

say ἐγκατερήσω θάνατον. The declaration resonates, however, both with the earlier significant scenes and themes of Euripides' own play and with profound meanings of the Heracles myth. We should require very good reasons indeed to tamper with it.⁵²

JOHN C. GIBERT

University of Colorado, Boulder

In a series of articles, A. Verbanck-Piérard has argued that "double cult" of Heracles as hero and god, often presumed to stand in a close relationship with the myth of his apotheosis, is weakly attested and open to dispute, while in Attica, at any rate, his cult is almost exclusively divine. See the summary, with bibliography, in "Héraclès l'Athénien," in *Culture et cité: L'Avènement d'Athènes à l'époque archaïque*, ed. A. Verbanck-Piérard and D. Viviers (Brussels, 1995), 103–25, esp. 118–20. (I am grateful to the anonymous referee for *CP* for the references to this author's work in this and the previous note.) This background, along with the play's overt hints at the Attic Heracles (cf. previous note) presumably affected the audience's response to the crisis Euripides crafted for his hero in some way. While I would maintain that the poet is primarily concerned with exploring the myth at a higher level of generality, I am only too aware of the difficulties involved in such a distinction and such an analysis. The notion of Heracles as *mortis victor* continued to develop, with all the variation one would expect; for examples, see C. Schneider, "Herakles der Todüberwinder," *WZLeipzig* 7 (1957–58): 661–66; J. Fitch, *Seneca's "Hercules Furens": A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Ithaca, NY, 1987), 17–18, 34–35. Incidentally, at the moment corresponding to *Her.* 1351, Seneca's Hercules says (*Her. F.* 1317) *uiuamus*. Because it does not aim to reproduce Euripides' pointed phrasing and involves significant innovations of its own, Seneca's version does not affect the decision at *Her.* 1351.

52. For their helpful criticism of this article, I would like to thank Anne Groton, David Kovacs, Christopher Shields, and the anonymous referee for *CP*.

WAS CARCINUS I A TRAGIC PLAYWRIGHT?: A RESPONSE

In an intriguing recent note in this journal, Kenneth S. Rothwell has argued that Carcinus I (*TrGF* 21) wrote not tragedies, as is generally supposed, but comedies.¹ Rothwell effectively demonstrates that very little is known of Carcinus' career. All the same, the bulk of what evidence there is still suggests that he was a tragic rather than a comic poet.

That Carcinus was a dramatic poet of some sort is clear from Aristophanes, *Pax* 792–95, where mention is made of a δῖμα belonging to him that was, allegedly, strangled during the night by a weasel.² As Rothwell (pp. 241–42) points out, however, the poet's presence in the catalogue of tragic victors at the City Dionysia at *IG II*² 2318.81 merely reflects Kirchner's adoption of a suggestion made by Lipsius, and ΚΑ[ΛΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ] (*TrGF* 38) or the name of some other, otherwise unknown poet might just as easily be restored. Nor does Strepsiades' mocking attribution of the words ἰὼ μοί μοι to "one of the δαίμονες of Carcinus" at *Ar. Nub.* 1260–61 prove anything about the genre in which the latter composed, particularly since the passage continues with what Σ^{RVENP} identifies as a quotation from a play by one of Carcinus' sons, the tragedian Xenocles (*Ar. Nub.* 1264–65 ~ *TrGF* 33 F 2).³ In support of his own thesis, Rothwell cites the claim of Σ^{RVT} *Pax* 795 that the play referred to at *Pax*

Thanks are due two anonymous referees, whose comments and criticisms substantially improved this note.

1. Kenneth S. Rothwell, "Was Carcinus I a Tragic Playwright?" *CP* 89 (1994): 241–45. Cf. Platnauer on *Pax* 791–95. The discussion that follows amounts to a commentary on the evidence set forth by Snell at *TrGF* I. 128–31 and is a defense of his position.

2. καὶ γὰρ ἔφασχ' ὁ πατήρ ὅ παρ' ἐλπίδας / εἶχε τὸ δῖμα γαλῆν τῆς ἐσπέρας ἀπάγξει.

3. Rothwell, "Carcinus," 242–43, citing Dover on *Nub.* 1261.

792–95 was called Μύεξ (*Mice*), a title that, he reasonably insists, can scarcely be attached to anything other than a comedy, and goes on to suggest that Carcinus' name could be worked into the surviving lists of victorious comic poets either at *IG* II² 2325.50 (in place of Capps' ΚΡΑΤΙ]ΝΟΣ ΠΙ) or at *IG* II² 2325.60 (in place of Capps' ΚΑ[ΝΘΑΡΟΣ]).⁴

Absolute certainty cannot be attained in a case of this sort, and it is thus not impossible that Rothwell's thesis is correct. All the same, the evidence that Carcinus I was a tragic poet is considerably more compelling than Rothwell suggests and the traditional view ought probably to be retained. The alleged title *Mice*, which is our only positive evidence that Carcinus wrote comedies, first of all, was dismissed long ago by van Leeuwen as an early commentator's invention,⁵ and while Rothwell (p. 243) insists that "this does not seem to me to be an obvious inference from the text," it is difficult to see why it should not be.⁶ Weasels are vicious and enthusiastic mousers, and Σ^{VG} *Pax* 795–96 in fact concludes a long and circumstantial account of Carcinus' supposed behavior in connection with this play (all clearly invented for the occasion) with the comment ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ γαλαῖ τοὺς μῦς νυκτὸς πνίγουσι, παρὰ τοῦτο παίζει. ⁷ Σ^{RVΓ} *Pax* 778, on the other hand, calls Carcinus a τραγωδίας ποιητής, and Rothwell's suggestion that this represents a confused deduction from the mention of Morsimus (*TrGF* 29) and Melanthius (*TrGF* 23) at *Pax* 802–3 finds no obvious support in the text. Our one bit of explicit ancient evidence for the sort of plays Carcinus wrote thus identifies him as a tragic poet, and there seems little point in trying to argue it away. A more substantial positive reason for believing that Carcinus wrote tragedies comes from our knowledge of his family and other theatrical families in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. At the end of Aristophanes' *Vespae*—a crucial passage almost completely ignored by Rothwell—Philocleon challenges any modern τραγωδοὶ who dare to face him to a dancing-contest (*V.* 1497–1500, cf. 1480–81), and it is specifically Carcinus' sons who appear onstage to compete (*V.* 1497–1511).⁸ Σ^{RVΓ} *Pax* 783 also says that Carcinus' sons were τραγικοὶ χορευταί, and (as noted above) Xenocles was

4. Rothwell, "Carcinus," 244–45. That ΚΑΡΚΙ]ΝΟΣ ought to replace ΚΡΑΤΙ]ΝΟΣ as the six-time (ΠΙ) winner in the City Dionysia named at *IG* II² 2325.50 is very unlikely, not only because the combination of the information contained in Σ κ 2344 (Cratinus won nine victories overall) and *IG* II² 2325.121 (three of those victories were at the Lenaia, leaving six for the City Dionysia) makes it almost certain that his name ought to be restored there (thus Kirchner ad loc.) but also because it is difficult to believe that no fragments would be preserved of a contemporary of Aristophanes who took first place so many times. That "[w]e have no external evidence for a victory by Cratinus in the 450s" (Rothwell, "Carcinus," 245) is beside the point, given that we have little firm evidence about the chronology of comic performances in that period at all, and *Ar. Eq.* 526–35 adequately establishes Cratinus' dominance in the "older generation" of poets before Aristophanes (cf. *Pax* 700–703). As for Cantharus, Capps' ΚΑ[ΝΘΑΡΟΣ at *IG* II² 2325.60 would seem to be confirmed by Oellacher's ΚΑΝΘΑΡΟΣ ΕΑ[ΙΔΑΣΚΕ for 422 B.C. at *IG* II² 2318.115 (= Canthar. test. *2 K.-A.), which Rothwell ignores. Cf. Paul Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, Philologische Untersuchungen Heft 30 (Berlin, 1925), 2, 6–7.

5. J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Pax* (Leiden, 1906) on 793–96: "Vesani hominis notula δρᾶμα ἐποίησε τοὺς Μύεξ non est digna quae refellatur, nedum in commentarios recipiatur."

6. For the phenomenon, see Stephen Halliwell, "Ancient Interpretations of ὀνομαστί κωμῳδεῖν in Aristophanes," *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984): 83–87.

7. Aristophanes' joke about the weasel's murder of Carcinus' play must accordingly mean only that it disappeared abruptly when his back was turned, perhaps with the implication that it never existed at all; cf. Sommerstein on *Pax* 792–96. For the quasi-proverbial thievishness of the weasel, a common house-pet (*Arist. HA* 609b28–30), cf. *Ar. V.* 363–64; *Pax* 1150–52; *Th.* 558–59; *Plu. Mor.* 519d; Otto Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt* (Leipzig, 1909), 164–71.

8. For the meaning of the term τραγωδός (here "performer in a tragedy") in the fifth century, see Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*³, revised by John Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford, 1988), 127–29. For Carcinus' family, see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971), 283–85; MacDowell on *V.* 1501.

a tragic playwright.⁹ As Sutton has shown, the professions of tragic and comic poet appear to have run in certain Athenian families in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.¹⁰ Thus Aeschylus' sons Euphorion (*TrGF* 12) and Euaeon (*TrGF* 13), as well as his nephew Philocles (*TrGF* 24), his great-nephew Morsimus (*TrGF* 29), and Morsimus' son Astydamos I (*TrGF* 59) and grandson Astydamos II (*TrGF* 60),¹¹ were tragic poets, as were Phrynichus' (*TrGF* 3) son Polyphresmon (*TrGF* 7), Pratinas' (*TrGF* 4) son Aristias (*TrGF* 9), Sophocles' son Iophon (*TrGF* 22) and grandson Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62), and Euripides' nephew Euripides II (*TrGF* 17). So too among the comic poets, Aristophanes' sons Philippus, Nicostratus, and Ararus all wrote comedies in their own right (Ar. test. 1 K.-A.; Arar. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 3737), as did Alexis' nephew Menander and his son Stephanus (Alex. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 1138),¹² while Hermippus and Myrtilus were brothers (Hermipp. test. 1a-b K.-A. = S ε 3044, μ 1460), and Damon was the father of Philemon I (Philem. test. 1 K.-A. = S φ 327) and grandfather of Philemon Junior (Philem. Jun. test. 1 K.-A. = S φ 329). Tragedians nowhere sire authors of comedies or vice versa, however, and while this cannot be treated as an absolute social law, the pattern is clear enough to deserve serious consideration in the case of Carcinus I: if Xenocles was a tragic poet, so too, most likely, was his father, particularly since the brothers as a group were well-known tragic dancers.

Rothwell's basic point, that we know very little about the career of Carcinus I, is thus well taken. The evidence as a whole nonetheless still supports the conclusion that he was a tragic rather than a comic poet.¹³

S. DOUGLAS OLSON
Center for Hellenic Studies,
Washington, D.C.

9. The tragedian Carcinus II (*TrGF* 70) is probably the son of Xenocles and thus another member of the family. I follow J. van Leeuwen, "Quaestiones ad Historiam Scenican Pertinentes," *Mnemosyne* II.16 (1888): 435-38, in believing that Xenocles I is the mysterious Datis (*TrGF* 34) whom Σ^{RV} *Pax* 289 calls a υἱὸς Καρκίνου.

10. Dana Ferrin Sutton, "The Theatrical Families of Athens," *AJP* 108 (1987): 9-26, with the additions and corrections of Niall W. Slater, "Aristophanes' Apprenticeship Again," *GRBS* 30 (1989): p. 80, n. 25.

11. Ar. *Pax* 802-8 can be interpreted to mean that Morsimus and Melanthius (*TrGF* 23) were brothers, in which case Melanthius would also belong to the family of Aeschylus. If they were not brothers and if Melanthius' brother (*Pax* 807-8) is instead another, unidentified tragedian, we have evidence for an additional fifth-century family containing several tragic poets.

12. Alternatively, Stephanus is said to be the son of the comic poet Antiphanes (Alex. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 2735).

13. The remote possibility that Diogenes Laertius' claim that Polycritus Mendaus thought Carcinus II a comic poet (D.L. 2.63 = *FGrH* 559 F 1) reflects confusion with Carcinus I (thus Rothwell, "Carcinus," 244) can certainly not be taken to outweigh the evidence outlined above. Rothwell also notes (p. 244) that S κ 394, 396 never says unambiguously that Carcinus I was a tragic poet, but the more important point is that the *Suda* never hints at any connection between Carcinus or any of his namesakes and comedy.

OVID'S ELEGY ON TIBULLUS AND ITS MODELS

Readers of *Amores* 3.9, the elegy on the death of Tibullus, have long noticed how Ovid recalls Tibullus' apprehensions of his own death (especially in Tibullus 1.3) and reshapes them in light of their fulfillment, pointing up the conceit with verbal