

THE LOST *THESMOPHORIAZUSAE* OF ARISTOPHANES

JAMES BUTRICA

I. DATE

THAT ARISTOPHANES WROTE TWO PLAYS called *Thesmophoriazusae* is established by a scholion to line 298 of the *Thesmophoriazusae* that we have which affirms that Calligenia spoke first ἐν ταῖς ἐτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις.¹ According to the current consensus, the extant one was the first and the lost one the second,² and the latter is regularly called the “*Second Thesmophoriazusae*” as if that were its title. This paper, however, will begin by arguing that the lost play belongs to the earlier years of Aristophanes’ career and was probably produced at the Lenaea of 423.

The conviction that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* postdates the extant one and so must have been written after 411/410 rests upon two props: its relationship to Euripides’ lost *Antiope*, generally regarded as a late play, and the supposed evidence of the ancient secondary tradition. The supposed certainty of this evidence has effectively preempted any study of the fragments or *testimonia* for other clues to the play’s date; but a search of this kind reveals a surprising amount of evidence that points to a period closer to *Acharnians* and *Knights* than to the years after 411.

For example, fr. 348 mentions Aristophanes’ older contemporary Crates. Since Crates’ *floruit* can be put about 450–430, it is not surprising that the only other reference to him in Aristophanes occurs in one of his earliest plays (*Knights* 537),

For various kinds of assistance in the development of this paper I should like to thank Douglas Olson and Keith Sidwell for comments on an oral version (APA, New York 1996), J. F. Gannon and Michael Hendry for assistance in tracking down secondary sources, my colleagues Mark Joyal and Toph Marshall, and Ian Storey and the *Phoenix* readers for their salutary skepticism.

The fragments of Aristophanes are cited here according to the text of Kassel and Austin 1984.

¹ The mere existence of quotations from a *Thesmophoriazusae* not found in our text of the extant play is not sufficient to establish that another play of the same name once existed (our text might be defective, or the attribution might be mistaken: for example, the *Suda* s.v. λευκοπληθής quotes *Ec.* 387 as coming from *Thesmophoriazusae*). This consideration applies in the evaluation of all the quotations now attributed to the lost doublets of extant plays of Aristophanes (*Clouds* and *Peace* being the best known examples), since the sole criterion for such attributions is the failure of our text of the extant play to contain the words quoted; for the problem as a whole, see Dover 1968: lxxxvii–lxxxix, and for an example of the scholarly disagreement that can arise because of it, contrast the discussions of “the other *Peace*” in Platnauer 1964: xvii–xx, Sommerstein 1985: xix–xx, and Olson 1998: xlviii–lii.

² Kassel and Austin (1984: 182) cite Kaibel to the effect that “superstitem deperdita antiquiorem fuisse nemo dubitabit,” and both Sommerstein (1994: 11) and Russo (1984: 306, n. 5) make the same assumption; for Deichgräber (1956: 22) it is a “Sicherheit.”

where Aristophanes identifies him as a figure of the past rather than of the present. A reference to Crates in the years after 411 would certainly be curious, though perhaps not wholly inexplicable.

A second and much more substantial piece of evidence is the cretic or cretic-paeonic sequences shared by fr. 348 with 347.³ White (1912: §446) has observed that “[p]aeonic rhythm is not found in the last five plays of Aristophanes except in a single subordinate period in a parody” (in *Frogs*—the exception that proves the rule) and that “Aristophanes has the rhythm chiefly in the *Acharnians* and *Equites*, plays written in the heyday of his youth.” This in itself suggests an earlier rather than a later date for the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, and we have as well the testimony of Hephaestion to the effect that Aristophanes “often” inserted such sequences in this play.⁴ It is impossible, of course, to tell precisely what he meant by “often,” and impossible to be certain why he illustrated this phenomenon from the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* rather than from *Acharnians* or *Knights*, but his testimony points even more strongly toward an early date. If our earliest surviving plays have the highest rate of frequency, then a play with an especially high rate ought to be especially early. One with a significant proportion of cretic-paeonics but written after 411 would certainly be a striking anomaly requiring explanation. L. P. E. Parker has recently confirmed White’s observations about Aristophanes’ use of cretics, noting that the metre is “well represented in the lyric of Aristophanes’ early plays, above all in *Ach.*”; more particularly, she finds the closest parallel for the metre of fr. 347 in *Acharnians* and the closest parallel for fr. 348 in *Knights*.⁵

That the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* must have been produced no later than the Lenaea of 423 is suggested by a third piece of evidence, a scholion to *Wasps* 61 which assumes that Aristophanes had already written a *Thesmophoriazusae* by the time that *Wasps* was produced at the Lenaea of 422. The Aristophanic context as a whole describes varieties of cheap and shabby humour in which the poet claims he will not indulge, including οὐδ’ αὖθις ἀνασελγαινόμενος Εὐριπίδης (61). Modern scholars entertain doubts about whether Aristophanes is referring ironically here to his own earlier productions, but the scholia do not, affirming on 61 that Aristophanes “produced the *Thesmophoriazusae* against Euripides.”⁶ This statement is invariably dismissed as an obvious error because

³ These are seldom mentioned in discussions of the lost comedy and undervalued when they are. For example, Gelzer (1971: 1410.65–68), accepting Webster’s date of 410 for *Antiopē* and committed to the notion that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* was the second, proposes a date for it between 409 and 405, commenting that “Die Paeone der Parabase . . . sind kaum viel später verstellbar.”

⁴ Heph. *Ench.* 13.3: ἐν δὲ ταῖς προτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις καὶ κρητικούς πολλάκις ἐν μέσοις τοῖς τετραμέτροις παρέλαβεν. For the problems associated with Hephaestion’s use of προτέραις, see below, 52.

⁵ Parker 1997: 45; the use of cretics in *Wasps*, *Peace*, *Birds*, and *Lysistrata* is discussed at 45–46, fr. 347 at 45, and fr. 348 at 163.

⁶ ὅτι τὰς Θεσμοφοριαζούσας καθῆκε κατὰ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου Lh; κατ’ αὐτοῦ (sc. Εὐριπίδου) γὰρ καθῆκε τὰς Θεσμοφοριαζούσας Vald.

neither *Thesmophoriazusae* could be so early, but the scholiasts, both here and on 62, do seem to have an accurate grasp of the *didascaliae*, and they otherwise name only plays that were contemporary with or earlier than *Wasps*: when naming other Aristophanic plays besides *Thesmophoriazusae* that featured Euripides, the note on 61 mentions *Proagon* and *Acharnians* but not *Frogs* (οὐ μόνον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ δράματι [*sc. Thesmophoriazusae*] . . . εἰσῆκται Εὐριπίδης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ Προαγῶνι καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἀχαρνεύσιν), just as the note on 62 naming plays that attacked Cleon mentions *Knights* but not *Peace*. Hence Zielinski was surely right that the scholion refers to the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*;⁷ its failure to specify “second” is no barrier, since we shall see below that it was normal in antiquity to refer to both plays simply as *Thesmophoriazusae*. Whether *Wasps* 61 really does allude to the lost comedy is irrelevant; what matters is that the scholion shows awareness in antiquity of an early *Thesmophoriazusae* that Aristophanes could have alluded to in a play of 422. This evidence shows that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, like the extant one, involved Euripides to a significant degree, more than could be assumed from fr. 342, which mocks a Euripidean etymology; and as one of Aristophanes’ plays κατ’ Εὐριπίδου, it was perhaps produced by Philonides.⁸

It may be possible to establish a more precise date in the range 426–423 with the help of still other evidence, first discussed by Deichgräber (1956), that sheds light on the parabasis of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*. This evidence survived by the slenderest of threads, in an Arabic translation of a lost Syriac translation of the first book of an otherwise lost work of Galen *On Medical Terms*; in the German translation of Meyerhof and Schacht, the passage now figures in Kassel–Austin as fr. 346. Galen quoted and discussed at length a passage in which Aristophanes employed certain words designating kinds of illness; the passage itself, of course, did not survive the process of successive translation, but Galen’s discussion preserves many of its details. The portion relevant to the present inquiry is the following:

I say that, when he once stood before the assembly [the public], in the course of wishing his poetry to be received well, this Aristophanes asked a group of Athenians to please forgive him any error if they suspected it in his speech [poetry] and for that reason did not approve it; for, as he explained, he had been plagued for four months by chronic hoarseness, by the illness called ἡπιάλος and by fever. Hence he says then of the illness called ἡπιάλος that it had been brought on by a chill that had befallen him, and that a fever seized him next, and that the fever is not at all like the cold but is thoroughly different from it in its nature; he mentioned this because, as a result of the cold, he had a desire to dress in wool as he wanted to become warm, while the fever seized him with heat and burning fire and caused him to drink water.

⁷ I owe my knowledge of his suggestion to Starkie 1897: 59 and his comment that “Zielinski . . . is led by an inept scholion . . . on line 61 . . . to propose that the first edition of that play . . . is meant.”

⁸ Cf. Anon. *De comoedia* 9 (= K–A Test. 4): τὰς μὲν γὰρ πολιτικάς τούτῳ (*sc. Καλλιστράτῳ*) φασὶν αὐτὸν διδόναι, τὰ δὲ κατ’ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σωκράτους Φιλωνίδῃ. See below, 71, however, for the suggestion that Aristophanes was himself the producer.

The progression of symptoms that Aristophanes describes here allows the source to be identified as the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, where we know from fr. 399 (ἄμα δ' ἡπίαλος πυρετοῦ πρόδρομος) that Aristophanes discussed not only the ἡπίαλος and the πυρετός, respectively a "cold" and a "fever," but also the fact that they occur in succession. As Deichgräber (1956: 20) observed, the anapaestic rhythm of fr. 399 implies that the passage treated by Galen came from a parabasis; so do the personal tone and the fact that Aristophanes apparently discussed the quality of his work. Deichgräber interpreted the reference to four months of illness and chronic hoarseness literally and so thought that the play must have been produced at the City Dionysia rather than at the earlier Lenaea.⁹ In that case, the only possible occasions for the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* before the production of *Wasps* are the competitions at the City Dionysia in 425 and 424, since *Babylonians* belongs to 426 and the first *Clouds* to 423.

But a literal interpretation of that hoarseness seems unlikely; Aristophanes was fond of metaphorical language, and a common cold or flu lasting four months presupposes an uncommonly weak immune system. Hence the language here is likely to be figurative; Aristophanes' real topic was not his health but something or someone that had impeded his ability to express himself normally. The key to understanding his language, and perhaps the key to dating the play, may be found in one last piece of evidence connecting the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* with works of 423–422. The scholion that preserves fr. 399 tells us that ἡπίαλος in the sense of τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ κρύος was used not only in (the lost) *Thesmophoriazusae* but in (the lost) *Clouds* as well, and the same combination of ἡπίαλοι and πυρετοί can also be found at *Wasps* 1038, identified as people whom Aristophanes "attacked" (ἐπιχειρήσαι) the previous year. Some of the scholia on *Wasps* identify these figures as the philosophers caricatured in *Clouds*, but this is probably a guess by someone who knew that the "cold" and "fever" were discussed there but had only the second, revised version available. For Deichgräber (1956: 20) they are—quite improbably—"die jungen Leute mit ihren neumodischen Ideen," while most modern commentators, in harmony with the author of our ancient *Vita* (= K-A test. 1), see a generic reference to sycophants. Gelzer has noted the similarity between the "cold" and "fever" mentioned in fr. 346 and 399 and those in *Wasps*, proposing that both passages refer to unspecified persons hostile to Aristophanes, here represented as sycophants.¹⁰

⁹ Performance at the City Dionysia has been accepted by, among others, Russo (1984) and Gelzer (1971); a dissenting voice is Cassio (1987), who prefers the hypothesis that the four months are those that elapsed between the acceptance of the play by the archon and its production.

¹⁰ Gelzer 1971: 1415–16: "Dass er da im Ernst sagen will, sein Stück sei möglicherweise schlecht, ... ist allerdings unwahrscheinlich. Mit ἡπίαλος und πυρετός bezeichnet er eher bildlich etwas recht Bestimmtes, das ihn zwang, sich in acht zu nehmen (Woldecken) und deshalb hinderte, gewisse Witze zu machen (Wassertrinken), und das schon seit vier Monaten herrschte Gemeint sind wohl (eine oder mehrere) Aristophanes widerwärtige Personen, auf die angespielt wird mit demselben Bild wie in den *Wespen* (1035ff.), wo Aristophanes sich (ebenfalls in der Parabasis) brüstet mit seinem

I propose instead that a specific reference to two anonymous individuals was intended in all three plays. *Wasps*, which mentions an attack against them in the previous year, must of course be the last play in the series, and it was preceded immediately in the sequence of competitions by the lost *Clouds*; hence the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* must have been the first, as one would expect in any case, given that it seems to have provided significantly more detail than the later passages. If this hypothesis is valid, then the plurals used in *Wasps* are generic; the fragment from *Clouds* implies, as the one from *Thesmophoriazusae* confirms, that only two individuals were involved. To judge by fr. 346, the parabasis of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* outlined a sequence of three separate and distinct events that impeded Aristophanes' self-expression—a chill ("Erkältung"), which led to a cold fit (the ἡπιάλος), which was followed inevitably by a fever (the πυρετός). Now, there are two obvious candidates for a "big chill" in Aristophanes' early career: his prosecution by Cleon over *Babylonians* and the γραφή ξενίας that contested his Athenian citizenship. I suggest therefore that one of these prosecutions, and very probably the latter, is the initial "chill" and that the "cold" and the "fever" are subsequent "copy-cat" prosecutions by two sycophants who are now, unfortunately, anonymous. (One expects, however, that Aristophanes himself originally characterized them in identifiable fashion when describing the different symptoms that they elicited.) It is interesting that the ancient biography of Aristophanes mentioned earlier can be read as reflecting precisely this sequence of prosecutions:

διήθρευσε δὲ αὐτῷ (sc. Κλέωνι) ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπειδὴ ξενίας κατ' αὐτοῦ γραφὴν ἔθετο, καὶ ὅτι ἐν δράματι αὐτοῦ Βαβυλωνίοις διέβαλε τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὰς κληρωτὰς ἀρχὰς παρόντων ξένων . . . δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τρίτον συκοφαντηθεὶς ἀπέφυγε, καὶ οὕτω φανερός κατασταθεὶς πολίτης κατεκράτησε τοῦ Κλέωνος· ὅθεν φησὶν "αὐτὸς . . . δῆ" (= *Ach.* 377), καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν εὐδοκιμῆσαι συκοφάντας καταλύσαντα· οὐς ὠνόμασεν ἡπιάλους ἐν Σφηξίν, ἐν οἷς φησὶν "οἱ . . . ἀπέπνιγον" (= *Vesp.* 1039).

Aristophanes was thoroughly at odds with him [i.e., Cleon] since he had laid a charge against him concerning his citizenship and because in his play *Babylonians* he slandered, in the presence of foreigners, the Athenians' practice of appointing office-holders by lot . . . He was acquitted in a second and third prosecution by sycophants and won out over Cleon, having thus been established clearly as a citizen; as a result of which he says . . . (= *Ach.* 377) and so on. They say that he was esteemed because of his defeat of the sycophants, whom he called ἡπιάλοι in *Wasps*, where he says . . . (= *Wasps* 1039).

Here, after Cleon's γραφή ξενίας (about which the *Vita* has a good deal to say, all of it omitted from the quotation above), Aristophanes is acquitted after a second and third prosecution by unnamed sycophants, apparently over

mutigen Kampf in früheren Stücken gegen τοὺς ἡπιάλους . . . καὶ τοὺς πυρετοῖσιν, οἱ τοὺς πατέρας τ' ἡγχοῦν νύκτωρ καὶ τοὺς πάππους, Leute, die sich in den weiteren Versen als politische Erpresser und Sykophanten herausstellen."

his citizenship (if the biographer has made his deduction from a reading of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, so much the better for the argument offered here). The *Vita* even associates the acquittals with the passage in *Wasps* that identifies Aristophanes' opponents as "colds" and "fevers." There is a minor chronological problem in that the *Vita* quotes *Ach.* 377, which refers only to Cleon, as though it were a response to all these victories (ὅθεν φησὶν), but this could well be a distortion produced by the effort of compressing a complex series of events into a simple statement. If these speculations are valid, then the four months that Aristophanes' hoarseness is supposed to have lasted are likely to indicate the approximate length of time since the prosecutions were initiated. These prosecutions seem to postdate *Acharnians*, which contains no allusion to the "cold" and the "fever"; there is also no such allusion in *Knights*, though we would probably not expect one, given the play's single-minded focus on Cleon. If the prosecutions do postdate *Acharnians*, then the Dionysia of 425 is too soon for Aristophanes to be discussing cases initiated four months earlier, and the only opportunities for the production of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* are the Dionysia of 424 and the Lenaea of 423. Of these, the latter is strongly favoured by the fact that Aristophanes says in *Wasps* (422) that he attacked the "colds" and "fevers" in the previous year: since it seems an unnecessary and unlikely hypothesis that Aristophanes wrote a fourth early play discussing these same men, we can identify the attack launched in the year before *Wasps* as the play known to have dealt with them in the greatest detail, the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*. If it seems unlikely that the parabasis of a play chiefly about Euripides attacked two sycophants, we need only recall *Clouds*, a play chiefly about Socrates, where the parabasis in the surviving version still attacks Cleon, and the one in the first version apparently attacked those same two sycophants.¹¹

Of course this evidence is suggestive rather than probative, but the connections with plays from the period 426–422 are surprisingly numerous: the reference to Crates implies an early date, perhaps near that of *Knights*; the high frequency of cetics implies a date in the vicinity of *Acharnians* (425) and *Knights* (424); the scholion to *Wasps* 61 knows a *Thesmophoriazusae* written before 422; and the application of Ockham's razor suggests that the ἡπίαλος and τυρετός of the lost

¹¹ Ancient sources tell us that the parabasis of *Clouds* is one of the parts that underwent revision, but the passage on Cleon in the epirrhema (575–594) must have stood in the first version (cf. Dover 1968: lxxx–lxxxvi); hence the "cold" and "fever" were probably discussed in the original antepirrhema. *Holcades* and *Georgoi* have hitherto been the most popular candidates for the play given at the Lenaea of 423, but in neither case is the evidence compelling; cf. MacDowell 1971 on *Wasps* 1038. If *Thesmophoriazusae* was indeed produced in 423 at the Lenaea, then the whole passage *Wasps* 1029–50 may refer to Aristophanes' activity at the Lenaea exclusively (perhaps favouring Bentley's μετ' αὐτόν in 1037) and the complaint about "betrayal" in the previous year (1043–45) refers not to *Clouds* but to the failure of *Thesmophoriazusae* to win after the consecutive successes of *Acharnians* and *Knights*. The promise at *Wasps* 61 not to travesty Euripides again could then be a very specific allusion to the previous year's offering.

Thesmophoriazusae are the same as those of the first *Clouds* (423) and of *Wasps* (422). While one datum of this kind might be dismissed as anomalous, the accumulation of four represents a greater challenge; on this evidence, anyone who maintains a late date for the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* needs to explain not only why this play, supposedly written after 411, contained three apparently anachronistic features—a reference to Crates, a high frequency of cetics, a continuity with the “fevers” of *Clouds* and *Wasps*—but also why these anachronisms all point consistently to the same period early in Aristophanes’ career, the years around 426–422, the very time when the scholion to *Wasps* 61 thinks that Aristophanes wrote a *Thesmophoriazusae*.

But, as was indicated earlier, other evidence has long been presumed to stand against an early date. It seems that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* must postdate Euripides’ *Antiope*, since fr. 342 (Ἄμφοδον ἐχρῆν αὐτῷ τίθεσθαι τοῦνομα) mocks the etymologizing that was applied there to the name Amphion.¹² *Antiope* has traditionally been assigned to Euripides’ last years because of a scholion to *Frogs* 53 that names it along with *Hypsipyle* and *Phoenissae* as plays produced a little before *Frogs* itself.¹³ Obviously this scholion and the one to *Wasps* 61 cannot both be right; the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* cannot postdate *Antiope* if it predates *Wasps*. If one of these scholia is in error, and it appears that one of them is, then it is more likely to be the *Frogs* scholion. It is difficult to see how the *Wasps* scholion could be emended to substitute the name of another play; to declare that this one is wrong while the other is right is merely arbitrary, especially when its author seems to know which plays mocking Euripides or Cleon predate *Wasps*. On the other hand, the *Frogs* scholion could be emended easily on the assumption that *Antiope* is an accidental substitution for a less familiar play with a similar name, such as *Antigone*. This latter suggestion has already been made by Cropp and Fick in their study of resolutions in Euripides’ trimeters after finding that *Antiope* seems to be too early for Euripides’ last years: they put it instead within what they call the “ten percent date-interval of 426.7–419.0” (Cropp and Fick 1985: 75–76; for the term “date-interval,” cf. 14–25). While statistical results based upon small samples can be unreliable, it should be remembered that we have more of *Antiope* than of most of the fragmentary plays and that the results have a correspondingly greater chance of being reliable. In any case, the suggestion that *Antiope* in the *Frogs* scholion is a scribal error for *Antigone* does not depend upon Cropp and Fick’s dating for its validity. It is worth adding that, if they are right about the date of *Antiope* and if this paper is right about the date of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*,

¹² Cf. *Etymologicum genuinum* 41.10 (in the text given by Kassel and Austin *ad loc.*): λέγει δὲ Εὐριπίδης ὁ τραγικὸς ἐτυμολογῶν τὸ Ἀμφίων, ὅτι Ἀμφίων ἐκλήθη παρὰ τὸ ἀμφ’ ὁδὸν ἦγουν περὶ τὴν ὁδὸν γεννηθῆναι. ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης κωμικευόμενος λέγει ὅτι οὐκοῦν Ἀμφοδοῦς ὠφείλει κληθῆναι.

¹³ διὰ τί δὲ μὴ ἄλλο τι τῶν πρὸ ὀλίγου διδαχθέντων καὶ καλῶν, Ὑψιπύλης, Φοινισσῶν, Ἀντιόπης; Cf. Webster 1967: 163: “The Scholiast to *Frogs* 53 seems to have preserved a didaskalic notice recording the production of *Antiope*, *Hypsipyle*, *Phoenissae*, probably in 410 B.C.”

then *Antiope* must belong to the beginning of the suggested range to have been parodied in a play of 423.¹⁴

II. NAME

A production of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* in 423 is also incompatible with the belief that it was known in antiquity as the "*Second Thesmophoriazusae*." But a survey of the ancient and Byzantine citations shows that the lost play, no less than the extant one, was normally called *Thesmophoriazusae* in antiquity, and that when the terms "first" and "second" are used, the evidence is either ambiguous or contradictory. In fact the only places in which the lost play is identified as "second" are a dubious passage in Harpocration (below, 62), two passages in scholia where the numbers are not attested unanimously (below, 61), and two more where the patriarch Photius seems to have added them himself (below, 60–61); hence it will be argued here that the designation of the lost comedy as "second" is an invention of Byzantine scholarship.

As was noted above, the vast majority of ancient (and Byzantine) citations call both plays *Thesmophoriazusae*. The extant one is so identified by Herodian and Harpocration and by various scholiasts,¹⁵ the lost one by Pollux, Athenaeus, Hesychius, Harpocration, Erotian, and others, as well as scholiasts.¹⁶ Perhaps the best evidence that this nomenclature was standard is that scholion to line 298 of the extant play mentioned at the very beginning of this article, where the lost play is called not the first or second but simply "the other" *Thesmophoriazusae*; but it seems to be confirmed by the evidence of Harpocration, who is the only ancient scholar to cite both plays and calls both of them *Thesmophoriazusae*.¹⁷

¹⁴One of the *Phoenix* readers has suggested that the reference to Agathon in fr. 341 points to a later date than 425; while Agathon is known to have won his first victory in 416 (Ath. 5.217a–b), there is no reason to assume that this success came at the very beginning of his career rather than after, say, five to ten years of unsuccessful competition.

¹⁵Citations of, or references to, lines of the extant play under the plain title *Thesmophoriazusae* are found in Herodian (481, repeated by Eustathius on *Od.* 13.401; 489, repeated in Stephanus *Ethnica*), in Harpocration (809), and in scholia to Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, *Wasps* (142), and *Birds* (168), to the *Iliad* (536–537) and to Pindar (973–976), to Plato's *Hipparchus* (447–449) and *Theages*, *Hippias Minor*, and *Gorgias* (all three with the same quotation of 390–391), and to Lucian *De morte Peregrini* (861). Of course some of the numerous cases of quotation in the *Suda* under the bare title *Thesmophoriazusae* may also derive from ancient sources (142, 146–147, 159–161, 162, 162–163, 163, 175, 363–364, 395, 422, 516, 1197, 1214). The only unambiguous citation that employs a number (Gellius) is discussed below.

¹⁶Of the twenty-eight certainly or possibly ancient citations and references, six are found in Pollux (fr. 332, 336.2, 338, 342, 343, 345), five in Athenaeus (fr. 333, 333.1, 336, 347, 352), three in Hesychius (fr. 350, 354, 358), three in Bekker's *Antiatticist* (fr. 353, 356, 357), two in the *Lexicon Bachmannianum* (fr. 339, 341), and one each in Erotian (fr. 351), Harpocration (fr. 336.2), an anonymous commentator on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Aspasius?) (fr. 355), Clement (fr. 332), Zonaras (fr. 344), the *Etymologicum genuinum* (fr. 333.6), and scholia to Aristophanes' *Clouds* (fr. 335), *Wasps* (fr. 399), and *Plutus* (fr. 337). The exceptions are discussed below, 52–54.

¹⁷For an allusion in Harpocration that seems to involve the designation "second," see below, 62.

Some citations of *Thesmophoriazusae* do deviate from this pattern,¹⁸ but their evidence is contradictory. On the one hand, Aulus Gellius (15.20.7) cites lines 453–456 of the extant play as coming from what he calls, in Greek, “the first *Thesmophoriazusae*” (or, more exactly, “the former”: ἐν ταῖς προτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις). On the other hand, Hephaestion (quoted in note 4 above) uses exactly the same designation for the lost one when citing fr. 348. It is not certain that either text should be emended (scholars are sometimes mistaken), much less that it is Hephaestion who should be “corrected” as he was by Brunck; the transmission of Greek letters was surely at greater risk in the Latin text of Gellius than in the Greek text of Hephaestion, and—if the arguments of this paper are valid—it is Hephaestion who seems to have been right in any case.

Clement of Alexandria also uses a number when citing a *Thesmophoriazusae*. In a passage concerning literary imitation and borrowing, he asserts that Aristophanes transferred words from Cratinus’ play *Empipramenoi* “in the first *Thesmophoriazusae*.”¹⁹ Now, we have no indication of such a borrowing either in the text of the play or in the scholia thereto, but the conviction that the extant play came first is so entrenched that Dindorf contrived a reference to it here by proposing that *Empipramenoi* is simply another name for *Idaioi*, a play of Cratinus which a scholion to line 215 of the extant play mentions as the source of a short phrase (τὰ γένεια· ταῦτα δὲ ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῶν Ἰδαίων Κρατίνου). In fact the only safe course is to admit that we simply do not know to which play Clement referred.

But another passage has often been thought to show definitively that the lost play was called the “*Second Thesmophoriazusae*,” Athenaeus 1.29a, which states that “Demetrius of Troezen entitles Aristophanes’ second *Thesmophoriazusae* the *Thesmophoriasasae*,” i.e., not “women celebrating the Thesmophoria” but “women upon [or after] celebrating the Thesmophoria.” The passage is cited here with the comic quotations abbreviated to save space:

ὅτι Ἀριστοφάνους τὰς δευτέρας Θεσμοφοριαζούσας Δημήτριος ὁ Τροιζήνιος Θεσμοφοριάσας ἐπιγράφει. ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ κωμικὸς μέμνηται Πεπαρηθίου οἴνου·

οἶνον δὲ πίνειν . . . τὸν ἔμβολον.

Εὐβουλοῦ·

ὁ Λευκάδιος πάρεστι . . . οὕτω πότιμοῦ.

Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ δειπνολόγου·

εἶθ’ ὅποταν πλήρωμα . . . τὰ παρ’ αὐτοῖς.

Two deductions have been drawn from the sequence of words immediately following the reference to Demetrius: first that ἐν ταύτῃ refers to the “second *Thesmophoriazusae*” just mentioned, then that the following quotation, in which

¹⁸ One unique title that can be dismissed out of hand is *Thesmophoroi*, a scribal error found in some of the sources of a scholion to *Plutus* 159 quoting fr. 337.

¹⁹ *Str.* 6.2.26: Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν ταῖς πρώταις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις τὰ ἐκ τῶν Κρατίνου Ἐμπιπραμένων μετήνεγκεν ἔπη.

someone mentions Peparethian wine, comes from that play.²⁰ Of course the fact that no such lines occur in the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* only reinforces the view that they have been quoted from the lost play and that the lost play must, therefore, be the one that Athenaeus called second.²¹

But this interpretation does not take into account the defective transmission of the first two and a half books of Athenaeus, which have come to us only as a series of extracts (often introduced by ὅτι) and not in a complete text;²² indeed, the reference to Demetrius occurs in just such an extract. It is preceded by a chain of citations in 1.28e–f (from Antidotus, Clearchus, Alexis, Ephippus, Antiphanes, and Eubulus), capped by the statement that “he [sc. Eubulus] also mentions Psithian wine” and by a quotation in which someone does so. Then comes the passage quoted above, which has clearly suffered substantial losses. For example, the quotation that mentions Peparethian wine is followed by another, introduced by the bare name Eubulus, which does not mention Peparethian wine; the (now) unmarked change of subject implies the loss of some transitional material, as does the fact that the following citation is introduced simply by the name Archestratus, this time in the genitive case. Just as obviously, we have lost the immediate context for the reference to Demetrius; Athenaeus’ subject here is wine, not the nomenclature of Aristophanes’ plays, and Demetrius must have been named in passing during a discussion of some variety of wine that was mentioned in one *Thesmophoriazusae* or the other—a discussion that is conspicuously lacking in our mutilated text. (Incidentally, given the evident truncation, it might be hazardous to continue assuming that the words ἐν ταύτῃ refer to a *Thesmophoriazusae* at all.) Having recognized the defective nature of the context in Athenaeus, we can acknowledge Demetrius’ “title” for what it probably was, a grammatical joke: once Aristophanes had written one play called *Thesmophoriazusae*, the chorus in the later one (whichever one it was) could be regarded, somewhat whimsically, as comprised of the same women, who—having celebrated the Thesmophoria in the first play of this name—would now be “Thesmophoriasasae.” Certainly the little that is known about Demetrius is consistent with his having been a literary humorist. For example, his epithet for the insanelly prolific scholar Didymus was βιβλιολάθας, “the man who kept forgetting his books” (Ath. 4.139c). More interestingly, the only direct quotation, from a work *Against the Sophists*, is not only written in dactylic hexameters but parodies Homer, reshaping the lines from *Odyssey* 11 on the death of Oedipus’ mother to report the death of Empedocles (Diog. Laert. 8.74); perhaps Demetrius employed the form of Menippean satire and interspersed his prose discussions with verse parodies. In any case, the

²⁰ The quotation is printed as fr. 334: οἶνον δὲ πίνειν οὐκ ἔασω Πράμνιον, / οὐ Χίον, οὐχὶ Θάσιον, οὐ Πεπαρήθιον, / οὐδ’ ἄλλον ὅστις ἐπεγερῇ τὸν ἔμβολον.

²¹ Cf. the presentation of the evidence for the designation “second” in Kassel and Austin *Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι* β’ test. ii, where the ὅτι clause in Athenaeus is quoted as far as ἐπιγράφει, then followed by the words “sequitur fr. 334.”

²² For the details, see Gulick 1961: 1.xvii.

passage does not tell us which play was first, only that Demetrius offered another (humorous) name for whichever one was second.

In antiquity, then, neither play was normally cited by number. Moreover, the few instances where numbers are used yield an uninformative confusion: both plays are called "the former" by one reliable authority, and we know neither which play Clement thought was first nor which Demetrius of Troezen or Athenaeus regarded as second.

A glance at Aristophanes' other "double" plays (especially *Aeolosicon*, *Peace*, *Clouds*, and *Plutus*²³) confirms that this is the normal state of affairs. Numbers were seldom used in citations, and confusion could occur when they were; more interestingly, the evidence suggests that some of this confusion could reflect a diversity of meanings that attached to terms like *πρότερος* and *δεύτερος*.

The use of numbers when quoting lines from a given play is in fact so infrequent that our knowledge that two plays of the same name existed generally depends upon other sources, and usually the sole criterion for assigning a line from a *Peace* or *Thesmophoriazusae* or *Clouds* or *Plutus* to the lost play is whether it is found in the extant one, not a number that accompanies the citation. Choeroboscus tells us that there were two plays called *Aeolosicon*,²⁴ and Athenaeus once cites the "second," but none of the other fifteen citations or references can be assigned to a specific version. In the case of *Peace*, only the scholiastic tradition, invoking the authority of Crates, tells us that another play of this name existed.²⁵ In the case of *Clouds* and *Plutus* (as in that of *Thesmophoriazusae*), we do have some citations and references (especially in scholia) to the "first" or "second" play, but the numbers employed are as inconsistent as those applied in reference to *Thesmophoriazusae*. Athenaeus, for example, follows normal practice in once citing the lost *Clouds* simply as *Clouds* (11.479c) and in four times citing the extant *Clouds* the same way (2.64f, 3.94f, 9.374f, 9.387a), but he also cites the extant play twice as "the second *Clouds*" (7.299b, 8.345f), and his sole citation of "the former *Clouds*" (4.171c) turns out also to come from the extant play.²⁶ In the case of *Plutus*, a scholion

²³ It is doubtful whether the two plays called *Dramata* should be regarded in this category, since each has a distinctive alternative title that is nearly always cited with it, *Δράματα* ἢ *Κένταυρος* and *Δράματα* ἢ *Νίοβος*. For attempts to emend away the puzzling reference at Ath. 15.699f to "the second *Niobus*," see Kassel and Austin on fr. 290; perhaps it is a kind of shorthand for "the second of the *Dramata*, the one also called *Niobus*."

²⁴ Choerob. in *Heph. ench.* 9 (p. 235 Consbr.): Αἰολοσίκων δράμα γέγονε πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον Ἀριστοφάνου, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πλούτος πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον.

²⁵ *Arg.* 2: Κράτης μέντοι δύο οἶδε δράματα, γράφων οὕτως· ἀλλ' οὖν γε ἐν τοῖς Ἀχαρνεῦσιν ἢ Βαβυλωνίοις ἢ ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ Εἰρήνῃ· καὶ σποράδην δέ τινα ποιήματα παρατίθεται, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ νῦν φερομένη οὐκ ἔστιν. Note again the use of *ἕτερος* rather than a more specific "first" or "second."

²⁶ There is also a difficult use of *Νεφέλαι* α' in a scholion to ps.-Pl. *Ax.* 367b. The phrase *δις παῖδες οἱ γέροντες* appears in the text, and the note cites Cratinus fr. 28 K-A (*Deliaides*) *verbatim*, then adds a quotation of Plato *Laus* 1, followed by καὶ Μένανδρος Χήρα καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης *Νεφέλαις* α' without citations. Confusion has arisen from the fact that the phrase in *Axiochus* that is being glossed appears *verbatim* at line 1417 of the extant *Clouds*. Dover (1968: lxxxix) adduces this as a case of

to *Frogs* 1096b identifies the lost play as “first” when quoting fr. 459. The extant one is cited as the “second” once by Athenaeus (9.368d) and six times elsewhere, though all six of these citations (five in Herodian, one in Σ *Il.* 23.361) involve the very same line (992), and a single common source surely accounts for all of them. But a curious phenomenon occurs in the scholia to the extant play, where notes on 115, 119, 173, and 1146 use “the second *Plutus*” in reference to the *lost* play. Since all of these are in contexts where the two versions are being compared, it would appear that δεύτερος here means not “(chronologically) second” but “the second (of two)” (cf. LSJ s.v. II.2), in effect “the other,” as opposed to the play being annotated; it is equivalent to the use of ἕτερος in reference to *Thesmophoriazusae* at Σ *Th.* 298 and to *Peace* in *Arg.* 2.²⁷ This observation alerts us to the possibility that δεύτερος, at least, could have more than one meaning and need not always refer to the order in which the two plays were written.

We have three other examples in Old Comedy of such “double” plays. Diocles seems to have composed two plays called *Thyestes*,²⁸ and Magnes is attested as author of a first and second *Dionysus*, both of them cited by Athenaeus (the first at 9.367f, the second at 14.646e—the only citations of his *Dionysus* anywhere). But the most interesting such case concerns the first and second *Autolycus* of Eupolis. Typically, we have twenty-three citations without number, but a scholiast on Plato *Apology* 23e explicitly cites the first, while another on *Clouds* 109 cites the second. In addition, a scholiast on *Thesmophoriazusae* 941 cites an idiom as found παρ’ Εὐπόλιδι . . . ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ θατέρῳ (implying that the note has been taken from a commentary on one of these *Autolyci*). But the most revealing reference comes in Galen, who assumes that his readers will be thoroughly familiar with both plays and with their relationship (he cites it σαφηνείας ἕνεκα in explanation) and explicitly describes the second as an adaptation of the first (τὸν δευτέρον Αὐτολύκον Εὐπόλιδος ἔχεις ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου διεσκευασμένον).²⁹

the second play being cited mistakenly as the first, and Kassel and Austin, unlike Meineke and Kock before them, no longer offer δις παιδες οἱ γέροντες as a fragment of the lost *Clouds*. Perhaps the solution lies in the word μέμνηται with which the scholiast introduces the four references, suggesting that we will find not these exact words but rather an expression of the same sentiment; that is precisely what we do find in the quotations from *Delianes* (δις παῖς γέρων) and from *Laws* (ὁ γέρων δις παῖς γίγνεται). I suggest, therefore, that the scholion might well refer correctly to a passage in the first *Clouds* where Aristophanes used a similar but not identical expression which was altered into the now familiar form when the play was revised. (It also follows, by the way, that δις παιδες οἱ γέροντες should no longer stand as Menander fr. 450 Körte.)

²⁷ This seems preferable to supposing that the annotator was confused about which play he was reading, as apparently assumed by Dover 1972: 202, “Some allusions in the scholia on our play [*sc. Plutus*] show that an ancient commentator believed himself to be commenting on the play of 408.”

²⁸ The Suda s.v. *Diocles* ends a list of his plays with Θυέστης β’, which has been emended to Θυέστης <α’ καὶ> β’.

²⁹ Galen *In Hippocratis de acutorum morborum victu librum commentarii* 1.4 (= Kühn 1826: 15.424). The relationship of the two versions is further suggested by his next words: οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰς Κνιδίας γνώμας ἐπὶ ταῖς προτέραις δευτέρας ἐξέδοσαν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Κνίδου ἰατροί, τινὰ μὲν ἐχούσας τὰ αὐτὰ πάντη, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δὲ ἀφρημένα, καθάπερ γε καὶ ὑπελλαγμένα.

Evidence from tragedy further alerts us to the variety of meaning possible in seemingly numerical terms. In the case of *Autolycus* and *Clouds* (and perhaps Aristophanes' other "double" plays as well), scholars needed to distinguish two plays of similar content, one a reworking of the other; in tragedy, on the other hand, the problem was normally to distinguish plays with different plots that shared the same title character, and the preferred solution was to add a distinctive epithet.³⁰ For example, Sophocles wrote two plays called *Ajax*, one extant, one lost. We do not know how the latter was recorded in the *didascaliae*, but we are reliably informed that the former appeared there simply as *Ajax*; outside the *didascaliae*, they were distinguished—though by no means invariably—as *Ajax Locrus* (the lost one) and *Ajax Mastigophorus*.³¹ Similarly, it seems likely that *Odysseus Acanthoplex* and *Odysseus Mainomenos* were called only *Odysseus* by Sophocles himself and received their distinctive epithets later; that his *Philoctetes in Troy* was so called to differentiate it from the extant *Philoctetes*; and that his *Thyestes Sicyonius* (or *Thyestes in Sicyon*, as it is also called) was also being differentiated from the other *Thyestes*. As to why Sophocles felt no need to distinguish these plays but later scholars did, this is probably because for Sophocles (as for the *didascaliae* as well) they were sufficiently distinguished by the company they kept in their respective tetralogies. Distinctions became necessary only when the plays were copied (or perhaps performed) as autonomous entities, and then scholars at least were free to devise special names of their own choice; that seems to be the natural deduction from the fact that Dicaearchus seems to have devised his own designation for the *Ajax*, namely *The Death of Ajax* (above, note 31). Euripides wrote two plays about Alcmeon, and sixteen citations of one or the other are quoted simply from *Alcmeon*; but Hesychius and the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* cite one as διὰ Ψωφίδος, while Hesychius again, the *Anecdota Parisiensia*, and the author of the treatise contained in *POxy.* 1611 cite the other as διὰ Κορίνθου. Both of Euripides' Iphigenia plays seem originally to have been called simply *Iphigenia*, even in the Athenian *didascaliae*; cf. *IG II²* 2320 for a victory by the actor Neoptolemus in 342–341 with [Ιφιγε]νεΐαι Εὐρ[ιπ]ίδου[ν]. In fact it is only Hesychius again who distinguishes them consistently (along with the scholia to *Frogs*), and they are not distinguished at all by Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Aelian, or Stobaeus (who qualifies only one of his twelve citations of an *Iphigenia* as coming from the one ἐν Αὐλίδι).

Sometimes, however, we find numbers used as well as epithets to distinguish like-named tragedies. Both *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Oedipus Coloneus* seem originally

³⁰ Euripides *Hippolytus*, of course, is a special case, where the extant "second *Hippolytus*" (*Hyp.*: ἔστι δὲ οὗτος Ἰππόλυτος δεύτερος) seems to be attested as a revision and correction of the earlier play (τὸ γὰρ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ κατηγορίας ἄξιον ἐν τούτῳ διώρθωται τῷ δράματι).

³¹ *Arg.*: ὅθεν καὶ τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ πρόσκειται ΜΑΣΤΙΓΟΦΟΡΟΣ, ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ΛΟΚ-ΡΟΥ. Δικαίαρχος δὲ ΑΙΑΝΤΟΣ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΝ ἐπιγράφει. ἐν δὲ ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ψιλῶς ΑΙΑΣ ἀναγράφεται. Of our eight fragments of the lost *Ajax*, four are cited from *Ajax*, four from *Ajax Locrus*.

to have been called simply *Oedipus* (this is how Athenaeus, for example, cites *Oedipus Tyrannus*). This is surely implied by the fact that Salustius, in *Argumentum* 4 to *Oedipus Coloneus*, refers to *Oedipus Tyrannus* as “the other *Oedipus*” (ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ Οἰδίποδι; cf. the references to “the other” *Autolycus*, “the other” *Peace*, and “the other” *Thesmophoriazusae*); if we had his *Argumentum* to *Oedipus Tyrannus* as well, we would no doubt see him refer there to the *Oedipus Coloneus* as “the other.” *Argumentum* 2 to *Oedipus Tyrannus* says that it has been titled “Tyrannus” to distinguish it from “the other” (ὁ Τύραννος Οἰδίπους ἐπὶ διακρίσει θατέρου ἐπιγράφεται). But it also goes on to say that some title it “the first [or former] *Oedipus*” rather than “*Oedipus Tyrannus*” and do so “because of the dates of the productions and because of the events” (εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ πρότερον, οὐ Τύραννον, αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφοντες, διὰ τοῦς χρόνους τῶν διδασκαλιῶν καὶ διὰ τὰ πράγματα). That is, *Oedipus Tyrannus* was called “the former *Oedipus*” not only because it was produced earlier also but for the much less conventional reason that its action takes place earlier in *Oedipus*’ life than that of “the other *Oedipus*.” It is not clear whether the καὶ after διδασκαλιῶν is joining two separate reasons or the two parts of a single reason; but it is clear that πρότερος, just like δεύτερος, need not refer to the order of composition.

Given the ambiguity of those terms, we can only conjecture in what sense Sophocles’ “former *Lemniae*” was “former” and his “second *Athamas*” was “second,” or why the first and second *Thyestes*, *Phineus*, and *Tyro* bore those numerical designations, or how the “second *Phoenix*” of Ion of Chios was “second.” The situation is no more clear with the better attested *Phrixus* of Euripides, where such numbers are used to the apparent exclusion of distinguishing epithets. Though we have nineteen ancient citations of, or references to, a Euripidean *Phrixus*, “first” and “second” are used only in a scholion to *Frogs* 1225, in Tzetzes’ commentary on the play,³² and in a papyrus containing an alphabetical compilation of first lines and hypotheses to Euripides’ plays (*POxy.* 2455). It is not clear why only numbers were used in this case; perhaps only the most popular or widely read plays earned (or needed) distinctive epithets. It is interesting, however, that all of these are contexts in which the first line of a given play is at issue: the scholiast asserts that Σιδώνιον ποτ’ ἄστυ is the opening of the second *Phrixus*, Tzetzes asserts in response that it is actually the opening of the first, then quotes the opening of the “real” second, while the papyrus sides with the scholiast. We have no means of knowing with certainty what “first” and “second” mean in this context: perhaps one *Phrixus* was a revision of the other, or perhaps the two were independent plays written at different times or concerning different phases of the hero’s life. But perhaps it is also possible that “first” and “second” refer simply to their position in an alphabetical list of the kind found in *POxy.* 2455. Such a list is certainly a plausible source for a scholar investigating Euripidean first lines, but

³² Koster 1962: 1047–49.

there is no reason to assume that its compiler had accurate didascalic information about the order of production, or would have cared if he had; it is conceivable, for example, that the compiler of *POxy.* 2455 simply followed alphabetical order in arranging his two *Phrixī* and put the one beginning with εἰ ahead of the one beginning with Σιδώνιον. The disagreement between the scholiast and Tzetzes over the order of the plays could reflect their use of compilations that employed different, but equally arbitrary, systems of ordering; but it seems that Tzetzes also had access to more extensive information than could be derived from a collection of hypotheses, since he is able to quote the first two lines of one play and the first six of the other.³³

Finally, New Comedy also offers examples of “double” plays, though it is impossible to say with certainty how the two plays of the same name were related. A scholion to Plato *Phaedrus* 279c shows that Menander wrote two plays called *Adelphoe* that could be distinguished by number (καὶ Μένανδρος ἐν Ἀδελφοῖς β'). That he wrote two called *Epiclesus*, again distinguishable by number, is shown by a citation of the first in Athenaeus (9.373c: Μένανδρος ἐν Ἐπικλήρῳ πρώτη) and a reference to the second in Harpocration (s.v. ὄρον: παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ ἐν β' Ἐπικλήρῳ). The existence of two plays called *Perinthia* is implied by a reference in Zenobius to the first (1.60: ἐν τῇ Περινθίᾳ τῇ πρώτῃ). As with Old Comedy, however, numbered citations are unusual: we have seven citations of *Adelphoe* without number and six of *Epiclesus* (there are no quotations of a *Perinthia*). It is more common in New Comedy to find alternative titles, though we are in no position to know whether these, like the numbers, were used to distinguish one play from another. The didascalic notice preserved in the papyrus of Menander's *Dyscolus* states that the play has the alternative title *Misanthropus* (ἀντεπιγράφεται Μισάνθρωπος), but it is not clear why the play should have required a second title, and no *Misanthropus* of Menander is ever cited.³⁴

While this survey of evidence from both comedy and tragedy has shown that the use of numbers or other special designations in citations and references was not standard, it has also shown that a very few scholars, at least, were quite scrupulous

³³ Euripides may also have written two satyr plays called *Autolycus*, again distinguished as “first” and “second.” Ath. 10.413c cites “Euripides in the first *Autolycus*.” The reference is defended against the suspicions of Nauck (who proposed that πρώτη is a corruption of σατυρικῆ, the designation used by Pollux in both his citations of the play) by *P.Vindob.* G. 19766, which appears to summarize the plot under the heading ...Ἰαυτόλυκος α[.... An alternative hypothesis is that “Euripides” in Athenaeus is a corruption of “Eupolis,” who did write two *Autolycei*.

³⁴ For other alternative titles in Menander, cf. the *Agroecus*, known also as the *Hypobolimaesus*, the *Anatibemene*, known also as the *Messenia*, the *Androgynus*, known also as the *Cres*, the *Arrhephorus*, known also as the *Auletris*, etc. Alternative titles are first attested for Old Comedy, where Eupolis, Menecrates, Metagenes, Pherecrates, Phrynichus, Plato, and Strattis are all identified as authors of plays with alternative titles. It is impossible to say why *Lysistrata* is the only Aristophanic example or why it has two such titles, both derived from a particular scene; Σ 389 says that “some” entitle the play *Adoniazusae*, οὐ καλῶς, while Σ 1114 says that it was called *Λυσιστράτη ἢ Διαλλαγαί*.

about employing them, most notably Athenaeus; and yet even he was not entirely consistent—he used no numbers in his citations of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and apparently called the extant *Clouds* both the “first” and the “second.” Athenaeus presumably took his numerical references from sources that contained them, and this interferes with our understanding of what they are supposed to represent. Usually, it seems, it mattered only that Aristophanes (for example) had used a certain word or expression in a *Clouds* or a *Peace* or a *Plutus*, not that he had used it in the first or the second; but sometimes a distinction was vital, and numbers could then be used to distinguish one play from another of the same name in a context in which the two had of necessity to be distinguished. For example, it was obviously important for Hephaestion to indicate which *Thesmophoriazusae* abounded in the cetics to which he referred. Scholars who discussed the two versions of *Clouds* often used numbers to distinguish them. It was even more obviously important for Tzetzes, the source quoted by the scholiast on *Frogs* 1225, and the compiler of the hypotheses in *POxy.* 2455 to distinguish the two plays called *Phrixus* whose openings they discussed, even though no-one else who made any of the nineteen citations of or references to a Euripidean *Phrixus* thought it necessary to append a number.

It was also useful for scholiasts discussing one play of a given name to distinguish it from its twin, whether they did so by chronological sequence (as in the case of fr. 459, cited from “the first *Plutus*”) or by using ἕτερος or δεύτερος to mean “other.” The difficulty lies in our uncertainty over whether the number reflects knowledge of the didascalic records and therefore chronological order or whether some other criterion underlies the choice—a criterion that is now beyond recovery, given the various meanings that we have seen applied to the key terms πρότερος and δεύτερος. This means that we are entirely at a loss as to what lies behind, for example, Athenaeus’ citation of “the second *Aeolosicon*” (9.371e): does he mean the one that was chronologically second? or does this come from a commentary on the second *Aeolosicon* where δεύτερος was used to mean “other,” so that it actually refers to the one that was chronologically first? Given that πρότερος (as seen in connection with Sophocles’ two *Oedipus* plays; above, 57) could designate a play whose action precedes that of another play with the same name, it seems at least possible that Gellius’ citation of the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* as “the former” could derive from a source which called it that simply because its action, set on the second day of the Thesmophoria, antedates that of the lost play, set on the third day (below, 66).

The secondary scholarly tradition offered still other possible sources of confusion in the numbering of same-named plays, for example in compilations of hypotheses like the Euripidean hypotheses discussed above (57–58), where “first” and “second” might refer simply to an arbitrary order in a list. Another complication arises in the occasional use of numbers before titles of plays in other catalogues of hypotheses, a use still not satisfactorily explained but apparent in

P.IFAO inv. P.S.P. 248, where a lengthy hypothesis to Euripides' *Medea* is introduced by β Μήδεια, ἥς ἀρχ[ή].³⁵ Similarly, a hypothesis probably to Menander's *Heauton timoroumenos* in *POxy.* 2534 (the *Hauton penthon* is another candidate) is introduced by Β Αὐτὸν [; this is hardly likely to indicate that the hypothesis stood second in a complete alphabetical list of Menander's plays, since in such a list this play would have been preceded by *Agroecus*, *Adelphoe* 1 and 2, *Halieis* (or *Halieus*), *Anatithemene*, *Andria*, *Androgynus*, *Anepsioe*, *Apistus*, *Arrhephorus*, and *Aspis*. And there is yet another potential source of confusion in the still unexplained application of numbers to plays in the comments occasionally found in *argumenta* that a certain play is τῶν πρώτων or τῶν δευτέρων.³⁶

In any case, the occasional use of numbers in citations, scholia, or hypotheses is to be distinguished from their use in lists of plays like those found in the *Prolegomena de comoedia* edited by Kost (= K-A Testimonia 2.a.) and in *POxy.* 2659 (= K-A Testimonia 2.c.), where they represent cardinals rather than ordinals. Thus the *Prolegomena* use "β" to identify *Aeolosicon*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, *Clouds*, and *Plutus* (though not *Peace*) as "double" plays by showing that there were two plays of the specified name (not that Aristophanes wrote only the second *Aeolosicon*, the second *Thesmophoriazusae*, etc.). The numbers in *POxy.* 2659 have the same function; in this case, however, the list seems to represent the holdings of a specific collection or library rather than Aristophanes' entire output.³⁷ Thus the entry Νε]φέλαι β' (13) indicates not that this collection possessed a copy only of the second, surviving version but that it had "two *Clouds*," i.e., copies of both versions;³⁸ and the entry Πλ]οῦτ[ο]ς α' (17) indicates not that it—rather improbably—had only the now lost first *Plutus* but that it had "one *Plutus*," no doubt the extant one. Whoever drafted the list seems to have been unaware that a second *Aeolosicon* existed (cf. 2: Αἰ]λοσίκων, without numeral), and the entry Θεσμο]φορ[ι]ά]ζουσαι (9) breaks off at just the point where a numeral might appear.

While the classical citations disagree about which *Thesmophoriazusae* was "first," and "second" appears only in the passage of Athenaeus discussed above (52–54), Byzantine citations never use "first" at all, and there is only a limited use of "second" for the lost play. The earliest application of "second" comes with the citations of fr. 350 and fr. 358 in the *Lexicon* of Photius. These fragments are

³⁵ Papathomopoulos 1964; Luppe 1986. Euripides did not write two plays called *Medea*, and the number cannot represent the position of *Medea* within its trilogy, since the hypothesis indicates that it stood third.

³⁶ The hypothesis to Euripides' *Hippolytus* calls it τῶν πρώτων, while the one to his *Andromache* calls it τῶν δευτέρων (the phenomenon seems not to occur in reference to Aristophanes, whose plays instead are described more specifically as τῶν εὐ σφόδρα πεποιημένων [*Acharnians*], τῶν ἄγαν καλῶς πεποιημένων [*Knights*], etc.).

³⁷ This is the deduction of John Rea, who edited the fragment in Parsons, Rea, and Turner 1968: 70–76. I disagree, however, with his interpretation of the numbers affixed to the entries for *Clouds* and *Plutus*.

³⁸ See Dover 1968: lxxxv–xcii for the survival of the earlier version.

also quoted in Hesychius and later in the *Suda* as well; the latter, like Photius, identifies their source as “Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι β’” and has probably taken them from him, but Hesychius names neither author nor play. Since any common ancient source of Hesychius and Photius (it is not known that Photius was aware of Hesychius’ work) is unlikely to have given anything more specific than the simple *Thesmophoriazusae*, it is logical to suppose that it was Photius who added the β’. “Second” or “β’” is also affixed to a citation in the scholia to Plato and to another in the scholia to Aristophanes, but in neither case are the manuscripts of the scholion unanimous in using it. In the scholion to Plato *Cratylus* 421d (= fr. 349), the lost play is called “the second” only in T (Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marciana App. Class. 4.1) and not in b (Oxford, Bodleian Library Clarke 39). Similarly, in the scholion to *Frogs* 3, only some manuscripts call the play “the second” or “β’.”³⁹ Some might argue that this inconsistency reflects the elimination of numbers by scribes rather than their addition,⁴⁰ but this seems unlikely. As we have seen, the overwhelming majority of ancient citations—not just of *Thesmophoriazusae* but of all the “double” plays, and by such authorities as Athenaeus, Pollux, Harpocration, Erotian, and Herodian—eschew numerical designations entirely. This means that if Byzantine scribes were deleting numbers rather than adding them, we are faced with two unlikely scenarios: that these scribes just happen to have eliminated the number in all the citations of the first *Thesmophoriazusae*, and that the ancient sources of these citations just happen to have been among the very, very few that bothered to distinguish the plays by number. Surely it is far more probable that these numbers were added by Byzantine scholars who noticed that the citation did not appear in the extant play, then—anticipating the procedure of modern scholars—deduced that it must have been found in the “other” one, which inevitably became “number two” (cf. the use of δεύτερος meaning “other” discussed above, 53).

These considerations can assist in evaluating two further cases in which a “second *Thesmophoriazusae*” is cited. One is a scholion to *Clouds* 52 which seems to attribute to it the opening of *Lysistrata*.⁴¹ Since the quotation involves Genetyllis, a deity who might well have figured in the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* as she does in the extant one (130: πότνιαι Γενετυλλίδες), we are perhaps dealing with a damaged scholion in which a quotation of the lost play has itself been lost; it is perhaps just as likely, however, that a reader of the Byzantine period added δευτέραις after consulting a copy of the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* (though evidently not of *Lysistrata*!) and failing to find the lines.

³⁹ Chantray (1999) reports β’ as the reading of RVEΘBarb, with δεύτερῃ in M and no number in Ald. According to Dübner 1877, however, the Ravennas and Ambros. L 39 sup. (= R and M) use “second,” Laur. pl. conv. supp. 140 (= Θ) uses “β,” while Marc. 474 (= V) and 475 and Laur. pl. 31,15 have no numerical designation.

⁴⁰ Kassel and Austin rather beg the question by stating in their apparatus for fr. 349 “β om. b.”

⁴¹ ὅθεν καὶ ἐν δευτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις Ἀριστοφάνης μνησθῆναι τοῦτο οὕτω που λέγων ἀλλ’ εἴ τις εἰς βακχεῖον . . . Κωλιάδος Γενετυλλίδος (= *Lys.* 1–2).

The other is a more complex case involving Harpocration's *Lexicon*. Here the designation "second" comes at the end of the entry Πύλαι καὶ Πυλία καὶ Πυλαγόρας, where a quotation of Demosthenes that mentions the Pylagorae is followed by Ἀριστοφάνης τε ἐν δευτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις. No words of Aristophanes are quoted, but the context shows that a reference is intended to fr. 335, preserved in a scholion to *Clouds* 623b which mentions the Pylagorae. But the status of the number is unclear. Keaney (1991) gives no indication that any manuscript reads anything except β'; on the other hand, Dindorf (1853) has "δευτέραις codices" *ad loc.*, but the notes in volume 2 state, "in manuscriptis ita legebatur, Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν ταῖς β Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις," while the *apparatus* of Kassel-Austin reports on fr. 335 that ms K has no number at all. Since the number is apparently not present in all witnesses, we are perhaps dealing with a case like those of the Platonic and Aristophanic scholia discussed earlier, where "β'," when present, seemed to derive from learned intervention rather than preservation. In addition, it has been argued by Keaney (1969: 201–207) that the version of Harpocration's *Lexicon* that we have was enhanced with additional quotations, many taken from Aristophanic scholia, by the Byzantine scholar Manuel Moschopoulos. This is perhaps just such an addition, since the full text of fr. 335 is preserved only in the aforementioned scholion to *Clouds* 623b, and so it was perhaps Moschopoulos himself who added the β' in this case.

Whether or not the theory offered here about how β' came to be attached to certain citations of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* is valid, the evidence adduced is surely sufficient to show that the occurrence of such designations in our ancient sources is too infrequent and too unreliable for them to be given precedence over the more substantial evidence discussed in Part 1.

III. PLOT

All that we know securely about the plot of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* is that the first person to speak was Calligenia, a minor deity associated with the Thesmophoria; this information is imparted in a scholion that glosses Καλλιγενεία in line 298 with δαίμων περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, ἣν προλογίζουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἐτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ἐποίησεν.⁴² The frequently repeated claim that she appeared as nurse of Demeter does not rest upon firm grounds, being derived from Photius *Lexicon* s.v. Καλλιγένειαν, which comments: Ἀπολλόδωρος μὲν τὴν γῆν, οἱ δὲ Διὸς καὶ Δήμητρος θυγατέρα· Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς τροφόν. Though this is invariably taken as referring to the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, Photius does not mention the play at all. Perhaps more importantly, the passage lacks a verb, and we cannot tell whether Photius meant that Aristophanes had her appear on stage as nurse or simply had a character refer to her as nurse. Finally, the evident parallelism of θυγατέρα and τροφόν surely implies that in Aristophanes Calligenia was either a nurse plain and simple or else a nurse not

⁴² For the interpretation of προλογίζω in this passage, see below, 74.

of Demeter alone but of both Zeus *and* Demeter, just as the unnamed οἱ made her the daughter of both; since the latter seems unlikely, she was probably called simply a nurse. Hesychius s.v. Καλλιγένειαν does say that some called her the nurse of Demeter, and Nonnus calls her the nurse of Persephone,⁴³ but neither mentions Aristophanes in connection with that role.

What little has been surmised so far beyond this can be found recorded in Kassel-Austin: “ad ipsam tertiam diem fabulae argumentum pertinet, quae peracta ieiuniorum severitate hilarioribus sacris dicata erat. computationem mulierum testatur Pollux IX 69 (fr. 345), ceteroquin quid egerint illae sciri nequit” (“the play’s plot pertains to the third day, which was dedicated to more cheerful rites after the severity of the fasts; Pollux IX 69 bears witness to the women drinking together—otherwise it is impossible to know what they did”). The remainder of this paper will offer a (nearly) new hypothesis concerning its plot.

It was suggested in Part I that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, like the extant one, involved some sort of attack against or travesty of Euripides;⁴⁴ I further suggest that the attack was a physical one, and that its planning and execution are reflected in an episode from the ancient biographical tradition regarding Euripides that is usually dismissed as a mere summary of the extant *Thesmophoriazusae*.

This episode involved a plot against Euripides’ life hatched by the women of Athens. It is first mentioned in the biography of Euripides by the second-century Peripatetic Satyrus partially preserved in *POxy.* 1176.⁴⁵ According to the remains of fr. 39, col. x, the tragedian was hated by men and women alike, by the former because of his lack of sociability (διὰ τὴν δυσ[σ]ομιλίαν[ν], 4–6), by the latter because of the slanders in his plays ([δ]ιὰ τοὺς ψόγους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν, 7–10). The first claim is supported through the previously unknown assertion that he was prosecuted for impiety by Cleon, the second through the following anecdote (23–39):

αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες / ἐπισυνέστη/σαν αὐτῷ / τοῖς Θεσμο/φορίοις / καὶ ἀ/θρόαι παρῆ/[σ]αν
ἐπὶ τὸν / [τό]πον ἐν ᾧ / [σ]χολάζων / [ἐ]τύγχανε. / [ἐξ]ωρ<γ>ισμέναι / [δὲ] ἐφε[ί]/
[σαν]το τὰν/[δρὸς] ἅμα μὲν / [ἀγ]ασθεῖσαι / [τὰς] μούσας / [. . . .] ν[.]σ[.] [. . . .]

The women rose up against him at the Thesmophoria and appeared in a group at the place where he happened to be studying. But they spared the man despite their anger, on the one hand because they marveled at the muses.

Unfortunately, the conclusion is lost along with the rest of the column.

A similar incident had long been known from a *Vita* found in several mediaeval manuscripts:

⁴³ Hesychius: οὐ τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ τὴν Δήμητραν. οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτως ἔφη τὴν γῆν. οἱ μὲν τροφὸν αὐτῆς· οἱ δὲ ἱέρειαν· οἱ δὲ ἀκόλουθον; Nonnus *D.* 6.140: ἐὺπαιδα τιθήνην (sc. Περσεφονείης).

⁴⁴ For ἀνασελγαινόμενος in *Vesp.* 61, see MacDowell 1971 *ad loc.*; the meaning “being treated lewdly” could certainly suit a play concerned with Euripides and women.

⁴⁵ Hunt 1912: 124–181; re-edited in Arrighetti 1964. Hunt’s text is followed here.

λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὅτι γυναῖκες διὰ τοὺς ψόγους οὕς ἐποίει εἰς αὐτὰς διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις ἐπέστησαν αὐτῷ βουλόμεναι ἀνελεῖν· ἐφείσαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὰς Μούσας, ἔπειτα δὲ βεβαιωσαμένου μηκέτι αὐτὰς κακῶς ἐρεῖν.

They say too that, because of the criticisms that he made against them in his plays, the women rose up against him at the Thesmophoria with the intention of doing away with him; but they spared him, first because of the Muses, then because he was compelled no longer to speak ill of them.

The dependence of this *Vita* upon Satyrus (or, less likely, the common dependence of both upon another source now lost) seems sufficiently established by their extensive agreement in wording: with διὰ τοὺς ψόγους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν in Satyrus compare διὰ τοὺς ψόγους οὕς ἐποίει . . . διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων in the *Vita*; with ἐπισυνέστησαν αὐτῷ τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις in Satyrus compare τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις ἐπέστησαν αὐτῷ in the *Vita*; with ἐφε[ίσαν]το τὰν[δρὸς] ἅμα μὲν [ἀγ]ασθεῖσαι [τὰς] μούσας in Satyrus compare ἐφείσαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ . . . διὰ τὰς Μούσας in the *Vita*.

The *Vita* also seems to provide further details of this alleged incident. Unless there were two attempts on Euripides' life, the scene of the attack is established by an earlier section which states that αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἐβουλήθησαν αὐτὸν κτείνειν εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον ἐν ᾧ γράφων διετέλει ("the women wanted to enter the cave where he spent his time writing and to kill him"). This is presumably the same as the cave on Salamis mentioned elsewhere in the biography;⁴⁶ and it seems likely that this is also "the place in which he σχολάζων ἐτύγχανεν" mentioned by Satyrus.⁴⁷ According to Kovacs, "this is the plot of Aristophanes' *Women at the Thesmophoria*, treated as biography";⁴⁸ those who have shared this opinion include Arrighetti, Leo, Lesky, and Lefkowitz.⁴⁹

But sound arguments against its acceptance, which I shall expand and elaborate here, were presented long ago by Kuiper:

perspicuum est haec cum Thesmophoriazusarum argumento haud accurate congruere. fingit quidem Aristophanes in extrema scena . . . Euripidem foedus cum matronis inire . . .

⁴⁶ φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι σπήλαιον κατασκευάσαντα ἀναπνοὴν ἔχον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκεῖσε διημερεῦειν φεύγοντα τὸν ὄχλον· ὅθεν καὶ ἐκ θαλάττης λαμβάνει τὰς πλείους τῶν ὁμοιωσεων ("they say that he equipped a cave on Salamis that had an exposure over the sea and spent his time there shunning the crowd; as a result, he takes many of his comparisons from the sea"). Again the detail is shared with Satyrus, who notes in similar language that Euripides [κεκτη]μένος δ' [αὐ]τόθι σπήλαιον τὴν ἀναπνοὴν ἔχον εἰς τὴν θάλατταν, ἐν τούτῳ διημέρευεν καθ' αὐ[τ]ὸν μερινῶν ἅει τι καὶ γράφων (fr. 39.ix.4–15). The story of the cave—whose "discovery" was announced by Greek archaeologists late in 1996—is supposed to have originated with Philochorus, and the site was apparently still available in the time of Aulus Gellius as a sort of tourist attraction (15.20.5).

⁴⁷ The translation in Hunt 1912, "where he happened to be resting," is unlikely in terms of "plot" (how could the women have tracked him down in such a location rather than in a known haunt?) and in terms of Euripides' supposedly brooding and intense character. It is more likely that σχολάζω has its "scholastic" sense here and suggests the careful "study" that went into the composition of his plays.

⁴⁸ Kovacs 1994: 9.

⁴⁹ Arrighetti 1964: 126; Leo 1912: 283, n. 1; Lesky 1971: 410; Lefkowitz 1981: 89.

sed nusquam in superstite τῶν Θεσμοφοριαζουσῶν comoedia videmus mulieres ad poetae antrum Salaminium iter facientes, nec vero eo cum advenissent eas temperasse adversario propter reverentiam Musarum legimus.⁵⁰

The discrepancies are in fact more numerous than Kuiper suggested. In Satyrus and in the *Vita*, the women visit Euripides during the Thesmophoria in his cave on Salamis with the intention of murdering him, then spare him for two reasons, one somehow involving the Muses, the other a pledge to cease his slanders. In the extant *Thesmophoriazusae*, on the other hand, Euripides has heard that the women of Athens are planning to discuss his extinction at the Thesmophoria; he persuades a kinsman (usually called “Mnesilochus,” though without authority from the text) to infiltrate the meeting, but before any resolution to murder Euripides is even passed the kinsman is discovered and held prisoner, whereupon a farce ensues in which Euripides seeks to rescue him in a series of scenes parodying the rescues of Euripides’ own plays. No-one comes to visit Euripides, with or without the intention of murdering him; Euripides and his kinsman visit Agathon. No-one agrees to spare Euripides’ life, because there has been no decision to do away with him. The only person endangered physically is the kinsman, and this happens in Athens during the celebration of the Thesmophoria, not after the Thesmophoria in a cave on Salamis. Euripides agrees to cease his slanders, but he does so to save his kinsman’s life, not his own. The Muses are not involved in any way. The anecdote must occur on the last day of the Thesmophoria to allow the women the freedom to visit Salamis; but the extant play is set on the second day.⁵¹ There does exist a basic core of shared concepts or situations—the Thesmophoria as backdrop, the notion of Athenian women wanting to kill Euripides over his “slanders,” a pledge to stop slandering—but the elaboration is quite different in the two sources. If the anecdote is supposed to summarize the plot of the extant *Thesmophoriazusae*, it is hopelessly inept; but the similarities are sufficient to allow that one of these “plots” is a reworking of the other. Scholars so far have derived the anecdote from the extant play, but I propose instead that it is the extant play that reflects the anecdote, not directly, of course, but in the anecdote’s original guise as the plot of the lost play.

It might seem an obvious alternative to regard the anecdote as free invention inspired by the extant *Thesmophoriazusae*. In the case of Satyrus, we have too little of the biography to determine whether the author thought he was giving an account of Euripides’ life or was discussing how he had been represented upon the stage; in fact the context could well have been a discussion of Euripides’ reputation

⁵⁰ Kuiper 1913: 236–237: “It is evident that this does not agree at all closely with the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae*. Aristophanes does indeed show in the final scene . . . that Euripides makes a pact with the women . . . but nowhere in the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* do we see the women journeying to the poet’s cave on Salamis, nor do we read that, when they arrived, they spared their adversary because of reverence for the Muses.”

⁵¹ *Tb.* 373–377: ἔδοξε τῇ βούλῃ . . . ἐκκλησίαν ποιεῖν ἕωθεν τῇ μέσῃ / τῶν Θεσμοφορίων.

for misogyny.⁵² But persuasive evidence against the view that the whole story has been invented comes from the statement in Satyrus that the women spared him [ἄγ]ασθεῖσαι [τάς] μούσας and from the parallel assertion in the *Vita* that they did so διὰ τὰς Μούσας.⁵³ The only meaning that this could have without context or further explanation is that the women spared him “because they marvelled at his poems” in the case of Satyrus or “because of his poems”⁵⁴ in the *Vita*: but this would be nonsensical, since it was his “poems” that had provoked their anger in the first place. It is more likely, therefore, that these Muses are the Heliconian nine and that the phrase represents a compression from some larger context in which their precise relevance to Euripides’ rescue was made clear.

One would like to be able to adduce evidence from the fragments of the lost play—331 to 358—to clinch the case, but by their very nature fragments tend to be uninformative; the best one can hope is to show that they do not exclude the hypothesis.

As was noted above, our most specific information regarding the “other” *Thesmophoriazusae* comes from the scholion on the extant play that tells us that Calligenia was the first character to speak. This helps to reconcile the celebration of the Thesmophoria in Athens with a visit to Salamis, for it shows that the play was set at the end of the festival, or at any rate on its last day,⁵⁵ to which Calligenia gave her name. Probably the women made their decision to kill Euripides at an assembly during the Thesmophoria, then visited Salamis to carry it out.

The presence of the male *therapon* who is attested by a scholion to *Frogs* 3 as the speaker of fr. 340 (ὥς διὰ γε τοῦτο τοῦπος οὐ δύναμαι φέρειν / σκεύη τοσαῦτα καὶ τὸν ὄμιον θλίβομαι) also demonstrates that there must have been a change of scene.⁵⁶ This man could hardly be attending the Thesmophoria (the presence of Euripides’ kinsman in the extant play is another matter entirely); rather he seems to have been engaged to assist in moving something (σκεύη τοσαῦτα). However, he is refusing to bear his load, using the pretext of a sore shoulder, but his real reason is τοῦτο τοῦπος, i.e., either something that has been said to him,

⁵² Cf. especially fr. 39.xiii, where someone (probably the interlocutor Diodora) comments on the absurdity of criticizing unfaithful women (as Euripides’ wife is supposed to have been) rather than their seducers.

⁵³ See below, n. 70, however, for the possibility that the correct reading is δι’ αὐτὰς τὰς Μούσας.

⁵⁴ For this meaning of μούσα, cf. Call. fr. 112.1: ἐμὴ μούσα; *A.P.* 5.134.3–4: ἅ τε Κλεάνθους μούσα, 9.571.2: μούσα Σιμωνίδεω. Hunt’s translation “poetical gifts” is perhaps influenced by the English use of “muse” in the sense of “inspiration.”

⁵⁵ “finxit poeta fabulam agi ea Thesmophoriorum die, quae Καλλιγένεια dicebatur” (Kock 1880–88: 1.473). As noted above (n. 51), the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* is set on the second day.

⁵⁶ Schol. *Ran.* 3: ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ εἰς ταῦτα ὀλισθαίνειν, ὥς καὶ ἐν [δευτέραις] Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις θεράπων φησὶν· ὥς . . . θλίβομαι. ἐνταῦθα δὲ φησιν ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἀνέχεσθαι τοῦ θλίβομαι λεγομένου. For the presence or absence of “second” in this note, see above, n. 39. Kassel and Austin point to several striking similarities to the language used by Dionysus and especially Xanthias in the first scene of *Frogs*: ὥς θλίβομαι (5), τί δῆτ’ ἔδει με ταῦτα τὰ σκεύη φέρειν (12), ὁ δ’ ὄμιος οὐτοσί πιέζεται (30).

or perhaps the word that designates the object(s) that he is to carry, something heavy or otherwise unpleasant. Perhaps his job was to assist the Thesmophorians on their voyage to Salamis by carrying their “luggage”; or perhaps he was a slave of Euripides, asked to move some props. But at the very least his presence shows that the play must have involved a change of scene from the all-female setting of the Thesmophoria.

A group of Athenian women assembled on Salamis after the Thesmophoria could have been led by a strong figure like Lysistrata or Praxagora who marshalled them for action and restrained them from the stereotypical temptations of wine and sex,⁵⁷ but there are fewer traces of her in the play’s remnants than usually suggested, and the extant play in fact dispenses with such a character. For example, this supposed leader has been proposed as the speaker of fr. 334 (quoted above, n. 21), in which someone indicates that he or she will not permit the drinking of any wine that will arouse sexual desire. It is odd, however, that this apparently refers to the rousing of male sexual desire⁵⁸ (but see above, 53, for the possibility that this fragment does not come from the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* at all). Perhaps the fragment should be connected with fr. 344 (ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναικὰ βούλομαι), where a male expresses a desire for intercourse;⁵⁹ or perhaps it was spoken by Euripides as part of a threat not merely to slander the women of Athens, as he had done so far, but to protect Athenian men from dangerous female “companionship” (this would of course provide another humorous and even more powerful motive for the sexually charged women of an Aristophanic comedy to want him dead).

It has also been suggested that this presumed leader was an interlocutor in the dialogue contained in fr. 333, but this too is unlikely. Here a woman asks anxiously whether any provisions have been purchased, mentioning *inter alia* the likes of cuttle-fish (σηπίδιον), “broad” prawns (τῶν πλατειῶν καρίδων), octopus (πουλύπους), honeycombs (σχαδόνες), and pig’s paunch (ἡτριάϊον δέλφακος). First of all, any “leader” to whom these questions were addressed would be a failure in that role, since it is clear that any provisions that have been purchased are disappointing or inadequate in this woman’s eyes. More seriously, the “hungry” woman seems to be speaking to a group rather than to an individual (note ἐπεκουρήσατε in 8). As to the source of their physical weariness (cf. γυναιξὶ κοπιώσαισιν in the same line), this is perhaps excessive for a normal celebration of the Thesmophoria, but it might reflect the effort of a journey to

⁵⁷ The suggestion goes back at least to Kock 1880–88, who wrote at 1.473–474: “loquitur mulier quae Lysistratae instar quasi principatum tenet sodalicii.”

⁵⁸ According to Hesychius s.v., ἔμβολος means αἰδοῖον here; for “awakening” the genitalia, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 681d: ἐπίνοιαὶ γὰρ ἀφροδισίων ἐγείρουσιν αἰδοῖα; for ἔμβολος as a sexual term, see Henderson 1975: 120–121.

⁵⁹ For the obscene meaning here, see Campbell 1989. In a play connected with the Thesmophoria, one wonders whether these words somehow allude to and pun upon the “going up” (ἀνοδος) from which the festival’s first day took its name.

Salamis, especially if the women left Athens in too great a hurry to eat (or to acquire adequate provisions) after their ceremonial fasting. It is also possible that husbands, and not the women themselves, were responsible for supplying the end-of-Thesmophoria feast, though this is by no means a necessary inference from Isaeus 3.80 (ἡναγκάζετο ἄν ὑπὲρ τῆς γαμετῆς γυναικὸς καὶ θεσμοφορία ἐστιᾶν τὰς γυναῖκας).

An allusion, at least, to Euripides is established by fr. 327, discussed above (50), though it hardly needs saying that a joke about the content of one of his plays is insufficient to establish his presence as a character on stage.

Persuasive evidence that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* involved “slanders” against women (if not also Euripides as their source) comes in fr. 332, a lengthy enumeration of fifty-two items associated with women, including razors, mirrors, scissors, false hair, pumice, eyeshadow, clothing and jewelry, dildoes, and even their private parts.⁶⁰ Our understanding of the passage would be aided if we knew the antecedent of τούτων in 9 (τὰ μέγιστα δ’ οὐκ εἴρηκα τούτων), since it would presumably identify the class to which the items belong. Whatever that class was, the speaker names thirty-two such items before continuing with twenty more which by implication do represent τὰ μέγιστα. A general atmosphere of hostility is apparent in the unflattering designations “the deep destruction” and “the pit” for the female genitalia. The sheer number of items seems to be part of the point being made, reinforcing the impression of vehemence; it may have been further reinforced by a comment equivalent to “the list goes on and on.”⁶¹ The vast majority of these items are connected with the female *toilette* and especially with clothing; hence one could perhaps subsume all of them under the heading of “women’s inconveniences” (especially regarding the expense involved in cosmetics, jewelry, and clothing). Handley (1983) aptly compares Plautus *Aulularia* 505–523, an exasperated enumeration of makers and sellers of goods equivalent to those mentioned in fr. 332. Perhaps the point in Aristophanes was similar to that in Plautus, namely to illustrate the problems of a wealthy bride (*in magnis dotibus / incommoditates sumptusque intolerabiles*, 532–533), or simply the “insufferable inconveniences and expenses” of women generally. Such a passage would obviously be appropriate in the mouth of Euripides depicted as a stereotypical misogynist.⁶² Clement of Alexandria at least had no doubt that women were being criticized here; this is clear both from the words with which he introduces his citation, “in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, then, Aristophanes details

⁶⁰ The obvious examples of these are ὀλεθρον τὸν βαθύν (3) and βάραθρον (8), for which see Henderson 1975: 139, with n. 162 for the first (the latter, by the way, recurs in Latin in this sense at Martial 3.81.1). Other certainly or possibly obscene expressions in the passage include κεκρύφαλον (6), “both ‘girdle’ and ‘secret phallus’” (Henderson 1975: 113), τρύφημα (7), “a garment/cunt” (Henderson 1975: 142), and ἔγκυκλον (8), which has the same two meanings as τρύφημα (Henderson 1975: 139).

⁶¹ In 14–15 Kassel and Austin print the conjecture of Fritzsche: ἄλλα <πολλά> ὦν / οὐδ’ ἂν λέγων λήξαις.

⁶² Compare the accounts of women’s tricks in the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* (383–432, 466–519).

the whole female *toilette* in an altogether critical manner" (*Paed.* 2.12.124: πάνυ γοῦν ἐπιπόγως πάντα τὸν γυναικεῖον καταλεγόμενος κόσμον Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ὑποδείκνυσιν), and from his characterization of its words as "precisely refuting the vulgarity of your folly" (διελεγχούσας ἀκριβῶς τὸ φορτικὸν ὕμῶν τῆς ἀπειραγαθίας).

An interest in women's adornment emerges again in the reference to women disguising themselves (whether literally or figuratively) in fr. 337,⁶³ as well as in the reference to *baucides*, a type of footwear favoured by Ionian women, in fr. 355. The "filthy bag" smelling of *myron* and *baccaris* perhaps alludes to the use of those unguents by women (fr. 336),⁶⁴ while the moneybag of fr. 343⁶⁵ is perhaps one from which a man pays for his wife's luxuries. Further evidence that women's behaviour was at issue in the play comes from fr. 345: τὸ χαλκίον θερμαίνεται, apparently in reference to their proverbial inclination toward tippling.⁶⁶ Additional references to drinking and to eating appear in the οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας of fr. 351 and in the μύστρον of fr. 354, though we can not be sure that the consumers are women. As to sex, fr. 338 alludes to lascivious female conduct,⁶⁷ while fr. 356 shows that Aristophanes used the verb διαλέξασθαι *sensu obsceno*, and in fr. 344 a man states bluntly ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναικᾶ βούλομαι. The journey that the women had to make to Salamis was itself a potential source of sexual humour.⁶⁸ It could well be that in the lost play, as in the extant one, Aristophanes used the notion of Euripides' misogynistic ψόγοι as an opportunity for humorous ψόγοι of his own.

One last fragment requires attention here.⁶⁹ It was noted earlier that the women, who are supposed to have spared Euripides "because of the Muses," cannot have done so simply because he was a poet. A more attractive hypothesis would be that one or more of the Muses intervened on the playwright's behalf in a debate with the women that seems a natural candidate for the play's *agon*. Another, and perhaps more attractive, possibility is that one or more Muses rescued Euripides by appearing as *dea(e) ex machina*—an obvious opportunity to parody his fondness for this device, perhaps in a series of attempted rescues

⁶³ ὅς' ἦν περίεργ' αὐταῖσι τῶν φορημάτων / ὅσαις τε περιπέττουσιν.

⁶⁴ ὦ Ζεὺ πολυμήθη', οἶον ἐνέπνευσ' ὁ μιαρὸς / φάσκωλος εὐθὺς λυόμενός μοι τοῦ μύρου / καὶ βακκάριδος.

⁶⁵ σακίον, ἐν οἷσπερ τὰργύριον ταμιεύεται.

⁶⁶ Pollux 9.69: ἐγὼ δὲ τὸ ἐν ταῖς Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις Ἀριστοφάνους εἰρημένον "τὸ χαλκίον θερμαίνεται" οὕτω πως ἤκουον ὡς εἰς πότον εὐτρεπιζομένων τῶν γυναικῶν.

⁶⁷ τὴν πτέρυγα παραλύσασα τοῦ χιτωνίου / καὶ τῶν ἀποδέσμων, οἷς ἐνὴν τιθίδια: for the sexual associations of πτέρυξ, see Henderson 1975: 128.

⁶⁸ For the possible sexual implications of Salamis itself, and the pun on κέλῃς (both "horse" and "row-boat") that could be used in connection with such a trip, see Henderson 1975: 164–165, esp. 165: "references to Salamis often appear in the context of *mulier superior* (the woman on top)."

⁶⁹ Unfortunately, nothing useful emerges from fr. 339, where someone rues the day when the herald said οὗτος ἀλφάνει, or from fr. 335, where "they say" that the Pythagorae and the Hieromnemon come from the Pylaea "bringing great good to the city," to say nothing of fragments even less substantial.

like those of the extant play—then brokered the reconciliation in which he agreed to stop his slanders.⁷⁰ A prime candidate for parody here was surely the *Antiope*; its etymologizing was mocked in fr. 342, and it featured Hermes rescuing Lycus from murder at the hands of Zethus and Amphion.⁷¹ Fr. 348 contains what could be an injunction to someone not to call upon the Muses' help: μήτε Μούσας ἀνακαλεῖν ἑλικοβοστρύχους / μήτε Χάριτας βοᾶν ἐς χορὸν Ὀλυμπίας / ἐνθάδε γάρ εἰσιν, ὥς φησιν ὁ διδάσκαλος. While it is obviously tempting to try to refer this fragment to the epiphany of the Muses hypothesized here, a connection does not seem likely; it is more probable that the poet is simply boasting of the high quality of his product.⁷²

IV. CONCLUSION

The lost *Thesmophoriazusae* is not a late play but the one with which Aristophanes failed to win at the Lenaea of 423; his discussion of it in *Wasps* implies that he produced it himself, as he had done with *Knights* in 424. Like the extant one, it achieved humour at Euripides' expense. It began at the Thesmophoria, probably with a scene of deliberation in which the celebrants agreed upon the necessity of doing away with Euripides (they could, but need not, have been motivated by a specific action on Euripides' part rather than by his "slanders" in general; see below, 72–73, for further speculation based on the assumption that *POxy.* 212 is a fragment of this play). The women may have been in such a hurry to eliminate their oppressor that they left for Salamis without adequately refreshing themselves, and a testy slave may have balked at carrying something for them. Confronted by his accusers, Euripides may have aired his unfavourable opinion of women (so expensive to maintain), and he may have been rescued by one or more Muses appearing as *deae ex machina*. In the parabasis, Aristophanes attacked two sycophants who prosecuted him, probably on a γραφή ξενίας, following the failure of Cleon's own prosecution. As to filling in the details, there is no-one whose comic invention I am less prepared to second-guess than Aristophanes.

If the anecdote preserved in Satyrus and in the *Vita* really does represent the plot of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, then that core of similarity mentioned

⁷⁰ The participle ἀγαθεῖσαι which Satyrus apparently applied to the women at this point in the story (fr. 39.x.37) seems more appropriate for describing a single act of "marvelling" at such an epiphany than their supposed "admiration" for Euripides' poetry. The case for direct intervention by the Muses is stronger with the reading of Westermann 1845: 136: δι' αὐτὰς τὰς Μούσας. The only reference to variants in Westermann's *apparatus criticus* is a note which states "τὰς add. Welckerus," thus implying that the manuscripts known to him read δι' αὐτὰς Μούσας. The text printed above (derived from Kovacs 1994) is taken from the Budé edition of Méridier (Paris 1976), where the *apparatus* records no variants; but the three manuscripts that Westermann used (Ambros. L 39 sup.; Vindobonensis 119; Hauniensis 3549) were also used by Méridier, with the addition of Vat. gr. 1345 and Paris, Ste Geneviève 3400.

⁷¹ Ian Storey, however, reminds me that a Muse appears as a *dea ex machina* at the end of *Rhesus*.

⁷² So Kock 1880–88: 1.480: "invocatione Musarum non opus esse poeta gloriatur: semper enim secum esse."

earlier between it and the extant one (above, 65) obviously allows that one of these plays might be a reworking of the other, comparable to what is attested for *Clouds* and for Eupolis' *Autolycus*. If that is the case, then the version offered by Satyrus and the later biographer is, in my opinion, more likely to be the original conception and the version in the extant comedy more likely to be the revision. Given the prominence of Euripides as a target in the comedies of Aristophanes, it is simply inconceivable to me that the latter should first compose a play—a play ridiculing Euripides—in which Euripides' role was essentially secondary (his kinsman confronts the women, utters the ψόγοι, and needs to be rescued), then only in a reworking conceived the idea of having Euripides himself require rescue from his angry accusers: surely the direct confrontation is the original conception, and what we find in the extant play is an attempt to use the same idea without repeating the original plot.

Clouds and *Autolycus* certainly involve reworking,⁷³ and scholars make comparable claims in the case of *Aeolosicon*, *Peace*, and *Plutus*, though the evidence is far less certain.⁷⁴ As to Aristophanes' motive in reviving and reworking the earlier *Thesmophoriazusae*, perhaps it was the same as that attested in *Argumentum* 1 to *Clouds*, dissatisfaction with the reception of the earlier work, no doubt with the related hope that the new play could achieve a better result in a new competition. (Kassel and Austin, however, follow Kaibel in rejecting this evidence, connected as it is with an alleged production of the revised *Clouds* the year after the first version; for further discussion, see Dover 1968: lxxx–lxxxi.) This suggestion receives support from the disappointment expressed in *Wasps* over the “betrayal” of the previous year's play (πέρυσιν καταπρούδοτε, 1044). Alternatively, one might suggest that the “double” plays represent cases in which the first version was produced by Callistratus or Philonides, who was accordingly inscribed as competitor or as victor in the official *didascaliae*, then the second was produced by Aristophanes himself with the aim of being recorded under his own name;⁷⁵ this hypothesis, however, seems to be contradicted by the fact that the passage in

⁷³ For the changes from the first to the second *Clouds*, see Dover 1968: lxxx–xcviii; for the revision of *Autolycus*, see above, 55, with n. 29.

⁷⁴ In the case of *Aeolosicon*, the title character's distinctive name suggests that the two versions could not have varied much; for *Plutus*, cf. the words of Kaibel, cited by Kassel and Austin on Πλούτος test. iii, “argumentum utriusque fabulae in universum fere idem fuit, sed tractatio pro temporum ratione diversa.”

⁷⁵ This hypothesis, of course, requires that it was the *didascalus* and not the author whose name was recorded officially; for a recent discussion, see Butrica 2001 (esp. n. 14). While the topic was hotly debated at the turn of the century, the current consensus (to the extent that one exists) seems to be that both *didascalus* and poet were recorded; cf., however, Russo 1984: 40: “dopo un'annosa polemica si è avuta la certezza che anche per il v secolo, e non solo per il iv, il nome del poeta e non quello del didascalo veniva iscritto nelle cosiddette Liste dei vittori.” The question of why poets employed substitute *didascali* is perhaps illuminated by the information about Plato Comicus provided in the Suda entry Ἀρκάδας μιμούμενοι that διὰ γὰρ τὸ τὰς κωμωδίας αὐτὸς ποιῶν ἄλλοις παρέχειν διὰ πενίαν, Ἀρκάδας μιμῆσθαι ἔφη, in combination with the information from *POxy.* 2737 fr. 1.ii.10–17 that Plato was successful as long as others produced his plays but failed when

Wasps apparently concerns productions for which Aristophanes himself served as *didascalus* (ὄτε πρῶτόν γ' ἤρξε διδάσκειν, 1029). Unfortunately, our information about the producers of Aristophanes' plays and about their success in the competitions is insufficient to prove or to refute either suggestion; while we know that the first *Clouds* and (apparently) the first *Thesmophoriazusae* failed to win a first prize, we know nothing about the fate of the first *Peace* (the extant one, produced by Aristophanes, finished second, which would at least be an improvement over third) or the first *Plutus* (though we do know that Aristophanes himself produced the second). It is intriguing, however, that in the case of Eupolis' *Autolycus*, a "double" play where we have the evidence of Galen to tell us that the second was an adaptation of the first, we also know from Athenaeus that one of the two was produced through a certain Demostratus as substitute *didascalus*, in the same way that some of Aristophanes' plays were produced through Callistratus and Philonides (Ath. 5.216d: Εὐπολὶς τὸν Αὐτόλυκον διδάξας διὰ Δημοστράτου). Perhaps Aristophanes' motive varied from case to case.

Russo (1984) has wondered why the second *Clouds* and second *Plutus* were chosen for preservation but not the second *Thesmophoriazusae*. If the arguments of this paper are valid, then it was the second version that was chosen in every case, leaving one to wonder whether the same is true of *Peace* as well (assuming that a second *Peace* ever existed); perhaps the author's δευτεραι φροντίδες were consciously chosen as more "definitive" versions.

APPENDIX

Two papyrus fragments have been assigned to the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, POxy. 212 and POxy. 3540.

POxy. 212 (now printed as fr. 592 K-A, the text followed here) has by far the better claim.⁷⁶ The speakers are all women, complaining about abusive mockery, and the first word of fr. A col. ii is ὑβριζόμεναι—appropriately for a comedy that, as hypothesized here, concerned ψόγοι against women. As the supplements printed here from Kassel-Austin show, it has been conjectured right from the fragment's discovery that the subject was dildoes. The women speak of being said to παίζειν with something: τί ἐστὶ τοῦθ' ὃ λέγουσι τ[ᾶς Μιλησίου] / παίζειν ἐχούσας, ἀντιβολῶ, [τὸ σκύτινον] (16–17); and something, perhaps that charge, is denounced as nonsensical reproach: φλυαρία καὶ λήρος ὑβρεω[ς]

δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ πρῶτον διδάξας. The excuse of πένια (implying that the *didascalus* incurred expenses not covered by the *choregus*?) may be only a joke, but it is an intriguing coincidence that one of the occasions between *Knights* and *Plutus* when Aristophanes is known securely to have employed a substitute *didascalus*—the production of *Frogs*—was also the only occasion when financial exigency required a *synchoregia* for the City Dionysia.

⁷⁶For editions and discussions, see Grenfell and Hunt 1899: 20–23; Fraccaroli 1900; van Herwerden 1900; Page 1941: 222–224; Demianczuk 1912: 91–92; Austin 1973: 25–27 (= *62). Handley (1983: 85, n. 1) dismisses the attribution out of hand, while Ciriello (1989) suggests that the fragment comes instead from *Lemniae*.

/ καὶ ἄλλως ὄνειδος καὶ κατ[άγελως] (18–19). Of the object in question one woman remarks that it “is said to be just like the real thing,” while according to another it is no more like it than the moon is like the sun—the surface appearance is the same, but it generates no heat: (B.) καὶ μὴν λέγεται γ’ ὥς ἐσθ’ [ὅμοιον ποσθίω] / ἄλη[θ]ινῶ κ[αὶ τ]οῦτο. (A.) νῆ Δ[ί] / ὥσπερ [σ]ελήνη γ’ ἡλίω· τὴν μὲν [χρόαν] / ἰδεῖν ὅμοιον ἐστί, θάλπει δ’ οὐ[δαμῶς] (24–27). These women are clearly disappointed with the technology (likened to “wind eggs” in 20–21) and miss “the real thing,” the substitute for which is so inadequate. Unless Aristophanes was exaggerating female sexual drive for humorous effect more than usual, the frustration apparent here seems to imply a longer period of abstinence than the three days of the Thesmophoria; and if the fragment really does come from the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, then perhaps we can hazard the guess that the women were frustrated and angry at Euripides because his “slanders” had been so successful that Athenian men were avoiding women entirely in response. In addition, sex is perhaps “the thing” that they apparently discuss sharing—in secret—with slaves: φέρ’, εἰ [δ]ὲ τοῖς θεράπουσι κοινωσ[αίμεθα] / τὸ πρ[ᾶ]γμα, τί ἂν εἴη· λάθρᾳ τεπ[ι]α[] (29–30). It is tempting to speculate that the *therapontes* mentioned here are not the women’s household slaves (in which case the women would be contemplating adultery after their return home) but slaves hired to help them move their provisions after their stay at the Thesmophoria, and tempting further to suggest that the *therapon* of fr. 340 is one of them.

The claims of this fragment to belong to a play with literary connections, such as one containing a travesty of Euripides would be, are strengthened by the few scraps of fr. B, where some adjectival or adverbial form of τραγικός appears ([τραγικῶ], 33), followed soon after by [ταγάθω] (35), which the accent shows is a form of the name of the tragic poet Agathon, who is associated with Euripides in the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* as well. It is also possible that the mention of Agathon overlaps fr. 341, cited from *Thesmophoriazusae* (καὶ κατ’ Ἀγάθων’ ἀντίθετον ἐξυρημένον); but Kassel and Austin restore here another fragment of Aristophanes with precisely the same collocation of letters.

The claims of *POxy.* 3540 were advanced by Handley (1983: 80–86). Believing that the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* began with an expository prologue spoken by Calligenia in the guise of Demeter’s nurse, Handley accordingly restored the opening lines as follows: [ἦ]κω πρὸς ὑμᾶς Θεσμοφορίων ἡ Τρίτη / [κ]ληθεῖσα Καλλιγένεια Δήμητρος τροφός. We have seen already, however, that the belief that Calligenia appeared in the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* as nurse of Demeter rests upon shaky grounds (above, 62–63), and in fact the rest of what survives of the expository prologue here—a household, a mother, a nurse, twin daughters, the trustworthy slave Midas—smacks so unmistakably of New Comedy that the *Didymai* of Menander or of Antiphanes, which Handley rejected in favour of the lost *Thesmophoriazusae*, seems a far more plausible candidate. Handley, however, was influenced decisively by a misunderstanding of the verb προλογίζω used in the scholion on *Thesmophoriazusae* 298 (quoted above, 62): “Aristophanes,

as is known to all connoisseurs of the comic prologue, began his lost *Second Thesmophoriazusae* with an exposition speech by Kalligeneia" (81). In fact the word means not "speak an expository prologue" but simply "speak before," i.e., "speak first," before any other character does. Other characters said in scholia or in hypotheses to προλογίζειν include Antigone in Sophocles' play (ten lines addressed to Ismene), Euripides' kinsman in the extant *Thesmophoriazusae* (two lines of complaint, and two more addressed to Euripides), and even Xanthias in *Frogs* (two lines addressed to Dionysus); it is even possible for *two* characters to προλογίζειν: cf. Ar. *Peace*, Arg. 1: προλογίζουσι δὲ οἱ δύο θεράποντες αὐτοῦ. Hence the existence of an expository prologue, though not excluded, is certainly not a necessary conclusion. It does not seem likely in any case that Calligenia spoke the sort of sober exposition attested in *POxy*. 3540; Aristophanes more probably characterized her as some variation on the comic stereotype of the bibulous old woman, consorting with the celebrants on the joyous last day of the festival.⁷⁷

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
ST JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND
A1C 5S7

jbutrica@morgan.ucs.mun.ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrighetti, G. ed. 1964. *Satiro, Vita di Euripide*. Studi Classici e Orientali 13. Pisa.
- Austin, C. ed. 1973. *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*. Berlin and New York.
- Butrica, J. L. 2001. "Democrates and Euripides' *Andromache* (Σ *Andr.* 445 = Callimachus fr. 451 Pfeiffer)," *Hermes* 129: 188–197.
- Campbell, D. 1989. "Going up? ἀναβῆναι in Anacreon 395 (Page)," *EMC/CV* n.s. 8: 49–50.
- Capps, E. 1907. "Epigraphical Problems in the History of Attic Comedy," *AJP* 28: 179–199.
- Cassio, A. C. 1987. "I tempi di composizione delle commedie attiche e una parabasi di Aristofane in Galeno (Ar. fr. 346 K.-A.)," *RFIC* 115: 5–11.
- Chantry, M. ed. 1994. *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusae, Ranas, Ecclesiazusae et Plutum* 3.4^a. Groningen.
- ed. 1999. *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusae, Ranas, Ecclesiazusae et Plutum* 3.1^a. Groningen.
- Ciriello, S. 1989. "Aristofane fr. 592 K.-A.: Lemnie?," *Sileno* 15: 83–88.
- Cropp, M. and G. Fick. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies*. BICS Supplement 43. London.

⁷⁷ Another consideration that tells against Handley's ascription of the fragment is the fact that its apparent "anticipation" of New Comedy is nowhere mentioned in ancient sources, which attribute these innovations to the *Cocalus* and *Aeolosicon*. Since the lost *Thesmophoriazusae* is cited about as often as these two plays combined and seems, therefore, to have been better known, one would expect it to be cited along with them, if not instead of them, for this novelty, especially when this fragment is significantly closer to New Comedy than either of them.

- Deichgräber, K. 1956. "Parabasenverse aus Thesmophoriazusen II des Aristophanes bei Galen," *Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst* 2: 1–38.
- Demianczuk, J. ed. 1912. *Supplementum Comicum*. Berlin.
- Dindorf, W. ed. 1853. *Harpocratonis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*. Oxford.
- Dover, K. J. ed. 1968. *Aristophanes: Clouds*. Oxford.
- 1972. *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Dübner, F. ed. 1877. *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*. Paris.
- Fraccaroli, G. 1900. "Briciole dai papiri di Ossirinco, 1: Un nuovo frammento di Aristofane," *RFIC* 28: 87–89.
- Gelzer, M. 1971. "Aristophanes der Komiker," *RE Suppl.* 12: 1392–1570.
- Grenfell, B. P. and A. S. Hunt (eds.). 1899. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 2. London.
- Gulick, G. B. ed. and tr. 1961. *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Handley, E. W. ed. 1983. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 50. London.
- Henderson, J. 1975. *The Maculate Muse*. New Haven.
- Holwerda, D. ed. 1977. *Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes* 3.1. Groningen.
- 1982. *Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam* 2. Groningen.
- Hunt, A. S. ed. 1912. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 9. London.
- Kassel, R. and C. Austin (eds.). 1984. *Poetae comici Graeci* 3.2. Berlin and New York.
- Keaney, J. J. 1969. "Moschopoulos and Harpocraton," *TAPA* 100: 201–207.
- ed. 1991. *Harpocraton: Lexeis of the Ten Orators*. Amsterdam.
- Kock, T. ed. 1880–88. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. Leipzig.
- Koster, W. J. W. ed. 1962. *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem* 3: *Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves, argumentum Equitum*. Groningen and Amsterdam.
- ed. 1978. *Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam* 1. Groningen.
- Kovacs, D. 1994. *Euripidea*. Leiden.
- Kühn, C. G. ed. 1826. *Galenii opera omnia*. Leipzig.
- Kuiper, K. 1913. "Ad Satyri fragmentum de vita Euripidis adnotationes duae," *Mnemosyne* 41: 233–242.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore.
- Leo, F. 1912. "Satyros, ΒΙΟΣ ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ," *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologische-historische Klasse*: 273–290.
- Lesky, A. 1971. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*³. Bern and Munich.
- Luppe, W. 1986. "Die ΜΗΔΕΙΑ-Hypothesis," *Anagennesis* 4: 37–58.
- MacDowell, D. M. ed. 1971. *Aristophanes: Wasps*. Oxford.
- Olson, S. D. ed. 1998. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.
- Page, D. L. ed. and tr. 1941. *Select Papyri* 3: *Literary Papyri*. London.
- Papathomopoulos, M. 1964. "Un argument sur papyrus de la Médée d'Euripide," *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3: 37–47.
- Parker, L. P. E. 1997. *The Songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford.
- Parsons, P., J. Rea, and E. G. Turner (eds.). 1968. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 33. London.
- Platnauer, M. ed. 1964. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.
- Russo, C. F. 1984. *Aristofane autore di teatro*². Florence.
- Sommerstein, A. ed. and tr. 1985. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Warminster.
- ed. and tr. 1994. *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusaë*. Warminster.

- Starkie, W. J. M. ed. 1897. *The Wasps of Aristophanes*. London.
- van Herwerden, H. 1900. "Ad papyros Graecos II," *Mnemosyne* n.s. 28: 122-125.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London.
- Westermann, A. ed. 1845. *Biographi Graeci minores*. Braunschweig.
- White, J. W. 1912. *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. London.