

might imagine, for example, that Aigisthos finally enters the palace, with much trepidation, only to emerge, in a comic *paraprosdokian*, with Orestes, arm in arm, perhaps sharing a drink of wine.

In a later chapter of his book, entitled 'Paratragedy and paraiconography', Taplin usefully surveys and defines the various possible relationships of comic scenes in vase-painting to their theatrical prototypes. As he shows, some scenes reflect comic performance while others depend for their humour more on a knowledge of the earlier iconographical tradition of epic and tragic material.<sup>16</sup> When a painted scene is making fun of a serious heroic theme, it may be derived from a comedy in which this was the case (a 'paratragedy' in Taplin's terms),<sup>17</sup> but it may in addition travesty a well-known visual formula, such as Neoptolemos slaying Priam on the altar at Troy.<sup>18</sup>

If our interpretation of the New York krater is correct, then it will most likely have been inspired not by Aristophanes or another poet of Old Comedy, but rather by a Middle Comedy of the following generation. As H.-G. Nesselrath has recently demonstrated in detail, this was the heyday of parodies of traditional myths, including those earlier dramatized in tragedy, and especially the first two decades of Middle Comedy, ca. 400-380, the same years to which our vase belongs.<sup>19</sup> Though, as noted above, no play parodying the *Choephoroi* is specifically attested, other preserved titles suggesting an interest in related material include a *Thyestes* by Diokles and a *Eumenides* by the Old Comic poet Kratinos, who seems to be the main precursor of the Middle Comedy taste for travesties of myth.<sup>20</sup> The two principal characteristics of such parodies are the rationalization of supernatural elements in the myth and the presentation of mythological situations in terms of institutions drawn from contemporary Athenian life.<sup>21</sup> The latter could apply to the agon on our vase, construed as a political or legal debate.

Aeschylus' *Oresteia* was well known to audiences in Magna Graecia, to judge from the many scenes drawn from it in South Italian vase-painting (more than in Attic).<sup>22</sup> There is also some evidence that Sophokles' *Elektra* was known, since on a Lucanian krater, Orestes and Pylades are shown bringing Elektra the urn supposedly containing the ashes of Orestes (*Elektra* 1113-25).<sup>23</sup> The scene at the tomb of Agamemnon was popular enough to be parodied on an Apulian vase (now only a fragment) with an ugly Elektra at the tomb.<sup>24</sup> If any comedy, then, were a good choice for revival in Magna

Graecia, it would be one that burlesqued the well-known and much-loved *Oresteia* myth. The closest we may come to a suitable candidate in our sources is the *Orestes* of Alexis, but his career began only in the 350's, a generation too late to be associated with our vase.<sup>25</sup>

If the scene on the New York vase is indeed based on a Middle Comedy of the kind known to Aristotle, then it lends as much support to Taplin's thesis of the 'Athenianness' of phlyax vases as his own, rather more convoluted interpretation. It also gives us valuable new evidence for what was obviously a favourite device of Middle Comedy, viz. 'paratragedy', but one which is all too seldom represented in the surviving fragments.<sup>26</sup>

H.A. SHAPIRO

University of Canterbury  
Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>25</sup> For the suggestion of Meineke that the *Orestes* of Alexis did have a happy ending like the one referred to by Aristotle see G.F. Else, *Aristotle's Poetics: the argument* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957) 405, n. 145. On the chronology of Alexis see W.G. Amott, 'The Suda on Alexis', in *Studi di filologia classica in honore di Giusto Monaco* I (Palermo, n.d.) 327-38.

<sup>26</sup> I wish to thank A.L. Boegehold for discussing my interpretation of this vase and making several valuable suggestions; the Editor and referees of the *Journal*, who do not accept all my arguments, for their advice; and Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman for the photograph reproduced here. After this paper was completed, further discussions of the New York krater appeared in the exhibition catalogue of the Fleischman Collection: *A passion for antiquities: ancient art from the collection of Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman* (Malibu 1994). Trendall, in his entry on the vase (p. 128), briefly anticipates the interpretation offered here, while Taplin (pp. 23-25) reiterates his earlier view. I am grateful to K. Hamma for sending me the relevant portions of the catalogue. I have not been able to consult the recent discussion of the vase by M. Schmidt, in *Vitae mimus* (Incontri del Dipartimento di Scienze dell' Antichità dell' Università di Pavia vi [1993] 37-38).

#### Eyeless in Argos; a reading of *Agamemnon* 416-19

πόθωι δ' ὑπερποντίας  
φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν·  
εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν  
ἐχθετα χάρις ἀνδρῖ,  
ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις  
ἔρπει πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτα.

In the first stasimon of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the estranged Helen and Menelaus share the second strophe. Beginning with an account of Helen's departure from Argos and her arrival in Troy, the chorus shifts its focus, moving back to the city deserted by the Queen, and to Menelaus grieving in the palace. With Helen no longer there, and Menelaus prey to the *pothos* that her absence inspires, 'a *phasma* shall seem to rule the house. And the charm of beautiful *kolossoi* is hateful to the husband, and in the absence of eyes, gone is all Aphrodite' (415-19). The difficulties of the stanza are legion. Lines 412-13 pose textual problems that have never been resolved, while the conclusion of the strophe presents three fresh riddles: what is the nature of the *kolossoi*, what is their relevance to Menelaus and his bride, and how should the

<sup>16</sup> Taplin 79-83.

<sup>17</sup> This is best illustrated in his (and E. Csapo's) interpretation of an Apulian bell-krater in Würzburg showing the scene in the *Thesmophoriazousai* that parodies the *Telephos* of Euripides. See Taplin pl. 11.4 and pp. 36-40, with references to early discussions of the vase.

<sup>18</sup> Apulian bell-krater, Berlin F 3045; Taplin 82, pl. 18.19.

<sup>19</sup> Nesselrath (n. 6) 188-241. On parody of tragedy as a feature of early fourth century comedy see also T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in later Greek comedy* (Manchester 1953) 17-19.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid* 203 with n. 68; 204 with n. 83.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid* 236.

<sup>22</sup> See Kossatz-Deissmann (n. 11) 89-117.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*. 97, n. 546; A.D. Trendall, *The Red-figured vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily* (Oxford 1967) 650, pl. 63, 1.

<sup>24</sup> Basel, Collection of Herbert Cahn 223; Taplin pl. 20.21.

missing eyes be understood? My concern here lies chiefly with the enigmatic *kolossoi*, and with their relationship to the neighbouring elements in the verse; drawing on some fifth century views of the powers and properties of statues, and on rituals surrounding sculpted images, I wish to propose a reading that can match the themes of the choral song with the religious and artistic character of ancient *kolossoi*.

Commentaries on Aeschylus' drama seek to explain the passage in the terms supplied by two competing views of Greek *kolossoi*. The first approach originates in the work of Emile Benveniste and Charles Picard, who argue that Aeschylus has chosen his expression with something quite specific in mind. Gathering archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence, both scholars propose that the pre-Greek term *kolossos* was originally applied to statues that fulfilled a ritual function quite distinct from that of the *bretas*, the *xoanon* or the *agalma*.<sup>1</sup> Acting as a 'replacement figurine', the *kolossos* could reproduce or 're-present' an absent or dead individual. Among the authors' principal evidence is the curious rite detailed in a sacred law from Cyrene and preserved in the abridged version of an early third-century redactor; here a householder finds his home troubled by a stranger sent by someone who 'has died in the land or perished elsewhere'; the text advises him to fashion male and female *kolossoi* out of wood or mud, to entertain the statuettes to a ritual meal, and then to deposit them in uncultivated ground (*SEG* ix 72.111-21).<sup>2</sup> Herodotus' references to the *kolossoi* he comes upon in Egypt supply additional proof; these statues are, in keeping with the funerary practices of the land, treated as the doubles of the individuals portrayed, still imbued with a semblance of life (ii 130,143). The *kolossos* may thus be defined as the 'double du mort', the 'fantôme d'outre-tombe', a talismanic or fetishistic equivalent which can stand in for the absent party and maintain communication between the living and the dead.<sup>3</sup> Benveniste and Picard apply the same 'logic' to

the statues that Aeschylus places in the stasimon; by having an image made, the bereaved Menelaus can evoke the presence of the missing loved one, following the strategy also proposed and, in one instance, adopted by Admetus and Laodamia.<sup>4</sup> This reading allows Picard to translate *Agamemnon* 416 'le charme des effigies qui remplacent [Hélène] est odieux à l'époux'.

The explanation not only suits the particular plight of Menelaus longing for his absent bride, but also groups the statues together with the other phenomena that populate the stasimon. As Jean-Pierre Vernant has argued on the basis of the accounts of Benveniste and Picard, if the *kolossoi* function as doubles for the absent Helen, then they closely cohere with the other manifestations described in this portion of the song, the *phasma* and the dream visions that the antistrophe will introduce; all belong to what he styles the 'psychological category of the double', and all serve as expressions of Helen's paradoxical 'absence in presence'.<sup>5</sup>

But for all the neatness of this line of interpretation, it raises as many difficulties as it resolves. First, more recent scholarship suggests a different reading of the sacred law from Cyrene. If the statues' function is to double for the stranger, then they serve not to recall or replace him, but rather to expel a revenant or ghost which this unknown assailant has dispatched to trouble the householder;<sup>6</sup> the individual that visits the home is none other than an evil spirit conjured up by spells, and through the creation of the *kolossoi*, the Cyrenean appeases the sender of the apparition, ridding himself of

<sup>1</sup> E. Benveniste, 'Le sens du mot *kolossos* et les noms grecs de la statue', *RPh* lviii (1932) 118-35 and C. Picard, 'Le cénotaphe de Ménéas et les "colosses" de Ménéas', *RPh* lix (1933) 343-54. Both authors treat many of the same sources (including two inscriptions from Cyrene, *SEG* ix 72 and ix 3, the *kolossoi* in Hdt. ii 130 and 143, and Aesch. *Ag.* 416); Picard also adds the evidence of the menhir-statues discovered at Midea (Dendra). In his commentary (Oxford 1950) Fraenkel *ad loc.* does not see any particular significance to the expression, and thinks that we should have in mind ordinary statues like those of the Attic *korai*. He expressly denies any analogy between the statues here and the use of the motif in the stories of Protesilaus and Laodamia (where the effigy does explicitly function as a substitute for the dead husband) and of Admetus in Euripides' *Alkestis*, where the husband proposes to replace his dead wife with a statue (348-52). J. Ducat, 'Fonctions de la statue dans la Grèce archaïque: *Kouros* et *Kolossos*', *BCH* c (1976) 249 returns to Fraenkel's view, arguing that the statues should be imagined as *korai*. But according to his argument, *korai* could operate as ritual substitutes: the function of both *kouroi* and *korai* is to serve as a 'stand in' for a god or individual.

<sup>2</sup> For a translation and commentary, see R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford 1983) 332-51 and C. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan horses* (New York, Oxford 1992) 81-4.

<sup>3</sup> The expression 'double du mort' belongs to Benveniste (n. 1) 133, the 'fantôme' to Picard (n. 1) 351.

<sup>4</sup> Eur. *Alc.* 348-52, Apollod. *Bibl.* iii 30. Note too Hdt. vii 69.2 where Darius has a statue made of his favourite wife (although the text does not specify whether she is alive or dead). In equating the images of Helen with those that figure in other myths of loss and bereavement, commentators have failed to notice an important distinction. Far from providing solace for Menelaus' longing, the *kolossoi* merely aggravate his sense of loss, their *charis* provoking hostility on the prince's part (417). By contrast, Laodamia's statue of Protesilaus seems to satisfy the Queen until her father's intervention (for the most complete accounts of the story see Apollod. *Bibl.* iii 30, Hyginus *Fab.* 103 and Ovid *Her.* 13). Admetus acknowledges the 'cold comfort' (Eur. *Alc.* 353) his wife's statue will bring him after Alcestis' death, but there is no suggestion of the hostility ἔχθρα that Menelaus feels. Pausanias ix 40.3-4 relates a story about an image of Aphrodite on Delos which offers some suggestive parallels. According to the author, Ariadne got the statue from Daedalus and took it with her when she followed Theseus: 'Bereft of Ariadne, say the Delians, Theseus dedicated the wooden image of the goddess to the Delian Apollo, lest by taking it home he should be dragged into remembering Ariadne, and so find the grief for his love ever renewed'. The image made by Daedalus—to whose statues I will be returning later on—exhibits precisely those love-renewing powers that seem absent from the *kolossoi*.

<sup>5</sup> See J.-P. Vernant, *Myth and thought among the Greeks* (London 1983) 305-20 and *Figures, idoles, masques* (Paris 1990) 25-7. His reading of the *kolossoi* and their place in the stasimon is that adopted by Bollack in his commentary (Lille 1981). As Vernant points out, the category of the double is one in which Helen has an obvious place: Aeschylus would have known the version of the myth that told of the Queen and her *eidōlon* that went to Troy in the place of the living woman. We should however observe Fraenkel's caution *ad* 415: 'The question so often raised .... whether Aeschylus had Stesichorus' *eidōlon* of Helen in his mind here, can hardly be answered'.

<sup>6</sup> Faraone (n. 2) 83-4 with the relevant bibliography.

a troublesome demon that haunts his home. Later Greek sources offer several other instances of the use of statues in such ghost-banning rituals; the Spartans succeeded in laying to rest the unquiet ghost of their general Pausanias when they followed the injunctions of the Delphic oracle, and erected statues of the deceased on the site of the temple where he starved to death (Plut. *Mor.* 560e-f; Themist. *Ep.* 5.15; cf Paus. ix 38.5). Although the combination of the *phasma* and the *kolossoi* in Aeschylus' song is an intriguing one (particularly with its evocation of a singular ghost and plural statues as in both the Spartan and Cyrenean examples), a ghost-expelling ritual cannot be the scenario that the chorus has in mind; there is no mistaking Menelaus' desire to recall the missing Queen, to replace the phantom with the living bride.

The misinterpretation of the Cyrenean law forms a piece with the broader weakness that undermines the account offered by Benveniste and Picard. The specific magico-ritual context that they assign to the *kolossoi* exists in only a few applications of the term, and elsewhere the sources introduce the expression less to characterize the particular function of the statues than to draw attention to their form. It is the distinctive appearance of a *kolossos* that supplies the basis for the second widely cited account of the effigies. According to the analysis first developed by Georges Roux, 'un *kolossos* désignait une statue aux jambes étroitement collées, sinon remplacées par un simple pilier, une statue figée d'allure archaïque ou archaïsante'.<sup>7</sup> But if Roux convincingly demonstrates that this rigid, columnar configuration distinguished many (if not all) of the *kolossoi* mentioned by the ancient sources,<sup>8</sup> he falls short of accounting for their presence in Aeschylus' verse. Suggesting that the chorus must be alluding to the herms that stand outside the palace doors—figures which represent metonymically for Menelaus all the charm that the house with his bride inside once held—he both imports into the verses extraneous figurines which carry scant thematic weight elsewhere in the drama, and ignores the convincing parallels observed by Vernant between the statues and other manifestations cited in the song.<sup>9</sup>

By modifying and building on these existing accounts, I want to offer a new response to the question of Aeschylus' introduction of the statues here. The disparate examples of *kolossoi* scattered through the ancient sources suggest that the meaning of the term is most probably a flexible one, and depends on its particular context and setting; on some occasions it may carry a

ritual charge, and serve to describe images deployed in funerary as well as ghost-banning rituals; on others the statue's morphology may dictate the use of the expression. So rather than assigning a single definition to a *kolossos*, and then seeking some corresponding object in Aeschylus' drama, we might begin with the particular motifs and concerns articulated in the choral song, and allow these to determine the reasons behind the dramatist's unusual choice of term. What will emerge is a close but unremarked coincidence between the properties of *kolossoi* identified in earlier discussions and the thematic material presented in the strophe and antistrophe; the attributes of this statue type, I will suggest, are precisely those that can best illuminate the situation of Helen and Menelaus, and sharpen the portrait of affairs in Argos fashioned in the song. In moving from the contents of the strophe and antistrophe to an interpretation of the *kolossoi*, I want to revise the earlier readings on a second count. Where previous commentators have sought to equate Helen with the statues, to discover ways in which the images can double for the Queen, I will focus on difference and unlikeness: the singers highlight precisely those areas where Helen and the statues most sharply diverge, which distance the living woman from the sculpted blocks. The symbolic function of the *kolossoi* is thus not to supply analogues, but foils for the missing bride, and it is dissonance, not similarity that structures their relationship to Helen.

#### MOTION AND IMMOBILITY

The first of the two properties which create this radical asymmetry between the statues and the Queen appears in the opening phrase of the strophe.<sup>10</sup> At the beginning of the verse, the singers remember Helen as she traveled from Greece to Troy. In their visualization of the Queen, she is nothing if not mobile: βεβάκει ῥίμφο διὰ πυλᾶν (407-8). The vocabulary of this and the preceding lines conveys a sense of a rapid and unencumbered passage. Helen slips lightly away in the liquid-sounding λιπούσα, and leaves behind to Argos the onomatopoeic and rhyming heaviness of the war preparations (ἀσπίστορας κλόνους λοχισμούς τε καὶ ναυβάτας ὀπλισμούς).<sup>11</sup> The term βεβάκει catches the

<sup>10</sup> The categories of the mobile and immobile, as well as those of sight and blindness, which I will also treat, play an important part in Vernant's discussion of *kolossoi* and other manifestations of the 'double' (see n. 5), and my treatment of these themes draws on his arguments. The account in F. Frontisi-Ducroux, *Dédale: mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1975) 104-11 also follows Vernant's general approach, while locating the issue of sight and mobility within the traditions surrounding the sculptor Daedalus. While referring to the *kolossoi* of the *Agamemnon*, neither author suggests the precise connections between Helen, Menelaus and the statues that I will propose.

<sup>11</sup> Note Plato *Crat.* 427 B and Socrates' discussion of the letter 'I', expressive of 'smoothness' and 'liquidity'. Euripides' *Helen* which, as Christian Wolff points out to me, can be read as a commentary on the ideas introduced in the second strophe and antistrophe of the first stasimon, supplies a very similar account of the Queen's departure, even echoing the term λιπούσα and focusing on Helen's 'delicate foot' (1526-29). On some other links between the two plays, see C. Wolff, 'On Euripides' *Helen*', *HSCP* lxxvii (1973) 78.

<sup>7</sup> G. Roux, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un *κολοσσός*?' *REA* lxii (1960) 34.

<sup>8</sup> However, this account fails to take into consideration three bronze *kolossoi* cited by Herodotus at iv 152; these are kneeling figures which support a large bronze vessel.

<sup>9</sup> Divine effigies do appear elsewhere in the play (519-20, 1081), but there is no suggestion of any parallels between the *kolossoi* and these other statues. For another assessment of the relative merits of the two theories, see the judicious remarks by Ducat (n. 1) 246 ff. Despite a critique of Roux, he nonetheless concludes that the earlier 'ritual substitute' idea cannot be applied in many cases where the term *kolossos* is used. His own equitable solution is to acknowledge that the expression could include several meanings, and could carry a different weight in different situations. Note too A.A. Donohue, *Xoana and the origins of Greek sculpture* (Atlanta 1988) 27 n. 65.

rapid movement of the Queen: Helen is before the audience's eyes and then quite gone. Her smooth passage seems all the more remarkable for the heavy burden that she carries, destruction in the place of bridal gifts. The portrait merely reconfirms the quality already attributed to Helen in the preceding stanza where the chorus imagined her new lover, Paris, in the likeness of a boy in vain pursuit of a flying bird (394).<sup>12</sup>

The remainder of the strophe and antistrophe develops the theme of motion that cannot be arrested or restrained. The presence of the ghost is a mere seeming, δόξει (415), and phantoms were notorious for their sudden appearances and no less rapid flight.<sup>13</sup> Line 419, describing the departure of Aphrodite, circles back to the leavetaking of the Queen. The term ἔρρει has all the swiftness of the earlier ῥίμφα and βεβάκει, and the parallel between mortal and goddess reinforces the hint of some element of the supernatural already present in Helen's too easy disappearance;<sup>14</sup> Eduard Fraenkel cites Wackemagel's observation that the adverb ῥίμφα applied to the Queen combines the meanings of ταχέως, ῥοδίως and εὐχερῶς and comments 'Helen walks away with divinely untroubled swiftness, like Artemis in Pindar's dithyramb for the Thebans (*POxy.* xiii 1604)'.<sup>15</sup> When Helen returns to Menelaus in the form of elusive night time visions or δόξαι (421), a fleeting evanescence again defines the apparitions. Lines 424-25 occupy the same metrical unit as lines 407-8, and echo several of the earlier terms: παραλλάξασα διὰ χερῶν βέβακεν ὄντις. In place of the living Helen who flits overseas, her visionary double now glides through Menelaus' extended hands. The scene previously played out at the city gates repeats itself in the intimacy of the home where the deserted husband sleeps dreaming of his wife.

Interspersed among these evocations of elusive and delusive motion, Aeschylus places reminders of the stillness and immobility that afflict others in the song. Although the condition of lines 412-13 makes any thematic reading highly speculative, some suggestions may be offered. The middle portion of the strophe introduces the figure of Menelaus who appears exactly equivoiced between the departure of Helen and Aphrodite's matching flight, but stays confined within the home. Line 411 holds together the husband and wife for a brief moment as Helen approaches the bed of her hus-

band with her loving tread (στίβοι φιλόνορες). But the chorus' words have already given the lie to this account. Helen is no bride of convention who moves towards the interior of the house to remain within the domestic space; instead she reverses the direction of her steps, abandoning the innermost chamber for the world beyond the city gates and a second union overseas. If Dindorf's conjecture ὀφημένων is sound, then it is Menelaus who assumes the pose of the wife, seated immobile inside doors, preserving the silence that is the customary portion of the woman.<sup>16</sup> The antistrophe will confirm the inversion of proper gender roles implicit in this visualization; there the chorus describes the plight of the mourning women left behind in their homes at Argos, waiting for husbands who also went to Troy. Their vigil receives no better recompense than that of Menelaus; if the entrances of the ghost and dream visions into the palace are the counternotes to the departure of the Queen, then the ash-filled urns are the women's corresponding return (435-36).<sup>17</sup>

Within this complex of motion and stillness, the riddling *kolossoi* appear. The dichotomy between the immobile statue and the fleet-of-foot is a commonplace in Greek verse of the archaic and classical period: when a poet chose to call attention to the powers of mobility invested in a particularly swift subject, he frequently evoked a pillar or sculpted image by way of negative paradigm or foil. The clearest evocation of the conceit belongs to Pindar's fifth *Nemean* where the poet declares himself no maker of idling *agalмата* which stand rooted to their pedestals, but a craftsman of a moving, sounding song which can step on board ship and travel abroad to herald the victor's triumph far and wide (1-5). The well-known epigram on Myron's statue of the victorious runner Ladas celebrates the paradox of an image so imbued with life (ἐμπνοος) that it seems about to take flight, while the viewer knows that the once swift athlete before his eyes is now lastingly fixed to his base (*Anthol. Planud.* 54, 54a).<sup>18</sup> Myth observes the same logic when it describes the petrification of supernaturally swift objects, whether the ship of the Phaeacians or the Teumessian fox, which stand as lasting monuments that both commemorate and negate

<sup>12</sup> Vernant (*Figures*, n. 5) 26 notes the symmetry between the situations of Paris and Menelaus, the one seeking to catch the bird, the other trying to keep the dream vision in his hands.

<sup>13</sup> See Paus. ix 38.5 for the problems in arresting the motion of a ghost.

<sup>14</sup> Of course, in myth and cult representations, Helen ranks at least as a demi-goddess, and the suggestion of her daemonic and supernatural nature is one that Aeschylus will develop in the second stasimon (see Fraenkel *ad* 749).

<sup>15</sup> The same ease of passage is expressed again in the second stasimon (691-92). Translations of line 419 regularly replace the name of the goddess with a periphrasis, rendering the term Aphrodite as the power or passion of love. But we can allow the goddess a more immediate role here; Aeschylus had no need to remind his audience of the intimate connection between Aphrodite and Helen, and of the goddess' role in prompting the flight to Troy (cf. *Il.* iii 399-401 and Eur. *Hel.* 238-39, 681, 882, 1099-110). In abandoning the house deserted by the bride, Aphrodite reenacts the departure of her protégée.

<sup>16</sup> This anomalous marriage, in which the wife is the one who used to visit her husband's chamber, and now has left the home, echoes the distorted marital relations that persist throughout the drama. The term δόμων ἀνάσσειν used to describe the role of the *phasma* in line 415, also calls to mind the position of Helen's sister, Clytemnestra, who has become the effective ruler of the house in the absence of Agamemnon.

<sup>17</sup> The language of the verses suggests two additional parallels between the sufferings of Menelaus and the experience of the grieving wives. The cardinal feature of the dream visions is their lack of substance, their intangibility. A corresponding weightlessness and evanescence belongs to the ashes of the dead soldiers. In the next strophe the chorus will complete the analogy when it portrays the ash-carrying urns too easily stowed on board ship (444). The term εἰμορφοί supplies the second link; just as the images of Helen are fair in form, so too are the corpses of the Greeks who died at Troy (454). The second use of the adjective retroactively emphasizes the distance between the living Helen and the statues which, I will be arguing, symbolize an inanimate condition.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Il.* xvii 434-39 where the supernatural swift horses of Achilles are compared to a grave stone as they stand suddenly immobile in their grief for the death of Patroclus.

the chief attribute of their owners.<sup>19</sup> Motion appears the more remarkable when juxtaposed with the quintessentially rooted stone.

But Aeschylus has not only included a traditional conceit in his choral song; instead he has refined and reinforced the topos by his choice of a distinctive kind of representation, the *kolossos*. All interpretations of the expression acknowledge the fixed and immobile character peculiar to this statue type. Benveniste suggests that its etymology contains the notion of 'une chose érigée, image dressée', parallel to the Latin *statua*;<sup>20</sup> Roux's analysis concludes that every *kolossos* described in the sources exhibits this upright and rigid character: the statue is a block of stone, its legs barely differentiated or encased in a constricting garment which prohibits motion.<sup>21</sup> At least one ancient source corroborates the modern view: according to a disputed reading, the lexicographer Hesychius glosses the term *kolossoi* with the expression ἄβαντες, 'those that do not walk'.<sup>22</sup>

Ritual behaviour seems also to have respected the rootedness of the stone. According to cult practice, a *bretas* or a *xoanon* regularly moves about, carried in the arms of the presiding priests and priestesses, transported in a wagon, escorted in procession from one site to another, taken to be bathed in the sea.<sup>23</sup> But once the *kolossos* has been placed in its proper location, whether in the tomb or sanctuary or uncultivated ground, it remains there for all time. According to the sacred law from Cyrene, the householder first treats the figurines to food and drink, and then takes them to a wood where they will stay planted in the earth; so too Herodotus notes that the Egyptian *kolossoi* he hears of are enclosed in a burial chamber (ii 130). The myths and legends that the Greeks wove around their statues can offer matching evidence; although *xoana* and *agalмата* are repeatedly credited with the ability to leave their stations and walk about, no *kolossos* displays analogous powers.<sup>24</sup>

If absence of motion is a cardinal feature of this statue type in art and cult, then one reason for the chorus' particular choice of term stands clear. What better to serve as

a foil to the departing Queen than a figure without limbs, incapable of leaving the site where it is raised? By presenting the polar opposite to the fugitive in the shape of the fixed statue, the chorus has underscored the problematic mobility that Helen possesses both here and elsewhere in the drama (*cf.* 740). The *kolossoi* act not as equivalents for the Queen, but as contrasting representations, stripped of the quality which Helen most prominently displays.

#### BLINDNESS AND SIGHT

Through the evocation of the *kolossoi*, the chorus rounds out a second concern developed in this portion of its song. With the departure of the Queen, a phantasmagoric and numbing atmosphere has overwhelmed Menelaus and his home. In place of a living being, a *phasma* now appears to rule and the delusionary dream visions of the antistrophe will seem as potent as waking reality. The strophe's closing remark—'in the lack of eyes, gone is all Aphrodite' (418)—offers an expression of the sensation of absence or vacancy that surrounds those left behind.<sup>25</sup> The phrase, I will suggest, not only introduces a fresh polarity between Helen and the *kolossoi*, emphasizing anew the incapacity of the statues to replace the faithless Queen, but succinctly signals the lifelessness that afflicts Menelaus and his palace.

My interpretation of the missing eyes depends on the assumption that the statues are the primary referent here. But as the contentious arguments advanced in commentaries on the line reveal, this reading is only one of several possibilities.<sup>26</sup> The uncertainty surrounding the owner of the *ommata* suggests that perhaps the ambiguity of structure and syntax in the phrase might be deliberate, and that the point may be less to assign the features to a single subject than to observe the relevance of the categories of sight and blindness to the dynamic uniting the several parties in the strophe. Just as the motionlessness implicit in the *kolossoi* allowed the chorus

<sup>19</sup> For petrification as the response to mobility, see the material gathered in P.M.C. Forbes Irving, *Metamorphosis in Greek myths* (Oxford 1992) 145-46.

<sup>20</sup> Benveniste (n. 1) 124. For additional discussion, see Vernant (*Myth and thought*, n. 5) 305.

<sup>21</sup> Roux (n. 7).

<sup>22</sup> Here I follow Roux (n. 7) 36 where he proposes replacing ἀλιβαντες with ἄβαντες.

<sup>23</sup> As noted by Vernant (*Myth and thought*, n. 5) 305. Witness the *bretas* of the goddess escorted in procession for its ritual washing in the sea in Eur. *IT*. 1199, the *agalma* of Hera that is mounted on a bullock wagon as part of the Daedala (Paus. ix 3.5-9), and the annual journey to a shrine on the road to Eleutheria performed by Dionysus Eleuthereus on the occasion of the City Dionysia. The cleaning and bathing of statues in cult, treated by Parker (n. 2) 27-8, would also involve such regular excursions. Frontisi-Ducroux (n. 10) 105 and Vernant (*Myth and thought*, n. 5) 315 n. 4 cite several other examples of *xoana* and a *bretas* which are held or carried or otherwise endowed with motion.

<sup>24</sup> *Xoana* and *agalματα* are the terms repeatedly used in the sources for the 'walking' statues of Daedalus, and for images that are bound with chains so as to prevent them from running away (e.g., Eur. *fr.* 372 N<sup>2</sup>, Paus. iii 15.7, viii 41.6, ix 38.5). For a rich collection of such stories concerning *xoana*, see the testimonia gathered in Donohue (n. 9).

<sup>25</sup> The term ἀχηνία, which I translate as 'absence', is itself a problematic one. It is glossed in the lexicographers with ἀπορία and πένια, and commentators cite *Cho.* 301 and Ar. *fr.* 20 K where it can be translated as a 'lack, want'. It should also be noted that the term ὄμμα can mean 'sight' as well as 'eye', and that both meanings are equally relevant in this context.

<sup>26</sup> Those who understand Helen as the rightful owner of the organs argue that since a ray from the eyes of the beloved was thought to implant passion in the lover, then, in the absence of the departed Helen's gaze, all love is gone (for the association between love and the eyes, *cf.* Emped. 31 B 95 DK, Theoc. 13.37. For a collection of other pertinent passages, see A.C. Pearson, *CR* xxiii [1909] 256, Barrett *ad Eur. Hipp.* 525-26 and West's note *ad Hes. Theog.* 910 where love, *charis* and the eyes are closely intertwined). Fraenkel—understanding ὀμμάτων as a subjective genitive governed by ἀχηνία, and translating the expression 'when the eyes are starved'—proposes that Menelaus is the owner of the empty eyes, starved with longing for the sight of Helen. But, as Denniston and Page (Oxford 1957) point out *ad loc.*, the structure and the syntax of the phrase—most particularly the problem of reading ὀμμάτων as a subjective rather than objective genitive, and the plural ἀχηνίαται that seems to refer to the plurality of the statues—argue for understanding the statues as the subject of the chorus' comment. Thomson (Amsterdam 1966) in a useful note *ad loc.* also suggests that the eyes belong to the *kolossoi*, while Bollack adopts a modified version of Fraenkel's reading.

to establish a dense network of relations between Helen, Menelaus and the statues, so too their eyelessness generates fresh likenesses and contrasts between the protagonists. The inability of the blind statues to stimulate passion on the part of the beholder recalls Helen's fatal ability to do precisely that, and in the second stasimon of the drama the chorus will elaborate on its brief allusion here, describing the Queen's eyes that emit a heart-stinging dart (742-43). Menelaus, by contrast, finds his own powers of vision altered and impaired; deprived of the sight of Helen, he perceives only the illusory ghost and dream visions populating his home.<sup>27</sup> Once again the *kolossoi* have offered a heightened representation of the condition of the prince, and a foil to the attributes of the Queen.

The distinction between the blind and the sighted would carry additional associations for a Greek audience. As numerous phrases in the sources attest, the ability to see forms a critical part of what it means to be alive; to live and to look on the light of the sun are one and the same, and to be dead is to inhabit the darkness of the realm of Hades, whose name ancient commentators gloss as the invisible or 'unseeing' (ἀ-ἰδής) one, and who regularly robs his victims of their sight.<sup>28</sup> Both Menelaus with his eyes empty of Helen, and the statues with their featureless faces, belong in this company of the sightless dead, while the absent Queen alone possesses the eyes or gaze that can fill the lover with a quickening passion and revivify the house.<sup>29</sup> The polarity suggested by the chorus forms a natural complement to the opposition between movement and immobility already introduced. Walking, no less than seeing, is a cardinal property of those who rank as alive, and the dead man's *psuchê* differentiates itself from the living being by its inability to move about with its feet upon the ground.<sup>30</sup> In a few choice phrases, the chorus thus describes how the attributes of life have come to cluster about the Queen, while the immobility and blindness of the Underworld are the portion of the statues and the grieving husband in the house.

<sup>27</sup> Menelaus' failure to see clearly is, according to the structures underlying Greek thought, tantamount to blindness. For this parallel, see the arguments of R.G.A. Buxton, 'Blindness and limits: Sophokles and the logic of myth', *JHS* c (1980) 33-4.

<sup>28</sup> For examples of the common equivalence between seeing and living in Attic tragedy, see Aesch. *Ag.* 677 (with Fraenkel's note *ad loc.*), *Pers.* 299, Soph. *Trach.* 828, Eur. *Hel.* 341. Among numerous examples of Hades' blinding power, *Il.* v 659, xiii 580; *cf.* xvi 502. Note too Vernant (n. 5) 312-13 and Frontisi-Ducroux (n. 10) 110.

<sup>29</sup> A second grieving husband, Admetus, will also reflect on what it means not to be able to look into the face of his wife again (Eur. *Alc.* 867-78). In the absence of the sight of Alcestis, his existence will similarly resemble a living death.

<sup>30</sup> *Cf.* Pind. *O.* vii 52; by contrast, the dead suitors on their way down to Hades at *Od.* xxiv 7 are no longer able to walk in the manner of living beings. Vernant (*Myth and thought*, n. 5) 313 contrasts the living, walking man with both the immobile *kolossos* and *psuchê*: 'as for the *psuchê*, it moves about without ever touching the earth ... Thus the colossos and the *psuchê* are opposed to the walk of a man, representing the two extreme positions in relation to an intermediary one'.

## ANIMATED STATUES

The two properties absent from the *kolossoi* explain why these figurines fail to achieve the desired cure. Because they lack the eyes that denote a living presence, and are additionally the channels of erotic passion, and because they lack the legs that distinguish the quick from the dead, they cannot provide any solace for Menelaus nor offer replacements for the absent Queen. But the chorus' focus on the attributes of motion and sight may do more than highlight the 'relevant unlikenesses' joining Helen to these effigies.<sup>31</sup> Set against the backdrop of contemporary Greek views concerning the power of images, the account supplied by the singers also creates a composite portrait of statues necessarily void of ritual efficacy; for, as the sources of the fifth and subsequent centuries reveal, the ability of images both to help and to harm depends precisely on their capacity to move and see.

According to Greek belief, statues which housed some force within, which were capable of influencing human affairs for good or ill, frequently signaled their powers through their eyes. The stone effigies of the gods outside Agamemnon's palace possess *ommata* that are radiant with joy at the king's return (*Ag.* 520-21);<sup>32</sup> elsewhere Aeschylus describes some satyr-head antefixes whose apotropaic powers depend on the 'terrifying look' each *eidôlon* emits from its eyes (*POxy* 2162). So too the sixth century statue of Artemis on Chios, a product of the school of 'Melas', was supposed to change its expression to denote emotion, looking severe when a viewer entered, and glad when he departed (Plin. *HN* xxxvi 13), and other statues turned their heads or averted their gaze so as to avoid witnessing some painful sight.<sup>33</sup> So potent were the eyes of some images that communities used protective measures to shield the viewer from their impact; Aphrodite Morphe in Sparta wore a veil (Paus. iii 15.10-11), and a statue of Artemis Soteira at Pellene, whose eyes might both cast a blight on the landscape and repel an attacking army, was kept hidden from view (Plut. *Arat.* 32).<sup>34</sup> When the eyes of an image were shut, covered or missing, then the live and efficient force that could reside in a sculpted figure was thought

<sup>31</sup> For 'relevant unlikeness' as a guiding principle in the creation of metaphors, see M. Silk, *Interaction in poetic imagery* (Cambridge 1974) 5.

<sup>32</sup> Here the herald asks the gods 'facing the sun' to receive the returning king with φαεινότερα ὄμμασιν. The phrase not only suggests the morning sunshine lighting up the effigies, but also indicates the facial expression that they will assume at the sight of the victorious Agamemnon. Thus Fraenkel *ad loc.* glosses 'let those eyes of yours look brightly shining on the king'.

<sup>33</sup> The image in Euripides' *IT* (1165) looks away in displeasure, while Strabo tells the legend of a statue of Athena standing in the port of Heracleotes which behaves in similar fashion: 'writers produce as proof of its settlement by the Trojans the *xoanon* of the Trojan Athena which is set up there, the one that closed its eyes, the fable goes, when the suppliants were dragged away by the Ionians who captured the city' (vi 1.14).

<sup>34</sup> *Cf.* Paus iii 16.7-11 and vii 19.6-9; for further discussion, see Faraone (n. 2) 136-40.

to be in abeyance or to have taken its leave.<sup>35</sup> In calling the statues 'eyeless', Aeschylus' chorus has suggested the absence or departure of a quickening presence even before it completes its phrase with the announcement of Aphrodite's flight.<sup>36</sup>

The immobility that belongs to *kolossoi* supplies a second indication that the statues of the stasimon are mere hollow vessels, empty of an internal mover. Walking and seeing form a pair in several fifth century descriptions of the miraculous properties of numinous images, featuring as the defining characteristics of the animated statues attributed to the legendary craftsman Daedalus. A character in Euripides' satyr play *Eurystheus* reassures his companion who is startled by the alarmingly realistic appearance of an *agalma*: 'Don't be afraid, old man, it's nothing. All the statues of Daedalus appear to move and see, so clever is the man' (fr. 372 N<sup>2</sup>).<sup>37</sup> When a bronze image of Pan disappears from the

<sup>35</sup> Frontisi-Ducroux (n. 10) 110 cites several examples of eyeless *kolossoi* in the archaeological record, suggesting that these may reflect a fear of the powers invested in an image's eyes: the stone figures found at Selinunte possess both hair and ears, but have neither eyes nor a mouth; the faces of the early female *kolossoi* of Cyrene are featureless and later on acquire veils which cover up their heads; for other instances of ancient eyeless statues, see W. Deonna, 'L'image incomplète ou mutilée', *REA* xxxii (1930) 324. Here Deonna draws attention to another method of stripping representations of their malevolent powers found in many different societies; this is to mutilate the eyes. The link between the eyes of an artistic representation and its possession of an animate force extends well beyond the borders of Greece; images are generally regarded as incomplete until the eyes are added, and, according to Chinese tradition, a painter would avoid including eyes in his portrait of a dragon for fear of its coming to life. On this topos, see D. Freedberg, *The power of images* (Chicago 1989) 84, 202 and 415. W. Deonna ('Les yeux absents ou clos des statues de la Grèce primitive', *REG* xlvi [1935] 222-46) 237-39 includes a discussion of rituals of consecration which involve 'opening the eyes' of a statue.

<sup>36</sup> Aeschylus was no stranger to the notion of effigies of the gods imbued with a live force that could come and go at will. On two other occasions, he endows divine images with this animating spirit. In the *Suppliants*, the members of the despairing chorus address their pleas to statues of the gods and threaten to turn themselves into votive plaques hanging about their necks; Friis Johansen and Whittle *ad loc.* draw attention to the 'notably concrete' use of the word  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in line 465, and to the close identification between the gods and their effigies that it establishes, citing as parallels Eur. *Hrclid.* 97-8, 112-13 and *Il.* vi 302-3, as well as Heraclitus' caution against confusing the gods with their images (B 5 DK). In Aeschylus' *Septem*, a second chorus of frenzied women proposes to fall down before the statues of the gods and to embrace them in supplication; once again the suggestion is that the statues act as embodiments of the deities. Eteocles warns the women that their faith in the efficacy of the images may be misplaced, and cites a *logos* that states that divinities leave a beleaguered city, intimating that the women are addressing their pleas to vessels emptied of their force (217-18). This scenario undergoes a reversal in Byzantine times when the pagan statues became a home to demons that had to be driven out by mutilating or destroying the image (with discussion in C. Mango, 'Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder', *DOP* xvii [1963] 53-75).

<sup>37</sup> Note the discussion of the reading  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\iota\nu$  in R. Kassel, 'Diologe mit Statuen', *ZPE* li (1983) 5. Other references to Daedalus' animated statues in Attic drama include Eur. *Hec.* 836-40 and Plato *fr.* 188 KA.

stage in Cratinus' *Thracians*, the characters once again point the finger at Daedalus, and hold him responsible for its perplexing flight (*fr.* 75 KA).<sup>38</sup> Later commentators would treat myths of Daedalus and his innovations as historical reality and, applying them to the developments they thought to discover in archaic and classical art, would repeatedly characterize the crude statues of the primitive age as lacking feet and eyes, while the more refined figures of subsequent times seemed able to walk and see.<sup>39</sup> But these rationalizing accounts miss the point that the fifth century authors make: it was not so much that the statues of Daedalus looked life-like as that their seeing eyes and moving limbs allowed them to confuse the boundaries between inanimate and alive.<sup>40</sup>

The figures crafted by Daedalus thus form part of a larger system of belief which privileges motion and sight as the choice criteria for distinguishing live and efficient images from mere sculpted stones. When viewed through this perspective, the *kolossoi* of Aeschylus' chorus must appear doubly disempowered ones. For all the surface *charis* and beauty they possess (416-17), their blindness and immobility denote an inner vacancy and want of force.<sup>41</sup> If my reading of the images is correct, then the *kolossoi* may take their place within a broader pattern spanning the first two plays of the *Oresteia*. The ritual remedies performed by the protagonists—prayers, sacrifices and libations among them—singularly fail to resolve the crisis that threatens to destroy the house of Atreus, and even aggravate the conditions they are designed to soothe. So too the images that are like, but more critically unlike Helen, can rank as another ritual remedy gone awry; far from

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Pl. *Meno* 97 D with the comment of the scholiast. For discussion of this and other passages treating the animated statues of Daedalus, see S. Morris, *Daedalus and the origins of Greek art* (Princeton 1991) 215-37.

<sup>39</sup> The canonical account belongs to Diodorus Siculus who comments that Daedalus 'so far excelled all men that later generations preserved a story to the effect that the statues he created were exactly like living beings. Having been the first to render the eyes open, and the legs separated as they are in walking, and also to render the arms and hands as if stretched out, he was marvelled at quite naturally by other men. For the artists who preceded him used to make their statues with the eyes closed, and with arms hanging down and attached to the ribs' (iv 76). Similarly a scholiast to Plato's *Meno* 97 D comments: 'In ancient times craftsmen shaped *zoia* that had closed-up eyes and feet that were not separated'; Tzetzes echoes the description, calling these early images 'handless, footless, eyeless' (*Chil.* i 19.538); cf. Diod. Sic. iv 76, *Lexeis Rhetorikai* s.v.  $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  ποιημάτων and *Suda* s.v.  $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  ποιημάτων. Aristotle *De An.* i.3 406 B 9 cites the view expressed by the comic poet Philippus that Daedalus' statue of Aphrodite had quicksilver poured into it (with discussion in Donohue [n. 9] 179-88). Morris (n. 38) 242 demonstrates the inaccuracy of these interpretations, noting that 'closed eyes' never characterized a phase of Greek sculpture, and pointing out that all our accounts of early images without legs and eyes belong to the Hellenistic and later periods.

<sup>40</sup> On Daedalus and the Greek fascination with these boundaries, see the important discussion by R.L. Gordon, 'The real and the imaginary: production and religion in the Graeco-Roman world', *Art History* ii (1979) 5-34.

<sup>41</sup> As ancient accounts of *charis* detail, it is an attribute that can beguile and deceive as well as charm (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 578-84, *Erg.* 65, Pind. *Ol.* i 30-32); on the association between *charis*, *daidala* and deceit, see Frontisi-Ducroux (n. 10) 72.

comforting Menelaus for his loss, they do nothing more than tantalize and vex their viewer, and mock him with doubling representations of his own situation. Here art not only fails to imitate life, but the deathlike pall that extends over the palace and its residents seems even to have infected the statues there.<sup>42</sup>

DEBORAH STEINER

Columbia University

<sup>42</sup> I would like to thank audiences at Smith College and Columbia University who listened to and commented on earlier versions of this paper. Particular thanks are also owed to Andrew Feldherr, Miranda Marvin and Christian Wolff, and to my readers at *JHS* whose judicious comments checked some of my more far-fetched notions.

### Philoxenos ... of Doubtful Gender

*Clouds* 685-7:

ΣΩ. ἄρρενα δὲ ποῖα τῶν ὀνομάτων; ΣΤ. μυρτα.  
Φιλόξενος Μελησιας Ἄμυνιας.  
ΣΩ. ἀλλ' ὦ πόνηρε ταυτὰ γ' ἐστ' οὐκ ἄρρενα.

*Wasps* 81-4:

ΞΑ. Νικόστρατος δ' αὐὸ φησιν ὁ Σκαμβωνίδης  
εἶναι φιλοθύτον αὐτὸν ἢ φιλόξενον.  
ΣΩ. μὰ τὸν κύν', ὦ Νικόστρατ', οὐ φιλόξενος,  
ἐπεὶ καταπύγων ἐστὶν ὁ γὰρ Φιλόξενος.

*Frogs* 931-4:

ΔΙ. ἦδη ποτ' ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ νυκτὸς διηγρύπνη-  
σα  
τὸν ξουθὸν ἱπαλακτρούνα ζητῶν τίς ἐστὶν  
ὄρνις.  
ΑΙ. σημεῖον ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶν ὀμαθέστατ' ἐνεγέ-  
γραπτο.  
ΔΙ. ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν Φιλοξένου γ' ὤμην Ἐρυξιν εἶναι.

Eupolis fr. 249 (*Poleis*) Σ *Wasps* 82

ὁ δὲ Φιλόξενος ἐκωμωδεῖτο ὡς πόρνος. Εὐπολις  
Πόλεσιν·  
ἔστι δὲ τις θήλεια Φιλόξενος ἐκ Διομείων.

Phrynichos fr. 47 (*Satyroi*) Σ *Wasps* 82: ... (vid. supra)  
Φρόνιχος Σατύροις

The date of Phrynichos' *Satyroi* is not known,<sup>1</sup> but it seems fair to assume that in the late 420s a certain Philoxenos 'enjoyed' a vogue in comedy as an alleged effeminate and catamite (note the descriptions of him as θήλεια, καταπύγων, πόρνος, οὐκ ἄρρηνη).<sup>2</sup> Both Dover and Henderson comment that καταπύγων in can

<sup>1</sup> P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1969) 35 puts it 425-420; fr. 46 is a parody of Euripides' *Peleus* (cf. *Cl.* 1154). As Phrynichos' début appears to belong to 429 (Anon. *De Comoedia* III 9), the date of *Satyroi* must be later than that year.

<sup>2</sup> This dating assumes that *Cl.* 685-7 belong to the original of 423 and not to the subsequent revision (419-7). This seems a reasonable assumption, since Amynias, made fun of in the following lines (691-2) is a *komodoumenos* of the late 420s (e.g. *Wasps* 74-6, 466, 1264-74; Eupolis' *Poleis*, fr. 222).

mean just 'worthless', but here the more precise and homosexual meaning of the term is meant.<sup>3</sup> Dover is very probably right that in *Cl.* 686 the poet has selected as male names those of 'three men whose masculinity could be called in question'.<sup>4</sup> The identity (and point of the joke) of Melesias is lost, but the following lines (691-2) make it clear that Amynias' 'effeminacy' is the result of his alleged *astrateia*:

ΣΩ. ὄρξ; γυναῖκα τὴν Ἄμυνίαν καλεῖς.  
ΣΤ. οὐκ οὐν δικαίως ἦτις οὐ στρατεύεται;

That this was a standard joke is clear from the alternative titles of Eupolis' comedy, *Astrateutoi* or *Androgynoi*. The epithets, *katapygon* and *pornos*, suggest rather that the joke at Philoxenos was the same as that directed at Kleisthenes, Straton *et al.*, the effeminate and pathics of Old Comedy.<sup>5</sup> The ultimate source of the joke may be that, like Kleisthenes, Agathon, and Epigonos, Philoxenos was a beardless male (either by accident or design) and hence a 'woman'.

Fragment 249, from Eupolis' *Poleis*, ἔστι δὲ τις θήλεια Φιλόξενος ἐκ Διομείων, raises two points of interest. First the dactylic hexameter suggests that the line came from a parody of an oracle, since in Aristophanes the use of this metre very often indicates this sort of parody.<sup>6</sup> Since fr. 231 from Eupolis' *Poleis* contains an address to the mantis Hierokles (who appears at *Peace* 1043-1121), Raspe argued that Hierokles was a character in *Poleis* also and that fr. 249 came from that scene.<sup>7</sup> The context may well have been a pun on φιλόξενος, like that at *Wasps* 82-3, or it may have resembled the proper names which slip into the oracular scene at *Knights* 997-1110 (in particular Antileon [1044] and Diopeithes [1085]).

Second considerable attention has been given to the phrase ἐκ Διομείων, which has been taken by most critics as the equivalent to the demotic Διομειεύς (of the tribe Aigeis).<sup>8</sup> In view of the common occurrence of the name (see below) it would not be impossible that Eupolis is singling out one particular Philoxenos from among several. But these jokes are presumably not new with his *Poleis* [probably 422-D<sup>9</sup>] and one wonders if there is another point to the designation. At least one

<sup>3</sup> J. Henderson, *The maculate muse*<sup>2</sup> (New Haven 1990) 210; K.J. Dover, *Greek homosexuality* (London 1978) 143.

<sup>4</sup> K.J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford 1968) 185.

<sup>5</sup> This aspect of comic humour is thoroughly discussed by Dover [n. 3] 135-53, and by Henderson [n. 3] 204-22, although not all the pathic *komodoumenoi* listed by Henderson (213-5) belong there (e.g. Chairephon, Aripheades, Lykourgos).

<sup>6</sup> See *Kn.* 1015-95, *Peace* 1063-1126 (which combines oracular with epic parody), *Birds* 959-91, *Lysist.* 770-6. The major non-oracular use of hexameters is found at *Frogs* 1528-33.

<sup>7</sup> G.C.H. Raspe, *De Eupolidos Δήμοις ac Πόλεσιν* (Leipzig 1831) 105. Compare the wording at *Kn.* 1037 ἔστι γυνή κτλ. and at *Kn.* 1059 ἔστι Πύλος πρὸ Πύλοιο; also that at Hermippos 77 (likewise in dactylic hexameter, spoken by Dionysos) ἔστι δὲ τις οἶνος.

<sup>8</sup> Kirchner in *PA* 14707; D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford 1971) 141; A.H. Sommerstein, *The comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 4, *Wasps* (Warminster 1983) 160.

<sup>9</sup> See I.C. Storey, 'Dating and re-dating Eupolis', *Phoenix* xlvii (1990) 18-20.