

Heracles, Cercopes, and Paracomed^{*}

JOHN KIRKPATRICK

New Trier Township High School

FRANCIS DUNN

University of California, Santa Barbara

SUMMARY: At Euripides, *Her.* 1380–81 Heracles imagines his weapons talking to him in direct speech, and rebuking him for the murder of his wife and children. Such a conceit is out of place in tragedy. The authors suggest that it is best explained as an allusion to the Cercopes, who figure prominently, and utter stinging rebukes, in one of Heracles' comic exploits. The distinctive moment in Euripides' play is read as representing and reevaluating the hero's complex and unfinished identity. Finally, the authors trace the effect of this allusion after Euripides, situating the reassessment of the hero within a larger dialogue involving sculpture, vase-painting, comedy, and satyr-drama.

NEAR THE END OF EURIPIDES' *HERACLES*, after murdering his wife and children in a fit of madness, and after accepting Theseus' offer of asylum in Athens, Heracles ponders whether or not to take his bow with him. It is an important symbolic moment, since the bow has served to identify the hero throughout the play,¹ and since it now represents not only the famous labors performed with the aid of this weapon (366, 392, 423–24), but also the mur-

^{*} For discussion, comments, and disagreements that helped us improve this paper, we would like to thank Ahuvia Kahane, Mark Buchan, Ann Michelini, Oliver Taplin, Linda Knier, audiences at Northwestern University, UC Santa Barbara, and Washington University, as well as Cynthia Damon and the anonymous readers for *TAPA*. For photographs of the vase in Plate 3, we would like to thank Aldo Finocchiario of the Museo Civico.

¹ The role of the bow in representing Heracles' heroism is established early in the play in Amphitryon's debate with Lycus (158–64, 188–203); for discussion, see, e.g., Michelini 242–46, Dunn 1996: 96–107. On the importance of Heracles' decision, with no discussion of the bow's ability to speak, see, e.g., Adkins 218, Walsh 307–8.

der of his family (942, 969–70, 991, 1000, 1062–63). Can he bear to carry with him this sign of his hideous deed? Can he bear to leave behind the emblem of his greatness? In what follows, we argue that this symbolic moment involves an allusion to one of Heracles' more comic exploits; the turning point in Euripides' play can thus be read as representing and reevaluating the hero's complex and incomplete identity. Finally, we trace the effect of this allusion after Euripides, situating the reassessment of the hero within a larger dialogue involving sculpture, vase-painting, comedy, and satyr-drama.

THE TALKING BOW

In the course of his monologue, after giving the bodies of his wife and children a final embrace, Heracles imagines his weapons rebuking him (1376–82):

ὦ λυγραί φιλημάτων
τέρψεις, λυγραί δὲ τῶνδ' ὅπλων κοινωνίαι.
ἀμηχανῶ γὰρ πότερ' ἔχω τάδ' ἢ μεθῶ,
ἂ πλευρὰ τὰμὰ προσπίτνοντ' ἐρεῖ τάδε·
'Ημῖν τέκν' εἶλες καὶ δάμαρθ'· ἡμᾶς ἔχεις
παιδοκτόνους σοὺς. εἴτ' ἐγὼ τάδ' ὠλέναις
οἴσω;

How sad the pleasure of
kisses, and sad the company of these weapons!
I can't decide whether to keep them or lay them aside,
since they will fall against my sides and say,
"With us you killed your children and your wife; we are
your child-killers you are carrying." So shall I take
them in my hands?

In imagining the actions and words of his weapons, Heracles personifies them and describes them talking to him. They fall against his side, remind him of his crime, and deliver one and a half lines of direct speech. This vivid personification is a strange conceit, perhaps as strange as the talking horse of Achilles (*Il.* 19.404–17).² Why do the weapons come to life in this startling way?

² The talking weapons of Heracles are in one respect *more* striking than the talking horse of Achilles, because they are inanimate (see below). Nevertheless, Achilles' horse is surprising and verges, like Heracles' weapons, on comedy or fable: "a particularly bold invention by Homer" that "would verge on the comic in a stock situation," (Willcock 221); "wise or prophetic speaking animals are familiar from folktale and fable ... but are unexpected" in the *Iliad* (Edwards 283).

One answer is to note that the personification of Heracles' weapons is dramatically appropriate. The bow and arrows, after all, helped the hero in all his labors, and he has already described them as his fellow-soldiers (1099). As Bond concludes, "It is natural for Heracles to converse with these constant companions, just as Philoctetes addresses his bow pathetically at *S. Ph.* 1130."³ In *Heracles*, the personification is especially pathetic since, after the murder of his wife and children, his nearest and dearest are mere weapons. But the personification is also more striking than that in *Philoctetes*, since Philoctetes speaks to his bow, whereas the bow and arrows, according to Heracles, will speak to him. The effect is heightened by what we might call the instrumental irony of their first word, ἡμῖν: as Bond observes (*ad* 1380), the instruments of Heracles' crime remind him of their part in his deed.

Another answer is to note that the representation of weapons as morally responsible "child-killers" may not be as strange as it initially seems. In Athenian law, as Wilamowitz and others have pointed out, inanimate objects could be tried for murder, and according to Plutarch (*Per.* 36.5) Pericles debated for an entire day with Protagoras the guilt of a javelin in an accidental death at the games.⁴ The practice of attaching guilt to inanimate objects also had precedents in Athenian ritual: according to Pausanias, for example, the sacrificial knife used at the Bouphonia was considered unclean, and following the sacrifice it was tried for murder.⁵

But if Athenian custom can account for the notion of the weapons' guilt, and if dramatic effect can account for their personification, neither explanation addresses what is most unusual about these lines: Heracles describes the personified and guilty weapons as able to speak, and he quotes the rebuke he expects them to utter. The talking weapons at *Heracles* 1380–81 are without precedent. The notion that strictly inanimate objects should be thought of as

³ Bond on 1379. We might add that Turnus addresses his spear at *Aeneid* 12.95–100. Compare the comments of Grube 260, Foley 168, Michelini 266, Barlow on 1378ff.

⁴ Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 3: 274; compare MacDowell 85–89, Bond 407–8. Athenian law provided for the exile of objects that caused the death of a person either accidentally, or in the case of murder when the criminal could not be brought to trial (compare D. 23.76, Aeschin. 3.244, Arist. *Ath.* 57.4, Paus. 6.11.6, Poll. 8.120; Plato likewise prescribes exile at *Lg.* 873e–874a). In the Plutarch passage mentioned above, Xanthippus ridicules not the existence of such legal precedents, but the sophistic examination of them.

⁵ Pausanias is explaining how the practice of prosecuting weapons at the Prytaneum began (1.28.11; cf. 1.24.4); for a different account see Porphyry *de Abstinencia* 2.29–30. The practice at the Bouphonia is noted by Foley 168; compare Pucci 185, who remarks that "Euripides here appropriates the old animistic view of weapons to exonerate Heracles, at least in part, from direct responsibility."

endowed with speech, and that their words should be quoted in direct discourse, has no parallel in Greek tragedy and few parallels in Greek literature. In what follows, we argue that allusion to another story involving Heracles can explain this anomalous feature of the scene. We suggest that the talking weapons recall the talkative Cercopes and that this allusion to a scene from comedy heightens the ambiguous status of the protagonist.⁶ We realize that detecting allusions can seem subjective; as one scholar has noted in a similar context, “demonstration of metadramatic double meaning in a text is an intrinsically slippery enterprise. If the reader ‘buys’ the idea that covert significance is couched in an author’s words, argumentation is almost unnecessary; if not, elaborate citing of evidence falls on deaf ears” (McDermott 241). The difficulty is compounded in this case by the fact that our prior texts do not survive and are mostly known only by their titles. Yet even in the absence of demonstrable verbal echoes, a plausible argument can be made for allusion to a familiar scene or tableau.

THINGS THAT TALK

The feature of this scene that has not been explained, and that could allude to the Cercopes, is the attribution of speech to inanimate objects. A brief survey will indicate that this is out of place in tragedy, and is largely a comic conceit.

Elsewhere in Greek literature things may talk because they are in fact animate beings, and, conversely, inanimate things may be personified without acquiring speech. As examples of the former, Earth is a goddess who speaks (Hes. *Th.* 164–66), and the island Delos is an animate being who negotiates divine honors with Leto (*h.Ap.* 62–82). A god may likewise speak through a thing or endow it with speech, as when Zeus speaks through an oak tree at Dodona (Hom. *Od.* 14.327–28), Athena makes the prow of the Argo able to speak (A. fr. 20 Snell [henceforth *TGF*], A.R. 4.585–91), and Hermes speaks through his statue (Call. *Iamb.* 7; compare Pl. *Com.* 204 in Kassel and Austin [henceforth *PCG*]). To these we might add the poetic subcategory of things that represent speech or are animated by the power of poetry. Dedicatory epigrams, for example, are imagined speaking (Call. *Epigr.* 5, 34, etc.);⁷ Helicon, home of the Muses, contends with Cithaeron in a poetry contest (Corinn. 1 in Page [henceforth *PMG*]); a poet may represent his verse as “talking arrows” (Pi. *O.* 2.83–85); and a dramatic character may protest, “my tongue has sworn, not my mind” (E. *Hipp.* 612). As examples of the latter category, things per-

⁶ An allusion to the Cercopes was first proposed in Dunn 1996: 220 n. 25.

⁷ The conceit may also extend to the dedicated object: Callimachus fr. 110 Pfeiffer, the so-called *coma Berenices*. On first-person inscriptions, see Svenbro 30–31.

sonified but not speaking, we need only cite the Homeric formula “pitiless bronze” (νηλεΐ χαλκῷ), or Homer’s reference to spears that “long to take their fill of flesh” (*Il.* 11.574 λιλαιόμενα χροὸς ἄσαι).⁸ None of these cases, however, involves an inanimate object that nevertheless speaks of its own accord.

Insofar as tragedies allude to powers of speech, they stress the fact that inanimate things *cannot* talk. “If the house itself could speak,” says the watchman in *Agamemnon*, “it would tell most clearly” the reasons for his concern (37–38 οἶκος δ’ αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, / σαφέστατ’ ἂν λέξειεν). The house cannot speak, however, and his forebodings remain shrouded in silence. Hippolytus considers a similar impossibility in wishing he could prove his innocence (*E. Hipp.* 1074–75 ὦ δώματ’, εἴθε φθέγμα γηρύσαισθε μοι / καὶ μαρτυρήσαιτ’ εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ’ ἀνὴρ), but as Theseus reminds him, the house is voiceless (1076 ἐξ τοῦς ἀφώνους μάρτυρας φεύγεις σοφῶς). Hecuba, wishing she had unheard-of powers of persuasion, says, “if there were voice in my arms and hands and hair and the tread of my feet, by the craft of Daedalus or some god, they would all cling to your knees weeping and uttering all kinds of speech” (*E. Hec.* 836–40). In each case, the fact that things cannot talk correlates with the character’s inability to speak or persuade. This use of *adunaton* may also convey the impression of a world out of joint. Phaedra marvels at hypocrites who do not fear that their dark rooms will speak and betray them (*E. Hipp.* 415–18). Hermione feels as if the very land hates her and as if the house is telling her to leave (*E. Andr.* 923–25). And Heracles, having decided to commit suicide, says that if he lives the earth will speak, forbidding him to touch it, as will the sea and rivers (*E. HF* 1295–97). In each case, a character represents the extremity of moral outrage, or rejection, or guilt, by imagining the impossible: things that can talk. Nowhere in tragedy does an object actually speak⁹ with the sole exception of the passage under consideration here, where Heracles reports the words his weapons will utter.

Tragedy’s aversion to talking things as a rule extends to animals. Only once does an animal speak, and here only because a character cites fable with its very different conventions (*A. Myrm.* fr. 139 *TGF*):

ὦδ’ ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυστικῶν κλέος,
πληγέντ’ ἀτράκτω τοξικῷ τὸν αἰετὸν
εἰπεῖν ἰδόντα μηχανὴν πτερώματος·

⁸ See more generally Webster 10–21, Stanford 136–39.

⁹ Iphigenia’s dream (*E. IT* 50–55) does not involve an inanimate thing that talks, but an inanimate thing that, in her dream, takes on the human qualities of Orestes: a column of her father’s house acquires tawny hair and human speech, and she prepares it, like a human, for sacrifice.

Τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς
ἀλίσκόμεσθα.

The report of Libyan stories is
that an eagle struck with the shaft from a bow,
seeing the feathered invention, said:
“So, we are destroyed not by others but by
our own feathers.”

In Euripides, Heracles holds the weapons before us and tells what words they will say. In Aeschylus, a human character merely repeats the fable in which an eagle complains of being struck.

The conventions of epic are similar but slightly freer. In Hesiod, as in Aeschylus, an imbedded fable reports the words of the hawk rebuking the nightingale (*Op.* 207–11). In Homer, animals may speak without such a frame. The horse Xanthus warns Achilles that the day of his death is near (*Il.* 19.408–17), and Penelope describes to Odysseus a dream in which an eagle spoke to her in human speech (*Od.* 19.545–50). Yet these are all animate beings.

The situation is quite different in less elevated genres. In fable, not only do animals regularly talk, so also do plants and inanimate things.¹⁰ The words of the plane tree (185 Hausrath and Hunger [henceforth *CFA*]), the oak (262 *CFA*), the olive (293 *CFA*), as well as bramble (19 *CFA*) and reed (239 *CFA*) are reported in fable, perhaps reflecting a widespread belief that trees were animate beings (thus Henrichs). But fables also report the words of strictly inanimate things such as a file (95 *CFA*), a wineskin (280 *CFA*), and a wall and stake (296 *CFA*). Other genres involve talking animals, as in the mock-epic *Battle of Frogs and Mice*, and talking plants, as in the fourth *Iamb* of Callimachus. The satires of Lucian go further, giving voice to skulls and skeletons (*DMort.*), to a tongue (*Pseudol.* 25), and to a bed and lamp (*Cat.* 27). In the last of these, when Megapenthes denies the charge of sexual misconduct, Hermes summons his bed and lamp as witnesses and both reluctantly speak against their master. In fable and in the late satiric dialogues of Lucian we thus have clear if infrequent examples of inanimate things talking.

Examples are more numerous in comedy. Not only was the comic stage full of talking animals, it regularly gave speaking parts to abstractions such as War and Confusion (Ar. *Pax*), Wealth (Ar. *Pl.*), Weaker and Stronger Argument (Ar. *Nu.*), and Agriculture (Ar. fr. 305 *PCG*), and to geographical places

¹⁰ We might add winter and spring (297 *CFA*), river (280 *CFA*) and sea (178 *CFA*), although seasons, rivers, and so on were regularly personified in Greek literature, as in the last of these fables where the sea has a woman's form (ὁμοιωθεῖσα γυναικί).

such as Islands (Ar. fr. 402–14 *PCG* from the play Νῆσοι, sometimes attributed to Archippus) and Cities (Eup. fr. 218–58 *PCG* from Πόλεις; similarly-named plays were written by Anaxandrides and others).¹¹ In comedy, as in fable, strictly inanimate objects are said to talk: a jar (Ar. V. 1437), a neck (Ar. *Ra.* 20), wine and vinegar (Eub. fr. 65 *PCG*), barley cakes and wheat loaves (Telecl. fr. 1.4–6 *PCG*), and roast thrushes (Pherecr. fr. 113.23–25 *PCG*). Furthermore, in several cases they have special speaking roles. In a lost play of Aristophanes the chorus consisted of merchant ships (fr. 415–43 *PCG*); in his *Knights* triremes gather and two of them speak to the others (1300–315);¹² in a play of Theopompus Mount Lycabettus observes, “at my place boyish boys give themselves to their fellows” (fr. 30 *PCG*); and in Crates’ *Theria* a fish being cooked replies, “I’m not yet done on the other side” (fr. 16.9 *PCG*), and the water says, “turn me off” (fr. 17.5 *PCG*).¹³

Two observations emerge from this survey of things that talk. First, the direct speech that Heracles ascribes to his inanimate weapons does not properly belong in tragedy; the passage is negatively “marked” for its audience as unusual and out of place. Second, the same conceit can occur in less elevated genres, and is especially frequent in comedy; the words of the weapons, when supplied on stage, are positively “marked” as a commonplace of comedy. Our original question, “Why this startling conceit?” has become more focused, and we now ask, “Why this out-of-place comic *topos*?” We shall eventually consider how this and other comic details contribute to a larger reassessment of Heracles; we begin by considering the more immediate connotations of the talking weapons.

CHATTERING CERCOPESES

An early and well attested legend involves two mischievous brothers known as the Cercopes.¹⁴ While Heracles was asleep, they stole his weapons; when

¹¹ More familiar forms of personification include Clouds, Moon, Seasons (Ar. fr. 577–89 *PCG*; Cratin. fr. 269–98 *PCG*), Months (Philetaer. fr. 12 *PCG*), and Breezes (Metag. fr. 1–5 *PCG*).

¹² If Dale is correct, a further example in Aristophanes is the feather of Lamachus (*Ach.* 1182–85), which in her view addresses the general. See Dale 1961: 47–48.

¹³ Crates Com. fr. 17.5 *PCG* ἐρεῖ δὲ θῦδωρ “ἀνέχετε”. Different readings are suggested by Bergk (ἐρεῖ (*vel* ἐρεῖς) δέ, θῦδωρ ἀνέχεται; see *PCG* app. crit.) and Edmonds (ἐρεῖ δὲ “θῦδωρ ἀνέχετε”; see Edmonds 1: 158).

¹⁴ The most complete accounts are late, namely Nonnus in Westermann 375 and the *Suda* lexicon (s.v. Κέρκωπες and s.v. Μελαμπύγου τύχοις); the versions of Tzetzes (*ad Lyc.* 91) and Zenobius (*Athous* 2.85) are given in West 68 (on Archilochus 178). On early evidence for the legend see Brommer 1984: 28–32 and Gantz 441–42. According to Diodorus Siculus, there were at least four Cercopes (4.31.7–8).

the hero awoke and discovered what had happened, he caught the boys and tied them by their feet to the ends of a pole; but as he carried them off, the irrepressible pair, hanging upside-down behind him, made fun of Heracles' dark and hairy behind. Heracles, however, instead of punishing them for their impudence in calling him "Black-bottom," responded by laughing and letting them go.¹⁵ The story would have been familiar to Euripides' audience. It had already been recounted in a poem ascribed to Homer (Allen 159–60) and alluded to by Archilochus (fr. 178 West), Herodotus (7.216), and Pherecydes (FGH 3 fr. 77).¹⁶ The tableau in which Heracles carries the Cercopes dangling beside him was especially popular in art, from sixth-century temple sculptures at Paestum and Selinus to numerous illustrations on sixth- and fifth-century vases.¹⁷ The story was also frequently dramatized on the comic stage. Cratinus produced *Archilochoi*, in which the Cercopes played a significant part, at least a decade before Euripides' *Heracles*; the *Cercopes* of Hermippus may have been staged only a few years before *Heracles*; and the *Xantriai* or *Cercopes* of Plato Comicus belongs to the same general period.¹⁸ It is likely that the story was also enacted on the satyric stage, since the episode is part of the Omphale cycle, and since both Ion (TGF 19 fr. 17a–33a) and Achaëus (TGF 20 fr. 32–35) produced a satyric *Omphale*. Heracles carrying the Cercopes upside-down beside him would invite endless comic variations, and a fourth-century vase illustrates just such a scene in satyr-drama: a satyric Heracles presents a ruler with two caged monkeys as the captured Cercopes (Plate 3).¹⁹

¹⁵ Diodorus reports a different version, in which Heracles killed some of the Cercopes and handed others over in chains to Omphale (4.31.7). Pherecydes adds that the Cercopes were eventually turned into stone (Jacoby [henceforth FGH] 3 fr. 77 = Schol. ad Luc. *Alex.* 4), while Xenagoras says they were turned into monkeys and settled on Pithecusae (FGH 240 fr. 28b = Harp. s.v. Κέρκωψ; cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.91–100).

¹⁶ The proverbial warning μὴ τοῦ μελαμπύγου τύχης, which their mother delivered to the Cercopes, may also refer to a black-tailed eagle (A. A. 115; Schol. B ad *Il.* 24.315–16); for detailed discussion see Fraenkel on A. 115.

¹⁷ Sculpture: a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (*LIMC* Kerkopes #11 = Plate 1), and a metope from Temple C at Selinus (*LIMC* #12). Vases: *LIMC* lists twelve examples on sixth-century vases and two on fifth-century vases, plus several illustrations in other media. In vase-painting Heracles is usually (though not always) portrayed looking backwards, as if in response to the taunts of the Cercopes.

¹⁸ A reference to Cimon helps to place Cratinus' *Archilochoi* near 449 (thus Edmonds 1: 23 note d, Geissler 18–19) or perhaps around 430 (*PCG* 4: 121). The *Cercopes* of Hermippus is dated by *PCG* to ca. 420–15, following Geissler 46–47. Metrical analysis suggests that Euripides' *Heracles* was produced around 416 or 414; see, e.g., Bond xxxi, Dale 1967: xxvii. The date of the *Cercopes* of Plato Comicus is uncertain.

¹⁹ See discussion of Plate 3 below, with reference in n. 46.

It follows that, in Euripides, Heracles' talking weapons are not only a comic *topos* on the tragic stage, but also recall a specific scene familiar in comedy. In Euripides and in scenes involving the Cercopes, Heracles has just woken up; in both, he contemplates the loss of his weapons; in both, the strange creatures that he carries mock or rebuke him; and in both, he tolerates their words and finally takes up his weapons. While Heracles' bow and arrows are unusual because they are able to speak, the Cercopes were proverbial because they spoke too freely: Cercopes were synonymous with liars, cheats, and "wizards with words." In fact their name was later derived from their wheedling tongues, and they were eventually punished for their abuse of language by being denied the ability to speak.²⁰ Finally, just as Heracles' talking weapons fall against his sides (1379 *πλευρὰ τὰμὰ προσπίτνοντ'*), the Cercopes are always portrayed dangling on either side of Heracles,²¹ and in at least one representation come in contact with the hero (Plate 1).

A plausible answer to our question, "Why this out-of-place comic *topos*?" is that the Euripidean tableau as a whole recalls a scene familiar from comedy, and that the talking weapons not only "mark" the scene as connected with comedy, but also signal allusion to the Cercopes. If the comic and satyric plays that enact this scene had survived, we could decide whether verbal echoes demonstrate a more particular allusion to one playwright's version. As things stand, we claim only a general and plausible allusion to a familiar scene, not a specific and provable allusion to one version of it.

SHADES OF COMEDY

Although our claim is not provable, the allusion is plausible enough to warrant an explanation. Why does tragedy allude to comedy, and why does it do so here, in the emotional finale of Euripides' *Heracles*? We begin with the more general question of tragedy's relations with comedy before turning to the particular scene in *Heracles*. It may at first seem surprising to suggest that a tragedy alludes to a scene from comedy, rather than the other way around. Yet we need to distinguish allusion from parody. Comedy regularly quotes and ridi-

²⁰ Cercopes are defined in the *Suda* lexicon (s.v. Κέρκωπες) as πανούργοι, δόλιοι, ἀπατεῶνες, κόλακες; the phrase "wizard with words" may come from an unknown comic poet (adespota 1307 Kock γόης τις ἢ Κέρκωψ λόγων). Their name is derived in the *Suda* (s.v. Κέρκωπες) from tongues that waggle like tails; the derivation is ascribed to Chrysippus: φενακίζουσι τῇ κέρκω τῶν λόγων; compare Chantraine 520 s.v. Κέρκωπες. On their punishment for abusing language see Ov. *Met.* 14.98–99. It is worth noting that their namesake, the κερκώπη or cicada, was proverbially talkative (Alex. fr. 96 PCG; cf. Lib. *Decl.* 26.34, and Eust. on *Il.* 6.293).

²¹ Thus Woodford 1992. See discussion below, with n. 44.

cules specific lines from particular tragedies. Tragedy, by contrast, occasionally alludes to comic scenes and episodes. The plot of Euripides' *Helen*, for example, seems to recall the story of Heracles and Busiris, which was extremely popular in vase-paintings and which had been presented on the comic stage by Epicharmus.²² The Egyptian king Busiris, who kills all foreigners that land on his shores but is eventually conquered by the captive Heracles, is revised in the Egyptian tyrant Theoclymenus, who likewise kills all foreigners that land on his shores but is eventually outwitted by the captive Helen.²³ The tragic revision involves a more sympathetic portrayal, as the tyrant turns out to be more love-smitten simpleton than cruel ogre.²⁴ Others have suggested that the festive conclusion to Aeschylus' *Oresteia* was modeled upon similar conclusions in Old Comedy (thus Herington), and that the debate in Euripides' *Antiope* appropriated comedy's portrayals of athlete and intellectual.²⁵ Dover (148–49) is surely right in detecting at least one case in which Euripides echoes specific lines of Aristophanes, recalling the trilling of the nightingale in *Birds* 209–16 at *Helen* 1107–13. An instructive parallel to the allusion in *Heracles* is the repeated reference to the story of Heracles and Omphale in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. As we shall see, Hyllus refers to the “stories” and “reports” of Heracles' subjection to Omphale (67–71), although with an effect very different from that in Euripides.

When comedy alludes to tragedy, the effect is usually parodic. Comedy invokes the serious tragic plot and the cultural values it embodies in order to deflate and domesticate them. Tragic allusion to comedy is both less common and less straightforward. In some cases the gesture may provide comic relief. Comic scenes in tragedy are often regarded as a diversion from the serious stuff of tragedy. The impending destruction of Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, for example, is so horrific that spectators must first be allowed the lighter scene with Cadmus and Teiresias (thus Seidensticker 122). Whatever the merits of such a model (and it seems to ignore the way in which *Bacchae* blurs the line

²² E.g., a Caeretan hydria (*LIMC* Bousiris #9) dated to ca. 530, and a black-figured amphora by the Swing Painter (*LIMC* Bousiris #10) dated to ca. 530. The many paintings from the first half of the fifth century (*LIMC* Bousiris #15–27) coincide with the period in which Epicharmus staged his *Busiris*. For Epicharmus, see Austin 81.10 and p. 54. Euripides himself staged a satyric *Busiris* (Nauck fr. 313–15; *P. Oxy.* 52.3651).

²³ For general, thematic similarities between *Helen* and satyr-drama see Sutton 1972: 321–30. It does not necessarily follow, as Sutton suggests, that *Helen* was pro-satyrical.

²⁴ Other differences are noted by Kannicht 51–52 in rejecting an allusion to the story of Busiris. The Egyptian king was more fully rehabilitated by Herodotus (2.45) and Isocrates (11).

²⁵ Scharffenberger 1996, who suggests a specific response to *Thesmophoriazusae*. See also her suggestion that a scene in *Phoenissae* responds to *Lysistrata* (1995: 312–36).

between comic and tragic), it cannot explain the allusion in Euripides' *Heracles*. First, the allusion here is too brief to offer relief. The nine imagined words of Heracles' weapons elicit a passing recollection of a comic scene or episode, but there is no scene played out for laughs as in *Bacchae*. And second, the tragic portion of the play is already over. Heracles' madness, his murder of his children, and his recognition of his crime are all past, and the hero is bracing himself for exile in Athens. The final scenes of the play prepare the hero for new and unfamiliar challenges, but not for horrific events that require diversion.

A second possibility is that the allusion is a momentary foil, a glimpse of the comic role that Heracles rejects as he takes up the bow and prepares to leave for Athens. A useful illustration of this technique, by which comic allusion reinforces a scene's tragic emphasis, is provided by Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. As we shall show, however, the effect in *Heracles* is entirely different than that in *Trachiniae*: the implications of the comic tableau are accepted, not rejected, in Euripides' play, and the status of Heracles becomes more complicated.

A TRAGIC REVISION

Trachiniae begins with a prologue speech in which Deianeira laments her long sufferings: first the courtship of Achelous and his battle with Heracles, then the many labors and long absences of her husband. The immediate cause of her complaints is his absence following the murder of Iphitus: Deianeira and her household are in exile, forced to rely upon the hospitality of strangers, and Heracles has now been gone for fifteen months, no-one knows where (38–45). Before the action begins, and long before Heracles appears on stage, our response to the hero is shaped or focalized by Deianeira: he is seen through a suffering wife's eyes. We are thus prepared not for the epic hero whose exploits a narrator celebrated in the *Shield of Heracles* and the *Sack of Oechalia*, but for a tragic protagonist whose actions abroad threaten to poison his domestic world. Deianeira underscores this new focus with her very first words, a familiar expression of tragic wisdom (1–5):

Λόγος μὲν ἔστ' ἀρχαῖος ἀνθρώπων φανείς
ὥς οὐκ ἂν αἰῶν' ἐκμάθοις βροτῶν, πρὶν ἂν
θάνῃ τις, οὐτ' εἰ χρηστὸς οὐτ' εἴ τῳ κακός·
ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἐμόν, καὶ πρὶν εἰς Ἄϊδου μολεῖν,
ἔξοιδ' ἔχουσα δυστυχή τε καὶ βαρύν

People have said since long ago
that you cannot learn if some mortal's life
is good or bad until one dies;
as for me, I know before going to the world below
that my life is a burden and full of misfortune.

The prologue thus begins to construct a tragic Heracles by viewing the hero from a suffering woman's point of view. Moreover, it clears space for this new hero by distancing the epic Heracles and his labors, setting them apart in time. Heracles has been gone for more than a year, and even before that, for what seems an eternity (34 τοιοῦτος αἰών), he was largely absent. By placing Heracles' labors in the past, Sophocles prepares a *tabula rasa* capable of accommodating other images of the hero. A third, and perhaps the most important, part of this revision is the introduction of a tragic crisis. When Hyllus reports that Heracles is in Euboea sacking Oechalia, Deianeira instantly recognizes the sign that a tragic crisis is at hand. "Don't you know the oracle about this?" she asks Hyllus. "Either he is about to end his life, or he will perform this task and live happily ever after" (76–77, 79–81). Deianeira elaborates upon this crisis in the following scene, telling the chorus that when her husband left upon this journey "like a man already dead" (161), he made his will and disclosed the prediction of the oracle that in one year and three months he would either die or live happily ever after (161–68). Since Deianeira has already told us that Heracles has been absent for fifteen months (44–45), the tragic crisis has arithmetic precision (173–74 καὶ τῶνδε ναμέρτεια συμβαίνει χρόνου / τοῦ νῦν παρόντος ὡς τελεσθῆναι χρεών).²⁶

COMEDY SUPPRESSED

But is a new focus and a new crisis enough to recast the epic hero in a new, tragic role? In addition to his epic labors, Heracles was also known for his comic exploits of eating, drinking, and philandering.²⁷ More specifically, Heracles' comic exploits performed for Omphale were familiar to Sophocles' audience. Pherecydes told how Heracles was sold as a slave to Omphale for three talents (*FGH* 3 fr. 82b = Schol. ad *Od.* 21.22). A red-figured vase of the fifth century seems to show the famous scene in which Heracles exchanged clothing with Omphale.²⁸ On the fifth-century stage, Nicochares' comedy

²⁶ As Easterling notes on 161–68, the sense of crisis is reinforced by the verbal repetition χρόνον, χρόνον, χρόνον (164, 166, 167).

²⁷ ἐνιαυσίαν γὰρ δεῖ με τὴν ὀρτὴν ἄγειν, says Heracles in Ion's *Omphale* (*TGF* 19 fr. 21). Heracles the glutton is such a common figure in comedy (compare Ar. *Av.* and *Ra.*) that Xanthias in *Wasps* can promise the audience something more original (60): οὐθ' Ἡρακλῆς τὸ δεῖπνον ἐξαπατώμενος.

²⁸ An Athenian red-figured pelike dated to ca. 430 (Brit. Mus. E370 = Brommer 1973: 36 Herakles und Deianeira B2) shows Heracles giving a servant woman his lion skin and receiving a robe from her, while a gesturing Omphale is portrayed on the other side; identification and discussion in Vollkommer 1988a: 35–37. A Boeotian red-figured skyphos also dated to ca. 430 (Berlin PM 6.3414 = *LIMC* Herakles #1537) shows Heracles handing his

Heracles the Bride probably parodied the hero's relations with Omphale, while Achaeus and Ion each produced a satyr-play called *Omphale*. Fragments of Ion's play apparently include Omphale's instructions to "dress up the stranger" and deck him out in oil and perfume, together with a tantalizing mention of eye-shadow.²⁹ The humiliating nature of Heracles' servitude was well enough known for comic poets to mock Pericles by calling Aspasia another Omphale.³⁰ This period of comic servitude included Heracles' gluttonous rampage in the cellars of Syleus, which was dramatized in Euripides' *Syleus*, and his capture of the pesky and talkative Cercopes, which was so popular in art and literature.

As scholars have noted, Heracles appears on the Athenian stage chiefly in comic or satyric roles. When he does appear in tragedy, it is only to rescue others, not to play the role of tragic protagonist, with just two exceptions: Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and Euripides' *Heracles*.³¹ We might therefore expect the tragic poets to position Heracles in relation to his more familiar roles on stage. Sophocles begins his play by suppressing the comic as well as the epic role of Heracles, while Euripides uses events of the plot to subvert his role as savior. From these differences follow different uses of comic allusion.

Sophocles adopts several strategies that effectively set aside or suppress Heracles' nontragic exploits. First, he distances them in time. As Hyllus reports, Heracles has been released from his servitude (72); the subsequent reports of the Messenger and Lichas explain that his fifteen-month absence included one year as slave of Omphale and three months as sacker of Oechalia. Now that these comic and epic exploits are over, as we wait for the hero to appear on stage we also wait for him to begin a new role as the tragic protagonist his wife has described. Second, Sophocles diminishes the authority or credibility of Heracles' comic *persona*. When Hyllus first mentions the year

bow to a woman, presumably Omphale, with a loom on one side; cf. Vollkommer 1988b: #216 and p. 32. For later literary versions see Ov. *Ep.* 9.53–118 (where Heracles is dressed as a woman and holds the wool while Omphale does her spinning) and Lucian *Dialogue of the Gods* 13 (where he is dressed in women's clothing and is beaten with Omphale's golden slipper).

²⁹ On *Herakles Gamoumenos* see Meineke 1: 255. The fragments from Ion are: ἀλλ' εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτραι, παλαιθέτων / ὕμνων αἰδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε (*TGF* 19 fr. 22), βακκάρις δὲ καὶ μύρα / καὶ Σαρδιανὸν κόσμον εἰδέναι χροός / ἄμεινον ἢ τὸν Πέλοπος ἐν νήσῳ τρόπον (19 fr. 24), and καὶ τὴν μέλαιναν στίμνιν ὁμματογράφον (19 fr. 25).

³⁰ Plu. *Per.* 24; compare Schol. *ad Pl. Mx.* 235e.

³¹ See Silk, especially 119. Heracles enters as savior in Phrynichus' *Alcestis*, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Unbound*, Sophocles' *Athamas* and *Philoctetes*, and Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Auge*, and *Pirithous*.

in Lydia, he repeatedly stresses his merely second-hand knowledge of this shameful episode (67–71):

Υλ: ἀλλ' οἶδα, **μύθοις** γ' εἴ τι πιστεύειν χρεών.

Δη: καὶ ποῦ **κλύεις** νιν, τέκνον, ἰδρύσθαι χθονός;

Υλ: τὸν μὲν παρελθόντ' ἄροτον ἐν μήκει χρόνου

Λυδῇ γυναικί **φασί** νιν λάτριν πονεῖν.

Δη: πᾶν τοῖνον, εἰ καὶ τοῦτ' ἔτλη, **κλύοι** τις ἄν.

HYLLUS: But I know where he is—if one can believe the stories.

DEIANEIRA: And where on earth have you heard he is staying?

HYLLUS: All this time for the past year

they say he worked as servant to a Lydian woman.

DEIANEIRA: If he endured that, anything might be said of him.

This “extraordinary emphasis on the hearsay quality of the information Hyllus reveals” (Davies *ad* 68) keeps the comic episode at arm’s length, reducing it to the subject of rumor. This second form of distancing is reinforced by the choice of words. Hyllus refers to Omphale as “a Lydian woman,” using the periphrasis to skirt the unwelcome comic episode. And both Hyllus in his report and Deianeira in her reply describe the hero laboring (70 πονεῖν) and enduring (71 ἔτλη), thus recasting his comic exploits as tragic sufferings. The third device involves explicit attempts to reject the authority of the comic cycle. Lichas, in response to Deianeira’s questions, admits that Heracles spent most of the past fifteen months as a slave (249–50 οὐκ ἐλεύθερος, / ἀλλ’ ἐμποληθείς), yet attempts to erase the shame of this episode by claiming that Zeus was responsible, not Heracles (251 Ζεὺς ὅτου πράκτωρ φανῇ). Heracles himself tried to atone for this shame by sacking Oechalia and destroying the man who caused his suffering (252–57). Finally, the messenger revises the past even further, claiming that Heracles sacked the city neither because of the murder of Iphitus nor because of his slavery in Lydia, but because of his love for Iole (351–57). Both the comic and the epic pretexts for sacking Oechalia are eliminated and replaced with Eros (354). The crucial role of desire, and of the jealousy it arouses, completes the construction of Heracles as a tragic character.

As this example demonstrates, allusion to other episodes involving Heracles can be quite complex. In this case, Sophocles begins *Trachiniae* with sustained allusions to the character’s epic and comic exploits and uses them to prepare the way for a new version of the hero. The other tragedy featuring Heracles as protagonist, however, works differently. Where Sophocles begins by setting aside the comic Heracles before his own version appears on stage, Euripides begins by bringing on stage the familiar Heracles the Savior only to overturn him.

THE SAVIOR DISMANTLED

Euripides' play begins with a pathetic tableau in which Heracles' father and wife cling to an altar as their last refuge from the tyrant Lycus. Their case is desperate and, lacking any means of salvation (54 ἀπορία σωτηρίας), they have turned as suppliants to the altar of Zeus the Savior that Heracles the Victorious established (48–50). More than half the play is taken up with this plot of salvation, in which Amphytrion and Megara hope that Heracles will make his familiar stage entrance as savior, but eventually resign themselves to death at the hands of Lycus—only to be rescued at the very last minute by Heracles, who saves his family and kills the tyrant (1–762). If Heracles' credibility as savior has been somewhat shaken by his long delay and his father's despair, it is now crushed by Iris and Lyssa, who enter unexpectedly and cause Heracles in his madness to kill the wife and children he has just saved. His work as savior is suddenly undone by his own actions, and he is reduced to the most wretched of mortals (1015).

If Heracles can no longer claim his stage identity as savior, what kind of figure is he? First, he is literally a mere mortal. A human being barely alive, he gradually wakes up after his fit of madness, thinking he is in the underworld (1101–5). Clinging to life, he notices his weapons and remarks, in a passage that anticipates 1376–82, “they kept my sides safe and were kept safe by me” (1100 ἔσωζε πλευράς ἐξ ἐμοῦ τ' ἐσώζετο). His identity as savior is reduced to the role of keeping safe the weapons that saved his life. Second, it is from this lowest common denominator, the mere humanity of a once-great hero, that Heracles constructs for himself a new identity. As scholars have noted, the semi-divine figure of myth is replaced at the end of the play by a strictly human figure (Gregory, esp. 275) embodying human values (Yunis 139–71). As we shall see, this new identity is complex and ambiguous, and its effect depends in part upon those talking weapons.

As he returns to the world of the living, what role should Heracles adopt? He begins by seeing the bodies strewn beside him and by learning from Amphytrion of the terrible deeds he has done. Step by step, Amphytrion lets Heracles see that he killed the children himself (1135), that he was mad (1137), and that in his madness he killed his wife as well (1139), so that his misfortune is complete (1143). Heracles plays the part of tragic protagonist, gradually comprehending like an Ajax or an Oedipus the full horror of what he has done. All that remains for the tragic hero to do is to confirm this recognition by killing or blinding himself. Heracles therefore decides to commit suicide (1146–52). Yet the tragic denouement is interrupted by Theseus, who not only obstructs this deadly plan (1153 ἀλλ' ἐμποδὼν μοι θανάσιμων βουλευμάτων) but also moves the plot in a new direction. In a lengthy addi-

tional scene, Theseus persuades Heracles not to commit suicide, to accept his friendship, and to return with him to Athens.

What kind of new episode and new identity does this scene prepare for? Unlike his epic exploits at Oechalia and his comic exploits in Lydia, the story of Heracles in Athens was unknown. There were sanctuaries of Heracles in Attica, but to our knowledge no account in art or literature of what the hero did there (Dunn 1997: 103–4). Heracles' new identity is therefore unmarked, or at this point marked only by what it is not: he is no longer the familiar savior of drama and is unable to complete the new role of tragic protagonist. Allusion to comedy thus has a very different role in *Trachiniae* and in *Heracles*. Sophocles begins with a clear allusion to the hero's comic exploits in order to replace this identity with a tragic one before the protagonist comes on stage. Euripides brings the hero on stage in his familiar role as savior, only to subvert this identity and explore possible alternatives. Before he constructs a new identity, his weapons and their allusion to the Cercopes introduce a comic role that he may or may not want to adopt. Before we consider the role of this allusion to comedy, we must dwell briefly on the importance of the weapons in establishing his identity.

A MANIFOLD SIGN

There are many different identities available to Heracles, and his bow and arrows constitute an important sign of this multiplicity. In the visual arts, the club and lion skin immediately identify the hero of the twelve labors, and in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (46–47) the effeminate Dionysus hopes that these same attributes will help him make the journey to the underworld. In Euripides, by contrast, the hero is identified only by his bow and arrows. These weapons are a sign of his greatness. As we learn from the great ode celebrating the Twelve Labors, they are the instrument of his heroic prowess, “leveling the race of Centaurs with murderous bow, destroying them with winged arrows” (365–67); “he destroyed with his bow guest-murdering Cycnus” (391–92); and “he wrapped his arrows in poison, using them to kill the triple-bodied herder Geryon” (422–24). Yet these same weapons are the instrument of his crime. As the messenger reports in grisly detail, Heracles in his madness called for his bow (942), then “readied his quiver and bow against his own sons, thinking that he was slaughtering Eurystheus' children” (969–71). The children ran away in terror, but he took aim at the first son and hit him by the liver (977–79); the second son was so close that Heracles could not draw the bow, so he crushed him with his club (991–94); his wife picked up the third child and ran inside the house, but Heracles tore down the door and killed son and mother with a single arrow (999–1000).

Heracles' weapons are ambivalent, a reminder both of his famous labors and of his hideous crime. They are also, more broadly, culturally ambivalent. In Homer, Odysseus with his bow (in *Od.*) is a foil to Achilles with his spear, the one practicing the art of cunning survival, the other seeking fame in battle. A bow is also the weapon carried by the infamous Paris, the effeminate lover whom Diomedes denounces in the *Iliad*: "Archer, scoundrel glorying in your bow, philanderer, if you and your weapons were put to the test that bow would do you no good, nor a host of arrows" (11.385–87).³² And in fifth-century Athens the bow conventionally distinguished cowardly Persians from Greek soldiers with their spears (A. *Persae* 147–49) and Scythian slaves from Athenian citizens (Ar. *Ach.* 707). The archer is an outsider, a devious and suspect figure who subscribes neither to the heroic values of the Homeric warrior nor to the civilized values of the fifth-century Greek.

This general ambivalence renders the particular emblem of Heracles subject to debate. Early in the play, as Amphytrýon waits for his son to return from the Underworld, and as Lycus prepares to put Heracles' family to death, they offer different readings of the hero's weapons. According to Lycus, the bow is a worthless weapon that marks Heracles as lacking strength or courage (158–62):

... τᾶλλα δ' οὐδὲν ἄλκιμος,
ὃς οὔ ποτ' ἀσπίδ' ἔσχε πρὸς λαίᾳ χερὶ
οὐδ' ἦλθε λόγχης ἐγγὺς ἀλλὰ τόξ' ἔχων,
κάκιστον ὄπλον, τῇ φυγῇ πρόχειρος ἦν.
ἀνδρὸς δ' ἔλεγχος οὐχὶ τόξ' εὐψυχίας

... has no courage at all
since he never held a shield on his left arm
or came near a spear, but holding his bow
(the vilest weapon) stood ready to flee.
A bow is no test of a man's courage!

Amphytrýon counters that it is a mark of cleverness in battle (201–2 τοῦτο δ' ἐν μάχῃ / σοφὸν μάλιστα) since it allows one to harm others without being seen (198–201).

If the action of the play subverts Heracles' stage *persona* as savior and leaves his new identity uncertain, it likewise subverts the stage property that identifies him. As the final episode begins, the negative process of subversion is complete: Heracles is now the most wretched of mortals (1014–15) and his use of the bow to save others is reduced to the pathetic gesture of saving the weapon that saved him (1100, quoted above). The play leaves him about to begin the

³² Aeneas likewise taunts Pandarus the bowman, who curses his bow, *Il.* 5.171–72, 204–16; compare Hera taunting Artemis the archer, *Il.* 21.483, 491.

positive process of finding a new identity, but the role or roles he will play are at this point unknown, as are his future deeds. His weapons likewise remain an uncertain emblem. They performed great labors and a hideous crime. They represent both cowardice and expedience. And as Heracles ponders whether to take them, they are for him a source of both pain and pleasure (1376–77): ὦ λυγρὰ φιλημάτων / τέρψεις, λυγρὰ δὲ τῶνδ' ὅπλων κοινωνία. This uncertainty is heightened by the words he imagines them speaking, words that form a chilling rebuke (1380 ἡμῖν τέκν' εἶλες καὶ δάμαρθ') even as they recall the pesky Cercopes. This ambivalence remains. When Heracles decides to keep the weapons, he makes no attempt to single out or exclude any of their associations. He does not say, “I keep them as a sign of my past labors,” nor, “I keep them as a reminder of my crime,” but simply, οὐ λειπτέον τάδ', ἀθλίως δὲ σωστέον (1385 “they are not to be left behind but kept safe, though painfully”).

A MANIFOLD RESPONSE

Heracles' stage identity is profoundly uncertain: What role should he play now that he cannot play the part of savior and has chosen not to play the part of tragic sufferer? As he leaves for Athens, his new identity is marked only by his friendship with Theseus.³³ And his weapons are equally ambivalent, since he keeps them only in self-defense, to avoid a shameful death (1384). In general, this uncertainty or openness is appropriate to a figure who is replacing a strongly marked identity with the more uncertain and less clearly marked role of human and friend. Why is this uncertainty compounded, in particular, by the strange voice of Heracles' weapons? At a minimum, this allusion to the hero's comic exploits compounds his ambivalent status. In so doing, it reinforces other comic details that complicate the audience's response in the final episode of the play. Such complication can work in two ways.

Tragedy contains implicit rules or moral expectations that allow its viewers to accept events that are unacceptable, to see the bounds in boundless suffering. What if events somehow exceed these limits? Before Heracles' madness, the implicit rules are weakened when Hera's will is questioned, not by a human character, but by the goddess Madness herself who has been sent to destroy Heracles (843–58). After his madness, as the messenger reports, the spectacle of Heracles attacking his wife and children while thinking he is attacking Mycene cannot be assimilated by the viewer. Should we laugh or cry? Do both or neither (950–52)?

³³ The vague promise of renaming sanctuaries while he lives and establishing festivals and buildings after he dies (1328–33) tells us nothing about Heracles' future actions or identity.

διπλοῦς δ' ὁπαδοῖς ἦν γέλως φόβος θ' ὁμοῦ,
καί τις τόδ' εἶπεν, ἄλλος εἰς ἄλλον δρακῶν·
Παίξει πρὸς ἡμᾶς δεσπότης ἢ μαίνεται;

with laughter and fear twofold together,
attendants would look at one another and say,
“Is master playing with us, or is he mad?”

When events exceed our implicit rules for comprehending them, the generic categories of comedy and tragedy can no longer be kept discrete. As Eugène Ionesco remarked, “I have never understood the difference people make between the comic and the tragic . . . it seems to me that the comic is tragic, and that the tragedy of man is pure derision.”³⁴ What is true of Heracles’ crime is also true of his shame in recalling that crime. When he contemplates exile, he first represents this as intolerable by literally imagining the words people will use to rebuke him (1286–90):

φέρ' ἄλλ' ἐς ἄλλην δὴ τιν' ὁρμήσω πόλιν;
κᾶπειθ' ὑποβλεπόμεθ' ὥς ἐγνωσμένοι,
γλώσσης πικροῖς κέντροισι ἴκλῃδουχούμενοι·
Οὐχ οὗτος ὁ Διός, ὃς τέκν' ἔκτεινέν ποτε
δόμαρτά τ'; οὐ γῆς τῆσδ' ἀποφθαρήσεται;

So now what other city shall I head for?
Shall I get suspicious stares when recognized,
locked out by the tongue’s bitter goads:
“Isn’t that the son of Zeus, who killed his children
and his wife? The Devil take him from our land!”

Because his situation is intolerable, he has decided to take his own life. In this same speech he then goes further. He imagines, in a figure common in tragedy, that his crime is so great that land, sea, and rivers will all forbid him to touch them (1295–98):

φωνὴν γὰρ ἦσει χθὼν ἀπεννέπουσά με
μὴ θιγγάνειν γῆς καὶ θάλασσα μὴ περᾶν
πηγαί τε ποταμῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄρματήλατον
Ἴξιον ἐν δεσμοῖσιν ἐκμυμήσομαι.

the land will give voice, forbidding me
to touch the earth, the sea will forbid me
to cross, rivers too, and I will imitate
wheel-driven Ixion in his bonds.

³⁴ *Notes and Counterpoints: Writings on the Theatre*, trans. D. Watson (New York 1994) 27.

Finally, after accepting Theseus' offer, Heracles picks up his weapons and imagines them literally speaking and rebuking him. The vivid image of Heracles' bow saying, "With us you killed your wife and children," marks his crime as excessive and unnatural. Moreover, the comic associations of this image mark his sense of shame not as tragically monstrous (as in 1295–98) but as outside categories or expectations. Just as Heracles' actions left attendants torn between laughter and dread, his shame is so great and is imagined so vividly that it invites both horror and laughter. But why this kind of laughter? When attendants observe Heracles' madness, their uneasy laughter is a response to his delusion of lashing imaginary horses and wrestling invisible opponents (947–49, 959–62). What is comic in the present scene that invites us to laugh at, and with, the implicit Cercopes? The laughter here, however subtle, is of a different kind, involving a comic reversal in which the lowly Cercopes turn the tables upon the mighty Heracles. This brings us to the second use of comedy.

Toward the end of the play, as the hero contemplates the future and his new identity, more specifically comic motifs intrude. The entire final episode incorporates a comic reversal. Having abandoned his identity as savior, Heracles now depends upon the intervention and assistance of Theseus. Yet as the scene proceeds, and as Theseus turns from offering a place of asylum to shaming Heracles into moving along, Heracles like a true comic slave finally turns the tables on his superior. The two heroes repeatedly and explicitly recall a time when Heracles rescued Theseus from Hades (1222, 1235–36, 1336–37), perhaps recalling the staging of this scene in *Pirithous*.³⁵ At first there is an intriguing paradox as Theseus recalls Heracles' past greatness (1250, 1252) and present abjectness (1248) in challenging him to the humbler task of accepting life. After Theseus tells Heracles to stop crying (1394) and Heracles still cannot tear himself from his family (1406–8), Theseus once more taunts him, this time for acting like a woman (1412, quoted below). But now Heracles turns the tables, asking whose life was abject when he rescued Theseus: "Do I live humbled in your eyes? Not back then, I think" (1413 ζῶ σοι ταπεινός; ἀλλὰ πρόσθεν οὐ δοκῶ), and then asking more pointedly, "What were *you* like, in the underworld, in trouble?" (1415 σὺ ποῖος ἦσθα νέρθην ἐν κακοῖσιν ὦν;). Bond (417–18) correctly discerns the comic banter in this exchange, but wrongly concludes that the text is suspect. The comic tone is accompanied by allusions to Heracles' comic exploits. Earlier, when Heracles decided to live, he said, "Now, it seems, I've got to play the slave to Fortune" (1357 νῦν δ', ὥς ἔοικε, τῇ τύχῃ δουλευτέον), indirectly recalling

³⁵ For allusion in *Heracles* to *Pirithous*, and for attribution of *Pirithous* to Euripides, see Sutton 1987, following Mette.

his service as slave to Omphale. And here in this exchange Theseus directly recalls Heracles' role as transvestite in that episode: "No-one who sees you being a woman will approve" (1412 εἴ σ' ὄψεται τις θήλυν ὄντ' οὐκ αἰνέσει).

Heracles' own allusion to the comic Cercopes is thus just one in a series of scattered but increasingly explicit reminders of Heracles' comic identity. These reminders remain subordinate to the developing relationship between Theseus and Heracles. Yet they also give substance to this relationship, showing that Heracles' new, human identity must accommodate qualities unsuited to the savior of tragedy in general or the suffering protagonist of Sophocles in particular. This new identity is characterized not by specific deeds or exploits but by a willingness to engage in the banter and one-up-manship that we more often find on the comic stage. From the allusion to the Cercopes and from other features of this final scene, we cannot predict what Heracles will do in exile, but we can appreciate more fully the very human identity he now accepts.

HERACLES VENTRILOQUIST

There is a final, curious feature of the talking weapons. Although their words are reported in direct speech (ἐπεὶ τόδε . . .), the weapons themselves cannot and do not speak on stage. In anticipating what they will say, Heracles gives voice to an otherwise inanimate prop, endowing it with a voice that is both his own and radically Other, an externalized voice that passes judgment upon him. This voice is made Other by the hero's guilt: he passes judgment upon himself, and because his sense of guilt is too great to speak in his own voice, it is expressed instead by his weapons. Yet the externalized voice has further implications.

The ventriloquized weapons embody the problem of the hero's identity. What, after all, is Heracles? He is not simply the actor on stage, nor the physical presence the actor projects. He is something much greater, and, on stage as in art, it is the man with his attributes—the lion skin, club, and bow and arrows—that together constitute the hero. In this play, as we have seen, the ambivalent nature of the bow is used to explore the ambivalent identity of the hero. And in the story of the Cercopes, the theft of the bow enables mockery of the hero's stature. We might say that in general the hero's weapons make up his unique identity, but do so in various ways: as a straightforward sign of his remarkable stature, as a complex emblem (in this play) of his new, uncertain identity, or as a token (in satyric versions) of the privileged qualities being mocked or challenged. Yet when Heracles lends his own voice to the bow and arrows, he draws attention to the fact that they are inanimate props. Heracles as ventriloquist in a sense deconstructs heroic identity, exposing how it is constituted from empty, lifeless things. The conceit of giving voice to inanimate things divorces the man from the emblem of the hero. And the

weapons themselves underscore this effect. On the one hand, the bow and arrows assert their identity with the blood-stained man: “we are your child-killers you carry” (1380–81 ἡμᾶς ἔχεις / παιδοκτόνους σούς); the weapons, like Heracles himself, are killers of children, with a weighty epithet to mark their role.³⁶ On the other hand, they make this assertion by speaking to, and as, the Other, and by attempting to collapse the categories “us” and “your” (ἡμᾶς . . . σούς). They remind Heracles of who he is, not by helping to fashion his identity, but by standing outside him, falling against his side (1379 πλευρὰ τὰμὰ προσπίτνοντ’), and reminding him of what he would rather forget. If the hero has many possible identities, the ventriloquized weapons remind us that no single identity is secure. We now set these weapons and the identity they represent in a broader context.

ALLUSION AND AUTHORITY

The study of allusion and Greek tragedy has tended to be hierarchical and logocentric. By this we mean that allusion is usually taken to engage a privileged poetic authority. Allusion *in* Greek tragedy tends to invoke the privileged texts of Aeschylus or Homer, rivaling or challenging the predecessor’s authority (see Garner). Allusion *to* Greek tragedy tends to involve a parodic challenge to tragic decorum (in the travesties of comedy) or a derivative citation of tragic authority (in the testimonia of vase-paintings).³⁷ In both cases, the word of epic or tragedy is prior to the gags of comedy or the snapshots on pottery. It should already be evident that this model needs correction. As we noted above, tragedy can and sometimes does allude to the less elevated genres of comedy and satyr-drama by invoking visual scenes or tableaux.³⁸ In what follows we shall extend and illustrate this correction by situating Euripides’ *Heracles* within a larger nexus of literary and non-literary productions. In alluding to multiple versions of Heracles, Euripides puts into circulation a new episode that may have been appropriated in turn by comedy and vase-painting. We mentioned above that many literary versions of this episode have been lost; we begin here by noting a possible version of the story of Heracles and the Cercopes that has not been recognized.

³⁶ The striking epithet is attested only four times in classical Greek: once at *S. Ant.* 1305 and three times in this play (835, 1280, and 1381); compare παιδοφόνος in *Hdt.* 7.190, likewise intensifying Achilles’ χεῖρας ἀνδροφόνους (*Il.* 23.18 and 24.478–79).

³⁷ Standard discussions are Rau, and Trendall and Webster. For an interesting approach to comedy and vase-painting see Taplin.

³⁸ It may be worth noting that the sophisticated discussions of allusion in Latin poetry by Conte and Hinds generally presume a familiar model of privileged epic authority.

In *On the Intelligence of Animals*, Plutarch reports that cranes keep watch by placing one foot on a round stone; if the bird relaxes or falls asleep, the stone will move and wake it (*Moralia* 967c). Plutarch then adds, “so we should not be surprised if Heracles put his bow beneath his armpit, and

κραταιῷ περιβαλὼν βραχίονι,
εὔδει πιέζων χειρὶ δεξιᾷ ξύλον.

embracing it with mighty brawn,
sleeps grasping the wood in his right hand.

The style and meter are clearly tragic, and the lines are therefore included among the anonymous fragments of tragic poets (*TGF* adesp. 416), as well as among the unidentified satyr plays (sat. inc. fr. 73 Steffen). From what work could these lines have come? A scene in which Heracles vainly tries to stay awake, propped upon his weapons, can only be one in which he tries to avert the theft of his bow and arrows. In other words, we can be reasonably sure that the lines are from a satyr-play, not a tragedy, and from one in which a sleeping Heracles is robbed of his weapons. The thieves might simply be satyrs, and these the only extant lines describing a theft fairly common on fifth-century vases.³⁹ But it is just as likely that the thieves are the Cercopes. If so, given Plutarch’s special fondness for quoting Ion, these lines may be from Ion’s *Omphale*.⁴⁰ Our point, however, is not to determine the author of these lines, but to suggest the number and variety of sources upon which Euripides may have drawn for the *Heracles* scene under consideration. And the fragment is instructive in another way. If the image or tableau of Heracles propped upon his bow impressed Plutarch so strongly, an image or tableau of dangling and chattering Cercopes could easily have had a similar effect upon Euripides and his audience.

REVISION REDUX

Revisions exist only to be revised in turn. We would love to know what effect, if any, Euripides’ allusion to the Cercopes had on subsequent drama, and in what ways this play with comic and satyric versions was appropriated by later authors. We know that among the comic poets Eubulus produced a *Cercopes*

³⁹ For satyrs stealing Heracles’ weapons in vase-painting see *LIMC* Herakles #3230–38 (with Boardman). For further discussion see Gallo, who notes the absence of any literary counterparts. In Hellenistic and Roman times, the hero’s weapons are often stolen by Erotes; see Woodford 1989: 200–204.

⁴⁰ Plutarch cites Ion by name six times in the *Moralia* (113b, 116d, 466d, 658c, 929a, 971f) and twice in the *Lives* (*Cim.* 9.1, *Dem.* 3.2).

in the early fourth century,⁴¹ and that a Menippus may also have done so.⁴² To the same period belong Antiphanes' *Omphale* and the *Omphale* of Cratinus the younger. Given the paucity of information in the extant fragments, we cannot speculate on the dates of these plays or their treatment of the Heracles myth, but we will suggest that later comedy may have made at least a topical allusion to Euripides. This takes us back to the Cercopes.

As noted above, the Cercopes were a popular subject in art, especially in temple sculptures at Paestum and Selinus and in vase-paintings of the sixth and fifth centuries. As if anticipating the comic punchline "Watch out for Blackbottom," the Cercopes are almost invariably shown as captured and hanging upside-down, falling at Heracles' sides, with their feet tied to the ends of a pole that the hero carried over his shoulder (Plates 1 and 2).⁴³ When they are not in this position, it is impossible to identify them securely as Cercopes.⁴⁴ In other words, when the Cercopes are depicted they almost always hang from Heracles' pole, and when figures hang from Heracles' pole they are almost always identified as Cercopes.⁴⁵

⁴¹ The play cannot be closely dated. Edmonds (2: 105 note c) suggests on tenuous political grounds a date of 366–64, while Hunter (140) argues from the mention of Ocimon the courtesan for a production in the first half of the century, most probably in the 360s.

⁴² The play is attested in the *Suda* (s.v. Μένιππος) and is dated by Edmonds (2: 311 note g) to the hegemony of Thebes (368–64), but this Menippus is otherwise unknown and Meineke (1: 494) argues that the name Menippus is a confusion for Hermippus.

⁴³ Plate 1, a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (Paestum, Mus. Naz. = *LIMC* Kerkopes #11) is dated by Woodford to ca. 550 (1992: 33). She dates Plate 2, an Attic red-figured krater (Munich, Antikenslg. 2382 = *LIMC* Kerkopes #8) to 480–70 (1992: 33).

⁴⁴ Note the problematic identification of *LIMC* Kerkopes #24–28, where these elements are not present. Woodford notes that the theft of the weapons apparently "had little appeal to artists" (1989: 201). Contrast the satyric representations of the theft of Heracles' arms by the satyrs. These are most often depicted in the act of stealing the weapons (*LIMC* Herakles #3223–38) or with the hero hot on their trail (*LIMC* Herakles #3242–44). They are at times captured and bound by the hero, as in *LIMC* #3241 and 3245, but not strung up. The Cercopes are the only ones who are caught and strung up.

⁴⁵ There is only one example of Heracles carrying something other than the Cercopes suspended from a pole or similar object, namely two amphorae hanging from either end of a pole on an Attic red-figured pelike dated to ca. 500–480 (*LIMC* Herakles #1324). Yet even here the presence of a satyr on the reverse of the vase suggests, as Boardman notes (798), that the scene might allude to a satyr-play. If so, the most obvious source would be yet another revision or parody of the Cercopes story.

However, there are two intriguing exceptions.⁴⁶ In two vase-paintings, a crater from Apulia and a Lucanian pelike (Plates 3 and 4), the Cercopes are shown hanging not from a pole but from a bow or yoke; both vases are dated to the early fourth century (ca. 380) and both are from southern Italy.⁴⁷ These are the only vase illustrations of Heracles and the Cercopes later than the fifth century.⁴⁸ The first of these is a scene from comic or parodic drama, showing Heracles with leggings and phallus bringing two small figures to a seated ruler; these dark, ape-Cercopes hang in baskets from the ends of his yoke;⁴⁹ an altar between the actors indicates a theatrical setting. The parody is clear and consistent: each of Heracles' famous attributes is made ordinary—his club is used as a walking stick, his lion skin becomes a cap, and even the treacherous, ape-like Cercopes become monkeys in cages. The second vase, contemporaneous with the first, is, however, quite different. Heracles is here presented in a familiar pose, walking from left to right and carrying his club, while the Cercopes hang on either side of him, in front and behind. The iconography is largely conventional, with no suggestion that this is a scene from drama, but there are several interesting anomalies. The most obvious of these is that the Cercopes hang not from a pole, nor from a yoke, but clearly and uniquely from Heracles' bow. There is more. Here for the first time (excepting its companion in Plate 3), the Cercopes are portrayed not as boys or men but as satyrs or ape-men: the figure on the left has pointed ears and a strange leering face, while that on the right has unmistakable monkey features. And here alone the Cercopes are both drawn with huge phalloi.⁵⁰ There may, of course, be little connection between the two vases beyond the legend portrayed. But given the sudden reappearance of the theme in two contemporary vases, an

⁴⁶ And to our knowledge these are the only exceptions. Roscher 2.1: 1167 has a line drawing restoring a bow in the metope from Selinus, but actual remains include only a straight portion of pole across Heracles' shoulders; compare the drawing of remains and restorations in Tusa 117.

⁴⁷ Plate 3 shows a red-figured bell crater from Apulia (Catania Mus. Civ. MB 4232 = LIMC Kerkopes #23) dated by Woodford to about 380–70 (1992: 34). Plate 4 shows a red-figured pelike from Lucania (Getty 81.AE.189 = LIMC Kerkopes #9) dated to about 380; on the latter see Brommer 1985: 203 and fig. 25.

⁴⁸ There is at least one gem later than the fifth century, an Etruscan scarab (LIMC Kerkopes #17) dated by Woodford to the fourth or third century (1992: 33).

⁴⁹ Bieber 133 wrongly identifies the yoke as Heracles' bow. For discussion of this baggage yoke, or ἀνάφορον, see Chamay 57–60.

⁵⁰ The closest parallel is a black-figured olpe (Brussels, Mus. Roy. R 293 = LIMC Kerkopes #5) in which one of the Cercopes has a large phallus while the other does not; both are drawn as young men. For the derivation of Κέρκωπες from κέρκος see Chantraine 520 s.v. Κέρκωπες.

economical (if unprovable) hypothesis is that both respond in different ways to a particular comic staging in southern Italy. One records the setting, costume, and props of this parody, including the monkeys in their cages, while the other imports these details into the standard iconography of the scene, giving the Cercopes ape-like faces and phalloi more suited to comedy.

If this hypothesis is correct, it helps explain what is unique to the two vases. The yoke in Plate 3, otherwise unattested, further illustrates the domestication of attributes, a domestication that in this case involves comedy treating Heracles' famous bow as an ordinary tool for slaves. And the bow in Plate 4, otherwise unattested, incorporates the bow that is the subject of this parody into its more conventional iconography. Setting aside the possible reasons for this innovation, let us consider the result. These two visual renderings of the scene, and these two alone, juxtapose Heracles' bow with the Cercopes. The otherwise distinct scenes of Heracles carrying his famous bow, and of Heracles carrying the Cercopes from a pole, are here collapsed into a single image in which the hero simultaneously carries both upon his shoulder. This effect has no parallels or precedents in the visual arts, but has a striking precedent in drama. When Heracles imagines his bow speaking, falling against his sides, and reminding him of his shame, he conflates the weapon he carries with the Cercopes his words recall. Euripides' unique conflation of bow with Cercopes on the tragic stage is thus mirrored some forty years later by the unique juxtaposition of the two in vase-painting.

This mirroring may of course be sheer coincidence. But a plausible and economical explanation is that the vase-paintings record a comic parody of the scene in Euripides. As we have noted, comic and satyric stagings of the Cercopes were common in the early fourth century, and our two vases, both produced about the same time in southern Italy, and the only paintings of the Cercopes after the fifth century, may react to or comment upon one of these productions. Did the comic version parody the entire *Heracles* or just this one scene? We cannot know. But we can say that it involved the familiar process of making tragic models ordinary, turning the rhetorical gesture in which Heracles imagines the bow as chattering Cercopes into a stage gag with servile yoke and caged monkeys as props. Finally, a comic revision of *Heracles* is all the more plausible if we remember that parody of Euripides was extremely popular in the fourth century, both on the comic stage in Athens and on vases from southern Italy that reflect Athenian or Italian comedy.⁵¹

⁵¹ Tragic parody was especially popular in Middle Comedy, and the clearest illustrations are parodies by Strattis and Eubulus of Euripides' *Phoenissae*, *Hypsipyle*, *Antiope*, *Ion*, and *Medea*; see Hunter 28–29. On parodies of Euripides in fourth-century vase-paintings from southern Italy see Bieber 129, citing figs. 110–12 and 115–22. There is a growing consensus that these so-called “phlyax” vases show scenes from Athenian comedies that were produced or re-staged in southern Italy; see, most fully, Taplin; also Green 49–56.

Scholarship on Athenian comedy has long been interested in comedy's appropriation of figures and themes from tragedy. But it is important to recognize the complexity of this process: tragedy may also allude to comedy and satyr-drama; drama and the visual arts may allude to one another; and a pointed allusion in one author may then be parodied by another. Although the layers of multiple revisions may be impossible to untangle, nevertheless Euripides' *Heracles* offers at least a glimpse of the process involved.

WORKS CITED

- Adkins, A. W. H. 1966. "Basic Greek Values in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Hercules Furens*." *CQ* 16: 193–219.
- Allen, T. W., ed. 1946. *Homeri Opera*. Vol. 5. Oxford.
- Austin, C., ed. 1973. *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*. Berlin.
- Barlow, S. A., ed. 1996. *Euripides*. Heracles. Warminster.
- Bieber, M. 1961. *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. Princeton.
- Boardman, J., O. Palagia, and S. Woodford. 1988. "Herakles." In *LIMC* 4.1: 728–838.
- Bond, G. W., ed. 1981. *Euripides*. Heracles. Oxford.
- Brommer, F. 1973. *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*. 3rd ed. Marburg.
- . 1984. *Herakles II: Die unkanonischen Taten des Helden*. Darmstadt.
- . 1985. "Herakles und Theseus auf Vasen in Malibu." In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum: Occasional Papers on Antiquities* 2. Malibu. 183–228.
- Chamay, J. 1977. "Autour d'un vase phylaque—un instrument de portage." *AK* 20: 57–60.
- Chantraine, P. 1970. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Vol. 2. Paris.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca.
- Dale, A. M. 1961. "A Heroic End." *BICS* 8: 47–48.
- , ed. 1967. *Euripides*. Helen. Oxford.
- Davies, M., ed. 1991. *Sophocles*. Trachiniae. Oxford.
- Diggle, J., ed. 1981. *Euripides*. *Fabulae*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. 1972. *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley.
- Dunn, F. M. 1996. *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama*. New York.
- . 1997. "Ends and Means in Euripides' *Heracles*." In D. Roberts, F. Dunn, and D. Fowler, eds., *Classical Closure*. Princeton. 83–111.
- Easterling, P. E., ed. 1982. *Sophocles*. Trachiniae. Cambridge.
- Edmonds, J. M., ed. 1957–61. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*. 3 vols. in 4. Leiden.
- Edwards, M. W. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5: Books 17–20. Cambridge.
- Foley, H. P. 1985. *Ritual Irony: Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides*. Ithaca.
- Fraenkel, E., ed. 1950. *Aeschylus*. Agamemnon. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Gallo, I. 1989. "Un dramma satiresco arcaico in testimonianze vascolari del territorio Salernitano." *A&R* 34: 1–13.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.
- Garner, R. 1990. *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London.
- Geissler, P. 1925. *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*. Berlin.
- Green, J. R. 1991. "Notes on Phlyax Vases." *NumAntCl* 20: 49–56.
- Gregory, J. 1977. "Euripides' *Heracles*." *YCS* 25: 259–75.

- Grube, G. M. A. 1961. *The Drama of Euripides*. London.
- Hausrath, A., and H. Hunger, eds. 1970. *Corpus fabularum Aesopiarum*. Leipzig.
- Henrichs, A. 1979. "‘Thou Shalt Not Kill a Tree’: Greek, Manichaean, and Indian Tales." *BASP* 16: 85–108.
- Herington, C. J. 1963. "The Influence of Old Comedy on Aeschylus’ Later Tragedies." *TAPA* 94: 113–25.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. New York.
- Hunter, R. L. 1983. *Eubulus, The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Jacoby, F., ed. 1923–. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.
- Kannicht, R., ed. 1969. *Euripides*. Helena. Heidelberg.
- Kassel, R., and C. Austin, eds. 1983–. *Poetae comici Graeci*. Berlin.
- Kock, T., ed. 1880. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*. 1981–99. 9 vols. in 18. Zürich.
- MacDowell, D. M. 1963. *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators*. Manchester.
- McDermott, E. A. 2000. "Euripides’ Second Thoughts." *TAPA* 130: 239–59.
- Meineke, A., ed. 1839–57. *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*. 5 vols. in 7. Berlin.
- Mette, H. J. 1983. "Perithoos-Theseus-Herakles bei Euripides." *ZPE* 50: 13–19.
- Michellini, A. N. 1987. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Madison.
- Nauck, A., ed. 1964 (original ed. 1889). *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. 2nd ed., supplemented by B. Snell. Hildesheim.
- Page, D. L., ed. 1962. *Poetae melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- Pucci, P. 1980. *The Violence of Pity in Euripides’ Medea*. Ithaca.
- Rau, P. 1967. *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*. Munich.
- Roscher, W. H. 1884–1937. *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 6 vols. in 9. Leipzig.
- Scharffenberger, E. W. 1995. "A Tragic Lysistrata? Jocasta in the ‘Reconciliation Scene’ of the *Phoenissae*." *RhM* 138: 312–36.
- . 1996. "Euripidean ‘Paracomedy’: A Re-consideration of the *Antiope*." *Text and Presentation* 17: 65–72.
- Seidensticker, B. 1982. *Palintonos harmonia*. Göttingen.
- Silk, M. S. 1993. "Heracles and Greek Tragedy." In I. McAuslan and P. Walcot, eds., *Greek Tragedy*. Oxford. 116–37.
- Snell, B., et al., eds. 1971–. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- Stanford, W. B. 1936. *Greek Metaphor*. Oxford.
- Steffen, W., ed. 1952. *Satyrographorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Poznan.
- Sutton, D. F. 1972. "Satyric Qualities in Euripides’ *Iphigeneia at Tauris* and *Helen*." *RSC* 20: 321–30.
- . 1987. *Two Lost Plays of Euripides*. New York.
- Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
- Taplin, O. 1993. *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama Through Vase-paintings*. Oxford.
- Trendall, A. D., and T. B. L. Webster. 1971. *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London.
- Tusa, V. 1984. *La scultura in pietra di Selinunte*. Palermo.
- Vollkommer, R. 1988a. "Die früheste Darstellung der Omphale?" *Annales d’histoire de l’art et d’archéologie* 10: 27–37.

- . 1988b. *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece*. Oxford.
- Walsh, G. B. 1979. "Public and Private in Three Plays of Euripides." *CP* 74: 294–309.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1954. "Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought." *JWarb* 17: 10–21.
- West, M. L., ed. 1971. *Iambi et elegi Graeci*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Westermann, A., ed. 1843. *Mythographoi: Scriptores poeticae historiae Graeci*. Brunswick.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von, ed. 1895. *Euripides*. Herakles. 3 vols. Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M. 1976. *A Companion to the Iliad*. Chicago.
- Woodford, S. 1989. "Herakles' Attributes and their Appropriation by Eros." *JHS* 109: 200–204.
- . 1992. "Kerkopes." In *LIMC* 6.1: 32–35.
- Yunis, H. 1988. *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama*. Göttingen.



Plate 1. Metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (Paestum). Photograph from E. Langlotz, *Ancient Greek Sculpture of South Italy and Sicily* © 1965. Published by Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York. Used with permission. All rights reserved.



Plate 2. Attic red-figured krater from the Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek München. Photograph used with permission.



Plate 3. Apulian red-figured krater from the Museo Civico del Castello Ursino. Photograph used with permission.



Plate 4. Lucanian red-figured pelike from the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, California. © The J. Paul Getty Museum. Photograph used with permission.