

Myth-making in Aristophanes

Innovation and evolution in Attic comedy

A thesis presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

Effie Zagari

May 2018

Abstract

The present study focuses on the development of Attic comedy as it is evidenced in four fragmentary plays by Aristophanes. The plays that are discussed and analysed are parodies of tragedies and present characteristics that are not prominent in the extant plays. The aim of this study is twofold: to demonstrate how Aristophanes composed plays as parodies, heavily relying on a tragic model, and, through these plays, to show how he contributed to the development of Attic comedy after the 5th c. BC. The fragmentary corpus of Aristophanes contains elements such as the use and re-use of myths, which are already exploited by other authors, as well as the production of a large-scale burlesque, that is whole plays which appear to have been composed as parodies of tragedies. *Polyidus*, *Daedalus*, *Aeolosicon*, and *Cocalus* belong to this branch of the Aristophanic oeuvre and are excellent case-studies that evidence the inner development and evolution of Aristophanic comedy. This study thus revisits Old Comedy and enriches the scholarship with new insights and new discoveries regarding Aristophanes, his literary interactions, as well as his innovating and influential work.

Declaration

I confirm that this is my own work and the use of all material from other sources has been properly and fully acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would have not been possible without the constant support of my supervisor, Prof. Peter Kruschwitz. His intelligent and much needed feedback was essential for the realization of this thesis. He has been an invaluable supervisor as well as a friend, always happy to go the extra mile, in very many instances. The final version of the thesis was the result of my examiners', Prof. Barbara Goff and Dr. Ian Ruffell, invaluable contributions and extremely useful comments. I would like to thank my former teachers and friends Dr. Athina Papachrysostomou, who was of great help when I was composing my PhD proposal, and Dr. Christina Manolea, for whose constant encouragement and support throughout my PhD studies I am immensely grateful. Special thanks goes to Akash Puranik for his constant psychological support the past three years and to Till Spanke for always offering his services as a translator and believing in me and my potential. Finally, I would like to express my vast gratitude and love to my parents, who have very generously supported me throughout my studies in the UK. This thesis is dedicated to them, as I would have never made it so far without their constant psychological and financial support.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
1. Disiecti membra poetae: The fragments of Aristophanes between tradition and innovation	3
1.1 Working with fragments: methodological issues, risks, and problems.....	4
1.2 The fragments of Aristophanes' comedies: The <i>status quaestionis</i>	11
1.3 Parody in Aristophanes	17
1.4 Generic development and Aristophanes.....	25
1.5 Aristophanes' four character plays.....	30
2. A different kind of Aristophanic comedy	34
2.1 <i>Polyidus</i> : The seer, the resurrection and the fraud	38
2.1.1 Introduction	38
2.1.2 The fragments	41
2.1.3 The characters.....	53
2.1.4 The plot of <i>Polyidus</i> : Linger between truth and deceit	56
2.1.5 Conclusion.....	63
2.2. <i>Daedalus</i> : The corrupting appeal of godlike power.....	65
2.2.1 Introduction	65
2.2.2 The fragments	74
2.2.3 The characters.....	89
2.2.4 The plot of <i>Daedalus</i> : Impregnated by the wind.....	98
2.2.5 Conclusion.....	101
2.3 <i>Aeolosicon</i> : Messing with the gods (and the genre!)	102

2.3.1 Introduction	102
2.3.2 The fragments	117
2.3.3 The characters.....	132
2.3.4 The plot of <i>Aeolosicon</i> : An incestuous love and the ingredients for a new type of comedy	145
2.3.5 Conclusion.....	150
2.4 <i>Cocalus</i> : Moving geographical and generic boundaries	152
2.4.1 Introduction	152
2.4.2 The fragments	159
2.4.3 The characters.....	169
2.4.4 The plot of <i>Cocalus</i> : Minos versus Daedalus – the final confrontation	180
2.4.5 Conclusion.....	183
3. Conclusion: Aristophanes, Attic Comedy and the re-invention of a political genre	185
3.1 Aristophanes and Araros	186
3.2 The beginning of a transition between sub-genres.....	190
3.3 Aristophanes and Middle Comedy	197
3.4 Aristophanes and New Comedy	200
4. Bibliography	205

Introduction

1. *Disiecti membra poetae*: The fragments of Aristophanes between tradition and innovation

Aristophanes is a towering figure in the history of ancient drama. The extant plays seem to transmit a coherent picture of the comic genius drawing up to a more or less monolithic image of the poet. The poet Aristophanes, as we may infer from the content of the plays, appeared as a defender of the *polis* and the *demos*, and the caustic commentator on the Athenians' daily pressing problems, and the social and political life of his city is the main focus within extant comedies.¹ This impression is well-justified and supported until one decides to look within the fragments. The fragments reveal that the nature of the Aristophanic corpus is much more complex than the picture that emerges from the complete comedies. The fragmentary plays of this thesis belong to a very different type of Aristophanic creation (and creativity), revealing the dynamics of an ever-evolving genre within a rapidly changing political order. Aristophanes experiments and engages with tragedy and parody more extensively than the instances found incorporated in his extant plays. That said, one could not but recognise the significant chunks of parody that exist in the extant plays such as *Acharnians*, *Peace*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, and *Frogs*, in which case the whole scenario is still original despite the clear presence of parodic scenes. This practice is more frequently adopted in Middle Comedy, rather than Old Comedy.² Another interesting feature of these plays is the non-Athenian setting as well as the apparent domestic issues that these plays might have been built around, elements which are also found more commonly in Middle as well as New Comedy.

The mechanics of this Aristophanic achievement will be the main topic of this thesis; in other words, one of the main issues in this study will be the ways in which Aristophanes managed to turn a tragedy into a comedy, adopting a non-Athenian,

¹ Heath (1987).

² There are, of course, other interesting examples such as Strattis, but for the purpose of this study focus will remain on Aristophanes. Further on Strattis and his parodies see ch. 2 in Farmer (2017).

domestic setting, and the ramifications of such a practice within the larger context of the dramatic tradition. The thesis focuses on the analysis of four plays in a way that has not been seen in any of the existing editions of the comic fragments. The achievement of this work is the reconstruction and analysis of these interesting plays in a meticulous manner. Dating, nature, content, characters and plot reconstruction are aspects that are investigated in detail for the first time (in some cases more than others, depending on the information available). The level of detail in the analysis of these plays as well as the observations that sprung from it, and what they add to our knowledge around the work of Aristophanes are the main contribution of this thesis.

1.1 Working with fragments: methodological issues, risks, and problems

This section will present the methodology adopted and the problems that one may face when dealing with fragments. A fragmentary play is a broken piece of art, a jigsaw, so to speak, of which we have been unable to recover every piece, and that is exactly what leaves room for various readings and interpretations, even regarding the plot.³ A fragment can be perceived as a piece of a broken vase, a ruined painting, or a piece of a puzzle. As in every puzzle, what matters is what is depicted on each piece; for example, if it is the middle part of a thigh, we would be fortunate to recognise that that is what it is, but if it is the mouth, then we are in the fortunate position to locate the lower end of the face, talk about the size of the lips, their colour and possibly draw some conclusions regarding the rest of the face and how it would be affected by the shape of the mouth. On the other hand, in the case of a vase, what would matter most is the size of the broken piece we have at hand. The bigger the piece the more of the original vase we have. In fragmentary literature both the size and content of a fragment matter⁴ as we shall see further on.

What this study will try to achieve is to combine the two aforementioned methods. By having the existing editions of the fragments as an initial guide, an obscure aspect of the Aristophanic corpus, that only lies in some of his fragmentary plays and that the

³ West (1973).

⁴ For more information on the nature of a fragment and how this can activate our imagination see Gumbrecht (1997) 319-327.

extant plays only give some hints of, will be brought to light. The all-too-familiar image of the comic playwright is that of an ingenious, creative, amusing, politically engaged poet, constantly alluding to the rest of ancient Greek literature, mainly the genre of tragedy, who produced comedies for the sake of the common good, offering beneficial advice to the *polis* and its citizens. The majority of the extant plays have taken the title from their chorus;⁵ some of them represent abstract personified concepts,⁶ often presenting women as protagonists. However, only one of them is named after the heroine Lysistrata, an imaginary woman, who, with the help of the other women, passes a strong anti-war message to the audience. However, is this all that we have from Aristophanes? Are these plays indeed representative and a good sample from his whole work as well as illuminating to the trends of the time? Bakola, without underestimating the value of Aristophanes' extant plays, argues against this and notes the idea that the evidence from the extant plays is hardly enough to be representative of 5th c. comedy.⁷ This is true not only with regard to the work of other comic poets such as Cratinus, but also Aristophanes himself and *inter alia* the purpose of the present study is to illustrate the reasons behind this.

As far as the quantity of the Aristophanic fragments that have survived is concerned, we have not been as lucky as with Menander or Euripides, but we still have more than that of any other playwright of Old Comedy. The problematic aspect of the large number of fragments is that, in most of the cases, quite brief segments have been found quoted in other ancient authors. However, we have been more fortunate regarding the quality, namely the content, of the fragments in many cases. Many of them, although brief, have proved to be very informative and useful regarding the plot, characters or language of a play as well as the general picture of Aristophanes' literary development until the very end of his productive period.

Unfortunately, not every fragment contributes to the plot, and many of them consist only of a single word. This may seem odd but it really is not if we consider that nothing more than a single word would interest a lexicographer for example. In the case of the

⁵ *Clouds, Frogs, Wasps, Birds, Acharnians, Knights, Ecclesiazusae, Thesmophoriazusae.*

⁶ *Peace, Wealth.*

⁷ Bakola (2010) 7.

embedded fragments, we are not only dealing with Aristophanes' intentions but mainly with the intentions of the author who decided to quote Aristophanes. Authors often quote other writers in order to support their argument and to get connected and become a part of the already existing scholarship. When a scholar decides to deal with fragmentary works, the first challenge they face is what to include. Should we include every bit of information found no matter whether we can make something out of it, whether it is relevant or not, or if we can put it into a wider context? As West points out, "when an editor wishes to publish only selected fragments he must include testimonia – not biographical statements about the author or aesthetic judgements on his work, but everything that helps to compensate for the loss of the work by supplying evidence about its form or contents".⁸

Taking that principle into consideration when dealing with embedded fragments, it is true that the exploration of their textual context is of great help in order to get closer to the meaning of words or phrases and their implications that otherwise can be quite obscure in comedy. For example, fragments that come from ancient dictionaries are of little help regarding the context; on the other hand, they help us interpret the term more accurately. Then again, there are authors such as Athenaeus who quote significant chunks. Whatever the type of source may be, it is important to bear in mind that the authors' purposes and perspectives would have influenced the choice of fragments as well as their physical environment in the host-text, which may also have an impact on our interpretation and its limitations.⁹ Papachrysostomou described all these limitations regarding Athenaeus as a source in detail. Athenaeus most likely had accessibility to many sources first hand, which is undoubtedly important, albeit not enough alone to securely deem him an authentic and trustworthy source.¹⁰

However, in such a case when the content of the fragments is not enlightening for the play's plot we are faced with the problem of the extent of freedom that a commentator has regarding their conjecture. However, one need not be discouraged by the above; we

⁸ West (1973) 96, where the main point is about editing fragments rather than reconstructing plays. His approach is useful, however, because the kind of evidence that West deems useful, can also help regarding not only the plot, but also the broader understanding of an author's work.

⁹ cf. Bakola (2010) 10; Most (1997) VI-VII; West (1973) 18.

¹⁰ Papachrysostomou (2008) 16-17; cf. Olson (2007) 29-30.

should examine each fragment as meticulously as possible and reach one or more conclusions based on the evidence and on our knowledge around the poet, the genre and the intertextual influences.

It is true that the fragments offer a unique freedom, but, as every unlimited freedom, it can be dangerous. Limits will have to be posed to the freedom of a scholar and their imagination regarding the extent of the assumptions that will unavoidably be made when one seeks the truth hidden in the fragments. Grafton, speaking of the approach to *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, says that “the honest historical scholar must report only what the sources yielded about the past, not what he and his readers would like to find there”.¹¹ This is an approach not free from subjectivity and personal argument and thus open to criticism.¹² Indeed, that is the safest path, particularly for a historical document, where imagination and creativity should be strictly refrained. The interesting point about fragments, whether they are literary or not, is the great potential they provide for their editor to be as creative as possible. The more fragmentary a work is, the higher the level of creativity there is. Scholars who have already worked on commentaries have always pointed out the dangers and risks involved in this type of philological work and have led to the principles of textual criticism and edition, which are very useful for the preservation of the scientific approach necessary.¹³

The reliability of sources is another possible hazard. There have been cases where a fragment has falsely been attributed to a play or cases where it is rather ambiguous if a fragment belongs to one play or to another. In addition, the manuscripts that have completely or partially survived and their copies quite often include errors that can distort the truth or make the text illegible. Textual transmission can be tricky, and the interference of the scribe or the editor adds to the problem. Personal taste, background, literary and other knowledge as well as personal experience are all definitely factors that can affect our judgment and attitude towards fragments. Whether textual criticism is a weapon and a shield against such interpolations still remains to be answered. Even then, when one tries to be as objective as possible, is it really feasible to leave our

¹¹ Grafton (1997) 124.

¹² See below pp. 8-9.

¹³ cf. Papachrystostomou (2008) 23-27; Karamanou (2006) xviii-xxi; Bakola (2010) 9-10.

opinion aside regarding the text's form and meaning? The truth is that in order to investigate the ideas expressed in the text, it is necessary to keep in mind that there are severe limitations. In many cases, the discovery of the author's background, habits as well as the moral beliefs of the contemporary society is an impossible task. All these elements can only be inferred to a very limited extent, although one may argue that such an investigation can result in very fruitful conclusions and discoveries, which would not have been possible otherwise.¹⁴ The question is if the outcome of an edited fragment should be considered as a new version of the surviving piece or an absolutely new creation. This question is constantly present when one attempts to reconstruct the broken pieces of a 'glorious past'. This is another project that aims not only to revive the past and investigate an under-researched area, but also to demonstrate that classical research and philology still have, and will always have, a very good reason for existence.

One of the most fascinating such areas, worthy of further research, is the genre of classical drama, specifically comedy, which was a very sophisticated means of transferring and spreading ideas. Aristophanes is one of the most famous representatives.¹⁵ Therefore, quite justifiably he has received tremendous attention from very skilled and professional scholars in antiquity as well as those in the modern world. His extant plays, in particular, have been analysed quite thoroughly throughout the years and many people are still performing various research projects on them.¹⁶

As discussed earlier, it should be pointed out that the whole operation involves a high percentage of subjectivity. Even though one may argue that we should solely rely on the sources and what they have preserved,¹⁷ being subjective when one attempts to interpret a source and explore possibilities based on this interpretation is unavoidable. Any interpreter will see the plays and their fragments through their own eyes, and as a result one cannot be sure of its certainty, but more of its uncertainty. Here perhaps lies the fascinating element, and beauty of the quest of an attempt to reconstruct plays. In order

¹⁴ West (1973) 8.

¹⁵ Probably due to the fact that the only plays of Old Comedy that have survived in a complete form belong to him.

¹⁶ For a comprehensive bibliography on Aristophanes' extant plays see Παππᾶς (2016).

¹⁷ cf. page 7.

to counterbalance that element of subjectivity, the discourse in the present study will represent alternative approaches and elucidate how decisions were taken.

The potential difficulties and dangers that one may face when dealing with fragmentary works are many. The fragment is by definition isolated from its original context; therefore, a close reading that gives full attention to the surviving words is essential; the bigger picture can only emerge as a result of an analysis of the details. In addition, one of the risks involved arises from the fragmentary nature of the text that allows more than one possible interpretation to be made. In the following there is a discussion on different ways around these problems but it is often impossible to completely eliminate the problem.

There are many reasons why it is worth dedicating time to something so uncertain and so broken as Aristophanes' fragmentary plays, rather than only looking into the works that have survived in a complete condition and therefore offer a complete image of the content and context. Not everyone would agree with this and a severe polemic against plot reconstruction has been expressed in the past. One of the most extreme examples is Olson's famous position that "systematic examination of the fragments of the preserved comedies in Athenaeus makes clear that reconstruction of the plots of lost comedies is almost inevitably doomed to failure by the poverty of our sources, on the one hand, and by the unrepresentative nature of the material preserved for us, on the other."¹⁸ Although he does leave some room for doubt in his phrasing ('almost') he is clearly sceptical towards such attempts.

Despite the fact that I do share his concerns about the intractability of the sources and the material available, which is indeed scarce in the case of Aristophanes too, I still believe that attempting a plot reconstruction in certain cases is worth our while. The over-reliance on Athenaeus is of course problematic, for his approach is very much one-sided and it is possible that he would omit material crucial for a plot. This need not mean that the material encountered in every source will involve the same problems. Especially when the hypothesis or the general context is known (e.g. that play X was composed as a parody of play Y), then there is at least a somewhat firmer ground on

¹⁸ Olson (2014) 2-34.

which certain plot elements can be recovered and more can be suggested based on the evidence. The researcher ought to investigate all the evidence in great scrutiny and suggest possible interpretations. As it is the case with every lost play, one can never be sure or certain of these suggestions, which on the other hand will be supported by as many pieces of evidence as possible, whether intertextual or historical. As a result and as we shall see in this thesis, even though a full plot may be impossible to recover, certain elements of it are not, and this means progress and addition to our knowledge. Therefore, attempts to reconstruct plot elements of lost plays are definitely significant and not necessarily doomed to failure.

There are two particular reasons behind the motivation of this study, which are related to two aspects that the fragmentary works offer, and particularly in relation to the genre of Comedy. The first one is exactly the same as when we are working on complete dramas. A play is not by definition of inferior significance simply because it was not copied, transcribed or has not survived fully. Philologists investigate and analyse fragments today because they have been proven to be as important as any extant play. In some cases, fragments have been our only resolution in order to discover and define the literature of a specific era or a specific author, which has usually led to the addition of essential information to our treasury of knowledge for contemporary history and society. Had we not attempted to work on fragmentary pieces, the whole work of writers such as Cratinus or Eupolis, who are equally important as Aristophanes, would have been dismissed, let alone whole periods of literary creation, such as what we call today Middle Comedy, which has survived only in a fragmentary form.

Out of all the hundreds of plays which were written and staged, to-date we only have eleven of them that are complete by Aristophanes and one of Menander. The rest of the corpus is entirely lost or has survived in fragments, through quotations by other ancient authors or on Egyptian papyrus scraps. In some cases, there are only a couple of words but in others more substantial bits have survived, which helped in the understanding of the developments and the standard patterns and themes used. The goal of Athenian

comedy was to impress the audience in an amusing way, and win the final prize.¹⁹ What was important about comedy is the fact that it reflected the sociopolitical life as well as the literary tradition of the era.²⁰ The second, much briefer answer is related to the unique nature of the fragments and their charm, which is nothing else but the exploration (and sometimes) discovery of the unknown. Therefore, the fragments present a mystery that would attract any human being, even more so a classicist.

1.2 The fragments of Aristophanes' comedies: The *status quaestionis*

The attempt to unlock the full potential of what would appear to hide within the fragmentary works of every genre, including comedy, has become a major trend in classical scholarship over the last couple of decades. The content of works of poets that we only knew by name has successfully been reconstructed and one is now in the fortunate position to be able to rely on some outstanding examples from scholars who published commentaries on poets from the genres of Old²¹ and Middle Comedy.²² The present thesis is a useful addition to this scholarship by providing a more detailed discussion of an intriguing aspect of the Aristophanic work which is encountered in the four fragmentary plays presented.

The fragments of Aristophanes have attracted some attention of scholars, which have revolutionised classical studies throughout the past centuries.²³ Today we have very few published editions of Aristophanes' fragmentary plays; some of them confine their analysis to an apparatus criticus and others attempt to interpret the content and context of the fragments, albeit briefly and not always well-justified. Both types of research have been crucial to the overall appreciation of the fragments, both individually as well as part of a lost comic play, and each has been consulted with equal care in this study, which will focus on four plays and discuss them in greater detail and will provide a

¹⁹ cf. Henderson (1990); Sommerstein (1998). Although the desire to win prizes has been questioned by Wright (2012).

²⁰ Olson (2007) 1.

²¹ Storey(2011; 2003); Bakola (2010);Orth (2009);Pirrotta (2009);Olson (2007);Telo (2007).

²² Papachrysostomou (2008); Hunter (1983); Arnott (1996).

²³ For an excellent literature review of the various publications of comic fragments of the last twenty years or so see Ruffell (2012).

much more thorough analysis than has been offered in the existing editions.

The best critical edition we have to date is the Kassel-Austin edition of the fragments of Greek comic poets, which is a most useful gift to classicists worldwide and a great heritage to the next generation of philologists.²⁴ The first volume was published in 1983 and it is a collection of Greek comic fragments. In addition, it is comprised of eight volumes and it is alphabetically organised, starting with a volume on *Doric comedy*, *mimes*, *phlyaces* and finishing with a volume that includes all the *adespota* fragments. Aristophanes is placed in the third volume, where the fragments are organised in plays, with an excellent and very informative apparatus criticus, justifying the transmitted form of the ancient text, embedded fragments in the majority. Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin organised the fragments and thus facilitated their study to a considerable extent. In other words, they gave us the ingredients pure and clean so that we can put them together and see what a lost play is like and what it can tell us about the work of an author (Aristophanes, in our case).

Despite it being the best organised edition of comic fragments, it was not the first. Kassel-Austin took not one but many steps to further the obsolete editions of comic Greek fragments by Augustus Meineke,²⁵ Theodor Kock²⁶ and Georg Kaibel,²⁷ that were incomplete, outdated and often included wrongly assigned fragments. However, their dated work does not render these editions irrelevant or useless. In many cases, for the interpretation of the fragments, comments that accompanied the fragments were illuminative to the context, and to the plot of the play.

The aforementioned 19th c. editions, along with Edmonds' edition published in 1957, belong to the second group of works on fragments that go beyond a linguistic approach and an apparatus criticus, and attempt to translate and comment (extensively in some cases) on other (non-linguistic) aspects of the fragments, a practice barely used by Kassel-Austin or even Henderson's more recent Loeb edition.²⁸ The Loeb edition of the fragments of Aristophanes stands somewhere in between the two types of approach,

²⁴ cf. Rusten (2001); Olson (2001); Hunter (1988); Wilson (1984).

²⁵ Meineke (1839-1857).

²⁶ Kock (1880-1888).

²⁷ Kaibel (1899).

²⁸ Henderson (2008).

since it does follow closely and relies on the Kassel-Austin edition, but also provides an English translation as well as very brief comments on the content/context of a fragment/play. It is a very useful volume for anyone who is seeking a study focused on the Aristophanic fragments, attributed and unattributed, with an apparatus criticus, an English translation and a useful foreword before each play, which introduces the content, intertextual allusions and overall significance.

However, more progress has been done since the Loeb edition with two quite dissimilar works. In 2011 Rusten's collection of selected²⁹ Greek comic fragments was published. This study also had Kassel-Austin as a guide but is more 'user-friendly' to a non-specialist due to its format. It includes English translations of the testimonia and fragments with very brief comments on the content and the metre. Rusten has also included illustrations as data, which can also be found in Webster and others.³⁰ An informative introduction precedes, discussing Athenian Comedy and its history, and (what could be deemed more important) the sources of the fragments. Speaking of commentaries on Greek comic fragments, the ongoing project which takes place in Freiburg at the moment and is designed to run for fifteen years should also be mentioned. The project "Commentary on Fragments of Greek Comedy" is based at the University of Freiburg, funded and supervised by the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities. In this project, PhD students and philologists collaborate under the lead of Professor Bernhard Zimmermann in order to produce a commentary on the Greek comic fragments accompanied by a German translation, thus contributing greatly to our knowledge of the history of classical Greek literature.³¹

Four years after Rusten's publication, we have the most up-to-date work on the fragments of Aristophanes, which is a new Italian edition of the Aristophanic fragments, the result of the work of a very competent team of classicists. Matteo Pellegrino's edition published in 2015 has enriched the modern scholarship with a very

²⁹ Rusten (2011: 2-3) explains that he deliberately excluded fragments which he suggests are better studied in the original language since they pose linguistic problems as well as those that are written in a difficult language and there is no translation that would do them justice.

³⁰ Webster & Green (1978); Webster (1969); Trendall (1967).

³¹ Information based on what is provided on the project webpage: <http://www.komfrag.uni-freiburg.de> (accessed: 23/09/17).

informative volume that equips us with a very well organised and updated edition, taking into consideration all the previous ones. He has built on what has already been published in order to provide us with new insights, particularly with regard to the context of the fragments. The volume has the structure of an extended Loeb, so to speak, and shows greater resemblance to the 19th c. editions with a translation and comments (sometimes occupying a whole page only for a single fragment). Pellegrino analyses each fragment and play using different approaches separately and in combination in order to achieve an optimum result. His volume also discusses textual and contextual problems. It should be noted that it is particularly useful for those who are mostly interested in the intertextuality between the Aristophanic fragments and the rest of classical literature. In addition, his analysis on the papyrus fragments is also praiseworthy.³²

The current thesis, although not a commentary of this type, is very much indebted to the research presented in all the aforementioned commentaries and editions of the Aristophanic fragments. The foundations of the present thesis were laid by the meticulous linguistic edition of the text and the intertextual references identified. What the thesis contributes is the further examination of the text in combination with these intertextual references, which were more closely and more extensively analysed and compared. The thesis aims to enrich the multilateral approach that a play requires, especially when the material is fragmentary and a vast amount of possibilities are available.

Among modern studies on the fragments of Aristophanes, which do not only offer a commentary on the fragments, but also include discussion as well as analysis of the themes that arise, one must mention Carrière,³³ who offers a very brief introduction to the thirty-three lost comedies with a selection of translated fragments and comments. In his introduction, Carrière divides the comedies into thematic categories, one of which is ‘Mythical subjects and paratragedies’; under this section are also found the four plays of this book along with the *Danaids*, *Dionysus Shipwrecked*, *Dramas or Centaur*, *Dramas or Niobus*, *Lemnian Women*, and *Phoenician Women*.

³² For a review of the work see Zagari (2016).

³³ Carrière (2000).

Another work important and relevant to this research is Casolari's³⁴ on mythical travesty in Greek comedy, which offers an overview of mythical travesties in Old, Middle and New Comedy. One of the most significant references is found in her sixth chapter under the title "Die Vorwegnahme einiger Motive der Neuen Komödie durch die Myhentravestie in der Mittleren Komödie", where she analyses the elements that bring *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon* much closer to Middle and New Comedy. These elements will be thoroughly discussed in the last chapter of this thesis. Equally important for similar reasons are Rau's *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*³⁵ and Bakola, Prauscello and Telo's *Greek comedy and the discourse of genres*,³⁶ which discuss the phenomenon of parody in Aristophanes but focus mostly on scenes rather than the whole fragmentary plays that are written as parodies.

Alan Sommerstein has contributed to the study of Aristophanic fragments in many ways. One example is his book titled *Talking about laughter and other studies in Greek comedy*,³⁷ in which he discusses crucial problems that arise in the fragments such as Platonius' somewhat unreliable testimonium on *Aeolosicon*.³⁸ Moreover, Gil Fernandez's³⁹ study could not be omitted from this section, particularly because of the importance of his chapters on the transmission of the text, the chronology of the comedies and because of the very brief introduction on each of the fragmentary plays.⁴⁰ It is a useful read before one decides to read the fragments, which are excluded from his study. Last but not least, Taplin's *Comic Angels* collects and presents the vase paintings depicting scenes from Greek comedy;⁴¹ in this study the visual representations of Greek tragedy in Greek comedy as well as his discussion on Greek theatrical productions in

³⁴ Casolari (2003).

³⁵ Rau (1967).

³⁶ Bakola et al (2013).

³⁷ Sommerstein (2009).

³⁸ One cannot disregard the many difficulties in Platonius' narrative about the change in the content and style of comedy, such as the fact that chorus had actually not lost its dramatic function. On the matter see Sidwell (2000) 248-249. I discuss this in ch. 2.3.1.

³⁹ Fernandez (1996).

⁴⁰ The exact same section is also found in his *De Aristofanes a Menandro* (2010).

⁴¹ Taplin (1993) makes a sustained argument of the so-called 'phlyax vases' and the spread of Old Comedy; see also Trendall (1967), which is more of the reference work.

South Italy were particularly relevant to the present thesis.

There is, however, a noticeable gap in the Aristophanic literature. The fragments of each play may be scarce; yet they provide a great deal of new information about Aristophanes' work, his time, and the comedic genre. What is particularly intriguing when reading these plays is the fact that among them there is hitherto neglected evidence for a different type of comedy that Aristophanes produced, which has not survived in any of the extant plays. Therefore, the four fragmentary plays covered in the present work represent this new type of Aristophanic comedy and this is ultimately the reason for why they were selected.⁴²

What is still missing from the contemporary Aristophanic scholarship is a synthetic approach to the fragments that would give prominence to these aspects of the Aristophanic creation that are hidden or absent in the extant plays. This is a secondary aim of the present research, which focuses on Aristophanic parody. In the extant plays there are significant chunks of parody, although their scenario and plot are still an original idea. On the other hand, the fragmentary plays selected seem to have been composed as parodies of tragedies. The scales are reversed here and originality loses its power and space to the creative comic reproduction of a tragic play. However, this is not the only novel piece of information we can acquire from the fragments. They are the only instance in which Aristophanes uses themes and plots from Greek mythology to this extent. The research on how Aristophanes may have reworked ancient myths is a fascinating aspect of the fragments.⁴³

Finally, an additional intriguing branch of this research emerged with the discovery of the interconnections between Aristophanes' so-called Old Comedy and the succeeding comic eras and sub-genres, i.e. the Middle and New Comedy. This is a very complex

⁴² The argument here is that these plays are different to the extant plays of Aristophanes as they appear to be parodies of a whole tragedy or a burlesque of a specific myth. While the extant plays certainly contain these elements, their scenario is still original rather than being mostly based on a mythical or tragic subject. As far as earlier mythological burlesque is concerned, there is certainly a continuity of this tradition, but the scarcity of the Aristophanic fragments does not allow us to say more on the potential differences that may have existed between the four plays of the thesis and the mythological burlesque of earlier comedy.

⁴³ On ancient forms of myth reworkings see Vöhler et al. (2005), and specifically on Greek tragedy in this context see Seidensticker (2005).

and fascinating topic that has also been hinted at in the extant plays and discussed in the scholarship,⁴⁴ but needs the contribution of a study of the fragments in order to be analysed and investigated further. The present study will facilitate future research on the ‘new’ elements in the extant comedies in combination with the fragmentary ones, perhaps with particular attention to the plays that Aristophanes produced towards the end of his career in the 4th c. BC.

1.3 Parody in Aristophanes

There is a significant amount of scholarship on Aristophanic parody, particularly in the extant plays. Silk discusses Aristophanes’ engagement with tragedy and especially with Euripides who was most appealing to him as an experimenter.⁴⁵ In his ‘Aristophanic Paratragedy’, he explores the ways in which Aristophanic paratragedy can be parodic and analyses the element of subversion used in it. He points out the fact that although parody has necessarily negative connotations, paratragedy does not. He draws parallels with modern parody, especially Mason’s parody of Auden and Pound’s parody of Housman. He supports the argument that most of the Aristophanic cases of paratragedy are not parodic. For example, he argues that Aristophanes’ use of *Telephus* makes the scene and the action richer, as generally does the co-existence of comic and tragic in the Aristophanic plays.⁴⁶ Indeed, in some cases Aristophanic paratragedy does not necessarily need to be parodic, although it is often the case that a paratragic scene is also parodic. For example, it seems to me that this could be the case with *Telephus* too and the way Euripides is presented in that scene in the *Acharnians*, which includes the element of ridicule with the implications regarding Euripides’ lowly origins, rather than simply being a reference to Euripidean tragedy.

In any case, *Telephus* has proved to be a very rich and useful character for many reasons and from different aspects. Foley states that Aristophanes with the use of *Telephus* invites the audience to admire the tragic accent he is giving to his comedy, his *τρογωιδία*. For her, *Telephus* is the perfect character as he is not an exile and he is

⁴⁴ cf. Nesselrath (1990; 1995). A fuller discussion of the scholarship on the topic is included in ch. 1.4.

⁴⁵ Silk (2000).

⁴⁶ Silk (1993).

trying to find justice for past actions disguised into a beggar. Aristophanes found him suitable as he himself is also functioning as the advocate of comedy seeking justice for it through the words of Dicaeopolis (the similarities between these characters do not end here).⁴⁷ Dicaeopolis and Telephus are two characters connected in the *Acharnians*, and it seems that the use of Telephus is helping Dicaeopolis reinforce his points.

From the point of view of both Silk and Foley, it seems that paratragedy can have a more important application and operation than parody, especially as far as the use of *Telephus* is regarded. However, I think that this significant role of paratragedy does not need to prevail over the parodic use when the two can co-exist in dramatic harmony. Goldhill focused on the parodic (mis)representation of the democratic institutions by Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians* and the Euripidean disguise as a parodic reference to *Telephus*, as well as the parody of the value of tragic poetry and the competition between tragedians that we find in *Frogs*. He sees the Aristophanic world as ‘Upside Down’, since parody goes hand in hand with comic inversion: “all fall under the general rubric of an inversion or distortion of an assumed model, set in a new context, for comic effect – a rubric that remains the starting point for definitions of parody”. He discusses the double voice of parody and the complicated relationship between parodist and the object of parody. He sees parody as a licensed transgression and compares it with carnival. The recognition of parody and the various interpretations that can exist among different spectators are central in his research.⁴⁸ Indeed, in order for a mechanism of parody to be successful the parodic model needs to be visible and comprehensible under the parodic disguise. The audience will need to recognise the original so that the parody is clear and what they see has some meaning for them. Rose also comments on the audience’s expectations and the contrasts (which are created on various levels between model and parodic result) that are supposed to be recognised in a parody. She argues that surprise and humour are closely related in this case.⁴⁹

The parodic and/or paratragic engagement of Aristophanes with Euripides is present in various instances in his comedies, whether thematically or verbally. Zeitlin, who

⁴⁷ Foley (1988).

⁴⁸ Goldhill (1991) 187-211.

⁴⁹ Rose (1993) 33-34.

points out that *paratragodia* exists constantly in Aristophanes, explores the parody of four Euripidean tragedies (*Telephus*, *Palamedes*, *Helen*, *Andromeda*) in *Thesmophoriazusae*. Euripides appears as the impersonator of a parody of his tragedies and specifically the rescue-recognition plays. She defines parody as “the literary device which openly declares its status as an imitation with a difference”.⁵⁰ *Thesmophoriazusae* is indeed a very rich in tragic parody play and especially Euripidean. It is always very interesting to see how a tragic scene can be transformed so that it can fit into a comedy successfully. For example, Diamantakou’s work focuses on the recognition scene between Menelaus and Helen in Euripides’ *Helen* and the ways this was exploited in *Thesmophoriazusae* by Aristophanes one year later. She discusses the Aristophanic method of parody that will provoke laughter. Aristophanes reproduces and reuses big chunks of the Euripidean drama but assigned to different characters and given a different context which will successfully lead to a comic result.⁵¹ This is something that the present thesis also aspires to achieve, but it is significantly harder when both the tragic model and the comedy are in a very fragmentary form, which is the case with the plays of the thesis.

Aristophanic parody operates on different levels and through various means. A parodic scene can be realised verbally as well as visibly in the course of a comic performance. Slater researches the metatheatrical devices/techniques in Aristophanic plays also through the use of parody of tragedies (especially Euripides’). For example, he explores the parody of Euripides in *Acharnians* from a metatheatrical aspect also discussing the props that may have been used in order to make the parody recognisable to the audience when Euripides appears on the *ekkyklema*. Another notable example he uses is from *Peace*, where Trygaeus using the *mechane* appears flying on a beetle. He argues that the use of the device on a first level parodies its tragic use (Euripides’ Bellerophon) but it is a parody at the service of the comic plot, serving a higher, broader purpose than the pretentious tragedy. More parodic scenes from Euripidean drama follow such as *Palamedes*, *Helen* and *Andromeda*, where the parody is also realised on a verbal level. *Frogs* has elements of a *katabasis* myth and contains

⁵⁰ Zeitlin (1981) 176-181.

⁵¹ Διαμαντάκου-Αγαθού (2007) 177-183.

numerous instances of literary parody, such as the mispronunciation of the protagonist of Euripides' *Orestes* in 408 (lines 303-304 in the comedy).⁵²

Most of the studies on Aristophanic parody are informed by works on the theory of parody and the ways it operates in literature. For example, P. von Möllendorff's work on the aesthetics of Old Comedy in relation to Bakhtin's theory is worth mentioning. After discussing the significance of laughter, dialogue and the idea of grotesque in Bakhtin he looks at Aristophanes' extant plays exploring the same looking specifically at the mechanics of distortion in them. He discusses the complicated nature of laughter at the grotesque and the phenomenon of carnivalisation of literature. Polyphony is another key element that is also investigated in relation to the Aristophanic theatre.

One of the most important works on the mechanics of parody is certainly Bakhtin's study,⁵³ which focuses on the genre of novel in which stylistic parody of other genres plays a fundamental role. For him, what he calls 'the absolute past' of the world of epic is 'contemporized' in parody and especially in travesty. Examples both from the ancient and the modern world such as the *Batrachomyomachia* and *Don Quixote* are employed. Bakhtin believes that every elevated genre had its parodic counterpart and also talks about the myths presented in Greek tragedy and satyr plays (written by the same author). He discusses cases of a parodied comic version of a hero such as Odysseus and Heracles and points out that parody is one of the essential structural components of Greek Comedy. The importance of polyglossia in parodic-travestying forms is stressed, such as it is observed in Latin literature that looks back in the Greek. It is argued that the parodic literature of the medieval era, which was to be found in times of holidays and festivals, is associated with the carnival. Parody is defined as an 'intentional hybrid' which operates usually within a linguistic system which includes different kinds of languages, it is a 'dialogized hybrid' as he calls it. Bakhtin also talks about Aristophanes and his comedy in which he sees a cultic laughter and a cultic foundation and death as the central theme which is accompanied by food, drink and sex. He completely dismisses Aristophanes' contribution to the development of the genre of

⁵² Slater (2002). Although the mispronunciation of Hegelokhos might not be the most representative element, it is still an interesting instance of this type of parody.

⁵³ Bakhtin (1981).

comedy as insignificant and superficial but he does see the Aristophanic thread picked up by Rabelais and medieval parodic farce.

Indeed, parody enriches a work with a creative polyphony and frequently opens dialogues between different literary genres, such as comedy and tragedy. However, the fact that tragic burlesque is something that becomes very prominent in the comic sub-genres after Aristophanes' time could mean that there was a level of contribution to the generic development from the part of Aristophanes as well as other authors of Greek Old Comedy. Although we cannot be sure of how heavily the later comic poets were influenced by Aristophanes, it is still worth looking at the ways that the work of Aristophanes might have contributed to the generic development. This is a topic that will be discussed throughout the thesis and especially in the conclusion.

There are more scholars who engaged with and assessed Bakhtin's theory when discussing Aristophanic parody. Rose, in her discussion of Russian formalists, focuses on Bakhtin whom she finds (and she is not the only one⁵⁴) wrong in simply defining parody as burlesque, which would at least be an understatement.⁵⁵ Hutcheon engages with Bakhtin's theory of carnival in order to examine parody's subversive power focusing on the paradoxical aspects of parody.⁵⁶ I would agree that the notion 'parody equals burlesque' is indeed an understatement, given the fact that parody is a very complicated process that can operate on various different levels, although one of them can certainly be that of burlesque.

Apart from the literature that focuses on Aristophanic parody there is also a large theoretical literature on parody (ancient and modern notions of it) and scholars do not neglect to discuss its relation to burlesque. Householder explores the definitions of *paroidia* in various dictionaries, investigating the difference between parody and burlesque. He presents an overview of the etymologically related words to parody starting from *paroidos*. The word *paroidia* is first attested in Aristotle who speaks of

⁵⁴ Silk (2000) 299: "Aristophanic comedy presents us with rich patterns of juxtaposition and confrontation, but not indeed with any uniform pattern of inversions such as Bakhtin ascribes to the carnival – nor indeed with the kind of universal dissolution of boundaries and categories that he finds there."

⁵⁵ Rose (1993) 164.

⁵⁶ Hutcheon (1985).

Hegemon.⁵⁷ Apparently, this parody is presented as being in relation to epic what comedy is in relation to tragedy. He discusses the differences that have been observed in the nature of the parodic interaction between comedy and tragedy, epic or lyric poetry and explores different types of parody as these are presented in Greek and Roman authors.⁵⁸

In addition to the aforementioned theories, scholars who have produced editions of parodies have contributed to the formation of the literary theoretical framework too, such as Olson and Sens's edition and discussion of Matro's fragments. Although the object of analysis here is epic parody, there are also comments on the mechanics of parody in general which can span from a whole genre to a couple of lines. They point out the necessity of a model which will be attacked, mocked and distorted, and whose significance will be recognised simultaneously. They start with the case of *Margites* as an epic parody. They support the idea that epic parody seems to have flourished alongside the works of the comic poets in the 5th c. BC, and continued to be produced in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Hegemon, Matro and Archestratus are mentioned among others. Matro's *Attic Dinner Party* follows the trend that placed more emphasis on the preparation and consumption of food in the 4th c. comedy. It is noted that stylistic imitations are important for Matro's epic (mostly Homeric) parody.⁵⁹

Going back to the origin and etymology of the word parody is a very interesting and useful way of investigating its meaning and how it might have developed over time. Rose is another scholar who noticed the problematic notion that parody means burlesque. She discusses the etymology of the word 'parody' tracing it back to Greek literature while also acknowledging the debate that has been triggered by the fact that meaning and use has changed over time. She gives an overview of the history of the meanings that have been attributed to parody and discusses examples of parody such as epic parody and the *Batrachomyomachia*, and how they have been treated by scholars. With special reference to Aristophanic comedy she notices how parody, apart from the language, can also be found in the depictions of masks used. She relies heavily on

⁵⁷ *Poetics* 48a12.

⁵⁸ Householder (1944).

⁵⁹ Olson and Sens (1999).

Householder's definitions of parody and discussion of its meanings. Rose's book offers an excellent literature review of theorists of parody ancient and modern.⁶⁰

Parody is definitely a diachronic mechanism that is still very much in use today. Modern parody can be identified in different artistic forms. Hutcheon discusses modern interpretations and functions of parody in forms of art. Her work abounds with modern examples, especially from the 20th c. She sees parody as a tool for self-reflection and an 'inter-art discourse'. She discusses the need that authors have felt to engage with the glorious past and its legacy often in the way of critical imitation, which entails an ironic inversion and an emphasis on the differences rather than the similarities. For her, the parodic models are not necessarily to be seen as objects of ridicule but as starting points of reference. It seems plausible to me that although the audience or the readers will be able to see the similarities to the parodic model, they might be more interested in identifying the differences and the means of distortion of that model, and that is possibly what was happening during the performance of an Aristophanic comedy which was enriched with tragic references. All these elements play a fundamental role to what Hutcheon defines as 'modern parody'. Hutcheon is inclined to see 20th c. parody as a genre and not merely a technique.⁶¹ This is a very interesting idea, that parody does not need to be part of another genre but it can be a genre on its own accord, no matter how heavily it relies on a (very much) distorted parodic model, which belongs to another genre.

Parody can be seen as a medium which facilitates the interaction between texts not only on a contemporary axis but also on a diachronic. The dialogue can be opened between a text that parodies another from the same era but it may also include references to older texts, in which case a dialogue with the past is opened. Genette's *Palimpsests* is a study of imitation and transformation in literature. Parody is discussed as part of the second category. He explores the relationship between new literary texts with older texts; all new literature is defined by the interaction between the two. His discussion on parody goes all the way back to Aristotle's work and parodic Greek literature. He also discusses modern definitions and theories on parody such as Sallier's

⁶⁰ Rose (1993).

⁶¹ Hutcheon (1985).

and Dumarsais' in chapter six. There we find theories which define parody as a genre entirely different to burlesque travesty but very close to satirical pastiche. Genette proposes a reformation of the current theoretical system which defines parody and rebaptizes it as "the distortion of a text by means of a minimal transformation". One of his observations is that parody is frequently found in titles whether they appear the same or slightly different. Under this rubric he discusses several examples of literary works across cultures and epochs.⁶² This idea that the parody may already be visible in the title of a work is very interesting for the present thesis too, as the titles or names of some of the comedies were also the titles of tragedies, which might have been the parodic model.

Before we carry on with the generic development within the comic genre and the role that parody played in it, it would be useful to sum up. Scholars have discussed Aristophanic parody to a great extent in his extant plays as well as the definition of parody from Aristotle up to the 20th c. theorists. The dynamic between *paratragodia* and parody has been a central issue. There is a debate on whether paratragedy is parodic or not and in which instances. The mechanics of parody have been discussed as well as the importance of the parodic object, which is presented distorted in the comedy but still easily recognisable by the audience. This is essential for the success of parody. Subsequently, another interesting question was how a tragic scene was transformed into a comic one. Some scholars have attempted to apply modern theories of parodies on Aristophanes' work, such as Bakhtin's, who argues that parody leads to the polyphony and carnivalisation of literature. Overall, I would agree that references to tragedy in the Aristophanic plays, whether parodic or not, made his comedy richer. And if a comedy was made richer by the addition of comic scenes in the extant plays, I wonder what the impression would be if the parody was realised on a much larger scale, such as a comedy destined to parody a whole tragedy, which might have been the case with the four plays of the thesis. This is a question that probably cannot be answered especially due to the fragmentation of the evidence, however, it will definitely be investigated in the course of this study.

⁶² Genette (1982) 2-36.

1.4 Generic development and Aristophanes

Parody and especially mythological burlesque, although not unprecedented, become more common in Middle Comedy. In this section, the reasons that have been suggested by scholars behind the changes within the comedic genre, which led to the so-called Middle and then New Comedy plays will be explored. After the war came to its unfortunate end there was a shift of focus to the internal workings of social life and the human *psyche*, best reflected in women's culture. Pictorial evidence⁶³ from the 5th and 4th c. demonstrates the transition from Old to Middle Comedy within a late 5th c.⁶⁴ Athenian context when a sort of escapism from the current political and economical situation is observed. Myth is increasingly becoming the centre and driving force of the plot with a particular focus on the 'more fully three-dimensional characters'. The same is observed in tragedy who was gradually losing its 'political' role. Presentation and dramatic action are now in the centre of attention instead. It is the time when, as Aristotle thought, the *politikos logos* was replaced by the *rhetorikos* and the trained audience also expected to feel some sort of identification with the characters and action on stage.⁶⁵ This is a change that will become even more evident in the next century with the appearance of the female nude sculpture and new types of literature, such as New Comedy.

Old, Middle, and New Comedy is a division that has been debated and is not as straightforward as it may appear and not everyone has agreed with it. For example, Lowe argues that the division into comic eras would be more accurate if Old and Middle Comedy were one period that involved a constant process of innovation and development that suddenly and inexplicably came to an end c. 320 BC. He sees a common ground shared by New Comedy and tragedy contemporary to Aristophanic comedy which involves features that are nowhere to be found in the 'inconsistent' Old Comedy: "they are Homerically plotted, illusionistic and naturalistic, strict in their

⁶³ See pp. 32-33.

⁶⁴ Green (1994) 63: "There is a growing concentration on Athenian myths and Athenian heroes, on youth, the care of youth and the power of youth, (particularly on pots) on personifications in the forms of 'women whose names prove that they embody various forms of happiness, pleasure and good fortune'."

⁶⁵ Ibid. 37-50.

observance of causality, transparency, the intelligibility of character and the functional economy of action.”⁶⁶

Cocalus and *Aeolosicon* have securely been dated in the 4th c. BC,⁶⁷ but for *Polyidus* and *Daedalus* the production date is unknown. However, we could have good reasons to place them at least towards the very end of the 5th, if not at the beginning of the 4th c. BC; as Olson pointed out, “a newer type of ‘Old Comedy’ becomes prominent around 400, when mythological parody suddenly grows immensely popular – and remains so for about half a century”.⁶⁸ On the other hand, having other plays such as Cratinus’ *Dionysalexandros* prevents us from making a secure assertion.

The truth is that the advantages offered by parody of tragedy in contrast to parody of epic are important, which could also explain the fact that Aristophanes started composing parodies of Euripides soon after Cratinus decided to produce a parody of epic. This is related to the numerous ways of handling a dramatic technique which will reveal the complex nature of the artistic creation, literary expression, and reality, all of which are the main characteristics of a sophistic era, as Foley argues.⁶⁹ Revermann also recognises Cratinus’ plays (*Nemesis*, *Odysseis*, *Dionysalexandros*) as the most popular examples of the mythological burlesque or *paramythological tragedy*. Alongside these he mentions that the same type of comedy was not unknown to Aristophanes, especially if we look at plays such as *Daedalus*, *Danaids*, *Aeolosicon*, *Cocalus*. Phrynichus, Hermippus, Strattis possibly produced such parodies too, but what is most interesting is that Revermann in some cases admits the necessity of a very similar plot between the comic play and the parodied one with what he calls a *paratragic chorus* and a *happy ending*.⁷⁰

The origins of parody along with its definition and the reasons behind it have been discussed thoroughly in the scholarship as we saw in the previous section. Aristotle in

⁶⁶ Lowe (2000) 86-87. cf. Sidwell (2000) 250-255, who suggests that we should abandon the later coined term of ‘Middle’ Comedy and instead distinguish between two periods of Old period and New, while refer the so-called ‘Middle’ as Sicilian Comedy whose first exponent in Athens was Crates.

⁶⁷ Nesselrath (1995: 18-19) mentions Araros and *Aeolosicon* and *Cocalus* as belonging to the Middle Comedy period.

⁶⁸ Olson (2007) 24.

⁶⁹ Foley (1988) 47.

⁷⁰ Revermann (2006) 101.

his *Poetics* (II, 1448a 12) calls Hegemon the father of parody and describes the technique as presenting the heroes worse than they really are. Sidwell uses Aristotle's⁷¹ differentiation between Old and New Comedy suggesting that instead of reading it in connection with the ancient evidence, one should read it as it was written, namely as an opposition to Plato's *Laws* and his ban on mimetic form. New Comedy is already in place at Aristotle's time and these developments in the style have already occurred as he is using the past tense. He also discusses Aristotle's point on how the type of comedy changed and instead of direct attack to real characters, these are transferred on stage as caricatures, which was also established by law in several occasions. With the rise of Macedon, caricature gradually fades in New Comedy; this definition/differentiation/transition from Old to New Comedy matches Aristotle's.⁷²

K. Diamantakou⁷³ refers to the use of the high epic style in order to present humble every day situations, such as the epic parodies that transfer the reader to the world of animals. She discusses authors who produced parodies at the beginning of the 5th c. such as the Sicilian Epicharmus and Phormes. Many mythical parodies contained political attacks, as we see in Cratinus especially against Pericles. On the other hand, there were also those which were parodies of myths without a clear connection to the current political/historical reality, such as Cratinus' *Odysseis*, Hermippus' *Athenas Gonai*,⁷⁴ and some of Plato Comicus' plays. The myth-parody flourishes in Middle Comedy and survives in New Comedy as some titles indicate. The same bloom is observed in South Italy as the comic depictions on phlyax vases prove. There is not one play that was composed as a parody of one mythical subject or of a tragedy that has survived. And although we have eleven extant Aristophanic comedies, none of them are

⁷¹ Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 1128a.23–5.

⁷² Sidwell (2000) 251-255.

⁷³ Διαμαντάκου-Αγαθού (2007) 438-446.

⁷⁴ cf. Nesselrath (1995) 2-19: Although his focus is on *θεῶν γοναί* – plays, he points out that in post-Aristophanic comedy, including the later Aristophanic period, we see a shift away from the usual political themes of Old Comedy and a more keen interest in the handling of myths in epic and tragedy as also attested by Platonius and this is when mythological parody flourished. The *θεῶν γοναί* – plays are part of this trend, as they tend to parody the birth of gods as they are presented already in archaic poetry. He draws examples from Hermippus, Philiscus, Polyzelus, Nicophon, Demetrius, whom he identifies as belonging to the transitional period between Old and Middle Comedy.

of this sort. On the other hand, we have clear evidence in his fragments that there were plays that could have been written as parodies of a tragic version of a specific myth, possibly with a critical approach and satirical application to the contemporary reality. The Aristophanic work is a gold mine of the various parodic techniques apparent in the extant comedies, even if they are restricted in specific scenes and narratives within a play. However, the four fragmentary plays of the thesis are different and very valuable for this reason, since there is evidence that they could have been composed as parodies of specific tragedies.

The inner development in the Aristophanic dramatic technique already becomes apparent with *Wealth* and *Ecclesiazusae*, which are noticeably different to his older plays. In these two, the style is noticeably less colourful and ‘poetic’, traits that are replaced by a more uniform and naturalistic style, that kept developing until Menander whose comedies demonstrate a perfected form of this new style. Another notable change between Aristophanes’ 5th c. plays and 4th c. plays is the absence of the choral parabasis in his last plays. By the time of New Comedy the addressing to the audience becomes less pointed and more conventional,⁷⁵ as do the metatheatrical comments on the quality of the play or the competitors.⁷⁶

Another change that is observed as we leave the era of Old Comedy behind is the diminished role of the chorus until it disappears. There have been various reasons put forward by scholars on the matter. The productions of the same plays travelled but that does not mean that they would always carry a chorus (or the same chorus) with them, even if there were still generous *choregoi*. The decline of the chorus was also brought about by the new theatrical architecture which by the Hellenistic times wanted a raised stage, which no longer facilitated the direct exchange between chorus and actors.⁷⁷ The reason for the so-called decline⁷⁸ of the chorus were many. One could add the influence

⁷⁵ Bain (1977) 195-205; Blundell (1980) 61-64.

⁷⁶ Slater (1995) 30.

⁷⁷ Slater (1995) 31-42; Rothwell (1995) 99.

⁷⁸ Henderson (1995: 179-180) argues that the fact that we have few to no choral parts that survived from the 4th c. should not be taken as a decline or even a change in the role of the chorus in the plays of Middle Comedy.

from tragedy,⁷⁹ where the same was happening in the 4th c. The playwright was eager to maintain the theatrical illusion, not to be interrupted by the choral interference, simultaneously increasing the emphasis on the actor and main action. In mid-5th c. the chorus is a core element of the play, a means of identification and an element of unity within the play. Its significance withered by time and was rather transferred to the main actor(s), although it is still important and maintains its role as an artistic convention that contributes to the identification of the play, even if it is not an organic part of the plot any more as pictorial evidence from the 5th and 4th c. demonstrates.⁸⁰ Rothwell argues that the funding of the chorus was not affected at all at least in the first half of the 4th c. The changes or decline in its use were both evident before and after 404, as almost half of the plays were mythological burlesques; we are talking about a change that took place gradually over decades. Choral experimentation in Aristophanes is first observed in his *Birds* in 414 BC and it is around the same time when Agathon started using embolima.⁸¹

Myth and myth making traces exist in Aristophanic extant plays such as *Birds* (story of creation) and *Frogs* (Empusa and tour through the underworld).⁸² Many tragic elements become the stock in trade that is more and more broadly used towards the end of 5th and 4th c. The only extant instance of a parody of a whole tragic mythical plot is Plautus' *Amphitruo*. Comedy takes myths and transmutes them, it distorts and changes them, just like it does with any historical/political facts and figures.⁸³

There are many stylistic developments that took place from Old to New Comedy, such as the depersonalization that is observed in Menander, in contrast to the 'polyphony, discourse irony, and improvisation' of Old Comedy. Dobrov traces these developments within the genre and especially between Aristophanes and Menander in

⁷⁹ cf. Henderson (1995) 182.

⁸⁰ Green (1994) 29-30.

⁸¹ Rothwell (1995) 116-117.

⁸² cf. Lowe (2000) 87-88, who singles out *Birds*, *Lysistrata*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, and *Frogs* as Middle Comedies, which tend to have a restricted cast, some unity of space, clear pointers to the endgame and specific story goals throughout. He sees more evident an air of change in *Ecclesiazusae* and *Wealth*, which he calls later plays, reductions that are due to changes in budget as well as dramatic technique.

⁸³ Handley (1985) 358-386, whose work includes a brief discussion of comedic literary allusions and burlesques from Homer to Euripides that are found already in Epicharmus' Doric comedy and Cratinus.

the harangue part of a play; in this part in Menander we have no intertextual references and it does not refer to a mythical theme as this appeared in a tragedy. This is a shift already evident in Middle Comedy and carries on in Menander, where the mythical element is still present but has gone through rationalization. Alexis and Menander's harangues are a lot more general and broad than Dicaeopolis'. Old Comedy differs to Middle also with regards to dithyramb and poetic model; the first one denies the dithyrambic style and parodies and mocks the poetic model, whereas the second incorporates and assimilates the stylistic features of the dithyramb and the poetic model. As we move into the 4th c. and Middle Comedy the poetic style is abandoned and instead we have a naturalistic composition with a more familiar language and a focus on the plot, showing clear signs of comic development.⁸⁴

1.5 Aristophanes' four character plays

Having discussed the relevant aspects of the project I hope to have demonstrated the need and purpose of the present thesis. The current study will focus on a largely obscure aspect of the Aristophanic work that consists of the male character-titled plays, which are possibly parodic plays, showing that Aristophanes did something else that has not succeeded in capturing our full attention so far. The four fragmentary plays presented in this thesis were selected for their unique nature as we shall see. *Polyidus*, *Daedalus*, *Aeolosicon*, and *Cocalus* will be addressed with an interpretational and analytical approach rather than a linguistic one (as there has already been some excellent work presented in the *apparatus critici* by Kassel-Austin).⁸⁵

Through a detailed analysis of four fragmentary plays it will be demonstrated that Aristophanes raised the level (in relation to his own earlier plays) of engagement and allusion to contemporary playwrights, using some of their plots more closely than ever, thereby creating whole parodies of specific tragedies. Scholars have repeatedly discussed individual lines or scenes from Aristophanes' plays that are clear parodies of

⁸⁴ Dobrov (1995) 54-81.

⁸⁵ cf. ch. 1.2 for more details.

scenes or lines from other writers, as mentioned earlier.⁸⁶ However, the possibility of a parody in the fragmentary plays occupies only a few lines in their articles or books, if mentioned at all.⁸⁷ Moreover, at least two 4th c. plays will be studied, and, thus, more information will be added regarding the generic development within the Aristophanic corpus towards the end of Old Comedy and the dawn of Middle Comedy. This is a modern division of the literary developments within the genre of comedy, but thanks to the last works of Aristophanes and the first works of the ‘Middle’ comic poets the ways that this transition was realised practically becomes clearer.⁸⁸

The choice of these specific four plays was not random. These plays were chosen for their unique and significant features, which still remain underexplored. Unlike the extant plays, the four comedies of the thesis, are character titled plays that seem to be based on a mythological subject and they could have been composed as parodies of tragedies. Furthermore, the setting of the plays is also very interesting as it is not in Athens anymore and two of them are not even set in the Greek world, but in Sicily. In addition, they are plays that seem to include elements that are commonly found in the later comic sub-genres. The research of all these aspects and what they mean for the work of Aristophanes as we know it today will be the contribution of the thesis.

As mentioned before, all the four plays share specific features, including the one male character as the protagonist and the mythical theme. Three of the plays share parts of the same myth,⁸⁹ and all of them appear to be parody plays. That is not to say that the two groups are not connected in any other way, but quite the opposite. Apart from the fact that they are all parodies of tragedies and refer to characters quite famous in the ancient world, three of them are reminiscent of, if not connected to, the Cretan mythical circle. King Minos features in both *Polyidus* and *Cocalus* as an important character. Daedalus’ character as he appears in *Daedalus*, although he is in a totally different set, definitely reminds us of his prehistory on Crete. *Aeolosicon* was also chosen due to its

⁸⁶ See Bakola, Prauscello and Telò (2013); Tsitsiridis (2010) 361-376; Brockman (2003); Reckford (1987) 115-120. cf. the scholarship in ch. 1.2.

⁸⁷ See Nesselrath (1990); Rau (1967).

⁸⁸ cf. Zeitlin (1981) 211; Green (1994) 12.

⁸⁹ *Cocalus*, *Polyidus* and *Daedalus*.

contribution to our knowledge on the generic evolution of comedy, as we shall see further on.

Another element that connects rather than separates these plays is the location in which the plot is supposed to take place. *Polyidus* is set on the island of Crete. *Cocalus* is the sequel and ultimate consequence of the events that took place on Crete between Daedalus and Minos and is set on Sicily. *Daedalus* happens in Sparta, in the heart of the Peloponnese, and *Aeolosicon* on the island of Aeolus, in the Tyrrhenian Sea off the northern coast of Sicily. None of these plays seem to be set in Athens, and why would they be when we know that the Greek plays have acquired a more international character and were performed outside the western borders of Greece.

Aristophanes, other than opting for a new plot-type, also pushed the geographical borders of his work outside Athens to places such as Sicily and Crete, not only in terms of the plays' setting but also as a potential candidate for performances.⁹⁰ Restaging and touring led to new kinds of comic productions, and demand for reproductions rises in the 4th c. As also the Apulian vases have shown, the phlyax drama is primarily Greek Middle Comedy, as Slater concludes.⁹¹

Vase painting reflected themes that were popular in late 5th c. Athens, one of which was Athenian myths and heroes, and youth subjects along with personified abstract subjects. The idea expressed in Green that Aristophanes was rather old-fashioned and developed his art slower than his contemporaries can be questioned I think.⁹² A more accurate picture of the state of play at the time can be given when one looks at evidence from both the extant and fragmentary corpus that shows clear signs of an evolving style, a style that has already started forming at the end of the 5th c. This is also evidenced by the so-called New York Group of terracottas,⁹³ which reveal a more standardised form of comedy which became quite popular in the next century, and reproductions of which are found not only throughout Greece but also in sites such as

⁹⁰ For more information on performances of Greek drama in Greek territory outside Athens but also in Sicily, such as Syracuse and Metapontum, see Carter (2011), Revermann (2006) 69-70 and Taplin (1993; 1999).

⁹¹ Slater (1995) 32-33.

⁹² Green (1994) 37.

⁹³ Against which the generic development within the Aristophanic corpus can be read.

Asia Minor, South Russia, Sicily and Spain (phlyax vases were not as international but they are definitely proof of reproductions of Greek plays outside Greece). The Tarentine bell krater from 380-370 BC which represents the parody scene of Telephus in *Thesmophoriazusae* demonstrates the importance of the role of the visual in the success of the parody. The terracotta figurines found are also proof that Athenian comedy is breaking the borders by becoming Greek comedy. The findings of terracotta figurines show the popular characters of Middle and New comedies: Heracles, slaves being the most popular including the cook, old men and women.⁹⁴

Certainly, this non-Athenian/international setting is another indicator of the development and evolution in the Aristophanic *oeuvre*. What should also concern us is the appearance and introduction of Araros by his father Aristophanes, which seems to be the case regarding Aristophanes' last two plays, that were produced by his son, Araros. All these issues will be discussed in the concluding fourth chapter, in which Aristophanes' contribution to the succeeding comic sub-genres will be viewed based on the preceding analysis of the four plays.

⁹⁴ Green (1994) 63-76.

2. A different kind of Aristophanic comedy

This chapter covers the four fragmentary plays that have been selected for the present study,¹ namely *Polyidus*, *Daedalus*, *Aeolosicon*, and *Cocalus*. For the sake of a clear methodology, the plays have been organised and analysed in a clearly structured way. Each play, representative of very specific issues, will be treated in a discrete chapter. Each play-section will be further divided into four sub-sections, i.e. an introduction which will provide the general background of the play and what our sources transmit; the individual analysis of the fragments but also as part of a plot; the analysis of the potential characters that featured in the play using the information that the ancient sources transmit; and the plot reconstruction, where a plausible scenario is suggested, to the extent that the preceding analysis will have allowed for.

The first sub-section aims to provide the general context and content of the play. The mythical frame will be discussed in order to lay out the ‘historical’ background of each play. This section will also include a detailed interpretation and translation of the testimonia, a discussion of the tragic model and the use of the myth by other comic poets where appropriate. A particularly interesting phenomenon in the Aristophanic plays of the present thesis is the fact that the same titles or themes were found in comic poets of later times,² which means that Aristophanes’ ideas were ‘modern’ enough to be imitated or to at least inspire the ‘Middle’ and ‘New’ comic poets. Such elements will also be discussed in the next section.

The second sub-section will consider the text of the surviving fragments as well as their context. Aristophanes’ fragments usually come from quotations in other authors’ works and damaged papyri. The source of a fragment and its context are very important and must be considered in detail. Only this allows us to interpret the fragment and make assumptions about the lost play when we observe it in its environment, and to appreciate why it was used at that specific point. Since we are facing embedded

¹ cf. ch. 1.2.

² Of course, there is no apparent need for two plays of the same title to approach the subject in the same way. However, it seems to be the case that authors follow the same basic plotline when the subject is a traditional myth, changing the focus, angle and some of the details (e.g. parts of the ‘Oresteia’ myth in the three major Greek tragedians but also in Seneca).

fragments in the case of Aristophanes, this method will also be useful in order to understand the meaning and use of the language in the Aristophanic fragments. Discussing the context of a fragment which was not recovered from a papyrus scrap but was instead found as a quotation in a later author's work is crucial for our understanding of its content at times. In addition, a detailed interpretation and translation of the fragments individually and as part of a whole shall be presented. The fragments have been arranged in an order that presents a suggested plot consecutively. The suggested plot is a result of a combination of testimonia, the pre-existing myth, as presented in the tragic model and elsewhere and the content of the actual fragments. Moreover, common points between the comedy and its tragic model are traced and pointed out, which has also helped to assign some of the fragments to a specific speaker.

This brings us to the third sub-section which will discuss the characters that could have appeared in the play, whether in an essential role or as a silent figure. In order to assemble these characters and discover which parts of their personalities would have been of particular use to Aristophanes, an overview of the ancient literature was essential. Some of the ways and the information that other authors have presented revealed an element that would serve the purpose of the comedy well. Hence, the more relevant passages were consulted and summarised in the present study.

Consequently, after all the different components have been investigated thoroughly, a plot reconstruction is attempted. The content of the potential Scenes (also referred to as Acts, which simply indicates the parts between the choral passages) will be suggested in the fourth sub-section. The sources that transmit the myth were consulted in order to discover in what ways Aristophanes could have turned a tragedy into a comedy in order to parody the tragic model. Plays with a very similar content are also discussed here. In many (if not all) cases, more than one plot component has been suggested pointing to slightly different scenarios, although the content should not digress too much from the original in order to still be recognised as a parody.

Specific allusions to other plays and poets shall be discussed as well as the level of Aristophanes' innovation and originality in handling common themes. Subsequently,

another aspect to be considered is the fact that often in Aristophanic comedies the plot does not revolve exclusively and openly around an existing and widely known myth as it is the case with tragedies. However, the ones that are being addressed here have all been inspired by, if not completely based on, an existing myth and what seems to be the case is that they were heavily based on existing tragedies. Therefore, the existence of other myths relevant to those found in the fragments will complete the picture for the success of the reception.³

To complete our understanding of the plays, the discussion of intertextual parallels across time and space and reference to the contemporary historical reality have contributed greatly to the discovery of the gems hidden within the Aristophanic fragmentary legacy as well as to the considerable enrichment of our knowledge regarding the work of Aristophanes. As a result, reference to the respective myths, their reception and specific tragedies that appear to have been the model for Aristophanes' parodies are crucial at least to the revelation of the plot and characters. Nevertheless, as Karamanou has demonstrated, all the different components of a play are necessary for the endeavor, and especially the plot reconstruction, to be successful, and lack of their availability has rendered it impossible at times.⁴ Indeed, even if we are not in a position to reconstruct every single detail of the plot, it is still possible to explore possible themes and ideas that may have been essential components of the plot.

The attributed fragments, as found in the Kassel-Austin edition,⁵ are presented in an order that in each case appeared to make the greatest sense towards the suggested plot.⁶ In some cases, where the context of the fragment is also included, the actual fragment is presented in bold in order to stand out from the rest of the text in which the fragment is quoted. The fragments are then discussed with regard to content and value for

³ The emphasis here lies on plays that re-tell a myth, not those that adopt narrative details or settings resembling those of myths (such as *Frogs* which is clearly based on *katabasis* myths, especially of Heracles).

⁴ Karamanou (2006) xx-xxi.

⁵ The numbering of the fragments in this edition will be in brackets.

⁶ This method/approach may be challenging but it has been tested successfully in Krenkel (1970). There are other methods that have been applied, such as the chronological order of the fragments, e.g. see Manuwald (2012). In this study, however, the fragments have been arranged in the order that they could have appeared in the play in order to create a plausible plot.

reconstruction. Of particular interest are the commonalities between the Aristophanic fragments and their tragic model as well as other transmitted forms of related myths. Intertextuality, part of which is the parodic model, is of vital importance in deciphering the content and meaning of the fragments as well as the plot of the comedies. The discussion of the fragments in relation to the tragic model will be complemented with the discussion of other literary pieces that were not necessarily composed as a parody of the treatment of the myth by another author, but simply present a different version of the same myth.

The space that each play occupies has been allocated evenly, with one exception. *Aeolosicon* has two additional sub-sections in its introduction regarding the problem of the existence of one or two plays under the same title and their dating. This is an issue that does not come up in the rest of the plays. The production dates of *Polyidus* and *Daedalus* are unknown, although they definitely preceded *Aeolosicon*⁷ and *Cocalus*, which were Aristophanes' final plays. Therefore, *Polyidus* and *Daedalus* precede.⁸ Instead of following a strict chronological order, the last two plays are arranged according to the quality of the elements of progress and generic development they present. Therefore, *Aeolosicon* shall follow as a play that demonstrates characteristics of a 'Middle' comedy, and finally *Cocalus* as a play that includes elements commonly found in a 'New' comedy. That said, this arrangement does not imply that the generic development was a gradual uninterrupted process (as already discussed in the introduction), but it is aimed to help with demonstrating these elements that seem to be more prevalent in the types of Comedy of the following eras.

Consequently, a more complete picture of the work of Aristophanes will emerge, and by adding this essential piece to the puzzle of his corpus one of the immediate outcomes will be a discussion of Aristophanes' contribution to the sub-genres of Middle and New Comedy. This will be based on new evidence from the fragmentary plays and the number of factors that have affected his creativity and the colour of his plays towards the end of his career.

⁷ If there were two *Aeolosicones*, we definitely know that the second one was Aristophanes' last.

⁸ See evidence in 2.3.1 and 2.4.1.

2.1 *Polyidus*: The seer, the resurrection and the fraud

2.1.1 Introduction

Polyidus belongs to the Cretan mythological cycle and focuses on a famous incident that occurred between king Minos and the seer Polyidus. This is a play of an unknown date but important for the purposes of the thesis. *Polyidus* is one of the plays that could have been composed as a parody of the myth of Polyidus, which was also a tragedy by Euripides. It is set outside Athens, on Crete, and it largely concerns a domestic affair. As discussed in the introduction, these are elements that we do not find in Aristophanes' extant plays and are more commonly found in the plays of the later comic sub-genres. This is the argument that I will keep revisiting in the course of this study. According to the mythological tradition,⁹ when king Minos had lost his son, Glaucus, and was looking for him, he did not know what to do, and he held a contest in order to find the best seer. This led him to Polyidus from Corinth, son of Coeranus. Indeed, Polyidus was able to find Minos' son, but not quite in the shape that the Cretan king would have preferred. Glaucus was found drowned in a tub of honey, and Minos, who was infuriated and deeply sad, locked up Polyidus with Glaucus' body. In that cell something miraculous happened. A snake approached the corpse but was killed by Polyidus; soon after, a second snake appeared and covered the first dead snake with grass, bringing it back to life. Polyidus used the same grass on Glaucus and he was revived as well. Minos, instead of freeing and rewarding Polyidus for his marvelous deed detained him so that the Corinthian seer would teach Glaucus the art of prophecy before he left. So Polyidus did and was ready to sail away, but just before his departure he asked Glaucus to spit in his mouth, and thus he took the art of prophecy back and away with him.¹⁰ In other sources, including Amelesagoras,¹¹ Glaucus is resurrected by

⁹ The story is found in Apollodorus (*Library* 3.3.17-20) and Hyginus (*Fabulae* 136); cf. ch. 2.1.4.

¹⁰ 'which seems to be a parody of the Euripidean tragedy (fr. 476), and it is obvious that the story of Glaucus being revoked from death by Polyidus would furnish a lot of funny material for a comic poet. This we know from the hypothesis, I do not know to whom Minos gave his daughter Phaedra as wife (fr. 469), which exceeds the end of the Euripidean tragedy.' Kaibel (1899).

¹¹ *FGrH* 330 F 3.

Asklepios whom Zeus kills afterwards with a thunderbolt. Servius¹² informs us that when little Glaucus grew up he led an expedition against Italy, where he introduced the Cretan shield and the military girdle after he killed king Thybris.

The spitting-in-mouth appears to be a recurring motif among seers. For example, Cassandra spat in Apollo's mouth when he asked for her kiss, but he was not able to take back the art of prophecy; instead, he cursed her never to be believed by anyone. Apollo spitting into her mouth is an alternative version of how he inflicted the curse upon her. The seer Melampus (Polyidus' ancestor) also interacted with serpents saving their lives, which offered him the gift of understanding the language of birds after they licked his ears. Snakes licking Cassandra's ears was another tradition of how she became a prophetess. In the European folktale of *The White Snake*, the hero comes to understand the language of beasts after being in contact with a serpent, whether he ate it, touched it or spat into his mouth.¹³

According to Pellegrino,¹⁴ the production of the play took place after the Sicilian expedition in 413 BC and the content was related to the events; more specifically, the Athenians were accusing the seers of filling them with hope when the outcome was utterly destructive for them.¹⁵ Aristophanes could have used the character of Polyidus to express this enmity and anger towards these seers who made the Athenians believe that they could conquer Sicily. Theseus' involvement in the story could be of a similar purpose; in Herodotus IX the Deceleans are accusing him of unnecessarily leading them to a war with the Spartans, just like many Athenians felt about Pericles.¹⁶

¹² *Aen.* 7.796; 8.72, 330; 10.564.

¹³ Rose (1959) 244. For the different versions see Grimal (1991: 346, 432) who goes through the primary evidence.

¹⁴ Pellegrino (2015) 273; the same belief is found in Blaydes (1885: 234). Edmonds (1957: 699) on the other hand, suggests that the play was performed between 419 and 413BC.

¹⁵ cf. Flower (2008) 115-119.

¹⁶ cf. Walker (1995) 195-199. Despite Pericles having long been dead by the potential production of the play, he was certainly a figure to be remembered as he was very much connected with the still ongoing Peloponnesian war.

The same basic story is retold by Sophocles and Euripides¹⁷ in their lost plays named after the seer,¹⁸ as much as we can tell from the fragments, and by Aeschylus in his play *Cretan Women*. Minos and Pasiphae receive an oracle by Apollo regarding their son Glaucus and are trying to decipher it in vain. The oracle talked about a marvelous cow that lived in Minos' herds and would change its colour thrice a day, into white, red and black. According to the oracle, the person that would be able to find something similarly spectacular, would also find Glaucus. The Cretan seers fail to do so until Polyidus appears and finds the solution to the riddle. He suggested a mulberry, which also changes colours throughout its life, and it is white as a bud, then turns red and eventually black. The story ends in the known way.

The riddle-nature of the myth would definitely appeal to the poets of Middle Comedy. Eubulus, Antiphanes and Anaxilas also exploited the myth and wrote comedies titled *Glaucus*, although there are barely any surviving fragments to tell us more about it. However, it is quite interesting that the poets of Middle Comedy clearly picked up the thread of the Aristophanic tradition. The same phenomenon is noticed in *Daedalus*, plays with this same title were written by Eubulus, Plato Comicus as well as Aristophanes, and apparently dealt with the same subject.¹⁹

The Polyidus-Glaucus type of story was a popular one in the Greek world that bears resemblance to and was undoubtedly influenced by Eastern traditions of the 'trial by riddle' stories.²⁰ Polyidus falls to this category since he needs to solve a first riddle (the *eikasmos*-riddle) in order to prove his worth and then he is assigned with the real and final *adynaton* problem (to restore Glaucus to his father). The myth has also attracted the attention of modern research for its initiation connotations. Linguistic connections between the potential animals of the myth, mouse or flies (*μῦς* or *μῦραι*), and the verb

¹⁷ Collard and Cropp (2008) suggest but do not pursue that the Aristophanic play is a burlesque of the Euripidean version.

¹⁸ Although the title of Sophocles' play may have actually been *Seers*, named after the members of the chorus of the play.

¹⁹ Hunter (1983) 110-113. Plato Comicus appears to have been a contemporary of Aristophanes, whose work presents many characteristics of Middle Comedy too (for a discussion on the matter see Rosen 1995).

²⁰ Konstantakos (2004) 104-108, 128-132.

initiate (*μυέω*) have been noticed.²¹ Young Glaucus went through the three stages of transformation (just like the berry of the riddle). These were the following: separation from society, a transitory period while he was buried and thought dead, and a rebirth and reincorporation in the society.²² This observation, combined with our knowledge of the young male initiation rituals particularly in Crete, illuminates a different aspect of the story and provides us with additional reasons that justify Aristophanes' interest in this particular myth.²³

2.1.2 The fragments

1.Suda α 2048 (470)

Ἀνάριστος: μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναρίστητος. Ἀριστοφάνης *Πολυίδω*.
διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς τρέχων, ἀναρίστητος ὢν.

Tr. *Ἀνάριστος* (Unbreakfasted): but rather *ἀναρίστητος*. Aristophanes in *Polyidus*;

running through the market, although being unbreakfasted.

This could be a reference to the time of the play's events that seem to have started early in the morning. Someone was rushing to the market to acquire something that was so important at the time that he went out there without having eaten his breakfast first.

2.Suda ε 2965 (473)

ἔρημον ἐμβλέπειν· ἀκίνητον καὶ νοθρόν, οἷον ὅταν εἰς ἐρημίαν ἢ πέλαγος μέγα καὶ ἀχανὲς βλέπωμεν. Ἀριστοφάνης *Πολυίδω*.

²¹ Jeanmaire (1939) 449.

²² Hoffman (1997) 122-125.

²³ For more information on the ritualistic aspect of the myth see Muellner (1998) 15–27; Willetts (1959) 21-28; Jeanmair (1939) 444-450. On initiation rituals and comedy see Lada-Richards (1999) and Bowie (1993).

Tr. To have a vacant look; still and idle, like when we are staring at a desert or the large and infinite sea. Aristophanes in *Polyidus*.

This could be a reference to the seers' look when they were interpreting auguries or when they had an epiphany, or a reference to Glaucus' look when he was found dead.

3.Stobaeus 4.51.15, vol. V 1069 H. (468)

Ἀριστοφάνους *Πολυΐδου*.

τὸ γὰρ φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θάνατον λῆρος πολὺς·
πᾶσιν γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦτ' ὀφείλεται παθεῖν

Tr. From Aristophanes' *Polyidus*.

For fearing death is great senselessness;

For this is due to all of us to suffer

This fragment from Stobaeus' collection of statements *Περὶ θανάτου* gives a famous maxim, although not of unique reference in drama as a similar line is also to be found in Sophocles' *Electra* 1171-3, which also indicates a *terminus post quem* (although we do not know when that terminus was exactly as the play is undated). Since the context is missing, we cannot be sure if that is an instance of parody or simply an intertextual reference.

{XO.} Θνητοῦ πέφυκας πατρός, Ἥλέκτρα, φρόνει·
θνητὸς δ' Ὀρέστης· ὥστε μὴ λῖαν στένε·
πᾶσιν γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦτ' ὀφείλεται παθεῖν

Tr. Chorus:

Remember, Electra, you are the offspring of a mortal father;

Orestes was mortal too. Therefore do not grieve so much.

For this (death) is due to all of us to suffer

This fragment seems to be part of an agon between Minos and Polyidus and it is worth to compare it with a very similar fragment from the Euripidean play:

Euripides' *Polyidus*

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ κατθανεῖν,
τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν κάτω νομίζεται;

Tr. Who knows if to live is to die,
and if in the underworld to die is considered to live?

Apparently, this is one of Aristophanes' favourite Euripidean topoi as he also refers to it in *Frogs* 1476-78:

{EY.} ὦ σχέτλιε, περιόψει με δὴ τεθνηκότα;
{ΔΙ.} «Τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ κατθανεῖν»,
τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθεύδειν κῶδιον;

Tr.Euripides:

You wretched, will you neglect me now I'm dead?

Dionysus:

Who knows if living is dying?

To breathe to dine, and to sleep a rug?

These lines are spoken right after Dionysus has made his decision on which poet to bring back to life. His decision infuriates Euripides, who expected to be the chosen one as Dionysus had sworn, but now he goes back on his promise (1469-71). In Euripides' *Polyidus*, these lines could have been uttered by the seer in defense against Minos' anger when his son was discovered dead. On the other hand, Minos could have been the one in need of a glib justification for burying Polyidus alive instead of rewarding him for finding his son.

In Aristophanes' *Polyidus* it is unclear who utters these lines; Bergk²⁴ suggests it is king Minos but it is equally probable to have come from Polyidus since he was the wiser one. More specifically, it could have been the seer's response to either Minos' attitude to the death of his son or to Polyidus' conviction by Minos. A wise man has no reason to fear his imminent and unavoidable death. On the other hand, this fragment could be part of a contest between Polyidus and the king or one of the king's advisors uttering a cliché about the inevitability of death. If that was the case, then we can easily imagine a punchline coming right after from Polyidus who proved that he could cheat death and revive the dead. Either way, it could result in Polyidus being locked up.

4.CGFP 343.21 (471)

καὶ ἐν Σατύροις· ἀλλ' ὅταν

[]σ, σάφ' ἴστε, καὶ σοφοῖς

]ε κἄν ὄναρ σε μόνον

]αι

[βέλεκκοι Ἀριστοφάνη]σ ἐν *Πολυίδῳ* / καὶ

[τῶν βελέκκων λέγ]ει δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν

[Φαινίας] τοῦτον ἔστιν

[]...[.]εσ παρὰ τοῖς τὴν

[]...[.] ὥς]περ ὁ πίσος καὶ λά-

[θυρος]]ι κριῶι τῶι τὸ μέγε-

[θος]]...καλοῦσιν

]...[

— — — —

Tr. and]in Satyrs; but when

[]s, you know well, and the wise

]e whether a dream only to you

]ai

²⁴ 'dicit haec nescio quis, fort. Minos rex, in Polyidum, quem iubet una cum Glauci corpore sepulchre includi' Bergk (cited in Meineke 1840).

[legumes - - - Aristophane]s in *Polyidus* / and

[of the legumes sa]ys about these

[Fainias]that he is

[]...[.]es beside which

[].[. li]ke the pea and chick-

[ling] of a chick-pea the si-

[ze]...they call

].[

- - - -

The word appears to be an *hapax legomenon*. According to Hesychius the definition of the word is:

β471

<βέλεκκος>· ὄσπριόν τι ἐμφερές λαθύρω μέγεθος ἐρεβίνθου ἔχον

Tr. legume; some kind of bean, similar to a chickling, which has the size of a chick-pea

This fragment is not that informative as to the plot, but it gives away one of the jokes that Aristophanes may have used here, which had to do with the consumption of legumes followed by the traditional gas production. On a second deeper level, we cannot ignore the special symbolism of beans in ancient Greek philosophy. There was the belief that beans were unclean food as they contained the souls of the dead,²⁵ hence the awful smell they gave off once opened. Pythagoras is said to have been completely opposed to the consumption of beans:

²⁵ The same idea is expressed in Latin literature: Pliny *HN* 18.118; Varro ap. Non. p. 135.15 M.; Ov. *Fast.* 5.435ff.

Aristotle fr. 195 = Diogenes Laertius VIII.34

φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης (195 Rose) ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων
παραγγέλλειν αὐτὸν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν κυάμων ἥτοι ὅτι αἰδοίοις εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι
ἢ ὅτι Ἄιδου πύλαις. ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον· ἢ ὅτι φθείρει ἢ ὅτι τῇ τοῦ ὅλου
φύσει ὅμοιον ἢ ὅτι ὀλιγαρχικόν· κληροῦνται γοῦν αὐτοῖς.

Tr. Aristotle says in his *On the Pythagoreans* that, Pythagoras counselled
abstinence from beans, either because they are like genitals, or the gates of
Hades, as being alone unjointed or because they are injurious, or because
they are like the form of the universe (τὸ ὅλον), or because they belong
<not> to oligarchy, since they are used in election by lot. (tr. Hicks)

Along the same lines is this couplet in the Homeric scholia:

ψυχῆς αἰζηῶν βάσιν ἔμμεναι ἢδ' ἀναβαθμὸν
ἐξ Αἴδαο δόμων, ὅταν αὐγὰς εἰσανίωσιν.

Tr. they are the step of the soul of the vigorous and stair
out of the Hades' chambers, when they rise towards the light.

Apparently, the beans were the medium of souls in order to achieve metempsychosis or
reincarnation. Aeschylus expresses the same idea in his *Glaucus Pontios*, in which
Glaucus of Boeotia gained immortality after consuming a herb (fr.28f) and became a
sea-god and a seer.²⁶ Was that the same herb that Polyidus applied on Glaucus? It is
quite clear that this Glaucus is not Minos' son but it is still very interesting that this
idea of immortality through beans/herbs that penetrates the ancient tradition is also
attested in Greek drama. Glaucus' herb, according to Palaephatus (*De incredibil.*, 26),
was given to Polyidus by a doctor named Drakon. Palaephatus connected the two
professions most likely through a developing tradition during which the drakon became

²⁶ For more details on the Glaucus Pontios story see Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 1.1309 ff;
Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9. 22. 7; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4. 48. 6; Philostratus the
Elder, *Imagines* 2. 15; Hyginus, *Fabulae* 199; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.900 - 14.74.

doctor Drakon. In Claudian's *De bello Getico* (438-449), we read a brief description of the (original) story, in which Claudian connects Polyidus' herb with the one that Circe used to resurrect Latona's daughter.

On the other hand, Aristoxenus believes the exact opposite regarding Pythagoras (fr.25), ie. that he approved of them and did not reject them:

Πυθαγόρας δὲ τῶν ὀσπρίων μάλιστα τὸν κύαμον ἐδοκίμασεν.
λειάντικόν τε γὰρ εἶναι καὶ διαχωρητικόν, διὸ καὶ μάλιστα κέχρηται αὐτῷ.

Tr. Pythagoras of all the legumes approved greatly the bean.
Because it is soothing and laxative, for which reason he used it a lot.

The idea of the forbidden beans also existed in other philosophical streams, such as orphism and Empedocles (OF, fr. 291; 31 B 141), which were both linked to metempsychosis.²⁷ On a more logical level, one could side with Callimachus (fr.553), whose explanation involves an allergy that Pythagoras had to beans, which may also be connected to his way of death. Pythagoras tried to escape but stopped in front of a field of beans, which he would not dare to cross:

Diogenes Laertius (VIII, 39-40)

τινὲς δ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς Κροτωνιάτας τοῦτο πράξαι, τυραννίδος ἐπίθεσιν
εὐλαβουμένους. Τὸν δὴ Πυθαγόραν καταλειφθῆναι διεξιόντα· καὶ πρὸς τινι
χωρίῳ γενόμενος πλήρει κύαμων κτλ.

Tr. some of these Krotonians did this, being cautious of an attempt to gain
tyranny. They seized Pythagoras while he was exiting; he was near a field full
of beans etc.

²⁷ For more information on Pythagoras and the beans see Zhmud et al. (2012) 237-8; Brumbaugh and Schwartz (1980) 421-2; Scarborough (1982) 355-8.

The special qualities of these beans have been well attested in the ancient world. There also was the well described and analysed notion that men resemble beans: “The blossom of the plant, or the bean itself, are transformed through certain procedures into human form, or into the form of parts of the human body, they are reminiscent of genitalia and smell like semen. At the origin of the world, bean and man emerged from the same primeval slime.”²⁸

To sum up, the legumes or beans referred to in our fragment could have several connotations. Their implications span from a reference to Greek philosophy and the various beliefs around their significance, with the most important and relevant for us being their connection to metempsychosis, to the funny, smelly, gassy results that followed their consumption. A suitable use of these in the play could be inside Glaucus’ tomb while Polyidus is trying to bring him back to life. Aristophanes could have also used their awful smell from which Polyidus would not be able to escape within the confines of the tomb in order to provoke laughter.

5.Suda θ 369 (475)

θησειότριψ· ὁ ἐν τῷ Θησειῷ διατρίψας. Ἀριστοφάνης *Πολυῖδω*. καὶ **θησ<ει>ομύζων** δὲ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λέγει.

Tr. Theseion-loiterer; someone who loiters in the Theseion. In Aristophanes’ *Polyidus*. He also says ‘Theseus-moaner’ in the same play.

The Theseion was built around 470 BC in the site where they buried Theseus’ bones, after Kimon brought them back from Skyros.²⁹ It was utterly sacred and a place where fugitives could find asylum. The site was also used for a number of other activities, such as assemblies, trials and elections.³⁰ Although the interaction of mythical and real-world elements is not new in Aristophanic comedy, it is a problematic issue when we

²⁸ Burkert (1972) 184.

²⁹ Webster (1973) 149.

³⁰ Weller (1913) 151; Papazarkadas (2011) 116; Robertson (1998) 297-298; Plutarch, *Thes.* 36.1-4; 9 Aischines, *Ctes.* 3.13; [Aristotle], *Ath. Pol.* 62.1.

talk about audience perception and what they would see as fictional or real. This is a technique by no means restricted to comedy; Pindar, for example, is connecting myth and reality when composing his epinicians, and, although his aim is not parody but glorification and correction of troublesome behaviours, the similarities between his fictional and real-world characters could be easily recognised.

Elements of the real contemporary life and references to real-life people are often in Aristophanes' plays. In *Polyidus*, the agora in the first fragment is surely an example of that, as well as the reference to the Theseion. It is hard to know with certainty to what extent the myths retold by the poets equaled fiction for the contemporary Athenian. Although the line between real and fiction seems to have been rather blurry, their mix would not necessarily create problems for the Greek audience; they would still identify the similarities between the fictional characters and the real ones.³¹ This is one of the ways that myth burlesque operated and which its success depended on.³² Aristophanes, bringing on stage characters from the past (whether fictional or not) in a parody, resembles Bakhtin's notion of parody as a way of 'contemporizing' the past.³³

The person described in the fragment could be a runaway slave (LSJ) or anyone who is trying to run away from something/somebody; there is a similar case in Aristophanes' *Seasons*,³⁴ where somebody is running to the Theseion hoping that he will be found by a potential buyer. Judging from the plot of the play, the person who is trying to sell himself in *Seasons* is no one else but the god Sabazius, who is being expelled from Athens.

6.Stobaeus 4.22^b, 43 p. 517 H. (469)

Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Πολυίδῳ.

ἰδοὺ δίδωμι τήνδ' ἐγὼ γυναῖκά σοι

Φαίδραν· ἐπὶ πῦρ δὲ πῦρ³⁵ ἔοιχ' ἤκειν ἄγων.

³¹ For a fuller discussion on this see Ruffell (2016); (2011).

³² cf. Zeitlin (1981); Genette (1982) 2-36.

³³ Bakhtin (1981) 21.

³⁴ Pollux 7.13.

³⁵ The proverb 'πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ' is also found elsewhere in ancient Greek literature, for more sources see K-A fr. 469.

Tr. Aristophanes in *Polyidus*.

There, I give you this woman

Phaedra; though I do seem to have come bringing a fire to a fire.

This line from Stobaeus' chapter *Περὶ γάμου* is likely to have been uttered by Minos, who betrothed his daughter, Phaedra, to Theseus. However, it is hard to imagine Theseus being there, but then again, comic poets have always been innovative and Aristophanes could have brought him in if he wanted to.³⁶ Sommerstein also finds it quite possible that Theseus visited Crete (again) in order to get married to Phaedra and that this second visit coincided with the Polyidus-Glaucus episode.³⁷ He suggests an interpretation of the proverb either as a reference to the 'explosive union' of Phaedra and Theseus or Minos is acknowledging the risk he is taking if we consider Theseus' previous treatment of Ariadne, Minos' other daughter. Moreover, one should also consider Theseus' general 'bad boy' history with the abduction of Helen and Persephone, and of course all his beneficial achievements through fighting and killing.³⁸ It is even more interesting that in the same paragraph Sommerstein draws a connection between this fragment and a passage from Euripides' *Hippolytus Kalyptomenos*, fr. 429: "a chorus of women describe womankind as ἀντὶ πυρὸς...ἄλλο πῦρ μεῖζον...πολὺ δυσμαχώτερον ('in place of fire...a different fire, greater and much harder to fight'). Kassel and Austin on Aristophanes' fr. 469 see no connection ('minus apte comparatur'), but Collard and Cropp on Euripides fr. 429 take the Aristophanic fragment as 'almost certainly an allusion' to the *HippK* passage." Sommerstein's opinion on the relation between the two fragments is rather convincing and one could also see this connection as a hint to what Aristophanes is about to contemplate in his

³⁶ cf. Meineke (1739) 1134-5.

³⁷ Sommerstein (2014) 178.

³⁸ For more information on Theseus' deeds see Walker (1995) 15-20. It is very hard to guess what Theseus' role in the play might have been; one suggestion could be his placement as Polyidus' ally in order to save him from Minos' anger with the view to marry Phaedra and forge an alliance with the king of Crete.

Anagyrus, which contains hints of parody of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, as Henderson suggested.³⁹

7.Pollux 9.31 (472)

Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Πολυίδῳ*· ἐλλιμενίζεις ἢ δεκατεύεις.

Tr. Aristophanes in *Polyidus*; you exact harbour-dues or you exact a *tithe*.

The same verb is found in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 655-660:

{Bδ.} ἀκρόασαί νυν, ὦ παπίδιον, χαλάσας ὀλίγον τὸ μέτωπον.
καὶ πρῶτον μὲν λόγισαι φαύλως, μὴ ψήφοις ἀλλ' ἀπὸ
χειρός, τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων συλλήβδην τὸν προσιόντα,
κᾶξω τούτου τὰ τέλη χωρὶς καὶ τὰς πολλὰς ἑκατοστάς,
πρυτανεῖα, μέταλλ', ἀγοράς, λιμένας, μισθώσεις, δημιόπρατα·
τούτων πλήρωμα τάλαντ' ἐγγὺς δισχίλια γίγνεται ἡμῖν.

Tr. Bdelycleon

Listen to me, dear little father, unruffle that frowning forehead a bit.
and reckon first without trouble, not with pebbles,
but on your fingers, what is the total of the tribute paid to us by the allied cities,
besides this we have the direct imposts, a mass of percentage dues,
the fees of the courts of justice, the produce from the mines, the markets, the
harbours, the public lands and the confiscations;
all these together amount to nearly two thousand talents.

The context of this fragment in our play is rather unclear, it could have simply been a reference to the same kind of taxes as in *Wasps*, with also a potential reference to the human tribute that Athens payed to Minos until Theseus' interference, since Theseus is referred to (if not actually appearing) in the play.

³⁹ Henderson (2007) 129.

8.Moeris 204.19 Bk. (474)

οὐκ ἀπέρκει· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἀπέχρει. Ἀριστοφάνης *Πολυίδω*

Tr. οὐκ ἀπέρκει (it wasn't enough); instead of οὐκ ἀπέχρει. Aristophanes in *Polyidus*.

9.Pollux 9.130 (476)

Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν *Πολυείδω* καὶ **προσεμφερίης** εἶπε.

Tr. Aristophanes in *Polyidus* also said 'similar'.

This one-word fragment is used by Pollux to indicate a synonym for ὅμοιος (similar). This is a possible intertextual reference to the mulberry that was similar to the cow, as attested in the Aeschylean fragment.⁴⁰

*Pollux 10.45 attributes Ar. *Thesmophoriazusae* 633 to our play. The reference is found in the section on the necessities of the toilet:

τῇ δὲ γυναικὶ σκάφιον, ὥς ἐν *Αὐτολύκῳ* Εὐπολῖς,
τί δῆτ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ τὸ σκάφιον αὐτῇ παρῆν;
ἄμφω δὲ παράλληλα ἐν *Πολυείδῳ* Ἀριστοφάνης,
σκάφιον ξενύλλ'⁴¹ ἥτησεν· οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀμῖς

Tr.: a woman's chamber-pot/nightstool, as Eupolis says in *Autolycus*,
But what then, if she didn't have the chamber-pot?
Both and beside one another in *Polyidus*, Aristophanes says,
Xenylla asked for a cup; for there wasn't any thunder-mug.

⁴⁰ *TrGF3*, F116-120, pp. 229-230.

⁴¹ In *Thesmophoriazusae* the text reads σκάφιον Ξένυλλ'.

Henderson, in the Loeb, excludes it, following Kassel-Austin's note: "Thesmophoriazusae 633 ex Polyido affert Poll. X 45 (ἐν πολυείδωι ABCL, ἐν πολυδωι FS), ubi Polyidi versum excidisse praeunte Dindorfio censet Kaibel. vid. Fritzsche Thesmophoriazusae P. 230 sq."

2.1.3 The characters

The following characters can be ascertained for this play: Polyidus, Minos,⁴² Glaucus, Theseus, Phaedra.⁴³

POLYIDUS⁴⁴

The title of the play suggests that the Greek seer Polyidus is the protagonist in this play, therefore is logical to start with the information that ancient literature has transmitted and an overview of the literary tradition that has shaped the character we know today as the ancient Greek seer Polyidus. This information is essential to our work as it helps us shed light on the (distorted) ways that Aristophanes may have presented him in his play as well as his actual role.

Polyidus' figure travels back in time as far as the Homeric epics. In *Iliad* 13.663-8 and 5.143-151, we read about Polyidus' son, Euchenor and how he fought at Troy. Polyidus, we read, had foreseen his son's imminent death whether he fought at Troy or stayed at home. From the second passage we learn about his death in the hands of Diomedes and Homer also names Polyidus' father, Eurydamas. In a very damaged Hesiodic fragment,⁴⁵ however, it appears that Euchenor's father was Coeranus and Polyidus, with Manto and Pronoe (clearly etymologically connected), are descendants of the seer Melampus.⁴⁶ Athenaeus was also familiar with Polyidus and in his

⁴² See the relevant section in *Cocalus*.

⁴³ Of all of them, however, only Phaedra is directly attested in the fragments (fr. 6). Theseus' name is also mentioned as part of the compound words of fr. 5.

⁴⁴ For a very detailed conglomeration of sources on Polyidus for the purposes of illuminating his character as he appears in Greek tragedy see Carrara (2014).

⁴⁵ Hesiod Fr. 136, line 5-7, P. Oxy. 2501, ed. Lobel.

⁴⁶ cf. Collard & Cropp (2008) 89.

Deipnosophistae we see him placed on the street performing some sort of a sacrifice, which was part of his profession.⁴⁷

Polyidus' genealogy does not become any clearer in Pausanias who considers him son of Coeranus but assigns two daughters to him, Astycratea and Manto, who were buried in Megara. In this source, Polyidus is the great grandson of Melampus. We also learn that Polyidus built a shrine for Dionysus in Megara. Now Euchenor appears here too dedicating a statue of Dionysus as Polyidus' grandson this time. To conclude, according to Pausanias, the genealogical tree goes like this (from older to younger male members): Melampus – Abas – Coeranus – Polyidus – Coeranus – Euchenor.⁴⁸

GLAUCUS⁴⁹

Apart from the sources already discussed our Glaucus does not appear in many others. One that describes some of his adventures when he grew up comes from Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* 7.796, 8.72, and 8.330. Glaucus invaded Italy, killed king Thybris and introduced the Cretan shield and the military girdle.

THESEUS and PHAEDRA

Theseus and Phaedra are not part of the traditional myth but the fragment probably describing their marriage indicates towards their presence. Perhaps an overview of their activity in Crete up to their marriage could help us identify their place in the Aristophanic version of the story. The problem is that apart from the fact that the wedding happened after the events between Theseus and the Amazon, Hippolytus' mother, the literature does not transmit any details from the wedding day. Therefore, what we can conclude is that the marriage may symbolize an alliance between Crete

⁴⁷ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.1.5-10.

⁴⁸ Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.43.5.

⁴⁹ For a full list with the pictorial evidence as well as info on the other 'Glaukoi' see LIMC s.v. *Glaukos*.

and Athens and the end of their conflicts. Phaedra may actually not have any other more organic part to play in the comedy.

There is, however, one source that is worth mentioning here and that is Plutarch's *Life of Theseus* 19.4, in which he mentions the triangular connection between Minos, Daedalus and Theseus. After the events with Pasiphae and Minos' death in Sicily, his son, Deukalion, continued the pursuit of Daedalus to Athens, demanding that they deliver Daedalus to him, but Theseus refused. Soon after these events, Theseus went sneakily to Crete, killed Deukalion and made a truce with Ariadne (who was head of affairs now as Plutarch says), ending the hostilities between the two cities for good. It seems that Daedalus and Polyidus had a similar adventure on Crete, as they were both at the king's service, but then the king turned against them and both had to seek shelter. If that shelter was Theseus for both, then the dispute could have ended in a similar way as well, Theseus receiving Ariadne in the first instance and Phaedra in the second (although chronologically it would be the other way round), forging an alliance with Crete both times as they both were the Cretan king's daughters.

To sum up, Polyidus was a known character in the ancient world, who comes from a long family line of seers. Minos has been depicted as a savage, difficult and unfair character,⁵⁰ as well as lord of the sea and lawgiver.⁵¹ For Glaucus, son of Minos, we do not have much but we do have later evidence that presents him as a successful military leader. Phaedra and Theseus are perhaps the most puzzling characters as they were not part of the myth. However, ironically, they are the only two characters whose names have survived in the fragments. Theseus' life seems to be connected with Crete in a violent way. He went there to kill the Minotaur, he offered shelter to Daedalus when Deukalion, son of Minos, was after him, thus creating tension between the two kingdoms. The dispute was resolved with Ariadne's help. A parallel involvement of Theseus would be an option in Aristophanes' play as well.

⁵⁰ Plato, *Minos*, 318.d.7-10.

⁵¹ Thucydides 1.4.1; Lucian, *Dialogi mortuorum*, Dialogue 25.

2.1.4 The plot of *Polyidus*: Linger between truth and deceit

A complete version of the myth of Polyidus and Glaucus is found in Apollodorus and Hyginus. They are the most important mythographers of the Greek and Roman civilisation respectively. Apollodorus' *Library* was composed c. 1st/2nd c. AD, probably by one of his students, and is an invaluable source as a compendium of Greek myths and heroic legends. Hyginus' *Fabulae* is the Latin equivalent composed around the same period (1st c. AD), and it offers a compendium of mythological legends and celestial genealogies.⁵² Both of them include an account of our myth in their works and follow the same main storyline, if with a few variations here and there.

Apollodorus' Glaucus fell into the jar while chasing a mouse, while in Hyginus he was playing with a ball. The Greek account wants the Curetes to be the source of advice to Minos, while the Latin speaks of Apollo instead. In both sources, Polyidus son of Coeranus accomplishes the same task. However, only Hyginus gives the details of the sort of divination that Polyidus used in order to find the body of Glaucus. Minos' reaction and impossible wish is the same, as is the episode in the tomb, with the only variation of the murder weapon that Polyidus used to kill the snake, being a stone in Apollodorus and a sword in Hyginus. For Hyginus the story finishes with Glaucus' successful restoration to Minos, but Apollodorus also includes the extra task that Polyidus had to fulfil before he was set free. Polyidus agreed to offer this gift to Glaucus, but he took it back right before he sailed away.⁵³ This is generally a tragicomic story on its own, so we can understand why it could easily be the object of the plot in both a tragedy and a comedy by a slight change in focus here and there.

Palaephatus was a mythographer of the late 4th c. BC with a rather sceptical approach to these incredible stories.⁵⁴ In his *De Incredilibus* (26) he includes a few lines describing the Polyidos-Glaucus incident as well, with a slight variation. Palaephatus finds the original story absolutely absurd (*παγγέλαιος*), and therefore in his own version of it Glaucus was not dead but simply unconscious and Polyidus, following the instructions of a doctor named Drakon, used the herb to heal Glaucus. This was a more

⁵² For more information on the work of both see Trzaskoma and Smith (2007).

⁵³ For a very good comparative work on the two sources see Muellner (1998) 1–14.

⁵⁴ For more on Palaephatus and his work see Stern (1996).

rationalistic approach by all means, another sign of the decadence of seers and the contempt of people towards them.

The question with every Aristophanic parody surviving in a fragmentary form is always summarised in the one single word: how? It is always helpful to know the mythical tradition of the story or the incident that Aristophanes parodies, but it is even more useful to know the plot of the lost tragedies that were contemplating the same story and which are most likely to have been Aristophanes' object of parody. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to know Aeschylus' particular focus in the myth in his *Cretan Women*, as only one (or two)⁵⁵ fragment survives, which refers to the berry riddle that Polyidus had solved. Judging from the two possible titles of Sophocles' relevant play (*Seers* or *Polyidus*), it is plausible that there was a chorus of seers,⁵⁶ a group of people who shared a talent which at times can be a curse, as it often happens in Greek literature (e.g. Teiresias in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Cassandra in *Agamemnon*). In the few fragments that survive we read about a festival that took place, Polyidus and Phamenus (maybe a rival seer), the riddle and the first snake which Polyidus had killed.⁵⁷

We find ourselves in a much more fortunate position with Euripides' *Polyidus*, from which we have more fragments, enough to illuminate key plot features. The testimonia include the full plot and the fragments include various maxims possibly uttered by Polyidus regarding money, happiness, justice and old age, the eagle that he saw as a sign and indicator to the place where Glaucus lay. There is one fragment that refers to perjury and similar crimes that are not forgiven by the gods as they are more intelligent than humans:

⁵⁵ *TrGF*3, F116-120, p. 229-230; see also Sommerstein (2008: 122-3), where he suggests that fragment 451h also belonged to this play, as it refers to the troubles of a man known for his hospitality and justice (presumably Minos), who has now suffered the death of a kin and is probably blaming the Corinthian seer for it, therefore assigning an impossible task to him as a punishment.

⁵⁶ It has also been suggested that this play was a Satyr play, in which the Seers of the title would have been satyrs dressed as seers trying to get some sort of a reward (Lloyd-Jones 1996: 207).

⁵⁷ cf. Pearson et al. (1917) 56-64.

Euripides' *Polyidus*, fr. 645

συγγνώμονάς τοι τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι δόκεις,
ὅταν τις ὄρκῳ θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν θέλῃ
ἢ δεσμὸν ἢ βίαια πολέμιων κακά,
ἢ τοῖσιν αὐθένταισι κοινωνῇ δόμων;
ἢ τάρ' αὖ θνητῶν εἰσιν ἀσυνετώτεροι,
εἰ τὰ πικρὰ πρόσθεν ἡγοῦνται δίκης.

Tr.: Do you think the gods are forgiving,
when someone wishes through perjury to escape death,
or bond, or violent harm from enemies,
or when he shares his house with murderers?
In that case, truly they are less intelligent than mortal men,
if they consider that fairness⁵⁸ comes before justice.

It would be useful to know the context and speaker in order to consider possible ways that Aristophanes might have used this. It seems plausible, though, that Polyidus facing death would commit perjury in order to escape death in the comedy. However, in the more serious tragedy the speaker could have very well been Polyidus, who is trying to prove that he is not lying when he tells Minos that it is not possible to revive his child. Minos' false oath could also be a possible context for this in the tragedy and perhaps in the comedy too.

While it is impossible to decide on which one of these plays and playwrights Aristophanes based his plot, and without ruling out the possibility that he took elements of all three and created a new comic version of the tragic myth,⁵⁹ it would not be

⁵⁸ This is the translation that is suggested in TLG for this specific fragment, which is the translation used when the adjective is in its plural neuter form like here (τὰ πικρὰ). Perhaps another suitable translation, which we also find in TLG, would be 'not according to the letter of the law', which would justify the difference stated in the Euripidean fragment to exist between τὰ πικρὰ and δίκη.

⁵⁹ cf. the prologue of *Peace*, which contains parodic references to Euripides' *Aeolus* and *Bellerophon* (for an analysis of this see Telò 2010).

surprising if he had actually been inspired by the Euripidean drama, especially if the scene of the incarceration in the tomb was included.⁶⁰

The details of Aristophanes' play are impossible to reveal at present given the fact that only nine fragments survive, one to two lines long each. What is still possible, though, is to see what we can make of these very few fragments regarding the plot of the comedy *Polyidus*. As mentioned before, the myth of Polyidus, fortunately for Aristophanes, does include some tragicomic instances, such as the fall of Glaucus into the honey tub or the scene in which Glaucus would have to spit in Polyidus' mouth in order to return the knowledge he had previously acquired from him. Also, the confinement of Polyidus in a tomb with a corpse and the staging of him fighting a snake could take a funny twist. The involvement of Theseus and Phaedra, although not a part of the traditional myth, could also suggest possible plot directions.⁶¹

The play was probably set on Crete, outside Minos' palace. Everyone is in unrest as the king has lost his son and is depressed and frustrated sending out for help all of his servants, one of whom could be the speaker of the first fragment, who complains about the early start of his day assigned with a task that prevented him from enjoying a full breakfast.⁶² This funny opening of the play would have also allowed for the speaker to relate the facts and reasons that are behind his complaint, which is often the job of a slave or servant.⁶³ As far as the nature of his task is concerned, if we place this scene at the beginning of the play, he could be the gatherer of the local seers that Minos needed, therefore the market place where everyone frequented is perfectly justified. The fragment found in Suda (ε 2965) may also refer to Polyidus' look while he was reading an omen as a seer.

⁶⁰ cf. Collard and Cropp (2008) 91; *TrGF*, p. 625.

⁶¹ It is, of course, impossible to reconstruct the plot with confidence; nevertheless, it is still feasible to suggest possibilities.

⁶² Suda α 2048.

⁶³ Slaves appearing in the prologue of an Aristophanic play is common in any case, as is the narration of the context of the play (cf. Dunbar 1995: 131).

The next scene that we can insinuate from the surviving fragments could be an agon between Polyidus and Minos,⁶⁴ similar to the one that occurs in Euripides' tragedy at least. This debate is where Aristophanes could have presented seers and fortune tellers in a negative light. Their involvement in decision making during the Peloponnesian war and especially before the Sicilian fiasco is attested in Thucydides.⁶⁵

The presence of seers in ancient literature is prominent and their contribution is quite significant in important turning points and landmarks in history.⁶⁶ However, their treatment differs in the various genres of Greek literature.⁶⁷ In epic and tragedy, for example, seers such as Amphiaraus and Teiresias are held in high esteem, whereas in comedy they are attacked and ridiculed for always being wrong (e.g. Aristophanes' *Peace* 1047 and *Birds* 521, 529).⁶⁸ That said, we should not disregard the fact that even seers like Teiresias do get questioned and treated as corrupted (*Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Antigone*, *Bacchae*).⁶⁹ Although Aristophanes never really attacks the centres of divination, such as Delphi, he openly ridicules individual seers, the various *χρησμολόγοι*, who are nothing more than charlatans and liars in his comedies. He cares to attack those who pose a danger for his *polis* and are useful tools in the hands of demagogues, whether they are *manteis* or *chresmologoi*, such as Hierocles,⁷⁰ Lampon, Diopeithes, Stilbides.⁷¹

⁶⁴ We cannot be certain that the relevant fragments indeed were part of a formal agon as they are in iambics. However, they could be part of an iambic/anapaestic tetrameter pair of epirrhema/antepirrhema (enough for an agon according to Gelzer 1960, who compares the parts and form of the parodos and the agon in Aristophanes' extant plays while also discussing the form of the parts of an epirrhematic agon, offering examples of the metrical form we seem to have in our play too).

⁶⁵ Thucydides 6.69.2, 7.50.4, 7.51.1 (in which the tone may also suggest wrong decision-making referring to the delay of the expedition).

⁶⁶ E.g. Hdt. 9.33-36, where the Spartans won the battle at Plataea with the help of the seer Tisamenus of Elis.

⁶⁷ Flower (2008) 12-21.

⁶⁸ Parker (1983) 15.

⁶⁹ Lloyd (2002) 36. It should be noted that Teiresias is always proved right.

⁷⁰ Hierocles, who also appears in *Peace* (1052-1119), is also attested in an inscription of 446/5 (a decree regarding the relations between Athens and Chalkis), where he is commissioned along with 3 members of the council of 500 to perform a sacrifice: Flower (2008) 62.

⁷¹ Smith (1989) 140-156. Hierocles, who also appears in *Peace*, is also attested in an inscription of 446/5 (a decree regarding the relations between Athens and Chalkis: *IG I³ 40*), where he is commissioned along with 3 members of the council of 500 to perform a sacrifice.

This was Aristophanes' chance to challenge the seers' alleged omnipotence and omniscience, as Polyidus' own name also suggests.⁷² The same observation applies in Glaucus' etymological relevance with *glaux* (owl) and *glaukōpis* (gleaming eyes); Glaucus will become a seer (even if it will not last for long) and it seems that they are both able to see in the dark tomb.⁷³ Polyidus (if he is the speaker of this fragment) states that he is not afraid of death as there is no point since it is inevitable.⁷⁴ Then, Minos decides to challenge him by locking him up with death (Glaucus' corpse). We are in the fortunate position to have some pictorial evidence of the tomb-scene. More specifically, the Sotades-cup is a white-ground kylix dated in the mid-5th c. BC that depicts Polyidus and Glaucus in the tomb along with two snakes.⁷⁵ Our cup is part of a set of three kylikes painted by the same painter around the same time as part of one idea that the creator wanted to express. Also, it has been suggested that the cup was actually designed by Sotades for funeral purposes.⁷⁶ The general scheme that we observe in the three cups is the hope for life, the prevalence of life over death. In our cup, Polyidus beat death and resurrected Glaucus. In the second cup,⁷⁷ the Hesperides are picking their apples, famous for offering immortality, which is the cancellation of death. In the third cup, there is a bearded *δράκων* attacking a hunter. In the scene we can also observe a woman fallen on the ground, who, according to Griffiths,⁷⁸ is Artemis having been beaten to the ground by Orion, implying a sexual assault. Consequently, the snake comes to his punishment. All in all, our cup was designed along with the other two so as to convey the message of immortality and hope in death, whether in the case of Polyidus and Glaucus, Hercules or Orion, who was granted immortality after he turned into a constellation. While this gives us more general information, it does not really help with the specifics of the comic plot.

⁷² Πολύιδος or Πολύειδος < ἰδεῖν (to see) and ἴδμεν (we know); εἶδον (I saw) and εἰδώς (knowing).

⁷³ cf. Hoffman (1997) 125.

⁷⁴ Stobaeus 4.51.15, vol. V 1069 H; see pp. 48-49 for a discussion of reality and myth with relevance to this fragment in specific.

⁷⁵ Cup, London B.M., D5: Glaukos and Polyidos.

⁷⁶ Griffiths (1986) 59.

⁷⁷ Cup, London B.M., D6: The Apple-Pickers.

⁷⁸ Griffiths (1986) 67.

The image that the rest of the fragments create can be quite blurry but if one were to attempt to connect the content to the plot, the placement of the gassy results of the legume in the tomb would be plausible, making Polyidus suffer even more, and it could also be the way to revitalise the dead Glaucus, either by the unbearable smell or through the use of that herb applied or fed to Glaucus and following the magical use of a herb as a means of resurrecting him in the original story. This dialogue that this myth opens between medicine and divination is quite interesting. On the one hand, Hippocratic doctors struggled to separate themselves from seers,⁷⁹ and, on the other, in this particular example of divination, we have a seer healing a person with the aid of a herb; the similarities are obvious.⁸⁰

The original contribution of Aristophanes to the traditional tale of the Polyidus-Glaucus myth lies with the featuring of Theseus.⁸¹ The evidence we have for this is to be found in the fragment that describes Phaedra's betrothal by Minos.⁸² Theseus' appearance in comedy has been connected to Pericles (both great symbols and leaders of Athens). In Cratinus' *Runaway Women*, interestingly enough, he comes in as a seer.⁸³ There is also the fragment that refers to somebody who frequents the Theseion, hence called *θησειότριψ*, and who moans or complains perhaps at Theseus himself.⁸⁴ It is quite hard to guess whether this was used merely as a descriptive adjective of a general sense or it was actually referring to someone who is there at the moment. The problem is that we cannot justify a scene in Athens in this play. Theseus must be visiting Crete in the play which would also agree and explain the content of the next fragment, where Minos is betrothing his daughter to someone for marriage. The receiver of Phaedra's hand is unknown. However, since the outcome of their marriage was known (Euripides' *Hippolytus* had been performed in 428 BC), the audience would have understood the proverb's relevance to the fiery union of Phaedra and Theseus.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ Hippocrates, *Regimen in Acute Diseases* 8.

⁸⁰ cf. Lloyd (2002) 37-28.

⁸¹ Edmonds (1957: 699) suggests that Theseus as well as the story of Minotaur were included in the play.

⁸² Stobaeus 4.22b, 43 p. 517 H.

⁸³ Edmonds (1957) vol. 1, 38; for Theseus' significance in Pericles' time see Walker (1995) 64-66.

⁸⁴ Suda θ 369.

⁸⁵ See also the comments on the relevant fragment in ch. 2.1.2.

What we can infer is that Theseus' second visit to Crete and his marriage to Phaedra coincided with the Polyidus-Glaucus episode. Theseus could have interfered in order to save Polyidus from Minos (the same way he had saved Daedalus from Minos' son), resulting in Theseus and Phaedra's marriage. Their wedding would have also been a suitable ending to our comedy.⁸⁶

The rest of the fragments comprise of one or two words and they are quoted for linguistic reasons and not for their interpretive implications. Therefore, it is not possible to figure out the speaker or the tax exactor of the seventh fragment, although we could take it as a reference to the harbour dues in Crete and Athens, as discussed. Similar problems exist in the last two fragments; what was not enough? Polyidus' first task maybe, so he had to perform a second one? And what was similar to what? Questions that will not be answered unless more of the play is discovered.

2.1.5 Conclusion

Polyidus is a play by Aristophanes which seems to deviate from the norm of the extant plays, in the sense that it is a character-titled play, which was possibly composed as a parody of Euripides' homonymous tragedy. Despite the fact that *Polyidus*' main model could have been Euripides' play, we cannot rule out the possibility that it is a parodic bricolage, where the main plotline is infected with other instances of parody (e.g. Sophocles). This is evidently a multi-stranded parody, which follows a technique very often found in Aristophanes' work. The difference between *Polyidus*' technique and the multi-stranded parody which is found embedded in the surviving plays, is the fact that in the extant plays (even *Peace* or *Thesmophoriazusae*, in which the technique is very similar) the main plot is still an original idea, the parody is restricted to verbal or tragic ideas,⁸⁷ and the mythological plot of the plays referred to is not followed. The setting of the comedy or the place where the events were supposed to take place is another factor that differentiates this play from the extant ones. Unlike, the surviving

⁸⁶ It should be added that a scene in the underworld is also a possibility. In any case, in comedy change of scene can happen easily (esp. *Peace* and *Frogs*), unlike in tragedy. That said, it is equally plausible that we had a scene set in Crete with potential allusions to the extra-dramatic reality (cf. the underworld in *Frogs*).

⁸⁷ See pp. 18-19 for a discussion of these.

comedies, *Polyidus*' events happen outside Athens, on the island of Crete, where Minos lives. The myth of Polyidus was a popular theme in Aristophanes' time, as the surviving titles of plays show, the parody of which continues on to poets of Middle Comedy, who apparently produced plays titled *Glaucus*. The rather domestic setting of the play is another feature that shows the inner developments in the Aristophanic comedy. The interest is transferred from the outside world of the *polis* to the private sphere of the problems of an *oikos*. All the aforementioned features flourish in the later comic eras and they will be further discussed in the last chapter, in combination with the very similar characteristics found in the remaining three comedies that the thesis discusses.

2.2. *Daedalus*: The corrupting appeal of godlike power

2.2.1 Introduction

Daedalus, as the title suggests, is another character-titled play by Aristophanes that belongs to the same (broader) mythical cycle as *Polyidus* and *Cocalus* (for the reasons illustrated in the introduction) and is another disguise play, along the same lines that we shall see in *Aeolosicon* (although the date of *Daedalus*' production is unknown, it is more probable that it preceded *Aeolosicon*). *Daedalus* was selected as a play that seems to share specific features which we find in the other three plays as well. The name of one male character as the title is one of them. The mythical story around the impregnation of Leda (possibly) with Helen by Zeus is another, as the fragments indicate.¹ The tragic myth was presented in Sophocles' *Daedalus*, which could imply that what we have here is a mythical burlesque and perhaps a parody of a tragedy at the same time. This is a tactic commonly followed in Middle Comedy. *Daedalus* is a character that appears here as well as in *Cocalus*, possibly due to the usefulness of his *technē*.² Another reason why this comedy was chosen is the domestic coloration of the play. The myth and the possible scenario of our play are unfolded within the confines of Tyndareos' palace and the problems of his *oikos*, when his wife got pregnant with someone else's child. As we have seen, the domesticity of a comedy's plot is broadly and most commonly found in the plays of Middle and New Comedy. All these features, which are not as common in the extant Aristophanic plays, along with the setting of the play outside Athens are common between all the four plays of the thesis and will be discussed further in this chapter as well as in the conclusion.

Interestingly enough, Sophocles also wrote a play under the same name (*Daedalus*);³ is it then another parody of a Sophoclean play by Aristophanes?⁴ The comic playwrights Eubulus⁵ (or Philippus) and Plato Comicus⁶ also produced a play under the

¹ fr. 3.

² frr. 8, 9.

³ See pp. 68-69.

⁴ The other one possibly being Sophocles' *Camici*, parodied in Aristophanes' *Cocalus*.

⁵ Hunter (1983).

same title. The two poets have been among those considered to mark the transition between Old and Middle Comedy in the early 4th c. BC.⁷ Plato Comicus had also composed political plays, where, unlike Aristophanes, he does not disguise the victims of his satire.⁸ He also produced a number of mythical burlesques and parodies.⁹ Eubulus' *Daedalus* is also placed closer to the plays of Middle Comedy as a mythological or tragic burlesque. Last but not least, Cratinus' *Nemesis* is a key play here, as it was a comedy based on the same myth and it also appears to be allegorical in nature. How Aristophanes may have differentiated from the other versions of the myth is hard to tell when we have so little evidence, but possible plot elements will be suggested in the course of the chapter.

Testimonium

Clement was a 2nd c. author who wrote theological works, one of which is *Stromata* (*Miscellanies*), written between 150 – 215 AD. Influenced by Plato and the Stoics, Clement's work has a clear philosophical colouring as well as religious.¹⁰ In his work we find references to both *Cocalus* and *Daedalus*; as a matter of fact, a couple of lines before his reference to *Cocalus*, he mentions Aristophanes' *Daedalus*:

Πλάτων δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ *Δαιδάλῳ* τὰ ἀλλήλων
ὑφαيروῦνται.

Tr. Platon the comic poet and Aristophanes in *Daedalus* plagiarised/stole
each other's material.

(Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6.26.5)

⁶ Pirotta (2009) 117.

⁷ cf. Rosen (1995) 2; Hunter (1983) 20-23.

⁸ e.g. *Hyperbolus*, *Cleophon*, *Peisandros*, although it is impossible to know with confidence how these characters may have appeared in his comedies. As also mentioned in the previous chapter, Plato Comicus was a contemporary of Aristophanes who presents certain methodological similarities to the Aristophanic work: the intertextual parodic references to different plays is one of them, the non-allegorical references to political characters (similar to those in the *Acharnians*) is another. His work could possibly be seen as evidence against the straightforward periodization of the genre of Comedy, since we see a mixture of features that could be more typical of one or another comic period. For a fuller discussion, see the relevant section in the introduction.

⁹ For an analysis of these see Rosen 1995.

¹⁰ For more information on Clement of Alexandria and his *Stromata* see Osborn (2005) and Itter (2009).

According to the testimonium the two plays by Aristophanes and Plato Comicus shared common features. Unfortunately, there is hardly anything left from Plato Comicus' *Daedalus* to allow for further and more specific connections. In Kassel-Austin we read the following brief comment on his comedy:

“vid. ad test. 1 et fr. 293. Euripides Fr. 372,2 sq. N. ap. Schol. Hec. 838 (I p. 67,5 sq. Schw.) τὰ Δαιδάλεια πάντα κινεῖσθαι δόκει, / βλέπειν τ' ἀγάλμαθ'· ὧδ' ἀνὴρ κεῖνος σοφός Platonī comico male tribuit Tzetz. hist. chil. I 520 L. ‘Tzetzae haud dubie alius Platonis locus obversabatur ab eodem Scholiasta servatus [fr.204]’ Meineke I p.169”

Pirrotta in her commentary on Plato Comicus' *Daedalus*¹¹ notes that the Suda (π 1708) conveys the title *Δαίδαλος* as one of the comedies by Plato Comicus. She argues that in fact none of the conveyed fragments can surely be assigned to *Δαίδαλος*. In the scholia of Aristophanes' *Clouds* 663a some verses under the title *Daedalus* are cited and allocated to Plato: καὶ ἐν τῷ Πλάτωνος Δαιδάλῳ· ἐνίοτε πολλὰ τῶν ἀλεκτρυνόνων ἴκαί / ὑπηνέμια τέκτουσιν ὅα πολλάκις. / ἴό δὲ παῖς ἔνδον ἰτὰς ἀλεκτρυόνας σοβεῖ. The first verse is also cited in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.374c; Photius p. 624,27 and Suda υ 425, but it is assigned to Aristophanes.

Therefore, it seems probable that the scholiast wrongly allocated the fragment to Plato Comicus. In the thesis, we follow the suggestion offered by Kassel and Austin, according to which the second verse (ἴό δὲ παῖς ἔνδον ἰτὰς ἀλεκτρυόνας σοβεῖ), which is exclusively delivered in the Scholia, is to be attributed under the *dubia* and not under the title *Δαίδαλος* (cf. fr. 293 Kassel-Austin). The same possibly happened to the second verse from the *Eurystheus* of Euripides (fr. 372.2-3 *TrGF*), which was mistakenly assigned to Plato (cf. *TrGF* 5.1, 420) by Tzetzes (*Cbil.* 1.521-2). Interesting is the testimonium by Clement from Alexandria, who reports that Plato Comicus and Aristophanes plagiarised each other while writing the *Daedalus* (*Stromata* 6.26.5). On the basis of the testimonium Cobet reconstructs in 1840 the history of a bitter rivalry between Plato Comicus and Aristophanes (cf. Kann 1909, 47-49; s.o. S. 30). However,

¹¹ Pirrotta (2009) 117.

it is more likely that Clement's source read the same verse under Plato Comicus as well as Aristophanes' name, and he explained the insecurity of the source with a mutual plagiarism (cf. Kaibel in Kassel-Austin III,2, 116 «verba plane inepta, nisi forte eadem quaedam verba modo tamquam ex Aristophanis modo e Platonis Daedalo memorata Clementis auctorem repperisse dicas, ita ut utrius essent ambigeret»¹²).

Things are not significantly better with the remains of Eubulus' homonymous play:

cognomines comedias scripserunt Aristophanes, Plato, Philippus,
tragoediam vel fabulam satirical Sophocles

20 (21) ἐθέλει δ' ἄνευ μισθοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς καταμένειν / ἐπιτίτιος

21 (23) Antiatt. p. 108,14 μήχι · ὥς ναίχι καὶ οὐχί. Εὐβουλος Δαιδάλωι
Schwyzer II p. 592. lusisse poetam arbitratur Kock¹³

Hunter¹⁴ in his commentary on Eubulus notes that,

although Hephaestus is labelled *Δαίδαλος* on a *phlyax* vase in the British Museum which depicts his duel with Ares (there labelled *Ἐννάλιος*), cf. Bieber, *HT* 133, it seems more likely that the title of this play refers to the legendary craftsman named Daedalus, but it is quite uncertain which myth was treated here. On the other hand, we could draw a connection between Eubulus' character who "wants to stay with them and to be fed without a pay" and the food being served (possibly to Daedalus in Aristophanes' play). The *Δαίδαλος* plays of Aristophanes and Plato seem to have handled the same version of Helen's birth as the *Νέμεσις* of Cratinus, and Aristophanes parodied the myth of Sophocles' *Καμικοί* in his *Κώκαλος*. Unfortunately the plot of Sophocles' *Δαίδαλος* is obscure, cf. Pearson 1, 110.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Plato Comicus in Kassel-Austin.

¹⁴ Hunter (1983) 112-3.

His actual commentary on the surviving words discusses the use of *ἐθέλει* in Middle Comedy and only in exceptional cases in New Comedy.

As for Sophocles' play it is true that the only two fragments we have are not very helpful regarding the plot of the play:

158: εἴλλει μὲν εἴσω τόνδ' ἀχαλκεύτῳ πέδῃ

Tr: He confines him inside with a fetter not forged of metal.

162: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ κάνθαρος / τῶν Αἰτναίων <γε> πάντως

Tr: But it is not a beetle, one of those from Etna, either.

Henderson¹⁵ notes that,

We know nothing about the plot. *Daedalus* may well have been another title for the *Men of Camicus*, q. v., or for the *Minos*, q.v. but the many stories about Daedalus, after whom three comedies were named, could have furnished material for several plays. Frr. 160 and 161 testify that the play contained something about Talos, who according to Simonides fr. 568 in PMG and Apollonius Rhodius 4, ('1638f') was a giant made of bronze who guarded the island of Crete by walking all round it three times daily. Simonides said that he was made by Hephaestus and was given to Minos, but Apollonius said that he was given by Zeus to Minos' mother Europa. In this play it appears from fr. 160 that he destroyed intruders by consuming them with fiery heat, and from fr. 161 that he was stated to be mortal. Daedalus came to Crete as a refugee from Athens; one wonders how he got past Talos.

It is quite difficult to reach any conclusions based on the evidence we have from the homonymous plays. However, we could say that Aristophanes' *Daedalus* could have been somehow connected to his *Cocalus* as two plays sharing part of the same myth

¹⁵ Henderson (1996) 64.

around Daedalus' character and story seen through the eyes of the comic poet Aristophanes.

As far as the plot that scholars have suggested is concerned,¹⁶ what we appear to have here is Zeus in need of Daedalus' craft skills. Zeus is quite famous for the different forms he would often take in order to seduce a woman.¹⁷ And by all means we cannot overlook the parallel with *Cocalus*. Although we cannot be sure if that specific element was part of the comedy, it was definitely part of the context, as what had brought Daedalus to Sicily in the first place was the help he offered to Pasiphae in order to facilitate the union with the bull. Zeus is in Pasiphae's position now and asks Daedalus to repeat what he had done for her, help him to appear in the form of an animal, a swan (or any birdlike creature) in this case. Aristophanes' choice to ridicule a god should not surprise us either as he had done so in other plays (Hermes in *Peace* and *Wealth*, Prometheus and Poseidon in *Birds*, Dionysus in *Frogs*).¹⁸ Even if Zeus did not appear in a play, he was always in the background (e.g. Aristophanes' *Birds* 558-9). It seems that in *Daedalus* Aristophanes, after a series of successful 'divine parodies', wants to bring Zeus forward and make him his main target. Zeus' notorious amorous adventures would serve any comic playwright, ancient or modern. Other than Cratinus' *Nemesis*, we also have Sannyrion's *Danae* and Plato Comicus' *Europa* that have the adulterous endeavours of the king of the gods as their theme, with him being disguised as well. Zeus also appears in the title of Plato Comicus' *Zeus Kakoumenos* (but not in the surviving fragments) and must have been a character of *Nyx Makra*, which dealt with Zeus' disguise as Amphitruo, his union with Alcmena and the subsequent conception and birth of Heracles.¹⁹ Zeus is usually presented in South Italian comic vase paintings

¹⁶ Henderson (2007: 199) and Pellegrino (2015: 130) only offer this specific piece of information which does not really reveal much about the plot. In my plot reconstruction I will discuss this further along with other possible plot elements in order to suggest a possible more complete picture of the play.

¹⁷ fr. 5.

¹⁸ cf. Parker (2005) 149-151.

¹⁹ Rosen (1995: 124-126) argues that both *Zeus Kakoumenos* and *Nyx Makra* present characteristics of Middle Comedy plays such as the more domestic amorous scenes and mythological burlesque that foreshadows those of the subsequent Greco-Roman comic periods. For a list with Zeus' love affairs in Tragedy, Comedy and Satyr drama see Henderson (2014) 194 and (2012) 10, n.37: "in tragedy and satyr drama by Aeschylus' *Alcmene*, *Callisto*, *Carians* or *Europa*, and *Semele*; Sophocles' *Amphitruo*, *Daedalus*, *Danae*, *Minos*, and *Tyro* (twice); Euripides' *Alcmene*, *Antiope*, *Cretans*, *Danae*, *Lamia*,

wearing a crown in order to be distinguished,²⁰ where we also find Helen's birth depicted in front of a "practicable stage door".²¹

In Aristophanes' play the object of his desire could be Leda. Leda was Tyndareos' wife and Zeus seduced her after taking the form of a swan. As a result, Leda gave birth to Helen.²² This could be the story satirised by Aristophanes. Zeus, with the help of Daedalus this time,²³ transformed into some kind of bird, impregnated Leda and she gave birth to the egg of our fragments. One could draw a parallel with Cratinus' *Nemesis* who gave birth to Helen in his homonymous play,²⁴ produced at the dawn of the Peloponnesian war.²⁵ The two alternatives express the different mythological

Melanippe the Wise, and *Pasiphae*; Ion's *Alcmene*; Chaeremon's *Io*; and Dionysus II of Syracuse's *Leda*. In comedy to ca. 380 by Crates' *Lamia*; Hermippus' *Europa*; Aristophanes' *Daedalus*; Archippus' *Amphitruo* (twice); Plato Comicus' *Daedalus*, *Europa*, *Io*, and *Nyx Makra*; Alcaeus' *Callisto*, *Ganymede*, and *Pasiphae*; Apollonophanes' *Cretans* and *Danae*; Nicochares' *Cretans*; Polyzelus' *Demotyndareos* and *Birth of Dionysus*; and Sannyrrio's *Danae* and *Io*, and then in the Middle Comic period by, e.g., Anaxandrides' *Helen* and Eubulus' *Auge* and *Ion*" and the list goes on including also Zeus' homosexual affairs.

²⁰ Beare (1964), fig. iv "Jupiter and Mercury, Phlyax vase-painting in the Vatican museum", carrying a ladder to Alcmene's window in order to reach her. The exact same vase is found in Trendall (1989) fig 364, as "Bell krater attributed to Asteas: Phlyax scene".

²¹ Konstantakos (2014) 173-5.

²² According to the mythical tradition, Leda gave birth to Helen, the Dioskouroi and Clytemnestra, as well as Timandra, Philonoe and Phoebe; from all of them only the last three appear to be definitely Tyndareos'. Another version asserts that Helen and Polydeuces were Zeus' offspring. For a detailed account of the myth see Grimal (1991) 405-407.

²³ We have seen that in comedy gods are not limitlessly powerful over humans (e.g. in *Birds*, the gods suffer when they stop receiving sacrifices and need to negotiate with humans/birds; Zeus in Plautus' *Amphitruo*; Dionysus in Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*), so it is not too strange that the king of gods would ask the help of a special human, like the most talented and skilled craftsman of the time.

²⁴ Zeus is said to have mated with Nemesis in the form of a goose. The outcome was an egg found by a shepherd and brought to Leda who safeguarded it until it hatched. The story is found in Apollodorus (*Library* 3.10.7): "But Zeus in the form of a swan consorted with Leda, and on the same night Tyndareos cohabited with her; and she bore Pollux and Helen to Zeus, and Castor and Clytaemnestra to Tyndareos. But some say that Helen was a daughter of Nemesis and Zeus; for that she, flying from the arms of Zeus, changed herself into a goose, but Zeus in his turn took the likeness of a swan and so enjoyed her; and as the fruit of their loves she laid an egg, and a certain shepherd found it in the groves and brought and gave it to Leda; and she put it in a chest and kept it; and when Helen was hatched in due time, Leda brought her up as her own daughter. And when she grew into a lovely woman, Theseus carried her off and brought her to Aphidnae. But when Theseus was in Hades, Pollux and Castor marched against Aphidnae, took the city, got possession of Helen, and led Aethra, the mother of Theseus, away captive."

²⁵ Helen could also function as a parallel for Pericles, both causing a war, with personal interests involved. That said, Aspasia might be a more plausible direct point of comparison than Pericles, given

traditions over the birth of Helen that do appear to intertwine as well, with the egg being born from Nemesis but ending up in Leda's lap in Sparta. In *Nemesis* Zeus was also connected to Pericles as a seducer.²⁶ Aristophanes, as an Athenian poet heavily inflicted and affected by the Peloponnesian war, could have chosen the setting to be Sparta.

In Edmonds' edition of the comic fragments by both Aristophanes and Plato Comicus we read an assumption, rather than a deduction based on the fragments, according to which Icarus was Alcibiades and Daedalus was Plato the philosopher, but both suggestions refer to Plato Comicus's *Daedalus* and not Aristophanes'.²⁷ That may have been the case in Plato's *Daedalus*,²⁸ but there is no good reason to assert such thing for Aristophanes' play. Another possibility, as Edmonds suggests, is that in Aristophanes' *Daedalus* there is a parody of the Sicilian expedition and Alcibiades is portrayed as Icarus.²⁹ However, this is probably a misunderstanding that sprang from a confusion between Aristophanes and Plato's *Daedalus*.

Plautus satirised the same theme in his *Amphitruo*, although in that case Zeus is transformed to a man and not an animal. I think Plautus' play is quite important to us, as it is the only complete comedy that we have on the matter of Zeus' disguises, and if Plautus decided to create only one play based on divine mythology and not the human affairs exclusively, it suggests that it must have been a very popular theme at the time. We cannot be sure if or to how many plays Plautus had access before he wrote his comedy, but I find it quite plausible that he had at least read one Greek tragedy (and/or comedy) that deals with the same theme.³⁰ That could be a possible interpretation of Mercury's words in the opening scene of *Amphitruo*, when we do not know what is going to follow yet (51-63). Mercury claims that he will change the plot of the tragedy

her involvement in the different accounts of the causes of the war we see in Aristophanes (*Acharnians* 524-529, *Peace* 603-611).

²⁶ Henderson (2014) 183.

²⁷ Edmonds (1957) 494-5.

²⁸ Although the date might create a problem regarding the allusion to Plato the philosopher in Plato Comicus (possibly it would be more suitable if it was placed at the end of Plato's career).

²⁹ Edmonds (1957) 40.

³⁰ Melo (2011) 6-7, Euripides' *Alcmene* is a possibility too.

and shall turn it into a *tragico[co]moedia* in order to suit the audience's preferences.³¹ Mercury also comments on the fact that the god most worthy of respect is going to appear on stage alleging that the spectators should not be surprised as the same thing happened last year and it has frequently happened in tragedy.

Looking for similarities between *Daedalus* and *Amphitruo*, we will find too many to reject the scenario that Plautus was influenced by the same literary agenda as Aristophanes, if not by the Greek comic poet himself. As far as the characters of Mercury/Hermes and the slave Sosia are concerned, unfortunately, we are not in a position to know if or how they featured in Aristophanes' comedy as well. However, Jupiter/J Zeus must have and in both cases we have the seduction of a married woman (Leda married to Tyndareos, Alcmena to Amphitruo), so adultery is definitely on the table and both women are accused of it.³² Plato Comicus' *Nyx Makra*, which contemplated the same myth, seems to have been concerned with the domestic marital life of Tyndareos and Leda, similarly to the Plautine version.³³ Now, regarding allusions to the extra-dramatic reality, it is interesting that both plays, I think, were written during or after a war (*Daedalus* perhaps during the Peloponnesian war³⁴ and *Amphitruo* around 195 B.C. after the war between Flaminius and Philip V of Macedonia). As has been already mentioned in the thesis, domesticity of comedy and the sphere of private life is a common running theme in the plays of this thesis. The emphasis in the plot of these comedies has shifted from the Athenian political setting to the private affairs of an *oikos* outside Athens. This is a feature which, although undoubtedly found in some plays of Old Comedy (especially the mythological burlesques), is still most commonly found after the Peloponnesian War and in plays of Middle Comedy.

³¹ On Plautus and Roman attempts at the peculiar mixed concept of tragicomedy see most recently the study by Gunderson (2015); on the case of *Amphitruo* in specific see pp. 206-211.

³² *Daedalus* fr.1; *Amphitruo* 869-870.

³³ Rosen (1995) 124.

³⁴ Geissler (1969: 45) suggests a date c. 420 BC.

2.2.2 The fragments

Athenaeus is one of our main sources for *Daedalus*' fragments. In the segment where he mentions *Daedalus*, there is a discussion about some very special side-dishes that are supposed to accompany coitus instead of the main dish.

1. Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae*, 9.367B (191)

Ἀριστοφάνης *Δαιδάλω*.

πάσαις γυναιξὶν ἐξ ἑνός γε του <τρόπου>

ὥσπερ παροψὶς μοιχὸς ἐσκευασμένος.

Tr. Aristophanes in *Daedalus*;

For all women, in one way or another,

like a side-dish a seducer is ready.

This could have been a reference to Leda's supposed adultery, of which she is accused when she is found with the giant egg that contained Helen. Leda had a husband, yet she cheated on him with Zeus.³⁵ A question one may pose here is related to Leda's responsibility in the adultery. On several depictions she is clearly being raped by the swan,³⁶ so according to the traditional myth, she was innocent. But is that how Aristophanes chose to portray her in his play? If we look back at the *Thesmophoriazousae*, *Ecclesiazusae*, and *Lysistrata* we realise that Aristophanes liked to portray women as adulterers and cunning among other not so flattering qualities, obviously suggesting a role reversal overall in the plays, especially in a society where child legitimacy mattered so much and men would be terrified by the idea that their

³⁵ cf. Dowden (2006) 43: "The Dioskouroi are, as we have seen, 'sons of Zeus'. He begets them by Leda and they have particular cult in Sparta, where to say *tō siō*, 'the (pair of) gods', is to name them. They are embedded in the pre-Dorian mythology as sons of the Spartan ruler Tyndareos. Here, however, Zeus, disguised as a swan, has sex with a married woman, Leda, and we can see that her marriage is not incidental but itself has a purpose. Mortal marriage is no obstacle to divine parentage, something which must take its origin ultimately from the pretensions of real royal genealogies - just as the Egyptian tradition led to the story that Zeus Ammon was the real father of Alexander the Great, rather than merely Philip. Boeotia too had its own version of the Dioskouroi, the twins Amphion and Zethus. It is therefore no coincidence that Zeus is their father too." Again, it is interesting to see how Aristophanes was inspired by a well-known myth with the emphasis on the divine parentage which was so important.

³⁶ cf. images 16, 19, 25, 26 in LIMC s.v. 'Leda'.

wives might cheat on them. Tyndareos suspecting his wife of adultery would be in accordance with other similar mythical women,³⁷ and with Aristophanes' general portrayal of the female.

2. Erotian α 24 (192)

ἀνεκάς· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνωτάτω. Σύγκειται γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἄνω καὶ ἐκάς. ὥς καὶ
Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Δαιδάλω* φησὶν.³⁸
ὁ μηχανοποιὸς, ὅποτε βούλει τὸν τροχὸν
εἶν ἢ κἀνεκάς† λέγε, χαῖρε φέγγος ἡλίου.

Tr. ἀνεκάς; instead of ἀνωτάτω. For it is a compound of ἄνω and ἐκάς.

Like Aristophanes says in *Daedalus*;

The machinemaker, whenever you wish to leave/let go the pulley
upwards say, farewell light of the sun.³⁹

This is perhaps Zeus flying to Rhamnous on the *mechane*, chased by eagle-Aphrodite, as the myth has it, using Daedalus' skill as he had already proved his capability of constructing wings and actually flying; or it might be just Zeus flying after he got disguised into a bird-like creature.⁴⁰ As far as the actual operation and resulting

³⁷ E.g. Helen (*Cypria*, fr.1; Sappho, fr. 16), Alcmene (Homer, *Iliad* 19.95-105), Pasiphae (Hyginus, *Fabulae* 40), Phaedra (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 24-27), Clytemnestra (Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1673).

³⁸ From the Erotian text. The word does not really occur in the actual passage as the corrections in the K-A edition show.

³⁹ cf. Bakola (2010) 1790: "Despite a long debate on the mechanics of the *mechane*, the suggestions put forward are mostly hypothetical. What we know is that the *mechane* needed to carry out two types of movement: one was on a horizontal axis (bringing the suspended actor(s) into sight and sometimes carrying them across the stage) the one on a vertical axis (lifting and lowering them). The references to the *mechanopoios* in comedy (Ar. *Peace* 174, *Daedalus* fr. 192, *Gerytades* fr. 160; Stratt. fr. 4) suggest that the suspended character depended on the crane operator for his movement. Yet if the character was lifted or lowered vertically with the aid of a pulley or a system of pulleys, it is not impossible that, in order to achieve a sudden movement upwards, the character himself would have pulled a rope appropriately set up with pulleys to make him 'fly up high';" Taplin (1977) 443-444. On this specific fragment and the broader use of the *mechane* in Aristophanes see also Dearden (1976: 75-85).

⁴⁰ Another suggestion here could be that in *Daedalus*' contraption there might be a reference to Archytas of Tarentum's air-powered dove (Gell. 10.12.8-9 = Archytas, test. A10a). If the play was produced

movement of the crane are concerned, one idea might be that Zeus is being hoisted upwards (and the invitation is to greet the sun) or let down (rapidly) in which case he might be saying farewell to the sun (as translated here).⁴¹ Depending on how one envisages the mechanism, it might be letting the pulley go upwards (which would bring Zeus crashing down) or letting the treadmill go (which might be more catastrophic, but with the same effect). In any case, this is clearly a metatheatrical comment coming from Zeus (who must have been the one flying in the play) talking to Daedalus (or the crane operator), who was responsible for the flying disguise at least. Possibly Aristophanes' attempt to parody the *deus ex machina* tragic convention⁴² having the king of gods hovering? Aristophanes' parody of the tragic convention is by no means new. Trygaeus in *Peace* (174-176) calls to the crane operator to save him;⁴³ this sort of metatheatrical reference is found elsewhere in Aristophanes and was probably imitated by Strattis. Iris is also suspended by the crane (*Birds* 1199, 1205-6, 1217-18).⁴⁴ Socrates is suspended in his basket using the crane (*Clouds* 218).⁴⁵ Dicaeopolis calls on

around 420 BC, it would be too early for such a connection, but perhaps not if the play was produced towards or after the Peloponnesian War (which currently we do not know).

⁴¹ cf. Sophocles, *Ajax* (856-853), where the hero extends a similar salutation to the sun before he falls upon his sword.

⁴² cf. Mastronarde (1990) 247-294; Taplin (1977) 14: "staging and presentation are quite often parodied in Aristophanes, and are regarded as part of the author's work, and not as the responsibility of actor, *κενοποιός*, *μηχανοποιός*, or someone else. Consider, for example, the parodies of *Telephus* in *Acharnians* or of *Andromeda* in *Thesmophoriazusae* the features of presentation which come in for parody include gestures, postures, costumes, props, stage machines, and so on. On the other hand, Taplin (444-5) states that "none of the Aristophanic uses is a parody of the 'θ.α.μ.' (*deus ex machina*)". He is actually rather suspicious of the literal interpretation of the phrase, claiming that it would have been more suitable to have the god appearing on the roof (on the *theologeion*) and not flying using the mechane or crane; However, I believe that that is a fair probability in *Daedalus* at least.

⁴³ "ὦ μηχανοποιέ, πρόσσεχε τὸν νοῦν, ὥς ἐμὲ/ ἤδη στρέφει τι πνεῦμα περὶ τὸν ὀμφαλόν,/καὶ μὴ φυλάξεις, χορτάσω τὸν κύνθαρον" (Ah! machinist, pay attention, because some wind's already whirling around my navel, and if you aren't careful I'll be foddering the beetle).

⁴⁴ Peisetaerus addresses Iris who appears on the stage crane: "αὐτὴ σύ, ποῖ ποῖ ποῖ πέτει," (You yourself there, where where where are you flying?); then he refers to Iris thus: "ταυτηνὴ τις οὐ ζυλλήψεται/ ἀναπτόμενος τρίορχος" (One of the buzzards, fly up and grab her!); and then he addresses her: "κάπειτα δῆθ' οὕτω σιωπῇ διαπέτει/διὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀλλοτρίας καὶ τοῦ χάους;" (And so you just fly in this stealthy way through a foreign city, and through the void?).

⁴⁵ Strepsiades refers to Socrates who appears in a hanging basket: "φέρε τίς γὰρ οὗτος οὐπὶ τῆς κρεμάθρας ἀνὴρ;" (come, who's that man in the basket?).

Euripides to have him wheeled out on the *ekkyklema* (*Acharnians* 408).⁴⁶ Agathon appears in a similar fashion (*Thesmophoriazusae* 96, 265).⁴⁷ Paphlagon is rolled back into the *skene* on the *ekkyklema* like a fallen tragic hero at *Knights* (1249).⁴⁸ In *Wasps* (488-492), as Slater argues, we find another reference to the *ekkyklema*, which surely makes it a tragic device that Aristophanes loves to satirize.⁴⁹

3. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.374C (193)

καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιδάλω·
ὄν μέγιστον τέτοκεν, ὥς ἀλεκτρυόν

Tr. And Aristophanes in *Daedalus*;
An enormous egg⁵⁰ she has laid, like a hen.

Ibid. (194)
ἐνίστε πολλαὶ τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων βίαι
ὑπηνέμια τίκτουσιν ὥς πολλάκις.

Tr. Many of the hens by force
lay wind-eggs many times

In this segment from his *Deipnosophistae*, Athenaeus discusses the use of the word *ἀλεκτρυόν* with a feminine meaning (373E τὸν δ' ἀλεκτρυόνα . . . οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καὶ θηλυκῶς εἰρήκασιν).

⁴⁶ Dicaeopolis speaks with Euripides who is wheeled out on the *ekkyklema*: “ἀλλ' ἐκκυκλήθητ'.” (*but wheel yourself out*).

⁴⁷ Euripides refers to Agathon's entrance on the *ekkyklema*: “ὅπου> 'στίν; οὗτος οὐκκυκλούμενος.” (*Where is he? there, the one who's being wheeled out*); and then Agathon asks to be wheeled back in: “εἴσω τις ὥς τάχιστα μ' εἰσκυκλησάτω.” (*someone roll me back inside as quickly as possible*).

⁴⁸ “κλίνδεται εἴσω τόνδε τὸν δυσδαίμονα.” (*wheel me inside, the ill-fated one*).

⁴⁹ Although in this instance we do not really have a character being wheeled in or out, Slater (2002: 90) argues that the use of the verb *κλίνδεται* was deliberately placed there in order to create a connection between the discussion on tyranny and the dramatic stage (through its connection to *ekkyklema*) as it could be presented to be “at least as insubstantial as theatrical plots”.

⁵⁰ There is some interesting iconographic evidence for this enormous egg both in a serious and a comic context. Taplin discusses them as a case of paraiconography in his *Comic Angels* (1993: 82-3), imag. 19.20 and 19.114, but he remains undecided as to which comedy may have inspired the artist; the possible candidates being Cratinus' *Nemesis*, Aristophanes' *Daedalus* and Eubulus' *Lakones* or *Leda*.

The wind-egg is not new in Aristophanic comedy and it is a quite important motif as well as a symbol. Eros himself comes from a wind-egg produced by Nyx (*Birds* 693-703).⁵¹ The adjective used in our fragment too indicates someone or something that is full of wind or empty in a metaphorical way.⁵² An egg like this was produced without intercourse and would normally be empty. Leda not only gave birth to Helen through an egg, but also her sons, the Dioskouroi. Aristophanes seems to refer to the view that the wind can fertilise an egg, also expressed by Aristotle (*Hist. anim.* 560a and *De generat. anim.* 750b)⁵³ and Alcaeus (fr. 327, Lobel-Page) referring to winged Eros, making him the offspring of Iris and Zephyros.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Dunbar in her commentary on *Birds* (1995: 441-443) interprets it as ‘an egg having wind underneath’ (instead of a developing chick). She notes that “ὕπηνέμιος is normally used of infertile eggs laid without preceding copulation, e.g. *HA* 559^b24. Night’s egg is ὕπηνέμιον since produced apparently by parthenogenesis, but Aristophanes is playing on the normal sense, for far from being infertile the egg contains Eros.” Another interesting view that Dunbar expresses is on Aristophanes’ Eastern influences with respect to the creative powers of wind; whether Aristophanes knew about the other cosmogonies or not, we do not know, but it is important enough to mention the egg-cosmogonies of Epimenides, the Phoenicians, Iranians, Hindus and Orphics.

⁵²cf. Montanari (1995) 2093 “ὕπηνέμιος –ον, *dor*: ὑπᾶν- [ὑπό, ἄνεμος]; a. **sollevato dal vento** Theocr. 5.115 | **del sole annunziante il vento** Arat. 839 | **di pers. rapido come il vento** Plut. *Sert.* 12.7; b. **pieno di vento, ventoso, portato dal vento**: ῥόν uovo del vento, uovo pieno di vento, *cioè* uovo sterile, *secondo gli antichi, uovo fecondato dal vento, non dal maschio* Aristoph. *Av.* 695, *fr.* 194 Aristot. *HA.* 559b 24, *GA.* 748b Plut. 3.38e; *περὶ τῆς Ἥρας ἄδουσιν ἄνευ τῆς ἀνδρός ὁμιλίας ὕπηνέμιον παῖδα γεννῆσαι τὸν Ἥφαιστον* di Era cantano che generò, senza congiungersi a un uomo, un figlio del vento, Efesto Luc. 30.6 | *fig.* **portato dal vento, cioè vuoto, vano, affimero**: ὄνειροι ὕ. sogni vani Plut. 46.8.735e.” Apparently, in our play there is also a word-play implying that the egg was brought by the wind as well as being fertilised by the wind, since there was no intercourse between Leda and Zeus (at least in the version of the myth that the egg is produced by Nemesis and then delivered to Leda). And as Aristotle suggests infertile wind-eggs can become fertile under specific circumstances. In our case, this special circumstance must have been Zeus’ interference fertilising the originally sterile egg (*uovo sterile*).

⁵³ According to Aristotle, the wind-eggs can be laid without copulation by a variety of birds. The wind-eggs bear certain differences compared to the normal eggs. They are smaller, less palatable, and more liquid than true eggs, and are produced in greater numbers. When they are put under the mother bird, both the yellow and the white remain separated. The season affects the time of hatching, which is shorter in summer. Wind-eggs take different names, such as the zephyr-eggs, which are laid at spring-time by hens which are observed to inhale the breezes; **they do the same if they be stroked in a peculiar way by hand** (Possibly that is what Aristophanes refers to by βία). However, wind-eggs can turn into fertile eggs, and these eggs due to previous copulation can change breed, if they be trodden by another cock. Aristotle surely based his observations on the ancient belief that the female provides the matter, but the male is responsible for the soul and life of the offspring. cf. Thorp (2007).

⁵⁴ Christopoulos (2010) 208-9.

The egg is then naturally enormous, as Helen would emerge. Guthrie having examined all the different traditions and ancient theories on the wind-eggs discusses its use by Aristophanes: “He (Aristophanes) calls it (the egg) *ύπηνέμιον*, a word whose first meaning is ‘born or wafted on the wind’. *φόν ύπηνέμιον* could also mean a wind-egg, one which is sterile and produces no chicken. No doubt Aristophanes knew of this and the incongruous juxtaposition of sense and nonsense which the association suggests is quite in keeping with his sense of humour. But it is another meaning which would be uppermost.” He goes on referring to Aristotle’s account and Lucian’s story about Hera and Hephaestus and, of course, he does not omit the creation of Eros by Night without the male contribution, which is expressed by Aristophanes when he claims that that egg was brought on the winds. There he remarks that “the idea behind this is that the soul, the life-principle, either is itself air or being of similar substance is blown about with the winds and is drawn into the body at birth. The breath is the life... The word *ύπηνέμιον* was becoming a common place, as the above quotations show, and examples from ancient philosophers and poets might be multiplied to illustrate both the belief that our soul is air breathed in from outside and also the complementary notion of the impregnation of a female by the winds.”⁵⁵ It is quite interesting how the wind was considered an agent of fertility in ancient thought, which we cannot render entirely absurd if we think of the role of the wind in the cross-pollination of plants.

The notion of a fertilising wind is also encountered in Roman thought; Varro (*De re rustica* II.1), Virgil (*Georgics* III.273), Columella (*Res Rustica* VI.27), Pliny (*Natural history* I.8 222) talk about mares being impregnated by the wind just like hens that lay wind-eggs.⁵⁶

4. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 7.316B (195)

Ἀριστοφάνης *Δαιδάλῳ*

καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔχοντα πολύπους καὶ σηπίας

⁵⁵ Guthrie (1993) 94.

⁵⁶ For more cases of animals impregnated by the wind read Zirkle (1936) 95-130.

Tr. Aristophanes in *Daedalus*;
And these having octopi and cuttlefish

Ibid. (196)
τὸν πουλύπουν μοι ἔθηκε

Tr. s/he served me the octopus

Ibid. (197)
πληγαὶ λέγονται πουλύπου πλουμένου

Tr. they are called wounds of a pounded octopus

This time Aristophanes' *Daedalus* is encountered in a discussion over octopus. Athenaeus' quotations are not that helpful in this case as he is focused on references to the octopus elsewhere in literature. What we can make of these fragments is that there was a table set for a meal (lunch/dinner). In Greek literature the duo of octopi and cuttlefish has often been offered during a special feast and not a regular meal. We also know that fish and seafood were considered luxurious treats too.⁵⁷ We find *σηπίδια* in Eubulus fr.150.6 that Hunter⁵⁸ connects with Suda a 1722 s.v. *ἀμφιδρομία, καὶ δῶρα πέμπουσιν οἱ προσήκοντες ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον πολύποδας καὶ σηπίας*. Considering that Leda is giving birth in the course of the play it could be a possibility that the Amphidromia were part of it. Aristophanes refers to the same ritual in *Lysistrata* (758) as well.

Wilkins mentions Aristophanes' *Daedalus* as one of the plays mentioning octopus in a figurative way.⁵⁹ In his account he divides the comic references to the octopus as for consumption or not, but he does put a question mark showing uncertainty. Aristophanes' *Daedalus* is listed with Alcaeus' *Sisters Seduced*, fr. 1, fr.30; Eupolis'

⁵⁷ Wilkins (2000) 304-6; for a fuller discussion of the significance of this specific type of food see Davidson (1997; 1993).

⁵⁸ Hunter (1983).

⁵⁹ See pic. in Wilkins (2000) 328.

Demes, fr. 117; Pherecrates' *Savages* fr.14. Indeed, some of the examples he includes are clearly used as similes or metaphors:

Alcaeus' *Sisters Seduced*, fr. 1

ἡλίθιον εἶναι νοῦν τε πολύποδος ἔχειν

Tr. to be silly and **have the mind of an octopus**

Eupolis' *Demes*, fr. 117

ἀνὴρ πολίτης πολύπους ἐς τοὺς τρόπους.

Tr. a male citizen **with the ways of an octopus**

This characterization was used to describe a bad politician, quite unstable in his positions, changing according to what was beneficial for him each time.

Pherecrates' *Savages* fr.14

ἐνθρύσκοις καὶ βρακάνοις
καὶ στραβήλοισι ζῆν· ὅποτεν δ'
ἤδη πεινῶσι σφόδρα,
ὥσπερ εἰ τοὺς πολύποδας
* * * νύκτωρ περιτρώ-
γειν αὐτῶν τοὺς δακτύλους.

Tr. to live off chervils, wild herbs
and wild olives; and whenever
they already have a big appetite,
like the octopi
in the night they bite off their fingers.

In all these cases the octopus is clearly used in a figurative way as a simile. The reason why Wilkins suggests the same for the use of octopus in our play is the verb that is

being used, λέγονται ('are called/named'), which could suggest a possible simile to show that someone was beaten like an octopus. Or, what is being described in our fragments is the octopus on the table in front of them, having obviously gone through the necessary preparations (*beaten* first and then served) in order to be served during a special meal. Both explanations seem equally plausible, and as it is, there is no other clear indication to argue for a metaphorical use of the 'octopus' in Aristophanes' *Daedalus*.

In his list with octopus referred to supposedly for consumption we find Ameipsias' *The Eater*, fr.6; Plato Comicus' *The Baby*, fr. 100; Theopompus' *Aphrodite*, fr. 6.

Ameipsias' *The Eater*, fr.6

δεῖ μὲν, ὥς ἔοικε, πολλῶν πουλύπων

Tr. **he/she needs, as it seems, many octopi**

Plato's *The Baby*, fr. 100

ὥσπερ τοὺς πουλύποδας πρώτιστά σε

Tr. like **the octopi** principally you

Theopompus' *Aphrodite*, fr. 6

ἀλλ' ἔντραγε

τὴν σηπίαν τὴνδὶ λαβοῦσα καὶ τοδὶ

τὸ πουλυπόδειον.

Tr. but he/she had the dessert

After receiving this cuttlefish and this octopus

Of all three examples the last one is of particular interest as it presents the seafood which also appears in a couple of *Daedalus*' fragments and may have been destined for consumption.

The person being served could have been Daedalus, hence the one speaking. What I suggest here is that part of Zeus and Daedalus' plan had probably included Daedalus going to Tyndareos' palace as a scout, where he would have been received with the honours of a guest by the Spartan king. Another possible scenario as the context of these particular fragments would have been a woman serving a man octopus with the purpose of seducing him. On the other hand, I think that Aristophanes could have very well chosen to 'serve' this particular food resulting in accidental and simultaneously funny consequences. What we should also bear in mind is that the purpose of serving this specific type of seafood had sexual implications as it is known for its special function as an aphrodisiac⁶⁰ and one of the stimulating foods.⁶¹

5. (a) Suda ε (198)

3717

Εὐρύβατον ἄνδρα: φασὶ τοῦτον Ἐφέσιον εἶναι καὶ λαβόντα χρήματα παρὰ Κροίσου, ὥστε στρατιάν συναγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τὸν εἰς Πέρσας, προδότην γενόμενον ἐγχειρίσαι τῷ Κύρῳ τὰ χρήματα τοῦ Κροίσου· καὶ ἐντεῦθεν τοὺς πονηροὺς Εὐρυβάτας καλεῖσθαι.

Tr. Eurybatus man: they say that he is from Ephesus and took money from Croesus, in order to gather an army for the war against the Persians; however, he became a traitor and entrusted Croesus' money to Cyrus; since then the cunning men are called Eurybati.

3718

καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιδάλω, ὑποθέμενος τὸν Δία εἰς πολλὰ ἑαυτὸν μεταβάλλοντα καὶ πανουργοῦντα· εἰ δὴ τις ὅμων εἶδεν Εὐρύβατον Δία.

Λέγεται τὸν Εὐρύβατον κλέπτην ὄντα, εἰρχθέντα καὶ παραφυλαττόμενον, ἐπειδὴ συμπίνοντες ἔλυσαν αὐτὸν οἱ φυλάσσοντες,

⁶⁰ cf. Athenaeus 8.357.

⁶¹ cf. McMahon (1997) 124-5. For more on fish and erotics see Davidson, who argues that fish was used as a medium for seduction and persuasion in antiquity and it is presented as such in art and literature, especially in comedy (1993: 63-64; 1997: 9-11).

ἐκέλευσαν ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἀναρρίχῃσιν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον διωθεῖσθαι· δεομένων δὲ ὥς οὐ βουλόμενον, ἐπεὶ μόλις ἀνέπεισαν, περιθέμενος τοὺς σπόγγους καὶ τὰς ἐγκεντρίδας, ἀναδραμεῖν εἰς τοὺς τοίχους. ἀναβλέποντες δὲ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ θαυμάζοντες τὰς τέχνας, λαβεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν ὄροφον καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντα, πρὶν ἐκεῖνοι κύκλῳ περιέλθωσι, διὰ τοῦ τέγους καταπηδῆσαι.

Tr. and Aristophanes in *Daedalus*, having Zeus changing many forms and performing cunning deeds; if anyone of you saw Eurybatus Zeus.

It is said that Eurybatus was a thief, chained and guarded; when his guards having been drinking unchained him, they ordered him to show them how to climb up the houses, at first they were refused; although they were afraid that he would not want to, when they persuaded him with difficulty, he placed around him the sponges and spikes worn on the leg, and he ran up the walls. While the guards were looking up to him admiring his skill, he reached the ceiling and jumped over it. Before they surround him he had leapt down from the roof.

(b) Eustathius on *Odyssey* 1864.10-30

καθὰ ὁ μῦθος τὸν Δία ἔπλασε πολλάκις μορφούμενον ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ἐπὶ δούλῳ, οὕτῳ, φασί, καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Δαιδάλῳ* ὑποθέμενος αὐτὸν εἰς πολλὰ μεταβαλλόμενον καὶ πανουργοῦντα φησὶν . . . ὥς τοῦ Εὐρυβάτου δηλαδὴ ποικίλου ὄντος πονηρεύεσθαι.

Tr. according to these the myth made Zeus changing into this and that many times in order to deceive, similarly, they say, and Aristophanes in *Daedalus* having Zeus changing many forms and performing cunning deeds says... as Eurybatus was very talented at wrongdoing.

(c) Scholia on Lucian, Alexander 4

ὁ δὲ Εὐρύβατος ὡς πονηρὸς καὶ πανοῦργος, πρὸς δὲ καὶ προδότης
εἰσάγεται Ἀριστοφάνει τῷ κωμικῷ καὶ Δημοσθένει τῷ ῥήτορι [18, 24].

Tr. Eurybatus is introduced by Aristophanes the comic poet and by
Demosthenes the orator as cunning and crafty as well as treacherous.

Zeus is as cunning as Eurybatus. Eurybatus is not unknown in Greek mythology. He features as the twin brother of Olus participating in numerous mischievous deeds that included mocking Hercules, depriving him of his sleep, taking different forms and shapes. Eventually Heracles captured the two brothers and carried them around tied and dangling upside-down from a pole.⁶² Is that a hint as to how Zeus was suspended from the *mechane*? Particularly interesting is the part εἰς πολλὰ ἑαυτὸν μεταβάλλοντα pointing out that the phrase probably refers to Zeus' notorious metamorphoses whenever he wished to seduce a woman (e.g. he became a bull when he chased Europa, he went to Danae in the form of a fertilising golden rain, he even turned to Amphytrion in order to fool Alcmena and to Artemis when he wanted to approach her nymph Callisto, and the list continues). Another possible scenario would be Zeus taking various forms into this comedy. Based on the evidence and on Zeus' 'history', he was definitely transformed into a bird in this play and if he was to take another form that would probably be that of Tyndareos, Leda's husband. Whether or not Aristophanes' plan was to combine the existing stories around Zeus' metamorphoses we are not able to say confidently; we can therefore only acknowledge the possibility and the alternative scenario.

⁶² Other versions of the myth connect the two brothers with Zeus who turned them into stone or apes so as to punish them. For a more detailed account of the myth see Grimal (1991) 354.

6. Photius 338.15 (199)

<ὄνου σκιά>: καὶ περὶ ὄνου σκιάς· Σοφοκλῆς *Κηδάλωνι*· Ὅτι ἂν τι γίνηται, τὰ πάντ' ὄνου σκιά·

Ἀριστοφάνης *Δαιδάλωνι*· Περὶ τοῦ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὁ πόλεμος νῦν ἐστί· περὶ ὄνου σκιάς·

Tr. <The ass's shadow>: over the ass's shadow; Sophocles in *Cedalion*; that whatever may happen, everything over the ass's shadow;

Aristophanes in *Daedalus*; what is this war over? the donkey's shadow?

Photius discusses the use and definition of the idiomatic phrase of this fragment in literature. Apparently the definition is a synonym to the English phrase *much ado about nothing* and in *Daedalus* someone comments that these people are quarrelling over nothing. Aristophanes uses the phrase again in his *Wasps* (190-191) where Bdelycleon is calling Philocleon *πονηρός*, an adjective which was found in the previous fragment. The origins of the proverbial phrase is traced back in an incident that took place in Abdera, between the Greek areas of Macedonia and Thrace, home of Democritus and Protagoras. A man rented a donkey once in order to perform a visit, but the day was too hot and there was no tree around. Consequently, at some point the passenger asked to stop for some time to rest from the sun, rest he found in the shadow of the donkey. When they reached their destination the owner of the donkey asked him to pay not only for the donkey he had hired but also for its shadow. The matter had no resolution so they were led to the court creating a division in the public opinion of Abdera.⁶³ We cannot be sure what the context is in the fragment of our play. It could be a quarrel similar to the one in *Wasps*, where somebody (presumably Zeus) is called a name (presumably *Εὐρύβατος/πονηρός*). It could also be an extra-dramatic (or metaphorical) reference to a war that has taken (or is taking) place (possibly the Peloponnesian war, which would be the most relevant in terms of time and location).

⁶³ Aesop, *Fab.* "The ass and his shadow".

7. Pollux 7.100 (200)

In his discussion over metals:

καὶ κογχυλίας δὲ λίθος ἐν Ἀριστοφάνους *Δαιδάλῳ*

Tr. and the shell-marble in Aristophanes' *Daedalus*

8. Pollux 7.117 (201)

In a discussion over arts and crafts:

ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς οἰκοδόμους Ὅμηρος τέκτονας καλεῖ, καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων
εἴρηται παρὰ Πλάτωνι. Βιαία γὰρ ἡ ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους *Δαιδάλῳ*
τεκτόναρχος μοῦσα.

τὸ δὲ ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν Ἀριστοφάνης εἴρηκεν ἐν *Δαιδάλῳ*.

Tr. For Homer names the builders craftsmen, he is called an architect in Plato. The muse who is chief of the builders of verse is violent in Sophocles' *Daedalus*.

Aristophanes mentions architecture in *Daedalus*.

9. Hesychius δ 48 (202)

Δαιδάλεια· Ἀριστοφάνης τὸν ὑπὸ Δαιδάλου κατασκευασθέντα
ἀνδριάντα, ὡς διὰ τὸ ἀποδιδράσκειν δεδεμένον.

Tr. **Daedalian**; Aristophanes mentions the statue made by Daedalus,
which was tied down in order not to escape.

One of Daedalus' wooden statues is also encountered in Plato Comicus' fragment 188,
where Hermes pretends to be one of Daedalus' statues that could talk and walk:

{A.} οὗτος, τίς εἶ; λέγε ταχύ· τί σιγᾷς; οὐκ ἔρεῖς;
{EPM.} Ἑρμῆς ἔγωγε Δαιδάλου φωνὴν ἔχων
ξύλινος βαδίζων αὐτόματος ἐλήλυθα.

What was this statue that had to be tied in order not to escape? Maybe the statue of a bird that contained something alive (Zeus' disguise/costume as a swan or some sort of bird)?⁶⁴ That said, it should be pointed out that there is no clear reason why this particular fragment has been assigned to this play and not another one. What is transmitted in the fragment by Hesychius is that it was included in a play in which Daedalus featured. Of course, as it is one cannot be entirely sure of the details of *Daedalus'* plot, but an *ἀνδριάς* could be used as Zeus' hide-out and disguise at the same time. What can also be suggested is that Daedalus constructed wings for Zeus, as he had done for himself and his son, according to the mythical tradition. Who and why would try to escape, so he had to be tied down, makes the decipherment of the fragment even more challenging, unless we take a look at *Cocalus'* plot. Daedalus featured there and, according to the interpretation presented in this thesis, he had a very crucial role. Following the potential plot reconstruction (as we shall see in the relevant section), the one that had reasons to try to escape was Minos while he was being attacked by Cocalus' daughters under Daedalus' instructions. If Hesychius' fragment were to be reassigned to *Cocalus*, then the one who would have tried to escape would be Minos; Daedalus had every reason to impede his escape, hence the creation described in the fragment. At the moment, that is as far as the possible conclusions can go, leaving the questions around the exact nature and application of the function of the statue along with any technical details unanswered and inscrutable.

10. Hesychius δ 2241 (203)

δορυφόρον· [τὸν δολοφονοῦντα]· Ἀριστοφάνης *Δαιδάλω*.

Tr. spear-slayer; [the assassin]; Aristophanes in *Daedalus*.

11. Phrynichus, Eclogue 400 (204)

κάκκαβον· διὰ τοῦ η **κακκάβην** λέγε, τὸ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ο ἀμαθές. καὶ γὰρ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Δαιδάλω* διὰ τοῦ η χρῆται.

⁶⁴ Which surely reminds us of Archytas of Tarentum and his dove (cf. p.75, n. 40).

Tr. partridge; pronounce *kakkabē* with eta, the one with the omicron is uncouth. Accordingly, Aristophanes in *Daedalus* also uses it with the eta.

Athenaeus (*Deipnosophistae* 9.390a) uses the same word *κακκάβη* to mean partridge and explains that it is an alternative to *πέρδις*, which coincidentally, according to one version of the story,⁶⁵ was the name of Daedalus' nephew whom he had murdered when he was still in Athens. Finally, Perdix was also the name of Daedalus' sister, mother of the young Talus, Perdix or Calos. *Κακκάβη* also means three-leg pot, which would have been used in the preparation of a meal.⁶⁶ With this meaning it is also used by Aristophanes in *Banqueters* fr. 224. Aristophanes talks about a partridge; is that what Zeus was transformed into in the play, also alluding to Daedalus' dark past as an assassin as the previous fragment suggests, or do we simply have a reference to the cooking appliance? This is all we can infer from the fragments, based on which a plot reconstruction will be attempted in section 2.2.4, after we first look into the characters that may have appeared in the play.

2.2.3 The characters

The following characters can be ascertained for this play: Daedalus,⁶⁷ Zeus, Leda, Tyndareos, Chorus.

ZEUS

Zeus' role in the comedy could have been of a similar significance to the Zeus that featured in Plautus' *Amphitruo*, as the same kind of conspiracy and adultery is being planned and probably executed. The method followed in order to reconstruct Zeus'

⁶⁵ Hyginus, *Fabulae* 39. In Apollodorus' account (*Library* 3.15.8) Daedalus' nephew is named Talus.

⁶⁶ For suggestions on what kind of meal this might have mean see the discussion of fr. 4.

⁶⁷ See the relevant section in *Cocalus*.

character as he could have appeared in the play will be the accumulation and analysis of the evidence from texts in which Zeus has appeared in a similar comic context.

In Plato Comicus' *Europa* (43.1), it has been suggested that there is a dialogue between Zeus and his advisor, while he thinks of ways to rape her.

{A.} γυνή καθεύδουσ' ἐστὶν ἀργόν. {B.} μανθάνω.

{A.} ἐγρηγορίας δ' εἰσὶν αἱ παροψίδες,

αὐταὶ μόνον κρεῖττον πολὺ χρεῖμα' εἰς ἡδονὴν

ἢ τᾶλλα

{B.} βίνου γάρ τινες παροψίδες

εἴς', ἀντιβόλῳ σε;

(*Europa* 43.1)

Tr. {A.} A woman who is sleeping is something inactive. {B.} I know.

{A.} But when she is awake, there are the side-dishes,

these are a much better way to acquire pleasure

than the rest

{B.} Are there any side-dishes of sex,

I ask you?

What is interesting is the use of *παροψίς*, which in both plays have sexual connotations pointing to some kind of adultery.⁶⁸ Adulterous Zeus is contemplating a careful plan to seduce his victim, again, it seems. In Sannyrion's *Danae* (8.1) Zeus appears in a similar context. He is trying to decide on the most suitable disguise, in this case in order to sneak into Danae's tower. His first thought is a shrewmouse, although a dangerous option apparently as there is a cat around!

From the field of tragedy the list of plays on Zeus' amorous activity is long. In Aeschylus *Carians* or *Europa* (99.1) his victim, Europa, talks about the way she was kidnapped by Zeus disguised as a bull and subsequently gave birth to Minos, Rhadamanthys and Sarpedon. However, the way it is put by Europa it could also mean that Zeus sent a bull to get her rather than that he turned into it (*τοιόνδε μὲν Ζεὺς*

⁶⁸ cf. fr. 1.

κλέμμα πρεσβύτου πατρὸς / αὐτοῦ μένων ἄμοχθον ἤγνυσεν λαβεῖν). Plato Comicus' *Nyx Makra* dealt with the conception of Heracles by Alcmene after being seduced by Zeus who was disguised as her husband Amphitryon. Only six fragments have survived, some of which may belong to the prologue and Hermes, who introduces the subject and the details of the disguise. One of the fragments possibly is spoken by Alcmene. It seems that the play revolved around Zeus' interference in the domestic affairs of Amphitryon and Alcmene's household and possibly resembled the plot of Plautus' *Amphitruo*.

As a rule and because of the space limit in this project, Roman literature is not referred to in this section. However, this play is quite important, as it has been pointed out before, because it is the only extant play dealing with Zeus' amorous adventures. Mercury in his opening speech (24-31) presents Zeus in a rather humane way, with weaknesses and fears. Mercury reduces the divine nature of Zeus, saying that he comes from mortal parents and shares similarities, rather than differences, with the mortal humans. Nevertheless, Zeus shall take whatever he likes, especially when it is a wife whose husband is away. Mercury speaks of Zeus' notorious affairs and his reputation as a womanizer (104-108). Zeus disguised as Amphitruo sleeps with Alcmena and then wants to leave as usual (499-501). One night was enough for him. Now Alcmena will give birth to both mortal and immortal children, like Leda did after Zeus' visit. In the third Act Zeus unfolds his plan to return as Zeus to restore the truth and Alcmena's honour (867-879). Zeus here appears as the fair god who will not let innocents be blamed and suffer for his own deeds (*nam mea sit culpa*). Zeus not only restored the truth but also soothed Amphitruo's anger, asking him to return to the previous affectionate relationship with his wife while she bears the children of both, similarly to Leda's case (1131-1143).

Zeus' amorous adventures and reputation are also encountered in later literature, including Christian literature. For example, Justin Martyr was an early Christian apologist who lived in the 2nd c. AD. In one of his works there is another testimony on Zeus' disguising habit when he wanted to commit adultery. He went to Antiope as a satyr, to Danae as gold, to Europa as a bull and he flew to Leda (*Oratio ad gentiles*,

38.d.2-5). Clemens Romanus, known also as Pope Clement I, lived in the 1st c. AD. In his *Homilies* he speaks of Zeus' illegitimate children by different women, Leda being one of them. Other examples include Perseus by Danae, Arcas by Callisto, Parthenos and Dike by Themis, Heracles by Alcmena (5.17.4.1-5.1). Nonnus, who was probably an abbot from the 6th c. AD, adds an interesting idea to our story, that Zeus turned into a swan, pursuing either Nemesis or Leda, in order to hide from Hera, his wife (5.1.17-20).

In a scholion in Callimachus we read about the place where Zeus lay with Nemesis, who gave birth to an egg, which Leda found and kept warm. Later, the Dioskouroi and Helen sprang from it. It is an interesting question, how the egg got transferred from Attica to Sparta. One possibility is that the intercourse took place in Attica but Nemesis laid the egg in Sparta, or somehow the egg was transferred to Sparta for Leda to find it (*Hymn.* 3.232.1-3).

Isocrates, in his *Encomium of Helen*, of course includes her parentage and actually talks about Zeus' deceptive ways to seduce beautiful women with some kind of disguise, different each time. Zeus was the mightiest but he lacked in looks; perhaps, that was another reason why he was so fond of disguise when he wanted to seduce a woman. He became Amphitryon when he went to Alcmena, golden rain to Danae, swan to Nemesis and Leda. In each and every case, Zeus used *techne* and not violence (*ἀεὶ δὲ μετὰ τέχνης ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ βίας θηρώμενος φαίνεται τὴν φύσιν τὴν τοιαύτην*).⁶⁹ Both these elements seem to fit in our play. An ugly Zeus uses the help of the master of *technai*, Daedalus, in order to seduce a woman.

TYNDAREOS

It cannot be said with certainty that Tyndareos appears in the play, but if the plotline was to resemble that of *Amphitruo*, then he would. The appearance of the cheated husband would also add to the comic-tragic effect of the play, similarly to Plautus' *Amphitruo*. Tyndareos is mostly known as the father of Helen of Troy, husband of Leda, who bound his daughter's suitors by oath, an act that led to the alliance of the

⁶⁹ Isocrates, *Encomium of Helen*, 59.8-9.

Greek kings against Troy in order to restore Helen to her husband, Menelaus. After the death of his sons, Tyndareos offered the kingdom to his son-in-law Menelaus. In this section, we will try to reconstruct the image of Tyndareos' character, as he had appeared in Greek literature and as he may have been known to the audience of the play. This, in turn, may also suggest certain directives and elements that could have been picked on in the Aristophanic play, whether that be Tyndareos' character or the social norms that may have been displayed through him.

First, a collection of sources from the extant plays is presented. In Euripides' *Orestes*⁷⁰ (457-459) Tyndareos does recognise the fault of his daughters, but at the same time he mourns for them as their father. Orestes speaks with affection and gratitude of Tyndareos and Leda, being thankful for having been brought up by them as if he was their own child (459-469). In *Orestes*, Tyndareos appears first as a kind, old man looking for his *φίλος* Menelaus (470-474), who in 475 addresses him as the man who shared his wife with Zeus. Tyndareos does see his daughters' mistakes but he hates Orestes even more (477-480). However, Tyndareos is not as kind towards Orestes, who, unlike Menelaus, is an enemy now. He appears as a rather harsh man, who demands Orestes to be stoned to death (503-541). Tyndareos is a man who cannot forgive his own children, let alone their murderer. One wonders how he would react to his wife's infidelity. In Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, we read that Leda was the daughter of Thestius who had three daughters, Phoebe, Clytemnestra and Helen. Helen is addressed as the daughter of Zeus or Tyndareos, while Clytemnestra is the daughter of Leda or Tyndareos' daughter. In Agamemnon's speech, it is Tyndareos alone that thinks of the oath resolution, without the help of Odysseus (49-71). In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae* Mnesilochus dresses up as Helen and says that her father is Tyndareos (859-860), and so does Euripides, dressed as Menelaus (918-919).

In Pausanias (*Description of Greece* 15.11.1-10) Morpho Aphrodite is described as sitting with a veil and anklets/shackles. Some say that Tyndareos had placed these in

⁷⁰ Since *Orestes* was produced around 408 BC, an influence on the play would have been possible if *Daedalus* was produced later, which is a possibility.

assimilation to the bonding between husband and wife. He also mentions another version of the story, according to which Tyndareos placed the fetters on the goddess's feet as a punishment, blaming her for the shameful acts of his daughters. He carved a simplistic statuette out of cedar and named it Aphrodite in order to repay the goddess. Pausanias relates a story that is not very well-known and definitely comes after the time of the play, as Helen is already a married woman when the incident described took place. However, anachronistically, this story may offer an explanation to the fragment by Hesychius (δ 48) where Aristophanes mentions the existence of a statue tied up.

LEDA

Leda's name and character is always found as part and parcel with Zeus and Tyndareos, her two husbands and fathers of her children, Helen, Clytemnestra, Castor and Pollux. This section concentrates on the sources about Leda and her story, daughter of Thestius, king of Aetolia. As it becomes clear from these sources, Leda was famous for the seduction by the Zeus-swan. Again, we start with a few segments from the three extant tragedies that talk about Leda. In Euripides' *Helen* Helen relates the story of Zeus' visit to Leda. Helen is calling herself daughter of Tyndareos (568), but at the same time she acknowledges the story that Zeus may have reached her mother, Leda, in the form of a swan escaping from an eagle (16-21). Then, Zeus slept with her, although sceptically she adds "if the story is true". Euripides' Helen expresses doubts regarding Zeus being the parent, so it is implied something that some of the sources transmit too, that this was only a story brought down to us from the Pierian Muses on a tablet (which does not really tell us whether it was a true story or not), as Burian says.⁷¹

On the other hand, the chorus sing of Helen's parentage and they mention the story of Leda and Zeus-Swan, naming Leda Zeus' offspring (214-216, 1144-1146). Helen is called daughter of Zeus and Leda, first by herself and then by Menelaus (257-259, 637), although these are two ambiguous segments, that may not belong to the text (one of

⁷¹ Burian (2007) 192.

them omitted by editors and the other is corrupt). Finally, Theoclymenus, at the end of the play, calls the Dioskouroi sons of Leda and Zeus (1680), and so we read in Dio Chrysostomus, a sophist, historian, and writer from the 1st c. AD (61.10.7-11.3), mainly because of their strength. In Euripides' *Orestes* (1381-1389) a Phrygian slave accuses Helen of the loss of his city, Ilium, calling her bird-born with a swan-feathered beauty, Leda's hatch. It is clear that Helen was thought to be a child of Zeus, who impregnated Leda in the form of a swan, which justifies the swan-like looks and the 'hatching', also attested in the fragments of our comedy.

In Athenaeus, a rhetorician and grammarian of the 3rd c. AD, Leda's incident is found in a very interesting discussion over different kinds of eggs, including the one from which Helen was born. Athenaeus informs us that in Aristophanes *Night* bore the first wind-egg, that they say that Leda found an egg, and that Clearchus also mentions Helen being born from an egg. It is a big and white egg as it did not come from a chicken but from a bigger and whiter animal, a swan or goose. The version of Neocles, according to which Helen's egg fell from the moon, is a different and interesting one too (*Deipnosophistae* 2.50.1-29, 38-45). In the same work we come across a fragment from Cratinus' *Nemesis*, quoted in Athenaeus (*Deipnosophistae* 9.16. 3), a play that contemplates the same theme, but the title indicates that the egg came from Nemesis in Cratinus' version. Leda only was assigned the duty to take care of it.

In a segment from Lucian's *Judgement of the Goddesses* (13.23-14.12), written in 2nd c. AD, Aphrodite is trying to convince Paris to pick her. For Lucian, Helen is a clear offspring of Leda and Zeus, who raped her in the form of a swan. Apollodorus refers to Helen's parents, who some say are Nemesis and Zeus. Nemesis fleeing the intercourse turned into a goose and Zeus pursuing her turned into a swan. According to Apollodorus, a shepherd found the product of this intercourse, an egg, and brought it to Leda, who kept it until Helen was born out of it and whom she raised as her own daughter (3.127.1-128.1).

The following source shows how the story was transformed when seen through the Christian lens. Clement was a theologian from the 2nd c. AD. In one of his heavily religious works, in which he exhorts people to convert to Christianity, he talks about

Zeus and his nature. He says that among other things Zeus is not a swan and that there are women more decent than Leda. It is all a myth, Leda is dead, the swan is dead, Zeus is dead, he writes. In this case, Leda is presented as an adulteress and not raped by Zeus (2.37.2.1-4.6).

A version different to the most well-known is transmitted by John Malalas, a chronicler who lived in the 6th c. AD. Joannes says that Thestius' three daughters, Leda among them, were the most decent. Thestius gave Leda to Tyndareos, who ruled in Sparta after his death. Then the couple had a daughter named Clytemnestra. When she grew up she got married to Agamemnon, king of Mycene. In the meantime, Leda committed adultery with a younger man called Kyknos (meaning swan), son of Ederion, king of Achaia, originating from Pikos Zeus. Tyndareos knew nothing about the adultery that was committed while Leda was near the river Eurotas, and she got pregnant by Kyknos and gave birth to three children, Helen, Castor and Pollux. Helen was then given to Menelaus. He finishes saying that the story that Zeus was the agent of the adultery is a myth made up by the poets (82.8-83.6). The exact same story is related by George Cedrenos (1.212.8-15), who was a historian from the 11th c. AD. It seems that in the Byzantine times, possibly due to the spread of Christianity, any divine element was ruled out and a more rationalised approach was adopted.

OTHER CHARACTERS

Unfortunately, the fragments are too scarce to give specific indications regarding the characters, but apart from the ones that we have already talked about there must have been a chorus. It may well have consisted of Spartan women, from Tyndareos' court.

To sum up, we have seen how Zeus, Tyndareos and Leda have been depicted in different literary sources. As far as Zeus is concerned, his amorous adventures were explored as this is the aspect of his character that would be relevant in the play. Evidently, Zeus' technique of disguise was very common and is also a common theme

among dramatists. Plato Comicus' *Europa*, *Nyx Makra*, Aeschylus' *Carians* or *Europa*, Sannyrion's *Danae*, Plautus' *Amphitruo* are some such examples. Cratinus' *Nemesis* is a very important parallel as the main theme is the same as in *Daedalus*. Zeus seems to be the almighty but nevertheless deceptive god, notorious for his lust towards women, whether free or married, with or without their consent. He is at fault chasing women whom he should not, tricking them with a disguise every time. Important offspring are the result of his bedding with these women, often leading to trouble for them, but eventually he would restore their reputation and family peace. An interesting idea that is found in Isocrates above was the potential reasoning behind Zeus' disguise. He wanted to hide from his wife and at the same time hide his ugly appearance through the use of art and crafts, a perfectly suitable idea for a comedy in which Daedalus helps Zeus to sleep with Leda.

Leda's husband, Tyndareos, is presented as the man who shared his wife with the king of Zeus. He sometimes appears as a sensible, kind man (raising Orestes) who can become quite harsh when he feels that injustice has fallen upon him and his kin. His polite treatment of Orestes turns to the worst enmity after Orestes slays Tyndareos' daughter. Aphrodite and more specifically love seems to have been the root of Tyndareos' problems. First, the unnatural offspring that he finds with his wife after Zeus' intervention, and then Helen and Clytemnestra's shameful acts of taking on a lover although being married. It is rather unfortunate that none of the surviving fragments seem to point out towards Tyndareos' character or even presence on stage. One could only assume that he would be equally furious to discover his wife's infidelity and perhaps react similarly to Apmhitryon, if not harsher.

Leda seems to have been famous among different sources from different times because of the story with Zeus. She was either the caretaker of Zeus and Nemesis' egg, which she either found or was brought to her, or she produced herself the same giant egg that contained Helen. Obviously, in this case she is an adulteress, while in the first she is just the kind nanny or adopted family that Zeus chose for his daughter, Helen. In either case, she is always referred to as Helen's mother.

2.2.4 The plot of *Daedalus*: Impregnated by the wind

This play's plot reconstruction differs from the rest merely because the fragments and testimonia allow for more than one equally likely interpretations. In this section, I will suggest those that seem more plausible to me and I will examine how they could be supported by the surviving evidence. To begin with, it is essential to keep in mind the mythical background of the play. Zeus is notorious for his extra-marital affairs with a number of mortal women, always leaving behind the seed of this or that illegitimate union. This time Aristophanes decides to give his own account of the story behind the birth of Helen of Troy.

The setting is Sparta this time (the Athenian setting is clearly not a 'must' any more looking at the rest of the plays of the late 5th c. and later comedy) and (at some point at least) on the stage we also have Tyndareos' palace where he lives with his wife, Leda. Zeus is charmed by the latter's beauty and cannot resist attempting a union with her. The whole plot shall be arranged around the way that this plan is to be executed. Zeus has been witnessed realising a similar plan in comedy when he wanted to sleep with Alcmena, Amphytrion's wife, and Hermes helped him. In *Daedalus* this role is taken on by Daedalus, who has been an assistant in adultery again, when he had helped Pasiphae, Minos' wife to unite with the bull.⁷² So far so good...The difficult part of the play starts now, as the surviving evidence is not enough to point out towards a specific direction and the other *Daedalus* plays that were dealing with the same topic, especially Plato's, which apparently was the most similar in content, have not survived.

Therefore, the content of the first Act⁷³/scene could be Zeus' enchantment by Leda and him trying to figure out a way of approaching her behind the back of her husband. How he came up with Daedalus we do not know; he could have thought of him by himself as the helper of adulterers or someone could have suggested Daedalus to him again because of the same special 'skill'. The choice of Daedalus also makes sense if we think of Zeus' disguise as a bird that could fly, and Daedalus, as was known to the

⁷² cf. Philostephanus' account in *FGH*, Vol. 3, fr. 36; Diodorus Siculus 4.77.

⁷³ The term (*Act*) is simply used to refer to the change of scene; it is not meant in the modern sense of *Act* in dramaturgy.

audience by the mythical tradition, was able to build this kind of device that would make Zeus look like a bird; all he needed was a few feathers and wax.⁷⁴

In the second Act, we have the realisation of the conspiracy planned by Zeus and Daedalus. What we can tell from the fragments is that the flight is taking place with the use of the crane.⁷⁵ According to the myth, there are two versions as to how Leda ended up with Zeus' offspring. One of them claims that Zeus chased Leda in the form of a swan, impregnated her, and consequently she gave birth to Helen.⁷⁶ A swan was possibly too pretty for a comedy, a chicken of some sorts would look much funnier. Maybe that was the use of the word partridge we read in the fragments.⁷⁷ The other tradition over her birth has Nemesis as Zeus' object of desire, so instead of chasing Leda, he chased Nemesis and the egg produced by Nemesis and containing Helen was placed in Leda's lap. The story of Nemesis and Zeus is also the theme of one of Cratinus' plays. We cannot know for sure if Nemesis was part of the Aristophanic play as well; however, a direct adultery with Leda might have been a more suitable topic for a comedy.

What happened exactly before or after the flight is hard to guess. Leda, as one of the fragments would suggest, is accused of adultery,⁷⁸ exactly as it happened with Alcmena in *Amphitruo*, although she was innocent. The question that arises here is how innocent would Aristophanes portray a woman? One scenario would be that Leda is raped by Zeus (as the myth has it) or that Leda is flattered by Zeus and the fact that the king of gods is interested in her and willingly lies with him. Consequently, Leda could be portrayed as the chaste wife or the naughty wife eager to sleep with other men when

⁷⁴ See also fr. 9 referring on Daedalus' craft.

⁷⁵ fr. 2.

⁷⁶ Disguise is a common Aristophanic technique. Disguise and deception go together and the deception often includes the assumption of a false identity. Euripides' kinsman's disguise in *Thesmophoriazusae*, Dionysus' in *Frogs*, the women's in *Ecclesiazusae* are a few notable examples. Disguise is observed in other comic poets too, such as in Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*, in which Dionysus is disguised as Paris and as a ram. Further on disguise in comedy see Marshall (2014) 140; Foley (2014) 264-265; Csapo (2014) 112-113; Muecke (1982) 17-34; Bowie (2010) 150-151.

⁷⁷ fr. 11.

⁷⁸ fr. 1.

given the opportunity. Here we need to figure out what Daedalus' role would be in all that, and that would be part of the second Act.

There is also a meal taking a place at some point.⁷⁹ The theories as to the use of that meal are two. First, it could be part of the ritual of Amphidromia some days after baby Helen was born in order to be recognised by her father(s) and thus it would be placed at the end of the play sealing the happy ending. Or, another possibility would be the use of octopus and cuttlefish as aphrodisiacs in order to facilitate the erotic intercourse.

To get back to our story, Daedalus reaches the palace as Zeus' scout and in order to prepare the ground for the god's arrival. He would be received as an honoured guest according to the custom of *xenia* (as established by Zeus *xenios*!), only to take advantage of it and abuse it. Leda, being not so faithful served the stimulating food to Daedalus trying to seduce him.⁸⁰ Whether successfully or not, who knows? If Tyndareos was present and not away, Daedalus would have kept him busy while Leda was in the bedroom or elsewhere with Zeus, after he had flown to the palace. According to the myth Leda slept with both Zeus and Tyndareos at the same night, so she gave birth to children of both. In any case, the plan is successfully carried out. Eurybatus Zeus⁸¹ committed adultery once again.

In the third Act, Leda lays an egg⁸² following her union with Zeus that contains Helen. Tyndareos logically does not believe that he was the agent of that bizarre outcome and accuses Leda of adultery. And possibly adultery with Daedalus which obviously puts him in a great deal of trouble with the king of Sparta who had received him as a guest. It seems plausible that if Daedalus had a sister named Partridge, it is difficult to avoid depicting him with birdly features in a comedy. In other words, what we could have here is a story of abuse of *xenia* similar to what happened with Menelaus, Paris and Helen. According to the mythological tradition, Helen had been abducted again by Theseus and was rescued by her brothers Castor and Pollux when they went to claim her back. Finally, the revelation of the truth by Zeus or by Daedalus

⁷⁹ fr. 4.

⁸⁰ Alternatively, the same food could be used in order to seduce Zeus.

⁸¹ fr. 5.

⁸² fr. 3.

and Zeus would have closed the play, with Tyndareos not so bothered by the fact that he would be raising a divine offspring, just like Amphytrion.

2.2.5 Conclusion

Daedalus is another play by Aristophanes which seems to present certain common features with *Polyidus* as well as the two subsequent plays in the thesis. Unlike the extant plays, it is a character-titled play, named after a mythical personality (Daedalus) and its main topic is the comic presentation of a well-known myth, that of the birth of Helen. Although we do not know which could be the direct model, if there was one, Sophocles' *Daedalus* is an option. Apart from the main theme, parody can also be traced in the fragment that contains references to the theatrical device of the crane and its operator. As discussed earlier, parodic references to the tragic use of the device are found elsewhere in the Aristophanic corpus.⁸³ The version of the story according to which Daedalus helped Zeus to sleep with Leda seems to have been a popular one among comic playwrights whose work has often been connected to the parodic mythological burlesque of Middle Comedy, such as Plato Comicus and Eubulus, who produced comedies under the same title. That said, it should be noted that Cratinus' *Nemesis* is a very important parallel as it focused on the same myth, but with slight variations. Zeus is chasing Nemesis and not Leda, therefore Leda is the receiver of the giant egg rather than the producer. There is no evidence that Daedalus was part of Cratinus' play either. Another feature that sets *Daedalus*, and *Polyidus*, apart from the extant plays is the non-Athenian setting. Leda lived in Sparta with Tyndareos, therefore the play was probably set there. The potential similarities between *Daedalus* and Plautus' *Amphytruo* are also noted. Their plot is very similar and their characters could correspond. In that case, the domestic affairs within Leda's household would be central in the plot, an element more common in the subsequent comic eras, as was the technique of parody and mythological burlesque.

⁸³ cf. the discussion on fr. 2.

2.3 *Aeolosicon*: Messing with the gods (and the genre!)

2.3.1 Introduction

Aeolosicon is one of the most puzzling plays of Aristophanes. Only 16 fragments and even fewer testimonia have survived, some of them being nothing more than a single word. Despite this difficulty, *Aeolosicon* was chosen for similar reasons to the rest of the plays. It is a character-titled play produced right at the dawn of the era of Middle Comedy and it was possibly composed as a parody of Euripides' *Aeolus*. In addition, *Aeolosicon* seems to present more features of Middle Comedy than the rest of the plays, such as the more prominent role of the cook. All these elements that make this play stand out from the extant ones will be addressed in the chapter as well as the rest of the issues that have emerged regarding the play and have not been explored in-depth until today. The initial issue that seems to emerge from the testimonia regards the existence and the dating of the play(s). In the following discussions various questions shall be addressed such as: Were there one or two plays under the same name? And if there were indeed two, when were they performed and how were they different? There could have been a number of reasons why a play would be re-written and revised, reasons that we cannot be certain of, be that the failure of the first one¹ or some form of censorship.² But, what was the point of changing the script after it had been performed? A possible answer found in the Hypothesis IV to *Wealth* (which will be discussed in this section) is for his son to (re)produce it at a later stage. This appears to be a rather problematic assumption, though, as the only difference presumably was the omission of the choral parts.³ Did Araros make his debut with a second *Aeolosicon* that was exactly the same as the first one but without the choral parts? So, basically the spectators would have to watch a poorer version of the exact same play. Another topic that emerges is the

¹ Such as in the case of *Clouds*, for a discussion on which see O'Regan (1992) ch. 5. For a discussion on the 'double' plays, both comic and tragic see Butrica (2001), who discusses all these briefly and focuses more on the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*.

² For a discussion on the forms of censorship that could have interfered in the production of a Greek comedy at the time see Hartwig (2015).

³ Platonius, *Diff. Com.* 13ff., lines 1-34 (which will be discussed in detail in this section).

categorization of the play as Old or Middle Comedy. The testimonia suggest that *Aeolosicon* is a 4th c. play that was produced after *Wealth*. Therefore, chronologically we can talk about plays that are created at the dawn of Middle Comedy. On the other hand, a qualitative argument can be put forward as well, given the fact that there are some fragments that suggest content and language also resembling a Middle Comedy play. These are all questions and problematics that may never be resolved, but they will all be discussed and a clear picture of the problem will be given in the course of the chapter.

As far as the plot is concerned, the testimonia⁴ suggest that Aristophanes wrote a parody of Euripides' *Aeolus* and the incestuous marriage of his children.⁵ This is not the first time that Aristophanes attempts to parody the content of this play and particularly the incestuous union of the siblings (*Clouds* 1371-74, *Frogs* 850, 1081, as well as the parody of the tragedy and the image of Aeolus as a father in *Peace*). Eriphus and Antiphanes seem to have ridiculed the same play as well.⁶

Testimonia

Choeroboscus lived in the 9th c. AD and wrote a commentary on Hephaestion's handbook of metre (*Encheiridion*). Hephaestion of Alexandria lived in the 2nd c. AD and he is famous for his metrical treatise.⁷ Apart from being the most important source on ancient metrical analysis, Hephaestion's handbook has also transmitted fragments of lost poetry. In a discussion over metres we come across an example that refers to the play, claiming that there were two *Aeolosicons*.

⁴ Platonius *Diff. Com.* 29-31.

⁵ Xanthaki-Karamanou & Mimidou (2014) 51.

⁶ K.-A. II 319, V 178.

⁷ For more information in Choeroboscus and Hephaestion see Ophuijsen (1987) and Consbruch (1906).

< Περὶ χοριαμβικοῦ. >

Αἰολοσίκων δράμα γέγονε πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον Ἀριστοφάνους, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πλοῦτος πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ἐν ᾧ κέχρηται τῷ χοριαμβικῷ μέτρῳ οἷονεὶ τροχιαμβικῷ· ἐκ τροχαίου γὰρ καὶ ἰάμβου σύγκειται. εἵπομεν δὲ καὶ ἄνωτέρῳ (230, 12), ὅτι λέγεται παρὰ τισιν ὁ τροχαῖος καὶ χορεῖος.

(Choeroboscus in Hephaestion 9.235)

Tr.: There was a first and a second *Aeolosicon* created belonging to Aristophanes, like there was a first and second *Wealth*, in which he has used the choriambic metre like the trochiambic; which consists of the trochaeus and iambus. We already mentioned above that the trochaeus and choreius are named next to them.

The *Hypothesis* IV to Aristophanes' *Wealth* implies the existence probably of one play under the name *Aeolosicon*, staged by Aristophanes' son Araros some time after the production of *Wealth* (388 BC).

τελευταίαν δὲ διδάξας τὴν κωμωδίαν ταύτην (referring to *Wealth*) ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ συστήσαι Ἀραρότα τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δι' ἐκείνου καθῆκε, *Κώκαλον* καὶ *Αἰολοσίκωνα*.

Tr.: Having produced this comedy last under his own name, and wanting to introduce his son, Araros, to the audience, he staged the remaining two through him, *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*.

Another option would be to assume that the *Hypothesis* refers to the second *Aeolosicon*. However, if we accept that this *Aeolosicon* was indeed the second one, then the source should refer to it as *Αἰολοσίκωνα δεύτερον* rather than just *Αἰολοσίκωνα*. This would have been the way to tell them apart as, for example, we see in his *Clouds*; the testimonia refer to it as *πρῶται Νεφέλαι* or *δεύτεραι Νεφέλαι* and not just as *Νεφέλαι*.

Platonius was an ancient critic who wrote two treatises on Attic comedy, one of which is the *Perì diaphorâs kômōidiôn*, a discussion and justification on the transition from Old to Middle Comedy and whatever this entailed. In Platonius' 'Prolegomena', in the course of a discussion over the shift from Democracy to Oligarchy and its consequences for comedy, he talks about the political reasons why the content and structure of comedies had to change and how *Aeolosicon* was affected. I am quoting Platonius' segment at length because the information it offers is quite interesting for us.

Καλὸν ἐπισημῆνασθαι τὰς αἰτίας δι' ἃς ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία κωμω-
δία ἰδιὸν τινα τύπον ἔχει, ἡ δὲ μέση διάφορός ἐστι πρὸς ταύτην. ἐπὶ
τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ Κρατίνου καὶ Εὐπόλιδος χρόνων τὰ τῆς δημο-
κρατίας ἐκράτει παρ' Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν σύμπασαν ὁ δῆμος
εἶχεν, αὐτὸς αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων ὑπάρ-
χων. τῆς ἰσηγορίας οὖν πᾶσιν ὑπαρχούσης ἄδειαν οἱ τὰς κωμωιδίας
συγγράφοντες εἶχον τοῖ σκώπτειν καὶ στρατηγούς καὶ δικαστὰς τοὺς
κακῶς δικάζοντας καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τινὰς ἢ φιλαργύρους ἢ συζῶντας
ἀσελγείαι. ὁ γὰρ δῆμος, ὡς εἶπον, ἐξήρει τὸν φόβον τῶν κωμωι-
δούντων, φιλοτίμως τῶν τοὺς τοιούτους βλασφημούντων ἀκούων.
ἴσμεν γὰρ ὡς ἀντίκειται φύσει τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ δῆμος καὶ
ταῖς δυσπραγίαις αὐτῶν ἥδεται. ἐπὶ τοίνυν τῆς Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ
Κρατίνου καὶ Εὐπόλιδος κωμωιδίας ἀφόρητοί τινες κατὰ τῶν ἀμαρ-
τανόντων ἦσαν οἱ ποιηταί. λοιπὸν δὲ τῆς δημοκρατίας ὑποχωρούσης
ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας τυραννιώντων καὶ καθισταμένης ὀλιγαρχίας
καὶ μεταπιπτούσης τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ δήμου εἰς ὀλίγους τινὰς καὶ κρα-
τυνομένης τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας ἐνέπιπτε τοῖς ποιηταῖς φόβος. οὐ γὰρ
ἦν τινα προφανῶς σκώπτειν, δίκας ἀπαιτούντων τῶν ὑβριζομένων
παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν· ἴσμεν γοῦν τὸν Εὐπόλιν ἐπὶ τῷ διδάξαι τοὺς
Βάπτας ἀποπνιγέντα εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς ὃν καθῆκε τοὺς
Βάπτας. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὀκνηρότεροι πρὸς τὰ σκώμματα ἐγένοντο
καὶ ἐπέλιπον οἱ χορηγοί· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι προθυμίαν εἶχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι
τοὺς χορηγούς τοὺς τὰς δαπάνας τοῖς χορευταῖς παρέχοντας χειρο-

τονεῖν. τὸν γοῦν *Αἰολοσίκωνα* Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδαξεν, ὃς οὐκ ἔχει τὰ χορικὰ μέλη. τῶν γὰρ χορηγῶν μὴ χειροτονουμένων καὶ τῶν χορευτῶν οὐκ ἐχόντων τὰς τροφὰς ὑπεξηιρέθη τῆς κωμωιδίας τὰ χορικὰ μέλη καὶ τῶν ὑποθέσεων ὁ τύπος μετεβλήθη. σκοποῦ γὰρ ὄντος τῇ ἀρχαίαι κωμωιδίαι τοῦ σκώπτειν δημαγωγούς καὶ δικαστὰς καὶ στρατηγούς, παρεῖς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης τοῦ συνήθως ἀποσκῶψαι διὰ τὸν πολὺν φόβον Αἴολον τὸ δρᾶμα τὸ γραφὲν τοῖς τραγωιδοῖς ὡς κακῶς ἔχον διασύρει. τοιοῦτος οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμωιδίας τύπος οἷός ἐστιν ὁ *Αἰολοσίκων* Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ οἱ *Ὀδυσσεῖς* Κρατίνου καὶ πλεῖστα τῶν παλαιῶν δραμάτων οὔτε χορικὰ οὔτε παραβάσεις ἔχοντα.

(Platonius, *Diff. Com.* 13ff., lines 1-34)

Tr. It is good to point out the reasons why the old comedy, on the one hand, is of a particular type, the middle comedy, on the other, is different to it. In the time of Aristophanes and Cratinus and Eupolis, there was democracy among the Athenians and the full power was in the hands of the demos, which had sole power and was master of political affairs. Because of the existing right to speech for everyone (*ἰσηγορία*), the writers of comedy had the permission to mock the generals and the judges who were judging poorly and some of the citizens whether greedy for money or living in a vulgar way. For the demos, as I said, took away the fear of the comedians, by enthusiastically listening to those who mocked such people. For we know that the demos is by nature against the wealthy from the beginning and enjoys their miseries. In the case of Aristophanes, Cratinus and Eupolis' comedy, the poets were unendurable in some cases against those at fault. But when the democracy was pushed back by the tyrants in Athens, and when the oligarchy was established, and the power of the people fell to some few,

and while the oligarchy was becoming powerful, fear fell upon the poets. For it was not possible to mock someone openly, as the mocked would demand lawsuits against the poets; we know then that Eupolis after he produced *Baptai* was drowned in the sea by the person against whom he had staged *Baptai*. And because of this they became more hesitant regarding mockery and the choregoi were missing; for the Athenians were not willing anymore to elect the choregoi who provided the funds for the members of the chorus. At any rate Aristophanes produced *Aeolosicon*, which does not have choral parts. For as the *choregoi* were not being elected and the members of the chorus had no provisions, the choral parts were taken away and the type of the plot changed. For the purpose of old comedy was to mock demagogues and judges and generals. Aristophanes having deviated from his usual mockery out of fear mocks *Aeolus*, the drama written by the tragedians, for being poor. Such is then the type of middle comedy as is Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon* and Cratinus' *Odyssseis* and very many of the old dramas that do not have choral parts or parabases.

Platonius' testimonium suggests that our play concentrates all these features of a Middle Comedy play and even offers an explanation on how and why there was a change in the type of comedy. It is claimed that it had no parabasis and no choral parts, just like Cratinus' *Odyssēs*. The shifting from Democracy to Oligarchy is said to be responsible for the reduction/exclusion of the choral parts as there were not sufficient funds to support the existence of a chorus. However, this particular testimonium appears to be problematic and even unreliable to some extent for the reasons that will be discussed in the following pages.⁸

Αἰολοσίκων or Αἰολοσίκωνες?

Aeolosicon is clearly a very interesting case within the study of fragmentary plays. The confusion starts from its title; not only can we not be sure about its actual name,

⁸ Specifically see pp. 111-112.

which has happened with others as well, but scholars have not yet been in the position to decide if there were one or two plays under the same name, in other words if there were one or two *Aeolosicons*. There is a significant level of confusion regarding the number of plays that are related to Aristophanes' lost play named *Aeolosicon*. Modern and ancient scholars have suggested different solutions to the matter, putting forward their own views and assumptions, and often contradicting one another.

The debate is quite an old one and it is already present in the testimonia. On the one hand, there are those who supported the existence of one play, or so it seems from their citations. Platonius considers *Aeolosicon* as one of the two plays with which the transition from Old Comedy to Middle Comedy is marked. He also speaks of only one play without indicating if it was the first or second version. Thus, according to Platonius there is one play, and it is without any choral parts. However, Platonius seems to be wrong in this account for different reasons that scholars have noticed and discussed.⁹ He links Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon* with Cratinus' *Odyssēs*, a rather problematic connection when matters of time are considered; the period when both of the poets lived and composed and the historical period to which he refers do not coincide. Furthermore, the surviving fragments of both plays do indicate the existence of choral parts¹⁰ and possibly a parabasis in the case of *Odyssēs*. However, the fact that certain information offered by Platonius is mistaken needs not invalidate his whole testimony. It is certainly an important piece which attests to the rather fuzzy boundaries between the genres of Old and Middle Comedy.¹¹

On the other hand, Hephaestion in his *Handbook of Metre* (οἷον δῖμετρα μὲν τὰ ἐξ Ἀιολοσίκωνος Ἀριστοφάνους) mentions only one *Aeolosicon* which had at least one choral part. He is clearly speaking of this version of the play which included the choral parts and he probably knew of no other as he does not refer to it as *first* or *second*. The same is the case of Pollux, who, in his *Onomasticon* 9.63, describes the money of the time and refers to the play thus: ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ διώβολον ἐν Ἀιολοσίκωνι Ἀριστοφάνους. It seems that we have another defender of the existence of only one play, or at least

⁹ Ruffell (2012) 162; Storey (2010) 189.

¹⁰ Sommerstein (2009) 272-288.

¹¹ cf. Konstan (2014) 35.

someone who knew no other. Another reference to a single *Aeolosicon* we find in Hdn. i.405.10, ii.912.4L (καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν Αἰολοσίκωνι “καὶ κ’ ἐπιθυμήσειε νέος νῆς ἀμφιπόλοιο”). However, this is not likely to be an accurate source as Kassel¹² has argued, but it is rather a case of confused sources (instead of “Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν Αἰολοσίκωνι”, we ought to read “Ξενοφάνει δ’ σίλλωνι”).

Last but not least, we come across the author of *Hypothesis IV* to Aristophanes’ *Wealth*, who also speaks of an *Aeolosicon*. However, this one could only be the second one produced after *Wealth* because it is named last, and according to the order that the play is mentioned, also after *Cocalus* (τελευταίαν δὲ διδάζας τὴν κωμωδίαν ταύτην ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ συστήσαι Ἀραρότα τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δι’ ἐκείνου καθῆκε, Κώκαλον καὶ Αἰολοσίκωνα). Dindorf¹³ disagrees with this sequence supporting his view with Platonius; he claims that since *Aeolosicon* belonged to Middle Comedy (according to Platonius), then it should precede *Cocalus* which may have had elements that anticipated New Comedy. Meineke¹⁴ argues against this opinion using historical data; however, he does speak of a second enumeration/review/recension at the end of his account (*Secundam autem Aeolosiconis recensionem, quam Athenaeus commemorare videtur, iam supra reieci*), which he had rejected previously on the basis that there has been a corruption of the text of Athenaeus and the word *δευτέρῳ*, and therefore there has not been a second play.¹⁵

Some scholars have shared the same opinion with Meineke mentioning a first and/or second *Aeolosicon*. Choeroboscus in Hephaestion 9.235 speaks of two distinct plays written one after the other just like *Wealth* (Αἰολοσίκων δράμα γέγονε πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον Ἀριστοφάνους, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πλοῦτος πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον). This is a very interesting connection from which certain assumptions regarding the two plays of *Aeolosicon*, if indeed there were two, can be made. It is possible that there was a temporal connection regarding between *Wealth* and the second *Aeolosicon* regarding their production as well as possibly style and structure similarities; both of them seem

¹² See schol. Aristoph. 465.

¹³ Meineke II (1839) 940.

¹⁴ Ibid. 941.

¹⁵ For more see Meineke (1839) 945.

to be plays of the Middle Comedy. In *Wealth* the decline of the choral and/or lyrical elements is obvious. After the parodos, the script includes only two lyric utterances in dochmiacs (636, 639-640).¹⁶ It appears that, as in *Aeolosicon*, the choral parts (or the majority of them) are omitted from the scripts possibly because of the notion that they were not fully part of the play. As can be inferred from the discussion above, we are talking about two versions of the plays. However, it seems that these two versions were not two quite distinct compositions (as in the case of the two *Thesmophoriazusae* and the two *Peaces*), but the first and the revised piece of the same play (like *Clouds*).¹⁷

On the same side with Choeroboscus we find Dindorf¹⁸ who refers to two editions of *Aeolosicon* following the Catalogue of the plays of Aristophanes from Codex Ambrosianus which mentions *Aeolosicon* as the second one (*Αἰολοσίκων β'*). Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*Hermes* 14.465) discusses the order of the plays in the catalogue which he characterises as troubled and disturbed because of the confusion of the alphabetical order with the chronological order and quotes them thus: *Ἀχαρνῆς* (425) *Ἀνάγνυρος* (419-16) *Ἀμφιάραος* (414) *Αἰολοσίκων* (*per Ararotem docta*); therefore, he refers to an *Aeolosicon* produced by Araros and not Aristophanes.

Furthermore, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in chapter 13 of *Griechische Verskunst*¹⁹ refers to *Aeolosicon*'s metre and he talks about an *Aeolosicon* produced after *Wealth*; he seems to side with Athenaeus' belief (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 48c) in favour of the existence of two versions and the connection to *Wealth*: "Den Aiolosikon hat Aristophanes erst nach dem Plutos aufgeführt, da fällt auf, daß die Bruchstücke außer diesen lyrischen Versen noch trochäische Dimeter, einen Hexameter und Choriamben zeigen. Allerdings spricht zum Teil eine Person, und den Hexameter hat auch schwerlich der Chor gehabt, aber das Drama ist doch viel reicher als der Plutos. Erklären wird es sich so, daß es auch vom Aiolosikon zwei Bearbeitungen gab (Athenaeus 372a und die vita Ambrosiana), und im Gegensatze zum Plutos und den Wolken die ältere vorwiegend gelesen ward; beim Frieden war es ebenso."

¹⁶ For the similarly diminished role of the chorus in *Ecclesiazusae* see Dobrov (2010) 291-292.

¹⁷ For more on the nature of the 'double' plays see Butrica (2001).

¹⁸ Dindorf (1846) 463. See also the discussion on Dindorf in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1879) 463 and in Meineke (1839) 940-941.

¹⁹ id. (1921) 396, n. 2.

Athenaeus in his citations gives both kinds of quotations, namely just *Aeolosicon* (*ἀκροκωλίων μέμνηται Ἀριστοφάνης Αἰολοσίκωνι*)²⁰ and *Aeolosicon second* (*Μνημονεύει τῶν γηθυλλίδων... Ἀριστοφάνης Αἰολοσίκωνι δευτέρῳ*),²¹ which probably implies that he believed in the existence of two plays. Does that mean that he quotes the first line from the supposed first *Aeolosicon* and the second line from the second one?

As has been pointed out, people have come up with different suggestions and ideas around the play. Overall, one way we could interpret the transmission of the play, testimonia and fragments, suggests one full version and one shorter version. The full version would have been produced approximately in 424BC, close to the dates when *Clouds* and *Peace* were produced, which also parody Aeolus. Also, if we accept the connection to Cratinus' *Odyssēs*, and given the fact that there is no evidence that Cratinus produced anything after his *Pytine* in 423,²² then it should have definitely been before 423. The version without the chorus would have been produced approximately in 387BC, after *Wealth* according to the author of the *Hypothesis*. This would have been a shorter one to the extent that some of the scribes considered the choral parts as not essential or even unnecessary parts of the play so as to omit them. In this case, there were two different productions of the same play, but this argument is weak, especially if the fact that Aristophanes was to introduce his son to the public with this second mutilated version is to be considered.

As for those mentioning only one version of the play, Platonius' account presents particular interest and, as discussed previously, it has provoked a considerable reaction among the scholars. It has been convincingly argued that Platonius' statement is not a historical one and his claims should be viewed as hypotheses rather than factual statements. Surely, one problem is that Cratinus' *Odyssēis* was not composed during the last years of Aristophanes' career as Cratinus had already been long dead by then. Platonius' second main inaccuracy is the information about the political reality that affected the dramatic composition when the Macedonians conquered Athens, by which time both Cratinus and Aristophanes were also long dead, and therefore could not have

²⁰ Athenaeus 3.95e.

²¹ Athenaeus 7.372a.

²² Sidwell (2009) 199.

been affected by the new order of things. His third major error is the statement about the absence of choral parts in both plays, when in fact there seem to be choral parts in the surviving fragments.²³ One cannot be sure whether Platonius had direct access to the fragments or what he actually did was to try and combine what he had heard about the plays with what he had picked up or vaguely knew about the political situation of that period.

As for the choral songs in particular, there might have been two different versions of the play, one including them and one excluding them, but it remains uncertain whether both of them were staged. Another suggestion is that there were choral parts but they are not included in the script (like *Wealth*). Therefore, what Platonius might have implied is that there were no choral parts in the middle of the play, namely no sung and danced stasima, and that the choral evidence that we find in the fragments come from the parodos. However, this assumption could only be supported if it was certain that this fragment comes from the parodos and not from a song in the middle of the play.²⁴ It is also possible that the playwright (or the scribe or even an editor) had produced a revised script adapted to a different occasion or period, which ‘demanded’ the exclusion of the choral parts (which might have also happened with *Frogs*).

To conclude, there can be three alternative answers to the problem:

- a. Aristophanes wrote a play that included choral parts. Later scribes copied it without the choral parts so as to adapt it to the time’s needs and restage it.
- b. Aristophanes wrote only one version of the play around 424 BC but it was not staged until 387 BC by his son.
- c. Aristophanes produced one play in 424 BC and revised it in 387 BC, so as to be restaged by his son.

From the three solutions, the last one seems less likely. Aristophanes had absolutely no reason to produce the exact same play twice, especially if the second time it was supposed to be a poorer version of the original and with which he meant to introduce his son to the public. The first and second explanations appear far more likely and

²³ cf. Sommerstein (2009) who discusses the problems with this particular segment of Platonius extensively.

²⁴ cf. Grauert (1828) 505-6.

possibly the truth is hiding somewhere in between. Consequently, there was probably only one play written by Aristophanes under the name *Aeolosicon*, possibly staged (or restaged as in the case *Frogs*)²⁵ by his son Araros after 387 BC. It presented features which are commonly found in plays of Middle Comedy and there were at least two different editions that survived from the transmission of the text,²⁶ one including the whole play and one excluding the minor choral parts and the parabasis, negligible or even unnecessary features in every play of Middle Comedy.

In addition, the evidence available to support the existence of a first and a second *Aeolosicon* cannot be deemed sufficient. In every other case of the existence of two plays under the same name, there is one version that has survived complete and one incomplete. However, the existence of three different sources (Catal. Fab., Choerob. In Heph., Athenaeus on fr. 5) mentioning a second *Aeolosicon* means that we probably had two versions. It is unlikely that all three sources are wrong. Then, the real question is what exactly they mean by ‘two versions’. And to that question is the explanation I have suggested above. Since such a thing cannot be deduced from the fragments, in other words, as there is no implication that another play preceded or succeeded, one

²⁵ The third Hypothesis says: *Οὕτω δὲ ἐθαυμάσθη διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ παράβασιν, καθ’ ἣν διαλλάττει τοὺς ἐντίμους τοῖς ἀτίμοις καὶ τοὺς πολίτας τοῖς φυγάσιν, ὥστε καὶ ἀνεδιδάχθη, ὡς φησι Δικαίαρχος*. We are in 405, just after the battle of Arginusae and the incidents with Alcibiades on whom Aeschylus and Euripides are asked to give their views (1422); Dover (1993: 73-75) discusses the emotional impact of the second performance on the audience and suggests that it was a ‘conflation of two versions’; Sommerstein (1996: 22-23) puts forward a particularly interesting argument, according to which political motives hide behind the restaging of *Frogs*, specifically in order to influence the demos against Cleophon.

²⁶ Norwood on *Peace* (1931: 233-234) provides a discussion where he concludes that in the library of Alexandria, Eratosthenes’ base, there was a copy of only one edition of *Peace*, when in the library of Pergamum, Crates’ base, there were copies of two editions. He also notes Zielinski’s theory (1885: 63-79) according to which there was an original earlier version of the play which was produced in 422 and the one we have now is a revision of that first piece, which was connected with the dedication of a statue of Peace at the Great Dionysia 421 made by Pheidias and one of his pupils. During this festival a *Peace* very similar to ours was produced, with slight modifications regarding the scene (it did not include our Zeus-passage). Another *Peace* was produced at some point during a festival, without the Polemos-scene, since it presented Brasidas and Cleon as recently dead. Instead of Polemos we have Zeus and possibly a simpler chorus; see Olson (1998: xlviii-li) for a detailed discussion on the transmission and sources for the two versions of *Peace*. The case of Eupolis’ *Autolycus* appears to be also similar to *Aeolosicon* as the evidence suggests that there were two versions of the script in circulation, the original and a revised one, which however does not necessarily mean two distinct productions (cf. Marshall 2012: 55-76).

should take great caution when relying only on the testimonia in order to decide on such a crucial matter as the actual existence of a play.

How could Aeolosicon be considered as innovative and to be forwarding the trend?

Regarding the play's dating it was probably produced after 387BC; according to Nesselrath Araros appeared at the Dionysia victoriously with the *Cocalus* of his father one year after the second *Wealth*. For Aristophanes wanted to help him at the start of his own career as a comic poet. He adds that Araros must have staged Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*. Therefore at the beginning of his stage career there are two mythical parodies which his father gave him. The Suda a3737 puts the beginning of Araros' stage career first in the 101st Olympics (376/5-373/2). Maybe, Nesselrath continues, the staging of his own pieces was meant with that. With those plays Araros could not keep up the high standard of his father.²⁷ We only have six titles from him and we are not in a position to tell whether these plays had any success or not. Nesselrath is also commenting on the language used in fragment 5:

τῶν δὲ γηθύων
ρίζας, ἐχούσας σκοροδομίμητον φύσιν.

He argues that it shows the same complicated, unclearly-structured (umständlich-verklausulierte) way of expression, just as one can find in a number of Middle fragments. A number of other poets of this transitional period show how such dithyrambic language elements were used more and more in comedies.²⁸

Additionally, the fact that the main character seems to be an acclaimed cook also points towards the direction of Middle Comedy. The chefs became very important in later comedies such as in the comedies of Alexis. The role of the chef changed on the way to New Comedy and became more subtle. The importance of the chefs of earlier comedians was hidden in the kitchens. These at the beginning were referred to with a

²⁷ Nesselrath (1995) 19.

²⁸ Nesselrath (1990) 252. Nesselrath also provides a list with examples of poets in which he observes the same phenomenon in the use of language such as Plato Comicus fr. 132 K-A, Archippus fr. 18 Kock, Theopomp fr. 4 K-A, et al.

lot of emphasis, but the chefs of Alexis place the cook to the front and talk about their magical dinners.

Toward the same direction points Andreas Willi's conclusion, which connects the speaking style of riddles that the cooks appropriated with the upper classes and the symposia. This was a clear sign of their *ἀλαζονεία* and the collapsing of social boundaries which made the cooks of Middle Comedy the forerunner of the *servus callidus* (found in Roman Comedy) and the witty *ἡγεμῶν θεραπέων* encountered in Greek and Roman New Comedy.²⁹ The riddly nature and the expression in the high tragic-dithyrambic language of the cooks and other lowly figures is found in the early-to-mid 4th c. Middle comedies such as Eubulus' *Sphingokarion*, the *Milesians* and *Cauldron* of Alexis as well as in Antiphanes' fragments. Willi argues that these poets developed this new type of comic cook who appeared in the 380s in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*. The comic cook certainly exists before *Aeolosicon* but perhaps is not fully exploited until the 4th c.³⁰ A notable example from 391 BC is Plato Comicus' *Phaon* in which a cookery book is mocked for the first time (fr. 189). The Middle Comedy *μάγειρος* is a tricky and aggressive *τεχνίτης* whose traits resemble these of slaves on stage. The cooks of the 4th c. were free in status and available for private hire. In the plays he is a lowly braggart frequently connected and interacting with slaves.³¹ Willi also refers to Nesselrath,³² who argues that the cook of Middle Comedy is a word wizard (Sprachzauberer). For Nesselrath³³ Old Comedy did not have a *μάγειρος* type, but only a few important types of slaves (except for Xanthias in *Frogs*,³⁴ and other

²⁹ Willi (2002) 27. For more on the characteristics of slaves in Menander see Konstan (2013) and in comparison with the Roman comic slaves see MacCary (1969). Silk (2000: 232-233) discusses the traits of an *alazon* and a *bomolokhos*, among others, pointing out the limitations of such a typology as well as the transferability of the characteristics of these types that one may notice in comedy, such as in *Thesmophoriazusae*, where we notice that whereas Mnesilochus appears as the buffoon at the beginning, later the Scythian does. The cook is often paralleled with the bomolochus and parasite, both demonstrating traits of a 'social deviant' (Wilkins 2000: 88-90).

³⁰ cf. Wilkins (2000) 342.

³¹ Dobrov (2007) 170-174.

³² Nesselrath (1990) 257.

³³ *ibid.* 283-309.

³⁴ Dionysus and Xanthias are interesting parallels to *Aeolosicon* regarding the identity theft that takes place in both plays. This kind of a dynamic slave appears in the last phase of Aristophanes' career; for more information on the Aristophanic slave see Akrigg & Tordoff (2013) 63-143.

characters that cook such as Dicaeopolis, Trygaios, Peisetaerus, or Heracles). Norwood notes that the main topics of Middle Comedy are eating, sex, riddles, philosophy, literature, and everyday life. Dining becomes an art and it is described in greater detail, placing the cook in the centre of attention. Aristophanes' very last play adopted this new motif including the famous chef Sicon.³⁵

Apart from the change in the role of the cook, on the way to Middle Comedy more developments are taking place. One of them is the observation that the choral parts continued losing their importance. Norwood argues that the reasons behind the changes (and supposed deterioration) in the composition of comedy were to be found in the political downfall and turmoil after the defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. He claims that lack of funds led to the replacement of the traditional chorus by a 'commonplace' group. These were the developments that gradually led to a new form of comic creation with less song and dance and more emphasis on the plot, the so-called Comedy of Manners.³⁶ This account of his is at least questionable as evidence has shown that there were still funds available for chorus and that the political situation did not affect it as much.³⁷ The decline in the chorus is an undoubted sign of the genre's inner developments (also apparent in *Aeolosicon*) but the reasons behind it were different, as discussed in the introduction.³⁸

In conclusion, it seems that *Aeolosicon* presents all these characteristics that would make it a product of Middle Comedy rather than Old Comedy. The chef Sicon, the sophisticated language and food, the possible diminished (or absence) of a chorus as well as the fact that what we may have here is a mythological burlesque provide us with sufficient evidence to argue that Aristophanes turns to the new trend at the end of his career.

³⁵ Norwood (1931) 38-42.

³⁶ *ibid.* 29.

³⁷ For a detailed discussion on this see Rothwell (1995) 116-117.

³⁸ See pp. 28-29.

2.3.2 The fragments

The first fragment of *Aeolosicon* is found in Athenaeus. This could very well have been the opening lines of the play too, and therefore part of the prologue, if not the beginning of it.

1. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 3.78. 9-10, 14-20 (1)

τῶν δ' Ἀττικῶν ἄρτων ὡς διαφόρων μνημονεύει
καὶ Ἀντιφάνης ἐν *Ομφάλλῃ* οὕτως (II 83 K):

πῶς γὰρ ἂν τις εὐγενὴς γεγῶς
δύναιτ' ἂν ἐξελθεῖν ποτ' ἐκ τῆσδε στέγης,
ὀρῶν μὲν ἄρτους τούσδε λευκοσωμάτους
ἵπνὸν κατέχοντας ἐν πυκναῖς διεξόδοις,
ὀρῶν δὲ μορφὴν κριβάνοις ἡλλαγμένους,
μίμημα χειρὸς Ἀττικῆς, οὓς δημόταις
Θεαρίων ἔδειξεν.

οὗτός ἐστι Θεαρίων ὁ ἄρτοποιός, οὗ μνημονεύει Πλά-
των ἐν *Γοργίᾳ* συγκαταλέγων αὐτῷ καὶ Μίθαικον
οὕτως γράφων (p. 518 b):

οἵτινες ἀγαθοὶ γεγόνασιν
ἢ εἰσὶ σωμάτων θεραπευταὶ ἔλεγές μοι πάνυ σπου-
δάζων, Θεαρίων ὁ ἄρτοκόπος καὶ Μίθαικος ὁ τὴν
ὀσοποιάν συγγεγραφὼς τὴν Σικελικὴν καὶ Σάραμβος
ὁ κάπηλος, ὅτι οὗτοι θαυμάσιοι γεγόνασιν σωμάτων
θεραπευταί, ὃ μὲν ἄρτους θαυμαστοὺς παρασκευάζων,
ὃ δὲ ὄψον, ὃ δὲ οἶνον.

καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Γηρυ-
τάδῃ* καὶ *Αἰολοσίκωνι* διὰ τούτων (I 392 K):

ἦκω Θεαρίωνος ἄρτοπώλιον
λιπών, ἵν' ἐστὶ κριβάνων ἐδώλια.

Tr. Of the Athenian loaves, Antiphanes also speaks, as distinguished in *Omphale* thus;

for how someone of noble birth
could ever come out of the house/building,
watching, on the one hand, these loaves of white substance
occupying the oven in quick succession,
seeing, on the other, that they have changed their form in the covered
earthen vessels,
a copy of an Attic hand, which Thearion
exhibited to the citizens.

This is Thearion the baker, whom Plato mentions
in *Gorgias* including Mithaecus with him in the same catalogue
writing thus;

those who have become skillful
or they are doctors of bodies you were enumerating to me very
carefully. Thearion the baker and Mithaecus
who has written the Sicilian Cookery and Sarambus
the innkeeper, the first one making wonderful bread-loaves,
the second one cooked food, the third one wine.

**And Aristophanes in *Gerytades*
and *Aeolosicon* using these words;**

**I come now having left Thearion's bakery,
where there are seats of covered earthen vessels.**

Thearion and his skill in bakery were clearly famous in ancient literature as we read in Athenaeus. The fact that Aristophanes seems to have opened his play with a reference to baking as part of a culinary art (as Thearion was not any random baker) could also reflect the importance of it in the rest of the play.

The last lines that refer to our fragment are familiar as they are a common prologue formula used in Greek tragedy as well:

Aeolosicon: ἦκω Θεαρίωνος ἄρτοπώλιον
λιπών, ἵν' ἐστὶ κριβάνων ἐδώλια

Hecuba: ἦκω, νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας
λιπών, ἵν' Ἀϊδης χωρὶς ὄκισται θεῶν,

The similarities are quite obvious and they lead us to date this particular fragment after 425 BC, which was the production year of *Hecuba*. Also, if Euripides' text is followed, then the next word missing from the fragment would be the name of the person *who just came*. This character is perhaps Sicon, who, as a cook, is likely to have come back from a bakery. It could also be Aeolus (disguised or not), which could draw a parallel with the opening speaker of *Bacchae*, Dionysus, who uses the same formula, and of *Trojan Women*, Poseidon, both gods and not common mortals. Although Aeolus' status is not clearly that of a god, he is still the lord of the winds, which grants him a special status superior to common mortals. The Aeolus of Euripides (possibly parodied in the play) has often been identified as this Aeolus.³⁹

Bacchae: ἦκω Διὸς παῖς τήνδε Θηβαίων χθόνα
Διόνυσος,

Trojan Women: Ἦκω λιπὼν Αἴγαιον ἄλμυρὸν βάθος
πόντου Ποσειδῶν, ἔνθα Νηρηίδων χοροὶ

A discussion on the different Aioloι will be presented later in the 'Characters' section. These similarities do raise the question of whether what we have here is a parody or a paratragedy. The aim here could be twofold. First, to parody a common opening formula of Euripidean tragedy and therefore to parody a Euripidean tragic technique. Second, the very similar structure and language also point towards the direction of paratragedy, as we talk about parody of a tragedy regarding the content (Euripides' *Aeolus*), but parody of other tragedies regarding the form (*Hecuba*, *Bacchae*, *TW*).

³⁹ According to Diodorus, Aeolus was son of Poseidon, which at least grants him divine descent, if it does not make him some sort of a demigod. For a further discussion on the evidence regarding the different Aeoloi see Grimal (1991) 61-63.

2. Photius a 225 (2)

Λέγουσι, τὸ δ' ἀγορῶ βάρβαρον. Παραδειγμάτων δὲ μεστὰ πάντα,
εἰλήφθω Ἀριστοφάνους ἐξ *Αἰολοσίκωνος* (-σικῶνος Photius):

ἀλλ' ἄνυσον· οὐ μέλλειν ἐχρῆν, ὥς ἀγοράσω
ἀπαξάπανθ' ὅς' ἂν κελεύης, ὦ γύναι

Tr. They call the verb 'agoro' (=I buy) barbaric. However, everything is
full of examples, let's take one from Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*;

But hurry up; we mustn't delay, so I can buy
Everything that you may order, woman

It seems like there is a lot of fuss going on in order to get the right ingredients for a dinner. The speaker in this fragment who is addressing a woman is possibly the one of the previous fragment.⁴⁰ This one could be the responsible for the household's shopping. Who the woman that he is talking to might be and who wants him to go and bring everything she needs, one cannot be sure; it could be one of the daughters, a maid, or even an older woman.

3. Pollux 9.63 (3)

τὸ μὲν τετρώβολον καὶ τριώβολον ἐν τῇ χρήσει τέτριπται· τὸ δὲ
διώβολον ὥς ἐπὶ πολὺ λύοντες ἔλεγον, ὥς Δημοσθένης⁴¹ ... ἔστι δὲ καὶ
τὸ διώβολον ἐν *Αἰολοσίκωνι* Ἀριστοφάνους· ὅπερ λοιπὸν μόνον ἦν ἐν τῇ

⁴⁰ This specific form of address was frequently directed to one's wife and was used in every context. For more on the use of *γύναι* in direct address see Dickey (1996) 223-225.

⁴¹ Dem. *On the Crown*, 18.28: [28] εἶτα τοῦτο μὲν οὐχὶ λέγει τὸ ψήφισμα· οὐδ' ἀναγιγνώσκει· εἰ δὲ βουλεύων ἐγὼ προσάγειν τοὺς πρέσβεις ᾧμην δεῖν, τοῦτό μου διαβάλλει. ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν με ποιεῖν; μὴ προσάγειν γράψαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦθ' ἤκοντας, ἵν' ὑμῖν διαλεχθῶσιν; ἢ θέαν μὴ κατανεῖμαι τὸν ἀρχιτέκτον' αὐτοῖς κελεῦσαι; ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἐθεώρουν ἄν, εἰ μὴ τοῦτ' ἐγράφη. τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως ἔδει με φυλάττειν, τὰ δ' ὅλα, ὥσπερ οὗτοι, πεπρακέναι; οὐ δῆπου. λέγε τοίνυν μοι τὸ ψήφισμα τουτὶ λαβών, ὃ σαφῶς οὗτος εἰδὼς παρέβη. ([28] That decree Aeschines neither cites nor reads; though he mentions to my discredit that I suggested in Council that the Macedonian ambassadors should be introduced. What ought I to have done? Objected to the introduction of men who had come expressly to confer with you? Ordered the lessee not to give them reserved seats in the theatre? But they could have sat in the threepenny seats, if I had not moved my resolution. Or was it my business to take care of the public pence, and put up the state for sale, like Aeschines and his friends? Surely not. Please take and read this decree, which the prosecutor omitted, though he knows it well. Trsl. by Vince 1926.)

γνάθῳ διώβολον, γένοιταί μοι δικόλλοικον (ἐν Αἰολ. – δικόλλ. Servavit solus F), unde Bergk (γένηται μοι traditum esse opinatus)

ὅπερ <δὲ> λοιπὸν μόνον <ἔτ'> ἦν ἐν τῇ γνάθῳ
διώβολον, γεγένητ' ἐμοὶ δικόλλυβον

Tr.: the four-obol and three-obol wear out during their use; the two-obol they said that they would dissolve it to a great extent, like Demosthenes...there is also the two-obol coin in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*;

The only two-obol bit left in mouth
has turned into a two-collybon on me

In Pollux's *Onomasticon* this fragment is encountered as part of a discussion over the money of the time. Aristophanes makes a joke here implying that the speaker was carrying the two-obol coin in his mouth for so long that it shrank and became a smaller coin. Apparently, carrying small coins in the mouth was a habit in ancient Greece. Aristophanes refers to it also in *Wasps* (785), *Ecclesiazusae* (818) and *Birds* (503). Possibly that was a way of carrying the inconveniently small coins especially in the absence of pockets, with the consequence of wear and tear. Apart from the comic satires of Aristophanes, the habit clearly existed as the custom of placing a coin on the dead's mouth in order to pay the ferryman also shows.⁴²

4. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 3.95E (4)

ἀκροκωλίων μέμνηται Ἀριστοφάνης *Αἰολοσίκωνι*
καὶ μὴν, τὸ δεῖν', ἀκροκωλιά γε σοι τέτταρα
ἤψησα τακερά. καὶ ἐν *Γηρυτάδῃ*.

Tr. Aristophanes mentions the extremities of bodies in *Aeolosicon*;
And, by the way, I cooked for you four
tender trotters. . And in *Gerytades*;

⁴² cf. Burns (2013) 261; Holt (1999) 119; Lucian 10.8-11.

Athenaeus transmits part of the food that was to be served on the day. *Gerytades* is mentioned again. We saw another cross-reference between the two plays in fragment 1. Not much has survived from that play but it seems that three poets (one of tragedy, one of comedy and one of dithyramb) descend to the underworld. There they also meet their dead predecessors and maybe a dinner party takes place (details of various food items have survived in the fragments).⁴³ The element of the dinner party is a possible common plot point between *Gerytades* and *Aeolosicon*, hence the joint references to the two plays by Athenaeus.

5. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9, p.371 E (5)

ΚΕΦΑΛΩΤΟΝ. τοῦτο καὶ πρᾶσιον καλεῖσθαι φησιν ὁ αὐτὸς Δίφιλος καὶ εὐχυλότερον εἶναι τοῦ καρτοῦ. εἶναι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ μέσως λεπτυντικόν, θρεπτικόν τε καὶ πνευματῶδες. Ἐπαίνετος δ' ἐν Ὀψαρτυτικῷ τὰ κεφαλῶτα καλεῖσθαι φησι γηθυλλίδας. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μνήμης εὐρίσκω τετυχηκὸς παρὰ μὲν Εὐβούλῳ ἐν Πορνοβοσκῷ οὕτως Ἰ 195 Κ':

οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην ἐμφαγεῖν ἄρτον τινά:
παρὰ Γναθαινίῳ γὰρ ἄρτι κατέφαγον,
ἔψουσιν αὐτὴν καταλαβὼν γηθυλλίδας.

οἱ δὲ τὸ γήθυον καλούμενον τοῦτό φασιν εἶναι, οὗ μνημονεύει Φρόνιχος ἐν Κρόνῳ Ἰ 373 Κ': ὅπερ ἐξηγούμενος δρᾶμα Δίδυμος ὁμοίᾳ φησιν εἶναι τὰ γήθια τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀμπελοπράσοις, τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ γηθυλλίδας λέγεσθαι. μνημονεύει τῶν γηθυλλίδων καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν Φιλοκτήτῃ οὕτως ῥ. 253 L': 'ἐν δὲ σκόροδα δύο καὶ γαθυλλίδες δύο.' Ἀριστοφάνης *Αἰολοσίκωνι* δευτέρῳ Ἰ 393 Κ':

τῶν δὲ γηθύων
ρίζας ἐχούσας σκοροδομίμητον φύσιν.

⁴³ Henderson (2007) 185.

Πολέμων δ' ὁ περιηγητὴς ἐν τῷ περὶ Σαμοθράκης 'fr. 36 Pr' 'καὶ
κιττῆσαί φησι τῆς γηθυλλίδος τὴν Λητώ, γράφων οὕτως: 'διατέτακται
παρὰ Δελφοῖς τῇ θυσίᾳ τῶν Θεοξενίων, ὅς ἂν κομίση γηθυλλίδα
μεγίστην τῇ Λητοῖ, λαμβάνειν μοῖραν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης. ἐώρακα δὲ καὶ
αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐλάττω γηθυλλίδα γογγυλίδος καὶ τῆς στρογγύλης ῥαφανίδος.
ἱστοροῦσι δὲ τὴν Λητὴν κύουσιν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα κιττῆσαι γηθυλλίδος:
διὸ δὴ τῆς τιμῆς τετυχηκέναι ταύτης.'

Tr.: The Leek. — This the same Diphilus says is also called *prasium*,
and it is more juicy than the 'sliced' plant. It is also moderately thinning,
nourishing, and may cause flatulence. Epaenetus in *The Art of Cookery*
says that leeks are called *gethyllides* (spring onions). This name, I find,
has received mention in Eubulus's *Pornoboscus*, thus:

I couldn't eat a bit of bread;
for I have just eaten at the house of Gnathaenium;
I found her cooking spring onions.'

But others say that this is what is called *gethyon* (horn onion), which
Phrynichus mentions in *Cronus*. Didymus, explaining this play, says that
horn onions are similar to the so-called vine-leeks, and that the same are
also called *gethyllides*. The *gethyllides* are mentioned by Epicharmus in
Philoctetes thus: 'among them were two heads of garlic and two horn
onions.' **Aristophanes (mentions the spring onions) in the second
Aeolosicon;**

**Roots of horn-onions,
having a garlic-mimicking form**

Polemon the geographer, in his work *On Samothrace*, says that Leto had
a pregnant woman's craving for the horn onion. He writes thus: 'It is

ordained among the Delphians for the sacrifice at Theoxenia, that whoever shall bring the largest horn onion to Leto, shall receive a portion from the table. And I have myself seen a horn onion as large as a turnip or the round radish. They relate that Leto, when she was pregnant with Apollo, had a craving for the horn onion; for this reason it has received this special honour.'

The description of the menu continues in Athenaeus. He is providing some information on a specific kind of leeks and onions. This particular food was common among writers apparently and even became special as we read above. Such detailed description of a food ingredient is interesting also because it is not that usual in Old Comedy but becomes more frequent in Middle Comedy when food and its preparation become a more central theme as well.

6. Pollux 10.104 (7)

ἐκ δὲ τούτων καὶ τυροκνήστις, ἣν κύβηλιν καλοῦσιν· ὧν ἡ μὲν τυροκνήστις ἔστιν ἐν Πλάτωνος *Ἀδώνιδι*· καὶ ἐν **Ἀριστοφάνους** *Ἀιολοσίκωνι*, *δοῖδυξ*, *θυεΐα*, *τυροκνήστις*, *ἐσχάρα*·

Tr. Of these there is also the cheese-grater, which they call cleaver; of which the cheese-grater is found in Plato's *Adonis*; **and in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*, pestle, mortar, cheese-grater, brazier;**

Along with the food come the cooking implements, which are found in Pollux's long list of the cook's appliances. These kitchen appliances, probably along with the horn-onions mentioned in the previous fragment, could be among the things that the woman of the fragment by Photius above had asked for. Sicon in Menander's *Dyscolus* (487-499) performs a similar task by having to successfully find and borrow cooking appliances from neighbours using wit and flattery. Kitchen appliances such as the cheese-grater is found elsewhere in Aristophanes and with particular sexual connotations,⁴⁴ which could also be the case in our play if a man is talking to a woman.

⁴⁴ *Wasps* (937-939), *Lysistrata* (896).

The kitchen-implements allegory found in the agon of *Wasps*, also exists in the War scene in *Peace* (236-288).

7. Pollux 10.116 (8)

ὁ δὲ νῦν φανὸς καὶ λυχνούχος, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Ἀχαρνεῦσιν* ἔφη,
φαίνειν ὑπευθύνους λυχνούχος. ἐν δὲ τῷ Λυσίου πρὸς Χυτρίνον,
ἐξαίφνης τοῦ συνακολουθοῦντος οἰκέτου λίθον τις λαβὼν ἔκρουσε τὸν
λυχνούχον. ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνους *Αἰολοσίκωνι*

**καὶ διαστίλβονθ' ὀρώμεν,
ὥσπερ ἐν καινῷ λυχνούχῳ
πάντα τῆς ἐξωμίδος.**

Tr.: now the light and the lampstand, like Aristophanes said in the *Acharnians*, the lampstand to shine among those under scrutiny. In Lysias' speech to Xytrinus, the moment that the suppliant was accompanying him someone grabbed a stone and hit the lampstand. **In Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*;**

**And we see,
as in a new lamp,
everything shining through the cloak**

In this fragment, which was encountered in a chapter where Pollux discusses the different kinds of lamps and some other ceramic appliances, judging by the content, there also seems to be there a reference to the female shamelessness. The cloak with one sleeve (*ἐξωμίς*) was a common piece of clothing for everyone (poor, slaves or the rich when dressed casually). Judging from the context, Aristophanes' wearers of this cloak were most probably women, wearing transparent, hence shameless cloaks. This

fragment (as well as fragments 11 and 15) could also be part of the parodos of a chorus.⁴⁵

8. Pollux 10.118 (13)

ὅταν δ' εἶπη ἐν τῷ *Αἰολοσίκωνι* Ἀριστοφάνης, **δυοῖν λυχνιδίων**, δῆλον ὅτι λυχνία εἶρηκεν, ἀλλ' οὐ λύχνους μικρούς, ὥσπερ καὶ ὅταν Κράτης φῇ ἐν τοῖς *Γείτοσι*, οὐκ ἔστι μοι λυχνίδιον.

Tr. When Aristophanes said in *Aeolosicon*, **a pair of little lamps**, it is clear that he was talking about a lampstand, but not small (portable) lamps, like when Crates said in *Neighbours*, I don't have a lampstand.

This fragment is mentioned only a few lines after the previous one in Pollux's *Onomasticon*. However, this is not a sufficient piece of evidence in order to assert that in the actual comedy they were mentioned in the same order or even close to each other. More importantly, this could be another useful piece of information in regards to the time that the events take place, as it is the one of the three surviving fragments that point towards night-time, when lamps were necessary. In this segment, Pollux explains the correct meaning of the phrase *δυοῖν λυχνιδίων* as (one) lampstand and not as two small lamps, which is what we read in the fragment.

9. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 7 p. 276 C (12)

τῶν δὲ παρόντων γραμματικῶν τις ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὴν τοῦ δείπνου παρασκευὴν ἔφη·

εἶτα πῶς δειπνήσομεν

τοσαῦτα δεῖπνα; ἴσως διὰ νυκτός,

ὥς <ό> χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Αἰολοσίκωνι* εἶπεν, οὕτως λέγων οἶονεῖ δι' ὅλης νυκτός.

⁴⁵ cf. Pellegrino (2015) 39. In terms of metre, fr. 7 is in trochaics, fr. 11 in aristophanics, fr. 15 in choriambics.

Tr. One of the learned men present after he had paid attention to the preparation of the dinner said;

**And then how will we eat
so many dinners? Maybe overnight,**

as graceful Aristophanes said in *Aeolosicon*, meaning to say as through the whole night.

In this part of Athenaeus' work there is a fragment containing a reference to a very rich overnight dinner.

10. Scholium on Ar.'s *Peace* 741c (11)

καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς γαστρίμαργον τὸν Ἡρακλέα κωμῶδει
καὶ ἐν Ὀρνισι (1583sq.) καὶ ἐν Αἰολοσίκωνι.

Tr. And Aristophanes himself satirizes Heracles as a glutton in the *Birds* and also in *Aeolosicon*.

The information which this scholium offers does not surprise us. It was a common comic topos to have the glutton Heracles appearing, especially in fancy dinners. In our case one cannot really know what his specific role in relation to the plot may have been.⁴⁶

11. Hephaistion, Handbook 9.2 29 (9)

29c (π. χοριαμβικοῦ)· τὰ δὲ εἰς τὸν ἀμφίβραχυν ἢ Βακχεῖον· οἶον
δίμετρα μὲν τὰ ἐξ Αἰολοσίκωνος Ἀριστοφάνους·

ΓΥΝΗ οὐκ ἐτός, ὧ γυναῖκες,
παῖσι κακοῖσιν ἡμᾶς
φλᾶσιν ἐκάστοθ' ἄνδρες·^{*}
δεινὰ γὰρ ἔργα δρᾶσαι
λαμβάνόμεσθ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

⁴⁶ The character of Heracles in comedy will be discussed further in the 'Characters' section.

* mss ἐκάστοτ' ἄνδρες

Tr.: (on choriambic); these in the metrical style that is short at both ends
or the Bacchius [a metrical foot of three syllables]; as the dimeters from
Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*;

WOMAN Not without reason, women,
are men belaboring us
for every trouble;
for we are caught by them
on each occasion doing dire deeds.

This fragment is quite interesting not only because it could be seen in combination with the previous but also because what we probably have here is a choral part. This picture of women as agents of evil deeds in combination with the title of the play makes one think of Euripides' *Aeolus* and other intertextual references. This comedy could have been written as a parody of Euripides' fragmentary play *Aeolus*.⁴⁷ Aristophanes used this tragedy again when he wrote his *Thesmophoriazousae* and quoted one and a half lines from it (σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρός, ὅστις ἐν βραχεῖ πολλοὺς καλῶς οἶός τε συντέμνειν λόγους). He also uses it in his *Frogs* 849-850 ({AI.} ὦ Κρητικὰς μὲν συλλέγων μοναρχίας, γάμους δ' ἀνοσίους εἰσφέρων εἰς τὴν τέχνην) and *Clouds* 1371-1372 (ὁ δ' εὐθὺς ἦγ' Εὐριπίδου ῥῆσιν τιν', ὡς ἐκίνει ἀδελφός, ὦ 'λεξίκακε, τὴν ὁμομητρίαν ἀδελφὴν). Aristophanes alludes to the same idea and the troubles caused by female lust, a suitable theme for tragedy (*Lysistrata* 137-139). In *Thesmophoriazousae* (466-533) Aristophanes included stories of cunning women such as the one who cheated on her husband only three days into their marriage, admitting guilt for many dire shameless deeds.

⁴⁷ Aeolus and Bellerophon have been used by Aristophanes as the tragic culpable fathers. For more see the discussion on Aeolus in the 'Characters' section.

12. Pollux 9.89 (14)

ἐπὶ δὲ ἀργυρίου Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Δαιταλεῦσιν*,

οὐδ' ἀργύριον ἐστὶν κεκερματισμένον.

καὶ ἐν τοῖς *Σφηξί*,

δραχμὴν μετ' ἐμοῦ πρώην λαβὼν,

ἐλθὼν διεκερμάτιζέ μ' ἐν τοῖς ἰχθύσιν.

ἐν μέντοι τῷ *Αἰολοσίκωνι* τὸ μὴ ἔχειν κέρματα **ἀκερματίαν** ὠνόμασεν·

Tr. On the silver Aristophanes says in *Banqueters*,

Nor is there a silver coin changed into a smaller coin.

And in *Wasps*,

He had just received a drachma with me

and went to the fish-market to get it changed

In *Aeolosicon*, the state of not having any coins he named **coinlessness**;

In this fragment, as part of Pollux's account on the different subdivisions of money, we come across a word most probably coined by Aristophanes himself. Money appears to be another issue in our play and in Euripides' play as well, where we have a discussion possibly between Aeolus and his son, Macareus, who says that has no admiration for a god (Wealth) who can be possessed even by the basest men. On the other hand, Aeolus (possibly) argues that there cannot be a world without both poor and rich people in it to complement each other's needs.

Aeolosicon: ἀκερματίαν

Euripides' *Aeolus*:⁴⁸

Fr. 20 μὴ πλοῦτον εἵπης· οὐχὶ θαυμάζω θεόν,

ὃν χῶ κάκιστος ῥαδίως ἐκτήσατο.

Tr. Do not talk about wealth; I do not admire a god,

whom even the basest man can get hold of.

⁴⁸ From the edition of Collard & Cropp (2008).

Fr. 21 δοκεῖτ' ἂν οἰκεῖν γῆν ἐν ἧ πένης ἅπας
 λαὸς πολιτεύοιτο πλουσίων ἄτερ;
 οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χωρὶς ἐσθλὰ καὶ κακά,
 ἀλλ' ἔστι τις σύγκρασις, ὥστ' ἔχειν καλῶς.
 ἃ μὴ γάρ ἐστι τῷ πένητι, πλούσιος
 δίδωσ'· ἃ δ' οἱ πλουτοῦντες οὐ κεκτῆμεθα,
 τοῖσιν πένησι χρώμενοι τιμώμεθα.

Tr. Do you think you could live in a country in which all the
 poor people governed the city without the rich?
 It would not be possible to have good things separate from bad things,
 but there is a mixture of them, so that things can be well.
 What the poor man does not have, the rich man
 offers; and what we rich do not possess,
 we get through our dealings with the poor: honour.

and the debate on money between the son and the father continues. In line with this is
 probably also the next fragment of Aristophanes.

13. Pollux 1.79 (6)

τῶν δὲ οἰκιῶν πρόδομος καὶ δῶμα καὶ δωμάτιον καὶ ξενών, ὃ παρὰ τοῖς
 νεωτέροις νοσοκομεῖον λέγεται, καὶ κοιτών· εἰ γὰρ καὶ Μένανδρος αὐτὸ
 βαρβαρικὸν οἶεται, ἀλλ' Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμωδοδιδάσκαλος τὰ τοιαῦτα
 πιστότερος αὐτοῦ, εἰπὼν ἐν *Αἰολοσίκωνι*·

κοιτὼν ἀπάσαις εἷς, πύελος μί' ἀρκέσει.

Tr.: the front chamber and hall and bedchamber and guestroom of the
 houses, which among the more recent writers is called hospital, and
 bedroom; for if Menander considers it to be barbaric, however
 Aristophanes the comic poet who is more reliable than him in such
 things, said in *Aeolosicon*;

One bed for all of them, one bath will be enough.

Pollux includes this line in a discussion over the different types of housing, referring to Aeolus' potential stinginess, who provided only one bed and one bath for all his daughters. Someone who thinks wealth and riches are essential, as we saw in fr. 21 of Euripides' *Aeolus* above, could also be presented as very careful when spending it, even becoming quite stingy for the sake of laughter and comedy. This might be a satirical allusion to the fact that nobility was very much based on family wealth and its preservation.⁴⁹

14. Pollux 10.24 (15)

ἐν δὲ τῷ Λυσίου πρὸς Φίλιππον ἐπιτροπῆς τὰς κλεῖδας εὐρήκαμεν· παρὰ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν *Αἰολοσίκωνι* καὶ **κλειδίον**· ἐν μέντοι τοῖς Πλάτωνος τοῦ κωμικοῦ *Μετοίκοις*, σημεῖα, παρασημεῖα, κλεῖν, παρακλείδιον.

Tr. In Lysias' speech to Philippus we have found a reference to keys; in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon* the **little key** as well; in Plato's, the comic poet, *Metics*, signs, counterfeit seals, key, false key.

This fragment is found in a list with all the things that a doorman may use.

15. Pollux 10.25 (10)

ἡ δὲ ὀπή εἴρηται ἐν *Αἰολοσίκωνι* Ἀριστοφάνους, καὶ δι' ὀπῆς **κάπὶ τέγους**.

Tr. The hole (in the roof) is mentioned in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*, **both through the hole and on the roof**.

And a couple of lines after the previous fragment we read this Aristophanic fragment. This hole on the roof mentioned in the fragment could very well be a chimney or any other hole made on the roof of Aeolus' house.

⁴⁹ Xanthaki-Karamanou & Mimidou (2014) 56-57.

16. Pollux 10.127 (16)

ἐν δὲ Ἀριστοφάνους Αἰολοσίκωνι καὶ **σηματοφορεῖον**.

Tr. And in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon* **unguent-case**.

Another indication to the female presence as well as another word probably coined by Aristophanes is found in a list with the vessels found in the women's quarters.

2.3.3 The characters

The following characters can be ascertained for this play: Thearion (not appearing on stage), Aeolus, Sicon, Chorus of women, Slave (?), Woman who gives orders regarding food, Heracles.

THEARION

Although the number of the surviving fragments is really small, we do come across a number of characters either introduced by the playwright or implied in the fragments. Starting from the probable very first line of the play, Aristophanes refers to a baker named Thearion (fr. 1). Who is Thearion and why did Aristophanes pick him to start his play? References to Thearion and his craft were not unusual, and sometimes they are encountered in an unexpected context.

Thearion is referred to in a rhetorical/philosophical context, i.e. Plato, although he is a plain baker, or is he? The fact that he is mentioned in comparison to a great name such as Socrates shows the fame and significance of Thearion and his art/skill at the time.⁵⁰ Another reference to our character is found in a similarly surprising environment. This time an orator of the 2nd c. AD decides that a baker would serve his goals if put next to an acclaimed political personality such as Pericles.⁵¹ Consequently, it would not be too wrong to assume that just like Pericles was considered the best politician of his time, Thearion was thought to be the best in his profession. Thearion is also referred to as an

⁵⁰ Anonymi in Hermogenem Rhet., Commentarium in librum *περὶ στάσεων* 7.333.11.

⁵¹ Scholia In Aelium Aristidem, Tett. 122,10.1-5.

example of the ‘ultimate’ (κορυφαῖον), like Agamemnon who had the most powerful kingdom and was the leader of the Greeks against Troy.⁵²

Plato’s Thearion is being praised more specifically for his skills in bakery as he was able to produce ‘admirable bread’ (ἄρτους θαυμαστοὺς).⁵³ This reference creates a direct link to the character mentioned in the Aristophanic comedy. In the Platonic dialogue the sycophantic cook is connected with the flattering orator (522d). They are both presented as the enemies of medicine and useful advice respectively. Rhetoric and cooking aim to please and not to make someone a better human being. Plato knew of Thearion, but the cooks are presented in a negative light in his dialogue. Plato possibly composed his *Gorgias* in 405 BC, which shows that Thearion’s skill was already known in Greece by the time that Aristophanes composed *Aeolosicon*.

Thearion appears also in Antiphanes, a poet of Middle Comedy who started his career after Aristophanes’ death in the 380s. Thearion’s reputation is attested in fr. 176 as well as the popularity of the myth around Aeolus and his children. Antiphanes’ Thearion seems to match Aristophanes’ too; in the following segment not only is there praise of Thearion’s bakery skills which he was able to teach his citizens but also a reference to *kribanos* (κριβάνοις), which also appears in a fragment of *Aeolosicon*.

Omphale fr.176: πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις εὐγενὴς γεγὼς
δύναιτ’ ἄν ἐξελθεῖν ποτ’ ἐκ τῆσδε στέγης;
ὄρων μὲν ἄρτους τούσδε λευκοσωμάτων
ἱπνὸν κατέχοντας ἐν πυκναῖς διεξόδοις,
ὄρων δὲ μορφήν κριβάνοις ἡλλαγμένους,
μίμημα χειρὸς Ἀττικῆς, οὕς δημόταις
Θεαρίων ἔδειξεν.

Tr. For how could any noble person
ever leave this roof?
Watching these whitebodied breads
occupying the kitchen moving constantly in and out,

⁵² Them. Phil., Rhet., *Βασανιστῆς ἢ φιλόσοφος*, 251.c.6.

⁵³ Plato, *Gorgias* 518b.

watching their form being changed by the baking vessels,
a representation of an Attic hand, which
Thearion demonstrated to the demesmen.

It is quite interesting that we find Thearion (who features in a play by Antiphanes) in a play named after Aeolus (*Aeolosicon*), which is actually the name of another play by Antiphanes, the theme of which is the incestuous marriage of Aeolus' children.

Aristophanes is probably giving an element of one of the main themes in his play, the preparation of food. Thearion was probably not one of the characters, but he is cleverly put in the beginning of the play and in this context by Aristophanes. He probably picks a baker among other characters, as food and its preparation was a common topos in the genre of Comedy and especially Middle Comedy. Thearion is compared to great names such as Pericles and Socrates. Aristophanes chose a famous baker to open his play perhaps with the intention to show that cooking will be important in the play, while using his name in a common tragic opening formula also showing that he was going to engage with tragedy again. Therefore, we could say that Aristophanes through the use of Thearion in this context introduced two very important elements of his comedy, cooking and parodic reference to the genre of tragedy. This is an essential element of the competition between him and the tragedians. This intertextual dialogue was constantly present only to show that although Aristophanes does not produce 'high-brow' literature, he can handle the type as well as its great representatives.

AEOLUS

The main character, Aeolosicon, seems to be a mixture of Aeolus and Sicon. If we examine each character on his own and then try and combine their characteristics and especially those ones that could provoke laughter, then the picture of the play's protagonist could possibly be drawn. Unfortunately, *Aeolosicon*'s fragments do not apparently include any of the quotations from him, therefore the decipherment of this character will be based on other sources.

There is the information that there were three Aioloι and not one.⁵⁴ The Aeolus that should concern us is probably Euripides' Aeolus, master of the winds. Euripides' Aeolus is the cruel father who desires his grandson and daughter's death as well as his son's punishment.⁵⁵ This Aeolus cares about securing bright descendants, good at war and at debates, with a physical and mental superiority (fr. 15, 16). In the agon between Aeolus and Macareus, the latter's main accusation is his father's greediness (fr. 20, 21, 22). In fr. 25 Aeolus, who is an old man, speaks of all the deficiencies of old age such as the illusion that an old man is still wise. In Aristophanes' *Clouds*, *Peace*⁵⁶ and *Frogs*, Aeolus is parodied but it is the play and the concept that are in target rather than Aeolus' character in it.

Euripides' Aeolus is mentioned by Stobaeus too.⁵⁷ According to Stobaeus he had six daughters and six sons by Amphithea. The oldest, Macareus, fell in love with and raped his sister, Canace. When Aeolus found out he sent a sword to his daughter with which she killed herself. The Aeolus who appears in Homer's *Odyssey* (10.1-12) could be the one of Euripides; there is certainly one element of his life that Aristophanes could use when he depicted him in his comedy. Aeolus is described by Odysseus as a mighty king living in his palace with his six daughters and six sons, married to one another. He is the ruler of the winds, a kind man willing to help Odysseus return to Ithaka. In addition, Aeolus' sole preoccupation as described by Odysseus is indulging himself and his family with rich banquets every day.

It is possible that Aristophanes took advantage of the aspects of Aeolus' character that indicated greediness (as could be implied also by Aristophanes' fragments) and he presents him in what resembled the routine of the Homeric Aeolus, a banquet. There

⁵⁴ Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 1.362.16 (εἷς ὁ Κρηθέως καὶ Ἀθάμαντος καὶ Σισύφου πατήρ, "Ἕλληνας παῖς, ὃν Ἕλληνα γόνῳ μὲν φασὶ Διὸς εἶναι, λόγῳ δὲ Λευκαλίωνος, ἕτερος δὲ Αἰόλος, ὁ ἐκ Μελανίππης καὶ Ἰππότου ὁ διατοῦτο νῦν Ἰππωτάδης, τρίτος δὲ ὁ ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἄρνης).

⁵⁵ see introduction at Euripides' *Aeolus* in Collard & Cropp (2008) 12-15.

⁵⁶ In the opening of *Peace* in particular, the character of Trygaeus impersonates both the Euripidean Aeolus and Bellerophon, the tragic culpable fathers, in what Telò calls a "struggle between a paternal son and a filial father". More specifically, the scene where Trygaeus on the dung-beetle extends his goodbye to his daughters (114-123) echoes a fragment from Euripides' *Aeolus* (fr. 17+18), a lyric exchange between the daughters and another character. Telò argues that Trygaeus is acting as the corrective counterpart of Aeolus, the 'errant father' (2010: 279-308).

⁵⁷ Jo. Stobaeus, *Anthol.*, 4.20b.72. 3-6.

are also sources that give information on a different Aeolus, king of Thessaly who had seven sons and five daughters, Canace is listed as one of his children, but not Macareus.⁵⁸

SICON

Sicon will be discussed and presented in a similar way to Aeolus since we cannot be sure whether he utters any of the surviving lines or not. From our sources, it becomes clear that Sicon was a stock character in literature. He appears at various places as a famous cook.⁵⁹ In Aristophanes he appears already in *Ecclesiazusae* (867) as a slave-cook a couple of years before the production of *Aeolosicon*, albeit with no special duties to perform yet. As we move from the era of Old Comedy to the Middle Sicon is a character that gradually takes up a more significant role in the plays as we shall see in this section.

Meineke discussed the references to Sicon in Athenaeus arguing that it was a slave-name, which shows that Sicon is already established as a typical slave.⁶⁰ In Athenaeus Sicon is presented in a feasting environment (πίνωμεν, ἐμπίνωμεν, ὃ Σίκων, Σίκων,/χαίρωμεν),⁶¹ which would essentially suit a comedy and especially a Middle comedy. Similarly, Sicon, as described by Athenaeus, suits Aristophanes' dining concept involving a lot of drinking as usually happens in Comedy. Athenaeus also attributes to Sicon knowledge beyond cookery such as astrology, architecture, science, strategy. Athenaeus' Sicon is more than an 'established' slave, he is a professional teacher who among the rest also happens to teach cookery. Sicon here appears more as a philosopher or sophist of the time who used to teach everything at his school.⁶²

⁵⁸ Apollodorus, *Library* 1.50.7.

⁵⁹ We cannot be sure whether a cook by the name Sicon actually existed or not. What we can tell by the sources is that he certainly enjoyed a reputation.

⁶⁰ Meineke II 1839: Siconis nomen servile fuit, quemadmodum est apud Eubulum Athenaeus I p.23 A.

⁶¹ Which is quoted from Alexis' *Asotodidascalo*, p. 336 E.

⁶² Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* Epit. 2.2.8.19.

Athenaeus' account is found in Sosipater (*Καταψευδόμενος* 1.13-19). On Sosipater's segment Grauert comments that we are unsure of the time when Sicon lived (whether as a stock character or an actual cook), but he does recognise the reputation he had as a cook at a time when the Athenians were tired of the simplicity and moderation of the Peloponnesian war. After its end the art of cookery flourished; for example, the epic parody of Matro of Pitane from the 4th c. BC is full of gastronomical details and sociopolitical implications and comments on the new political scenery in Athens towards the end of the century.⁶³ Around this time Sicon and his art thrived. Grauert uses the title and the content of the fragments of *Αἰολοσίκων* as evidence for this change in the sociopolitical life and the increased interest in cookery, a play which was likely written as a burlesque of Euripides' tragedy and projects the by no means obscure image of his era.⁶⁴

Last but not least, we come across Sicon in a New Comedy by Menander. Apparently, Sicon started appearing on stage as a stock character with great ambitions. He came to stay and so shows his survival and development all the way up to the time of New Comedy. *Dyscolus* (316 BC) belongs to the period of New Comedy. One of its main characteristics was the presence of a cook, an *hetaera* etc. At the beginning of the third Act the slave Getas and the 'great' cook, Sicon, attempt unsuccessfully to borrow from Cnemon a cooking utensil in order to prepare the sacrifice that Sostratus' mother wants to do at Pan's temple after a dream she had.

This Sicon is an arrogant cook who used to borrow whatever he needed from others easily by flattering them. It is quite possible that the Sicon who appears several times in that play is the cook of our play. However, one cannot be sure that Sicon's above qualities are the ones that Aristophanes' Sicon had as Menander's play was written around eighty years later; and one cannot be sure how Sicon's image would have developed through all these years.

⁶³ Further see Olson and Sens 1999: 24-33. Other such evidence on the socio-political life can be found in late 5th and 4th c. vase painting, possibly reflecting a change in Athenian attitudes in general as well as in specific occasions such as a wedding. The focus is shifted from divine elements to the relationship between the groom and bride (Oakley & Sinos 1993: 46).

⁶⁴ Grauert (1828) 59.

Sicon is apparently found in an entirely different context to what we have seen so far in the following letter from the mid-4th c., in which Libanius warns Andronicus 3, a former pupil and frequent correspondent, to beware the anger of a powerful and dangerous uncle. The uncle is identified as either Nebridius 1, *comes Orientis* (354-58), or Strategius Musonianus, *PPO Orientis* (354-58), Seeck., *BLZG* 73, and *PLRE* 65 prefer Nebridius, with whom Libanius had poor relations. However, Bouchery (1936), 63-68 (followed by Norman [1992], v. 1, 402-03, and Petit, *FOL* 239) argues that the uncle is the Prefect Strategius, who was angry with Andronicus on two accounts: 1) his refusal to sever relations with a Cleomenes towards whom Strategius was very hostile, and 2) his refusal to cede a contested piece of property that Strategius had wanted to include as part of his daughter's dowry. Attempts by Libanius and Themistius to mediate only angered the Prefect further (cf. *ep.* 512/N21). Open hostility towards the powerful is rare in Libanius' letters and seems all the more imprudent in view of Libanius' recent exasperation with Andronicus for failing to keep the contents of a letter private (*ep.* 477/N17). In the *Autobiography*, Libanius depicts his relationship with Strategius as harmonious and untroubled (*Or.* 1.106-13). The letters, however, reveal that he experienced many ups and downs in his personal relations with this difficult Prefect (cf. *epp.* 476/N16 and 529/B28).⁶⁵

Ἀνδρονίκω.

Βουλῆς σοι δεῖ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, καλεῖσθω γὰρ καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς θεῖος, ὅπως φαίνεται, τίς ὢν τίνα ἔργα ἐργάζεται. δεῖ δεῖσαι τῆς ἐκείνου δυνάμεως τὸν τρόπον, οὐ γὰρ αὐτῇ χρῆται δικαίως ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ φυγεῖν· εἰ μὲν σοὶ γνώμη Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν, εἰς Ῥώμην, εἰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἥδιον, εἰς Ἑλλάδα. καὶ μὴ αἰσχύνου φεύγων, τὸ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν εἰς τὸν φοβήσαντα ἔρχεται. ἐγὼ δὲ οἶσω βαλλόμενος, καὶ ἔλθῃ ποτὲ καιρὸς, ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν λήψομαι δίκας, τὸν δὲ τρόπον ᾧ δίκας εἶωθα λαμβάνειν, οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς. καίτοι καὶ νῦν ὀρθῶς κρίνονται δίδωσι δίκας. ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ μίσους ὃ μισεῖται παρὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν περὶ τὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐ σολοικίσαντα ποιεῖται σπουδῇ. εἶποι ἂν οὖν ὁ

⁶⁵ Bradbury (2004) 85.

Δημοσθένης ὅτι <ᾧ καταράσασαι' ἄν τις αὐτῷ, ταῦτα ἐκ προαιρέσεως ποιεῖ. ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἐστίν> ἀδελφοῦ παιδὶ καὶ τῷ τούτου διδασκάλῳ, <φίλος δὲ Πausανία τῷ πόρνῳ>, **καὶ φρονεῖ μὲν μείζον Ἀλκιβιάδου, ποιεῖ δὲ τὰ Σίκωνος. ὅ τι δὲ οὗτος ἔδρα, τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ἐροῦ.**⁶⁶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἐφ' ὅ τι ὀρμήσεις, ἐπίστεilon, καὶ δὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἐλπίς ὑποφαίνοιτο μηδὲν ἔσεσθαι μένοντι κακόν, μένε· τουτὶ γὰρ ἐκείνου κάλλιον.

(Liban. Ep. 420 = 506.14F506.t.1)

Tr.: 1. You need a plan against the plotting of your uncle – let him be called ‘uncle’, even in letters, so that it’ll be clear just who it is who is doing what. One must fear the character of his power, for he does not use it justly. 2. What’s left for you and me is to run. So if it’s your intention to see Rome, then to Rome, but if it would be more pleasant to see Greece, then to Greece, and don’t be ashamed at running away, for the shame attaches to the one who intimidated you. 3. I shall endure the buffeting and if the opportunity ever arises, I shall take revenge for both of us – you aren’t unacquainted with the way I usually take revenge. And yet, he’s being punished even now, if you evaluate the situation correctly. For apart from the ill will felt by good men against him is the fact that he makes a fuss over that fellow who is forever uttering verbal absurdities! 4. Demosthenes would say, ‘He does by preference the very things that one might invoke upon him as a curse’, for he is an enemy to his brother’s child and to the young man’s teacher, but a ‘friend to Pausanias the sodomite’, and though he thinks bigger than Alcibiades, he imitates Simon – ask Aristophanes what he did! 5. In reply, write to me what plan you will take up and, in particular, if any glimmer of hope should appear that no evil will befall you if you stay, then stay, for that would be better than leaving.

⁶⁶ The passage is modelled on Demosthenes, *Letters* 4.11.

Bradbury's translation is deliberately used here for two reasons: firstly, it is a very good and accurate one and, secondly, there is something of particular interest in it, where he refers to the line that has been related to *Aeolosicon*.⁶⁷ He decides to follow the emendation that gives 'Simon' instead of 'Sicon' and he explains his preference thus: "The mss read 'Sicon', who is unattested. David Moncur proposes 'Simon', pilloried in *Clouds* for pilfering public funds (351) and perjury (399). This emendation was suggested as well by Kassel (1978), 56-59."⁶⁸ Were Bradbury's criteria strong enough so as to lead him towards that specific choice? His reference to David Moncur is surprisingly not included in his list of bibliography, so one cannot be sure how he knows about Moncur's account. The next link he creates is between Libanius' 'Simon' and the person named in Aristophanes *Clouds*. Consequently, what we have to do next is to examine how the uncle in Libanius' letter could be connected to Aristophanes' 'Simon'.

'Simon' is mentioned in the *Clouds* as a harpy of the public chest (348-352) as well as a perjurer (395-402). What are the characteristics that Simon could share with Libanius' 'uncle'? Libanius is accusing him of power abuse (δεῖ δεῖσαι τῆς ἐκείνου δυνάμεως τὸν τρόπον, οὐ γὰρ αὐτῇ χρηται δικαίως), intimidation (τὸ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν εἰς τὸν φοβήσαντα ἔρχεται), violence (ἐγὼ δὲ οἶσω βαλλόμενος), a friend to people who are looked upon with contempt by the society and he is one of them as well (ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ μίσους ὃ μισεῖται παρὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν περὶ τὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐ σολοικίσαντα ποιεῖται σπουδῇ), an adversary to his nephew and to his nephew's teacher (ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἐστίν > ἀδελφοῦ παιδὶ καὶ τῷ τούτου διδασκάλῳ). Aristophanes' 'Simon' could have used his power to access and steal from the public chest. Therefore there is one similarity traced between the 'uncle' and 'Simon' but there is no obvious indication of perjury committed by the 'uncle'. As a result, the choice of 'Simon' over 'Sicon' does not seem to be a well-supported one.

Consequently, we are led back to the manuscripts' scribe and Libanius' last way of describing the character of the 'uncle': καὶ φρονεῖ μὲν μεῖζον Ἀλκιβιάδου, ποιεῖ δὲ τὰ Σίκωνος. We have a person who thinks very high of himself to that extent as to see

⁶⁷ cf. Foerster (1963) 482.

⁶⁸ Bradbury (2004) 86.

himself as better than Alcibiades, who was at least famous among the Greeks, although the sentiments he had provoked were quite ambiguous, as we also see in his depiction by Aristophanes.⁶⁹ He was loathed for encouraging the destructive Sicilian expedition as well as treachery and also acknowledged for his unique naval skills.⁷⁰ However, there is no further connection made between the two by Libanius, as he does with Sicon. “He acts like Sicon”, is the way that Libanius decides to complete the uncle’s portrait and he even refers to Aristophanes for further information on his deeds. Sicon’s character started as an indifferent slave (*Ecclesiazusae*, 867) but gradually evolved to an acclaimed cook and according to some sources, he was much more than an excellent cook.⁷¹ Menander’s Sicon is a skilful, but sneaky cook, notorious for his flattery as means of achieving his goals (while also annoying Cnemon obviously).

Which of all these characteristics could be identified in Libanius’ ‘uncle’ is very unclear. Libanius’ phraseology and sentence structure indicates a character, who is boastful and thinks of himself as, at least, as important as Alcibiades and, yet, he acts like the less important Sicon. “Less important” in what sense? *Aeolosicon* would perhaps be the most appropriate source to provide an answer, if only a larger or different amount of fragments had survived. The way it is now, it only allows for assumptions based on the play’s fragments and the characters’ agenda. Certainly, the connection between politicians and cooks is not without precedent. We have already discussed the parallel that Plato draws in *Gorgias* between cooking and rhetoric and how a baker and a politician might be harmful to the public. A similar image is drawn in Aristophanes’ *Knights* 214, where politics are downgraded to cooking and the politicians resemble the cooks.

⁶⁹ For a discussion on Alcibiades in Aristophanes see Moorton (1988) and Vickers (2016).

⁷⁰ See further Gribble (1999) who explores the various facets of Alcibiades’ character and life through the evidence from contemporary literature.

⁷¹ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* Epit. 2, 2. 8.19; Sosipater, *Καταψευδόμενος* 1.13-19.

THE CHORUS

If the next fragment refers to women, it could have been uttered by either a man or a woman who describes them as provocative and shameless characters:

καὶ διαστίλβονθ' ὀρώμεν,
ὥσπερ ἐν καινῷ λυχνούχῳ
πάντα τῆς ἐξωμίδος

The women's portrait in the play completes the fragment that is likely to be a choral part.

οὐκ ἐτός, ὦ γυναῖκες,
πᾶσι κακοῖσιν ἡμᾶς
φλῶσιν ἐκάστοθ' ἄνδρες.*
δεινὰ γὰρ ἔργα δρῶσαι
λαμβανόμεσθ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

* mss ἐκάστοτ' ἄνδρες

If that is indeed a choral part then the chorus consisted of women and in this particular fragment the koryphaia addresses the other women of the chorus. These women seem to reflect the ancient Greek beliefs about women as the root of all bad things that is found in ancient literature, women like Pandora and Klytemnestra.⁷² This picture is similar to the one given by Euripides in his tragedy. One of *Aeolus'* fragments reveals a similar notion for women:

Euripides *Aeolus*, fr. 36:

γυναῖκα δ' ὅστις παύσεται λέγων κακῶς,
δύστηνος ἄρα κοῦ σοφὸς κεκλήσεται.

Tr. The man who will stop speaking ill of a woman,
will in fact be called a wretch and not wise.

⁷² Similar notions are expressed by women in *Lysistrata* (137-139) and *Thesmophoriazusae* (466-533).

Henderson suggests⁷³ that the women of the chorus are the daughters of Aeolosicon, but if Aeolosicon is a persona for Aeolus then this might not be the case if Aeolus had six daughters, who logically could not possibly form a chorus.

SLAVE OR ΤΡΑΠΕΖΟΠΟΙΟΣ

The speaker in the second fragment who is addressing a woman is possibly the one responsible for the household's shopping, possibly a slave or the *τραπεζοποιός* that we encounter in Middle Comedy. The *τραπεζοποιός* was responsible for everything that had to do with the preparation of the banquet, from the table to the music. The cook with the house-slaves and the *τραπεζοποιός* were common in Middle and New Comedy, especially during the preparation of a festive banquet.⁷⁴

ἀλλ' ἄνυσον· οὐ μέλλειν ἐχρῆν, ὡς ἀγοράσω
ἀπαξάπανθ' ὅσ' ἂν κελεύῃς, ὦ γύναι

OTHER CHARACTERS

In the above fragment, the speaker is addressing a woman from whom he is taking orders. There is no further evidence as to who that woman might be; she could be a servant, the wife or one of Aeolus' daughters.

According to a scholium on Ar. *Peace* 741c (see fr. 10), another character that appears to have a part in the comedy is Heracles, portrayed as glutton once again. More specifically in *Peace* (741), the chorus states that characters such as Heracles were rejected from the play by the poet:

τούς θ' Ἡρακλέας τοὺς μάττοντας καὶ τοὺς πεινῶντας ἐκείνους
ἐξήλασ' ἀτιμώσας πρῶτος.

⁷³ Henderson (2007) 111.

⁷⁴ Krieter-Spiro (1997) 31-32.

Tr. and as for those Heracleses, who are always chewing and hungry,
he was the first to ridicule them and banish them from the stage.

However, the fact that Heracles actually still appears in Aristophanic plays as the glutton, buffoon and great eater shows that the above statement was not followed through. For example, in *Birds* (1579-1590) Heracles appears again as quite interested in the food preparations and the ingredients used. So we see in specific scenes in *Frogs* (e.g. 63-65, 112-115). The evidence from the fragmentary comedies are few and are mostly found in Middle and New Comedy and the image that we can draw from it is similar, although it is hard to tell what elements of his character are buffoonish and which simply mythological.⁷⁵ In the surviving plays of Aristophanes, Heracles plays the burlesque role of the glutton who is as controlled by the demands of his belly⁷⁶ as any parasite who is traced in Old Comedy but constructs its identity in 4th c. comedy.⁷⁷ As Wilkins puts it, “he experiences the parasite’s hunger but invariably lacks his wit and verbal dexterity.”⁷⁸

To sum up, as in every fragmentary play it is impossible to ascertain which characters might have appeared, although we can reasonably make assumptions about some of them. Thearion is a character that is mentioned but might actually not take up any role in the play. He is named in the probable opening lines of the play possibly as a way to introduce the culinary topic on the one hand and the tragic burlesque on the other. Thearion in antiquity certainly had the reputation of a skilled baker and in philosophy his art is connected with that of an orator, albeit not in a favourable light. Aeolus and Sicon were examined afterwards, as they create the character of the title. As discussed, we know of three Aioloι, but the one of our play must have been Euripides’ Aeolus, notorious for the intermarriage of his children. The far from exemplary mythical father has been parodied elsewhere in Aristophanes and therefore it is not a surprise to see

⁷⁵ For a detailed discussion of Heracles in fragmentary comedy see Wilkins (2000) 92-97.

⁷⁶ With the possible exception of *Frogs* where, on top of his love for food, he also seems to have a good knowledge of the contemporary dramatists and even has an opinion on the dramatic creation (74-106).

⁷⁷ Papachrysostomou (2013) 176.

⁷⁸ Wilkins (2000) 90.

him again. Sicon was a famous cook, known from comedy mostly. He probably was not a historical figure and he is mentioned together with Alcibiades in a byzantine source. Politics and cooking might have been combined again (the fragmentary evidence is too scarce to make any confident assertions), as they were in Aristophanes' *Knights* and Plato's *Gorgias* (as oratory was an essential skill for politicians). How *Aeolosicon* might have acted as a mix of the two is very hard to say at the moment, but what I will suggest in the next section is that Aristophanes presented Aeolus' story borrowing the characteristics of Sicon in a burlesque play. The rest of the characters can only be inferred from the fragments rather than the context: these are the chorus, a slave or *τραπεζοποιός* and Heracles, who has been a frequent character in Aristophanes as a glutton, buffoon, albeit with literary knowledge and taste. Certainly, he was a suitable character for a comedy that involves a famous cook and gastronomical details.

2.3.4 The plot of *Aeolosicon*: An incestuous love and the ingredients for a new type of comedy

One of the most obscure points in Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon* is the plot itself. In Kassel-Austin and Henderson's editions there is the notion that Sicon appeared as Aeolus in parody of him as the latter appears in Euripides' *Aeolus*. No further explanation is given from either so as to support this view. In Kassel-Austin there are a few parallels mentioned as supporting evidence; however, such evidence is not absolute as there is no direct written or even implied connection to our play or character. A closer look to the title and possibly the name of *Aeolosicon*'s main character along with some similar cases⁷⁹ might help us shed some light in that obscure spot of the play.

The most relevant example which I propose that we come across with within the Aristophanic corpus is the slave from *Frogs* (499) named *Ἡρακλειοζανθίας*. This is a good parallel as it is a compound name consisting of two names and not a name and a noun or two nouns as usually happens in Aristophanes' comedies. *Frogs* is a typical disguise-play as right from the beginning we have Dionysus entering pretending to be Heracles, provoking the second's laughter when they meet. Later Dionysus hands his

⁷⁹ cf. Carrière (2000).

role over to Xanthias and becomes *Ἡρακλειοξανθίας*. In this case, the person giving their name to the second part of the compound name pretends to be the first one; the same happens in Lucian's *Ἰκαρομένιππος*, in which Menippus realized a flight to Heaven, like Icarus.

Without undermining the relevance of the above examples there is another plausible parallel that comes from Aristophanes' rival, Cratinus, giving another attestation to their constant intertextual dialogue. Cratinus wrote a comedy under the title of another compound name which consists of two names, the name of a god and the name of a famous mortal. This play is nothing else but Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*,⁸⁰ which implies a reversal to the interpretation of the above examples, namely the character who gave his name to the first half of the play's title pretends to be the character whose name appears in the second half of the compound title, i.e. Dionysus pretends to be Alexandros.

The similarities between *Aeolosicon* and *Dionysalexandros* are by no means restricted to the title. What will be argued here is that the concept of the play rather resembles Cratinus' play and not so much the characters or plays that scholars have suggested so far. This view will be supported by pieces of evidence and similarities that have been found during the close investigation of the two plays. The suggested interpretation of the name and plot reconstruction are not necessarily superior to the existing ones but they are at least equally plausible and therefore it is a surprise that they have not been suggested before. In *Dionysalexandros*, there is a god, Dionysus, pretending to be a famous mortal, Alexandros or Paris. Dionysus takes his place on Mount Ida as judge of the famous 'krisis' between Aphrodite, Athena and Hera. Aphrodite wins and Dionysus takes Helen as his reward, causing the great war between Trojans and Greeks. Later there is a confrontation between him and the real Paris which ends in the god's captivity by the Greeks.⁸¹

⁸⁰ A play which has been discussed for its intertextual allusions in other Aristophanic plays, including how Aristophanes is drawing on *Dionysalexandros* (Ruffell 2002: 151-152). See also Bakola (2010) and Storey (2006).

⁸¹ Hypothesis (P.Oxy.663).

On the other hand, in *Aeolosicon* there is again the name of an exceptional man⁸² and a mortal, a famous cook. It is equally likely that it was Aeolus who pretended to be Sicon and not the other way round. The two plays could also be considered to be following the same pattern:

Disguise: Dionysus as Paris – Aeolus as Sicon

Marriage: Paris and Helen – Aeolus' sons and daughters

Debate/agon/contest: Dionysus and Paris – Aeolus and real Sicon (?)

Especially this last part could have been used by Aristophanes to provoke great laughter as the way to disclose the fraud would probably be a cooking contest between Aeolus and the real Sicon. The outcome would be hilarious in terms of preparation and taste taking into account that Aeolus was not a cook. A logical question that might arise at this point is why Aeolus would pretend to be Sicon and not have the real one to prepare the wedding dinner? A look at the fragments we have and those of Euripides' *Aeolus* could suggest a potential explanation.⁸³

In Aristophanes' play there is probably the parody of the wedding of Aeolus' daughters to his sons and, as becomes obvious from the fragments, the preparation of food. One possibility is that the dinner would be the after-wedding feast that Homer describes in Book 10 of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus narrates to the Phaiakian court his experience from the island of Aeolus: "Twelve children of his...are in the halls, six daughters and six sturdy sons, and he gave his daughters to his sons to wife. These, then, feast continually by their dear father and good mother, and before them lies boundless good cheer". In Euripides' *Aeolus* there is a debate between Aeolus and his son where the latter accuses the former of stinginess. Hints of this stinginess one might argue that we also have in *Aeolosicon*'s fragments. What Pollux 1.79 probably implies is that although Aeolus had six daughters, they all had to share one bed and one bath, probably because he did not want to spend money and give his daughters their personal bed and bath. Pollux 9.89 may contain a similar hint.

In Euripides' *Aeolus* there is a long debate between Aeolus and his son on the same matter. Here is part of it:

⁸² This Aeolus is often identified with Aeolus, son of the god Poseidon (see Grimal 1991: 62-63).

⁸³ For a thorough analysis of Euripides' *Aiolos* see Μυμίδου (2003).

20.

<Macareus>: μὴ πλοῦτον εἴπῃς· οὐχὶ θαυμάζω θεόν,
ὃν χῶ κάκιστος ῥαδίως ἐκτήσατο.

Tr. Do not talk about wealth; I do not admire a god,
whom even the basest man can get hold of.

21.

<Aeolus>: δοκεῖτ' ἂν οἰκεῖν γῆν ἐν ἧ πένης ἅπας
λαὸς πολιτεύοιτο πλουσίων ἄτερ;
οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χωρὶς ἐσθλὰ καὶ κακά,
ἀλλ' ἔστι τις σύγκρασις, ὥστ' ἔχειν καλῶς.
ἂ μὴ γάρ ἐστι τῷ πένητι, πλούσιος
δίδωσ'· ἃ δ' οἱ πλουτοῦντες οὐ κεκτήμεθα,
τοῖσιν πένησι χρώμενοι τιμώμεθα.

Tr. Do you think you could live in a country in which all the
poor people governed the city without the rich?

It would not be possible to have good things separate from bad things,
but there is a mixture of them, so that things can be well.

What the poor man does not have, the rich man
offers; and what we rich do not possess,
we get through our dealings with the poor: honour.

22.

<Macareus>: τὴν δ' εὐγένειαν πρὸς θεῶν μή μοι λέγε,
ἐν χρήμασιν τόδ' ἐστί, μὴ γαυροῦ, πάτερ·
κύκλω γὰρ ἔρπει· τῷ μὲν ἔσθ', ὃ δ' οὐκ ἔχει·
κοινοῖσι δ' αὐτοῖς χρώμεθ'· ᾧ δ' ἂν ἐν δόμοις
χρόνον συνοικῇ πλεῖστον, οὗτος εὐγενής.

Tr. Do not speak to me of nobility, in heaven's name.
this depends upon money, do not take pride in it father;
money goes around in a circle; one man has it, another does not;
but we use it as common to all; and whoever has it dwelling with him in
his house the longest time is noble.

Clearly, wealth and nobility are two of the main issues that appear in Euripides' play⁸⁴ and seem to matter a lot to Aeolus. This would be a very good element of Aeolus' character for Aristophanes to ridicule. It could also serve as a small piece of evidence for our plot. What is suggested here is that Aeolus was probably too stingy or could not afford to hire Sicon, the most acclaimed cook of the time, who would suit a god's dinner. An individual uses festivity to display to the community his well-being and the major stages in the life-cycle of his family, such as birth and marriage.⁸⁵ Thus, Aeolus, not wanting to risk his good reputation and social status as the lord of the winds, decides to become Sicon, making everyone believe that he did hire the best cook.

As a result, Aeolus as Sicon or Aeolosicon comes on stage at the beginning of the play presenting himself as Sicon in preparation of the dinner coming from the bakery, like Dionysus appears as Heracles already from the beginning of *Frogs*. *Magiouroi* often speak their boastful piece en route from the market to the private house for which they are to cook.⁸⁶ It is most probable that the first fragment is also the opening lines of the play as it depicts a common opening formula of Euripides' dramas.⁸⁷

The presentation or explanation of the situation would follow and the chorus might sing how the crafty women led to the incestuous marriages. The preparation of the food by Aeolus' regular cook possibly and not by him follows and it is being described in the fragments that refer to the ingredients used. Later there could be the confrontation between Aeolus and the real Sicon who appears at the beginning of the feast, the agon

⁸⁴ Xanthaki-Karamanou & Mimidou (2014) 50.

⁸⁵ Wilkins (2000) 52.

⁸⁶ Ibid. 66.

⁸⁷ See comments on fr. 1.

and/or cooking contest, and disclosure of the truth. Right here we could place Heracles as the judge of the contest. Who would be more suitable than the traditional glutton to decide what food tastes better, especially someone who most likely had tried Sicon's cooking in the past.

The actual wedding dinner would close the play as often happens in Aristophanes. Some of the fragments suggest that there is an overnight dinner where women would take part. Gender affected eating habits greatly in ancient Greece. Noble women would eat along with the men at *ariston*, at home, or on a special occasion such as a festival or wedding. On the other hand, men and their female companions (*hetaerae*) would often dine at *deipna* and symposia. There may have been a *pannychis* (all-nighter), often similar to sympotic festivity, usually found in the context of a festival (e.g. Panathenaea) or an extempore celebration in which women would participate.⁸⁸ This would offer an interpretation to fragments 12 and 13 (*δοῶν λυχνιδίον*), that refer to an all-night dinner and since it is night-time, lamps would be in use.

2.3.5 Conclusion

Aeolosicon is a play that demonstrates all these elements that are relevant to the main argument and contribution of the thesis. All of these are also observed in the other three plays (two of which we have seen, one still to follow) and have not been discussed and analysed to this extent until today. They are all features that make it stand out from the extant plays in ways similar to *Polyidus* and *Daedalus*. *Aeolosicon* is another character-titled play, which was possibly composed as a parody of Euripides' *Aeolus* and the intermarriage of his children. Consequently, the setting was probably, again, outside Athens. It was considered useful to view *Aeolosicon* in comparison to Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* in order to facilitate the suggestion of a new plot reconstruction, which differs to the usual assumption that Sicon appeared as Aeolus, as I argue that it is equally plausible that Aeolus appeared as Sicon instead. *Aeolosicon*'s (probable) opening lines parody a common tragic opening formula. Food and its preparation are attested in the surviving fragments, which is not surprising as Sicon was a famous cook.

⁸⁸ For more on the gendered dining habits see Wilkins (2000) 55-57.

In addition, what makes *Aeolosicon* an intriguing case is its date of production in 386 BC as Aristophanes' last play, produced *post mortem* by his son. *Aeolosicon* is therefore chronologically placed very close to Middle Comedy, it is a mythological burlesque, perhaps with a diminished chorus, dealing with the domestic affairs of a famous household, placing importance on a famous cook, Sicon. All the above lead us to the conclusion that *Aeolosicon* indeed shows some features that place it among the plays of Middle Comedy rather than Old Comedy.

2.4 *Cocalus*: Moving geographical and generic boundaries

2.4.1 Introduction

The slightly differentiated scheme that Aristophanes apparently introduced in his 4th c. plays seems to be inaugurated in his last two plays, *Aeolosicon* (the second one if we accept that there were two), and *Cocalus*, a comedy produced in 387 by Aristophanes' son, which came first. Although *Cocalus* is said to have preceded *Aeolosicon*, it is the play that, according to the *Vita*, “gave the first example of New Comedy, which both Menander and Philemon took as their starting-point as dramatists” (4-6), presenting a plot with the following themes: “rape, recognition and all the other elements that Menander imitated” (50-51).

Aeolosicon appears to have many characteristics of those comedies that belong to the genre of Middle Comedy,¹ such as the very sophisticated and detailed preparation of the food, an assumption that fortunately the fragments do allow us to make. Another possible feature, or rather the absence of it, that leads us to enlist the play among Middle Comedies, is the political element, which might have been significantly restricted; however, this is not something that can be confirmed by the fragments or the testimonia. *Cocalus* has been chosen for similar reasons. It is a play that presents features that we do not come across in the extant plays. It could have been composed as a parody of a Sophoclean tragedy, it is set outside Athens, in Sicily, it was produced in the 4th c. and appears to have characteristics commonly found in the plays of Middle and New Comedy (e.g. it could have been composed as a parody of a tragedy, presents a domestic scenario, and probably included the element of false children). Unfortunately, we again have to do with very little evidence and fragments, but all these aspects will be investigated as much as possible in order to see how this play reflects the slightly different aspect of the Aristophanic work presented in the thesis and reflected in the preceding three plays too.

¹ cf. Platonius, *Diff. Com.* 13ff., although otherwise an unhistorical or at least problematic source as discussed in the previous chapter.

The fact that Aristophanes seems to have created a supposedly New Comedy (i.e. *Cocalus*) first and a Middle comedy (i.e. *Aeolosicon*) second and last only attests to the non-linear development of the genre. What we can ascertain is that the Aristophanic work is developing according to the times, leaving Old Comedy behind.² Aristophanes did not have in mind to create a Middle or a New Comedy, therefore it is not very fair to classify them as such. It is probably more just and safer to assume that Aristophanes' last two plays show more extensive evidence of the transition from Old Comedy to the new-born types of comedy, which started to present certain differences to their predecessors, differences that grew and dominated the plays resulting in the formulation of these upcoming sub-genres of comedy.

The reason why *Cocalus* in particular is said to have contributed towards that development is about to be explored. What are those characteristics that led scholiasts to consider this play as a model for the plays of New Comedy? Is there any evidence of these in the fragments and testimonia? And why only New Comedy and not Middle Comedy as well?

Testimonia

The first testimonium is found in the work of Clement who has been discussed before at various points. Here we will only look at what is particularly relevant to *Cocalus*. As already discussed, the single testimonium on *Daedalus* comes from his work. In this work, Clement talks about plagiarism among the Greeks and quotes various similar phrases referring to different subjects as evidence and proof of the literary exchange between them, which he actually calls theft (6.2.4.3-4). Here is the part that concerns the current project:

² Which already becomes obvious with *Wealth* (cf. Ehrenberg 1962: 69-70).

Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν ταῖς πρώταις *Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις* τὰ ἐκ τῶν Κρατίνου *Ἐμπιπραμένων* μετήνεγκεν ἔπη. Πλάτων δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ *Δαιδάλῳ* τὰ ἀλλήλων ὑφαιροῦνται. τὸν μέντοι *Κώκαλον* τὸν ποιηθέντα Ἀραρότι τῷ Ἀριστοφάνους υἱεῖ Φιλήμων ὁ κωμικὸς ὑπαλλάξας ἐν *Ὑποβολιμαίῳ* ἐκωμώδησεν.

(Clem., *Strom.* 6.2.26.4-7)

Tr: And Aristophanes the comic playwright in the first *Thesmophoriazousae*, transferred the words from Cratinus' *Empipramenoi*. Plato the comic poet and Aristophanes in *Daedalus* steal from each other. *Cocalus* however, the one created(?) by Araros, Aristophanes' son, Philemon the comic poet ridiculed in *Hypobolimaesus* after he made some changes.

Unfortunately, the less than ten words we have from Philemon's play do not allow us to make much sense of it or draw any illuminating connections. What we can be sure of is that *Cocalus* had quite an impact on later poets as equally suggested by the *Vita*.

τὸν μέντοι *Κώκαλον* τὸν ποιηθέντα Ἀραρότι τῷ Ἀριστοφάνους υἱεῖ

This particular phrase demands our special attention mainly because of its apparent ambiguity, an ambiguity that lies in the syntax of it and therefore in its translation. More specifically, the use of the dative case in the aforementioned testimonium should be reconsidered, i.e. *Ἀραρότι*, in order to find the right interpretation. Of what kind is this dative and of what nature is its dependence on the preceding verb?

Henderson in the Loeb edition translates it thus: "...having altered the *Cocalus* by Ar.'s son Araros,...". To begin with, Henderson's phrasing does not clearly state if the verb used by Clement means 'produce' or 'create'. The verb *ποιέω* means 'make, produce' in the sense that I create something, and not as if I am producing a performance as the producer and not the writer of the play. The important issue that is being raised here actually questions the authorship of the play. It seems that all the evidence (except for one) suggests that Aristophanes is the writer. Is Clement's

intention to imply that the comedy belongs wholly to Araros and not his father? In the list of comedies written by Araros *Cocalus* is not present,³ although interestingly enough we only have plays named after a male character. Consequently, if Clement wrote that the comedy was created by Araros then he could metaphorically mean that it was produced by him on stage. One is hesitant to consider the possibility that Clement mistakenly believed that the play was actually written by Araros and not Aristophanes, also because all the other sources refer to it as created by Aristophanes, and in the list found in the Suda, Araros first produces his own play during the 101st Olympiad (376/373).⁴

Naturally, the previous interpretation also depends on the way one chooses to translate the dative *Ἀραρότι*. A possible alternative translation would be ‘created **for** Araros’ instead of ‘**by** Araros’, with the agent of the action implied, as it is mentioned as his father. It is quite important and crucial for our interpretation to identify the dative correctly. The use of ‘by’ in Henderson’s translation suggests that what we have here is a **dative of agent**, but, if we take a look at the tense of the participle, we can tell that this would be an extremely rare instance as in classical Greek, the dative of the personal agent is preferred to the regular *ὕπό* + genitive when the passive verb (the participle *ποιηθέντα* in our case) is in the Perfect or Pluperfect (infrequent in *koinē*), whereas we have a passive aorist. To conclude, what I suggest, contrary to the aforementioned translation, is that the **indirect dative** appears to be much more suitable, since it shows

³ Kassel-Austin (1991) Vol. 2, 524-531.

⁴ A similar problem has been discussed over *Acharnians* 628-633, where the word *ποιητής* might refer either to Aristophanes or Callistratus, who was the producer of that play as well as others. MacDowell (1982) argues that the reference to the ‘maker’ could have been directed to Callistratus and not Aristophanes, since he was the known producer of the plays until then, although the young and still unknown Aristophanes was the author. But Callistratus was the maker of the play in the broader sense, he made it happen, taking care of the different components of a play, although not having written the script. However, at the end of his article, MacDowell confirms that by the 4th c. things were much clearer and the *ποιητής* was strictly the author of the play and not simply the producer. Halliwell (1980), on the other hand, argues that the implied *ποιητής* and target of Cleon’s accusations after the *Babylonians* was Aristophanes, the known author of the play, and not Callistratus, known as simply the producer. So does Heath (1987: 8).

to or for whom (or what) the action of the verb takes place (e.g. *στεφάνου*ς οὗς ἐποιήσάμην τῷ χορῷ, Demosthenes *In Midiam* 21.16).⁵

In addition to the above, there is actually a similar case if we consider *Aeolosicon*, through which, according to a testimonium, Aristophanes introduced his son to the audience. The first and the last interpretations seem equally plausible. Thus, Clement either meant that the play was produced by Araros (and not created by him) or that the play was written by Aristophanes for his son to produce on stage; two interpretations similar although not quite identical. We would probably be closer to the truth and one step further from the field of mere speculation if the following conclusion is drawn: Clement did not really intend to differentiate from what the rest of the evidence shows regarding the authorship of the play, but, rather, he reinforces them by saying that Aristophanes created this play for his son.

Cocalus in Sophocles' Camici

In an attempt to identify the character named in the title, scholiasts have pointed out the king Cocalus as he appears in Sophocles' fragmentary play *Camici*. Richard Johnson Walker suggests that it was the third play of a tetralogy containing the following plays: *Minos*, *Theseus*, *Camici*, *Daedalus* sive *Talos*.⁶ In the edition by Jose Maria Lucas de Dios⁷ we read that the Camici are the inhabitants of Camicus, an isolated territory in Sicily, where today's Agrigentum is (or more possibly even to the north above the baths of Silenus⁸) and, as the title indicates, they formed the chorus.

According to Thucydides 6.2, the population of Sicily when the Greeks arrived was divided into four ethnic groups. One of them were the Sicanians, possibly one of the more ancient tribes who in reality were Iberian coming from the river Sican ('el Jucar'). Cocalus was the local ruler, when the ingenious Daedalus landed, after the unfortunate flight during which he lost his son, Icarus. Daedalus soon became a member of the

⁵ For the uses of dative see the standard Greek grammar of Smyth (1920).

⁶ Walker (1921).

⁷ Lucas de Dios (1983) 179-180; cf. Pearson (1917) 3-4.

⁸ Freeman (1891: 495-505) gives a very detailed geographical description of the area as well as an account of the different versions and sources of the myth of Cocalus and Daedalus.

king's household. There also arrived Minos looking for him and offering great gifts to anyone who would be able to thread the spiral shell that he had produced in every place he went. He knew that in this way he would discover the hidden Daedalus, the only person actually capable of doing it. Minos brought the shell to Cocalus and Cocalus brought the shell to Daedalus himself. Daedalus made a hole in the shell, tied the thread onto an ant and waited until the ant went from one end to the other. As a result, Minos immediately knew that Daedalus was there and he demanded that Cocalus give Daedalus to him. Cocalus agreed and followed the custom of *xenia* towards his guest, Minos. In the meantime, Daedalus had charmed Cocalus' daughters who were determined to help Daedalus escape Minos once again. With the help of Daedalus, they managed to kill Minos during his bath by pouring boiling water on him.⁹ Apollodorus¹⁰ mentions also another version, replacing boiling water by pitch.

On this latter version, Pearson (1917) gives an impressive conglomeration of the relevant sources: "The latter alternative as we learn from schol. Hom. B 145, was derived from Philostephanus (*FHG* 3.31) and Callimachus in the *Αἴτια* (fr. 5 Sch.), and through Callimachus no doubt passed to Ovid (*Ib.* 290). An additional detail is mentioned by schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 6.5. Diodorus, who as usual converts the myth into a semblance of history, makes Daedalus the engineer of Cocalus, who constructs for him an impregnable fortress. Minos then invades Sicily, but Cocalus entraps him by proposing a friendly conference, and then suffocates him with the steam of the bathroom (4.78, 79). But long before his time Cocalus and the invasion of Minos had become the part of the stock-in-trade of the historians as an indispensable element in the narrative of the Greek colonisation of Sicily: see Philistus fr. 1 (*FHG* 1.185), Arist. Pol. 2.10.1271^b 39, Strabo 273, 279, Diod. 12.71, Heraclid. Pont. 29 (*FHG* 2.220)."

The action probably started with the arrival of Minos in Camicus and his following *peripeteia* with the discovery of Daedalus and the terrible end of the Cretan king. In the meantime, there could have been a scene with Cocalus and Minos and, similarly, at

⁹ Zenobius 4.92, *Paroem.* 1.112.

¹⁰ Apollodorus, *Epitome* 1.13-5. On the problem of the various mythography, cf. the edition of Apollodorus by Frazer (1946) 142, n. 1.

least, a confrontation between the Sicilian king and Daedalus. But everything else remains in the field of pure hypothesis.

Jose Maria Lucas de Dios closes his introduction with a reference to Aristophanes' *Cocalus* thus: "Aristophanes wrote a comedy under the title *Cocalus*, in which he describes a love story on this same theme: one of his daughters, being in love with Daedalus, persuades her father to offer death to Minos instead of her beloved one. And the most widespread opinion is that in this work the Athenian comic poet parodied the Sophoclean tragedy."¹¹

This is a view that could indeed be true; so, if there is a connection between the two plays, what those elements that they had in common are, and, even more specifically, what elements Aristophanes could take advantage of and adapt for his own purposes, are the two major questions that remain to be investigated.

The theme, place and strategy are not new to the comic playwright. Aristophanes is parodying another myth presented by a tragedian and since sexual intercourse is involved, things are made even more appealing and more suitable for a comedy. As for the place, Sicily was one of the crucial destinations and battlefields during the Peloponnesian War. Therefore, even though referring to the extreme policy of some¹² or passing peaceful, anti-war messages would be considered passé for *Cocalus*' production time, Aristophanes can still refer to Sicily simply geographically. Italy and particularly Sicily had definitely been particularly important for Greeks¹³ and references to it are not uncommon among the playwrights; Aeschylus' *Aitnaiai* were set in Sicily and in his *Heliades* there is a reference to the river Eridanos, which could be in Sicily according to Diggle.¹⁴ The same river features in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Po)¹⁵ and there is another reference to Sicily in his *Electra* creating a connection between it

¹¹ Lucas de Dios (1983) 180.

¹² The parody of Philoxenus' *Cyclops* in *Wealth* could be another example as it probably contained satire towards the tyrant Dionysius (cf. Farmer 2017: 219).

¹³ Towards the end of the 5th c. BC the Carthaginian troops destroyed a few major Greek settlements in Sicily and around the 400s there is significant tension in the relationships between Greeks and natives. Local archaeological evidence also testify for the popularity of Greek dramas in the area (see chapter 19.5 in Smith & Plantzos 2012).

¹⁴ Diggle (1970) 27-32.

¹⁵ Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 722-42.

and the Dioskouroi. In Euripides' *Melanippe Desmotis* we have a reference to Siris, which was a town in south Sicily as well as Metapontum.¹⁶ Now, how much Aristophanes was influenced by Sophocles' tragedy remains unknown. Sophocles' choice of place could also have colonisation connotations, since Daedalus moved to Sicily from Greece. This would give Aristophanes an additional reason for parodying his play if the history of Sicily and the presence of Greeks there is also considered. In the next section, it will be demonstrated that there are some fragments which could be related to Sophocles' *Camici* and the myth behind it.

2.4.2 The fragments

1. Erotian φ 19 (359)

<φῶδες>· ἔστι μὴν ἡ λέξις Δωρική, καλοῦσι δὲ φῶδας
τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς γινόμενα, μαλίστα δὲ ὅταν ἐκ ψύχους ἐν τῷ
πυρὶ καθίσωσι, στρογγύλα ἐπιφλογίσματα. ἐσχημάτισται δὲ
ἡ λέξις ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἐρεύθους, ὡς <Διοκλῆς> ὁ Καρύ-
στιός φησιν· 'ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἐξανθήματα φοινικᾶ οἶον φῶδες περὶ
τὸν θώρακά που γινόμενα'. καὶ <Ἰππῶναξ> δέ φησι· |

πρὸς τὴν μαρίλην τοὺς πόδας θερμαίνων

<φῶδας τ' ἔχων> οὐ παύεται.

καὶ <Ἀριστοφάνης> ἐν *Κωκάλῳ* φησί·

<πολλά> γὰρ; ἔξω, κατέτριβεν ἱμάτια. (B.) κάπειτα πῶς

φῶδας τοσαύτας εἶχε τὸν χειμῶν' ὅλον;

ἔνιοι δὲ τὰς φλυκτίδας ἐξεδέξαντο.

παρέσο: codd.: <πολλά> γὰρ; ἔξω e.g. Austin

¹⁶ For further info see Zacharia (2003) 61, 67-68.

Tr: <blisters>; the word is of Doric origin, they call blisters those caused by fire, especially when they sit at the fire (coming) from the cold, the round superficial inflammations. The word has been formed from the light and redness, as <Diocles> the Karystian says; ‘and when purple-red efflorescence like blisters appear somewhere around the chest’. And <Hipponax> says; | with regard to the coal-dust he has not stopped warming the legs <and having blisters>.

And <Aristophanes> in *Cocalus* says;

<Many> garments he wore out <outside> and then how did he have so many blisters the whole winter?

Some on the other hand took on boils.

Erotianus lived in the 1st c. AD and he was famous for his work on Hippocrates (*Collection of Hippocratic words*). In this lexicon there is the lemma *φῶδες* and his reference to Aristophanes’ play. Consequently, in fragment 1 there is a reference to someone who had blisters, although he had worn out many clothes when outside. The man with the blisters could be Minos after he got scalded to death during his bath. The way that the speakers could have known about the blisters is by having seen his corpse after the king’s murder. Unaware of the way he died, they are trying to explain the blisters he had, assuming that he had had them all winter long and he did not get them suddenly.

2. Suda ω 14 (III 605.3) (362)

Ὡδε: οὐ μόνον τὸ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐνθάδε· ὡς ἡμεῖς. Κρατῖνος
Δραπέτισι· τοὺς ὧδε μόνον στασιάζοντας καὶ βουλομένους τινὰς εἶναι.
**Ἀριστοφάνης *Κωκάλῳ*· ἐκδότω δέ τις καὶ ψηφολόγιον¹⁷ ὧδε καὶ
δίφρῳ δύο.** καὶ Πλάτων που κέχρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ δεῦρο καὶ ἐνθάδε·

¹⁷ In LSJ the word is recorded as found in Sud.: *ψηφολογεῖον* and it is only attested in this fragment of Aristophanes.

Tr: Thus: not only ‘in this way’, but also ‘here’; like we. Cratinus in *Drapetides*; they who only want to cause internal strife here and wish to be somebody. **Aristophanes in *Cocalus*; Someone bring out both the account-board here and two stools.** And Plato has used to somewhere instead of *δεῦρο* and *ἐνθάδε*;

In the above lemma of Suda where a definition for the word *ᾠδὲ* is given, there is a reference to this fragment, where we have someone ordering for an account board and two seats to be brought. This setting reminds us of the one in *Knights* where the same kind of seat is brought in by Paphlagon when his debate/competition with the Sausage-seller is about to start (1163). There is a similar setting in *Wasps*, where we see the preparations for the trial, reminding us of the courtroom. Zachary Biles discusses this particular setting of the domestic courtroom in his article and traces it back to the rivalry between Aristophanes and Cratinus.¹⁸ Probably, an agon or a trial is about to start in *Cocalus* as well at this point. And this might be what this fragment describes. Following Sophocles’ play, this debate could have been either between Cocalus and Minos, or Cocalus and Daedalus. However, there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that there could have also been another debate between Minos and Daedalus. If this fragment comes after the supposed death of Minos, then the voting could very well be the trial in order to find Minos’ murderer and, as Daedalus was the primary suspect, he would be the one tried. Consequently, one stool could be for Daedalus and the other for his accuser.

¹⁸ Biles (2002) 197. The word *δίφρος* is also used by Eupolis fr. 58, although it is impossible to know the context (*δίφρος Θεσσαλικός τετράπους*).

3. Pollux 7.162 (363)

καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τέγος οὐ μόνον οἱ νῦν κέραμον ὀνομάζουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἂν εἴκοι καλεῖν, εἰπὼν ἐν *Κωκάλῳ*,

κοφίνους δὲ λίθων ἐκέλευες

ἡμᾶς <ίμᾶν> ἐπὶ τὸν κέραμον.

ἀγγεῖα κεράμεια, καὶ γήινα. καὶ τὰ εἶδη κεράμεια, πίθοι, πιθάκναι, ἀμπορεῖς, βίκοι, κώθωνες, σταμνία, στάμνοι, σταμνίσκοι. ὅθεν εἴρηται ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κωμῳδίᾳ, κατασταμνίζειν τὸν οἶνον, τὸ κατερᾶν. λεπρᾶν δὲ κεράμειον ὀξηρὸν, ἀντὶ τοῦ μυδᾶν, Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει. πίνακες κεράμειοι, τρυβλία, χύτραι.

1 var. ἐκέλευον 2 suppl. Bergk

Tr: and the same roof not only they nowadays call potter's clay, but also Aristophanes would seem to name, having said in *Cocalus*,

baskets of stones you ordered

us <to draw up> onto the tiling (of the roof).

vessels made of clay, and of earth. And the shapes of clay, large wine-jars, casks, two handle jars, drinking bowls, Laconian drinking-vessels, wine-jars, earthen jars, small jars. which has been mentioned in middle comedy, to draw off wine into a smaller vessel, the pouring off. the vinegar-jar is mouldy, instead of to be damp, Aristophanes says. planks out of clay, cups, earthen pots.

The above is the next fragment that could present an allusion to the myth, where the daughters poured hot water or pitch on Minos. That is a detail of the myth that comes down to us from schol. Pind. *Nem.* 4.95 (59), according to which Daedalus had contrived a device for carrying the water through a pipe on the roof and subsequently having it fall on Minos with fatal consequences. In our fragment we read that someone ordered a bunch of people to bring baskets full of stones on the roof. Aristophanes

seems to be replacing the water or pitch of the myth, as we saw it in the introduction, with stones.¹⁹ The speakers (in plural - ἡμᾶς) could possibly be the chorus consisting of Cocalus' daughters who were ordered by Daedalus to bring the weapon of the murder up on the roof and from there cast it on Minos. Moreover, there is something more of particular interest in Pollux's segment that adds up to our knowledge on Aristophanes' impact on Middle Comedy and its word treasury, which was heavily influenced by the poet (ὄθεν εἴρηται ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κωμῳδίᾳ).

4. Pollux 3.86 (368)

ἀργύρια δὲ κατὰ πλῆθος ἥκιστα λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί,
εἴρηται δ' ἐν *Κωκάλῳ* καὶ *Νήσοις* Ἀριστοφάνους.

Tr: the Attics scarcely name silver coins in plural,
it is said, though, in *Cocalus* and *Islands* of Aristophanes.

It is impossible to know the context of this fragment. One suggestion might be that the money (silvers) that is mentioned could refer to Minos' reward to whoever gave Daedalus away, although we are still in the area of pure speculation.

5. Stephanus of Byzantium 374.5 (370)

Κόρινθος, πόλις ἔσω τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ τῆς Πελοποννήσου...οἱ πολῖται
Κορίνθιοι, καὶ θηλυκῶ Κορινθιάς. καὶ σύνθετον κορινθιουργῆς ὡς
ἀττικουργῆς...**καὶ κορινθιάζομαι τὸ ἐταιρεῖν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ
ἐταιρῶν, ἢ τὸ μαστροπεύειν. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Κωκάλῳ*.**

Tr: Corinth, a city in the inner part of the Peloponnesian narrow
channel...the citizens *Κορίνθιοι*, and in feminine *Κορινθιάς*. And the
compound *κορινθιουργῆς* (a work in Corinthian fashion) as in
ἀττικουργῆς (wrought in Attic fashion)...**and to practise fornication to**

¹⁹ This is of particular significance if one thinks of the contemporary Sicilian history and especially the Carthaginian siege, during which the women and the children sought refuge on the rooftops and from there threw stones and tiles at the enemy. An event that was traumatising for the local Greeks as well (Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 56.7-57.1).

keep company with, from the female companions of Corinth, or the seduction. Aristophanes in *Cocalus*.

In Stephanus Byzantinus' work, as part of the entry *Κόρινθος* we come across this Aristophanic fragment. Stephanus describes the geographical location of the Greek town giving also some information on the mythological background behind some of the derivatives, names, nouns, adjectives and one verb. That verb is the verb *Κορινθιάζομαι*. Although its meaning is very clear it is hard to guess the context and use of the verb in the play. Most probably it refers to a woman/women who were acting like hetaerae, maybe Cocalus' daughters?

6. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.478D (364)

Κοτύλη· Ἀριστοφάνης *Κωκάλω*·

ἄλλαι ὑποπρεσβύτεραι γράες Θασίου μέλανος
μεστὸν κεραμευομέναις κοτύλαις μεγάλαις
ἔγχεον ἐς σφέτερον δέμας οὐδέν ἄκοσμον,
ἔρωτι βιαζόμεναι μέλανος οἴνου ἀκράτου

Tr: Ladle· Aristophanes in *Cocalus*·

Other elderly women a...full of dark Thasian
with large ceramic ladles
were pouring into their bodies without measure,
forced by the desire of dark unmixed wine²⁰

This time it seems that Athenaeus is providing only a single word from our comedy. It would be reasonable though to connect the *kotule* with the segment that follows and assume that it was a kitchen appliance used for a similar purpose in the Aristophanic play. The gender of the users can be related to the play's scenario as there probably

²⁰ This is a very problematic segment for metrical reasons and various corrections have been attempted (see Kassel-Austin edition for full documentation and analysis). Here I follow the K-A edition.

were a few female characters (Cocalus' daughters). The same kind of wine handled (but not drunk) by women is found in *Lysistrata* 195-197 who orders somebody not to pour any water in the wine cup. It has been suggested that the apparent female bibulousness attested in our fragment might be contrasted in *Lysistrata*.²¹

The rest of the fragments are not so descriptive or meaningful as to the plot of the play. However, it is equally important to try to analyse and interpret their meaning as much as possible.

7. Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.18.4 (365)

Aristophanes vetus comicus in comoedia Cocalo sic ait:

ἤμουν ἄγριον
βάρος, ἤγειρεν γάρ τοι μ' οἶνος
οὐ μείζας πῶμ' Ἀχελώϊωι

Tr: Aristophanes the ancient comic poet in the comedy *Cocalus* says
thus:

I was vomiting a savage load, for the wine stimulated me
Not having mixed the drink with Achelous

In this segment, Macrobius is describing the meaning and use of the name of the river Achelous in Greek literature. More specifically, in this chapter Macrobius will give his own explanation to the fact that ancient authors were referring to river Achelous when they wanted to speak generally about water and not the waters of this particular river. He is focused on the reasons why they picked this specific river and not another one. The example he uses comes from Virgil and his reference to the river when he speaks of water influenced by ancient Greeks. This is the point that concerns the present study, as Macrobius goes on to mention the example found in Aristophanes' comedy, *Cocalus*, where he speaks of wine mixed with water and instead of the word ὕδωρ we read *Achelous*. He continues his explanation quoting a segment of Ephorus' second

²¹ Bowie (1997) 14.

book of *Histories*; there, Ephorus talks about the Greek habit of generalisation which is reversed in the case of water: the Athenians are called ‘Hellenes’ and the Lacedaemonians ‘Peloponnesians’, whereas we call the water, any water, ‘Achelous’. According to Ephorus, this custom originated from the oracles of Dodona in which the god was ordering the sacrifice to be made in Achelous meaning any river and not this particular one.

Macrobius will not stop here; he wants to enforce his account using another example coming from Didymus this time. Didymus’ opinion on the matter is an interesting one as it comes from mythology. He sides with Acusilaus’ account when he claims that Achelous is the eldest of all three thousand rivers born from the marriage of Ocean and Tethys and, therefore, the most honoured. It comes as no surprise that Didymus’ next paradigm is taken directly from Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* saying “I will show the Argives a stream of Achelous”, although that river or stream was very far from Achelous’ region, Acarnania. Now, this could be simply a random coincidence, or Aristophanes could be alluding to Euripides.

8. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 4.156B (360)

Καὶ ὁ καλὸς δ’ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Κωκάλῳ* ἔφη·

ἀλλ’ ἐστίν, ὦ πάτερ, κομιδῇ μεσημβρία,
ἥνικα γε τοὺς νεωτέρους δειπνεῖν χρεών.

Tr: And the admirable Aristophanes said in *Cocalus*·

But it is, (old) sir/father, exactly noon,
the time when the younger men should dine.

Athenaeus, in this segment of his work *Deipnosophistae*, mentions examples of the importance of the time that someone ought to eat, and there he cites Aristophanes. The additional information we get from this fragment is that there could be a young boy (or boys if we take the adjective *νεωτέρους* literally) in the play and that the play is set during the day.

9. Harpocration 268.7 Dind. (361)

Πώμαλα: ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδαμῶς Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰσχίνου. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν πῶ Δώριον, τιθέμενον ἀντὶ τοῦ πόθεν· τὸ δὲ μάλα ἤτοι παρέλκει ἢ ἔστιν ἐν ποσοῖς λεγόμενον πώμαλα, οἷον οὐ μάλα, οὐ πάνυ. πολὺ δ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ κωμῳδίᾳ· Ἀριστοφάνους

**{A.} <ῆ> λουιδορία τις ἐγένεθ' ὑμῖν; {B.} πώμαλα·
οὐδ' εἶπον οὐδέν.**

Sud. π 2177 πώμαλα· κεῖται...καὶ παρ' Ἀριστοφάνει ἐν *Κωκάλῳ*.

Tr: 'Πώμαλα': instead of *οὐδαμῶς* Demosthenes is using it in *Against Aeschines*. 'πῶ' is Dorian, placed instead of 'πόθεν'; it draws aside 'μάλα' or when it is said for certain quantities 'πώμαλα', such as 'οὐ μάλα', 'οὐ πάνυ'. It is much in ancient comedy; Aristophanes

**{A.} was some kind of reproach made by you? {B.}
Not at all; I (or they) didn't say anything.**

Sud. π 2177 'πώμαλα'; it is found...in Aristophanes' *Cocalus*.

Another fragment is located in the *Harpocrationis Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos* under the lemma *πώμαλα*. Harpocration claims that it is also used in Ancient Comedy giving an example found in Aristophanes.

10. Zenobius, *Vulg.* 6.47 (366)

χρυσὸς ὁ Κολοφώνιος: μέμνηται ταύτης Ἀριστοφάνους ἐν *Κωκάλῳ*. εἶρηται δὲ, παρόσον οἱ Κολοφώνιοι τὸν κάλλιστον χρυσὸν ἐργάζεσθαι νομίζονται. καὶ Ἡρόδοτος δὲ Κολοφώνιον καλεῖ τὸν ἄριστον χρυσόν.

Tr: The Colophonian gold: Aristophanes makes mention of it in *Cocalus*. It is named (thus), in so far as the Colophonians are considered to make the best gold. And Herodotus calls Colophonian the best gold.

This could have also been a reference to Minos' reward, although it could also refer to the Cretan wealth. In Plato's *Gorgias*,²² Minos was the only one holding a golden sceptre.

11. Photius α 2051 (367)

ἀνταναιρεῖν· οἶον οἱ πολλοὶ ἀνθυφελεῖν λέγουσιν. Ἀριστοφάνης
Κωκάλῳ (fr.12 Dem.).

Tr. strike out of an account· as the majority say 'to deduct'. Aristophanes in *Cocalus*.

12. Hesychius ι 774 (369)

ἰπνός· *κάμινος. φούρνος. φανός. κλίβανος s. μαγειρεῖον. καὶ μέρος τι
νεώς. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν *Κωκάλῳ* καὶ τὸν κοπρῶνα οὕτως εἶπεν

Tr: furnace· * kiln. oven. light. covered earthen vessel s. kitchen. and
some part of a temple. Aristophanes in *Cocalus* spoke of the privy in this
way.

13. Pollux 4.187 (371)

καὶ στραγγουρία, ὥς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν *Κωκάλῳ*

Tr: and strangury, just as Aristophanes in *Cocalus*

This word was found in Pollux's list of illnesses in his *Onomasticon*.²³ Probably this is a comic reference to strangury used by Aristophanes again in his *Wasps* 810 and *Thesmophoriazusae* 616. Strangury is a disease that affects the bladder and causes irritation and the urge to urinate. According to Hippocrates,²⁴ unmixed wine could cure

²² Plato *Gorgias* 526c7-d1.

²³ cf. Galen., *De symptomatum differentiis liber*, 7.81.1.

²⁴ *Aphorisms* 7, 48, 4.590, 10f. L. For a discussion on the therapeutic uses of wine as well as a medium for vomiting see Jouanna (2012) 186.

strangury, which might lead us to connect this fragment with frr. 6 and 7 that refer to this kind of wine.

2.4.3 The characters

The following characters can be suggested for this play: Cocalus, Daedalus, Minos, Chorus of Cocalus' daughters, Slave, Young man (at least one).

COCALUS

Although the fragments have not been attributed to any specific characters, an attempt will be made to relate those which are at least forming a phrase to a specific character. There is no point in trying the same thing for words that have survived as individual references in the comedy, as they could have been uttered by any of the characters.

The first character analysed in this section will be the king of the title. The lines that might have been uttered by Cocalus are the ones found in Suda ω 14 (III 605.3):

*ἐκδότω δέ τις
καὶ ψηφολόγιον ὧδε καὶ δίφρῳ δύο.*

The most appropriate character to order the preparation for the trial would have been the master of the house who could have also been the judge. There has already been an extensive discussion on the area of his rule in Sicily and how he has been involved in the myth as we see it in Sophocles' *Camici* and different scholars have described it. Consequently, in this section the ways in which ancient writers have used his name and the aspects of his character they have been interested in shall be presented.

A famous writer that decided to give his own version of the story giving it a more historical rather than mythical dimension was Diodorus Siculus or Diodorus of Sicily. It only appears appropriate that a Sicilian Greek historian would have included the (hi)stories around a Sicilian king in his historical work known as *Bibliotheca Historica* (or Library) and written in the second half of the 1st c. BC.

In the fourth book of his universal history, where he commences the description of the geography and culture of Greece and Europe, he gives his own account of the story around Cocalus' name as well. At the end of chapter 77 he starts the narration of Daedalus and Icarus' flight from Minos and Crete. He describes in detail how Icarus was gone and how his father found shelter in Sicily. Diodorus also talks about the appreciation that the Sicanians had towards Daedalus and his art and all these works he constructed there and how he built the impregnable city of Camici ruled by Cocalus. The king built his palace in there storing all the treasures.²⁵ A few paragraphs later there is Cocalus' plan to destroy Minos after having received him in his palace and treated him according to the custom of *xenia*, only to lead him to his death while taking his bath. According to Diodorus, Minos died because he was made to stay in hot water for too long. Cocalus returned the body to the Cretans with the excuse that Minos slipped and fell into the hot water.²⁶

The story is also found in Zenobius' work, a Greek sophist of the 2nd c. AD who composed a collection of proverbs. In his work, he describes Daedalus and Icarus' escape as well as Daedalus' arrival in Sicily and Cocalus. He mentions Minos' way of discovering Daedalus through the snail shell and his murder by Cocalus' daughters during his bath. Zenobius transmits the tradition according to which hot pitch was poured on Minos and caused his death.²⁷ The interesting difference between the two aforementioned sources is that the first one presents Cocalus as the agent of Minos' death, whereas the second one seems to be shifting the blame entirely on to Cocalus' daughters.

The next reference to the king comes from a geographer of the same century as Zenobius. In the seventh book of Pausanias' *Description of Greece* we read a slightly different version of the story, according to which Daedalus went to Crete after he killed his sister's son and from there he fled to Sicily and Cocalus. Minos arrived there seeking him only to find his death by Cocalus' daughters for Daedalus' sake. This is another interesting version of the myth that wants a war to have erupted between

²⁵ Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.78.2.7-3.1.

²⁶ id. 4.79.1.7-3.1.

²⁷ Zenobius, *Epitome collectionum Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi* 4.92.62-70.

Sicilians and Cretans because of Daedalus as Cocalus actually refused to give Daedalus to Minos. According to Pausanias' account, however, the death was caused by Cocalus' daughters without any apparent involvement of the king in its planning or execution.²⁸

DAEDALUS

The next most important character is Daedalus, the infamous craftsman of unique skill in antiquity. The story of Daedalus and Icarus is known; there are a couple of different versions of the story, but according to the one mostly referred to, Daedalus created the string that Ariadne gave to Theseus so that he finds his way out of the labyrinth and therefore saved his life. Daedalus then leaves Crete accompanied by his son, Icarus, who dies on the way because he ignored his father's wise advice and flew too close to the sun, making the wax that was holding his wings together melt. That is the core of the myth, preserved and presented by different authors in different times and in different ways.

Diodorus of Sicily, who has already been discussed, dedicated a considerable amount of space to the narration of our myth.²⁹ According to Diodorus, Daedalus was an Athenian from the clan of Erechthids. He draws an ancestral line that goes back to Erechtheus himself. His father was Metion, son of Eupalamus. Of all men Daedalus excelled in the art of building, creating statues and workings of stone. He was also the inventor of many admirable devices and was the pioneer of creating statues with separated legs and overall presenting the body's natural movements.³⁰

Diodorus mentions that Daedalus had to flee from Athens because of his being accused of committing murder. According to this version of the myth, Daedalus killed his nephew, Talos, out of jealousy and fear that the young lad who was proving to be even more skilled than his uncle and teacher would surpass him in fame. Daedalus was discovered, tried and condemned by the court of the Areopagites. He first fled to another deme in Attica, which was named after him, and subsequently went to Crete

²⁸ Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 7.4.6.1-7.1.

²⁹ Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.75.6.1- 77.1.3

³⁰ cf. Palaeph., *De incredilibus* (1553: 001); *Mythographi Graeci* 3.2. 21.1-10 [Περὶ Δαιδάλου.]

and found shelter and a strong friendship next to Minos and among a people that greatly admired his art. Daedalus was living peacefully until he decided to help Pasiphae satisfy her passion for a bull.

Diodorus gives even more details on Daedalus and how he reached Cocalus. A couple of paragraphs later the consequences of Daedalus' creation are presented. Minos became furious on the news of his guest's invention regarding his wife, Pasiphae, and Daedalus, alarmed by the king's threat, decides to leave once again. He and his son approached an island, but while Icarus tried to disembark from their vessel he was not careful enough and fell into the sea and perished. Daedalus continues his journey until he reached Sicily where he received a warm welcome from the local king, Cocalus.

Diodorus carries on mentioning another version of the myth that wants Daedalus to have stayed in Crete hidden a while longer until he figured out that since Minos was investigating every vessel in search for him offering a generous reward to whomever gave him away, he had to find another way to escape. Daedalus crafted wings for himself and his son who recklessly perished in the sea when he flew too close to the sun and the wax on his wings melted. Daedalus continued his journey until he arrived in Sicily. There he constructed many marvellous works including the strongest city in the area of the river Camicus, which he made impregnable. The king Cocalus had his royal residence in the walls of the city together with his treasures.³¹

On a different note, the 2nd c. writer, satirist and rhetorician, Lucian gives us an additional piece of information regarding the character of Daedalus. According to his account, Daedalus also had musical skills and while he was in Crete he taught Ariadne how to dance. This same dance is depicted on the Shield of Achilles.³² In another excerpt from Lucian's work he calls Daedalus an Athenian and adds astrology to his skills. Daedalus taught his young and reckless son astrology, who however was not able to understand the truth and think reasonably, lost in a metaphorical ocean of perplexities. Lucian also mentions the version that wants Icarus being drowned presenting it as a myth. Pasiphae was also a 'victim' of Daedalus' astrology, as she heard from him of a bull appearing among the constellations and she fell in love with

³¹ Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.77.5.1-78.2.6.

³² Lucian, *De saltatione* 13.1-8.

the doctrine. Lucian says that is the reason why they think that Daedalus married Pasiphae to a bull.³³

The next author who recited the myth was Pausanias, who has already been mentioned. Pausanias sticks to the traditional myth more than Lucian and gives the following information: the murder of Kalos (instead of Diodorus' Talos) by his uncle, Daedalus, who then fled to Crete and some time later to Sicily and Cocalus.³⁴ In another passage, Pausanias confirms Daedalus' family origins and speaks of Daedalus' despicable crime that led him to voluntary exile to Minos in Crete. Pausanias, without giving a reason, says that Minos put Daedalus and his son into jail,³⁵ from where they escaped to Sicily. Daedalus, like a male Helen, then becomes the cause of a war between Cretans and Sicilians when Cocalus refused to give Daedalus back to Minos. Cocalus' daughters, charmed by Daedalus, helped him to kill Minos. The story made Daedalus' reputation to spread all over Italy.³⁶ In Book 9, Pausanias agrees with the version that Daedalus and his son fled from Crete by boat. Daedalus was saved but Icarus' boat capsized due to the bad navigation of the young and inexperienced Icarus. Heracles is said to have found Icarus' body ashore and buried it there, giving his name to the island and the sea around it.³⁷

Philostephanus was a Hellenistic writer who lived in the 3rd c. BC. He was a historian who in his work included references to islands and myths. Therefore, it is not surprising that he alludes to the myth of Daedalus' flight to Cocalus. He writes one century after Aristophanes' *Cocalus* was produced; this may be an indicator that this version of the story was mostly used at least up until his time. Philostephanus offers a brief summary of the myth as we know it;³⁸ namely, after Pasiphae's intercourse with the bull, Daedalus wanted to escape Minos' wrath, so he flew away with his son, who perished

³³ Lucian, *De astrologia*, 14.3-16.5.

³⁴ Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.21.4.2-5.

³⁵ Palaephatus, *De incredilibus* 3.2.12.1-15.

³⁶ Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 7. 4.3.5 -7.4.7.3.

³⁷ *ibid.* 9.11.4.3-5.7.

³⁸ *FHG*, Vol. 3, fr. 36.

in the ocean. Daedalus continued his flight until Sicily. He was warmly received by Cocalus' daughters who later killed Minos by pouring hot water on him.³⁹

The next source is a Greek writer, historian, orator and philosopher from the 1st c. AD and part of the Second Sophistic philosophical movement. Dio Chrysostomus presents Daedalus from a different angle and under a negative light. He does not approve of any of Daedalus' deeds while he was in Crete calling them bad, unfair as well as impious. He should not have built the labyrinth so that the young men would perish, he should not have helped with Pasiphae's illness and on top of all he was responsible for Icarus' death. He maintains a suspicion around the myth especially regarding Icarus and the wings. Without being positive regarding Dio's reasons or influences, this cunning and not so innocent Daedalus would serve Aristophanes' purposes as well.⁴⁰

The next reference to Daedalus and part of the myth comes from Photius and looks back to Pausanias' Book 1 giving specific information; Daedalus' father was Eupalamus (and not Metion as elsewhere) and his sister is Perdix (Partridge), whose son, Kalos, was murdered in Athens by Daedalus out of jealousy. Photius confirms that this is the version of the myth that we had in Sophocles' tragedy, who names the son Perdix. These implication for birdlike relations of Daedalus would have served Aristophanes' purposes even regarding Daedalus' appearance.⁴¹

The next source offers a blend of the different information transmitted about Daedalus, which shows that the different versions of the myth survived in the 12th c. AD. In a segment from Eustathius' commentary on the *Iliad* there is emphasis on Daedalus' dance skills and how he taught the seven boys and girls that were saved by Theseus in Knossos, Crete. He also appears as a mediator in Pasiphae's love for the bull, for which Minos rightfully pursued him. Interestingly, Eustathius mentions Daedalus' reputation as the facilitator of erotic unions and helper of women's loves (ἐρώτων γὰρ γυναικῶν ὁ Δαίδαλος ὑπουργὸς παραδέδοται).⁴² This certainly matched the Daedalus we have seen in the plays of the thesis. Apart from the mythical background

³⁹ cf. Scholia In Pindarum Ode N 4, scholion 95b, line 3-8, where there is also a reference to the roof from where the hot water was poured.

⁴⁰ Dio Chrysostomus 71.6.3-7.1.

⁴¹ Photius π 413.12-17.

⁴² Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 4.267.21-268.9.

of Daedalus in *Cocalus*, Daedalus was probably also the facilitator of Zeus' union with Leda in *Daedalus*.

MINOS

The third character of the play is Minos, the famous king of Crete, husband to Pasiphae and Ariadne's father. According to the legend, Minos had asked Daedalus to create a labyrinth where he could keep the offspring of his wife and bull, the Minotaur, until Theseus came and killed the wild beast.

Returning to the theme of our comedy there is one fragment that could be assigned to Minos as a result of an attempt to make him heavily drunk during the feast and therefore more vulnerable:⁴³

ἤμουν ἄγριον
βάρος, ἤγειρεν γάρ τοι μ' οἶνος
οὐ μείζας πῶμ' Ἀχελώϊωι

There are a number of details given by different authors, of whom the most representative will be used and cited in order to draw the character of Minos, who according to Plato was savage, difficult and unfair.⁴⁴ The second source, like previously, shall be Diodorus Siculus. In his account regarding Minos he provides information on the prehistory of the myth. Minos used to sacrifice the fairest bull every year to Poseidon. One year Minos was so amazed at a bull's beauty that he did not want to sacrifice him, so he chose the next fairest of his herd. Poseidon got angry at Minos and in order to punish him he planted a strong love in Pasiphae's heart for that beautiful bull. With the help of Daedalus Pasiphae managed to satisfy her erotic desire for the bull and after the intercourse with the bull she gave birth to the Minotaur, a strange creature with the body of a man and the head of a bull. The Minotaur was kept in a

⁴³ The consumption of unmixed wine was frowned upon and dismissed as a barbarian and very non-Greek habit (cf. Hunter & Koukouzika 2015: 27).

⁴⁴ Plato, *Minos*, 318.d.7-10.

labyrinth created by Daedalus and he was fed with the seven boys and seven girls that were sent to Crete from Athens as a tribute for an old debt.⁴⁵

Diodorus continues his story with Minos' preparations for his quest to hunt Daedalus to Sicily. He is actually organising a naval campaign against the island. He disembarked in the territory of Acragas and sent messengers to the local king, Cocalus, demanding Daedalus from him. Cocalus invited him to a meeting agreeing to fulfil all his requests. He then treated him according to the ancient custom of *xenia* and invited him to his house, where Cocalus killed the Cretan king by keeping him too long in the hot water while the latter was taking his bath. Cocalus returned the body to Minos' people presenting his death as an accident during his bath, justifying thus the scars on Minos' body. A similar reference to Minos' body seems to be there in the remaining fragments from a dialogue in our comedy.⁴⁶

Subsequently, Minos' comrades buried the body in a magnificent tomb where they also built a shrine of Aphrodite. For many years, the local inhabitants were honouring and offering sacrifices to the tomb believing it was a shrine of Aphrodite. Later, when Theron was lord of Acragas, the bones were unburied and returned to the Cretans. After Minos' death, his comrades were at a loss and could not return to Crete. Consequently, they decided to stay in Sicily and founded the cities of Minoa and Engyum.⁴⁷

We have already discussed Zenobius' account of the myth in the description of Cocalus, but let us see what Zenobius says regarding Minos. According to Zenobius, Minos, the king of the Cretans, was murdered by Cocalus' daughters when they poured hot pitch on him. A slightly different version of the prehistory is found here; Minos had imprisoned Daedalus and his son in the labyrinth itself when they both flew away. Minos went after him carrying the snail shell with him and offering a reward, hoping to find Daedalus.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.77.1.3-4.6. For detailed information on Minos' relationships with Athens and Daedalus as well as the different versions of the myth around the related events see Plutarch *Theseus* 15-19.7.

⁴⁶ fr. Erotian ϕ 19.

⁴⁷ Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 4.79.1.1- 6.1.

⁴⁸ Zenobius, Epit. collectionum Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi, 4.92.48-61.

The following source is dated in the 1st-2nd c. AD and it is a collection of ancient myths. In Pseudo-Apollodorus we get some more information on Minos' large family and how he came to be the king of Crete alleging that it was a divine will and that Gods gave him whatever he asked for. Poseidon helped him to prove the allegation that he was chosen by the Gods and win the kingdom becoming the lord of the sea around his area; however, Minos did not fulfil his promise to sacrifice the bull that Poseidon sent to him provoking the God's wrath. A detailed description of the events with Pasiphae and Daedalus' contribution follows.⁴⁹ In the same book, a few paragraphs later, there is the story about Minos and Polyidus as we saw in Chapter 2.⁵⁰

The next segment comes from John Malalas, a Greek chronicler of the 6th c. AD. That is a different version of the myth which most probably was not the one followed in Aristophanes' comedy. Minos was the son of Europa and lord of the sea⁵¹ after he defeated the Athenians as well as a lawgiver.⁵² After he found out about his wife's adultery with the bull, he locked her up until her death. Daedalus and Icarus both died, the first one was slaughtered, the second one drowned.⁵³

Constantinus the 7th, an emperor of the Macedonian dynasty (905-959) continues John's story adding that after the death of Minos, the Minotaur wanted to become the king of the Cretans, but they would not accept him as he was the disgraceful outcome of adultery. The Cretans asked Theseus' help to get rid of the Minotaur, who, scared, fled to the Labyrinth land and hid in a cave on the mountain. Theseus discovered him and killed him.⁵⁴

In the following segment from the *Scholia in Euripidem* we learn that after the loss of his son, Daedalus fled to Athens. When Minos heard the news, he sent messengers to Athens asking for him. The Athenians refused but they agreed to send one person every year to be devoured by the Minotaur. Unlike the sources that were discussed before and

⁴⁹ Apollodorus, *Library* 3.7.1-11.6.

⁵⁰ *ibid.* 3.17.1-20.8.

⁵¹ cf. Thucydides 1.4.1.

⁵² In addition to that, Minos is also assuming the role of a judge in ancient literature: Lucian, *Dialogi mortuorum*, Dialogue 25.

⁵³ *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*, 85.18-86.11.

⁵⁴ Constant.VII Porphyrogenitus, *De virtutibus et vitiis*, Vol.1.159.9-20.

which speak of a tribute of seven young boys and seven girls, the scholia mention only one person as the annual tribute. Theseus volunteered to go and there he fell in love with Pasiphae's daughter, Ariadne.⁵⁵

THE CHORUS

As suggested before, the most suitable candidates to form a chorus for this comedy would have been Cocalus' daughters, for whom unfortunately we do not have detailed information. There is one fragment that was probably uttered by them, where they seem to be addressing Daedalus as the leader of the conspiracy against Minos. Although they are both incomplete lines, the metre seems to be marching anapaests and therefore the fragment could be from a scene where the chorus is moving.

κοφίνους δὲ λίθων ἐκέλευες
ἡμᾶς <ἰμᾶν> ἐπὶ τὸν κέραμον

SLAVE AND YOUNG MAN

Last but not least, it is likely that there is a slave as well as a young man who utters the following lines:

ἀλλ' ἐστίν, ὦ πάτερ, κομιδῇ μεσημβρία,
ἡνίκα γε τοὺς νεωτέρους δειπνεῖν χρεών.

⁵⁵ Scholia in Euripidem *Hipp.*, 887.1-25. This scholion is on Euripides *Hippolytus* and explains Theseus' descent from Poseidon as he is calling him father when he needs his help to revenge his son, Hippolytus.

To sum up, there is hardly any evidence on the characters in the surviving fragments of the play, which has been a very challenging aspect of every play in the thesis. What we could do in this case, like in the previous ones, is to assume that at least the main characters of the myth around Daedalus and his escape to Cocalus might have featured in Aristophanes' play. As we saw, Cocalus was the king of Camici in Sicily, which was a very wealthy kingdom apparently. According to our sources, Cocalus and the inhabitants of Camici were very fond of Daedalus and gladly offered him shelter when Daedalus arrived. Cocalus even participated in the conspiracy against Minos which resulted in the latter's death. Cocalus then returned the king's body to the Cretans presenting his death as an accident. Other sources place the blame on Cocalus' daughters, also very fond of Daedalus, who killed Minos during his bath. We also find the version of the myth where Cocalus was willing to go to war with Minos, instead of handing Daedalus over to him.

According to the mythical tradition, Daedalus first went to Crete after he killed his nephew out of jealousy and then he had to escape to Sicily with his son, whom he lost on the way, because of another mischief he conducted on Crete when he decided to help Pasiphae, the queen, with her unnatural passion for a bull. Daedalus was also the maker of the string that Ariadne gave to Theseus in order to find his way out of the labyrinth. By that time, Daedalus had already built the reputation of the most skilful craftsman of the time, especially distinguished in the art of building statues that looked very much alive. When Daedalus arrived in Sicily he was the architect of many constructions there which resulted in making the city impregnable. Lucian which is a later source adds astrology and dancing to his talents. His account of the myth is interesting as he is dismissing many parts of it as fiction or a misunderstanding. For Lucian, the cause of Icarus' 'metaphorical' drowning and Pasiphae's destructive love were not facilitated by Daedalus' devices, but by his astrological teachings. Looking back at Daedalus' past, it is not a surprise that a 1st c. writer might accuse Daedalus of being a sort of a criminal. He was responsible for the labyrinth, where the Athenian 'tribute' would perish, he crafted the wings that killed his son as well as the device for an adulterous and unnatural union, not to mention the murder of his own nephew.

Daedalus also had the reputation of the ‘love assistant’ and so could he have been in Aristophanes’ *Daedalus* as well. Unfortunately, the surviving evidence make it impossible to suggest a similar role in this play; however, the piece of information according to which there was a suppositious child in the play might point towards that direction. Was Daedalus a helper of yet another illegitimate union which resulted in an offspring just like in the other cases (i.e. Leda and the Minotaur)? This will be discussed further in the next section.

The third character that might have appeared is Minos who has been transmitted as cruel and unfair, which we might also insinuate from his role in the Polyidus myth (and perhaps play). Minos became ruler of Crete with the help of Poseidon. He is a very strict punisher of crimes against him and the pattern of not killing directly but locking people up seems to be followed (Pasiphae, Polyidus, Minotaur, even Daedalus and Icarus according to some sources). Minos was determined to retrieve Daedalus and prepared a naval campaign for this purpose. The majority of the sources mention his death and seem to agree regarding place/manner.

We are far from sure about the rest of the characters that featured in the play, but Cocalus’ daughters seem to be a plausible assumption, as well as at least one young man as indicated by the fragments. Apparently, there are also some women consuming or serving unmixed wine (fr. 6), however it is impossible to guess whether they actually appeared in the play or it is simply a reference to them and their ‘guilty’ habit.

2.4.4 The plot of *Cocalus*: Minos versus Daedalus – the final confrontation

In this section, a plot reconstruction will be suggested based on the evidence from the testimonia and the sources. Despite the fact that the fragments indeed do not offer sufficient information for a certain scenario, there are some pieces in them that definitely indicate some very probable elements that would allow us to suggest at least one potential plot that the playwright had in mind when he was composing the play. In the existing editions, scholars suggest that the play contained the parody of the myth of Cocalus, king of Camici, and the story of Daedalus seeking refuge there. They also

suggest elements such as sexual abuse and ἀναγνωρισμός.⁵⁶ What I will present here is the result of a combination of these suggestions along with an attempt to investigate the ways in which Aristophanes might have turned a tragic plot into a comic one, suggesting many more details than the existing editions.

Taking into consideration the possibility that this is another parody play, it is worth looking at the play on which it might have been based, Sophocles' tragedy, *Camici*, in this case. Therefore, it seems useful to start with the plot of the model play and then discuss the ways in which Aristophanes could have taken full advantage of it in order to create his comedy. Cocalus was a local ruler in Sicily, leader of the Camici. Daedalus found shelter at his palace after the unfortunate loss of his son, Icarus, while they were trying to flee from Crete and Minos' wrath. Minos arrives there during his quest to find and punish Daedalus for having helped Theseus find his way out of the labyrinth and kill the Minotaur. Minos immediately suspects that Daedalus is hiding there with the help of the snail shell riddle. Cocalus, thinking of being just, agrees to give Daedalus to Minos. In the meantime, Daedalus is planning his escape from Minos for good this time. With the assistance of Cocalus' daughters he kills Minos in his bath and saves his own life.

In the version of the myth which was possibly presented by Aristophanes in *Cocalus*, the king of the title had a very important role in the comedy as well as Daedalus. Following the plot of the tragedy, the opening scene could have very well been set in Cocalus' palace during the day as one of the fragments (Athenaeus 4.156B) indicates. Minos arrives at the palace looking for Daedalus. Cocalus receives him and hears his request. He gets impressed by Minos' reward and admits that he has been hiding Daedalus. There are too many references surviving to assume that money was not important in the play.⁵⁷ One cannot be sure of the context, but the concept of the reward appears quite plausible. However, Cocalus does not really want to lose such a skilled engineer, so instead of giving him away immediately, he agrees to hold a trial and hear what both sides would have to say.

⁵⁶ For an overview of these scholarly suggestions see Pellegrino (2015: 221).

⁵⁷ Zenobius, *Vulg.* 6.47 and Pollux 3.86. Photius α 2051 could also be related to money.

In the next scene/episode the agon in the form of a trial inside the palace could be placed. Daedalus is the defendant and Minos the accuser with Cocalus assuming the role of the judge. The concept of the domestic trial has been discussed in the chapter on the analysis of the fragments individually; the fragment that points towards this idea is Suda ω 14. There is no indication as to the outcome of the debate and we cannot be sure of the verdict; however, it seems plausible that if the decision favoured Daedalus, then there would be a rapid solution to the problem without much left for the plot to continue. Consequently, if Daedalus was judged guilty, then the only thing left was for him to find a way out. Unfortunately, the fragments do not include any pointers to the funny elements of these parts and the possibilities are endless.

Daedalus' escape from his condemnation would have unfolded at the end of the play. Daedalus with the crafty mind of Odysseus would have had to think of an ingenious and simultaneously funny solution to his problem suiting the needs of the comedy. The most suitable ally were Cocalus' daughters who for some reason agreed to help Daedalus. The evidence that this was a play that involved a supposititious child and that the play involved elements that are commonly found in New Comedy⁵⁸ might come in here. Daedalus, the famous helper of adulterers, might have helped with another illegitimate union, the result of which would have been this child. It is also impossible to guess the parenthood of this child at this stage or what happened to it, but it must have been a comic addition to the story that would have certainly given it a funny twist and an original addition, especially if the mother had many lovers, as it could have been indicated by fragment 5 mentioning prostitution. We are not in a position to know if Cocalus was also aware or contributing to the plan against Minos. The way this conspiracy against Minos could have been planned and based on the fragments is the following: Daedalus wants to get rid of Minos, make him go away and leave him alone for good, so something very intimidating should happen to him so as to traumatize him and make him forget about his revenge. This deed would also have to happen somewhat discreetly, Daedalus had to make sure that he could secure an alibi in case he was to be blamed for whatever would happen to Minos.

⁵⁸ See the introduction to the play.

The conventions of the comedy and the sacred institution of *xenia* could not have been more useful to Daedalus' plan. Before Minos leaves the palace with the captive Daedalus, Cocalus decides to organize a banquet in order to honour his guest. Daedalus is aware of this and asks Cocalus' daughters to help him drag Minos into a place where there would be no witnesses, and this place could have only been the toilet,⁵⁹ where one goes alone. Cocalus' daughters would have made sure to serve something special to Minos that would upset his stomach and made him go to the toilet. That possibly had to do with his drink and especially the unmixed wine as indicated in the fragments: Athenaeus 11.478D, Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.18.4 and Pollux 4.187.

Once Minos entered the toilet, Cocalus' daughters from the roof would throw a hot substance on him on the one hand and on the other they would have to prevent his escape, so they also had to throw stones and impede his exit. Daedalus' plan had been executed successfully.⁶⁰ After Minos had been long absent the king would have sent somebody to look for him and once they found him they would have helped him out of the toilet. Minos after his traumatic experience would have immediately left the palace probably shouting and accusing Daedalus of what happened to him; yet, full of blisters because of the hot liquid poured on him leaving people wondering as it seems to be the case in fragment Erotian φ 19.

The play would have ended with the continuation of the banquet with Daedalus being freed, staying with Cocalus as his engineer. The restoration of the suppositious child to his real parents and possibly a wedding between his/her parents could have also closed the play, as we could see in a New Comedy.

2.4.5 Conclusion

Cocalus is the last play chosen for this thesis as it was thought that it would fit with the other three plays, sharing certain features with them that make them stand out from Aristophanes' extant plays. This is another character-titled play inspired by an existing

⁵⁹ Evidence for the mention of a toilet we have in Hesychius ι 774. It is possible that Aristophanes decided to shift the 'crime' scene from the bathroom to the toilet, which would have had funnier implications.

⁶⁰ See fragment of Pollux 7.162.

myth and perhaps based on an existing tragedy by Sophocles. It was possibly set in Sicily and it could be argued that it is connected and contains allusions to its recent contemporary history. The same way Aristophanes was composing plays for Athenians, set in Athens, it seems that he would also compose a play for the Greeks and Sicanians who lived in Sicily. Myth and history meet in this Aristophanic play with the story of Daedalus, Cocalus and Minos on the one hand and the possible references to the Carthaginian siege of Sicilian cities on the other. Unfortunately, not much can be said about the details of the comic plot due to the scarcity of the surviving fragments. A possibility is that we have an international comedy that was composed as a parody of the Sophoclean play. The testimonia also refer to it as containing elements of a New Comedy, the illegitimate child could be one. It is rather difficult to guess who might have been involved in this secret union but Daedalus could have had his usual role as the mediator, even perhaps in exchange for his salvation(?).

3. Conclusion: Aristophanes, Attic Comedy and the re-invention of a political genre

Aristophanes, the exemplary representative of Old Comedy, was a significant contributor to the subsequent genres of comedy, as has been evidenced in the plays of the present study and as will be further discussed in this section. His name has always been connected to the era of Old Comedy mostly due to the nature of all of his surviving extant plays that belong to that period. However, it should be considered plausible that this ingenious mind of Old Comedy would have a strong impact on the comedy playwrights to follow. He, along with the rest of the comic poets that used some techniques which were more broadly used in Middle and New Comedy, was not only the treasure chest from where his successors would be able to borrow and use character types as has often been pointed out, but also an experimenter with the new styles and forms that gradually replaced those of the Old Comedy.¹

Relevant research has already shown that many elements found in Aristophanes' extant comedies were broadly used in later Greek and Roman comedy. Hunter² has done thorough research on Greek and Roman New Comedy, and has supplied us with a broad range of analogies drawn between not only Greek and Roman New Comedy but also between Old and New Comedy. He traces this continuity first of all in the stock characters including the 'absurd general' Lamachos in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, who definitely sets the ground for the soldiers of the New Comedy, and the chorus of *The Flatterers* by Eupolis, one of Aristophanes' competitors, that pointed to the 'parasite' character of the later age. Hunter goes on to draw a line between *Wasps* and Philocleon as the 'obsessive juror' and Menander's *Dyscolus* and Cnemon, who is obsessed with peace and quiet. In addition, Euclio in Plautus' *Aulularia*, is also obsessed with his

¹ Reckford (1987: 389-90) poses the same question and discusses the matter applying a quantitative method as well as arranging Aristophanes' extant plays into thematic groups attempting to show an internal progress and evolution that would ultimately point towards the genres of Middle and New comedy; Papachrysostomou (2013) 182-3; Foley (1998: 47) and Revermann (2006: 101) discuss the same with a particular focus on the technique of parody, which was broadly adopted in Middle Comedy.

² Hunter (1985) 8-11.

beloved pot of gold and the potential dangers that might surround it. On a second level he traces thematic continuities (such as family relations or city versus countryside) with similar comic situations. A first example that comes from *Dyscolus* describes the slave Pyrrhias rushing onto the stage chased by Cnemon, which reminds us of Amphitheos' entry and exit in the *Acharnians*, who brings peace and is chased by the angry chorus. *Frogs* presents a second example, when the disguised slave Xanthias is being offered a really interesting chance of entertainment (*Frogs* 503-533); similarly it happens in the *Menaechmi* of Plautus when the visiting brother receives an exotic offer of hospitality by a sexy lady who has confused him with his brother. Last but not least, there is a reference to the comic narrative techniques, such as puns, exploitation of tragedy, broad comedy and farce, and disguise among others.³

Hunter also mentions Aristophanes' influence on Middle Comedy as this is traced in the surviving fragments. What the present study aims to show is that Aristophanes' impact is not only traced in his so-called Old Comedies but also in his later comedies, possibly starting with *Ecclesiazousai* and *Wealth*, which look forward to Middle and New Comedy also in terms of structure (e.g. the diminished role of the chorus). The same thing is indicated by the evidence found in a few of his fragmentary plays, such as the ones that were presented in the thesis.

3.1 Aristophanes and Araros

This particularly interesting and useful evidence is found in Aristophanes' last two comedies, *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*, which have been related to Middle and New Comedy based on the information that the testimonia and fragments offer. Although we are not in a position to judge how trustworthy these testimonia are, there have been some internal pieces of evidence that could also point toward the same direction.

³ Hunter (1985) discusses all these features with examples in his work and it would take another thesis to do the same here, but see for example the parody of Euripides' *Telephus* in *Thesmophoriazusae* and specifically the scene of someone seeking refuge to an altar which could also be linked to a similar scene in Menander's *Perinthia* and Plautus' *Mostellaria*. Euripides' *Hippolytus* and Menander's *Samia* could also be argued to share a common theme as they are both concerned with a misunderstanding between father and son which is related to the father's partner. Disguise in Greek comedy has been discussed in n. 257, but a good example from an Old and New Comedy could be seen in the transvestite humour found in *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Casina* of Plautus.

Another peculiarity concerning these two plays is the fact that both of them were connected to Aristophanes' son, Araros. However, opinions on the exact nature of Araros' involvement in the production of the two comedies vary.

It was not uncommon at all for a playwright to entrust the *didaskalia* of his creations to someone else, given the large amount of time and work it required, and this was probably the role assigned to the son by the father in the present case. Therefore, other than Aristophanes himself there is a record of other names that were assigned the duty of the *didaskalos* for his comedies, such as Kallistratos, Philonides and Araros.⁴ Russo⁵ attempts to discuss the matter starting with a quotation by Anon., *De comoedia* II:

τὰς μὲν γὰρ πολιτικὰς τούτῳ φασὶν αὐτὸν διδόναι, τὰ δὲ κατ' Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σωκράτους Φιλωνίδῃ. διὰ δὲ τούτων νομισθεὶς ἀγαθὸς ποιητής, τοῦ λοιποῦ <αὐτὸς> ἐπιγραφόμενος ἐνίκα. ἔπειτα τῷ υἱῷ ἐδίδου τὰ δράματα, ὅντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν μδ', ὧν νόθα δ'.

Tr. They say that he gave his political comedies to this man, and those against Euripides and Socrates to Philonides. Because of these, he was considered to be a good poet; the rest of his work, which he signed himself, granted him wins. Then he gave the plays to his son, being 44 in total, of which 4 are doubtful.

He then provides an interpretation of the above segment based on some personal assumptions regarding the object of the source to which it refers, which, according to his opinion, could be the plays entrusted by Aristophanes to different *didaskaloi*, such as *Proagon*, in which Euripides possibly featured. The same makes him wonder if *Thesmophoriazusae* was also produced by Philonides based on Hypothesis I, which

⁴ Aristophanes did produce most of his plays by himself but he did not start or ended his career thus. For example, *Babylonians* was produced by Callistratus (Suda σ 77), *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon* by Araros (Hypothesis IV to *Wealth*). We know that Eupolis also entrusted the *Autolycus* of 420 to a *didaskalos*, Demostratus (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 216cd).

⁵ Russo (1962) 26-28.

mentions the (seemingly) hostile atmosphere of the play towards Euripides.⁶ Russo thinks that what Anonymus means to say when he speaks of the beginning steps of his son, is not that Aristophanes wrote the comedies for his son but rather used him as their *didaskalos* (Hypothesis III.5-7 on *Wealth*). He eventually recognises the highly hypothetical nature of the short treatise, characterising it as ‘pure hearsay’, as also indicated by the repeated use of the verb *φασιν* and the general type of language used in it, which proves the Este and the manuscripts used by the Aldine edition unreliable.

Russo then goes on to thoroughly examine Araros’ presence and his connection to his father by gathering a considerable amount of evidence. He presents different sources, including Hypothesis III of the extant *Wealth*⁷ and the *Vitae Aristophanis*, mentioning Aristophanes’ intention to present his son to his audience with the last two plays (*Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*). There is also information about the written evidence from the Dionysian Fasti⁸ regarding 387 BC where there is a record of a victory of]ΡΩC. Scholars have agreed on the missing half and therefore we have Ara]ros as the victor of the year. His next piece of supporting evidence comes from Suda on Araros: *διδάξας τὸ πρῶτον ὀλυμπιάδι ρα*’, i.e. he made his debut in 375-372 BC. If that is the original version of the text then Aristophanes was the real winner at the Dionysia of 387 BC, with Araros as *didaskalos* of *Cocalus* (if the 388 *Wealth* was Lenaian). The fact that Araros did not stage any of his own comedies for a whole decade after staging *Aeolosicon* has presented scholars with a problem and led them to reject Suda and consider Araros as the author of the winning comedy at the Dionysia of 387 BC. If we accept this, then the date of Araros’ debut was not the 101st Olympiad, but the 98th, during the years 387-384 BC. However, the fragments of the Fasti, engraved from 346

⁶ Although Euripides’ presence in the play is far more complex than that as it could very well be argued that Aristophanes is also giving him the chance to defend himself (through Mnesilochus in 466-519) against the apparent misogynistic accusations against him.

⁷ *Wealth* was produced during the City Dionysia of 388 BC. It has been argued that this is a comedy that tied nicely with this dramatic festival as it included both dithyrambic and tragic elements (Farmer 2016: 212-228).

⁸ Inscription are invaluable pieces of evidence as they contain lists of victors in the dramatic festivals, for dithyramb, tragedy, and comedy (e.g. *IG* ii2 2318, *IG* ii2 2325). The information found in these lists contained the *choregos* of the winning drama, the *didaskalos*, and the protagonist. The *didaskalos* could be the author of the play but not necessarily, as we have seen (cf. p.155, n. 4).

onwards and the rest of the contemporary evidence renders it impossible to distinguish whose name (of the *didaskalos* or playwright) was engraved. In his final supposition he considers the possibility of *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon* as fellow competitors, with Araros writing one and producing the other.

Russo does not really reach any conclusions through this long discussion; what is interesting, however, in his account, is the notion that Aristophanes did not necessarily write his last two plays in order to present his son to the audience through them, but rather he might have just used his son as he did with the other *didaskaloi*. It could have also been a trial period for his son who was fascinated by the profession and decided to try to write his own plays.⁹ There are not many instances in comedy like this one, where the son was producing a play on behalf of his father;¹⁰ Stephanus, an Athenian comic poet of New Comedy, was most likely Antiphanes' son, who is said to have exhibited some of his father's plays.¹¹ That could draw an analogy to our case; two young comic poets present their fathers' plays. Araros appeared in the dawn of the new comedy sub-genres producing the two comedies by his father that seemed to demonstrate features that are mostly found in Middle and New Comedy plays. Araros, as a 'junior newer Aristophanes' introduced Aristophanes' later works, representing all the freshness and innovativeness that his father demonstrated in these two plays.

⁹ cf. Russo (1962) 227: "the Argument's considerations regarding Aristophanes' desire to recommend his son to the audience are certainly no more than the opinion of a scholar who happened to have theatrical information relative to the two comedies succeeding *Wealth*. It is instead admissible to assume that Aristophanes died after *Wealth* and that his son brought the two comedies his father had left him to the stage, particularly when the Suda reports that Araros made his debut (with comedies of his own) no earlier than 375-372. It seems almost definite that one of the two Aristophanic comedies was staged by Araros at the Dionysia of 387, inasmuch as the Fasti that year ascribe a victory to him...No information has survived about the contest either. However, if, as seems to be the case, the contest was Lenaian, then *Cocalus* might already have been staged at the Dionysia of 388."

¹⁰ Whereas they are more frequent in tragedy: for example, Euphorion won with his father's plays (although it is debateable whether Euphorion was actually the author or simply the producer of some of Aeschylus' plays: for a detailed discussion on the opposing views see Lamari 2017: 154-155) and the allegation of Sophocles helping Iophon is clear in *Frogs* 71-79 (for a discussion on the relationship between father and son see Wright 2016: 93-94).

¹¹ Smith (1859) 904.

3.2 The beginning of a transition between sub-genres¹²

The first seeds of this new era and poetic style are already traced in Aristophanes' last two extant comedies, *Ecclesiazusae*¹³ and *Wealth*, where the role of the chorus of the last one is even more restricted than the first one and rather passive. The diminished role of the chorus was a sign of the gradual process that underlined the developments within the genre of comedy.¹⁴ This procedure possibly carries on in the Aristophanic plays of this thesis, although only very few fragments have survived. The shift to a domestic environment and plot as well as the possibility that these plays could have been composed as parodic burlesques of a tragedy are characteristics that show this inner change, a change that is more evident in the last two plays that Aristophanes composed. Fortunately, it is possible to identify some features of the 'Later Comedy', and not the 'Old Comedy', in the fragments of *Aeolosicon* as well as in the otherwise problematic testimonium by Platonius. He claimed that when oligarchy was established at democracy's expense fear fell upon the poets, which made them quite reluctant to mock openly, as the offended members of the public were quite likely to take the poet to court. Therefore, they became more conservative in their mockery and there were no producers. Under these circumstances Aristophanes produced *Aeolosicon*, and the type of the plot changed.¹⁵ Unlike the Old Comedy, he argues, whose goal was to mock and ridicule demagogues, judges and generals, Aristophanes (possibly out of fear, or other reasons) deviated from the usual political mockery and turned to the satirising of a tragedy. This was also the reason for the elimination of the parabasis, which was used by Aristophanes not only to praise his poetry but also to attack and mock the contemporary political figures.¹⁶ Platonius gives more information which is deliberately

¹² For a more general theoretical approach on genres and the legitimacy of their existence, which has already been discussed extensively in the introduction, see Nauta (1990) 116-118.

¹³ *Ecclesiazusae* is also supposed to have had a strong influence on Amphis' *Γυναικοκρατία*, a Middle Comedy: Papachrysostomou (2007) 43.

¹⁴ cf. Slater (1995: 31-42) and Rothwell (1995: 99); Henderson (1995: 179-180) challenges this view based on the argument that lack of such evidence does not necessarily mean that the role of the chorus changed in Middle Comedy.

¹⁵ Platonius, *Diff.Com.* 13ff.

¹⁶ The treatment of the parabasis indeed varied after 422, which could be seen as a signal of this inner generic development.

excluded as it has been proved to be unhistorical, and although the reasoning he is offering for these changes is at least questionable, the developments he describes did occur to some extent. For example, as we saw and as will be discussed further on, *Aeolosicon*, as far as we can tell, resembles the plays of Middle Comedy. Another piece to the puzzle of Aristophanes' creating/influencing a new type of comedy is added by the *Vitae Aristophanis*, where we read about *Cocalus* and how it set an example for New Comedy. This was followed by Philemon and Menander (4-6), since it included all its characteristics, namely "rape, recognition and all other elements that Menander imitated" (50-51).¹⁷

More specifically, in the *Vita* there is an account of Aristophanes' beginning and development throughout his career. Information about his family background and his enmity with Cleon is also given in great detail. Here is the part of it that relates particularly to the concern of the present study:

It is he who first is thought to have transformed comedy -which was still wandering around in the old style- into something more useful and more respectable. Comedy had previously been spiteful and more shameful, because the poets Cratinus and Eupolis uttered more slander than was appropriate.¹⁸ Aristophanes was first also to demonstrate the manner of

¹⁷ One can choose whether to trust or not this testimonium (or any for that matter), especially given the fact that the content of the surviving fragments does not include any of these elements. However, the information that Philemon mocks it in his play about a supposititious child (Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 6.26.6) as well as the domestic setting that we could argue for the comedy, are features commonly found in New Comedy. On the other hand, according to Suda α 1982 (= Anaxandr. PCG t 1) Anaxandrides was the one who introduced topics of New Comedy such as love and rape (for a discussion on the two sources see Webster 1970: 77 and Millis 2001: 7-9).

¹⁸ cf. Lefkowitz (2012) 104: "No sources for this information are specified, but the idea that Aristophanes was not only a better poet but more elegant and less crude than his predecessors and contemporaries comes from several *parabaseis* in his own plays (*Knights* 516-50, *Clouds* 533-48, *Peace* 734-51)"; see, also, in *Acharnians* 629-58, *Frogs* 12-15. On the other hand, what we know is that Eupolis and Aristophanes' plays did contain very similar elements such as the raising of a dead person whether or not this included a *katabasis* to the underworld (e.g. *Demoi*), the presence of Dionysus (e.g. *Taxiarchoi*), attacks on politicians such as Cleon and Alcibiades (e.g. *Chrysoun Genos*), etc. The absence of even one extant Eupolidean play renders it impossible to definitively establish what the differences between the two poets might have been, whereas the existing material does allow for similarities to be traced. Whereas in Platonius' *Prolegomena II*, Aristophanes stands between and above Cratinus and Eupolis artistically, others place Eupolis alongside Aristophanes: see Teló (2016) for a fuller discussion.

New Comedy in his *Cocalus*, a play Menander and Philemon took as the starting point for their dramatic compositions. Aristophanes was responsible for his imitation by the writers of New Comedy, I mean Philemon and Menander. When the decree about *choregoi* was passed, that no one could be ridiculed by name,¹⁹ and when the *choregoi* were no longer rich enough to provide subsidies to train choruses, and because of these measures the substance of comedy had been completely removed (the purpose of comedy being to ridicule people), Aristophanes wrote the *Cocalus*, in which he introduces seduction and recognition and other such events, which Menander especially likes. When once again the subsidies for training choruses were taken away, Aristophanes, when he wrote the *Wealth*, in order to give the actors in the scenes time to rest and to change, wrote ‘for the chorus’ in the directions, in the places where we see the poets of New Comedy writing in ‘for the chorus’ in emulation of Aristophanes. In that drama he introduced his son Araros and so departed from life, leaving three sons, Philippus (named after his grandfather), Nicostratus, and Araros. (Transl. by M. Lefkowitz).

Whether he was indeed considered the first to change the style of comedy by some contemporaries is hard to know. He was certainly not the only one demonstrating ‘later’ elements in his comedies. For example, the ‘Middle’ mythological burlesque is found already in Cratinus and his *Dionysalexandros* and other elements probably also existed in other contemporary playwrights whose works are lost, as discussed in the introduction. In a similar way, later comic poets might have been influenced by more earlier poets apart from Aristophanes. The information about the reasons behind the gradual disappearance of the chorus is certainly debatable as we have seen.²⁰

Before this apparent discourse of comedy’s sub-genres within the same poet’s work as well as its influence on others is discussed in depth, there is one thing that should be

¹⁹ There is evidence that such a decree was at least proposed by different people but the evidence is far from concluding that it ever had any real restrictive effect on the license of comedy: see Halliwell (1991) for a list of the potential decrees as well as a detail discussion on the same evidence.

²⁰ See pp. 28-29.

clarified. The division of comedies in these three categories depending on their production date as well as their form and content was not coined by Aristophanes but by later scholiasts.²¹ Certainly, the development to the later comic sub-genres was far from straightforward and linear; it rather seems that elements that were more broadly adopted and prevailed over others were found in Old Comedy too. There was a gradual development and transition to a different comedic style but it was far from clear-cut or sudden.²² Therefore, it would be inaccurate to talk about Aristophanes and how he produced Old, Middle and New comedies. We do, however, have to refer to the difference or, better said, to the development of the Aristophanic comedies passing through a series of overlapping stages. Perhaps, a better term to describe the aforementioned different types of comedy would be ‘Old’ and ‘Later’ Aristophanic Comedy. Aristophanes’ Old Comedy probably reached its final days with his last extant play, *Wealth*. In Aristophanic Later Comedy we see more of these elements which later dominated the Middle and New Comedies.

These elements that seem to draw a connecting line between Aristophanes’ Later Comedies and Middle/New Comedy will be closely looked at in an attempt to shed some light in this somewhat obscure corner of the game of intertextuality across time. Starting right from the title of our comedies, we could say that Aristophanes is trying to differentiate from his usual concepts, that is the political or social ideas and ideals that had a primary role in his Old Comedies as also indicated in some of their titles (e.g. *Wealth*, *Peace*, *Poetry*, *Old Age*) and decides to create a more character-centred comedy style.

A basic thematic characteristic that features in New Comedy is, for example, the love between two young people who have to overcome a series of obstacles and misunderstandings until their love triumphs. This might have been the case in some of

²¹ The division of Comedy was probably coined by Aristophanes of Byzantium during the Hellenistic times: Korte (1921) 1257; cf. Nesselrath (1990) 180-187; Platonius: *γεγόνασι δὲ μεταβολαὶ κωμωδίας τρεῖς· καὶ ἡ μὲν ἀρχαία, ἡ δὲ νέα, ἡ δὲ μέση* (III.7-8 Koster). For more ancient evidence regarding the tripartite division of ancient comedy see the general introduction in Papachrysostomou (2008).

²² Although scholars are still sceptical towards the tripartite division of comedic eras, they seem to agree that the generic developments become noticeable around the 400s (Lowe 2000:86-87; Sidwell 2000: 250-255; Olson 2007:24). For the detailed discussion see the relevant section in the introduction.

Aristophanes' comedies which are named after one character²³ and this is of particular interest if we take into consideration that the image we have regarding Old Comedy relies heavily on the extant plays, but there is no character-titled play that survived complete. Apart from *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*, which have the additional justification of their production date (being closer to the dawn of Middle Comedy), there are also a few other older plays that are named after the main (or one of the main) character and they do not really have to do with the polis and the social behaviour of the citizens. More specifically, the plots of *Polyidus*, *Anagyros*, *Amphiaraos*, and *Daedalus* do not seem to be as socio-political as in the rest of Aristophanes' comedies and *Anagyros* and *Daedalus* definitely involve a love story as well.

This seems to be the case in *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*. Speaking of *Cocalus*, *Polyidus* seems to present an additional interest as he was a hero of two plays, one by Euripides and one by Sophocles and the play also involves Minos, as may also be the case in *Cocalus*. *Anagyros* appears to be a burlesque play of Euripides' *Hippolytus*,²⁴ the fragments of which do not really allow us to see how Aristophanes reworked the myth and turned it into a comedy. As described in the testimonia on the other hand, the story resembles a tragedy much more than a comedy. *Daedalus* is a clearer case; Zeus and Daedalus must have been two of the characters and it seems to be another disguise play such as *Aeolosicon*, looking forward to Plautus' *Amphitruo*, where Zeus changes his form again in order to satisfy his erotic desires and Mercury appears as a human as well, Sosia. It seems that we definitely have a continuity regarding the disguise comic plays, particularly when a god (or a mortal with an exceptional status such as Aeolus) takes the shape of a human (e.g. Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*, Aristophanes' *Aeolosicon*, Plautus' *Amphitruo*).²⁵

²³ The possible 'love-stories' that we could have in the four plays of the thesis without being sure about their significance in the plot could be the following: Zeus and Leda in *Daedalus*, Aeolus' daughters and sons in *Aeolosicon*, a hidden love story which resulted to a supposititious offspring in *Cocalus*. In *Polyidus* the existence of a love-story is rather unclear, we only have the fragment about the possible betrothal of Phaedra to Theseus.

²⁴ The plot of the comedy that is attested in Suda α 1842 and in *Proverbia Coisliniana* 30 bears striking similarities to the plot of the Euripidean tragedy.

²⁵ The style of disguise-plays survives throughout the three comic phases also in terms of human disguise: e.g. it is possible that in the play *Ἰατρός* by the Middle Comedy poet Aristophon, the doctor was

Euripides seems to have been Aristophanes' 'favourite' tragedian, but Euripides' myths seem to be equally interesting for 4th c. playwrights such as Antiphanes, who wrote an *Aeolus* parodying Euripides' tragedy. Hence, it comes as no surprise that Aristophanes used the same device and material before Antiphanes, although in the same century, and that Antiphanes should have also been inspired by Aristophanes' reinvention of the tragic myth. Antiphanes is considered as one of the most acclaimed representatives of Middle Comedy who started his career right at the end of Aristophanes' in 387 BC. Indeed, the theme of complicated love relationships would serve well the needs of the Middle/New Comedy having its origins in stories of earlier years such as Euripides' *Aeolus*.

Another topic that appears to be quite popular among the New Comedy poets is that of the supposititious child. Thus, there is a number of plays that have unfortunately been lost under the title of *Υποβολιμαῖος*. Philemon is attested to have made fun of Aristophanes' *Cocalus* in his *Υποβολιμαῖος*. However, the one actual line that survives from the play is not of much help as to how Philemon adapted *Cocalus*' plot. If we take into account the tradition that wants Philemon coming from Sicily, then he definitely had more reasons to pick and build on this specific comedy. What might be an interesting hint is that, due to the strict Attic citizenship law, the setting of such comedies that involve the adoption of a bastard child is located outside Athens, as different New Comedies indicate: Menander's *Periceirromene* is set in Corinth where the citizens find and adopt a foundling whose origin nobody knows. Plautus' *Poenulus* is located in Calydon, where a local citizen adopts a slave-boy, and a similar case is found in his *Menaechmi*, set in Epidamnus, where a slave-boy originally from Syracuse is being adopted.²⁶ In the same manner, the setting of *Cocalus* should have been in Sicily where the king Cocalus and his people lived, and of *Aeolosicon* as Aeolus was

not a real doctor, but a young man pretending to be one in order to have access to a brothel house (see Papachrysostomou 2008: 101-102); in Menander's *Dyscolus*, Sostratus pretends to be a labourer so as to win over Cnemon. The presence of the element of disguise in plays of Old Comedy such as *Dionysalexandros* attests to the rather non-linear development of the genre and it rather shows the influence of Old Comedy all the way through to Plautus' time.

²⁶ Ogden (1996) 174-177.

not in Athens either, but the king of the Aeolian Islands, who happened to also be to the north of Sicily.

In favour of this ‘internationalisation’ of comedy, Revermann raises an interesting point speaking on its paraepic aspect. He talks about a change that occurs in the fourth century and later on and the way it is connected to the non-Athenian backgrounds of the then comic playwrights who addressed a much wider audience all over the Greek world. He argues that one way to achieve that was the use of mythical themes mostly as these were found in tragedy and epic poetry. He then goes on employing some examples taken straight from the epic cycle. Comic poets, such as Archestratus of Gela or Matro of Pitane, did not attack the epic characters by creating a comic version of them but they rather focused on the formal epic characteristics. But when the generic boundaries are hardly detectable, the mythological parody of the 4th c. would make it rather hard for the audience to engage and identify a specific play or even lines from epic in those parodies. He argues that the operation of paraepic parody is rather complex as the aim was to demonstrate the interaction between various genres: comedy and epic in this instance. The same could be argued for the generic interaction between comedy and tragedy by means of parody in the 4th c. as well as earlier, although it becomes hard to say whether we definitely had parody of a specific play or engagement with the broader mythological and literary tradition.²⁷

Aristophanes’ later plays do fit with this tradition, with *Aeolosicon*, influenced by tragedy (Euripides’ *Aeolus*),²⁸ and *Cocalus* moving the boundaries of comedy to the west; two plays, both parodying a Greek tragedy, possibly set in the same territory, Sicily. The non-Athenian setting is also followed in the other two plays of the thesis, *Daedalus* (probably set in Sparta) and *Polyidus* (on Crete), both of which could have been composed as an extensive parody of a tragedy or could have been a parodic bricolage of the mythological tradition.

A useful tool for the exploration of Aristophanes’ contribution to Middle and New Comedy are those sources which talk about the structure, style and specific

²⁷ Revermann (2013) 127.

²⁸ And perhaps also by Homer if we could tell whether or not we have a case of a Homerised cook in *Aeolosicon*, like we have in Strato’s paraepic comedy.

characteristics common in such plays. One of these sources is *The Characters* by Theophrastus (c. 370-286 BC). It is plausible that Theophrastus' comic description of some characters was influenced by New Comedy characters and/or reversely, the important point is that he does give an outline of the characters found in Later Comedies such as grumpy old men, love-sick youths, crafty slaves and their ilk - the typical denizens of later Greek comedy, especially found in Menander.²⁹ It is also important to note that some of these types are deeply Aristophanic as we will see in the following pages.³⁰

3.3 Aristophanes and Middle Comedy

These types of characters, just like the cook, did not play such an important role in Old Comedy, and their role is bound to change in the plays of Middle Comedy. Sadly enough, not a single Middle Comedy work has survived in its complete form today but from the fragments that survive it is sufficiently clear that in these fourth century plays significant changes have developed. One of them is related to political mockery, which is not fully eliminated but is not as direct and as fierce as in Old Comedy. Unlike New Comedy, in the period of Middle Comedy, we still have dramas including characters from the political and intellectual life, which, however, were not (as they were in Old Comedy) closely connected with the Athenian state. Political attack is brought on the comic stage in the form of caricatures, still identifiable by the audience which would in turn allow for a certain degree of engagement, even if the means was parody. Frequently, the parody of this type either targeted individuals from the political scenery, and beyond the Athenian borders, such as Philip of Macedonia and Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily, or political facts and situations from everyday life.³¹

On the other hand, another feature that seems to arise and dominate in Middle Comedy is the parody of myth and tragedy, particularly that of Euripides. Aristophanes' 'exploitation' of him is common knowledge and it does not come as a

²⁹ For a fuller discussion of Theophrastus' character types apparent in New Comedy see Nikulin (2014) 115; Hunter (1985) 148-149; Barigazzi (1965) 69-86; Steinmetz (1960) 185-191; Ijzaren (1923) 208-220.

³⁰ cf. Ussher (1977) 75-79.

³¹ Ξανθάκη-Καραμάνου (1991) 44.

surprise when we read that *Aeolosicon*, for example, parodies the tragedian's *Aeolus*. However, the use and re-use of this myth only becomes evident from the fragments. The parody of Middle Comedy, when it turns towards myth, takes two forms: it imitates, and ridicules popular classical tragedies, especially Euripides', and refers to mythological characters generally, not specific characters of a well-known tragedy. These mythological characters are presented as characters from everyday life and act within a myth that is completely distorted. That is the so-called gradual transition from the mythological comedy to the urban drama.³² What is even more interesting is the fact that Middle Comedy poets took interest in the same mythical cycle as well. Amphis wrote a play named after Athamas,³³ son of Aeolus. However, this was probably not the Aeolus used by Aristophanes, but the one who ruled in Thessaly. If it is the same character or not is not of much significance, neither to us nor to the comic playwrights; it would have actually been rather convenient for them to play with the different traditions and stories around the same name, giving their character a multi-dimensional role, that is more easily adjustable to their aims. The playwrights of this period used Euripides' tragedy broadly but in order to serve their own purposes, as later happened when the Romans started taking advantage of the Greek literature that they had at hand (*imitatio-aemulatio*). The comic playwrights of Middle Comedy often took a myth and distorted it in order to provoke laughter. The mythical element weds the contemporary reality and a number of allusions to real people are achieved.³⁴

Another significant differentiation had to do with the role of the chorus. The fragmentary evidence that exists does not allow us to assume much, but it is quite probable that the choral parts became smaller and less connected to the main plot losing their importance and connection to it entirely by Menander's time. The members of the

³² Ibid. 37.

³³ We have a number of playwrights who wrote homonymous plays: Aeschylus, Sophocles, Antiphanes, Xenocles, Astydamas, Ennius, Accius.

³⁴ cf. Papachrysostomou (2008) 25-27. A common practice in Middle Comedy is the placing of mythological figures in the contemporary 4th c. Athenian reality, in which they act as real Athenians. Examples include Anaxandrides' *Protesilaos*, Alexis' *Galateia*, Theophilus' *Neoptolemos*. Athamas and Odysseus are also employed in a similar way as the fragments indicate (for a more detailed discussion on this see Papachrysostomou 2017: 165-180)

chorus sang inserted songs, the *embolima*,³⁵ as Aristotle calls them, under the indication *chorou*, a genitive of possession indicating that these parts belonged to the chorus. It is quite possible that the number of the choral parts was determined to four at this stage, which meant that the plays would consist of five acts, like later Roman tragedy.³⁶ The same fate seemed to have befallen the parabasis; the playwrights stopped addressing the audience in the ‘Old’ way, mocking a political situation and the politicians who were involved in a very crude way.³⁷

All these elements gave way to a variety of new upcoming character types such as the love-sick young man, the clever slave, the greedy prostitute, the braggart soldier, the miserly old man, the talkative cook, and the scheming pimp. Alexis of Thurii was evidently the prominent representative of Middle Comedy, from whom one hundred and forty titles and over three hundred fragments of comedies have survived. The characteristics found in his fragments also thrive in New Comedy, such as intrigue and deception. Another type of character that was used by Alexis was indicated in his play *Parasitos* (‘The Parasite’). The Parasite character had the sole purpose of sneaking into feasts uninvited and earning his meal by amusing and flattering the diners. Another key feature attested in Middle Comedy is the opening of the borders, as mentioned before. Among the over fifty names of playwrights of this period there are those who were not Athenians. The new post-classical cosmopolitan character of Athens affected the theatre as well. Scholars have often referred to this comic genre as an amalgam of different ingredients found in both Old and New Comedy plays, and an experimentation that eventually led up to the form of New Comedy.³⁸

This is exactly what the case seems to be regarding Aristophanes’ two last comedies as well as the other two plays of the thesis. *Aeolosicon* and *Cocalus* have the additional piece of evidence of their dating, which we do not have with *Polyidus* and *Daedalus*, whose date is unknown, but in all four plays there are these elements that were

³⁵ Arist. *Poetics* 1456a25-31; cf. Hunter (1979).

³⁶ id. (2008) 628.

³⁷ This does not mean that the role of the parabasis was restricted to political invective. Its purpose was more sophisticated than this – sometimes, for example, it was fully integrated into the plot and promoted it, as it happens in *Birds*. Further see Hubbard (1991).

³⁸ cf. Papachrysostomou (2008) 18.

commonly found in Middle Comedies. All of them were or at least contained extensive mythological burlesque,³⁹ they had a setting outside Athens and especially the last two dealt with an international theme, as they were set in the area of Sicily. This is a mix of different ingredients in a style that drifts away from the old ways and eventually leads to the shaping of New Comedies.

3.4 Aristophanes and New Comedy

Menander took over from Alexis as the exemplary representative of New Comedy and had more luck than him as there is a play that survived in its complete form written by him (*Dyscolus*). His plays were affected by the new reality that came with the rise of Alexander the Great and his plans for expansion not only all over the Greek world but the then known world. Menander had to adjust to the new era's needs.⁴⁰ He also decided to create character-centered plays using themes and problems of people's daily life, mostly worries of the richest people who would be watching his plays on stage. It seems that the plays' plots started following an inward direction. Old Comedy was primarily occupied by the social and political concerns of the public; New Comedy is an entirely introverted form of art, concerned with the twisted ways of the human character and how this may lead to very specific problems within a family or two. In the plays of New Comedy there are problems of a more private nature and their solution at the end of each play.

The four Aristophanic plays of the thesis seem to follow this inward plot direction, in the sense that they seem to be *oikos* plays and not necessary *polis* plays as we would characterise Aristophanes' Old Comedy. The setting of all four plays is domestic and the main plot seems to revolve around a specific *oikos* and their private affairs. Apart from social and political issues, fate, luck, money and coincidence were the primary causes of such problems, just like in real life. The difference is that fate is acting as a helper and will make sure that there will be a happy end. Hence, there are themes that

³⁹ By extensive I do not mean the type of parody found in *Thesmophoriazusae* for example, which has an otherwise original plotline. I mean that the whole play was based heavily on an existing myth or tragedy, although we cannot know how heavily.

⁴⁰ Lape & Moreno (2014) 367-370; Green (1994) 37-50; Sidwell (2000) 251-253.

have to do with lost children who were later discovered to live very close to their parents, women thought to be prostitutes because of a misunderstanding, later proved to be totally respectable, and marriageable women who once succumbed to the rape by their future husband(s), and courtesans helping out virgin sisters. Similar elements we probably had in *Aeolosicon*, *Cocalus* and *Daedalus*. The troubled love story between Aeolus' daughter and son is well known and in *Cocalus* who also happened to have daughters we might have had the problem of the supposititious child as well. In *Daedalus* we seem to have both, with Leda's adultery (voluntary or not) and the illegitimate offspring, Helen. In addition, there is a dominant mixture of rescue-plays that is not so popular in earlier comedies. Menander's rescue plays had to do with love and how two young people achieved unison after a series of misunderstandings and adventures (e.g. *Samia*). The element of rescue could have been part of our plays too. A rescue was necessary in all four myths that these plays were based on, although it is very hard to tell at the moment how Aristophanes might have played with it. Aeolus' daughter had to be saved from her difficult father (another Menandrian feature as observed in *Dyscolus*), Daedalus as well as Polyidus had to be rescued from Minos, and Leda's life or at least reputation needed to be salvaged too.

Moreover, Menander had his own stock characters⁴¹ such as the headstrong sons (e.g. Gorgias), the traditional predictable father who cares too much about his fortune and social status (Cnemon, whose traits could probably be seen in Aeolus in *Aeolosicon*, or Minos (and Cocalus?) in *Cocalus* and *Polyidus* or Tyndareus in *Daedalus*), and the slaves who are eager to take their own initiatives on matters when they think they can get away with it (e.g. Daos) Menander, of course, frequently surprised his audience by revealing the inner kind nature of all these seemingly troublesome characters. He also chose to use characters that already had an established fame among his audience such as Moschion ('Bull-Calf'), the impulsive youth acting recklessly by sleeping with a woman and then leaving her pregnant with or without her consent (which could have been the case in *Aeolosicon* – Aeolus' son; *Cocalus* – although it is hard to tell who would be the father of the supposititious child; *Daedalus* – even though Zeus may not

⁴¹ For an analysis of these see MacCary (1970); (1969).

have been that young, still the act is the same). Another type is Moschion's usual old judgmental relative. Smikrines ('Small') is a similar character, who is also aged but more miserable than the previous one. These characteristics along with his greediness *Aspis* 123 could be seen in Aeolus and Cocalus. The romantic intrigue is unfolded all around him (especially as it happens in *Epitrepontes*) which was probably the case with Daedalus too. Although the aforementioned elements could be traced in the characters of our four Aristophanic plays as well, according to the myth behind them, due to their fragmentary nature, it is very difficult to make any secure assertions about them.

The way that New Comedy uses and refers to the gods is also quite interesting and revolutionary, as appropriate to the new times. The traditional Olympian gods have begun losing their influence in such a philosophically active time. The burst of the philosophical ideas of the Hellenistic times would not have left theatre intact. Thus, we have abstract nouns being personified gods in the plays, a technique already familiar in Aristophanes' Old Comedy although there exists a mixture of the two.⁴² Some famous examples come from Philemon ('Air') or Menander ('Ignorance'); a goddess named Agnoia ('Misapprehension') delivers the prologue of Menander's *Perikeiromene* ('The Shorn Girl' or 'The Rape of the Locks').

The aforementioned internationalisation of theatre is celebrated in New Comedy, as of the 'big three' only Menander was a true Athenian. The other two members, Philemon and Diphilus, came from outside Attica and from quite far away in some cases. Philemon (c. 368-267 BC), Menander's greatest rival and a close contemporary of Alexis, was, according to Strabo, a native of Soli, though Suda makes him a Syracusan, probably because he resided some time in Sicily. Similar is the case of the third member of this New Comedy trio, Diphilus (c. 360-290 BC), who was born in Asia Minor. Unfortunately, no extant play of these two playwrights has survived; we are, however, in a position to know that later Roman writers created adaptations of their Greek plays.

The 'ancient' origins of all of the above newly inserted characteristics been discussed in the introduction along with the developments that gradually led to the form of New

⁴² Personified abstract nouns were not uncommon in Old Comedy (e.g. Poetry, Wealth, Poverty, Demos etc. in Aristophanes). cf. Newiger (1957).

Comedy, but one of its most important and influential ones was Aristophanes himself. Not only in the sense of the stock characters found in his comedies but also with the actual creation of comedies as such that present elements mostly attested in Middle and New Comedies rather than Old Comedies. Aristophanes wrote comedies which, according to the testimonia, were composed as parodies of a whole tragedy, which was not the case in his older plays, some of which contained large chunks of paratragedy but the main plot was still original and not based on an existing myth or tragedy. This type of extensive parody or mythological burlesque is a feature that arises in Middle Comedy plays. The more important role of the cook is another ‘Middle’ element attested in Aristophanes’ *Aeolosicon* as well as the moving of the geographical boundaries outside not just Athens but Greece, as we see in both *Aeolosicon* and *Cocalus*. In these plays neither Aeolus nor Cocalus lived in Athens, just like in *Polyidus*, where the action takes place on Crete. *Daedalus*’ main setting must have also been outside Athens as we have seen, in Sparta.⁴³ In addition, the fact that *Cocalus* probably had to do with the rescue of Daedalus from the hands of King Minos renders it a rescue-play, an element commonly found in New Comedy plays, and the same could be argued for *Polyidus*, being rescued from the tomb and death (although the very many gaps in the plot do not allow for further clarifications). The production dates of the last two plays can only support the argument of the present study. Of course, one can go further if we take into account the characters that could feature in the plays and have even more associations with the ‘Later’ characters. *Aeolosicon*’s cook as well as Aeolus’ son who impregnated his sister and then tried to conceal it from his father trying to find a solution⁴⁴ definitely remind us not only of Sicon who is mentioned by name but also of Moschion in Menander’s *Samia*.

Segal describes this long and rather complicated evolutionary process through time as “the development of the comic genre toward its ultimate *φύσις*”. Aspects of his

⁴³ Non-Athenian setting is also encountered in Old Comedies such as *Dionysalexandros* or *Birds*, which attests to the complicated and rather non-linear generic development. However, the focus here is on the Aristophanic work whose setting is more realistic than the underworld.

⁴⁴ Due to the fragmentary nature of the play we cannot be sure of the ways that Aristophanes might have altered the mythical plot; all we can do for now is make suggestions based on the myth that each play seems to have been based on or inspired by.

argument support the opinion that Old Comedy should not be seen as an independent genre but as the first stages of Greek Comedy as a whole, which after undergoing several modifications resulted in the form and style of New Comedy; tragedy had followed a similar course too. Segal borrows Aristotle's argument on the *σύντασις τῶν πραγμάτων* and the connection to the human *ψυχή*: "the happy ending does indeed appeal directly to certain needs of the human psyche". One of his concluding remarks supports the conclusion presented here that the changes that are present in Aristophanes' later comedies do not mark the decadence of his Comedy but a natural development.⁴⁵

Working with fragments has its own charms and demands a combination of skills. They demand a knowledgeable detective with an imaginative insight. Every fragmentary play is a puzzle, a very difficult puzzle in the case of comedy. This thesis' purpose has not been to complete the puzzle, but to contribute towards its completion. In Aristophanes' case there are two types of puzzles, a macro and a micro. The micropuzzle (being each fragmentary play individually) will help us discover the obscure (macro-)aspect of the comic technique called parody. The Aristophanic fragments add information regarding this aspect of his *oeuvre*. The present study has been dedicated to this endeavour with the view (and hope) to inspire and attract the scholarly attention towards the same direction.

⁴⁵ Segal (1973) 136.

4. Bibliography

Akrigg, B. & Tordoff, R., (2013). *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greek Comic Drama*. Cambridge.

Arnott, W.G., (1996). *Alexis: the Fragments: a Commentary*. Cambridge.

Ash, H. B. transl., (1955). *Columella: On Agriculture*. Cambridge.

Atkinson, J.E., (1992). 'Curbing the Comedians: Cleon Versus Aristophanes and the Syracosius' Decree', in *Classical Quarterly* 42, 56-64.

Bain, D., (1977). *Actors and Audience: a Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*. Oxford.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1982). *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, M. Holquist (ed. & transl.), C. Emerson (transl.), Austin.

Bakola E., Prauscello L., Telò, M., (2013). *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*. Cambridge.

Bakola, E., (2010). *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford.

Barigazzi, A., (1965). *La Formazione Spirituale di Menandro*. Turin.

Barnes, J. ed., (1984). *Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Princeton, N.J.

Beare, W., (1964). *The Roman Stage*. London.

Bergk, Th., (1838). *Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae Libri Duo*. Leipsig.

Biles, Z.P., (2002). 'Intertextual Biography in the Rivalry of Cratinus and Aristophanes', in *The American Journal of Philology*, 123 (2), 169-204.

- Blaydes, F.H.M., ed., (1880-1893). *Comedies and Fragments, with Critical Notes and Commentary*. Halle.
- Blundell, J., (1980). *Menander and the Monologue*. Göttingen.
- Bowie, A.M., (2010). 'Myth and Ritual in Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*. (Leiden), 143-178.
- (1997). 'Thinking with Drinking: Wine and the Symposium in Aristophanes' in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 117, 1-21.
- (1993). *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Bradbury, S. transl., (2004). *Selected Letters of Libanius, from the Age of Constantius and Julian*. Liverpool.
- Brockman, C., (2003). *Aristophanes und die Freiheit der Komödie: Untersuchungen zu den frühen Stücken unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Acharner*. München.
- Brumbaugh, R. S. & Schwartz, J., (1980). 'Pythagoras and Beans: A Medical Explanation', in *Classical World*, 73, 421-422.
- Bühler, W., ed., (1982-1999), *Zenobii Athoi Proverbia*. Göttingen.
- Burian, P. transl. (2007). *Euripides: Helen*. Oxford.
- Burkert, W., (1972). *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, E.L. Minar (transl.), Cambridge, Mass.
- Burns, A. R., (2013). *Money and Monetary Policy in Early Times*. New York.
- Butrica, J., (2001). 'The Lost *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes', in *Phoenix* (55), 44-76.
- Carrara, L., (2014). *L'indovino Poliido: Eschilo, Le Cretesi, Sofocle, Manteis, Euripide, Poliido*. Roma.

- Carrière, J. C., (2000). *L'Aristophane Perdu. Une Introduction aux Trente-Trois Comédies Disparues avec un Choix de Fragments Traduits et Commentés*, in *Le théâtre Grec Antique: la Comédie. Actes du 10^{ème} Colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer, les 1^{er} & 2 octobre 1999*. (Paris), 197-236.
- Carter, D.M., (2011). *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*. Oxford.
- Casolari, F., (2003). *Die Mythen travestie in der griechischen Komödie*. Münster.
- Christopoulos, M., (2010). 'Dark-Winged Nyx and Bright-Winged Eros in Aristophanes' "Orphic" Cosmogony: The Birds', in M. Christopoulos, E. D. Karakantza & O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Light and Darkness in Ancient Greek Myth and Religion*. (Plymouth), 207-220.
- Collard, C. and Cropp, M., ed. & transl., (2008). *Euripides. Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Consbruch, M., ed., (1906). *Hephaestionis Enchiridion, cum Commentariis Veteribus*. Leipsig.
- Csapo, E., (2014). 'The Iconography of Comedy', in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. (Cambridge), 95-130.
- Davidson, J., (1997). *Courtesans and Fishcakes*. London.
- (1993). 'Fish, Sex and Revolution', in *Classical Quarterly* 43.1, 53-66.
- Dearden, C.W., (1976). *The Stage of Aristophanes*. London.
- Διαμαντάκου-Αγαθού, K., (2007). *Περί Τραγωδίας και Τρυγωδίας*. Αθήνα.
- Dickey, E., (1996). *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford.
- Diggle, J., (1970). *Euripides, Phaethon*. Cambridge.
- Dobrov, G.W., (2007). 'Μάγειρος Ποιητής. Language and Character in Antiphanes', in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. (Oxford), 169-190.

-- (1995). 'The Poet's Voice in the Evolution of Dramatic Dialogism', in G. W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 47-98.

Dover, K., ed., (1993). *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford.

Dowden, K., (2006). *Zeus*. London.

Dunbar, N. ed., (1995). *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford.

Edmonds, J. M., ed. & transl., (1957). *The Fragments of Attic Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock*. Leiden.

Ehrenberg, V., (1962). *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. Oxford.

Fairbanks, A., transl., (1979). *Elder Philostratus, Younger Philostratus, Callistratus*. Cambridge.

Fairclough, H.R., transl., (1978). *Virgil: Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid I-VI*. Cambridge.

Farmer, M.C., (2017). *Tragedy on the Comic Stage*. New York.

Festa, N., ed., (1902). *Mythographi Graeci. Vol. III Fasc. II, Palaephati Peri Apistōn. Heracliti Qui Fertur Libellus Peri Apistōn. Excerpta Vaticana* (Vulgo Anonymus *De Incredilibus*). Leipsig.

Firth, F. (2013). *The Golden Verses of Pythagoras and Other Pythagorean Fragments*. Worcestershire.

Flower, M.A., (2008). *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. London.

Foerster, R., ed., (1963). *Libanii Opera*. Hildesheim.

- Foley, H. P., (2014). 'Performing Gender in Greek Old and New Comedy', in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. (Cambridge), 259-274.
- (1988). 'Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 108, 33-47.
- Fontaine, M. & Scafuro A. C., (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford.
- Frazer, J. G., transl., (1921). *Apollodorus. The Library*. Cambridge.
- Freeman, E.A., (1891). *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Geissler, P., (1969). *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*. Dublin.
- Genette, G., (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, C. Newman & C. Doubinsky (transl.), Lincoln.
- Gelzer, T., (1960). *Der Epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes: Untersuchungen zur Struktur der attischen alten Komödie*. Munich.
- Gil Fernandez, L., (2010). *De Aristofanes a Menandro*. Madrid
- (1996). *Aristofanes*. Madrid.
- Goldhill, S., (1991). *The Poet's Voice*. Cambridge.
- Grafton, A., (1997). 'Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum: fragments of some lost enterprises', in G. Most (ed.) *Collecting fragments = Fragmente sammeln*. Göttingen.
- Grauert, H.W., (1828). 'De Mediae Graecorum Comoedia Natura et Forma', in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und griechische Philosophie*. Band 2, 50–63 (Teil I) and 499–514 (Teil II).
- Green, J.R., (1994). *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*. London.
- Gribble, D., (1999). *Alcibiades and Athens: A Study in Literary Presentation*. Oxford.

- Griffiths, A., (1986). 'What Leaf-Fringed Legend...? A Cup by the Sotades Painter in London', in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 106, 5-70.
- Grimal, P., (1991). *Λεξικό της Ελληνικής και Ρωμαϊκής Μυθολογίας*. Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Gulick, C. B., transl., (1961). *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gumbrecht, H. U., (1997). 'Eat your fragment: about imagination and the restitution of texts', in G. Most (ed.) *Collecting fragments = Fragmente sammeln*. Göttingen.
- Gunderson, E., (2015). *Laughing Awry: Plautus and Tragicomedy*. Oxford.
- Guthrie, W.K.C., (1993). *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement*. Princeton, N.J.
- Hall, J. B., ed., (2010). *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*. Leipsig.
- Halliwell, S., (1991). 'Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens', in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 111, 48-70.
- (1980). 'Aristophanes' Apprenticeship'. in *The Classical Quarterly*, 30, 33-45.
- Handley, E. W., (1985). 'Comedy', in P. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. (Cambridge), 355-425.
- Hartwig, A., (2015). 'Self-Censorship in Ancient Greek Comedy', in H. Baltussen and P. J. Davis (eds.), *The Art of Veiled Speech: Self-Censorship from Aristophanes to Hobbes*, 18-41.
- Heath, M., (1987). *Political Comedy in Aristophanes*. Göttingen.

- Henderson, J., (2014). 'Comedy in the Fourth Century II: Politics and Domesticity', in M. Fontaine & A. C. Scafuro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. (Oxford), 181-198.
- (2012). 'Pursuing Nemesis: Cratinus and Mythological Comedy', in G. Kovacs & C. Marshall ed., *No Laughing Matter: Studies in Athenian Comedy*. (London), 1-12.
- ed. & transl., (2008). *Aristophanes: Fragments*. Cambridge.
- (1995). 'Beyond Aristophanes', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 175-184.
- (1991). *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. Oxford.
- (1990). 'The Demos and the Comic Competition', in J.J. Winkler & F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. (Princeton, N. J.), 271-313.
- Hicks, R. D., transl., (1925). *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. Cambridge.
- Hoffmann, H., (1997). *Sotades: Symbols of Immortality on Greek Vases*. Oxford.
- Holt, F. L., (1999). *Thundering Zeus: The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. London.
- Householder, F.W., (1944). 'Παρωδία', in *Classical Philology*, 39 (1), 1-9.
- Hubbard, T. K., (1991). *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*. London.
- Hunter, R., (2008). *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and Its Reception*. Berlin.
- ed., (1989). *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica*. Cambridge.
- (1988). 'Book Review of Poetae Comici Graeci, Vol. V: Damoxenus—Magnes', in *Classical Review*, Vol. 88 (1), 14-15.
- (1985). *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge.

- ed., (1983). *Eubulus: the Fragments*. Cambridge.
- (1979). 'The Comic Chorus in the Fourth Century', in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 23-38.
- Hunter, R. & Koukouzika, D., (2015). 'Food in Greek Literature', in J. Wilkins & R. Nadeau (eds.), *A Companion to Food in the Ancient World*. (Oxford), 19-29.
- Hutcheon, L., (1985). *A Theory of Parody*. London.
- Ijzeren, J. v., (1923). 'Theophrastus en de nieuwe comedie', in *NPh*, 8, 208-220.
- Index Fabularum Aristophanis, Ex Codice Ambrosiano L 39 Sup. *Hermes* 14, no. 3 (1879): 461-65.
- Inwood, B., ed. & transl., (2001). *The Poem of Empedocles*. London.
- Itter, A., (2009). *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria*. Leiden.
- Jacoby, F., ed., (1839). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.
- Jeanmaire, H., (1939). *Couroi et Courètes*. Lille.
- Johnston, I.C., transl., (2007). *Aeschylus: the Oresteia*. Arlington, VA.
- Jones, W.H.S., transl, (1931). *Hippocrates*. Cambridge.
- transl., (1918). *Pausanias: Description of Greece*. Cambridge.
- Jouanna, J., & Allies, N. (2012). *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*, P. Van der Eijk (ed.), N. Allies (transl.), Leiden.
- Kaibel, G., ed., (1899). *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Berlin.
- Kannicht, R., ed., (2004). 'Euripides' in *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. V.1-2, Göttingen.
- Karamanou, I., (2006). *Euripides, Danae and Dictys: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. München.

- Kassel, R. & Austin, C., eds., (1984). *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Berlin.
- Melville, A.D., transl., (2008). *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, E.J. Kenney (ed.), Oxford.
- Kitto H.D.F. & Hall, E., eds., (2008). *Sophocles' Antigone; Oedipus the King; Electra*. Oxford.
- Kock, Th., ed., (1880). *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta I*. Leipsig.
- Konstan, D., (2014). 'Defining the Genre', in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. (Cambridge), 27-42.
- (2013). 'Menander's Slaves: the Banality of Violence', in B. Akrigg & R. Tordoff (eds.), *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Greek Comic Drama*. (Cambridge), 144-158.
- Konstantakos, I. M., (2014). 'Comedy in the Fourth Century I: Mythological Burlesques', in M. Fontaine & A.C. Scafuro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman comedy*. (Oxford), 160-180.
- (2004). 'Trial by Riddle: the Testing of the Counsellor and the Contest of the Kings in the Legend of Amasis and Bias', in *Classica and Mediaevalia*, (55), 85-138.
- Körte, A., (1921). 'Komödie', in *RE*, (11), 1207-1275.
- Krenkel, W., ed., (1970). *Lucilius Satiren*. Leiden.
- Krieter-Spiro, M., (1997). *Sklaven, Köche und Hetären: Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde*, 93. Stuttgart.
- Lada-Richards, I., (1999). *Initiating Dionysus: Ritual and Theatre in Aristophanes' Frogs*. Oxford.
- Lamari, A. A., (2017). *Theater, Politics, and Cultural Mobility in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*. Berlin.

- Lape, S. & Moreno A., (2014). 'Comedy and the Social Historian', in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. (Cambridge), 336-372.
- Lattimore, R. A & Grene D., eds., (1958). *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Euripides*. Chicago, IL.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (2012). *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London.
- Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*. 1981-1997. Zurich, Munchen, Dusseldorf.
- Lloyd, G.E.R., (2002). *The Ambitions of Curiosity*. Cambridge.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., ed. & transl., (1996). *Sophocles: Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Lobel, E., ed., (1927). *Alkaiou Melē: The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Alcaeus*. Oxford.
- Lombardo, S., transl., (2000). *Homer: Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lowe, N.J., (2000). *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge.
- Lucas de Dios, J. M., ed., (1983). *Sophocles Fragmentos*. Madrid.
- MacCary, W.T., (1970). 'Menander's Characters: Their Names, Roles and Masks', in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 101, 277-290.
- (1969). 'Menander's Slaves: Their Names, Roles, and Masks', in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 100, 277-294.
- MacDowell, D. M., (1982). 'Aristophanes and Kallistratos', in *The Classical Quarterly*, 32, 21-26.
- MacMahon, J. M., (1997). *Paralysin Cave: Impotence, Perception, and Text in the Satyricon of Petronius*. Leiden.

- Manuwald, G., ed., (2012). *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta II: Ennius*. Göttingen.
- Marshall, C.W., (2014). ‘Dramatic Technique and Athenian Comedy’, in M. Revermann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. (Cambridge), 131-146.
- Marshall, H. R., (2012). ‘*Clouds*, Eupolis and Reperformance’, in G. Kovacs & C.W. Marshall (eds.), *No Laughing Matter: Studies in Athenian Comedy*. (London), 55-76.
- Mastromarco, G., (1994). *Introduzione a Aristofane*. Roma.
- Mastronarde, D. J., (1990). ‘Actors on High: the Skene Roof, the Crane and the Gods in Attic Drama’, in *Classical Antiquity*, 9 (2), 247–94.
- Maurus Servius Honoratus. (1881). *In Vergilii Carmina Comentarii*. Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii; G. Thilo & H. Hagen (eds.), Leipsig.
- Meineke, A. ed., (1839-1857). *Fragmenta Comicarum Graecorum*. Berlin.
- Melo, W.d., ed. & transl., (2011). *Plautus: Amphitryon. The Comedy of Asses. The Pot of Gold. The Two Bacchises. The Captives*. Cambridge.
- Millis, B. W., ed. & transl., (2001). *Anaxandrides : introduction, translation, commentary*. PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Μιμίδου, Ε., (2013). *Ερμηνευτικός Σχολιασμός των Αποσπασμάτων της Τραγωδίας Αίολος του Ευριπίδη*. Αθήνα.
- Mitchell, S., transl., (2011). *Homer: The Iliad*. London.
- Möllendorff, P.v., (2002). *Aristophanes*. Hildesheim.
- (1995). *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie. Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bakhtin*. Tübingen.
- Montanari, F., (1995). *Vocabolario della Lingua Greca*. Torino.

- Moorton, R.F.Jr., (1988). 'Aristophanes on Alcibiades', in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 29, 345-360.
- Most, G., (1997). *Collecting Fragments = Fragmente sammeln*. Göttingen.
- Muecke, F., (1982). 'I Know You by Your Rags: Costume and Disguise in Fifth-Century Drama', in *Antichthon*, 16, 17-34.
- Muellner, L., (1998). 'Glaucus Redivivus', in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 98, 1-30.
- Nauta, R., (1990). 'Gattungsgeschichte als Rezeptionsgeschichte am Beispiel der Entstehung der Bukolik,' in *Antike und Abendland*, 36, 116-137.
- Nesselrath, H., (1995). 'Myth, Parody, and Comic Plots: The Birth of Gods and Middle Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 1-28.
- (1990). *Die attische Mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Newiger, H.J., (1957). *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes*. Munich.
- Nikulin, D., (2014). *Comedy, Seriously: A Philosophical Study*. New York.
- Norwood, G., (1931). *Greek Comedy*. London.
- Oakley, J.H. & Sinos, R.H., (1993). *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. London.
- Ogden, D., (1996). *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*. Oxford.
- Oldfather, C.H., transl., (1933). *Diodorus Siculus: Library of History*. Cambridge.
- Olson, S.D., (2014). 'Athenaeus' Aristophanes and the Problem of Reconstructing Lost Comedies', in S. Chronopoulos & C. orth (eds.), *Fragmente einer Geschichte der griechischen Komödie – Fragmentary History of Greek Comedy*. (Heidelberg), 2-34.
- (2007). *Broken Laughter*. Oxford.

- (2001). 'Review of Poetae Comici Graeci. VI (2): Menander: Testimonia et Fragmenta apud Scriptores Servata', in *The Classical Journal*, 96 (4), 442-445.
- ed., (1998). *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.
- Olson, S. D. and Sens, A., (1999). *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the 4th c. BC*. Oxford.
- Ophuijsen, J.M.V., transl., (1987). *Hephaestion on Metre*. Leiden.
- O'Regan, D., (1992). *Rhetoric, Comedy, and the Violence of Language in Aristophanes' Clouds*. New York.
- Orth, C., ed., (2009). *Strattis. Die Fragmente. Ein Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Osborn, E., (2005). *Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge.
- Owen, Th., ed., (2014). *The Three Books of M. Terentius Varro Concerning Agriculture*. Charleston, SC.
- Papachrysostomou, A., (2017). 'Time- and Space-Travelling in Greek Middle Comedy', in A. Bierl, M. Christopoulos, A. Papachrysostomou -- (eds.), *Time and Space in Ancient Myth, Religion and Culture*. (Berlin) 165-180.
- (2013). 'Continuity and Change in the Comic Genre or How It All Ended Up with Menander: the Case of 'Sub-Trends'', in *Ordia Prima*, 11-12, 165-189.
- (2008). *Six Comic Poets*. Tübingen.
- Papazarkadas, N., (2011). *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Παπᾶς, Θ.Γ., (2016). *Ἀριστοφάνης: Ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ τὸ Ἔργο του*. Ἀθήνα.
- Parker, R., (2005). *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- (1983). *Miasma*. Oxford.

- Pearson, A.C., Jebb, R.C. and Headlam, W.G., eds., (1917). *The Fragments of Sophocles*. Cambridge.
- Pellegrino, M., transl., (2015). *Aristophane. Frammenti*. Lecce.
- Pirrotta, S. (2009). *Plato Comicus: Die Fragmentarischen Komodien*. Berlin.
- Rackham, H., transl., (1999). *Pliny: Natural History*. Cambridge, MA.
- Radt, S., ed., (1985). "Aeschylus" in *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, III, Göttingen.
 -- (1977). "Sophocles" in *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, IV (F730a-g edidit R. Kannicht), Göttingen (Editio correctior et addendis aucta, Göttingen 1999).
- Rau, P., (1967). *Paratragodia : Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*. München.
- Reckford, K. J., (1987). *Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy*. London.
- Revermann, M., (2013). 'Paraepic Comedy: Point(s) and Practices', in E. Bakola, L. Prauscello and M. Telò (eds.), *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres*. (Cambridge) 101-128.
 -- (2006). *Comic Business*. Oxford.
- Robertson, N., (1998). 'The City Center of Archaic Athens', in *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 67 (3), 283-302.
- Rose, H. J., (1959). *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York.
 -- ed., (1934). *Hyginus Fabulae*. Leiden.
- Rose, M.A., (1993). *Parody, Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern*. Cambridge.
- Rosen, R.M., (1995). 'Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 119-137.

- Rothwell, K.S., (1995). 'The Continuity of the Chorus in Fourth-Century Attic Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 99-118.
- Ruffell, I.A., (2016). 'Tragedy and Fictionality', in I. Ruffell & L.I. Hau (eds.), *Truth and History in the Ancient World: Pluralising the Past*. (Oxford), 32-54.
- (2012). 'Comedy', in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 132, 157-171.
- (2011). *Politics and Anti-Realism in Athenian Old Comedy: the Art of the Impossible*. Oxford.
- (2002). 'A Total Write-off. Aristophanes, Cratinus, and the Rhetoric of Comic Competition', in *The Classical Quarterly*, 52 (1), 138-163.
- Russo, C. F., (1962). *Aristofane, Autore di Teatro*. Florence.
- Rusten, J. S., (2011). *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486-280*. Baltimore.
- (2001). 'Review of Poetae Comici Graeci I: Comoedia Dorica, Mimi, Phlyaces & Dorische Posse, Epicharm und Attische Komoedie. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Band 147', in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (Available at <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2001/2001-12-23.html>)
- Scarborough, J., (1982). 'Beans, Pythagoras, Taboos, and Ancient Dietetics', in *Classical World*, 75, 355-358.
- Segal, E., (1973). 'The Physis of Comedy', in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 77, 129-136.
- Seidensticker, B., (2005). 'Mythenkorrekturen in der griechischen Tragödie', in M. Vöhler, B. Seidensticker, W. Emmerich (eds.), *Mythenkorrekturen: Zu einer paradoxalen Form der Mythenrezeption*. (Berlin), 37-50.

- Sidwell, K., (2009). *Aristophanes the Democrat: The Politics of Satirical Comedy during the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge.
- (2000). 'From Old to Middle to New? Aristotle's *Poetics* and the History of Athenian Comedy', in J. Wilkins & D. Harvey (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. (Cambridge), 247-258.
- Silk, M., (2000). *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*. Oxford.
- (1993). 'Aristophanic Paratragedy', in A.H. Sommerstein et al. (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*. (Bari), 477-504.
- Slater, N. W., (2002). *Spectator Politics*. Philadelphia.
- (1995). 'The Fabrication of Comic Illusion', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. (Atlanta), 29-45.
- Smith, N. D., (1989). 'Diviners and Divination in Aristophanic Comedy', in *Classical Antiquity*, 8, 140-158.
- Smith, T.J. & Plantzos, D., eds., (2012). *A Companion to Greek Art*. Chichester.
- Smith, W., (1859). *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. Boston.
- Smyth, H.W., (1920). *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York.
- Sommerstein, A. H., (2014). 'Menander's Samia and the Phaedra Theme', in S.D. Olson (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception*. (Berlin), 167-179.
- ed. & transl., (2009). *Aeschylus: Fragments*. Cambridge.
- (2009). *Talking about Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy*. Oxford.
- ed. & transl., (2001). *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, Vol. 11. Warminster.
- (1998). 'The Theatre Audience and the Demos', in J.A. Lopez Ferez (ed.), *La Comedia Griega y Su Influencia en la Literatura Española*. (Madrid), 43-62.

- ed. & transl., (1996). *Frogs*. Warminster.
- Steinmetz, P., (1960). 'Menander und Theophrast: Folgerungen aus dem Dyskolos', in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 103 (2), 185-191.
- Stern, J., (1996). *On Unbelievable Tales*. Wauconda, IL.
- Storey, I., ed. & transl., (2011). *Fragments of Old Comedy*. Cambridge, MA.
- (2010). 'Origins and Fifth-Century Comedy', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Greek Comedy*. Leiden.
- (2006). 'On First Looking into Cratinus' Dionysalexandros', in L. Kozak & J. Rich (eds.), *Playing Around Aristophanes: Essays in Celebration of the Completion of the Edition of the Comedies of Aristophanes by Alan Sommerstein*. (Oxford), 105-125.
- (2003). *Eupolis, Poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford.
- Taillardat, J., (1965). *Les Images d' Aristophane. Etudes de Langue et de Style*. Paris.
- Taplin, O., (1999). 'Spreading the Word through Performance', in S. Goldhill & R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. (Cambridge), 33-57.
- (1993). *Comic Angels*. Oxford.
- (1977). *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford.
- Telò, M., (2016). *Aristophanes and the Cloak of Comedy: Affect, Aesthetics, and the Canon*. London.
- (2010). 'Embodying the Tragic Father(s): Autobiography and Intertextuality in Aristophanes', in *Classical Antiquity*, 29 (2), 278-326.
- ed., (2007). *Eupolidis Demi*. Firenze.
- Thorburn, J. E., (2005). *The Facts On File Companion to Classical Drama*. New York.
- Thorp, J. (2007). 'Aristotle, Females & Wind Eggs', in *Philosophy Presentations*, Paper 6. (Available at <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/philosophypres/6>)

- Trendall, A.D., (1989). *Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily*. New York.
- (1967). *Phlyax Vases*. London.
- Trypanis, C.A., transl. (1958). *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems, Hecale, Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems, Fragments of Epigrams, Fragments of Uncertain Location*. London.
- Trzaskoma, S. & Smith, R., transl., (2007). *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*. Cambridge, MA.
- Tsitsiridis, S., (2010). *Parachorēgēma: Meletēmata gia to Archaio Theatro pros Timēn tou Kathēgētē Grēgorē M. Sēphakē*. Hērakleio.
- Ussher, R. G., (1977). 'Old Comedy and 'Character': Some Comments', in *Greece & Rome*, 24 (1), 71-79.
- Vickers, M. J., (2015). *Aristophanes and Alcibiades: Echoes of Contemporary History in Athenian Comedy*. Berlin.
- Vince, C.A. & J.H., (1926). *Demosthenes with an English Translation*. London.
- Vöhler, M., Seidensticker, B., Emmerich, W., (2005). *Mythenkorrekturen: Zu einer paradoxalen Form der Mythenrezeption*. Berlin.
- Walker R.J., ed., (1921). *Sophoclean Fragments*. London.
- Walker, H. J., (1995). *Theseus and Athens*. New York.
- Webster, T.B.L., (1978). *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy*. London.
- (1973). *Athenian Culture and Society*. Berkeley.
- (1970). *The Greek Chorus*. London.
- (1969). *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy*. London
- Weller, C.H., (1913). *Athens and Its Monuments*. New York.
- West, M., (1973). *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v., (1921). *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin.
- (1879). 'Anmerkungen zum Index Fabularum Aristophanis', in *Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie*. Band 14, 464–465.
- Wilkins, J., (2000). *The Boastful Chef*. Oxford.
- Willetts, R.F., (1959). 'The Myth of Glaucus and the Cycle of Birth and Death', in *Klio*, 37, 21-28.
- Willi, A., (2002). 'The Language of Greek Comedy: Introduction and Bibliographical Sketch', in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. (Oxford), 1-32.
- Wilson, N.G., (1984). 'Review of Poetae Comici Graeci, IV: Aristophon - Crobylus', in *Classical Review*, 34 (2), 178-180.
- Wiseman, A. & P., transl., (2013). *Ovid: Fasti*. Oxford.
- Wright, M., (2016). *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy (Volume 1): Neglected Authors*. London.
- (2012). *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics*. London.
- Ξανθάκη-Καραμάνου, Γ., (1991). *Παράλληλες Εξελίξεις στη Μετακλασσική (4ος π.Χ. αι.) Τραγωδία και Κωμωδία*. Αθήνα.
- Xanthaki-Karamanou, G. & Mimidou, E., (2014). 'The Aeolus of Euripides', in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 57, 49-60.
- Zacharia, K., (2003). 'Sophocles and the West: the Evidence of the Fragments', in A.H. Sommerstein (ed.), *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*. (Bari), 57-76.
- Zagari, E., (2016). 'Review of Aristofane: Frammenti', in *Classical Review*, 66 (2), 337-338.
- Zeitlin, F., (1981). 'Travesties of Gender and Genre', in H.P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. (New York), 169-217.

Zhmud', L. I., Windle, K., Ireland, R., (2012). *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*. Oxford.

Zielinski, T., (1885). *Die Gliederung der Altattischen Komoedie*. Leipsig.

Zirkle, C., (1936). 'Animals Impregnated by the Wind', in *Isis*, 25, 95-130.