concern), other people, and especially politicians, did believe that they could have such an impact.

But if the conclusion I have reached about the restaging of *Frogs* is a true one, it is one that many may well find regrettable. Artistically, after all, *Frogs* is one of Aristophanes' greatest achievements. Politically, if I am right, it helped to open the way for the most vicious régime Athens had ever experienced — and one may be tempted to feel that if Aristophanes didn't know it would have this effect, then he should have done. On the other hand, as W.G. Arnott 1991 reminds us, there were some who should have known far better and didn't. Plato, who was much more closely acquainted with some leading members of the Thirty than Aristophanes is at all likely to have been, had (or so he says)[33] no notion before the event of what their rule would prove to be like. Skill with words and ideas — whether the skill of an Aristophanes or of a Plato — is one thing. Political understanding is another. They do not always go together — and, as Socrates noted[34], the possessor of one kind of expertise is all too prone to be unaware that he lacks another kind![35]

[33] Plato, *Seventh Letter* 324d.

[34] Plato, *Apology* 22c-e.

[35] When this paper was in press, I found that parts of its argument had been anticipated by Salviat 1989. It will be seen that I agree with Salviat's date for the second production of *Frogs*, and with his perception of a close link between it and the condemnation of Kleophon; I also find attractive his interpretation of 679 ff (identifying the «Thracian swallow» with Kleophon's mother; cf. MacDowell, this volume 369-370). I see, however, no reason to believe, as Salviat does, that the play underwent *major* revision for its second production, and some reason to believe it did not: it there were two very different versions of *Frogs*, how came it that the highly successful first version vanished without trace, when the unsuccessful first version of *Clouds* survived to Hellenistic times and possibly beyond?

M.S. Silk
(London)

Aristophanic paratragedy

Aristophanes' comedies embody a remarkable preoccupation with tragedy. Explicit interest in tragedy was nothing new for a comic poet. Meagre though they are, the fragments of Aristophanes' predecessors and contemporaries contain allusions to tragedy and tragedians as well as samples of paratragedy[1]. However, Aristophanes' interest in tragedy is special. It was concentrated (so our evidence suggests) within the twenty-year span from *Acharnians* (425) to *Frogs* (405), two plays in which tragedy and tragic poets figure prominently. In this period Aristophanes seems to have composed a series of other comedies (including *Thesmophoriazusae* in 411) in which the same emphasis is demonstrable or, at least, probable[2]. On the other hand, we know of only one Aristophanic comedy which had a prominent interest in art or literature, but was not centred on tragedy[3]. There is no parallel to this balance of

[1] Tragedy: e.g. Cratinus 276 *PCG*. Tragedians: e.g. Cratinus 17 *PCG* (Soph.), Telecleides 15 *PCG* (Aesch.), Cratinus 342 *PCG* (Eur.). Paratragedy: e.g. Cratinus 115 *PCG*. See further Silk (forthcoming), ch. 2, where the whole question of Ar.'s preoccupation with tragedy is itself more extensively discussed. (In this note and those following, Ar. = Aristophanes).

[2] Besides *Thesmo.* , the plays in question were: a second *Thesmophoriazusae* (on the contents of which see the summary in Norwood 1931: 252-3); a *Phoenissae* (apparently a parody of Euripides' play of that name); and *Preview* and *Dramas*, in both of which, according to Σ *Vesp.* 61c (*PCG* III. 2.158, *test.* iv), Euripides was a character (though whether the Δράματα in question was the Aristophanic *Centaur* or the spurious *Niobus* is uncertain). *Preview* (Προάγων) was staged in 422 with *Wasps*. On the dates of the others, see (*Thesmo.* II) Geissler 1925: 63, (*Phoen.*) Geissler 61, (*Cent.*) Geissler 33 ff. (and cf. Kasssel and Austin, *PCG* III.2.159).

[3] *Gerytades*, in which we meet a delegation of assorted poets (*PCG* III.2.102, *fr.* 156) in Hades. The date of the play is commonly taken to be *c.* 408 (so Geissler 1925: 61 ff.), but cf. Kassel and Austin, *PCG* III.2.101.

interests in the work of Aristophanes' predecessors. Cratinus, for instance, wrote no known play centred on tragedy, but did write a play about Archilochus and Homer, one about comedy, and one concerned, apparently, with music[4].

Tragedy, then, is one of Aristophanes' preoccupations, and throughout the fifth century in particular this preoccupation is made evident, over and over again, by his use of paratragedy. Paratragedy may, of course, take various forms, including visual forms. For the purposes of the present discussion, however, I treat it as a linguistic phenomenon, which, in a drama as word-dominant as all Greek drama was, it must always primarily be[5].

What, then, is a suitable starting-point for the consideration of this linguistic phenomenon? Since there exists one substantial discussion of paratragedy in Aristophanic comedy, Peter Rau's monograph, *Paratragodia* (1967), it might seem natural to begin there. Rau's study offers interpretations, often in some detail, of the most prominent paratragic components or elements in Aristophanes. He begins by considering relevant concepts of parody and paratragedy, and in the course of this part of his book he confronts a number of significant issues. The discussion, however, seems less than satisfactory, if only because it is conducted in an oddly eclectic spirit, as if the urgent task were to list all the possible ways in which the field might be subjected to categorization. Thus (we learn) parodies (or paratragedies) may be classified first according to the nature of the model — which is, perhaps, a literary genre, like tragedy, or perhaps a specific tragic *locus*, or a tragic scene, or a formal element from tragedy, or a tragic convention, or a tragic motif[6]. As an alternative, Rau then offers us a set of classifications which depend on the relation of a parody to its original: is exact quotation involved? or variation of the *ipsissima verba*? or ...?[7] For good measure Rau then draws our attention to other possible classifications, based variously on the 'point' of the parody, the

[4] Ἀρχίλοχοι, Πυτίνη, Εὐνεῖδαι respectively.
[5] See the opening discussion in Silk, forthcoming.
[6] Rau 1967: 12-4.
[7] Rau 1967: 14-6.

stance of the speaker of the parody, and the spirit of the parody which might, for instance, be comic or critical[8].

The suspicion that, as it stands, all this classifying is too much of a good thing seems to be shared by Rau himself, in that the practical discussions that occupy the bulk of his book tend to ignore these categorizations as determinative guides in favour of a kind of *ad hoc* pragmatism. His discussions, however, are weakened severely thereby. Categories are necessary; above all, we need to distinguish paratragedy and parody. Rau tends to use the two terms, if not interchangeably, then at least promiscuously[9], despite his consideration of definitions earlier on. By way of a working distinction, let me suggest that *paratragedy* is the cover term for all of comedy's intertextual dependence on tragedy, some of which is parodic, but some is not; and that *parody* is any kind of distorting representation of an original, which in the present context will be a tragic original. All Aristophanic parody of tragedy, then, is paratragic; but not all Aristophanic paratragedy is parodic. The primary object of this paper is to present and elucidate this difference, in Aristophanic comedy in particular. I am not, therefore, concerned here to explore the meaning of Aristophanic paratragedy as a general phenomenon — not concerned, then, to ask *why* paratragedy should be so pervasive in Aristophanes. Nor am I concerned (as some theorists have been) to consider the rationale of parody as such[10]. However, it may be helpful here to anticipate the argument to the extent of offering a couple of general assertions

[8] Rau 1967: 16-7.
[9] It is common, also, to find *all* of Ar.'s paratragedy, parodic or not, called 'parody': so e.g. Dover 1972 (n. 41 below) and, more recently, Goldhill 1991: 167-222. I must plead guilty myself: e.g. Silk 1980: 117 and 135.
[10] Not that the theorists seem to be making much progress. Among the more notable recent examples, Hutcheon 1985 is largely obfuscatory and M.A. Rose 1979, though full of interesting ideas, repeatedly ties herself up in fashionable ideological knots. Rightly stressing the subversive nature of parody, Rose makes far too much of current reinterpretations of that principle as subversion of 'realism'. It is symptomatic that she should be tolerant towards the inanely self-defeating *reductio* of Macherey, for whom literature as such is 'essentially parodic' (p. 102). In such portentous equations, the actual specifics of literary parody get lost.

concerning the difference between parody and paratragedy and, therefore, the rationale of parody as well. Parody is essentially negative: it works by recalling a more or less specific original and subverting it. Non-parodic paratragedy is not necessarily subversive or negative at all. Parody, in the second place, commonly exists within a comprehensive identificatory frame; non-parodic paratragedy does not.

Regarding the specifics of paratragedy, one may say that a perceived paratragic moment in an Aristophanic comedy must involve *either* the presence of a positively tragic feature commonly absent in Aristophanic comedy *or* the absence of non-tragic features commonly present in Aristophanic comedy *or* both. What one is presupposing here is two norms, or codes, or communicative systems, which share some common features but each of which has features distinctive to itself and alien to the other. We might therefore imagine a model akin to the overlapping circles in a Venn diagram: the two systems overlap, but there is also a perceptible gap between two areas of respectively distinctive features. Alternatively, we might say that items from the two systems may be compatible, or else they may collide[11].

Aristophanic paratragedy readily foregrounds collision. *Knights* 1194 provides a simple and representative instance. Paphlagon and Sausage-Seller are bribing Demos:

ΠΑ. Λαβέ νυν πλακοῦντος πίονος παρ' ἐμοῦ τόμον.
ΑΛ. Παρ' ἐμοῦ δ' ὅλον γε τὸν πλακοῦντα τουτονί.
ΠΑ. Ἀλλ' οὐ λαγῷ' ἕξεις ὁπόθεν δῷς· ἀλλ' ἐγώ.
ΑΛ. Οἴμοι, πόθεν λαγῷά μοι γενήσεται;
Ὦ θυμέ, νυνὶ βωμολόχον ἔξευρέ τι.
ΠΑ. Ὁρᾷς τάδ', ὦ κακόδαιμον;
Ὀλίγον μοι μέλει·
ΑΛ.
(*Eq.* 1190-5)[12]

A passage of comic iambics suddenly includes an alien item that would be at home in tragic iambics. The alien element, ὦ θυμέ, collides with the surrounding context in general, and with νυνὶ βωμολόχον in particular. Whereas the vocables νυνί and βωμολόχος are used only in comedy and prose[13], the apostrophe, ὦ θυμέ, evokes, by contrast, tragic contexts of self-address like Euripides, *Medea* 1056, μὴ δῆτα, θυμέ ... and *Alcestis* 837, ὦ πολλὰ τλᾶσα καρδία ... and Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 1260, ὦ ψυχὴ σκληρά ...[14]. The collocations ὦ θυμέ and νυνὶ βωμολόχον belong to mutually exclusive stylistic habitats, tragic and less than tragic[15].

In this, as in many other instances, no particular tragic context seems to be involved. There is no suggestion of a tragic quotation. (It would indeed have to be a peculiar, and peculiarly well-known, original that *could* be evoked by such a short quotation.) Nor are there any grounds for supposing that the tragic feature is especially associable with any particular drama or dramatist. All this being so, the label 'parody' is surely inappropriate here. The effect of the paratragedy (one might note) is not a negative one. An element of subversion is indeed present, in the sense that, by virtue of the paratragic dislocation, a given idiom, the 'ordinary' idiom to which νυνί and βωμολόχος by rights belong, is briefly subverted. But the effect is still not negative. On the one hand, the collision impinges as an enjoyably 'proper' feature of Aristophanic style: a style in which dislocation is almost as much the norm as the exception[16]. On the other hand, the subversion is not focused on any target external to the given passage: it is not achieved at tragedy's expense[17]. Compare

[11] Compare the discussion in M.A. Rose 1979: 21-8.

[12] Here and elsewhere quotations from Ar. follow Coulon's text (1923-30), unless otherwise indicated.

[13] *Sc.* up to the end of IV BC (for the principle see Silk 1974: 38-9, 82). For νυνί see LSJ *s.v.*: the form is Attic, but (like the pronominal -ί forms) alien to Attic high poetry, i.e. tragedy. βωμολοχ- occurs only in comedy and prose, and fairly frequently in both (cf. LSJ, and add Pherecr. 150.2 *PCG* and Theopomp. Hist. 162.236 J); it is common in Ar. from *Eq.* 902 onwards.

[14] For other such apostrophes, in and out of tragedy, see Rau 1967: 37-8. The type goes back, ultimately, to the Homeric τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη (*Od.* 20.18).

[15] 'Less than tragic': the point at issue is the precise nature of the colloquiality of comic dialogue. See variously Silk 1980: 119-23; Dover 1981/1987a: 16-30, esp. 19; ad Dover 1987b, esp. p. 224.

[16] See Silk, forthcoming, ch. 3.

[17] Everything said here about ὦ θυμέ (from the world of Ar.'s dialogue) applies equally to a lyric instance like the ὦ πάτερ ... of *Pax* 114 ff., on which see Silk 1980:117 (where I ill-advisedly called it 'parody': cf. n. 9 above).

and contrast, therefore, such a passage with Aeschylus' parody of Euripidean monody, *Frogs* 1331 ff. The opening is as follows:

> Τὰ μὲν μέλη σου ταῦτα· βούλομαι δ' ἔτι
> τὸν τῶν μονῳδιῶν διεξελθεῖν τρόπον.
> Ὦ Νυκτὸς κελαινοφαὴς
> ὄρφνα, τίνα μοι δύστανον ὄνει-
> ρον πέμπεις ἐξ ἀφανοῦς Ἀΐδα
> προμολῶν, ψυχὰν
> ἄψυχον ἔχοντα, μελαίνας
> Νυκτὸς παῖδα, φρικώδη δεινὰν ὄ-
> φιν, μελανονεκυείμονα, φόνια φόνια
> δερκόμενον, μεγάλους ὄνυχας ἔχοντα;
> (*Ran.* 1329-37)

This is parody of a tragic original and the subversion is focused on that original. The original must be identified for the subversion to be effective, and the fact that this identification does not involve a specific tragic drama does not affect the point. It is not, indeed, essential that the identification be as explicit as it is here, though it often is so explicit. It is, on the other hand, essential that the parody should be compartmentalized, as an explicit identification ensures that it will be. There must be some kind of framing, by which the parody is signalled and within which its orientation is established. (Contrast the paratragedy of ὦ θυμέ, where no signal is given and no frame is required).

There is no one Euripidean model for Aristophanes' remarkable effusion. The point indeed is precisely that, as the Aristophanic-Aeschylean introduction indicates, the parody purports to direct us towards Euripidean *characteristics* (τὸν τῶν μονῳδίων ... τρόπον, 1330). Those characteristics, however, are represented in many Euripidean passages, but here are accumulated in one. Parody involves distortion, and the distortion here (as often with parody) involves the accumulation of various features, each of which may be Euripidean, more or less, in itself, but which would never be accumulated — not all of them — in any single Euripidean original. So here, besides the elevated lyric features which are common to tragic lyrics in general — ornate compounded adjectives (like

κελαινοφαής) but simplex verbs (πέμπεις etc.)[18], Doric alphas (δύστανον etc.), verse vocabulary (ὄρφνα etc.), absence of particles and articles — we have a series of features which point to Euripides in particular: a melodramatic preoccupation with night and dreams; oxymoron (ψυχὰν ἄψυχον / κελαινοφαής); pleonasm (νυκτός ... νυκτός ... / κελαινο- / ... μελαίνας ... μελανο- / ...); operatic repetition (φόνια φόνια)[19]. In addition there are one or two incidentals that hardly strike us as especially Euripidean at all: notably the accumulated adjectives (φρικώδη κτλ) and the dithyrambic multiple compound μελανονεκυείμονα (both seemingly as characteristic of Aeschylus as of Euripides)[20]. Nevertheless, this is, if not a Euripidean mixture, still largely a mixture of Euripidean elements. As such, it is reasonably homogeneous and, conversely, involves little if anything by way of collision.

With a view to gaining some perspective on our discussion, it is worth pausing at this point to look at a couple of parallel specimens from the world of modern poetry. Against Aristophanes' satirical stanza, relatively homogeneous and free from collision, one might set Ronald Mason's parody of Auden. His 'Self-Congratulatory Ode on Mr Auden's Election to the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford' begins thus:

> He has come back at last, the boy with the inky fingers
> Who scrawled on the lavatory walls and frightened his granny
> By roaring his inexplicable
> Songs in the bathroom, grubby, embarrassing visitors ...[21]

[18] For the high-poetic tendency to use *simplex* verbs, see (e.g.) Wackernagel 1928: 186-91, Dornseiff 1921: 18-9, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 1055-6, Jebb on Soph. *Aj.* 1333, Friis Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Supp.* 534, Braswell on Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 106a.

[19] Night and dreams: e.g. *Hec.* 68-72. Oxymoron: Breitenbach 1934: 236-8. Pleonasm and operatic repetition: Breitenbach 194-6.

[20] Accumulated adjectives: found in Eur., e.g. *HF* 368 (and see Bond *ad loc.*) and 1272-3, *El.* 1098; common also in Aesch., e.g. *Supp.* 794-6, and see Friis Johansen and Whittle *ad loc.* and Stanford 1942: 133-4; likewise e.g. in Bacchyl., as 13.194-5, and see Jebb 1905: 62-3. Multiple compounds: in Eur., see Breitenbach 1934: 61-6; in Aesch., see Fraenkel on *Agam.* 122 and Stanford 1942: 65.

[21] Quoted from Brett 1984: 41; the rest of the parody is less felicitous.

With which compare (for instance) the opening of Auden's 'In Memory of W. B. Yeats',

> He disappeared in the dead of winter:
> The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted,
> And snow disfigured the public statues...

and this, from Auden's 'A Misunderstanding':

> The smiling grimy boy at the garage
> Ran out before he blew his horn; the tall
> Professor in the mountains with his large
> Tweed pockets full of plants addressed him hours
> Before he would have dared; the deaf girl too
> Seemed to expect him at her green chateau;
> A meal was laid, the guest-room full of flowers ...[22]

The parodic detail is accurate. Like various of Auden's poems, including the poem on Yeats, the parodic piece begins abruptly with a 'He'. Its mannered way of splitting lines between adjective and noun ('ineplicable/Songs') is authenticated in 'A Misunderstanding': 'tall/Professor', 'large/Tweed'. The parody evokes a particular, and typical, Audenesque image of a 'grimy boy', and it does so in bathetic Audenesque phraseology, with its 'boy with the inky fingers' seeming to recall the 'grimy boy at the garage' of 'A Misunderstanding' quite specifically. And if '...inky fingers', alongside 'grubby', is too clumsily repetitive for Auden, and if, again, 'frightened his *granny*' is a caricature surpassing even the far depths of Auden's bathos, it has to be admitted that the parody successfully captures Auden's peculiar habit of accumulating ordinary, yet unpredictable, appended phrases and short clauses. So

> ... the boy *with* the inky fingers
> Who scrawled on ... *and* frightened...
> *By* roaring ...
> ... *in* the bathroom...

is like

> ... the tall
> Professor *in* the mountains *with* his ...
> ... pockets *full of* plants ... *hours*
> *Before* he would have ...

What, of course, makes Mason's parody especially apt is the application of all his Audenizing to Auden himself: *he* is the boy with the inky fingers (etc.). Not dissimilar is Henry Reed's parody ('Chard Whitlow')

> As we get older we do not get any younger.
> Seasons return, and today I am fifty-five
> And this time last year I was fifty-four,
> And this time next year I shall be sixty-two.
> And I cannot say I should like (to speak for myself)
> To see my time over again — if you can call it time ...[23]

of Eliot's *Four Quartets,* with its

> Time present and time past
> Are both perhaps present in time future,
> And time future contained in time past...
> ('Burnt Norton')

and its

> I can only say, *there* we have been: but I cannot say where.
> And I cannot say, how long, for that is to place it in time ...
> ('Burnt Norton' again)

and

> It was not (to start again) what one had expected ...
> ('East Coker')

and

> So here I am, in the middle way, having had twenty years —
> Twenty years largely wasted ...
> ('East Coker' again)

and of course

[22] My own suggestions for the originals. With parody of modern poetry, understandably, no published consensus (or even discussion) about such matters may exist.

[23] Quoted from Brett 1984: 143-4.

As we grow older
The world becomes stranger ...

('East Coker' again)

Here too we have a plethora of Eliotian characteristics, from the preoccupation with time to the dead-pan parenthesis, applied back to Eliot himself, under the pretext of the famous 'So here I am ...' from 'East Coker'. In the process, Eliotian paradox ('Time present and time past / Are both perhaps present in time future') is deftly converted — *sub*verted — to banality ('As we get older we do not get any younger'), and room is found for a little joke at Eliot's expense ('today ... fifty-five, ... last year ... fifty-four, ... next year ... sixty-two'). That joke, however, materially alters the parodic mode. Such a joke — or *any* joke — is not something that Eliot might have offered himself. Instead of replicating, or even caricaturing, any of Eliot's characteristic features, it points (under cover, still, of a vaguely Eliotian cast of witing) to an implied target separate from its own jocularity: the *elderliness* of Eliot's manner and attitudes.

Consider, in the light of that paradign, the continuation of the Aristophanic parody of Euripidean lyric. In the second stanza, we become aware of a deflection of idiom:

'Αλλά μοι, ἀμφίπολοι, λύχνον ἅψατε
κάλπισί τ' ἐκ ποταμῶν δρόσον ἄρατε, θέρμετε δ' ὕδωρ,
ὡς ἄν θεῖον ὄνειρον ἀποκλύσω.
'Ιὼ πόντιε δαῖμον,
τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν'. ἰὼ ξύνοικοι,
τάδε τέρα θεάσασθε.
Τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα μου ξυναρπάσασα
φρούδη Γλύκη.
Νύμφαι ὀρεσσίγονοι,
ὦ Μανία, ξύλλαβε.

(*Ran.* 1338-45)

The stanza begins, still, ornately. The first two verses, for instance, come complete with simplex verbs (ἅψατε / ἄρατε /θέρμετε), verse vocabulary (ἀμφίπολοι), suppression of the article (ἐκ ποτ-), 'poetic' plural (ποταμῶν), conventional 'poetic' trope (δρόσον = 'fresh water'), and, for good measure, epic long vowel (ὕδωρ)[24]. And the given level of ornateness is still maintained by the middle of the stanza, as the suppression of the article in τάδε τέρα shows. But now comes a switch of idiom and, in consequence, a collision. The switch is perceptibly from high to low; it has a specific point; and the point is that the switch impinges as a collapse into bathos. Euripides (the implicit argument runs) is the great (?) democratizer (δημοκρατικὸν γὰρ αὖτ' ἔδρων, 952). He (so the chorus will proclaim) has stripped tragedy of τὰ μέγιστα (1494) by filling it with (in his own words) οἰκεῖα πράγματα ... οἷς χρώμεθ', οἷς ξύνεσμεν (959). Accordingly, his new 'democratic' poetry is now the subject of a parodic critique, and the switch from the more ornate to the less ornate, representing the supposed distance between the traditional stuff of tragedy and the new 'popular' substitute, is a target in its own right. The case for arguing that the real Euripides actually democratized tragic style is, to say the least, not strong[25]; and the evidence in his work for any such hybrids as we find here is non-existent. Nevertheless, the parody proceeds on these lines.

The climax, or anti-climax, of the stylistic descent in stanza two is the woman's articulation of her plight:

Τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα μου ξυναρπάσασα
φρούδη Γλύκη.
Νύμφαι ὀρεσσίγονοι,
ὦ Μανία, ξύλλαβε.

Her friend or neighbour, Glyce (so the woman tells a servant, Mania), has run off with her chicken. On the level of diction, the impression of descent is unmistakable: Γλύκη and Μανία are ordinary names, while ἀλεκτρυών is the ordinary word for a chicken (with its 'ordinary' definite article to keep it company). And irrespective of the

[24] 'Epic' long vowel: ὄνομα ἐπεκτεταμένον (Arist. *Poet.* 1457[b]35-58[a]3, with Homeric examples).

[25] Especially not in lyrics. Lesky 1966: 403 reasonably contrasts the 'simple and pure diction' of Eur.'s dialogue ('which, with certain reservations, approached colloquial speech') with the 'increasing flamboyance of the wording of the choral lyrics'. Even in the dialogue such 'flamboyance' is not uncommon: hence Ar.'s satirical digs in *Ach.* 449, 479. Cf. Ritchie 1964: 217-8 with further references.

fact that Euripidean drama is not actually replete with such ordinary names or such chickens[26], satirical satisfaction is achieved. The nature of the achievement is epitomized by the harsh — and wholly un-Euripidean — juxtapositions, φρούδη: Γλύκη and ὀρεσσίγονοι: Μανία, high against low[27]. That said, however, one must draw attention to a complicating factor. The un-Euripidean depths near the close of the stanza and the un-Euripidean collisions associated with them are elegantly prefigured by the more-or-less Euripidean phrase, τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' (1342), and its collision — admittedly less spectacular collision, but collision none the less — with ἰὼ πόντιε δαῖμον, the words preceding:

> O lord of the sea - that's it![28]

As a self-contained syntactic unit, the interesting phrase τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο occurs twice in Euripides, but not in lyrics[29]. In this precise form, it occurs nowhere else in extant tragedy (though Sophocles

[26] Neither of these names is attested in tragedy, nor is the word ἀλεκτρυών, unlike the loftier, unchickenlike, ἀλέκτωρ (Aesch. *Agam.* 1671, *Eum.* 861). All three items, conversely, occur elsewhere in comedy, e.g.: Γλύκη at *Eccl.* 43 and Phecr. 76.1 *PCG;* Μανία at *Thesmo.* 739, Ameips. 2 Kock, Pherecr. 130 *PCG;* ἀλεκτρυών at *Nub.* 663, Pl. Com. 293 *PCG.* Μανία is a slave's name (cf. Pherecr. *loc. cit.,* Gow on Machon xiv. 191, Headlam-Knox on Herod. *Mim.* i. 1); Γλύκη (*pace* Stanford on *Ran.* 1344-5) belongs to a free woman, as at *Eccl.* and (presumably) Pherecr. *locc. citt.* (cf. Herod. *Mim.* ix. 2 and the occurrences of the name cited in Kirchner 1901-3: nos. 3038a-41). The employment of ἀλεκτρυόνα is an implicit riposte to *Ran.* 935 (εἶτ' ἐν τραγῳδίαις ἐχρῆν κἀλεκτρυόνα ποῆσαι;) spoken by Ar.'s Euripides and referring back to the joke about Aeschylus' ἱππαλεκτρυόνα (*fr.* 134 Radt), *Ran.* 930-3.

[27] For φροῦδος, see the distribution of instances in LSJ *s.v.* and cf. Rau 1967: 134. The phrase νύμφαι ὀρεσσίγονοι is ascribed to *Aeschylus* by Σ^{v} *ad loc.* (= Aesch. *fr.* 168 Nauck), but the matter is shrouded in mystery: see Lloyd-Jones 1957: 566-7 and *TrGF* III, 281-3 Radt. The word ὀρεσσίγονος itself is, at all events, a typical high-poetic compound.

[28] τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο is sometimes best translated 'there you are' (as by West on Eur. *Or.* 804 and Dover 1987: 235), but hardly here.

[29] *Ion* 554 and *Or.* 804 (both in recitative trochaics). τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' ὅ ... occurs in iambic trimeters at *Tro.* 624, as an 'elaboration' of the phrase (Lee *ad loc.*), and τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο in iambics likewise at *Hel.* 622. τόδ' ἐκεῖνο, self-contained, occurs in recitative anapaests (cf. Dale 1968:50) at *Med.* 98, and τόδ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖν' in iambics at *Hel.* 788. The various phrases are closely related, but their equation (as by Rau 1967: 134) is not helpful.

uses the two words as part of a longer sequence); but it does occur elsewhere in Aristophanes, in Plato, and in two (or three) passages of Aristotle, for instance *Rhetoric* I. xi. 23[30]:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ μανθάνειν τε ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ θαυμάζειν, καὶ τὰ τοιάδε ἀνάγκη ἡδέα εἶναι οἷον τό τε μιμούμενον, ὥσπερ γραφικὴ καὶ ἀνδριαντοποιία καὶ ποιητική, καὶ πᾶν ὃ ἂν εὖ μεμιμημένον ᾖ, κἂν ᾖ μὴ ἡδὺ αὐτὸ τὸ μεμιμημένον· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτῳ χαίρει, ἀλλὰ συλλογισμός ἐστιν ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ὥστε μανθάνειν τι συμβαίνει.

The importance of this distribution of usage is that it at once suggests a collocation remote from tragic grandeur. Not unnaturally, the phrase has been much discussed. Stevens included it in his catalogue of 'colloquial expressions in Euripides', and many others (though not Rau) agree[31]. In fact it is not necessary, and may not be correct, to identify the tone so specifically as colloquial. The Aristotelian evidence is especially useful, perhaps, as suggesting an ordinary-prosaic flavour, rather than an ordinary-colloquial one. On either interpretation, however, it is apparent that (as suggested), τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' is *more or less* Euripidean: *more,* because the real Euripides does use it; *less,* because the real Euripides does not use it as his Aristophanic counterpart does, in a lyric context. Accordingly, we can see that what Aristophanes is doing is to set up a quasi-Euripidean pretext for the highly entertaining, but essentially un-Euripidean, pot-pourri that follows, with the result that though the pot-pourri itself is not like Euripides, it has the power to point, satirically, to the aspect of Euripides that is implicitly in question. And if the ὦ νυκτός ... stanza is modally akin to Mason's parody of Auden, this second stanza is now seen to trace a pattern closer to Reed's satire on Eliot. Though largely an exaggerated *mimesis* of its target, it accommodates a — shall we say? — momentary

[30] Sophocles: *El.* 1115 (cf. Jebb *ad. loc.*). Ar.: *Ach.* 820, *Pax* 289, *Av.* 354 (cf. also *Ach.* 41, *Pax* 516, *Av.* 507, *Lys.* 240). Plato: *Phdr.* 241d (cf. also *Phdr.* 252c, *Smp.* 210e, 223a, *Hipp. Ma.* 296d, *Chrm.* 166b). Aristotle: *Rhet.* III. x. 3 (and cf. *Poet.* 1448^{b} 17 οὗτος ἐκεῖνος, where Gudeman conjectured τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο).

[31] Stevens 1976: 31-2; so e.g. Dover 1987b: 235, Jebb on Soph. *El.* 1115, Willink on Eur. *Or.* 804. Contrast Rau 1967: 134.

deconstruction of that target, whereby, under cover of Euripidean features, and in order to make a specific satirical point about Euripides' 'democratic' tendencies, it offers a constatation which Euripides himself would never have entertained.

In case the distinction between the imitative and the deconstructive parody is not yet fully clear, one might offer, as a paradigm of the deconstructive, Ezra Pound's poetic critique of Housman. It represents, perhaps, the extreme form that this kind of parody can take without forfeiting the status of parody altogether:

O woe, woe,
People are born and die,
We also shall be dead pretty soon
Therefore let us act as if we were dead already.
The bird sits on the hawthorn tree
But he dies also, presently.
Some lads get hung, and some get shot.
Woeful is this human lot.
Woe! woe, etcetera....
London is a woeful place,
Shropshire is much pleasanter.
Then let us smile a little space
Upon fond nature's morbid grace.
Oh, Woe, woe, woe, etcetera...[32]

This piece, which goes beyond a mere *jeu d'esprit,* presupposes many moments in many of Housman's poems, such as this,

But oh, my man, the house is fallen
That none can build again;
My man, how full of joy and woe
Your mother bore you years ago
To-night to lie in the rain ...

or this,

The cuckoo shouts all day at nothing
...
For nature, heartless, witless nature,

[32] Quoted from Brett 1984: 195.

Will neither care nor know ...

or this,

Leave your home behind, lad ...
Be sorry you were born ...

or this,

You and I must keep from shame
In London streets the Shropshire name ...

or this,

What, lad, drooping with your lot?
I too would be where I am not ...

or (very particularly) this:

Shot? so quick, so clean an ending?
Oh that was right, lad, that was brave:
Yours was not an ill for mending,
'Twas best to take it to the grave[33].

Yet in his parody (quoted here in its entirety) Pound makes no attempt to recreate Housman with any consistency or precision, and much of the time he is hardly recreating Housman at all. The most striking feature of the piece, the repeated 'woe, woe', is not obviously Housmanlike. The given stanza form bears a vague resemblance to the Housmanic staple; but whereas Housman deals in impeccably rhymed, rhythmically neat, stanzas, Pound's first stanza is rhythmically irregular and barely rhymes, and his other two rhyme, or pararhyme, in blandly different ways. A few items mimic Housman directly, notably the 'lads' with which Housman's verse abounds; and notwithstanding the absolute unlikeness of the stanzaic formula to any of Housman's, it is noticeable that, after stanza one, stanzas two and three seem, by comparison, to approximate to the characteristic lilt of the unspecified originals. But overall the poem is less concerned to reproduce either what Housman actually says or

[33] From (respectively) *Last Poems* xviii and xl, *A Shropshire Lad* iii, xxxvii, li, xliv.

how he says it than to convey what, purportedly, Housman *is*: in a word — in Pound's word — *morbid.*

Appropriately, then, the parody is entitled 'Mr Housman's Message'. And yet, as one rereads it, and notes the way that the approximation to Housman's lilting music takes shape as the stanzas proceed, it becomes apparent that this parody contrives both to establish a critique and then to enact it: first we are offered statement and then effect.

It is not apparent that in his tragic parodies Aristophanes ever goes very far down this kind of deconstructive path; certainly, he does not go as far as Pound does with Housman. The most emphatic Aristophanic instance, perhaps, comes during the parody of Aeschylean lyric style that precedes the critique of Euripides in *Frogs*:

> Ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἥβας,
> τοφλαττοθρατ τοφλαττοθρατ,
> Σφίγγα, δυσαμεριᾶν πρύτανιν κύνα, πέμπει,
> τοφλαττοθρατ τοφλαττοθρατ ...
> (*Ran.* 1285 ff.)

Aeschylus likes refrains, but (so far as we know) never indulges in a meaningless refrain, as the parodist does here[34]. At this point, then, the parody is not directly imitative of any Aeschylean habit, but rather points to the supposed obscurantist exoticism of Aeschylus' whole idiom, all

> δεῖν' ἄττα μορμορωπά,
> ἄγνωτα τοῖς θεωμένοις.
> (*Ran.* 925-6)

But even in such a case, τοφλαττοθρατ ... is much more directly imitative than Pound's 'Therefore let us act as if we were dead already'. Aristophanes keeps mimesis and deconstructive interpretation largely separate.

[34] Contrast the wholly traditional αἴλινον ... of *Agam.* 121 (= 139 = 159) or the *meaningful* exotica of *Supp.* 118-9 (= 129-30). Cf. Fraenkel and Friis Johansen & Whittle *ad locc.* and, generally, Stanford 1942: 85.

With our earlier discussion of the paratragedy at *Knights* 1194 in mind, we may note the lesson that these parodic examples have for us in regard to collision. From the given instances of satirical parody, it should be clear that in parody collision is possible, but neither necessary nor even characteristic. In the second *Frogs* stanza *contra Euripidem,* there is perceptible collision; there is none in the first. In the parody of Auden there is none (the stylistic ups and downs are a feature of Auden's own idiom), nor is there any in the parody of Eliot. In Pound's parody of Housman, collision is latent — between, for instance, 'born and die', which Housman might have written, and 'pretty soon', which he would not; but Pound is not concerned to *realize* the collision in the poem. Parodic imitation can exist without collision, then[35], and where parody specifically cultivates collision, it will, as likely as not, be collision that is *not* directly reflective of the original itself. Aristophanes' φρούδη: Γλύκη and ὀρεσσίγονοι: Μανία are cases in point, and so too (it will be as well to remember) are many simpler instances of parody. Take (if only for the sake of impartiality) Housman's 'Fragment of a Greek Tragedy'[36]. In this celebrated piece Housman sets out to expose the artificiality of tragic language and/or the language of translations of it, and achieves his purpose by an accumulation of literalisms and distortions. Misrepresentation is the flag hoisted in the opening words,

> O suitably attired in leather boots
> Head of a traveller ...

where a malicious selection of more or less 'authentic' phrases produces not only the ludicrous *iunctura*, 'boots: Head', but also the entertaining, but quite un-Greek-tragic, collision, 'O: suitably', part conventional verse, part prose. For the very end of the poem the same technique is given free rein. The result is a pair of extravagantly untragic collocations:

[35] Notwithstanding the fact that 'imitation without collision' is equally a formula for non-parodic pastiche, as represented in (say) the pastiche of high lyric idiom in the parodos of *Clouds,* where the sung portions establish the idiom and within them there is no breach of that idiom; the breach comes outside the lyrics, as with Strepsiades' ἀνταποπαρδεῖν and χεσείω (*Nub.* 293-5; Silk 1980: 106-8).

[36] Quoted from Ricks 1989: 236-8.

— O! O! another stroke! That makes the third.
He stabs me to the heart against my wish.
— If that be so, thy state of health is poor;
But thine arithmetic is quite correct.

'Thy: state of health' and 'thine: arithmetic' once again play off poeticism against prosaism in a way that even the Aristophanic Euripides was never accused of. By contrast, the opening of the choral section of the 'Fragment' works in the more familiar way of the parodies of Eliot and Auden. It sticks closer to the actualities of its presumed target and, instead of contriving collision, maintains a sort of parodic decorum:

In speculation
I would not willingly acquire a name
For ill-digested thought,
But after pondering much
To this conclusion I at last have come:
Life is uncertain ...

Here distortion is consistent or cumulative and the parody, in broad terms, is homogeneous.

Most of Aristophanes' paratragedies do not involve such homogeneity, because most of Aristophanes' paratragedies are not parody at all. The extensive use of Euripidean drama in *Thesmophoriazusae* — *Helen*, *Andromeda*, *et al.* — is largely nonparodic, and so too is the well-known sequence in *Acharnians*, sometimes referred to as parody of Euripides' *Telephus*. The connection with *Telephus* is not in doubt, but if parody involves subversion of the tragic original, this is not parody. Take *Acharnians* 497-8:

Μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν ἔπειτ' ἐν 'Αθηναίοις λέγειν ...

Dicaeopolis is in search of the wherewithal to plead a case against war. He visits Euripides and comes away with (among other things) the beggar's clothes that Euripides' Telephus wore when seeking to convince the Greek leaders of the Mysians' right to self-defence.

Here, typically, he begins his great oration with phraseological assistance from Telephus' original speech:[37]

μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες Ἑλλήνων ἄκροι,
εἰ πτωχὸς ὢν τέτληκ' ἐν ἐσθλοῖσιν λέγειν.

On a mechanical calculation, the items retained predominate: μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες, and εἰ πτωχὸς ὤν, and ἐν (+ dative plural) λέγειν. The new elements, however, are strikingly different from the original. In particular, in place of lords of Greece (Ἑλλήνων ἄκροι) we get spectators (θεώμενοι), and instead of the highborn (ἐσθλοῖσιν) we get unspecific Athenians ('Αθηναίοις). The upshot is unmistakable collision, incidentally between the rhythmical properties of the tragic and non-tragic elements[38], but chiefly between their metatheatrical status: between, that is, the phraseology of tragic 'illusion' (beggars etc.) and the phraseology of direct address (spectators). Tragedy keeps to, and within, its fictive presuppositions; Aristophanic comedy need not[39].

The collision, however, still has no Euripidean affinities itself, and in this instance there is no pretext for supposing that it might. This is not parody. Parody exists within a frame: here there is none. Our attention, accordingly, is not, or not primarily, focussed on Euripides as it would be were parody involved. The qualities of the original are not directly in question as they would be with parody. In an obvious sense, the sequence entails distortion of a Euripidean original, but there is no distorting imitation or deconstruction. Instead, there is a re-use of Euripidean quotations in (literally) a new cause, which has no more in common with parody than Eliot's use of Shakespeare (and a dozen others) does in 'The Waste Land':

The chair she sat in, like a burnished throne,
Glowed on the marble, where the glass
Held up by standards wrought with fruited vines

[37] Eur. *fr.* 703 Nauck.

[38] In *v.* 498 the tragic opening is disrupted by the non-tragic rhythm of ἐν 'Αθη- (fourth-foot anapaest).

[39] See the recent discussion by Taplin 1986: 166-72.

From which a golden Cupidon peeped out ...[40]

Correlatively, it is of no significance — as it would be of great significance in a parody — whether the Euripidean phrases are, or are felt to be, characteristic or distinctive. It only matters that they be recognizable. We do not even need to know much about the original —[41] though, conversely, the more we do know, probably the better. For what the paratragedy does is ensure that the situation of the *Telephus* is available as a parallel to enrich the given action[42]. This is to say that what Aristophanes is doing is creating a tragic co-presence, and this is what he does likewise in the *Knights* passage, with its modest ὦ θυμέ, and what he does over and over again with his paratragic evocations. There is, then, no difference of kind, but only a difference of degree, between the *Knights* instance, where the original could be anything, provided only that it be recognizably tragic, and the *Acharnians* instance, where the original is a specific tragedy that has been specifically drawn to our attention in an earlier part of the play[43]. In the *Acharnians* instance, of course, the co-presence is enormously more vivid and much richer in effect. In both cases, nevertheless, the effect is reasonably described as bifocal, in that some recognition of the two, separate, presences is required. And in all such cases this will be the characteristic effect: we do not feel called upon to forget the immediate comic context, but neither can we be unaware of an extra presence, because such a presence is evoked by items which in texture or idiom are bound to stand out as alien, thanks to the ubiquitous collisions between the original and the new context. Looking back to the earlier part of our discussion, then, we may say that not only does non-parodic paratragedy accommodate

[40] 'The Waste Land' 77 ff.: *Antony and Cleopatra* II, ii, 190 ff.

[41] I.e. the original need not even be identified. The point is made by Dover 1972: 188-9, though apropos 'parody' (which Dover uses as a cover term to include paratragedy: *ibid.* p. 73).

[42] For a recent interpretation of this parallel, see Foley 1988, though her interpretation seems to me marred by the current fashion for seeing cautionary tales in the (mis)behaviour of Aristophanic heroes (*ibid.* pp. 45-6). Her position in effect depends on the character-continuity fallacy (cf. n. 55 below).

[43] *Ach.* 414-72.

collision: it is a central, diagnostic feature of paratragedy of this non-parodic kind that collision should be involved.

If this conclusion is important, its corollary is no less so. Suppose there were *no* collision in such a sequence: could that sequence still work as an instance of the kind of non-parodic paratragedy under discussion? The answer must be: no. A paratragic sequence without collision must be a sequence in which the (para)tragic elements are not immediately distinguishable from their non(para)tragic context: a sequence in which, on the contrary, *color tragicus* is integrated into a new kind of text. Such a sequence would belong to a *third* category, equally distinct from parody and from tragic co-presence. In such a sequence, it would not merely be possible that no specific original were evoked (as in the case with our *Knights* example): it would be essential. In such a sequence there must be no double focus, as would follow from the evocation of any distinct tragic context.

Instances of this third category do occur in Aristophanes, but not often. There are, to begin with, moments like *Acharnians* 27[44]:

> Ἀλλ' οὐδεπώποτ' ἐξ ὅτου 'γὼ ῥύπτομαι
> οὕτως ἐδήχθην ὑπὸ κονίας τὰς ὀφρῦς
> ὡς νῦν, ὁπότ' οὔσης κυρίας ἐκκλησίας
> ἐωθινῆς ἔρημος ἡ πνὺξ αὐτηί,
> οἱ δ' ἐν ἀγορᾷ λαλοῦσι κἄνω καὶ κάτω
> τὸ σχοινίον φεύγουσι τὸ μεμιλτωμένον.
> Οὐδ' οἱ πρυτάνεις ἤκουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀωρίαν
> ἥκοντες, εἶτα δ' ὠστιοῦνται πῶς δοκεῖς
> ἐλθόντες ἀλλήλοισι περὶ πρώτου ξύλου,
> ἁθρόοι καταρρέοντες· εἰρήνη δ' ὅπως
> ἔσται προτιμῶσ' οὐδέν· ὦ πόλις πόλις.
> (*Ach.* 17-27)

Dicaeopolis' bitter reflections on the state of Attic democracy reach an obvious climax on ὦ πόλις πόλις, which is an attested tragic phrase and sounds like one[45]. And yet the words hardly obtrude. On analysis, one notes the way that this climactic moment is prepared, in

[44] Part of a much discussed stylistic sequence: see esp. Dover 1987b: 225-36; Edmuds 1980: 25-33; Silk, forthcoming ch. 1.

[45] Soph. *OT* 629: cf. Rau 1967: 185.

the words preceding, by a tightening of metrical features to what would pass for tragic rhythm, and by a selection of idioms which would be equally 'normal' (that is, unremarkable) in comedy or tragedy. Specifically, the sequence, εἰρήνη δ' ὅπως / ἔσται προτιμῶσ' οὐδέν, is free of comic anapaests, violations of laws of final cretics and the rest, while its plain language contains nothing alien to elevated verse[46]. The introduction of tragic material, in short, is made as *natural* as it could be; and given the emotional intensity of the preceding lines, the effect of the tragic presence is not to double the focus, but to affirm the existing intensity and elevate it. The result, then, is a certain enlargement of tone.

The *Acharnians* effect is momentary. *Clouds* 1452-62 is more substantial[47]:

Στ. ταυτὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, ὦ Νεφέλαι, πέπονθ' ἐγώ,
ὑμῖν ἀναθεὶς ἅπαντα τἀμὰ πράγματα.
Χο. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν σαυτῷ σὺ τούτων αἴτιος,
στρέψας σεαυτὸν εἰς πονηρὰ πράγματα.
Στ. τί δῆτα ταῦτ' οὔ μοι τότ' ἠγορεύετε,
ἀλλ' ἄνδρ' ἄγροικον καὶ γέροντ' ἐπήρατε;
Χο. ἡμεῖς ποοῦμεν ταῦθ' ἑκάστοθ', ὁντιν' ἄν
γνῶμεν πονηρῶν ὄντ' ἐραστὴν πραγμάτων,
ἕως ἂν αὐτὸν ἐμβάλωμεν εἰς κακόν,
ὅπως ἂν εἰδῇ τοὺς θεοὺς δεδοικέναι.
Στ. ὤμοι, πονηρά γ', ὦ Νεφέλαι, δίκαια δέ·

Pheidippides has threatened to give his mother a beating. Strepsiades is brought to his senses: ταυτὶ δι' ὑμᾶς ... πέπονθ' ἐγώ. He points his finger at the Clouds: *they* are responsible. And with this allusion to responsibility comes an evocation of that well-known world of late-archaic and early classical ideology, whose watchwords are *suffering, responsibility, god, justice and punishment, delusion then, recognition now — too late.* This nexus of ideas dominates (for

[46] For the construction with ὅπως, see the parallels in Goodwin 1912: 123; for προτιμᾶν thus, those in LSJ *s.v.* II. The metrical features have a tragic strictness in contradistinction to e.g. the violation of Porson's Law in 24 or the second-foot anapaest in 23.

[47] Reading ἐπήρατε in 1457 with Dover (*q.v.*); on 1458 see n. 51 below.

instance) Creon's anguished exchange with the chorus in *Antigone,* 1270-6:

Χο. οἴμ' ὡς ἔοικας ὀφὲ τὴν δίκην ἰδεῖν.
Κρ. οἴμοι,

ἔχω μαθὼν δείλαιος· ἐν δ' ἐμῷ κάρᾳ
θεὸς τότ' ἄρα τότε μέγα βάρος μ' ἔχων
ἔπαισεν, ἐν δ' ἔσεισεν ἀγρίαις ὁδοῖς,
οἴμοι λακπάτητον ἀντρέπων χαράν.
φεῦ φεῦ, ἰὼ πόνοι βροτῶν δύσπονοι.

Likewise, it underlies (for instance) Herodotus' presentation of Croesus (1.87.3):

Κροῖσε, τίς σε ἀνθρώπων ἀνέγνωσε ἐπὶ γῆν τὴν ἐμὴν στρατευσάμενον πολέμιον ἀντὶ φίλου ἐμοὶ καταστῆναι; ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἔπρηξα τῇ σῇ μὲν εὐδαιμονίῃ, τῇ ἐμεωυτοῦ δὲ κακοδαιμονίῃ· αἴτιος δὲ τούτων ἐγένετο ὁ Ἑλλήνων θεὸς ἐπάρας ἐμὲ στρατεύεσθαι.

As the Herodotean passage reminds us, this is by no means an exclusively tragic nexus, but it is, of course, one that Attic tragedy makes peculiarly its own in *Antigone* and in many other plays.

No (says Aristophanes' chorus), Strepsiades himself is αἴτιος: he chose his πονηρὰ πράγματα for himself. And why, then, did they not tell him all this *at the time,* τότε? Why was he left, like a Creon, to see it all too late? It seems that they led him on in his delusion (ἐπήρατε), as the god of the Greeks led Croesus on in his (θεὸς ἐπάρας ἐμέ). True enough (say the chorus), but it is done for a purpose: they drive men on, so men can learn the hard way, as Creon learned (μαθὼν δείλαιος). And Strepsiades is convinced. Like Cadmus in *Bacchae,* another (though, so to speak, later) tragic sufferer, he recognizes that the punishment is just, though cruel, πονηρά γε ... δίκαια δέ — or, as Cadmus was to put it:

ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐνδίκως μέν, ἀλλ' ἄγαν,
... ἀπώλεσ' ...
(*Bacch.* 1249 f.)

A sinner like Strepsiades must learn, however late,

ὅπως ἄν εἰδῇ τοὺς θεοὺς δεδοικέναι.

For, as the vengeful god of *Bacchae* was to put it:

ὄψ' ἐμάθεθ' ἡμᾶς, ὅτε δὲ χρῆν, οὐκ ᾔδετε.
(*Bacch.* 1345)

In the remarkable exchange between contrite Strepsiades and vengeful Clouds, *color tragicus* is spread over the passage, yet no distracting attention is drawn to it. There is no defined or articulated evocation of a reality outside the comic reality: it is part and parcel of such an effect that the tragic coloration should be unspecifiable, and not point us to a particular tragic locus or a particular tragedy or tragedian[48]. And the paratragedy does not impinge like a sudden change of key: there is no effect of suddenness at all, but rather one of concealed modulation into a new hybrid that establishes itself unannounced and without advertisement.

The prerequisite for this noteworthy effect is the exclusion of any operative collision. The means to that end are several. In the first place the passage exhibits a marked restraint in expression, which in Aristophanic comedy is generally so unrestrainedly exuberant — in word play, in obscenities, in accumulations, in metaphors, in jokes, in discontinuities of all kinds[49]. Here all such exuberance is absent; and even an apparent exception like the punning metaphor in στρέψας σεαυτόν (Στρεψιάδης) serves only, once again, to evoke a *tragic* menace, because (with a wholly appropriate imprecision) the usage carries a faint suggestion of the *nomen omen* that had, or would, beset Aeschylus' Helen (ἑλέναυς), Sophocles' Ajax (αἰαῖ), Euripides' Pentheus (πένθος)[50]. Rhythmical restraint, too, plays an important part here. Although there are three sets of untragic anapaests, together with violations of Porson's Law, the rhythm is passably

[48] Rau 1967: 173-5, following Newiger 1957: 67-8, talks of an 'Aeschylean theodicy' here. There is nothing so distractingly specific, and in phraseological terms nothing especially Aeschylean at all.

[49] Fuller discussion in Silk (forthcoming) ch. 3.

[50] *Agam.* 689, *Aj.* 430, *Bacch.* 507. The *nomen omen*, again, is not exclusively tragic (see e.g. Stanford 1939: 34-8 and 184, index *s.v.*), but especially so. On 'appropriate imprecision', cf. Leavis 1948: 77: 'the inimitable mark of the poet ... is his ability to control realization to the precise degree appropriate ...'.

close to a tragic norm[51]. Then again, the phraseology and idiom of the passage is, for the most part, indistinguishably tragic or Aristophanic: the language mostly comes from the common ground, the overlap, between the genres. Into this category fall such expressions as ἅπαντα τἀμά / πονηρὰ πράγματα / ἠγορεύετε / ἐπήρατε / ἐραστήν / ὅπως ἄν ...[52]. Meanwhile, non-tragic phraseology, non-tragic idiom, is restricted to a few, minor items (ταυτί / ἄγροικον / ἑκάστοτε / ἐμβάλωμεν)[53], and, conversely, any touches that might

[51] Anapaests: 1452 and 1462 (fourth foot), 1453 (second foot) — and also 1458 (fifth foot), if we accept the predominant reading of the manuscript tradition, ὅταν τινά, as does Coulon. (The text quoted above, with Porson's ὅντιν' ἄν, follows Dover). Porson's Law: 1454, 1459. Oddly, Dover (on 1458) and also Sommerstein (on 1452-64) comment on the approximation to tragic rhythm, but fail to note the extent of these exceptions. Anapaests, especially in proper names, occur increasingly in late fifth-century tragic trimeters in general, and Euripidean trimeters in particular (see e.g. West 1982: 81-2), but their appearance, especially their avoidable and concentrated appearance, is still uncharacteristic of tragedy as such.

[52] ἅπαντα τἀμά (1453): see e.g. Soph. *Aj.* 132 ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια and *OC* 1613 πάντα τἀμά, Ar. *Thesmo.* 262 τἀμὰ ταυτί and 591 τἄλλ' ἅπανθ', notwithstanding a baffling error in LSJ *s.v.* ἐμός: 'contr. with the Art., οὐμός ... τἀμά, Trag. (not Com.) ...'. (Fuller details on (ἅ)πας in Gildersleeve 1911: 304-16). πονηρὰ πράγματα (1455): see e.g. Eur. *fr.* 1027.1 Nauck πονηρὰ πράγματα (1455): see e.g. Eur. *fr.* 1027.1 Nauck πραγμάτων αἰσχρῶν, Thuc. 7.48 πονηρὰ τὰ πράγματα, Ar. *Vesp.* 1496 μανικὰ π. and *Av.* 1472 δεινὰ π. ἠγορεύετε (1456) is standard Greek from Homer onwards: see LSJ *s.v.* ἐπήρατε (1457): Ar. *Nub.* 42 ἥτις με γῆμ' ἐπῆρε τὴν σὴν μητέρα, Pherecr. 156.1 *PCG* εἰκῆ μ' ἐπῆρας, and (tragic and ominous) Soph. *OT* 1328 (τίς σ' ἐπῆρε δαιμόνων), Eur. *Or.* 285-6. ἐραστήν (1459): Ar. *Pax* 191, Amphis 15.3 Kock, Pl. *Phdr.* 253d, Soph. *OT* 601, Hdt. 3.53. ὅπως ἄν + subj. of purpose (1461): Aesch. *Cho.* 579, Soph. *El.* 40, Ar. *Ach.* 444 and *Vesp.* 178, Pl. *Smp.* 199a etc. (see further Goodwin 1912: 117).

[53] ταυτί (1452): deictic -ί never in tragedy, ubiquitous in comedy (*Nub.* 8 etc.). ἄγροικον (1454), alien to fifth-century high poetry, including tragedy; common in comedy and prose: Ar. *Ach.* 371 (+ 16 other examples in Todd 1932), Eup. 222.2 *PCG*, Thuc. 3.106, Xen. *Mem.* 3.13.1, Arist. *EN* 1128ª9, Thphr. *Char.* 4. ἑκάστοτε (1458), ditto: Ar. *Nub.* 617 (+ 21 other examples in Todd), Antipho 6.13, Thuc. 1.68, Hp. *Aer.* 5. ἐμβάλωμεν (1460), in its given idiom, ditto: Antipho 3. iv. 10 ἡμᾶς εἰς μὴ προσηκούσας συμφορὰς ἐμβάλητε, Pl. *Phlb.* 20a, Aeschin. 3.79, Ar. *Ach.* 679, Aristophon 6.5 *PCG*, Hp. *Morb.* 4.54 (p. 598, 14 Littré); Eur. *El.* 962 (ἐμβάλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον λόγον) is not parallel.

impinge as distinctively tragic are avoided[54]. There is no ὦ θυμέ here: nothing that would mean collision and double focus[55].

In this climactic part of *Clouds*, Aristophanes achieves an impressive hybrid effect. Yet impressive as it is — precisely because of how impressive it is — the effect is puzzling, in so far as it is hard to find Aristophanic parallels for it elsewhere. It is not indeed that in Aristophanic comedy there is any shortage of hybrids as such. After all, the paratragedy of ὦ θυμέ and the *Telephus* scenes in *Acharnians* is itself a hybrid mode; our specifications of *double* focus and tragic *co*-presence imply just that. And of course there is the case of Aristophanes' lyric poetry. One of his predominant lyric modes is a hybrid, a compound of high and low, which I have discussed elsewhere under the label, 'low lyric *plus*'[56]. Furthermore (to quote my own conclusion on the matter), 'it is tragedy, above all, ...that helps to engender the new, irregular compound ...'[57]. However, that lyric compound, like the ὦ θυμέ kind of paratragedy, is quite different from the *neutral* hybrid of *Clouds*. Far from avoiding the extremes of high and low, and so mediating between the two, it revels in the discrepancies between them, so that one and the same lyric section can soar joyously to an ὦ πάλαι ποτ' ὄντες ... and descend, with no less delight, to a εὐρυπρωκτίαν[58]. Moreover, it is characteristic of those lyrics that their tonal ingredients are unevenly dispersed: the lyrics tend to start high and then dip[59], as if the very object of the exercise were to flaunt the unexpected high tone and then assert its

[51] With the possible exception of στρέψας (σεαυτόν), whose status is difficult to determine. The only very close parallel for the idiom is Eur. *Supp.* 412-3 [πόλιν] πρὸς κέρδος ἴδιον ... στρέφει. Less closely, cf. Soph. *Ichn.* 224, Pl. *Tht.* 194b, and Ar. *Thesmo.* 1128 (= Eur. *fr.* 139 Nauck, but perhaps *not* paratragic itself: cf. Rau 1967:88).

[55] Fisher 1984: 227 argues that the discrepancy between solemn chorus now and devious chorus earlier serves to undermine the impression of 'seriousness' here; in effect, this implies a long-distance collision of elements. His position ignores the unobtrusiveness of the modulation to the 'tragic' here; it also puts an impossible weight on an argument from continuity of character (*vel sim.*) which Aristophanic comedy precludes: see Silk 1990 (and Silk forthcoming. ch. 4).

[56] Silk 1980: 133 ff.

[57] Silk 1980: 134.

[58] *Vesp.* 1060-70: Silk 1980: 143.

[59] Silk 1980: 133-4, 142-3.

dispensability, as well as its distance from the low. Nothing could be more unlike the restraint, the modulation, the imperceptibility, of the hybrid in *Clouds*. The fact is, then, that a parallel in Aristophanes' lyrics — some hypothetical low lyric that elevates itself, effectively und unobtrusively, *en route* — is no easier to come by than any parallel elsewhere in his dialogue[60].

So the puzzle remains. Aristophanes is demonstrably interested in the creation of hybrids, and, in particular, hybrids involving a compounding of the low with the tragic high; he is (as the *Clouds* paradigm shows) aware of the possibilities of a mediating, neutral hybrid; *and yet* (outside the *Clouds* paradigm) he seems wary of exploring the opportunities that such a hybrid might present. The answer to the puzzle (I suggest) lies, in part, precisely in the very neutrality of the neutral hybrid and, in part, in the general principle that, in the creation of art, any choice creates problems as well as opportunities. The line of thought that serves to bring these two considerations together is suggested by a valuable note by Dover on *Clouds*. In the next paratragic moment following his 'tragic' exchange with the Clouds, Strepsiades, now in dialogue with his son, loftily tells him to 'respect Zeus paternal'[61]. *Nub.* 1464-9:

Στ. νῦν οὖν ὅπως, ὦ φίλτατε,
τὸν Χαιρεφῶντα τὸν μιαρὸν καὶ Σωκράτη
ἀπολεῖς μετ' ἐμοῦ 'λθών, οἵ σέ κἄμ' ἐξηπάτων.
Φε. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἀδικήσαιμι τοὺς διδασκάλους.
Στ. ναὶ ναί, καταιδέσθητι πατρῷον Δία.
Φε. ἰδού γε Δία πατρῷον. ὡς ἀρχαῖος εἶ.

Here we have the familiar effect of collision and bifocal orientation, associated with a sense of incongruity between tragic evocation and 'ordinary' non-tragic context, the latter epitomized by the 'ordinary' names, 'Chaerephon' and 'Socrates', in the father's words, and the

[60] *Eq.* 397-408 (discussed briefly in Silk 1980: 143) is no exception. Instances of high lyric pastiche — ἀέναοι νεφέλαι ... / Παλλάδα τὴν φιλόχορον ... (*ibid.* pp. 106-8, 112) — are again quite different: no compound is involved at all.

[61] On the tragic provenance of the phrase, καταιδέσθητι πατρῷον Δία, see Rau 1967: 191 and Dover *ad loc.*

(apparently) demotic collocation ἰδού γε, in the son's[62]. Given this incongruity, the tragic phrase actually tends to deflate the tone of the passage, rather than elevate it, and (as Dover puts it) 'the serious tone of the last twenty lines is set aside by the incongruity of tragic quotation'[63]. The corollary is that the oddly elevated effect of the earlier sequence is only made possible by an elimination of the rich variety of 'incongruous' discontinuities through which Aristophanes customarily and exuberantly articulates his version of comedy, including his favourite hybrids elsewhere. The point, then, is that to cultivate the restrained hybrid of *Clouds* would tend to subvert Aristophanic Old Comedy itself, *tout court*. By the fourth century, it would seem, Aristophanes was indeed ready to move in that direction. During the period of his engagement with tragedy, however, he was in no hurry to do any such thing. And if his range of hybrids may, therefore, have been the poorer, his comedy overall (most of us would agree) remained the richer for it.

[62] ἰδού γε: Denniston 1954: 129 cites ten Aristophanic instances, including the *Nub.* passage, and no others. There are certainly no attested instances in tragedy, though ἰδού itself is comon there. In 1468 note also the sub-sophistic derogatory use of ἀρχαῖος (Griffith 1977: 219, Dover on *Nub.* 821). Though the word does indeed occur in this sense in late fifth-century tragedy ([Aesch.] *PV* 317, Eur. *fr.* 1088 Nauck), it is surely not entirely circular to argue that this use of the word there is less than *distinctively* 'tragic' too.

[63] Dover on *Nub.* 1468. Note that what is lowered is the tone of Ar.'s own context: the original tragic context of the tragic element, and likewise tragedy as such, are not affected. Dover elsewhere (1972: 75) mistakenly interprets such moments as 'devaluation of tragedy'.

Pascal Thiercy
(Brest)

Les odeurs de la polis ou le «nez» d'Aristophane[1]

De nos cinq sens, l'odorat est sans doute celui qui s'est le plus anémié chez nous, les lecteurs du superbe roman de Patrick Süskind, *Le Parfum*[2], en conviendront certainement. De nos jours, nous n'avons plus besoin de déceler un danger ou une maladie grâce à notre seul nez, ou nous en sommes incapables. De plus, l'atmosphère empuantie de nos modernes *poleis* noie toutes les odeurs dans un magma nauséabond que nous n'osons plus respirer que du bout des narines.

Que pouvons-nous donc encore sentir dans l'oeuvre d'Aristophane? Rien peut-être? Ou une odeur de pet ou de sueur qui perce la poussière des parchemins?

Un effort serait pourtant souhaitable car Aristophane avait, lui, un nez de chien de chasse, et peu d'auteurs grecs nous ont laissé un

[1] Pour les références des comédies d'Aristophane, nous utilisons ici les abréviations suivantes:
a = *Les Acharniens*
as = *Les Femmes à l'Assemblée*
c = *Les Cavaliers*
g = *Les Guêpes*
gr = *Les Grenouilles*
ly = *Lysistrata*
n = *Les Ninées*
o = *Les Oiseaux*
p = *La Paix*
pl = *Ploutos*
t = *Les Femmes aux Thesmophories*
fr = *fragment (ed. Kassel - Austin).*

[2] Cf. Süskind 1986.

TRAGEDY, COMEDY AND THE POLIS

Papers from the Greek Drama Conference

Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990

edited by
ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN
STEPHEN HALLIWELL
JEFFREY HENDERSON
BERNHARD ZIMMERMANN

LEVANTE EDITORI - BARI

Cover picture:
Paestan bell-crater. Museo Provinciale, Salerno.