING TO DO WITH PHAEDRA? ARISTOPHANES, *THESMOPHORIAZUSAE* 497–501

*εἰ δὲ Φαίδραν λοιδορεῖ,  
ἡμῖν τί τοῦτ' ἔστ'; οὐδ' ἐκείν' εἴρηκέ πω,  
ὥς ἡ γυνὴ δεικνύσα τὰνδρὶ τοῦγκυκλον  
ὑπαυγὰς' οἶόν ἐστ',<sup>1</sup> ἐγκεκαλυμμένον  
τὸν μοιχὸν ἔξεπέμφεν, οὐκ εἴρηκέ πω.*

But if he abuses Phaedra, what is that to us? Nor has he said anything about this, how the woman, while showing her husband her cloak to see by the light, sent her lover away with his head swathed; he hasn't said anything about that.

The bulk of the disguised Mnesilochus' defence of Euripides against the charge of slandering women is a catalogue of the female iniquities which the tragedian does *not*

describe.<sup>2</sup> Among these is the case of the adulterous woman who distracts her husband by holding a garment up to the light for inspection while her lover escapes, his head swathed. This final detail has caused mild distress among some commentators. To van Leeuwen, it is either of no advantage to the lover, if the husband spots him, or of no use to him, if he does not, so he proposes an emendation of *ἐγκεκαλυμμένον* to, *exempli gratia*, *οὐχ ὁρώμενον*.<sup>3</sup> Austin agrees but emends less radically to *εἰδ κεκαλυμμένον*.<sup>4</sup> Seager convincingly answers this objection by noting that the swathing 'would obviously be extremely useful if he were seen but not caught', though his further suggestion, that the *ἐγκυκλον* which the wife displays is the wife's naked rear, is attractive but only partially convincing.<sup>5</sup> There is thus no need for emendation, but the combination of the striking detail of the swathed head with the immediately preceding reference to Phaedra might lead us to consider a further explanation.<sup>6</sup> I wish to argue that these two details would lead the audience to think of Euripides' *Hippolytus Kaluptomenos*, but only as an inferior tragic analogue to Mnesilochus' more relevant and useful comic anecdote.

The swathing or veiling of the head is associated, not only with disguise (itself a central motif of the play),<sup>7</sup> but with shame, each of which leads to a desire not to meet another's eyes, nor to be seen nor recognised.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, *ἐγκαλύπτεσθαι* is frequently used of those who veil their heads from shame.<sup>9</sup> Marzullo sees this as the explanation, citing Hesychius' gloss *αἰσχύνεσθαι* (ε 186), so that the participle in our passage does not mean literally 'swathed' at all, but rather 'ashamed'.<sup>10</sup> In a context so full of disguise and textiles, the verb cannot be entirely metaphorical, but Marzullo's foregrounding of the overlap between veiling in shame and in disguise does suggest another solution. Among the most famous examples of a head veiled in shame is that

<sup>1</sup> The conjecture of Hermann, as printed in C. Austin and S.D. Olson (edd.), *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford, 2004), but the reading of this crux does not affect the argument of this article.

<sup>2</sup> Ar. *Thesm.* 466–519. Euripides' *κηδεστής* is not named in the play, but is called Mnesilochus by Σ ad Ar. *Thesm.* ante 1, 603, 1065, and ad *Ach.* 332a. On reasons for using it in preference to Inlaw or Relative, see M.S. Silk, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy* (Oxford, 2000), 208, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> J. van Leeuwen (ed.), *Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusae* (Leiden, 1904), ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> C. Austin, 'Aristophane, *Thesmophories*, vers 500', in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergaele (edd.), *Le monde grec. Pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 186–7, at 187. The emendation is printed in Austin and Olson (n. 1).

<sup>5</sup> R. Seager, 'Notes on Aristophanes', *CQ* 31 (1981), 244–51, at 248, followed by A.H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae* (Warminster, 1994), ad loc.

<sup>6</sup> Gregory Hutchinson suggests *per litteras* that the lover's concern is to conceal not his head but his nakedness, comparing Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.132 and Apul. *Met.* 9.20. This is plausible, but not inconsistent with an emphasis on both disguise and shame.

<sup>7</sup> J. Tobe, 'The significance of disguise in Aristophanic comedy', *JCS* 32 (1984), 28–40; G. Compton-Engle, 'Control of costume in three plays of Aristophanes', *AJPh* 124 (2003), 507–35, at 515–24.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Eur. *HF* 1198–201 and see n. 9 below. 'The veiling of one's head is a typical *aidōs*-reaction, a consequence of the fear of being seen and part of the general complex of associations between *aidōs* and the eyes', D.L. Cairns, *Aidōs: the Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford, 1993), 292.

<sup>9</sup> Pl. *Phdr.* 243B, *Phd.* 117C, *Dem. Epist.* 3.42, *Aeschin.* 2.107, Ar. *Rhet.* 1386a. The idiom is common enough for Alexis to pun on it at *Crateia* fr. 115.16–17 K-A, where the liver in a feast is wrapped (*ἐγκεκαλυμμένον*) in caul because it is ashamed either of its livid colour (J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef*, [Oxford, 2000], 390), or because it is blushing (W.G. Arnott, *Alexis, The Fragments. A Commentary* [Cambridge, 1996], ad loc.).

<sup>10</sup> B. Marzullo, 'Aristoph. *Thesm.* 499–501', *MCr* 10–12 (1975–7), 141–2, at 142.

of the eponymous hero of the non-extant version of Euripides' *Hippolytus*.<sup>11</sup> This tragedy's alternative name, the *Hippolytus Kaluptomenos*, is generally (though not universally) taken to refer to the chaste hero's shocked and shamed concealment of his face in reaction to the brazen advances of his stepmother, Phaedra.<sup>12</sup> Mnesilochus' description of an adulterous woman receiving her unexpectedly-returned husband while a young man flees, his head swathed, bears a clear, if perverse, resemblance to the Euripidean scene. In a comedy where so many Euripidean scenes are parodied, so that Mnesilochus successively plays the roles of Telephus, Oeax (in *Palamedes*), Helen and Andromeda, it is far from unexpected to find an irreverent appropriation of the Hippolytus plays, which are themselves alluded to and even virtually quoted from elsewhere in the play.<sup>13</sup>

Phaedra, with Melanippe, is held up by Mica as a particularly prominent instance of Euripides' alleged slander of women.<sup>14</sup> Considering her relatively virtuous behaviour in the extant *Hippolytus*, it is not unreasonable to assume that the apparently more shameless Phaedra of the *Kaluptomenos* is primarily meant.<sup>15</sup> The audience would be more likely to spot a subtle allusion to a play of which they are regularly reminded. Moreover, the immediately preceding reference to Phaedra in our passage foregrounds this particular myth and more specifically this particular tragedy in the audience's mind, so that, even in the decidedly comic, untragic context of a suburban adultery, the scene of a lecherous wife and a young man running away with swathed head will immediately (if only partially) evoke Hippolytus.

Before setting this allusion in the broader paratragic context of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, it is important to address the controversy over what the self-veiling of Hippolytus in the lost Euripidean tragedy constituted.<sup>16</sup> The traditional and still widely-accepted version is, as has been stated, that the chaste Hippolytus fled the approaches of Phaedra, veiling his head in shame. However, Craik has argued that *καλυπτόμενος* is not middle but passive and refers to Phaedra's covering of Hippolytus' corpse with her shorn hair.<sup>17</sup> Roisman similarly believes that the external action of Phaedra could not cause Hippolytus to veil himself in shame, and her explanation is that he had succumbed to his stepmother's suggestion, not only of adultery, but of attempted usurpation, and was thus ashamed of his *own* actions.<sup>18</sup> Both these arguments rest largely on the misconception that shame can only be felt for one's own actions, but Cairns shows that '[s]ince one can be affected by another's

<sup>11</sup> The debate as to which of the Hippolytus plays was earlier does not affect my argument. For discussion, see J.C. Gibert, 'Euripides' Hippolytus plays: which came first?', *CQ* 47 (1987), 85–97, and G.O. Hutchinson, 'Euripides' other *Hippolytus*', *ZPE* 149 (2004), 15–28, at 23–8.

<sup>12</sup> W.S. Barrett (ed.), *Euripides' Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 37. M.R. Halleran (ed.), *Euripides' Hippolytus* (Warminster, 1995), 26. A.N. Michelini, *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition* (Madison, 1987), 287–8, considers it 'tempting...and...likely enough to be true' but still only a supposition.

<sup>13</sup> On paratragedy in the play, see P. Rau, *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Munich, 1967), 42–89.

<sup>14</sup> Lines 546–8. Cf. *Ran.* 1043, Silk (n. 2), 321–2, n. 53, Austin and Olson (n. 1), *ad* 153. At 153, Agathon copulates on top when composing a *Phaedra*. Lines 275–6 allude to *Hipp.* 612, but without reference to Phaedra.

<sup>15</sup> This assumes that the plurals at 547 are generic, though Phaedra and Melanippe each appeared in two different Euripidean tragedies.

<sup>16</sup> Attempted reconstructions of the plot and the placement of surviving fragments can be found in Barrett (n. 12), 15–45, Halleran (n. 12), 25–37, Hutchinson (n. 11), 19–23.

<sup>17</sup> E.M. Craik, 'Euripides' first *Hippolytos*', *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987), 137–9.

<sup>18</sup> H.M. Roisman, 'The veiled Hippolytus and Phaedra', *Hermes* 127 (1999), 397–409, at 407–9.

disgrace, one can veil one's head in response to it'.<sup>19</sup> We need not therefore reject Hippolytus' self-veiling on the grounds that it is an inappropriate reaction to shameful behaviour from Phaedra.

The evidence of the hypothesis of the lost *Hippolytus*, partially preserved on *P. Oxy.* 4640 and *P. Mich.* inv. 6222A, has been recently examined, notably by Luppe and Hutchinson.<sup>20</sup> The traces of a description of someone being ordered to veil (or unveil) themselves with the cloak of Hippolytus might suggest a different meaning for the title, which has nothing to do with Hippolytus' veiling himself.<sup>21</sup> This may or may not be connected with the ἐλεγχος to which Phaedra seems to have been subjected, perhaps involving a slave disguised with Hippolytus' cloak.<sup>22</sup> However, despite Luppe's tentative and unpersuasive parallel of Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*, this cannot account for the attested title in which Hippolytus, and not someone else using Hippolytus' cloak, either is veiled or veils himself.<sup>23</sup> The extant *Hippolytus* also features two distinct but corresponding veilings (243–5 and 1458), a parallel and perhaps even an allusion to the other version, so that this second veiling does not in itself rule out an earlier scene in which Hippolytus veiled himself.<sup>24</sup> In the absence of further evidence, the traditional interpretation that – at some point in the play at least – Hippolytus is veiling himself from shame seems the most probable.<sup>25</sup>

How then does Mnesilochus' allusion to such a tragedy function? As we have observed, his defence speech catalogues female crimes which Euripides has *not* described. His evocation of the *Kaluptomenos* does not suggest that Euripides had also described this sordid tale of comic adultery. On the contrary, it demonstrates the sort of scenario – parallel but, for that very reason, the more distinct – which Euripides had *not* described, hence the strongly disjunctive οὐδ' ἐκεῖν' εἴρηκέ πω. When *he* tells a story about a young man fleeing an older woman with his head veiled, it is for the relatively inoffensive reason that his stepmother has proposed incest, as opposed to the 'real', or rather 'comic',<sup>26</sup> reason that he is an adulterer disguising himself from her husband. Just as Mnesilochus' defence of Euripides answers Mica's prosecution speech (383–432), so his claim that the tragedian has not described the majority of women's misdemeanours aims to counter her assertion of what Bowie calls 'his tragedy's improper involvement in women's affairs'.<sup>27</sup> Bowie argues that Euripides has not only, through Mnesilochus, transgressed into the female sphere of

<sup>19</sup> Cairns (n. 8), 293, n.100.

<sup>20</sup> W. Luppe, 'Die Hypothesis zum ersten *Hippolytus* (*P. Mich.* inv. 6222a)', *ZPE* 102 (1994), 23–39; Hutchinson (n. 11).

<sup>21</sup> 'Ἰππολύτου στολήν [–] κίαν ἐκέλευσε [–] καλυψάμενον *P. Mich.* inv. 6222A fr. B 3–5, with Luppe (n. 20), 28–9; Hutchinson (n. 11), 23.

<sup>22</sup> *P. Mich.* inv. 6222A fr. B 8–9. Luppe (n. 20), 30–1; Hutchinson (n. 11), 23; O. Zwierlein, 'Senecas *Phaedra* und ihre Vorbilder nach dem Fund der neuen *Hippolytos*-Papyri', *Lucubrationes philologae* 1: *Seneca* (Berlin, 2004), 57–136, at 66.

<sup>23</sup> Luppe (n. 20), 37–8.

<sup>24</sup> On allusion between the two *Hippolytus* plays, but in different directions, see E.A. McDermott, 'Euripides' second thoughts', *TAPhA* 130 (2000), 239–59; Hutchinson (n. 11), 26–7.

<sup>25</sup> One might also note the unreliability of many hypotheses of extant plays, on which see A.L. Brown, 'The dramatic synopses attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium', *CQ* 37 (1987), 427–31.

<sup>26</sup> Of course, Mnesilochus' tales of female debauchery are not 'real', and 'the anecdotes he tells of adultery and supposititious babies come straight out of the typical male discourse of the comic theater': F.I. Zeitlin, 'Travesties of gender and genre in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae*', in H.P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), 169–217, at 174.

<sup>27</sup> A.M. Bowie, *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge, 1993), 225.

the Thesmophorium, but has transgressed in his plays into the sphere which properly belongs to comedy and to women.<sup>28</sup> This generic transgression is most clearly exemplified by the way in which the menfolk in Mica's speech quote, or at least ape, Euripides in the context of the *οἶκος*, applying the tragic to the domestic (401–6):

κἄν ἐκβάλη  
σκεῦός τι κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν πλανωμένη,  
ἀνὴρ ἐρωτᾷ· 'τῷ κατέαγεν ἡ χύτρα;  
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ τῷ Κορινθίῳ ξένῳ.'  
κάμνει κόρη τις, εὐθὺς ἀδελφὸς λέγει·  
'τὸ χρῶμα τοῦτό μ' οὐκ ἀρέσκει τῆς κόρης.'

And if a woman wandering around the house drops a pot, her husband asks 'For whose health was the vessel broken? It cannot but be for the Corinthian guest.' A girl is ill, immediately her brother says, 'This colour of the maiden's does not please me.'

In an incongruous domestic setting, a husband sees his wife as a Stheneboea like the Euripidean version he has just watched breaking a pot to the health of Bellerophon,<sup>29</sup> while a brother assumes that his sick sister is actually concealing her pregnancy, like the Euripidean Canace or Deidamia.<sup>30</sup> Yet the incongruity is not the fault of the men but of Euripides, whose tragedy has trespassed into this alien sphere. Mnesilochus' response sets out to counter this by showing where Euripides has *not* trespassed on the domestic or comic sphere. The contrast between Euripides' Phaedra and Mnesilochus' adulterous *γυνή* emphasises this distance. Mnesilochus' argument is, as Silk puts it, that 'Euripides has not so much misstated the case against women but understated it'.<sup>31</sup>

This rhetorical strategy serves, not only as a defence of Euripides against the charge of slandering women, but also as an attack upon him and his ability as a tragedian to cope with the representation of women, specifically *vis-à-vis* Aristophanic comedy. As Tzanetou puts it, '[t]he trial of Euripides offers a pretext for evaluating his dramatic skill in portraying women, judged against the skill of comedy'.<sup>32</sup> Comedy is not only the more appropriate genre for depicting the wickedness of womankind, it is also the more effective. The juxtaposition of the tragic Phaedra and Hippolytus against the comic cunning wife and shamed, disguised adulterer throws into relief how much better comedy is at revealing the 'truth' about women. There are other examples in Mnesilochus' speech and its sequel. One might, more tentatively, think of the extended labour of Alcmene as an implicit tragic analogue of the woman who claims to be in labour for ten days until a supposititious baby can be smuggled in (502–16).<sup>33</sup> The resumption of Mnesilochus' catalogue

<sup>28</sup> Bowie (n. 27), 217–27.

<sup>29</sup> Eur. *Stheneboea* fr. 664.2 Kannicht. Austin and Olson (n. 1), *ad* 400–2, suggest that the weaving of garlands might allude to the same tragedy.

<sup>30</sup> From *Aeolus* or *Scyri* respectively. B.B. Rogers (ed.), *The Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes* (London, 1904), *ad loc.*, objects that, if 406 were adapted (its metre is untragic), from *Aeolus*, the brother would be the seducer Macareus rather than the watchful guardian of Mica's speech. One wonders whether, if it were adapted from a line delivered by Aeolus himself and given instead to a brother, this might be a further joke. Lines 411–3 also play on Eur. *Phoenix* fr. 804 Kannicht.

<sup>31</sup> Silk (n. 2), 327.

<sup>32</sup> A. Tzanetou, 'Something to do with Demeter: ritual and performance in Aristophanes' *Women at the Thesmophoria*, *AJPh* 123 (2002), 329–67, at 357.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.95–133, Ov. *Met.* 9.281–315. Austin and Olson (n. 1), *ad* 502–3, note that 'ten days is a ridiculously long time for contractions to continue' but, as with the swathed lover,

following the chorus' and Mica's interruption (552–65) stresses the many crimes which *he* has not yet described, a striking parallel to the earlier, repeated reminder of what *Euripides* has not described, and one which underlines the capaciousness and efficacy of comedy's repertoire in contrast to tragedy's.<sup>34</sup> His allusion to a woman killing her husband with an axe cannot but make the audience think of Clytemnestra and perhaps specifically the Euripidean Clytemnestra. Both Sommerstein and Austin-Olson note the parallel but carefully emphasise that Mnesilochus is referring to 'contemporary' or 'actual' events, 'as [his] argument requires.'<sup>35</sup> Quite so, but the evocation of the tragic analogue is key to the emphasis on how much more real, relevant and effective the comic anecdote is.

In all these cases, with Phaedra and Clytemnestra, possibly Alcmena and others, the implicit allusion to an unsatisfactory tragic plot emphasises how much more satisfactory comedy is, just as the tragic escape plans fail and only the comic ruse with the dancing girl succeeds. Indeed, this comic analogue of *Iphigenia in Tauris*,<sup>36</sup> with the archer as an unwitting Thoas, stands in much the same relation to the more explicit tragic parodies of *Helen* and *Andromeda* as the adulterous γυνή does to Phaedra. As Bowie describes the situation at the end of the play, when Euripides has agreed no longer to tell the terrible truth about women, 'Though there will be no more help from Euripides,...a new champion has arisen, whose plays, as Mnesilochus the comic hero proceeds to demonstrate in his great speech, will give a much more accurate and fulsome picture of female villainy.'<sup>37</sup>

Balliol College, Oxford

ROBERT COWAN

bob.cowan@balliol.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S000983880800027X

this extra detail might lead the audience not only, as they suggest, to sense the husband's foolishness, but to think of another, allusive explanation. The fragments of Euripides' *Alcmena* seem to point to a depiction of the long night of Heracles' conception rather than his birth, but Plautus' *Amphitruo* conflates the two events and may allude to a tragic version of Alcmena's extended labour by having Jupiter promise, in contrast, a painless birth (878–9). Outside tragedy, one might compare the labour of Leto, also extended by Hera, for nine days and nights (*Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 91).

<sup>34</sup> Austin and Olson (n. 1), ad 556–7, note the parallel but not its implications.

<sup>35</sup> Line 560, with Sommerstein (n. 5) and Austin and Olson (n. 1), ad loc. Cf. Eur. *El.* 160 (with Cropp ad loc.), 279, 1160.

<sup>36</sup> E. Bobrick, 'Iphigeneia revisited: *Thesmophoriazousae* 1160–1225', *Arethusa* 24 (1991), 67–76; M. Wright, *Euripides' Escape Tragedies* (Oxford, 2005), 50–2; cf. E. Hall, 'The archer scene in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae*', *Philologus* 133 (1989) 38–54, at 41–3.

<sup>37</sup> Bowie (n. 27), 227. I am very grateful to Bill Allan, Gregory Hutchinson, Adrian Kelly, John Wilkins, Matthew Wright and *CQ*'s reader for their helpful comments.

## THE ΠΥΡΡΙΧΗ OF KINESIAS, A PUN? ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS* 153

Kinesias, son of Meles, is no stranger to students of Old Comedy.<sup>1</sup> Pherecrates, Strattis (who based an entire play on Kinesias) and Plato Comicus, made him a target

<sup>1</sup> For handy summaries of references to Kinesias and his activities, see P. Maas, s.v. *Kinesias*,