

Subtilität, die dazugehörige Textinterpretation und Funktionsbestimmung von großer Konsistenz. Dennoch ergab sich, daß der historische Kontext anders, als von Käppel zugrundegelegt wird, zu rekonstruieren ist, daß die Schlußpartie 130–32 als Bitte um den Sieg in einem Agon aufzufassen sein dürfte, während es keine Paian-Agone gegeben hat, und daß die Transformation des mythischen in den realen Chor, die ‚Lied-im-Lied‘-Technik in ihrer unbedingten Gültigkeit durch die Parallele in Timotheos’ *Persern* in Frage gestellt ist. Die Dithyramben-These ist nicht mit diesen Problemen behaftet: Der historische Kontext ist für sie ohne zentrale Bedeutung, die Bitte um den Sieg im Agon führt lediglich auf die vergleichsweise geringe Schwierigkeit, die in hellenistischer Zeit belegten Agone auch für das frühe 5. Jh. anzunehmen. Schließlich – und das ist nicht zu verachten – spricht zu ihren Gunsten die antike Einordnung von Bakchylides 17 als Dithyrambos⁶³).

Greifswald

Martin Hose

63) Ich danke Carl Werner Müller für Hinweise und Kritik.

A TRAGIC LYSISTRATA? Jocasta in the ‘Reconciliation Scene’ of the *Phoenician Women**)

I

Euripides exhibits a fondness for borrowing material not only from the works of his fellow tragedians, but from the comic repertoire as well. Bernd Seidensticker has comprehensively investigated instances of comic influence in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and

*) I am indebted to Professor James A. Coulter, who most generously read the drafts of this paper and offered many suggestions for its improvement. My thanks are also due to Professor Helene P. Foley, Mr. David W. Hinkle, and Ms. Ann H. Rittenbaum for their helpful criticism.

Euripides, and his studies make it plain that, of the three authors, Euripides is the most ready to use such elements and the most masterful at incorporating them into his plays¹). Among Seidensticker's valuable contributions is his elucidation of how Euripides uses comic material to intensify the "serious" impact of his tragedies. The conduct of Pentheus dressed to kill in the *Bacchae*, for example, may have its humorous side, but, its fundamental effect is to increase our apprehension of the terrible consequences of his actions²).

Seidensticker has been concerned primarily with Euripides' adaptation of jokes as well as stock comic motifs and scenarios. This paper will inquire into the possible "translation" into a tragedy of the blocking and action used in a specific scene of a specific comedy; it will thus explore Euripides' "borrowing" of a comedy's dramaturgy more than his manipulation of humor and humorous elements. My suggestion is that the tragedian has modelled the key events of the first episode in the *Phoenician Women*, produced perhaps in 408 B.C.³), upon the "reconciliation scene" in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, produced a few years earlier⁴). I argue

1) B. Seidensticker, *Palintonos Harmonia. Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie, Hypomnemata 72* (Göttingen 1982) (hereafter cited as *Harmonia*), and *Comic Elements in Euripides' Bacchae*, *AJP* 99 (1978) 303-320. See also C.J. Herington, *The Influence of Old Comedy on Aeschylus' Later Trilogies*, *TAPA* 94 (1963) 113-23.

2) Seidensticker, *Harmonia* 123-9.

3) The *Phoenician Women* is generally dated to 410, 409, or 408 B.C.; see e.g. E. Craik, ed., *Euripides' Phoenician Women* (Warminster 1988) introd. 40. C. W. Müller, *Zur Datierung des sophokleischen Ödipus*, *AbhMainz* 1984, 5 (Wiesbaden 1984) 66-9, has presented good reasons for rejecting 409 and, citing the compelling evidence of Σ Frogs 53, argued for 408; following him are Chr. Mueller-Goldingen, *Untersuchungen zu den Phoinissen des Euripides* (Stuttgart 1985) 6-13, and W. Luppe, *Zur Datierung der Phoinissai des Euripides*, *RhM* 130 (1987) 29-34. Euripides' tetralogy in 408, according to this argument, would have comprised the *Antiope*, *Hypsipyle*, *Phoenician Women*, with the *Orestes* replacing the usual satyr play. Convincing as this argument is, I have some reservations about considering the *Orestes* prosatyrlic, and I consequently should not like to discount 410 as the possible year for the *Phoenician Women's* production. That it was staged at least one year after the *Lysistrata* seems guaranteed by Σ Frogs 53, and a date later than 408 is impossible. - The works by Craik and Mueller-Goldingen will hereafter be cited by the authors' names. I use the text of the *Phoenician Women* prepared by G. Murray, ed., *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. III (Oxford 1909).

4) Aristophanes most likely produced the *Lysistrata* at the Lenaea of 411 (i. e., in January or February) according to A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes and the Events of 411*, *JHS* 97 (1977) 112-26, who is followed by J. Henderson, ed., *Aristophanes' Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987) introd. xxii-xxv (hereafter cited by the author's name alone). See also Th. Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the*

specifically that the actions and arguments of Jocasta, whose effort to make peace between the warring sons of Oedipus dominates the first third of the tragedy, are intentionally reminiscent of Lysistrata's approach to reconciling the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors⁵). As with the instances in the *Bacchae* that Seidensticker has examined, Euripides' appropriation of "comic" material for this episode of the *Phoenician Women* would serve ultimately to heighten its terrible tragic tension.

Euripides' willingness to range into the territory of comedy has intrigued many students of his dramas. Aristophanes himself, as noted by Froma Zeitlin, calls attention in the *Thesmophoriazusae* to the tragedian's "trespass of aesthetic modes" and "transgression of tragic decorum"⁶). The development of "tragicomic" plots in the *Alcestis*, *Ion*, *Helen*, and *Iphigeneia in Tauris* has received ample critical attention⁷), and the comic aspects of plays like the *Orestes* and *Electra* seem widely acknowledged. In noting the resemblance of Helen 1107–12 to *Birds* 209–14, Richard Kannicht cites an instance in which Euripides has possibly reversed Aristophanes' technique of paratragic adaptation and reworked lyrics taken from a comedy⁸). Even if the tragedian has not derived the lines in the *Helen* specifically from the *Birds*, the closeness of the two passages corroborates the idea that, in the last decades of the fifth century, the common ground of tragedy and comedy was expanding while the distinctions between the genres were erod-

Intertextual Parabasis (Ithaca and London 1991) 243–5. – I use the text of the *Lysistrata* prepared by Henderson.

5) In discerning a connection between Euripides' Jocasta and Aristophanes' Lysistrata, I am anticipated by C. Hernando Balmori, ed. and trans., Euripides, *Las Fenicias* (Tucumán 1946) 95–6, who states that "...el contenido político de Lisistrata fué para Euripides la idea inspiradora ... de las *Fenicias* ..." and notes important similarities in the actions of Lysistrata and Jocasta. But he does not seem to be concerned, as I am, with Euripides' technique as a dramatist – i. e., the way the tragedian adapts the pattern of action of the *Lysistrata*'s reconciliation scene for the *Phoenician Women*. Nor does he appear interested in exploring the significance of the contrast, invited by this adaptation, of Jocasta's failure to reconcile her sons with Lysistrata's success in winning over the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors.

6) F. Zeitlin, *Travesties of Gender and Genre in Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazusae*, in: *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. H. Foley (London, New York, and Paris 1982) 169–217, especially 173 ff.

7) E. g. Seidensticker, *Harmonia* 129–241; A. Pippin Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971); B. M. W. Knox, *Euripidean Comedy*, in: *The Rarer Action. Essays in Honor of Francis Ferguson*, ed. A. Cheuse (New Brunswick 1970) 68–96.

8) R. Kannicht, ed., *Euripides Helena II* (Heidelberg 1969) 281, note 8.

ing⁹). Euripides and Aristophanes, though not working in the same genre, were apparently viewed during their careers as akin, and, as Zeitlin has observed, the conception of the playwrights as rivals is long-standing¹⁰). Indeed, it is possible to discern in their dramas the intellectual and spiritual affinities of these two authors¹¹). Given this evidence, it seems entirely credible that Euripides, upon finding something intriguing and important in the *Lysistrata*, may have been moved and inspired to appropriate and adapt it, a year or two later, into his *Phoenician Women*. Just as Aristophanes, from the *Acharnians* on, frequently reworks specific scenes from Euripides' tragedies in a comic context, so Euripides, on this hypothesis, may have reworked the reconciliation scene of the *Lysistrata* in a tragic context¹²). Such re-working, I submit, would indicate the tragedian's admiration for and appreciation of what the comic poet presents; it would also intimate his desire to challenge his "rival" and, perhaps, their shared audience to consider again what the process of making peace actually involves.

Despite its sexually explicit humor and the celebratory mood of its finale, the *Lysistrata* is problematic and thought-provoking, presenting some of the most serious and poignant moments in Aristophanes' comedies¹³). It is not, I think, a platform for partisan political propaganda, but it does explore in an especially pow-

9) See H.-J. Newiger, Die Vögel und ihre Stellung im Gesamtwerk des Aristophanes, in: Aristophanes und die alte Komödie, ed. H.-J. Newiger [= Wege der Forschung 265] (Darmstadt 1975) 266–82; also Th. Gelzer, Tradition und Neuschöpfung in der Dramaturgie des Aristophanes, *ibid.* 283–316. Knox (above, note 7) 68–9 would disagree with my contention: he qualifies his discussion of "Euripidean comedy" by stating, "One reason for stopping short of this word [= "comedy"] is that Euripides himself would have repudiated it with some indignation . . . In fifth century Athens the two genres were rigidly separate . . ."

10) Zeitlin (above, note 6) 192 ff. and 214, note 25, where she cites the often quoted fragment in which Cratinus coins the participle, εὐριπιδαισιοτοφανίζων (fr. 342 PCG [= fr. 307K]).

11) C. Prato, Euripide nella Critica di Aristofane (Gallatina 1955) 21–35 and *passim*, explores the common interests and concerns of Euripides and Aristophanes.

12) There is a distinct possibility that the comic poet himself may be in part indebted to Euripides for inspiring his daring heroines like *Lysistrata* and *Praxagora* in the *Ecclesiazousae*; see e.g. H. J. Tschiedel, Aristophanes und Euripides. Zu Herkunft und Absicht der Weiberkomödien, *Grazer Beiträge* 11 (1984) 47–8. *Lysistrata*, as Henderson and others have observed, begins her important speech in the reconciliation scene (Lys. 1124) with a quotation from Euripides' *Melanippe the Wise* (fr. 483 Nauck). According to my hypothesis, then, Euripides in the *Phoenician Women* may be borrowing something back from Aristophanes.

13) E. g., *Lysistrata*'s moving description of how war ruins women's lives in lines 588–97.

erful manner what causes men to fight and keeps them fighting¹⁴). Even its happy reconciliation scene, in which the heroine prevails upon the desperate Athenian and Spartan ambassadors to make peace, hints at the difficulty of persuading men to abandon their claims and ambitions¹⁵). The *Lysistrata*'s examination of the stubborn attitudes that lead to war and its hardships must have retained and even gained relevance in the years immediately following its original performance, when the Athenians witnessed not only the continuation of the Peloponnesian War, but also factional violence and political upheaval within their own city.

Like the *Lysistrata*, the *Phoenician Women* is concerned with the reasons why men draw up battle lines and go to war, and its relevance to the current situation in Athens during the last years of the fifth century cannot be disputed. Jacqueline de Romilly has called it one of Euripides' "most topical plays," in which "... ancient myth has been revived and rejuvenated in the light of recent experiences," and Dieter Ebener, Roger Goossens, and E. Delebecque have concurred about its immediacy¹⁶). In particular, the

14) The exploration of intransigent attitudes, especially concerning power and territorial prerogative, is in my view one of the comedy's principal concerns (see especially lines 254–705). See also Henderson, introd. xv–xxv and xxx–xxxii. For other views of the comedy's (political) purpose, see e. g. E. Visser, Zu *Lysistrata* 1137–1156, in: *Κωμωδοτρογῆματα*. Studia Aristophanea viri Aristophanei W. J. Koster in honorem, ed. R. E. H. Westendorp (Amsterdam 1967) 150–4, and N. Wilson, Two Observations on Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, GRBS 23 (1982) 157–61.

15) See *Lys.* 1162–75, which I shall discuss in detail.

16) J. de Romilly, *Phoenician Women of Euripides*. Topicality in Greek Tragedy, *Bucknell Review* 15 (1967) 109; D. Ebener, *Die Phönizierinnen des Euripides als Spiegelbild geschichtlicher Wirklichkeit*, *Eirene* 2 (1964) 71–9; R. Goossens, *Euripide et Athènes* (Brussels 1962) 608 ff., E. Delebecque, *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse* (Paris 1951) 347–64, and Craik, introd. 44–5, discuss the relevance of *Phoenician Women* to contemporary events. F. Zeitlin, *Thebes. Theatre of Self and Society in Athenian Drama*, in: *Nothing to Do with Dionysus?*, edd. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (Princeton 1990) 130–167 explores in broad terms the relevance of events dramatized in *Thebes* to the experiences of the Athenians. – De Romilly, 109–12, takes Goossens and Delebecque to task (rightly, I think) for interpreting the drama too narrowly as specific propaganda in the support of the democratic party (Goossens) or in favor of the recall of Alcibiades (Delebecque). Balmori (above, note 5) introd. 97–99, also presses too closely the analogy between current affairs – this time, the war with Sparta – and the drama's depiction of the brothers' strife; he claims that Eteocles represents Sparta and Polyneices, Athens. To my mind, Euripides' dramatization of the quarrel between Oedipus' sons is sufficiently generalized that it easily evokes both the war between Athens and Sparta and the factional strife within Athens, and there is no need to require the play to be more specific.

first episode's agon, which is in fact a failed "reconciliation scene," lays bare the motivations and ambitions that drive Eteocles and Polyneices to battle, and their selfish desires for power and property must mirror the reckless and destructive impulses that seem to have inspired Euripides' contemporaries in the war against the Peloponnesians, as well as in the recent factional conflicts within Athens¹⁷). It seems clear that, in the *Phoenician Women*, Euripides deals with the same problems that Aristophanes explores in the *Lysistrata*. The common interest of the two dramas, combined with the close proximity of the dates of their original performances, makes it reasonable to investigate the possibility of a relationship between the "reconciliation scenes," equally prominent in both plays, that feature women striving to make peace between men. This tragedy's rich and well appreciated layers of allusion to the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Homer, as well as the innovative complexities of its structure, supply additional reasons for inquiring into its possible links to Aristophanes' comedy¹⁸).

That the *Phoenician Women* lacks direct, explicit quotations or "parodies" of lines from the *Lysistrata* does not preclude such an adaptation, nor should the silence of ancient commentators dissuade us from examining potential similarities in the two "reconciliation scenes" and the strong resemblance of Jocasta, as presented in the tragedy's first episode, to Lysistrata. "Visual allusions," instead of verbal ones, may have been used to suggest connections between the events and characters of the two plays; in addition, C. J. Herington's argument that the dramatists of fifth century Athens incorporate into their plays "parodies of situations" borrowed from other works, as well as the more familiar verbal parodies, may prove very relevant¹⁹). If we compare Jocasta's situation at the beginning of the *Phoenician Women* with the circumstances faced by Aristophanes' Lysistrata, we find that there are indeed general but fundamental similarities. As women in cities that are threatened by war, both initiate bold plans to bring together the hostile parties and resolve their conflicts, and both naturally rely upon the power of persuasion to achieve their ends.

17) See e.g. P. Burian and B. Swann, trans., Euripides: The Phoenician Women (Oxford 1981) introd. 5–8 for analysis of the contemporary relevance of Phoen. 447–585.

18) See e.g. S. Saïd, Euripides ou l'attente déçue, ASNP (serie 3) 15 (1985) 501–27; Mueller-Goldingen 52–69 and 175–82; Craik, introd. 41.

19) C. J. Herington, A Study in the Prometheia (Part II: Birds and Prometheia), Phoenix 17 (1963) 242–3.

Aristophanes, we should note, has his heroine treat the Peloponnesian War as a quarrel between family members²⁰), which is, of course, what the dispute between Oedipus' sons actually is. Thus the comic poet's representation of the war between Athens and Sparta makes the duty undertaken by his heroine – that is, the reconciliation of two hostile parties who should be φίλοι and ξυγγενεῖς – very much like the task of Euripides' Theban queen. Both Jocasta and Lysistrata are presented as women of integrity who are kind, patient, loyal, and sensible; the similarity of their personalities, which transcends, I think, the differences in their social station and age, is another factor that could have prompted Euripides to view the comedy's reconciliation scene as an appropriate model for this crucial segment in his tragedy.

The chilling and disastrous encounter of Eteocles and Polyneices in the first episode of the *Phoenician Women* seems designed to dishearten its spectators, and it is a fitting prelude to the events that follow, in which all actions (except possibly Menoeceus' self-sacrifice) appear futile at best and outright destructive at worst²¹). Contrasted with the happy resolution presented in the *Lysistrata*, the dismal outcome of the meeting between Oedipus' sons would be all the more striking. If, then, Euripides has structured this episode as a tragic re-working of Aristophanes' comic scenario, he would heighten its tension and exacerbate the dark mood that builds up throughout it and prevails at its conclusion. What is more, by associating Jocasta's attempt to reconcile her children with Lysistrata's effort to end the Peloponnesian War, he would make his queen's actions seem wholly correct and blameless. The "Lysistratization" of Jocasta may have struck the tragedian as particularly apt and desirable, given that earlier incarnations of the mother of Oedipus' sons – notably Jocasta in Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* and perhaps also the queen in the "Lille poem" attributed to Stesichorus – seem characterized by presumptuous thinking and transgressive action, albeit well-meaning²²). To disassociate his Jocasta from such error and em-

20) Especially Lys. 1129–34; see Henderson, introd. xix.

21) See e.g. Burian and Swann (above, note 17) introd. 8–11.

22) Jocasta in *Oedipus the King* unwisely encourages Oedipus to disregard what he has heard from the oracle at Delphi, and she also seems to have acted in concert with Laius, exposing the infant Oedipus and thus attempting to thwart Apollo's predictions. A. Burnett, *Jocasta in the West*, CA 7 (1988) 117–20, argues that the Theban queen in the Lille poem, who is the mother of Oedipus' children and is perhaps Jocasta, similarly errs by intervening in her sons' quarrel and suggesting that they divide by lot their father's kingdom and property. It is interesting

phasize the soundness of her actions, Euripides may have modeled her conduct upon the actions of the irreproachable comic heroine²³). Linked to the approach used by *Lysistrata*, her intervention in her sons' quarrel would seem justifiable and appropriate, and her strategy for bringing them together would appear valid. The ultimate failure of the negotiations would call attention to the irresponsibility and presumptuousness, not of the mother who wishes to reconcile, but rather of the sons who refuse to be reconciled. The parallelism between Jocasta and *Lysistrata* and their efforts to make peace would thus forcefully underscore the problems inherent in the attitudes of Eteocles and Polyneices and all the short-sighted men whom they represent.

II

The case for Euripides' debt to the *Lysistrata* requires not only review and analysis of what we know about the two scenes in question, but also speculation about what may have occurred in the original performances of these dramas. The visual impressions created by theatrical performances are always important, and judicious yet imaginative recreations of the action in Greek dramas can help us appreciate the impact of these plays and the individual scenes within them. Therefore, since the blocking of Phoen. 447–585 could have been instrumental in suggesting to Euripides a link between the reconciliation scene in the *Lysistrata* and the agon of his *Phoenician Women*, we should consider, in investigating the possible relationship between Jocasta's and *Lysistrata*'s efforts,

to note that, in the *Phoenician Women*, the conception and subsequent exposure of Oedipus are presented as the deeds of Laius alone (lines 21–26), and the problematic plan for sharing power on a yearly basis is attributed to Eteocles and Polyneices (lines 69–74). These details corroborate the idea that Euripides may have aimed to dissociate his queen from her earlier incarnations. For discussions of Euripides' possible awareness of and debt to the "Lille poem," see Mueller-Goldingen 30–5; A. Dihle, *Der Prolog der 'Bacchen' und die antike Überlieferungsphase des Euripides-Textes*, SBHeidelberg (1981) 54–5, and A. Gostoli, *Some Aspects of the Theban Myth in the Lille Stesichorus*, GRBS 19 (1978) 23–27. There are, of course, some obvious affinities between Jocasta in the *Phoenician Women* and her counterpart in *Oedipus the King*, who mediates the dispute between Oedipus and Creon; see Dihle 53–7, who also compares Euripides' Jocasta to Hecuba in the *Trojan Women* and *Hecuba*. In addition, H. Foley has suggested that Jocasta in the *Phoenician Women* has much in common with Praxithea in Euripides' *Erechtheus*.

²³ See e.g. Henderson's assessment of *Lysistrata*'s character (intro. xxix–xxx).

whether the actions of the Theban queen and her sons could have been visually reminiscent of the events in the comedy²⁴).

First, obvious and indisputable similarities in the “reconciliation scenes” of the *Lysistrata* and *Phoenician Women* need to be reviewed. Each scene is dominated by a woman (Lysistrata/Jocasta) trying to reconcile two men who, though enemies, should by all rights be friends (the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors/Eteocles and Polyneices). More precisely, both women orchestrate the meetings between the men and deliver climactic speeches in which they reproach the hostile parties separately in an attempt to convince them to resolve their differences. It is also worth observing that both scenes are introduced and marked by similar “advertisements” which highlight the conciliatory roles of the women. In particular, the concentration of forms and derivatives of the noun διαλλαγή in Phoen. 435–46 and Lys. 1076–1115 is notably conspicuous²⁵).

The language in this passage of the *Phoenician Women*, with its echoes of the “parallel” passage in the *Lysistrata*, is the first suggestion of a link between their “reconciliation scenes.” If we consider what the staging of these scenes may have looked like in the original productions, there is further corroboration. Turning to the *Lysistrata*, we see that Aristophanes brings on stage the three principals of his reconciliation scene one by one, with the Spartan ambassador and his entourage certainly entering by means

24) I think that the visual parallelism between the action in the *Phoenician Women* and *Lysistrata* would have been appreciable, despite some differences in the costumes and masks of tragic and comic actors. See O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1978) 13–5, and L. Stone, *Costume in Aristophanic Comedy* (Salem, New Hampshire 1984) 19–59 and 72–143, for recent discussions of the costumes, masks, and padding worn by Athenian actors in both genres. This visual parallelism in the action of these episodes, I believe, would have also transcended what must have been obvious differences in Lysistrata’s and Jocasta’s ages and social stations.

25) Phoen. 435–7, 444–6, 468, also 375 (deleted by some editors), cf. Lys. 1091, 1101, 1104, 1114, also 984. These “advertisements” coincide in both cases with the entrances of the third party (Lysistrata in the *Lys.*, Eteocles in the *Phoen.*), which permit arbitration to begin. In addition, the assertion by the chorus that Jocasta’s job is to use arguments that will reconcile her sons (σὸν ἔργον . . . λέγειν Phoen. 444–5) resembles the first words that Lysistrata uses in the reconciliation scene to describe her own task (ἀλλ’ οὐχι χαλεπὸν τοῦτοργον . . . Lys. 1112–4). A further parallelism is that both women are encouraged by their choruses at the onset of the “reconciliation scenes” to take on the task of making peace (cf. Phoen. 444–5 and Lys. 1108 ff.); such exhortations are, of course, frequent and perhaps predictable.

of the eastern, or "out of town," εἴσοδος²⁶) (lines 1072–5), the Athenian ambassador arriving through the western ("from town") εἴσοδος (lines 1082–5), and *Lysistrata* herself appearing at the (main) door of the stage building (lines 1106–7). During the chorus's exhortation in lines 1106–11, the heroine may well have stepped forward²⁷); whatever her movements, she clearly continues to occupy a central position relative to the ambassadors. Thus the moments following *Lysistrata*'s appearance would have presented a striking and memorable tableau, in which a woman ready to effect reconciliation and peace stands between two men whose hostile relationship has been the cause of grief and hardship²⁸). Having summoned personified Reconciliation to assist in the negotiations, *Lysistrata* instructs her aide to lead first the Spartans and then the Athenians to stand next to her, one party on each side; clarity in staging suggests that Reconciliation escorts to *Lysistrata* just the two ambassadors who will respond to her questions and negotiate the terms of peace²⁹). Once the heroine has these men standing beside her, she begins her formal discourse which, we may readily imagine, she punctuates by turning first to the Spartan while she chides him (lines 1137–46) and then to his Athenian counterpart (lines 1149–56). Throughout this speech and the ensuing negotiations, *Lysistrata* and her silent agent Reconcili-

26) A. E. Haigh, *The Attic Theatre* (Oxford 1907; third edition revised by A. W. Pickard-Cambridge) 194–5, explains how and why the western εἴσοδος in the theatre of Dionysus was always used by characters who came from the city or the harbor, while the eastern one was always used by characters who had traveled by land from other areas.

27) The question of whether there was a raised stage (if so, how raised?) remains open; Henderson, introd. xli, cites *Wasps* 1341 ff., "where the action presupposes a raised stage (but one not raised very high)." If there was a raised stage for the productions of the *Lysistrata* and *Phoenician Women*, it is not clear whether *Lysistrata* and *Jocasta*, upon emerging from the σκηνή, would have descended to the orchestra, or whether the men in each scene (i. e., the ambassadors in the *Lysistrata*, *Polyneices* and later *Eteocles* in the *Phoenician Women*) would have mounted the stage. The latter would have certainly been more convenient for the spectators. In any case it seems evident, as I shall argue, that the three principal characters in each "reconciliation scene" eventually stand close together. For convenience, I shall use the term "stage" when referring to the place in the theatre of Dionysus where these characters stood.

28) Taplin (above, note 24) 101 gives the following definition for the term I use here: "By tableaux I mean (rather loosely) those places where there is not only a lack of dramatic movement, but also some or all of the visual constituents of a scene are held still for a longer or shorter time in a combination which captures or epitomizes a particular state of affairs." He adds that a tableau "[creates] a pictorial impression which will remain as a kind of after image."

29) The plural is used in lines 1115 and 1120–1, and the singular in line 1119.

ation without question remain standing between the ambassadors, and the basic arrangement of the characters is not altered until the end of the scene.

Euripides also assembles the participants in the reconciliation scene of the *Phoenician Women* one at a time, with each entering from a different direction. Polyneices, coming from the army camped outside the city, must arrive by means of the eastern (“out of town”) εἴσοδος (lines 261 ff.); Jocasta, summoned by the chorus to greet him, emerges from the door of the stage building (lines 296–304), and Eteocles, who has been making arrangements for the city’s defenses, enters last, undoubtedly by means of the western (“from town”) εἴσοδος (lines 443–6)³⁰. It is arguable that, as Jocasta greets Polyneices and converses with him before Eteocles’ arrival, she moves close to him, but, it seems reasonable to suppose that the spatial territories of both characters remain fairly well defined, so that, when Eteocles finally appears, the queen is situated between her feuding children. This arrangement would have been maintained, I believe, during Eteocles’ salutation to his mother in lines 446–51, thus forming another tableau in which a woman literally and figuratively mediates between two men. The first step that Jocasta takes as reconciler is to bring her sons together physically and make them look each other in the eye, and, while urging each to turn toward the other (lines 454–9), she may well have beckoned both to move closer to her, one at each side. After each man has set forth, in the most uncompromising manner, the terms under which he will agree to peace (lines 469–525), Jocasta intervenes and attempts to convince both to reconsider their selfish and dangerous stances; it seems likely that, as she reproaches Eteocles and then Polyneices (lines 528–85), she turns from one to the other.

Visualized in this way, the action in this segment of the *Phoenician Women*, from Eteocles’ arrival to the end of Jocasta’s speech, bears a substantial and specific resemblance to what takes place in the reconciliation scene of the *Lysistrata*. Like the comic heroine, Jocasta comes out of the stage building and occupies a central position that permits her to mediate between her sons, who arrive by means of the opposite εἴσοδοι, as do the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors. In each case, the arrival of the third figure (*Lysistrata* in the *Lysistrata*, Eteocles in the *Phoenician Women*) may have formed a tableau in which the female reconciler stands

30) See Craik, introd. 46.

between the male combatants. More remarkably, the first steps of both women, once encouraged by the respective choruses to undertake the task of making peace, are to direct the movements of the men and draw their focus to the center of the stage. My sense is that Eteocles and Polyneices, though clearly reluctant, would have moved closer to their mother as a natural response to her request that they make eye contact; even if this is not the case, Jocasta's attempt to guide her sons, in its spirit and intent, seems to be fundamentally similar to Lysistrata's maneuvering of the ambassadors³¹). Lastly, the gestures used by both women while chastizing their menfolk may have been similar, if not identical. Each doubtless turns from one man to the other during their speeches (Lys. 1137–56; cf. Phoen. 531–83), and, when addressing her sons, Jocasta may have moved her hands and arms in an emphatic manner that could have easily recalled Lysistrata's comportment toward the ambassadors.

III

This summary glosses over the obviously dissimilar aspects of the two “reconciliation scenes” and the probable differences in their staging, which, as I shall soon argue, may be integral to Euripides' re-working of Aristophanes' dramaturgy. Let us first consider the speeches delivered by the female reconcilers that constitute the high points of the scenes and constitute one of the most conspicuous parallelisms between them. In addition to the coincidence of the timing of these speeches, the similarities in their organization, purpose, and content are profound and reinforce the basic resemblance in the accompanying stage action. After a conventional introduction that sets forth her right to speak, each woman addresses – and (more specifically) criticizes – the men who stand beside her in turn. Lysistrata, upon faulting both the Athenians and Spartans for neglecting their bond of “kinship” (Lys. 1128–35), chides each ambassador for the shortcomings (and short memories) of his people. Turning to the Spartan ambassador, she

31) Jocasta's reasons for requesting her sons' compliance in these basic acts of civility seem to be similar to Lysistrata's rationale for bringing the ambassadors together. As she explains in Phoen. 460–4, the queen believes that physical proximity and eye contact will render it easier for her children to discuss their differences; the action of Lys. 1122 ff. suggests that similar concerns motivate the comic heroine.

criticizes the ingratitude of the Lacedaemonians who, she asserts, do not remember the aid they received from the Athenians during the disasters of the 460's (Lys. 1137–46)³²; she thereupon lets his Athenian counterpart know that, in her eyes, the failure of her own people to recollect how the Spartans helped them expel the Peisistratids is equally reprehensible (Lys. 1149–56). So Jocasta, too, reproaches her sons in an effort to point out to each the errors in his thinking. Directing her attention first to Eteocles, she argues that his lust for power is a form of madness that puts him at odds with the natural laws of the universe (Phoen. 531–48), and, it seems, counters his glorification of *τυραννίς* with the argument that the quest for more property only brings more trouble (Phoen. 549–567)³³. She then attempts to make Polyneices perceive the futility of his plan, challenging him about the wisdom of leading an attack against Thebes (Phoen. 568–583). The manner in which Jocasta addresses her sons singly, by itself, is reminiscent of Lysistrata's strategy, and the queen's noteworthy impartiality further evokes the conduct of the comic heroine. Jocasta might be expected to excuse Polyneices, who has plainly been wronged by Eteocles, for his part in the conflict; nonetheless, she does not permit him to escape criticism once she has responded to the reprehensible position taken by his brother. In this she is very much like Lysistrata, who reproaches the Athenian ambassador, the re-

32) I. e., the earthquake in 464 B.C. and the subsequent revolt of the Helots.

33) D. J. Mastronarde, *The Optimistic Rationalist in Euripides. Theseus, Jocasta, Teiresias*, in: *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*, edd. M. Cropp, E. Fantham, and S. E. Scully (Calgary 1986) 210, notes 21 and 23, cites several parallels for the ideas about tyranny, equality, and justice that figure prominently in Jocasta's speech. For other analyses of Jocasta's speech, see Mueller-Goldingen 101–9; Craik, note to lines 528 ff.; Burian and Swann, (above, note 17), introd. 4–5. Virtually all critics accept the excision of lines 555–8 that has been defended by E. Fraenkel, *A Passage in the Phoenissae*, *Eranos* 44 (1946) 81–9. In addition, D. Kovacs, *Tyrants and Demagogues in Tragic Interpolations*, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 42–5, maintains that lines 549–67 are the work of an interpolator from the fourth century or later. Mastronarde, *ibid.* note 20, maintains the authenticity of lines 549–67, with the exception of 558; Mueller-Goldingen, 104–8, also retains this passage, arguing that in it Jocasta attempts to appeal to Eteocles in terms that he can understand, by showing that *τυραννίς* is in fact unprofitable for the tyrant. – If this passage is athetized, it would make Jocasta's speech more balanced, with seventeen lines addressed to Eteocles and sixteen lines to Polyneices, and hence more like Lysistrata's, in which the critiques of the Spartans and Athenians are roughly equal in length. On the other hand, I think that the ideas expressed in lines 549–67 are thematically important to the action dramatized in the "reconciliation scene". Line 554, ... τὰ γ' ἀρκοῦνθ' ἱκανὰ τοῖς γε σώφροσιν, can be compared to Lys. 1159–60, τί δῆθ' ὑπὲρ γὰρ γένων γε πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν / μάχεσθε...;

presentative of her own city, just as she scolds the “enemy” Spartan³⁴).

Most significantly, the fundamental aim of these arguments is identical, and there is a strong resemblance in their general content. Both women want to demonstrate to each of their listeners that he has failed to take into consideration factors that are of the utmost importance, and they seek to prove that the narrow-mindedness of their menfolk is not only inappropriate, but also dangerous³⁵). The essential contention that lies at the heart of both Lysistrata’s and Jocasta’s speeches is that the men who stand before them must learn to yield and share what they possess in order to put an end to their destructive conflicts. When Lysistrata finally asks the ambassadors to explain what stands in the way of their reconciliation, it quickly becomes clear that peace depends upon the willingness of each party to give up territorial claims that are contested by the other³⁶), and the comic heroine’s discourse consequently culminates in an attempt to negotiate the concession of disputed territory. Likewise, the principal aim of the queen is to convince both of her sons to concede what they vehemently claim as their own³⁷). The thesis Jocasta presents to Eteocles in lines 535–548, that the equal sharing of privileges is the principle upon which the entire working of the world is based, from the changes

34) Cf. *Lys.* 1149 and *Phoen.* 568. The Athenian ambassador clearly expects that Lysistrata will not upbraid him. Given Jocasta’s obvious affection for Polyneices (see especially *Phoen.* 302–54), her reproach to him may have seemed just as unexpected.

35) See *Phoen.* 533–35 and 578–83, where Jocasta warns of the destructiveness in the stances taken by both Eteocles and Polyneices, and, in addition, lines 584–5 for her condemnation of their ἀμαθία. See also *Lys.* 1129–1134, where the heroine criticizes the Greeks for “destroying Greek cities and men while the barbarian enemy is in arms.” Lysistrata wants to show that the Spartans and Athenians as peoples have not reckoned their situations properly, but her comments are addressed to individuals (i. e., the ambassadors), as are Jocasta’s.

36) Henderson, notes to lines 1162–74, explains the sexual double entendres of the ambassadors’ demands. The Spartan ambassador wants the Athenians to give up Pylos, whereas the Athenian requires that the Spartans concede Echinous (on the northwest coast of the Malian Gulf) and the territory that joins Nisaea and Megara.

37) Jocasta obviously wishes to talk Eteocles into conceding power and property to Polyneices. Her argument to Polyneices is more subtle, since she never specifically mentions that he should make concessions to Eteocles, but rather tries to convince him that attacking Thebes is an unworthy and unprofitable endeavor. Nonetheless, her ultimate purpose is plainly to persuade Polyneices, as well as Eteocles, to make concessions. Mueller-Goldingen, 108, maintains that Jocasta’s plea to Polyneices is appropriately shorter than the discourse she directs toward Eteocles, since she is not calling into question the justice of Polyneices’ cause.

of seasons to the alternation between day and night, is significant, I think, not merely for its echoes of Heraclitus' philosophy³⁸), but also because it is a striking and succinct expression of the idea that unites Jocasta's attempt to mediate her children's conflict and Lysistrata's effort to reconcile the ambassadors. Indeed, the final words of the queen, directed to both of her sons, contain a plea for them to "let go of excess" (μέθετον τὸ λίαν, μέθετον), recalling the similar use of the imperatives ἀφετ(ε) and ἔατε by Lysistrata to urge the ambassadors to abandon the territorial claims that threaten to ruin their reconciliation³⁹).

The similarity of these speeches, taken in conjunction with the general parallelism of the events presented in the two "reconciliation scenes" and the possible resemblance of key aspects of their staging, suggest strongly a Euripidean debt to the dramaturgy of the *Lysistrata*. These factors suggest specifically that the tragedian may have written the agon of the *Phoenician Women*, culminating in Jocasta's address to her sons, in such a way as to evoke both the actions and arguments of Aristophanes' heroine, including the steps she takes through her agent Reconciliation. On this interpretation, Eteocles, arriving on the western εἴσοδος, would literally and figuratively assume the position of the Athenian ambassador. Since both characters are the figures of authority within their cities, this association would be apt. Polyneices, entering by means of the eastern εἴσοδος, would accordingly correspond to the Spartan ambassador; once again the connection would be apt, since like the Spartan he is a φίλος who has nonetheless become an ἐχθρός⁴⁰).

38) See Craik, note to lines 528 ff., and Mastronarde (above, note 33) 210, note 23. Mueller-Goldingen, 102, sees a reflection of Pythagorean thought in Jocasta's thesis. He also points out that, by defending ἰσότης, the queen is in fact defending the democratic principle of ἰσονομία; Burian and Swann (above, note 16) introd. 6, similarly recognize that her speech contains "the Athenian democrat's praise of equality as the foundation of civilized life;" see also Malgorzata Borowska, *Le Théâtre Politique d'Euripide* (trans. Wojciech Gilewski, Warsaw 1989) 76–79.

39) Cf. *Phoen.* 584–5 and *Lys.* 1166 and 1172.

40) There are, in addition, distinctive parallels between Polyneices' furtive entrance in *Phoen.* 261 ff. and the appearance of the Spartan herald in *Lys.* 980 ff. Should Euripides have fashioned the arrival of Oedipus' exiled son as a darkly humorous reflection of Aristophanes' dramaturgy, Polyneices' association with the Spartan side in the *Lysistrata* would be intensified. See the appendix at the end of this paper for suggestions about the staging of Polyneices' entrance. – That the Spartans, from 413 on, were camped year round in Attica (at Decelea) could have facilitated the association between the Spartans in Aristophanes' comedy and Polyneices, whose Argive army occupies Theban territory.

This evocation of the *Lysistrata*'s reconciliation scene would be intended to make Jocasta's strategy for resolving her children's dispute mimic – as much as possible – the tack taken by Lysistrata in directing the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors toward peace. Occupying Lysistrata's place on stage, imitating her movements, and finally adapting her arguments, the queen of Thebes would resemble, in character and motivation, the comic heroine and would appear to be guided by the same principles and patterns of thought. Jocasta undeniably takes a bold step by interfering in her sons' quarrel, and her *μακρὰ ὄησις* reveals that she expects a great deal from them. Because she fails so completely in her endeavor, however, she runs the risk of seeming either presumptuous and wrong-headed in her interference⁴¹), or naïvely simplistic in believing that her views should appeal to Eteocles and Polyneices⁴²). But linked to Lysistrata, whose daring efforts to save Greece ultimately attain the good results that confirm her sound thinking, the queen would appear to be taking the correct course of action, since her strategy for dealing with her children is in its essence the one that works in the reconciliation scene of Aristophanes' comedy. Most importantly, if Jocasta's conduct is patterned on Lysistrata, this would make the concessions she requests from her sons seem reasonable and moderate. She is, after all, asking no more from them than is successfully gained from the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors. If the queen's arguments do in fact evoke those of her comic predecessor, her expectations that Eteocles and Polyneices yield to one another would appear all the more deserving of fulfillment.

IV

The Euripidean adaptation that I have posited must be considered, of course, creative and free. Most notably, no alluring figure of personified Reconciliation stands at Jocasta's side to facilitate negotiations; Eteocles and Polyneices do not for the most

41) The stigma of impropriety and transgression that seems to characterize other incarnations of "Jocasta," as I suggested above, may have supplied Euripides with an especially strong reason to ensure that his Jocasta seems to act properly.

42) Mastronarde (above, note 33) 202 and 204–6 discusses the optimism that informs the ideas Jocasta expresses in *Phoen.* 527–85. On p. 205, he comments that "[Jocasta] surely is meant to win the audience's approval and admiration . . .;" see also Borowska (above, note 38) 77. Other critics, however, seem less impressed with the value and importance of the queen's argument; see e.g. Burian and Swann (above, note 17) introd. 5 and Craik, note to lines 528 ff.

part behave like Aristophanes' ambassadors, and the dénouements of the two "reconciliation scenes" could not be more disparate. Yet if the tragedian establishes in this episode a link between Lysistrata's and Jocasta's approaches to making peace, he also stresses the crucial dissimilarities in their situations which lead to the success of the former and the failure of the latter. The "Lysistratization" of Jocasta may be understood, then, not only as a tool for confirming the soundness of the queen's strategy, but also as a device that poignantly highlights the daunting odds that she, unlike the comic heroine, must face.

One of Euripides' concerns in this episode, I have suggested above, is to expose how stubbornness and self-centeredness keep Eteocles and Polyneices from making peace. It is to this end, I think, that he has Jocasta afford each the opportunity in the agon to express his feelings. Both men let it be known that they will not be the ones to compromise, and they offer what may at least appear to be good reasons for refusing to alter their positions. But their words reveal that less than noble motivations underlie their refusals to compromise. Eteocles does not even attempt to conceal his lust for power and his willingness to do wrong for the sake of retaining absolute authority (especially Phoen. 524–5). Polyneices, in contrast, presents a fair claim against his brother; nonetheless, he confirms in this passage that his interest in material possessions eclipses all other considerations (especially Phoen. 484–91)⁴³. Each man's statements, then, make it clear that his intransigence is

43) See lines 490–3. Scholars debate how the character and motivations of Polyneices are to be interpreted. E. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoinissen des Euripides*, SB München (1963) 26–7 and Mueller-Goldingen 94 ff. and 112–5, view Polyneices as a sympathetic figure. Fraenkel, citing C. Robert, *Oidipus vol. II* (Berlin 1915) 143 ff., specifically denies that Polyneices is driven to war by concern for property. Craik, note to lines 438 ff., defends the idea that Polyneices is very interested in regaining his possessions, as would any person in exile, and Mastronarde (above, note 33) 205 and 210, note 18, declares that Polyneices' desire to regain his patrimony does not "[unmask] greed," but reveals his adherence to "aristocratic values." Euripides undoubtedly casts Polyneices as the victim of Eteocles' machinations, yet I am convinced that the tragedian exposes Polyneices as being like the selfish and self-centered Eteocles in his willingness to place his welfare and satisfaction above the preservation of his family and homeland. Among those who advance this view of Polyneices are Burian and Swann (above, note 17) introd. 5–8, who call this tragedy "a story of self-destruction through the passionate pursuit of selfish ends," and point to Polyneices' hypocrisy, as does Saïd (above, note 18) 512–3. De Romilly (above, note 16) 111–2, maintains that "... it is too often forgotten that both sons are guilty." In addition, Mueller-Goldingen 96, note 49, cites M. Arthur, *Euripides' Phoenissae and the Politics of Justice* (Diss. Yale University 1975) 104 ff., for a skeptical assessment of Polyneices' conduct in this scene.

to be accounted for by his overwhelming interest in what is to his own immediate advantage; the concern of the brothers for themselves keeps them from entertaining the possibility of compromise and considering the impact of their actions upon their homeland and family.

If we visualize once again the staging of the initial events in the “reconciliation scenes” of the *Phoenician Women* and *Lysistrata*, we may appreciate how Euripides could have used the adaptation of material from Aristophanes’ comedy to focus attention upon the selfish intransigence of Oedipus’ sons. I have suggested that the steps Jocasta takes to make her sons look at one another and perhaps move closer to her at the center (Phoen. 454–64) may have been meant to recall Lysistrata’s actions in having the ambassadors brought to her sides. Should this be the case, the behavior of Eteocles and Polyneices would inevitably be compared with the conduct of the Athenian and Spartan representatives, and it is consequently worth considering how the two pairs of potential “reconcilees” may have acted on stage. Indeed, when Lysistrata instructs Reconciliation to lead the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors to her sides, her humorous instructions – if the Spartan is unwilling to give his hand, she bids Reconciliation to “lead him by the dick,” and so also for the Athenian (Lys. 1119 and 1121) – invite speculation about the accompanying action. It seems to me likely that the men, starved for sex because of the strike organized by Lysistrata, advance toward the female who is approaching them and proffer what are, given their situation, the appropriate appendages⁴⁴). The “parallel” moment in the *Phoenician Women* obviously features no such comic business; rather, it seems plain that Oedipus’ surly and uncooperative sons can hardly bear to look at one another and only grudgingly obey their mother, and their movements would surely betray their unwillingness. If, then, the first steps taken by Jocasta to bring her sons together are intended to evoke Lysistrata’s actions, the brothers’ unrelenting hostility would stand out in the sharpest possible contrast with the comical readiness of the ambassadors to participate in Lysistrata’s plan. Euripides would force his spectators to focus on the different factors that affect the efforts of Lysistrata and Jocasta, which are, in truth, differences in the attitudes of the men whom they must

44) A. Sommerstein, trans., *The Lysistrata and Other Plays* (London and New York 1973) 227 interprets the staging of this moment in a completely different manner, stating that the ambassadors are to turn away when Reconciliation approaches them.

reconcile. He would thus maximize from the beginning the tension in the meeting of Eteocles and Polyneices, and the continued adaptation of material from the *Lysistrata* would sustain at its peak the uneasy and disquieting atmosphere of this “reconciliation scene,” in which the spectre of failure rather than the expectation of success looms large for his queen.

The simmering ill-will between the brothers that is evident from the moment they meet explodes into the naked expression of contempt and hatred immediately after Jocasta finishes her speech. Without bothering to reply to his mother’s argument, Eteocles coldly rebuffs her efforts by commenting that her “zeal achieves nothing”⁴⁵). Nor does Polyneices pay any attention to what his mother has said; provoked by his brother’s command that he leave the city at once, he angrily retorts with a threat against Eteocles’ life, and the encounter between the sons of Oedipus, intended to provide them with the opportunity to settle their differences, quickly degenerates into an ugly confrontation. As they taunt one another, Jocasta remains standing between them, silent and no longer in control of the situation, until her children’s dreadful agreement to kill one another on the battlefield causes her to interject her last words in the scene, “Won’t you flee your father’s Furies?” But neither man is interested in escaping the cycle of violence that troubles their family. Eteocles carelessly dismisses any concern for the family, and Polyneices, as he departs, affirms his hope to kill his brother and thus become ruler of Thebes (Phoen. 624–37).

The words by which the brothers arrange to meet in battle allow us to perceive with the greatest precision the problem that foils Jocasta’s efforts as mediator. When Polyneices asserts that he wants to position himself opposite his brother so as to kill him, Eteocles responds, “Desire for this seizes me, too”⁴⁶). The key word here is *ἔρωσ*, which can also be translated as “lust.” Commonly used to describe many human passions, *ἔρωσ* properly refers, of course, to sexual longing; in this line, however, Euripides employs it to signify the brothers’ unnatural and terrible desire to

45) Phoen. 588–91, especially line 589, . . . *περαίνει δ’ οὐδὲν ἢ προθυμία*. At the beginning of the second episode, Eteocles again disparages his mother’s attempt to mediate the conflict: *πολλῷ γὰρ ἠὔρον ἐνδεεῖς διαλλαγᾶς / ὡς ἐς λόγους συνῆψα Πολυνείκει μολών . . .* (lines 701–2).

46) Lines 621–2. Specifically, Polyneices states that he wants to know where Eteocles will be stationed because “I will station myself opposite, so that I can kill you.” To this Eteocles replies, *κάμῃ τοῦδ’ ἔρωσ ἔχει*.

shed each other's blood. The striking use of the word ἔρωϛ in this context may call our attention again to the differences, in terms of attitude and motivation, between Oedipus' sons and the ambassadors portrayed in Aristophanes' comedy. These characters are also affected by ἔρωϛ – though a most disparate sort of ἔρωϛ – which impels them toward reconciliation rather than toward mutual destruction. Indeed, the sexual longing of the ambassadors and of all the men whom they represent is what enables Lysistrata to reconcile the Athenians and Spartans. The sex strike which she has organized achieves its goal, precisely because it imposes upon the men of Greece a desire that overwhelms their desire for power, prestige, and – more particularly – territorial control. The strike forces them to reconsider their priorities and their reasons for going to war, and hence the ambassadors, when they enter at the beginning of the reconciliation scene, are receptive to Lysistrata's arguments and advice. The sexy figure of Reconciliation, who acts as Lysistrata's agent and stands with her throughout the negotiations, is perhaps to be understood as the corporeal embodiment of this overwhelming ἔρωϛ that permits the heroine to achieve her goal⁴⁷). In contrast, the action of the *Phoenician Women* reveals that Eteocles and Polyneices, unwilling to control themselves, have succumbed to an intractable desire for property and power that prevents them from heeding their mother's advice. This appetite that impels them to possess all they can and their consequent jealousy of one another are clearly what give rise to their dreadful feelings of blood-lust.

There is, we should remember, a point in the reconciliation scene of the *Lysistrata* where the process of mediation almost breaks down. When the topic of territorial concessions is brought up, the ambassadors, previously cooperative, immediately resist the concept of yielding territory to one another, and the prospect of peace, which has seemed virtually guaranteed until this moment, is suddenly in jeopardy (Lys. 1164 ff.)⁴⁸). The comic heroine takes several steps to preserve the progress she has made as the arbiter of these negotiations; insisting that both sides give up claims to important territory, she repeatedly bids the ambassadors not to squabble, and she also appeals to their lustful impulses with

47) See Henderson, note to lines 1106–27, for a somewhat different assessment of what Reconciliation “embodies.”

48) To the Spartan's bid for Pylos, the Athenian replies, μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶ τοῦτο μὲν γ' οὐ δράσετε (line 1165); the Spartan similarly tries to refuse the Athenian demand: οὐ τῷ σιῶ οὐχὶ πάντα γ' ὦ λισσάνει (line 1171).

the reminder that the satisfaction of their sexual desires depends upon their reconciliation. To get the men to agree to these crucial concessions, Lysistrata evidently realizes that she must do more than use arguments to persuade them intellectually; she must, in addition, appeal to that powerful *ἔρωσ* that was instrumental in forcing them to reconsider their priorities so that negotiations could begin. Fortunately for her, she is a character in a comedy where almost anything is possible, and it is within her power to make sure that the ambassadors, remembering their desperate circumstances, consent to give up their claims to the territories in question⁴⁹).

The reconciliation scene of the *Lysistrata* presents, in Jeffrey Henderson's words, a "utopian scenario"⁵⁰). Yet Aristophanes may hint at the difficulties of the real world within his fantastic depiction of the negotiations spearheaded by Lysistrata. He has his heroine ultimately prevail for the sake of peace, but acknowledges in the course of her victory that the desire to retain territory and power can create serious impediments to the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Euripides, I would argue, uses the first episode of the *Phoenician Women* to explore in depth what the comic poet only briefly intimates in his representation of the ambassadors' reluctance to yield disputed territory. I would submit that, in particular, he encourages reflection upon what the comic heroine in the reconciliation scene asserts upon her entrance:

ἀλλ' οὐχὶ χαλεπὸν τοῦργον, εἰ λάβοι γέ τις
 ὄργωντας ἀλλήλων τε μὴ ἔκπειρωμένους.
 τάχα δ' εἴσομαι ἴγώ . . . 1112–1114

"But the job [of reconciliation] won't be difficult, if one should be dealing with people who are eager and aren't making trials of one another. Soon I'll know . . ."

49) Once Lysistrata promises that the ambassadors, upon settling their dispute, will be able to "farm" Reconciliation's body, they are so eager to conclude an agreement that they do so on the spot, without consulting their allies. Henderson, note to lines 1177–81, observes that their quick decisions are dramatically convenient, but they also add to the impression of the ambassadors' desperation.

50) Henderson, *ibid.*, asserts that "Aristophanes wants the negotiators (and the spectators) to focus on this happy end-product of negotiations [i. e., the restoration of sexual pleasure] rather than on the issues they would have to face in real-life negotiations." He points out that the comic poet renders the reconciliation scene even more acceptable to his Athenian audience by making the Spartan ambassador seem more desperate than the Athenian and thus more "easily out-bargained". Nonetheless, I would qualify the judgment that this scene in the *Lysistrata* is completely utopian in tone; Aristophanes does, I think, insinuate into his representation something of the real world and its problems.

The first episode of the *Phoenician Women* seems to suggest a significant emendation to Lysistrata's pronouncement – the job of reconciliation is easy, *only if* one deals with eager and cooperative people; if not, the task is insurmountably difficult. By having Jocasta use gestures and arguments modelled upon what the comic heroine does and says in Aristophanes' reconciliation scene, Euripides would affirm not only the propriety of his queen's actions, but also the ineluctable limitations of her power. For her adaptation of Lysistrata's words and gestures would poignantly underscore her inability to take over the other elements of the comic heroine's strategy which lead to its success. Persuasion, we should bear in mind, figures prominently in the plans developed by both Jocasta and Lysistrata to bring peace to their cities⁵¹). But the queen, unlike the comic heroine, faces intractable constraints in her efforts to be persuasive. She is a character in a tragedy, not in a comedy, and a mother dealing with her sons; she is thus doubly constrained. She has only honest counsel and kindly gestures, which are geared to work on an intellectual and moral level as counterweights to her sons' possessive and hostile impulses⁵²).

By inviting his spectators to contrast Jocasta's failure with Lysistrata's success, Euripides would force upon them the realization that *πειθῶ* which appeals solely to intellectual and moral sensibilities is insufficient to overcome the potent and unchecked desire for power and property. With Lysistrata's efforts to end the war taken out of the context of comedy, where such things as sex strikes are possible, and inserted into the tragic story of Oedipus' sons, and with the mother of these men cast in the comic heroine's role, he would expose in a harshly provocative manner the lamentable inadequacy of mere words and good intentions. This is a revelation, as I suggested above, to which Aristophanes himself subtly points in the final moments of the *Lysistrata's* reconciliation scene. The troubling events that took place in the few years separating the productions of the *Lysistrata* and the *Phoenician Women* could have easily encouraged the tragedian to rework the comic poet's presentation, in order to show how a potential recon-

51) Jocasta's persuasiveness is emphasized by all three participants in the *Phoenician Women's* "reconciliation scene," for example in lines 81–3, 272–3, and 446–51. The same is true concerning Lysistrata; see especially lines 203 ff., where she and her co-conspirators pray to the goddess Πειθῶ as the patron of their attempt to effect peace.

52) See the comments of Mastrorarde (above, note 33) 206; also Saïd (above, note 18) 514.

ciler has sufficient influence to succeed in mediating a bitter dispute only within the realm of fantasy. Through his tragedy, which pointedly reflects and comments upon the events of his day, Euripides reveals that arguments appealing to reason and moral conscience cannot instill the willingness to negotiate in men who allow themselves to be ruled by aggressive and possessive passions. Jocasta in the first episode in the *Phoenician Women* should thus be viewed as a disquieting instance of this inadequacy, made all the more pitiable and frightening by a comparison with Lysistrata. A far cry from the victorious comic heroine, she must resign herself to the likelihood of her sons' deaths and listen to the threats they cruelly flaunt in front of the mother who loves them both.

The tragedian, in fact, seems to have constructed the dénouement of his "reconciliation scene" so as to make it stand in the sharpest possible contrast with the parallel point in Aristophanes' plot. Instead of harmony and agreement, there is discord; instead of the promise of festivities, food, and sex, there is the threat of violence and death. Unlike Lysistrata, who remains in charge of the action on stage as she invites and then leads the ambassadors to the feast, Jocasta loses control of the meeting she has organized and looks on helplessly while her sons' quarrel grows more and more savage. In contrast to the happy group in the *Lysistrata* that enters the stage building together, the three members of the Theban royal family go their own ways at the end of the episode, and their separate paths of exit constitute the visual expression of their complete lack of spiritual unity. What is more, Euripides does not permit us to forget, as the drama unfolds, how Jocasta's efforts to make peace are foiled by her children's intransigent refusal to make concessions. Undeterred by one failure, she hurries off at the end of the fourth episode to prevent her sons from murdering each other in single combat, but arrives too late and kills herself in despair. After the messenger's description of these unhappy events, the bodies of the mother and her sons are brought in and set before the palace. Forming a grimly perverse reprise of the tableau created in the "reconciliation scene," the corpses remain on stage throughout the final episode of the tragedy, concrete signs of the brothers' destructive stubbornness⁵³).

53) It is reasonable to suppose that Jocasta's body is set in between the corpses of Polyneices and Eteocles, so that in death these characters would assume the places that they occupy in relation to one another during the one and only scene in which they are present on stage alive. Antigone's lamentation in lines 1524-9

V

My purpose in this paper has been to put in a new light the role of Jocasta in the *Phoenician Women* and to suggest some further significance in the events dramatized in the tragedy's first episode. The argument presented here has, I hope, advanced inquiry into Euripides' dramaturgical techniques and, in particular, into his willingness – indeed inclination – to use material derived from comedy. The exact extent of the influence of the *Lysistrata* upon Euripides must, of course, be a matter of conjecture. That Euripides owes something to Aristophanes' comedy, however, is a conclusion toward which much evidence points, and this conclusion should lead us to reflect anew upon the complexity of artistic relationships in this difficult but fascinating period of change.

VI

Appendix: Polyneices' Entrance in Phoen. 261 ff.

I should like to argue that Euripides, inspired by situational similarities, designed Polyneices' nervous entrance so as to recall the arrival of the awkwardly ithyphallic herald of Lys. 908–95. This momentary association of Oedipus' son with the Spartan would anticipate the adaptation in the following agon of the *Lysistrata*'s reconciliation scene.

At Lys. 980, the herald, whose mission is to proclaim that the Spartans are ready to reconcile, makes an unannounced entrance. He very likely uses the eastern εἰσοδος and certainly wears a long cloak, or χλαμύς (Lys. 987)⁵⁴. Cinesias' comments indicate that the herald is moving about in an odd manner; at one point, he turns his body, attempting to conceal under his cloak something that looks like a weapon (Lys. 985–6), and it is easy to imagine that he has been uncomfortably turning throughout his conversation with Cinesias. His "weapon", of course, turns out to be his erect phallus, which he uncovers a few moments later.

certainly evokes the image of Jocasta's body placed with her sons at each side, close to her breasts.

54) Henderson, note to lines 980–1013; Stone (above, note 24) 169–70. Henderson convincingly argues that the Athenian man who questions the herald must be Cinesias.

Like the Spartan, Polyneices appears unannounced at Phoen. 261 and, as well, almost surely uses the eastern εἶσοδος. It also seems reasonable that, as a warrior and traveller, he too wears a χλαμύς⁵⁵). His fear of Eteocles' treachery plainly makes him agitated, and he quickly turns at line 269 when startled by a noise. It is consequently possible that Polyneices in the original performance of the *Phoenician Women* would have resembled Aristophanes' herald in appearance and movement. If Polyneices has been apprehensively turning his body throughout his speech, as is plausible, the resemblance would have been yet stronger.

While explaining his wariness of Eteocles, Polyneices declares in lines 267–8, “but having armed my hand with this sword here (τῷδε φασγάνῳ) I shall give myself reasons to be confident”. The demonstrative suggests that the drawn sword is meant to be noticed at this moment⁵⁶); in that case, it should not be visible – or completely visible – until this point, when Polyneices brings it into full view. That he has kept it sheathed, however, seems unlikely given his fear of an ambush; it seems preferable to imagine that he has entered with his sword drawn, but until lines 267–8 has kept it concealed, wholly or partially, under his cloak. If so, his conduct and appearance in lines 261–8 are particularly evocative of the Spartan herald.

By adapting Aristophanes' dramaturgy, Euripides would create a visual allusion that humorously plays upon spectators' familiarity with the herald's condition and thereby contributes to the deflation of Polyneices' heroic image⁵⁷). Polyneices' brief association with the aroused herald would also add a disconcerting element to this scene, which takes place against the backdrop of the troubled sexual history of Oedipus' family. In its effects, then, this reminiscence of the *Lysistrata* can be compared to the *Bacchae*'s humorous but disturbing dramatization of Pentheus' transvestite primping.

New York

Elizabeth W. Scharffenberger

55) Haigh (above, note 26) 250–2.

56) See Taplin (above, note 24) 77 on the sparing but emphatic use of props in Greek drama.

57) Craik, note to lines 261–2; Burian and Swann (above, note 17) introd. 5.