

MULTIPLICITY, DISCONTINUITY, AND VISUAL MEANING IN ARISTOPHANIC COMEDY

For Greek tragedy it has become a widely accepted principle that what happens before the eyes of the audience is, for the most part, indicated verbally.¹ The works of Lorene Shisler, Anna Spitzbarth, Wolf Steidle, and, more recently, Maarit Kaimio have demonstrated that the text of tragedy is surprisingly generous with information about stage-business, including not just larger movements within the playing area but affective and communicative gesture as well.² This generosity gave Oliver Taplin the confidence to assert that all action that is essential to the understanding of a play is indicated in its text.³ That, of course, depends upon what we understand by 'essential.' Communication-theory has shown us that small gestures serving deictic, indexical, segmenting, amplificatory, or confirmatory functions are indissolubly connected to human speech,⁴ and the anthropologist Birdwhistell claims that the stream of human speech is accompanied by a continuous stream of gesture which complements language and is roughly ana-

1) O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1977) 28: "The characters of Greek tragedy say what they are doing, or are described as they act; and so the words accompany and clarify the action." See also, Id., *Did the Greek dramatists write stage instructions?*, *PCPhS* n. s. 23 (1977) 121–32. Cf. D. J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1979) 2–3.

2) F. L. Shisler, *The Technique of the Portrayal of Joy in Greek Tragedy*, *TAPhA* 73 (1942) 277–92; Ead., *The Use of Stage Business to Portray Emotion in Greek Tragedy*, *AJPh* 66 (1945) 377–97; A. Spitzbarth, *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie* (Diss. Zürich, Winterthur 1945); W. Steidle, *Studien zum antiken Drama unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Bühnenspiels* (Munich 1968) esp. 9–38; M. Kaimio, *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy. A Study of Stage Conventions* (Helsinki 1988).

3) *Stagecraft* (above, note 1) 30.

4) K. Ęlam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* (London and New York 1980) 69–78. Cf. E. Fischer-Lichte, *The Dramatic Dialogue – Oral or Literary Communication*, in: H. Schmid and A. van Kesteren (eds.), *The Semiotics of Drama and Theatre* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia 1984) 155–63; Ead., *The Semiotics of Theater*, tr. J. Gaines and D. L. Jones (Bloomington, Ind. 1992) 43–50.

logous to it.⁵ Even so, it seems to me that Taplin basically is right, and that we can accept his rule as a working assumption. Most of the movement in tragedy that would have attracted the notice of the audience as especially significant is indeed confirmed by the written text.⁶

In Aristophanic comedy that is not the case.⁷ There are more than a few passages in which the reader can perceive only that some stage-business takes place, which Aristophanes allows to go by with only a sketchy reference, or no reference at all, to what was seen by the audience.⁸ I offer in Appendix I a representative list of places where some action, character or object is presented which is not identified verbally, or which is identified only some time later. How, for instance, do Bdelykleon and Xanthias deal with Philocleon as he climbs down the rope at *Vesp.* 396 ff.⁹ At *Pac.* 937–55 several trips are made into the skene by Trygaeus, his slave, and

5) R. L. Birdwhistell, *Kinesics and Context. Essays on Body Motion Communication* (Philadelphia 1970) 115–23.

6) Cf. Steidle (above, note 2) 26: “Es mag ... wohl sein, daß uns vieles, ja das meiste des antiken Spiels entgeht, aber die Grundabsicht, die der Dichter hatte, ist faßbar.” J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique* (Paris 1954) 201–02, however, lists a number of places in Greek tragedy where movement in the playing-area is not specified verbally until after it has occurred.

7) Taplin, *Stagecraft* (above, note 1) 31 note 1 maintains that generally in comedy, as in tragedy, significant actions are reflected in the text, but he allows that comedy is not so rigid in its procedure. As an example of action unaccompanied by words he cites *Plutus* 1097 ff., where Hermes probably enters, knocks, and hides without saying anything to the audience. See also *Id.*, *Greek Dramatists* (above, note 1) 129. C. F. Russo, *Aristophanes, an Author for the Stage*, tr. K. Wren (London and New York 1994) 37–38 admits that Aristophanes’ stage-directions in the text often are inadequate, but, like Taplin, he asserts that the text is detailed enough to be understood.

8) D. Bain, *Masters, Servants and Orders in Greek Tragedy* (Manchester 1981) 44–45: “... [T]he demands made upon the reader or commentator on [Old Comedy] are ... more exacting than the demands made upon anyone attempting to visualise the staging of Greek tragedy. The reader or commentator is sometimes compelled to read between the lines and to interpolate business to a degree that would be illegitimate with tragedy.” Bain attributes this problem rather vaguely to Old Comedy’s greater “realism.” See, in addition, Russo (above, note 7) 38–39, N. J. Lowe, *Greek Stagecraft and Aristophanes*, in: James Redmond (ed.), *Farce* (Cambridge 1988) 47, D. M. MacDowell, *Clowning and Slapstick in Aristophanes*, in: *Farce* 4–7. W. G. Arnott, *Comic Openings*, in: N. W. Slater and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Stuttgart 1993) 14–32, discusses the prologues of several plays which present the audience with a stage-picture calculated to pique their curiosity.

9) See the very different interpretations of Russo (above, note 7) 131 and D. M. MacDowell (*Aristophanes, Wasps*, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1971) ad 398.

perhaps one or two unnamed extras (see below, p. 280f.). The text does not make it entirely clear, however, how many trips Trygaeus makes or who fetches what when. What does Dicaeopolis do at Ach. 117–18, 122 to lay bare the disguises of Cleisthenes and Straton?¹⁰ At Thes. 1056, where does Echo enter? Is she visible to the audience at all? If not, how is the Scythian's attempt to pursue her presented?¹¹

In each of these passages the reason for the obscurity is that certain details are communicated to the spectator by exclusively visual means.¹² I am not making the claim that such communication is more than sporadic. Old Comedy is not pantomime but a mixture of comic modes. Everyone will agree, however, that Aristophanes quite often, especially in earlier plays and especially in the prologue and after the parabasis,¹³ gives his public a great deal to see: people, things, and people doing things. For this spectacle I use the word 'communication' not to imply that the poet thereby conveys anything profoundly meaningful but to emphasize that it is a resource enabling the poet to communicate to the spectators' thoughts and emotions that he wants them to have. The purpose

10) Compare K. J. Dover, Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, in: Greek and the Greeks: Collected Papers I (Oxford 1987) 288–306 (= Maia n. s. 15 [1963] 6–25), pp. 291–92 and W. J. M. Starkie (The *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, with introd., Engl. prose transl., critical notes and comm., London 1909) ad Ach. 120.

11) P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (Munich 1967) 79–82 assumes, because Echo is invisible in Euripides' *Andromeda* and because Euripides enters playing the role of Perseus, that Echo never appears.

12) If, on the other hand, an attentive reader can reconstruct tragic actors' movements with some confidence, that is not, I think, because, as Steidle (above, note 2) 10–11 speculates, the tragic poet wrote with the reader in mind but because he was concerned to convey to the audience verbally what he wanted them to think and feel. The idea that the tragedian of the fifth century wrote not simply for the one-time production but for a wider readership was argued strongly by U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles I: Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1889) 121–28. The plays were unquestionably read, but that written versions were widely available seems extremely doubtful. I follow Taplin, *Stagecraft* (above, note 1) 15, who observes that "... there is no good reason to think that the reading of tragedy was at all widespread before the end of the [fifth] century, let alone that tragedians composed with any consideration of a public of readers." For a concise account of the debate over this question see A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip, *Reader and Spectator: Problems in the Interpretation of Greek Tragedy* (Amsterdam 1990) 3–20.

13) For good brief accounts of the difference in character of the comic action preceding the parabasis and that following see R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes* (Oxford 1979) 9, 11, 13; cf. A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, rev. T. B. L. Webster (Oxford ²1962) 198–99, 209, T. Gelzer, *Aristophanes*, *RE Suppl.* XII (1971) 1525–27.

of this essay is not to discuss and analyze all that the spectators saw in Aristophanic comedy, but to examine one feature of Aristophanes' visual presentation – what I will call its 'multiplicity' – and to suggest that this is an expression of the structure of this kind of comedy.

I would make the claim that in many passages of Aristophanes, even where the language is detailed enough to make clear to the reader what the audience sees (or must have seen), it is visual communication that dominates.¹⁴ At *Ecc.* 976–1111, for example, the stage-picture of the young man being dragged away first by one old woman, then by another, then by more than one surely is more effective than the rather vapid dialogue. And the spectacle of the suspicious Cleisthenes running around the *kedestes*, who shifts his phallus from back to front to back again, would be just as funny without the exchange between the former and Mica (*Thes.* 643–46). All this suggests that in passages where the comic 'message' is conveyed visually, Aristophanes may simply be unconcerned about referring verbally to what the spectators can see. In his presentation of one type of activity, however, that of expressive gesture, he goes one step further, consciously avoiding a verbal device that is quite frequently employed in tragedy. This avoidance, I think, tells us something important about Aristophanes' dramatic strategy.

In tragedy gestures indicating emotion, which would have been seen by the spectators, often are pointed out in the text. References to gestures of grief, for example, have been found in 40 different passages.¹⁵ The emotion may be expressed by veiling of the head,¹⁶ by a silent departure from the stage,¹⁷ by sinking to the ground,¹⁸ as well as a number of other ways.¹⁹ In some of

14) Fischer-Lichte, *Dramatic Dialogue* (above, note 4) 154–58 offers a useful analysis of the interplay between what she calls verbal and non-verbal signs. Her discussion 158–62 of dialogue in which non-verbal signs dominate is useful, although what she has in mind is a more realistic kind of drama with a serious theme.

15) See Shisler, *Stage Business* (above, note 2) 381–89, 394–95, Spitzbarth (above, note 2) 86–92, Steidle (above, note 2) 9–32 *passim*, esp. 18–19, 23–24, 26, O. Zwielerlein, rev. of Steidle, *GGA* 222 (1970) 217.

16) *HF* 1198, *Eur. Supp.* 286–87, *IA* 1123.

17) *Ant.* 1244–45, *Trach.* 813–14, *OT* 1073–75.

18) *Heraclidae* 602–03, *Hec.* 438–43, *Andr.* 1076–80, *Tro.* 462–65.

19) Bowing head: *Or.* 957–59. Weeping (with or without mention of bowed head): *Sept.* 873; *Ant.* 527; *Soph. El.* 829; *OC* 1709–10; *Alc.* 137; *Med.* 922–23 (turning away), 1012; *Eur. Supp.* 21–22, 286–87 (and veiling head); *Ion* 241–42; *IA* 1122–23, 1433. Wiping tears: *Eur. El.* 501–02. Lying or sitting on ground for an extended period: *Hec.* 438–501; *Eur. Supp.* 1–112; *Tro.* 1–98, 462–505. Turning away: *Med.* 922–23 (cf. *Phil.* 934–35, indicating another kind of distress). Attempting to run

these tragic passages the emotion that is signalled visually to the spectators is reinforced twice, by a reference to the physical gesture and by a further verbal expression of grief.²⁰ To Aristophanic comedy, of course, the portrayal of deep and earnest emotion is something alien. But the expression of negative feelings, often in exaggerated language,²¹ is frequent enough.²² And in only five instances – three of them in a single play – have I found any reference to anything resembling a physical gesture of distress. When the Paphlagonian at Eq. 1250–51 exits in defeat, surely σ' ἄκων ἐγὼ λείπω means that he places or drops his garland on the ground. At Vesp. 982 Philocleon exclaims ἐς κόρακας, adding (983–84) that he just burst into tears because of eating lentil soup. We are told that Philocleon expresses distress at 741–42 (when the chorus has judged against him) by a sudden lapse into silence and at 995 (at the dog's exoneration) by falling to the ground. At Thes. 930 the prytanis asks the miserable kedestes, who has not spoken in this passage, τί κόπτεις.

into flames: Tro. 1282–83. Beating bosom: Andr. 826–27 (and tearing off veil), Tro. 793–94. Tearing off veil: Andr. 830–31. Pouring ashes on head: Eur. Supp. 826–27. Dashing scepter to ground: Andr. 1223.

20) Hecuba, for example, cries out at Hec. 438 that she is fainting and her limbs are giving away. After vainly begging Polyxena not to leave her she tells the chorus that her life is over and that she wishes the same destruction on Helen.

21) At Eq. 1243, for example, the Paphlagonian exclaims οἴμοι κακοδαίμων οὐκέτ' οὐδέν εἰμι' ἐγώ.

22) Interpreting 'grief' liberally – excluding only expressions of simple anger, physical pain, or imminent fear – I have found 26 passages manifesting dismay: Ach. 67 (Dicaeopolis, hearing about the pay of the ambassadors), 105 (Dicaeopolis, hearing that Athens will receive no subsidy from the Persians), 208–09 (chorus, having discovered that Amphitheos has escaped), 1018 (Dercetes, mourning the loss of his oxen), 1036 (Dercetes, at his rejection), 1071 (messenger, bringing news to Lamachus), 1079 (Lamachus, called away to war); Eq. 1243 (Paphlagonian, suspecting that the oracle has been fulfilled), 1248 (Paphlagonian, after confirmation of the oracle); Nub. 698–99 (Strepsiades, dismayed at the prospect of bedbugs), 791 (Strepsiades, after Socrates has rejected him); Vesp. 309–15 (chorus-leader and son, out of concern about dinner), 696–97 (Philocleon, learning the corruption of the judicial system), 741–42 (Philocleon, in silent despair when the chorus has judged against him), 750 (Philocleon, crying out his despair), 982–83 (Philocleon, out of pity), 995 (Philocleon, at the dog's exoneration); Lys. 954 (Cinesias, having been abandoned by Myrrhina); Thes. 209 (Euripides, hearing Agathon's refusal to help), 754 (woman, grieving for her 'child'), 930 (kedestes, arrested); Ecc. 323–24 (Blepyros, regretting that he married as an old man), 391 (Blepyros, learning that he's too late to earn three obols at the Ecclesia); Pl. 169 (Plutus, told that Zeus' power depends on wealth), 850–53 (sycophant, regretting his loss of income), 1125–32 (Hermes, exclaiming over loss of sacrifices). I omit several cries of distress by the kedestes after Thes. 1000, when he is fastened to the board and unable to make any gesture with his body.

Exuberant physical manifestations of joy might be expected to be very common²³ in the farcical plot²⁴ of Aristophanes' earlier comedy, with its frequent moments of comic triumph.²⁵ I believe that they are (or were, in the ancient production). But the only mentions of any such gesture by an actor that I have found in Aristophanes' text are two references to dancing, at Eq. 697, where the sausage-seller exclaims that he has kicked up the *μόθων*, and in Aristophanes' last play, at Pl. 290–92, where Cario, leading the rejoicing chorus in its entry into the orchestra, proclaims that he will dance the Cyclops-dance. In tragedy, on the other hand, Shisler found more than 15 passages which tell us that joy is communicated in part by some movement of the body.²⁶

The reason for Old Comedy's reticence in this respect can hardly be that the use of gesture in comedy is more restrained than it is in tragedy. Verbal expressions of comic emotion and attitude are characteristically loud and vociferous. As Philocleon, for instance, at Vesp. 1335, responding to a legal threat, exclaims in disdain, "ἦ ἰεῦ, summon me to court!" it is very hard to believe that he stands motionless. And the young man of Ecc. 1045–48, on the

23) I have found 16 indications in the text of joy, pleasure, or sudden relief. I make no claim that this list, or that in note 22, is exhaustive. (Here I leave out of account expressions of satisfaction at the expulsion of an intruder. I exclude as well strictly choral expressions of joy, which are common, as well as conventional festive exits; both were accompanied by dance, which will have included appropriate gestures.): Ach. 195 (Dicaeopolis, having smelled the 30-year *σπονδαί*), 1058–60 (Dicaeopolis, having heard the bride's request); Eq. 696–97 (sausage-seller, mocking the Paphlagonian); Nub. 174 (Strepsiades, in amusement at the lizard's having defecated on Socrates), 773 (Strepsiades, at Socrates' expression of approval), 1150 (Strepsiades, having been informed that Pheidippides has learned the worse argument), 1170–72 (Strepsiades, seeing Pheidippides' pale complexion); Pac. 425 (Hermes, having been given a gold libation-bowl); Lys. 145 (Lysistrata, when Lampito consents to cooperate), 857 (Cinesias, when told that Myrrhine talks about him); Thes. 130 (the *kedestes*, delighted by Agathon's song), 1191–92 (the Scythian, having kissed the dancing-girl); Ran. 42–43 (Heracles, who can't help laughing at Dionysus), 337–38 (Xanthias, getting a whiff of pork); Ecc. 1045–46 (young man, saved from the old woman at the girl's intercession); Pl. 290–92 (Cario, leading the rejoicing chorus). I exclude the *kedestes*' hopeful cry at Thes. 1009 since he is bound to the board and cannot make a gesture with his body.

24) On general exuberance in farce see J. M. Davis, *Farce* (London 1978); on the motif of the hero's triumph over his enemies, pp. 25–26. For Aristophanes in particular see MacDowell (above, note 8) 1–13; Lowe (above, note 8) 46–49.

25) For a catalogue of incidents of physical violence see below, note 53.

26) Shisler, *Joy* (above, note 2) 287–88. Since happiness in tragedy so often is associated with reunion, the most common gesture is an embrace. At Ag. 31, however, the watchman dances, at Soph. El. 871–74 Chrysothemis shows her joy at the signs of Orestes' return by rushing into the playing-area.

departure of the first old woman, surely embraces the girl as he cries out to her, "You've done me a favor, sweetest!" If visual communication is as important in Old Comedy as I have asserted, gesture must be frequent in occurrence, and I would like to think that it is extravagant as well. But since the scholia indicating actors' movements are not reliable,²⁷ there is very little direct evidence that either is true.²⁸

At this point the objection may justifiably be raised that I have been comparing incomparables. Aren't the emotions of comedy trivial compared with those of tragedy? The answer is yes, and

27) W.G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation III: Scholia Aristophanica* (London 1905) 118 (speaking of scholia on the spectacle in general): "The information that these give is, of course, extracted from the plays themselves." See Rutherford's collection of references in the scholia to movements and gestures.

28) For its extravagance we do fortunately have some indirect evidence. B. Fehr, *Bewegungsweisen und Verhaltensideal* (Bad Bramstedt 1979) 16–22, has demonstrated that Greeks of the classical period associated decorum and dignity with moderation in both sweep ("Spielraum") and quickness of movement. Presumably gesture and movement in general of the opposite kind would have characterized comic impropriety. See esp. Plato, *Leg.* 7.815e–f, *Charm.* 159a–b, Aristotle, *EN* 1125a 12–15, [Aristotle], *Physiogn.* 807b; cf. Demosth. 45.77, 37.52, *Soph. El.* 871–72 (διώκομαι τὸ κόσμον μεθεῖσα σὺν τάχει μολεῖν). See also J. Bremmer, *Walking, Standing, and Sitting in Ancient Greek Culture*, in: J. Bremmer and H. Roderburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture from Antiquity to the Present Day* (Ithaca, N. Y. 1992) 15–20. The extravagance of comic movement would seem to be confirmed by scenes depicted on 4th-cent. south-Italian 'phlyax'-vases. Here we find running, bending, crouching, raising or extending of the arms, pointing, and in general the kind of swaggering busyness that seems to be reflected in a number of scenes of Aristophanic comedy. A good selection of such scenes can be found depicted in K. Neuiendam, *The Art of Acting in Antiquity* (Copenhagen 1992), a small monograph which is not otherwise very helpful, since Neuiendam does not attempt any analysis of the gestures. On the difficulty of interpreting gestures on one such vase see O. Taplin, *Comic Angels* (Oxford 1993) 59. We must, of course, treat such evidence as this with caution, since we do not know the relationship between this south-Italian drama and Old Comedy. Several recent arguments have been made that the relationship is very close, if the comedy represented on the vases and Attic Old Comedy are not actually identical. See E. Csapo, *A Note on the Würzburg Bell-Crater H5697* ('Telephus Travestitus'), *Phoenix* 40 (1986) 379–92; C. W. Darden, *Phlyax Comedy in Magna Graecia – a Reassessment*, in: J. H. Betts et al. (eds.), *Studies in honour of T. B. L. Webster II* (Bristol 1988) 33–41; J. R. Green, *Notes on Phlyax Vases*, *Quaderni ticinesi di numismatica e antichità classiche* 20 (1991) 49–56; O. Taplin, *Comic Angels and Phallology, Phlyaxes, Iconography, and Aristophanes*, *PCPhS* 213 (1987) 92–104. My own opinion is that Aristophanic comedy is so topical that it could not successfully have been translated whole to another place and time; that, however, the influence of Attic comedy on the Italian must have been very great since similarities of costume and, occasionally, motif are so striking.

the difference accounts in part for tragedy's inclination to express emotion with words. Expressions of tragic emotion are relatively more significant for two reasons: not only because the audience takes them more seriously as representations of the real human condition but also because, like other tragic actions, they receive significance from their context. Since an emotion felt by a character in tragedy almost always belongs to a logically coherent unit, it can be perceived by the audience as a likely consequence of events that have preceded, and its own consequences can be foreseen, at least in broad outline, in accordance with the laws of probability. In other words, it fulfills an expectation of the audience and prompts a new expectation. When Neoptolemus at Phil. 935 turns his head away and falls silent, the audience understands that his refusal to respond to Philoctetes reflects a conflict within him and is not surprised by his subsequent yielding to the lame hero's demands. The gesture, moreover, has meaning not merely in the narrower context of the play. To the extent that the spectator accepts a gesture as likely, he generalizes it as a representation of human nature and the human condition.²⁹

If tragedy often calls verbal attention to what the audience can plainly see, that is – perhaps among other things³⁰ – because a work that represents events as meaningful is naturally inclined to emphasize what is more meaningful.³¹ For not all movements (nor all expressive gestures) that advance the action of a tragedy are mentioned in the text. During her emotional speech of Hec. 251 ff. Hecuba probably makes a “proximal”³² movement toward Odysseus.

29) See I. Lada, *Emotion and Cognition in Audience Response*, PCPhS 39 (1993) 122–25.

30) Lowe (above note 8) 34 (cf. 47) suggests that the large scale of the theater and the subsequent difficulty of perception encouraged the “highlight[ing] in dialogue” of the stage-action. I am skeptical. For, as Lowe 47 admits, Aristophanes, in a number of places, relies solely on visual communication. He is particularly fond of indicating a portable object with nothing more than a deictic pronoun.

31) Verbal reference to an action is not, of course, the only way to indicate its special significance. On occasion both Aeschylus and Sophocles found it more effective dramatically to delay any reference to a person or thing brought on stage. Cassandra, who arrives at Ag. 783, is not mentioned until 950. A shrouded body which is carried on at Hec. 657 is not mentioned for 14 lines. Cf. Tro. 37. At Per. 150 Aeschylus seems simply to find it superfluous to mention Atossa's chariot, which the spectators can see for themselves. See Steidle (above, note 2) 11.

32) See Elam (above, note 4) 73. Odysseus' arrival to fetch Polyxena receives only a short announcement, and, while we cannot be sure how the scene originally was played, it would be appropriate to the situation for him to stop at the end of the announcement, maintaining some distance from Hecuba; for in the speech 218–

The text, however, does not indicate how they come into proximity to each other. What it does describe is the much more evocative gesture of supplication: at 275–76 she says, and the spectators can see, that she has taken his hand and fallen on her knees. Similarly, when Jocasta silently leaves the stage at OT 1072 the chorus takes notice, although at 945, when she heard with elation that Oedipus' father had died in Corinth, there was no mention of any gesture. A verbal reference to an actor's movements may, therefore, not be essential to the spectators' understanding. Because of the coherence of the plot, Neoptolemus' gesture at Phil. 935 would have meaning for them even if it were not described in words. Actions whose succession is based on cause and effect interpret each other. The function of the description of Neoptolemus' gesture is to communicate to the audience not so much the emotion that the gesture mirrors but the importance of the emotion: to prompt the spectators (whose ears have been bombarded by Philoctetes' pleas) to take it adequately into account. Verbal reference in tragedy to physical movement is often a hierarchizing device.

Dercetes' dismay at Dicaeopolis' rejection (Ach. 1036; see note 22) seems more trivial than Jocasta's despair partly because our awareness of the comedy as make-believe is greater. But this dismay also is trivial in the sense that it literally is of very limited consequence within the structure of the play's action. Manfred Landfester, from whom I have borrowed the term 'inconsequentiality,' has observed that Aristophanes' earlier comedies, at least in long sections, break down into relatively short episodes, like Dercetes' petition of Dicaeopolis, which have no direct bearing on what happens subsequently in the play.³³ This inconsequentiality, in fact, characterizes not only whole episodes but single actions within the comic plot – Dicaeopolis' expulsion of the Boeotian pipers (Ach. 864–66), for example, or the horseplay with the dress of the Triballian at Av. 1567–73 – which have no effect whatever on the plot and in addition are likely to be poorly motivated by previous events.

It is, I suggest, because emotions in Aristophanic comedy seldom are very consequential that verbal references to affective ges-

28 he attempts to maintain an emotional distance. It would be equally appropriate for Hecuba, who attempts an emotional appeal to Odysseus' conscience, to make a movement toward him. She must at any rate be very near at 274. See J. Gould, *Hike-teia*, *JHS* 93 (1973) 84–85.

33) M. Landfester, *Handlungsverlauf und Komik in den frühen Komödien des Aristophanes* (Berlin/New York 1977) esp. 11–12, 212–38.

tures are so infrequent. In Aristophanic comedy such references are avoided precisely because in tragedy they emphasize the significance of the feelings that they express. And it can hardly be accidental that three of the five descriptions, cited above, p. 259 f., of gestures of grief in Aristophanes, Eq. 1250–51, Vesp. 741–42 and 995, occur in passages which Rau regards as paratragic, while a fourth, Thes. 930, immediately follows a parody of a passage in *Helen* (Thes. 850–928).³⁴

A second hierarchizing device which tragedy often employs is the substitution of exclusively narrative for dramatic presentation of events. The extensive use of narrative, especially in entrance speeches, allows the tragic poet to expand the scope of action while maintaining unity of place; but it also allows the poet, because he often has a certain flexibility about where he may cause events to take place, to relegate to so-called ‘diegetic space’³⁵ action which he chooses to subordinate. To give an example: Deianeira is not seen as she conceives the idea of using Nessus’ charm, anoints the robe, or, later, notices the disintegration of the flock of wool. What is important to Sophocles is the act of presenting the robe as a gift for Heracles, her anxiety after she has done these things, and her dismay after she learns that her fears have been fulfilled. These are acted out before the audience (Trach. 600–32, 663–812).

Aristophanes, especially in the plays, or sections of plays, where plot plays a stronger role, is capable of utilizing off-stage action. For example, at Ach. 1142 Dicaearchus and Lamachus end a scene by departing in different directions, one to a party, the other to war. At Lys. 253 the women-conspirators leave the playing-area for the Acropolis, which they have occupied before the next scene begins. At Av. 849 Euelpides is sent off to build a wall for the new city. At Pl. 626 Cario, Chremylus, Blepsidemus, and Plutus depart for the temple of Asclepius.³⁶ Nevertheless many scenes end with-

34) Rau (above, note 11) 53–65, 152–53, 169–73, 192, 201.

35) K. Joerden’s “außer- und hinterszenischer Raum” (Zur Bedeutung des Außer- und Hinterszenischen, in: W. Jens [ed.], *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* [Munich 1971] 369–412). I prefer M. Issacharoff’s term “diegetic space” (*Space and Reference in Drama*, *Poetics Today* 2:3 [1981] 211–24) because it emphasizes the narrative character of off-stage presentation of action.

36) Other occurrences: Ach. 202: Dicaearchus exits to celebrate the rural Dionysia (a celebration which in fact in the next scene takes place in the playing area); Eq. 495: the sausage-seller to the Assembly; Nub. 510: Strepsiadēs and Socrates to begin the former’s education, 1114: Pheidippides and Worse Argument with the same purpose; Vesp. 1264: Philocleon and Bdelykleon to a dinner-party; Pac. 1022: the slave with the sheep which is to be sacrificed; Av. 1693: Peisetaerus with

out any anticipation of a continuation of action out of the sight of the audience. One thing that accounts for this is the episodic character of Aristophanic comedy.³⁷ Often a scene ends with the departure of characters whom the audience will not see again, and with whose future actions it does not concern itself. But even when there is a continuity of plot from scene to scene Aristophanes may choose not to subordinate action by reducing it to narrative.

Vesp. 1122–1264, for example, is, as Landfester emphasizes,³⁸ an interior scene, even though the actors who participate emerge from the skene-door. Immediately before their retirement into the skene at 1008, Bdelykleon has promised to take Philocleon along wherever he goes, to social events and entertainments. By analogy with Trach. 531–87, Deianeira's speech to the chorus explaining the origin of her love-charm and her decision to anoint the robe with it, we might expect Bdelykleon to emerge at 1122 and tell about the preparation of Philocleon for a party, describing his father's initial reluctance and perhaps expressing his own anxiety and uncertainty about Philocleon's suitability for polite compa-

the gods to fetch Basileia; Lys. 1013: the Spartan herald to fetch delegates; Thes. 654: Cleisthenes to report to the prytaneis, 946: the archer and the kedeses to fasten the latter to a σάβις; Ran. 478, 521, 578: respectively, Aeacus, the maidservant, and Pandokeutria to announce Heracles' return, 673: Aeacus, Xanthus, and Dionysus together to visit Pluto; Ecc. 288: Praxagora and her allies to the Pnyx, 871: Chremes to turn in his property and go to the Pnyx; Pl. 228: Cario to fetch the chorus of farmers.

37) See Landfester (above, note 33) 223, who says that behind-the-scenes action in Aristophanes' earlier comedies is insignificant. Lowe (above, note 8) 38–40 attributes Aristophanes' modest use of off-stage spaces to the relatively vague definition of what the playing area itself represents. I would say that the vagueness of definition makes it possible to bring more scenes into the playing-area, but it does not explain the lack of continuity from scene to scene which so often characterizes Aristophanic comedy.

38) Landfester (above, note 33) 202, 209 note 18. (I cannot agree, however, that the scene would have been enhanced by the use of the ekkyklema.) Russo (above, note 7) 131 claims that the actors are outdoors because at 1154 and 1251 servants are either sent inside or called out. Russo, we might notice, also argues (110–11) that the prologue of *Clouds* is set out-of-doors, but he allows (195) that the orchestra represents the interior of the Thesmophorion in *Thesmophoriazusae*. For the prologue of *Clouds* see also K.J. Dover, *Aristophanes. Clouds*, ed. with introd. and comm. (Oxford 1968) ad 1–78. What we have in all three cases is a problem of imprecision of location similar to what occurs when changes of location take place in the middle of a scene (for instance at Ach. 395). For a good brief discussion of lack of spatial definition in Aristophanes, see Lowe (above, note 8) 38–39.

39) Since it is a very common tragic practice to bring actors on individually, Philocleon would not be present during this monologue. See my article, *The Determination of Episodes in Greek Tragedy*, *AJPh* 114 (1993) 352–60.

ny.³⁹ In the dialogue which would follow Philocleon's emergence from the house Philocleon might repeat his concern about his own behavior in the presence of wine (cf. *Vesp.* 1252–55) or give voice to the dissatisfaction with his new clothes (which he already would be wearing) that we hear in lines 1133–67. The dinner called for at *Vesp.* 1251 would then be delivered and the two depart, as they do at *Vesp.* 1264.

Aristophanes, of course, in defiance of realistic plausibility, adopted a completely different strategy, and it is obvious why he did so. At this point in the play he is not interested in the dinner party and certainly is not concerned with representing anxiety about how Philocleon will behave there, or with prompting it in the audience. He is interested in Philocleon's antics for their own sake. These are not in any real sense subordinate to or preliminary to the hero's disastrous performance at the party. What is important to the dramatist is not only that Philocleon first refuses then consents to change clothes but how he does these things: that when he is shown the *καυνάκης* he makes silly jokes about a certain Morychus and about sausages (1141–42, 1144); that he hesitates to put on Laconian shoes (1159–67); that he cries out that the *καυνάκης* is belching heat (1150–51). What chiefly interests me, however, is that the humor of the scene has an important visual dimension. It is obvious from the text, for instance, although details are not always clear, that early in the scene Bdelykleon is holding out a cloak which Philocleon is physically avoiding.⁴⁰ At 1150, with οἴμοι δειλαίος, Philocleon presumably either jumps back in shock or thrusts the cloak away. When Bdelykleon at 1168–69 says, “Walk *πλουσίως*, like this, in a pretentiously luxurious way,” it is his movements (as well as those of Philocleon, who makes a clumsy attempt to imitate him) that are funny rather than his words. Similarly, when Philocleon lies down *ᾠδί* at 1211, what he says is not inherently funny but the “ridiculously clumsy way”⁴¹ that he moves. One reason, then, for Aristophanes' relatively great reliance on visual communication is a factor which we might call ‘comic ineffability.’

If the character of the gestures and movements of the actors in this scene makes a considerable contribution to the scene's effect

40) MacDowell (above, note 9) ad 1122: “Gestures, more than words, make clear at once that Bdelykleon is trying to get him to take off his *τρίβων* and put on the *καυνάκης*, and he is refusing to do so.”

41) MacDowell (above, note 9) ad loc.

on the spectators, it also is important that there are a lot of them. Philocleon enters (1122) exclaiming that as long as he lives he never will take off *τοῦτον*. The line is incomprehensible without some kind of deictic gesture. Lines 1122–68 – a third of the scene – are devoted to the reluctant removal of Philocleon’s cloak and shoes and their replacement. At 1168–73 Philocleon receives walking lessons, and from 1208–13 he learns to recline gracefully, after which Bdelykleon instructs him by example in the demeanor appropriate to a sophisticated guest. In Greek tragedy, by comparison, most scenes are quite static.⁴² Tragedy’s tendency to hierarchize and to focus on what is most meaningful encourages it to ration action for the sake of emphasis. Thus Deianeira, who at *Trach.* 531 appears holding the already anointed robe, to which she calls attention at 580, makes no significant movement until she hands it over to Lichas, immediately before the end of the scene (600 ff.).

However uninhibited the activities of Philocleon and Bdelykleon may seem, there are a number of passages in Aristophanic comedy which seem completely emancipated from the constraints of a continuous plot, where the action seems even more various and undirected. At *Ach.* 1003 (after a brief silent appearance in the middle of the preceding stasimon to throw out feathers) Dicaeopolis returns, shouting orders to slaves inside and those accompanying him who must be carrying kitchen-utensils, then proceeds to grill his newly-acquired thrushes. He is immediately interrupted (1018–36) by Dercetes, whose petition he refuses, then by a best-man in a wedding and the bridesmaid (1048 ff.). After she whispers (probably) in his ear, he calls to a servant for his ‘treaty’ and pours some wine from it into her flask, to the accompaniment of a couple of obscene remarks. On the heels of the departure of these petitioners a messenger arrives (1071), calling Lamachus from the house with orders to leave for the war-front. At 1085 a second messenger

42) Taplin, *Stagecraft* (above, note 1) 20: “There are long stretches of the tragedies where there is little movement There is no denying that the tragic theatre of the fifth century was more static than most other schools of drama.” Steidle (above, note 2) 12–13 asserts that episodes of very lively movement are to be found in the works of all three tragedians, and stresses correctly that Euripides introduced “eine Menge neuer und zum Teil raffinierter Spieleffekte.” Kaimio (above, note 2) 25 says of Sophocles’ *Philoctetes* that it “. . . concentrates on a few crucial instances of physical contact, loading them with significance,” but observes that a scene in Euripides can be quite lively. This she regards as an expression of Euripides’ greater realism. It seems to me that, while the greater animation of some scenes in Euripides is undeniable, these never approach the level of movement found in certain passages of Aristophanes.

appears with an invitation for Dicaeopolis for dinner. Between 1097 and the joint departure of Dicaeopolis and Lamachus at 1141–42 their slaves run alternately from the skene to the playing-area and back 20 times, carrying food and equipment. Thus within 140 lines the spectators are presented with six speaking characters, at least five mutes (and perhaps several more), an indeterminable number of objects, and four discontinuous sequences of action.⁴³

The considerable activity in the comic theater brings to mind a distinction which Michael Issacharoff has made between tragedy and comedy: that the former is relatively “closed,” the latter relatively “open.”⁴⁴ Issacharoff is mainly concerned with the spatial dimensions of comic action. Aristophanes opens up the dramatic space available to him not only by extending the range of his actors into the orchestra and by bringing scenes which belong indoors outside (above, p. 266) but, as often has been noticed,⁴⁵ by freely

43) After the iambic syzygy Av. 801–902 Peisetaerus is confronted successively by a poet, an oracle-seller, a geometrician, an episcopus and a decree-seller. Each of these characters brings to Peisetaerus a new situation and a new instance to action. The poet must be bribed to leave, prompting the hero, absurdly, to order a slave to strip off his own jerkin (934–35) and his tunic (946–48) on the spot. The oracle-seller is a patent fraud whose presumption Peisetaerus counters by producing a threatening oracle of his own, whose prediction he fulfills by beating the man, apparently with the oracle itself (981–91), causing him to run across the orchestra and out the parodos. Immediately after (992), a geometrician enters from the other parodos carrying instruments with which he proceeds to demonstrate how he will lay out a street-plan in the air. This alazon (1016), when threatened by Peisetaerus, first begins to retreat, then, having been struck, runs out the way by which he arrived (1019). At 1020 Peisetaerus is accosted by an episcopus whom he chases away with blows at 1031–32. At 1035 a decree-seller arrives, who receives similar treatment at 1043–45. The last two are more persistent than their predecessors, returning, almost certainly by opposite parodoi, so that the sequence ends with Peisetaerus running four times from one side of the orchestra to the other. Within 154 lines (904–1057) the spectators are presented with five situations and five speaking characters – six, if we count Peisetaerus – in addition to at least two attendants (cf. 933–48 and 958–59). Between the parabasis and the end of *Birds*, according to K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London 1972) 141, 18 new characters appear. In the whole of *Trachiniae* and Euripides' *Electra*, by contrast, there are only seven characters with speaking roles, in *Oedipus* and *Hippolytus* eight.

44) M. Issacharoff, *Comic Space*, in: James Redmond (ed.), *Themes in Drama* 9 (Cambridge 1987) 188–89, 192–93.

45) See, for instance, Russo (above, note 7) 45–47, 85–86, 109–111, 225–26, Lowe (above, note 8) 38–39, A. Cassio, *Commedia e partecipazione. La Pace di Aristofane* (Naples 1985) 120–21, Dover (above, note 43) 22–23, 107; see also Dover's essay, *The Skene in Aristophanes*, *PCPhS* n. s. 12 (1966) 2–17 and A. M. Dale, *An Interpretation of Ar. Vesp.* 136–210 and its Consequences for the Stage of Aristophanes, *JHS* 77 (1957) 205–211. Cf. Landfester (above, note 33) 201–203, 209, P. von Möllendorff, *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie*.

changing the location which the orchestra represents. Issacharoff, however, correctly regards the concept of space in drama as a reflex of plot or action. Tragic action normally is sensitive to the demands of the law of probability and therefore, as I have said in an earlier paper, tends to foreclose alternatives. Comedy is open in the sense that the laws of probability are suspended.⁴⁶ Some comedies, of course, are more open than others. Situation-comedies, like the plays of Menander and some Roman comedies, may have tight plots and may be open only in the sense that in them the improbable can intervene to bring about complications or comic resolution. But as comedy becomes more open, action becomes more absurd, for openness creates theoretically unlimited comic possibilities: anything goes. This emancipation from necessity realizes itself in fantastic accomplishments, like the establishment of a kingdom in the sky which rivals Olympus, as well as the indulgence of physical desires and the confounding of enemies. But action in very open comedy also becomes more frequent, because the absurd lacks, on the one hand, a logical antecedent and is, on the other, minimally consequential.⁴⁷ This disjunctive character is what licenses irrelevant jokes, like the adjustment of the Triballian's costume (*Av.* 1567–73; see above, p. 264), Strepsiades' threat and the slave's flight (*Nub.* 58–59), or Dionysus' sitting on the oar (*Ran.* 197–99). Most of the jokes in Aristophanes are not quite so independent of context as these; an absurd idea or action may follow a sort of skewed logic. Thus Dicaeopolis, as a result of the founding of his private free-market and his need for a product not found in Boeotia, wraps up a sycophant for export (*Ach.* 926–51). But such sequences are never of long duration, for, as Rainer Warning has pointed out, it is impossible to maintain logical consequence in an irrational situation for long without arriving at a *reductio ad absurdum*.⁴⁸ Because inconsequentiality is a dead end that requires a new beginning, long sections of most of the comedies are divided into a succession of short scenes, usually with a succession of new char-

Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Bachtin (Tübingen 1995) 112–24, P. Händel, *Formen und Darstellungsweisen in der aristophanischen Komödie* (Heidelberg 1963) 216–20.

46) Entrances, Exits, and the Structure of Aristophanic Comedy, *Hermes* 127 (1999) 200.

47) Poe (above, note 46) 199.

48) *Elemente einer Pragmasemiotik der Komödie*, in: W. Preisendanz and R. Warning (eds.), *Das Komische* (Munich 1976) 286–87, 311–16, citing E. von Hartmann, *Ästhetik*, in: *Ausgewählte Werke IV* (Leipzig 1888) 333–34.

acters.⁴⁹ Multiplicity, then, is a characteristic of comedy that functions at a high level of absurdity.

I would like to believe that multiplicity is not simply a by-product of absurdity but an expression of it as well. In Aristophanic comedy there is a variety of humor – sexual, scatological, satirical; there are conventional routines, such as preparation of food,⁵⁰ prayer and sacrifice,⁵¹ change of costume,⁵² cheerful violence.⁵³ Each individually has such a strong appeal that it is easy for a reader to overlook the less obvious effect of simple accumulation. This accumulation, in so far as it is realized in action, is best represented by movements of persons into and out of the playing-area. In

49) Landfester (above, note 33) esp. 11–12, 219, speaking of the earlier comedies. Landfester observes that in *Acharnians*, *Clouds*, *Peace*, and *Birds* the number of speaking characters is about twice as large (10–12) as the norm for tragedy (about 6).

50) Ach. 1003 ff.; Pac. 1026 ff., 1193 ff.; Av. 1579 ff.

51) Instances listed in W. Horn, *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des Aristophanes* (Nürnberg 1970) 4–11.

52) I omit mention of stripping by the chorus and the not-infrequent play with garlands: Eq. 873 (Demos/shoes), 883 ([?] Demos/chiton), 891 (Demos/διφθέριον [rejected]); Nub. 500 (Strepsiades/cloak, [?] shoes); Vesp. 1132 (Philocleon/τρίβων), 1155 (Philocleon/καυνάκης), 1160 (Philocleon/ἐμβάδες), 1162 (Philocleon/Laconians); Pac. 886 (Theoria/all clothing), 1124 (Hierocles/sheepskin); Av. 934 (slave/jerkin), 947 (slave/chiton); Lys. 533 (proboulos/veil); Thes. 214 (kedestes/himation), 253 (kedestes/κροκωτός), 255 (kedestes/στροφιόν), 260 (kedestes/κεφαλή περίθετος), 262 (Agathon/shoes), 263 (kedestes/shoes), 568 (woman/himation), 636 ff. (kedestes/κροκωτός and στροφιόν), 731 ('baby'/Cretan dress); Ran. 497 f. (Dionysus and Xanthias/lion's skin and Xanthias' clothing), 532 and 589 (the same), 641 (Dionysus and Xanthias/clothing [to be beaten]); Ecc. 266 ff. (women of chorus/men's clothing and beards), 500 ff. (Praxagora and chorus/men's clothing and beards); Pl. 929 ff. (sycophant/himation, shoes), 940 (sycophant/τριβώνιον).

53) Here I offer a list of instances that I have found of probable striking and beating. It does not include other kinds of physical violence, such as the Scythian's tightening of the kedestes' bonds (Thes. 1003 ff.) or the brandishing of a fist or weapon in a threat or attempt to attack: (It is not always easy to be certain whether a threat to harm actually has been carried out.) Ach. 827 f. (Dicaeopolis/sycophant), 925 f. (Dicaeopolis/Nicarchus); Eq. 247 ff. (sausage-seller and first slave/ Paphlagonian), 452 ff. (sausage-seller and first slave/Paphlagonian); Nub. 1297 ff. (Strepsiades/second creditor: poking with a goad), 1321 ff. (Pheidippides/Strepsiades), 1508 f. (Strepsiades and slaves/Socrates and disciples); Vesp. 251 ff. (chorus-leader/son), 399 ff. (Xanthias/Philocleon), 456 ff. (Xanthias, [?] Bdelykleon/chorus), 1384 f. (Philocleon/Bdelycleon), 1436 (Philocleon/accuser); Pac. 256 (Polemos/Kydoimos), 1119 ff. (slave/Hierocles); Av. 989 f. (Peisetaerus/oracle-seller), 1018 f. (Peisetaerus/Meton), 1029 ff. (Peisetaerus/episcopus), 1335 ff. ([?] Peisetaerus/Manes), 1464 ff. (Peisetaerus/sycophant); Lys. 459 ff. (women/Scythian archers); Ran. 644 ff. (Aecus/Dionysus and Xanthias). In addition, at Eq. 1 the first slave enters crying out. His pursuer, the Paphlagonian, does not, however, appear.

very episodic passages, with brief scenes, each beginning and ending with exits and entrances, these movements may be repeated several times within a brief number of lines. In these passages farcical violence also usually plays a strong role. Between verses 904 and 1057 of *Birds*, for example, five different characters scurry off-stage accompanied by threats or by actual blows, and what prompts laughter here is largely the comic haste with which the intruders depart. I think, however, that it can be demonstrated that exits in themselves, as well as entrances, have independent aesthetic value. For (1) at the ends of brief episodes the poet often draws visual attention to their frequency by causing an entering actor to arrive in the playing-area almost on the heels of the one departing.⁵⁴ (2) Aristophanes wrote into his text a number of such movements which have nothing to do with the beginning or ending of scenes.

Occasionally actors run into the skene in the middle of a dialogue, normally to fetch something, like Dicaeopolis' basket of charcoal (Ach. 327/331) or Strepsiades' rooster and hen (Nub. 843/47), returning soon if not immediately.⁵⁵ More often mutes,

54) To a previous essay on the divisional structure of Old Comedy (above, note 46, Appendix II) I attached a schematic analysis of exits and entrances in the sections following the parabasis, or first parabasis, of five plays. An examination of this table will show that in these five passages, which average about 700 lines apiece, 16 arrivals occur immediately after the departing actor turns to leave, another seven being separated from the departure by no more than two lines. The passages considered were Ach. 718–1223, Nub. 627–1511, Pac. 819–1356, Av. 801–1765, Lys. 707–1321. In this calculation I do not include quick repetitions of exits and entrances by the same characters.

55) Here I do not list repetitions of exits and entries, which are cited in note 86 below: Ach. 327, 331 (Dicaeopolis/charcoal), 361 (Dicaeopolis/chopping-block); Eq. 98, 101 (second slave/wine), 1161, 1164 (Paphlagonian, sausage-seller/chair, table); Nub. 843, 847 (Strepsiades/rooster and hen), 1245, 1247 (Strepsiades/kneading bowl); Vesp. 178 (Bdelykleon/donkey), 798, 805 (Bdelykleon/courtroom-equipment), 833, 843 (Philocleon/"pig-sty of Hestia"), 848, 851 (Bdelykleon/indictments); Pac. 4, 5 (first slave/dung cakes carried inside), 262, 268 (Kydoimos/pestle), 1040, 1042 (slave/entrails and sacrificial cakes); Lys. 918, 920 (Myrrhine/bed); Hec. 729–39 (Mica, attendant/kindling wood); Pl. 228, 253 (Cario/Chremylus' fellow-farmers).

In the instances above, spoken dialogue continues without choral intervention. In addition, the following exits and re-entries are followed by a continuation of the preceding dialogue, even though they are accompanied by a brief lyric: Eq. 972, 997 (sausage-seller, Paphlagonian/oracles), 1110, 1151 (sausage-seller, Paphlagonian/gifts); Nub. 699, 723 (Socrates/no motive [exits again, 726]); Pac. 937, 947 (slave/sheep), 938, 942 ([?: see M. Platnauer, Aristophanes, Peace, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1964, ad 938] Trygaeus/altar), 1032, 1039 (Trygaeus/table); Av. 850, 859 (Peisetaerus/priest [see note 58]). Finally, in a variation, actors occasional-

usually servants, are called from the skene, or attendants – whose presence in the playing-area may not have been hinted previously by the text – are sent inside to bring something out.⁵⁶ A glance at notes 55 and 56 will show that many of the items fetched from the skene – Strepsiades' rooster and hen, Peisetaerus' bird-sling, Mica's kindling-wood – are never mentioned again after their initial presentation. Most find employment, if at all, only in the scene or the

ly emerge from the skene and exit almost immediately. At Ach. 988–89 Dicaeopolis appears at the door to throw out feathers (see below). At Pac. 114 Trygaeus' daughters, called out, beseech their father as he flies away. At Lys. 728 the first of the women attempting to escape appears, at 735 the second. They probably are sent back by Lysistrata into the skene at 734 and 741 respectively. See my article (above, note 46) Appendix II note.

56) Here, as in the note above, repetitions of entrances and exits are omitted (see below, note 86). It is not always clear whether a servant is called out of the skene or sent inside to return. In the following instances, however, it seems probable that the order is given to attendants who are present in the playing-area: Ach. 927 (Dicaeopolis/wood-shavings [for packing]); Vesp. 522 (Philocleon/sword), 860 (Bdelykleon/fire, myrtle wreaths, incense); Av. 463 (Peisetaerus/garland and water), 1311 (Peisetaerus/wings); Lys. 184 ([?]Lysistrata/Scythian archeress); Ran. 569 (Pandokeutria/Cleon), 570 (Plathane/Hyperbolus). At Ran. 569 and 570 the (speaking) characters sent away do not return. In a variation, at Thes. 1203 Euripides tells a παιδάριον to run off taking τὰυτί.

In each of the following cases the command is given to servants who are or may be still inside the house: Ach. 805 (Dicaeopolis to bring figs from inside), 887 (Dicaeopolis/brazier and fire; Dicaeopolis' children seem to come out with the servants without motivation: cf. 891), 1061 (Dicaeopolis/his 'treaty'), 1097 (Lamachus/γυλιός), 1098 (Dicaeopolis/κίστη); Eq. 1389 (sausage-seller/the [personified] thirty-year peace-treaties), 1407 (sausage-seller/Paphlagonian); Nub. 18 (Strepsiades/account-book), 1297 (Strepsiades/goat), 1485 (Strepsiades/ladder, mattock); Pac. 1059 (Trygaeus/libation); Vesp. 434 (Bdelykleon/slaves to hold Philocleon), 529 (Bdelykleon/writing tools), 937 (Bdelykleon/'witnesses'), 1251 (Bdelykleon/dinner); Av. 850 (Peisetaerus/basket, holy water), 1187 (Peisetaerus/sling), 1693 (Peisetaerus/bridal clothes); Lys. 186 (Lysistrata/τὰ τοῦία), 199 (Lysistrata/wine-jar, mixing-bowl); Thes. 238 (Euripides/torch or lamp); Ran. 847 (Dionysus/black lamb), 872 (Dionysus/incense, fire); Pl. 624 (Chremylus to Cario [who in this scene has no speaking role]/blankets, Plutus), 1194 (Chremylus/torches), 1196 (Chremylus/Wealth).

Bain (above, note 8) 45 regards the command for a black lamb (Ran. 847) as something like an exclamatory response rather than a real order which is carried out. N. Dunbar (Aristophanes, *Birds*, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1995) ad loc. is inclined to interpret the command at Av. 463–64 similarly, since the reason for ordering water is not clear. Because, however, Peisetaerus needs the garland for his speech, I cannot agree. MacDowell (above, note 9) ad Vesp. 522 calls Philocleon's demand for a sword a melodramatic utterance. It is by no means certain, however, that Philocleon does not hold a sword throughout the debate that follows and at 755–59, as A. Sommerstein (*Wasps*, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster 1983) translation ad loc. suggests, attempt suicide with it. In this context it should be noted that objects brought on stage are by no means necessarily put to use. See below, p. 286.

comic routine that follows and have no effect on subsequent action. The trips, therefore, to bring these objects into the playing area, like the brief visits of comic intruders, call attention to the lack of progress in the dramatic action (see below, p. 280).

The purposes of most of the entrances and exits that we have been talking about are, if not absurd, at least trivial. Occasionally performers enter without any clear motive within the fiction of the play.⁵⁷ Dicaeopolis during a lyric at Ach. 988–89 appears in the doorway to throw out feathers. At Ach. 860 Theban pipers arrive with the Boeotian and are driven away from the door by Dicaeopolis (864–66), who emerges from the house. A piper costumed as a raven must appear at the beginning of the strophe Av. 851–58; for Peisetaerus, who re-enters at 859⁵⁸ and immediately rebukes him, has not noticed him before. Bystanders who are not identified in the text arrive at some time before Lys. 1217–20, where they are driven away from the door by an Athenian ambassador who has emerged from the skene (see below, p. 280).

Fairly often mutes enter the playing area whose motives lie completely outside the dramatic fiction. In recent years students of Aristophanes have recognized that the many objects that are brought on stage in Aristophanic comedy present strategic problems.⁵⁹ Objects have to be carried off during the course of a play and in a number of places it is clear that this cannot be done by the actors themselves. After Lys. 953, for example, Cinesias, who is left in the playing-area with the many objects brought on by Myrrhine in the course of the repeated trips which she makes into the skene (918 ff.), could not possibly take them all off by himself. He does not, in fact, attempt to do so but remains on stage singing. The cot, pillow, blanket, etc. must be carried off by mutes, who appear either during his song or at the end of the scene that follows. I be-

57) The poet's comic purpose in such instances may, of course, be quite obvious.

58) Dunbar (above, note 56) ad 849 is inclined to think that Peisetaerus does not exit at 850 and re-enter, even though he says explicitly that he will call the priest. She also suggests that the piper is part of the sacrificial procession. I think, however, that the analogy with Ach. 860–66 makes both of these interpretations unlikely. In each case the hero angrily rebukes the musician(s), and in each case the name 'Chaeris' is mentioned.

59) See especially Dover (above, note 43) 21, 143–44, Id. (Aristophanes, *Frogs*, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1993) ad Ran. 35, 1525, Russo (above, note 7) 45, 50, 69, 111, R. G. Ussher (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae*, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1973) ad Ecc. 311–26, 509–13, J.-M. Jacques, *L'Idée comique et sa réalisation scénique dans les Archarmiens d'Aristophane*, CGITA 5 (1989) 14–15.

lieve that such dramatically unmotivated appearances are more common than is generally recognized (although it often is hard for a reader to say exactly when they occur). I have found more than 35 occasions where objects in the playing area have to be taken off and where it seems improbable that this is accomplished by the actors themselves (see Appendix II).⁶⁰

To my knowledge, moreover, it has never been remarked how often things appear in the playing area which are unlikely to have been brought there by actors (Appendix II). Thus at Pac. 424 Trygaeus gives Hermes a gold libation-bowl. At 431 he pours wine into the bowl. If he had been carrying these items, without comment, since the beginning of his appearance, they surely would have distracted the attention of the spectators; and it is more likely that they are handed to him spontaneously by ‘attendants.’⁶¹ At Ran. 1370 a balance must be brought out, although no order has been given for this to be done. In some of these instances it is not inconceivable that the object has been concealed unobtrusively until the appropriate moment by an actor or by an attendant who entered with him unremarked. But since some of these objects, like the balance of Ran. 1370,⁶² the folding chair and βατραχίς of Eq. 1384 and 1406, or the sacred couch of Nub. 254,⁶³ could not readily have been concealed, we should ask ourselves whether unobtrusiveness was one of Aristophanes’ concerns.

Dover presumably would say yes, for he seems uncomfortable with too much breaking of the dramatic illusion. Thus he asserts that the stage-hands who appear to take off objects which no

60) In addition to the instances cited in Appendix II, on two occasions (Pac. 729–32, Av. 433–35) mutes are ordered to carry items away, but, like some of the mutes who are sent to fetch objects, these seem already to have appeared spontaneously. See Dover (above, note 43) 144.

61) A. Sommerstein (Aristophanes: Peace, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster and Chicago 1985), transl. ad loc., who has a very good eye for such staging-problems but usually tries to explain them away, conjectures that a member of the chorus, who has entered the skene at 427, emerges at this point with the wine. Sommerstein says nothing about the appearance of the libation-bowl, which presumably he assumes to have been concealed on Trygaeus’ person.

62) Dover (above, note 59) ad Ran. 1374. See also Jacques (above, note 59) 14–15.

63) Dover (above, note 38) ad Nub. 184–99 offers an elaborate strategy for the presentation of the couch: that it was on stage at the beginning of the play, behind a screen which also concealed the Phrontisterion until the screen was removed at 184. This of course requires us to believe that the spectators would have found the removal of the screen less dramatically implausible than the sight of the Phrontisterion during the first scene of the prologue.

longer are wanted would not have disturbed an Athenian audience accustomed to the omnipresence of servants. In the prologue of *Frogs*, for example, Aristophanes will have gotten rid of the donkey when Dionysus and Xanthias arrive at Heracles' house, where the leading away of guests' animals would seem part of the natural routine of a well-run household.⁶⁴ Here we should ask ourselves how great the spectators' demand for realistic illusion would have been. At the same time that the donkey will have been led off to be fed, the guests are kept standing before the door in accordance with a convention of Athenian drama. Russo says, more aptly, that the stage-hands on such occasions are drawn into the drama,⁶⁵ but that is not quite right either. In Aristophanes' very open comedy the boundaries of possibility are not as clear or as restrictive as they are in either tragedy or New Comedy. The more open comedy becomes, confronting the spectators with the unexpected, the unmotivated, and the impertinent, the more amorphous the dramatic situation becomes and the more the dramatic illusion fades into the background. It sometimes therefore is very weak, so that a dramatically unmotivated appearance of someone who has no role in the plot, far from being inappropriate or intrusive, adds to the effect of undirected, inconsequential coming and going which in places Aristophanes strives to achieve.

I am not trying to claim that in Old Comedy there is no such thing as dramatic illusion,⁶⁶ which is strongest in those plays, or parts of plays, whose plots are more coherent. This Dover defines reasonably as "... the uninterrupted concentration of the fictitious personages of the play on their fictitious situation."⁶⁷ And in those well-documented places where the actors refer to the play as a theatrical production or even speak directly to the audience, it is fair to say that the concentration is interrupted. In recent years, however, we have become more conscious that illusion in comedy and illusion

64) Dover (above, note 43) 21, id. (above, note 59) ad Ran. 35.

65) Russo (above, note 7) 50. See also Cassio (above, note 45) 120–21.

66) As G. M. Sifakis, *Parabasis and Animal Choruses* (London 1971) 7–14 strongly maintained for both tragedy and comedy. This position has been more cogently defended (for comedy) by E. Rechenberg, *Beobachtungen über das Verhältnis der alten attischen Komödie zu ihrem Publikum* (Diss. Humboldt-Universität, Berlin 1966).

67) Dover (above, note 43) 56.

in tragedy are two very different things.⁶⁸ Because the spectators are so often reminded that what they are seeing is play and not ‘reality,’⁶⁹ Taplin suggests that it is misleading to speak of a rupture.⁷⁰ He views Aristophanic comedy as occupying an area between illusion and its reality as a performance – or rather, as skating on the edge of illusion, “seldom los[ing] sight of its own theatricality,” repeatedly “invading” the world of the audience but never completely giving up its fantasy.⁷¹ Chapman’s idea of a “theatrical self-consciousness,” which is maintained by frequent reminders, is not very different, even though he is willing to speak of breaking the illusion.⁷²

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of comic illusion. What I am concerned with here is the coming and going of mutes who enter and leave without any motive within the comic fiction, and with the question whether this phenomenon is to be associated with such movements as Strepsiades’ quick exit and entry in *Clouds* for rooster and hen (843, 847) or the running departure of the oracle-seller at Av. 991. It is, nevertheless, appropriate at this point to observe that the valuable work of Taplin, Chapman, and others leaves important problems unaddressed. (1) The various devices which interrupt or diminish the illusion differ greatly in kind and in the degree to which they command the attention of the audience.⁷³ When Hermes at Pac. 543–44 points and says, “Look at the faces of these spectators,” that is a very different thing from the changes, or exchanges, of costume which are so frequent in Aristophanes.⁷⁴ (2) Aristophanic comedy, as I have asserted before, is a generically mixed drama, full of variety and change. If this comedy often crosses, or blurs, the line between the play as fiction and the play as production, it can also – in large parts of *Clouds* or *Lysistrata*, for instance – step far back from this boundary, maintaining a fictional illusion over long passages of a play. But I know

68) See especially G. A. H. Chapman, *Some Notes on Dramatic Illusion in Aristophanes*, *AJPh* 104 (1983) 1–23, O. Taplin, *Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis*, *JHS* 106 (1986) 163–74, F. Muecke, *Playing with the Play: Theatrical Self-Consciousness in Aristophanes*, *Antichthon* 11 (1977) 52–67.

69) Instances categorized and catalogued most fully by Chapman (above, note 68). Chapman 22 claims more than 100 instances.

70) *Synkrisis* (above, note 68) 164; cf. *Comic Angels* (above, note 28) 67.

71) *Comic Angels* (above, note 28) 67, *Synkrisis* (above, note 68) 164.

72) Chapman (above, note 68) esp. 2–3, 22.

73) I avoid the word ‘metatheater’ not only because it is trendy but because it is an essentially meaningless term which tends to mask these differences.

74) These are said to remind the spectators that the characters are actors in costume (Chapman [above, note 68] 18). See also Taplin (above, note 68) 170.

of no attempt at a systematic discussion of the relation between “theatrical self-consciousness” and other components of the play.⁷⁵

Given the inadequate state of our understanding of dramatic illusion and its rupture, I prefer to look at the poorly motivated exits and entrances in Aristophanes’ plays from a slightly different and narrower perspective, that of audience-expectation.⁷⁶ Earlier (p. 263) I observed that in a tragedy, because it is generally a logically coherent unit, an action normally arouses an expectation; and it also fulfills an expectation, at least in the sense that the spectators can appreciate the intention behind it. Chapman makes the interesting point that, because of its coherence, a tragedy is shut off from audience-influence; that tragedy may be said to be played in front of an audience, while comedy is played to the audience, inviting audience participation.⁷⁷ It would perhaps be more true to say that the tragic audience participates in a different way. The tragic spectator’s perception of the tragic action is by no means a passive one. Tragedy, by engaging his expectations, and therefore his emotions,⁷⁸ invites the spectator’s vicarious participation. Departures and arrivals of tragic actors, we might notice, are naturally moments of high expectation.

That is sometimes true in Aristophanic comedy as well. Strep-siades at Nub. 1131 enters and knocks at the door of the Phrontisterion, anxious to learn about the success of Pheidippides’ training. The Spartan herald exits at Lys. 1013 to fetch delegates to attend a peace-conference. But when, at Av. 1371, the young man with patricidal impulses departs and at 1372 the poet Cinesias arrives,

75) For a good brief discussion of Old Comedy’s variety, see Lowe (above, note 8) 47–50, who speaks of comedy’s “diversity of purpose.” Taplin (above, note 68) 172 recognizes that comedy’s abundance of activity and “looseness” distinguish it from tragedy, but he does not examine implications of this fact.

76) Muecke (above, note 68) 58–59 speaks of contradiction of expectations in discussing comic interruptions of the fictional situation.

77) Chapman (above, note 68) 1–2, 23. Lowe (above, note 8) 44 uses the word “collusion.” I believe that the distance of the tragic actor from his audience often is overestimated. Pronouncements like that of Chapman (2) that in tragedy “... there is no audience awareness at all,” or of O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London 1978) 166, that “[t]he world of the play never acknowledges the world of the audience,” are gross exaggerations. See my article *Entrance-Announcements and Entrance-Speeches in Greek Tragedy*, *HSPH* 94 (1992) 142–56.

78) On the role of cognition in the generation of tragic emotion see Lada (above, note 29) 113–22, esp. 113–14. An action like Neoptolemus’ turning away makes a double claim on the spectator’s emotions, since it has meaning not only for Neoptolemus’ particular situation but for the human condition which the spectator shares (above, p. 263).

the conventional situation tells the audience that the former's role in the play is over. When Dicaeopolis disappears into the skene to return at Ach. 331 with a basket of charcoal, the audience has no sense of an expectation fulfilled, for Dicaeopolis' response to the chorus' threats is a fantastic one and therefore unexpected.⁷⁹ In each case the spectators perceive a small discontinuity which forestalls any concern for the comic agents. I admit that some trips into the skene are more plausibly motivated: the one at Vesp. 862, for instance, in response to Bdelykleon's demand for fire, myrtle, and incense. But all this is just to say that Aristophanic comedy is more open in some places than in others, and that different passages reduce the audience's sense of engagement in the fictional situation to different degrees. To some degree, however, the significance of all such movements is devalued by the frequency with which they occur.

Devices such as audience-address or references to the performance as a performance, which overtly cross the boundary between illusion and quotidian reality, have justly been recognized as distinctive features of Aristophanic comedy. But this comedy is full of discontinuities, larger and smaller, which the audience perceives as breaks in the chain of cause and probable effect. These have not been clearly recognized as related phenomena. Even brief, irrelevant jokes, such as the satirical comments about public figures, divert the interest of the audience from the fiction at hand. Conventional routines, such as the expulsion of an intruder or change of costume, even though they fulfill comic expectations,⁸⁰ are recognized by the audience as intrusions prompted by considerations external to the fiction.⁸¹ The cumulative effect of these and other disjunctions is a kind of comic 'Verfremdung,' or distancing of the audience from the comic fiction.

This suggests that at Eq. 1384, where an anonymous mute must enter unbidden to give Agoracritus the folding chair, and Ach. 927, where Dicaeopolis calls for a servant to bring him shavings, the difference is one more of degree than of kind. While

79) This is not to say that the only comic effect of Dicaeopolis' entry is one of surprise. The audience's recognition of the parody plays an important role in its appreciation of the scene.

80) T. Gelzer, *Feste Strukturen in der Komödie*, in: J.M. Bremer and E. W. Handley (eds.), *Aristophane* (Geneva 1993) 51–90, emphasizes Aristophanes' dependence on the public's expectation of fixed, traditional forms. See esp. p. 89.

81) Warning (above, note 48) 311–12 calls conventional procedures 'implicit ruptures' of the fiction.

Dicaeopolis' fictional motive is absurd, that of the mute is non-existent, taking us one step further away from the realm of meaningful intention. Analogously, when the Athenian ambassador at *Lys.* 1218–20 says that he won't sing the bystanders near the door, then consents to do so at the pretended behest of the audience, his reason for so speaking comes from outside the fiction being presented. It can hardly be said to be a rupture of the fiction, however, because the bystanders themselves, whoever they may be, already have entered without motive.⁸² The reference to the φορτικὸν χωρίον confirms that they are present in the playing area in order to make the vulgar commonplace of driving them away possible.

We have seen that dramatic characters exit and return within the same scene with some frequency. This is a procedure unique to comedy.⁸³ What has not yet been noticed is that in about one-third of such instances (cf. notes 55, 56) the movement is repeated. At *Nub.* 694–98 *Strepsiades*, who at 634, with no attempt at realistic justification, has brought a cot outside, is told by *Socrates* to lie down and think his problems through. In the course of his lucubrations, which are accompanied by a lyric exchange of jokes (communicated by both words and gesture) about bedbugs (709–15) and masturbation (733–34), *Socrates* exits at 699 (before a choral strophe and a lyric exchange between actor and chorus), re-enters, for no apparent reason, at 723, exits at 726, and re-enters at 731. Here we might notice that neither exit is written into the text. The reader knows that the spectators have seen him leave only from remarks that he makes at each return. What is of more interest to me now, however, is that the exits and entries do not service the plot; in the end *Socrates* simply remains on the stage, and at 731 *Strepsiades* continues his under-cover thinking in *Socrates*' presence.

A more complicated series of comings and goings, involving at least two actors and perhaps a mute extra, is found at *Pac.* 922–1022 (see above, p. 257f.), a passage which represents preparations for a sacrifice. Although the details are not completely clear, it is apparent that at 938 the anonymous slave goes inside for a sheep.

82) J. Henderson (*Aristophanes, Lysistrata*, ed. with introd. and comm., Oxford 1987) ad 1216–38 rationalizes them as slaves of the ambassadors.

83) In tragedy it is unusual for a character with a speaking part to exit before the end of what I have called the 'actional dialogue' of a scene. In the few cases where this does happen, the character does not return before the scene's end. See my article (above, note 39) esp. 388–89.

Perhaps, as Platnauer thinks (above, note 55), Trygaeus also goes inside for the altar which he says he will fetch (ποριῶ), reappearing at 942 after four lines of choral lyric. After four additional lines of lyric (943–46) someone arrives, not with the sheep but with a basket containing grains of barley and apparatus for sacrifice. Is the new arrival a mute or the slave who left at 938? If the latter, he must depart again immediately, because at 955 he comes back with the sheep. Meanwhile lustral water (956) has also appeared. Is this because, as Sommerstein conjectures,⁸⁴ Trygaeus also has exited during the choral lyric and re-entered at 955, or are the exit and re-entry made by a mute? After further preliminaries for sacrifice, which include flinging barley to the spectators (962)⁸⁵ and soaking the chorus with lustral water (see 970–72), the sacrifice in the playing-area is cancelled; that is, everything that has happened since 922 is rendered inconsequential. The slave exits with the sheep (1022), Trygaeus exits to bring back a table (1032), returning with the slave at 1039 – the slave bearing the sheep’s thighs – and finally the slave exits for the intestines with which he re-enters (1040, 1042).

This procedure, a repetition or succession of exits and entrances within a brief passage, is a favorite comic routine of the first seven plays.⁸⁶ (With *Thesmophoriazusae* it is abandoned, although the brief, parallel appearances at *Ran.* 464–78, 503–20, 549–78 of Aeacus, a maidservant, and the tavern-keeper, each followed by a change of clothes, are not very different in their effect.⁸⁷) In some

84) Stage-directions to ll. 949 and 956 of his translation (above, note 61).

85) Cf. Cassio (above, note 45) 126.

86) *Ach.* 1097–1133 (anonymous slaves of Lamachus and Dicaeopolis alternately with military and culinary supplies and equipment); *Eq.* 98–115 (second slave first for pitcher of wine then for oracle); *Nub.* 699–731 (Socrates with no apparent motive); *Vesp.* 833, 835, 843, 844 (Bdelykleon exits for a court-railing one line before servant enters to report Labes’ misdeed, servant exits immediately before Philocleon re-enters); *Pac.* 1–18 (first slave with dung-cakes), 255–80 (Kydoimos called out to go first to Athens then to Sparta seeking a pestle), 938–1042 (slave and Trygaeus [and perhaps also a mute] with supplies and equipment for sacrifice and cooking); *Av.* 459 (but see Dunbar [above, note 56] ad 448–50), 464 (slaves exit first to take armor then presumably at 464 exit for garland and water, returning at once), 1045–55 (decree-seller and episcopus alternately exit and return, as Peisetærus runs from one exit to another), 1312–36 (a mute attendant, Manes, exits and enters repeatedly with wings); *Lys.* 918–51 (Myrrhine repeatedly exits and re-enters for bed, blanket, etc.). In addition we should notice the variation of this routine at *Lys.* 728–42, where within 15 lines three women enter, each of the first two probably departing before her predecessor, with a fourth woman arriving at 760 (see above, note 55).

87) On the parallelism here and its comic effect, see A. Katsouris, *Doubling of Scenes for Comic Purposes in Menander and Aristophanes*, LCM 6 (1981) 73.

instances the exits and entrances are repeated a number of times, and in the majority more regularly – in Bergsonian terms more mechanically⁸⁸ – than at Pac. 922–1042. At Ach. 1097–1133, for instance, the slaves of Dicaeopolis and Lamachus run in and out nine times each (performing several other tasks in between). Between lines 918 and 947 of *Lysistrata* Myrrhine runs in and out of the skene six times, finally disappearing for good at 951. The more regular a repetition is, of course, the more it calls attention to the lack of progress in the action.

Why was Aristophanes so fond of multiplying exits and entrances?⁸⁹ The entries of imposters at Av. 904–1057 and their flight before Peisetaerus' wrath had real comic point. But what is humorous about a succession of exits and entrances to fetch an altar, a basket, a goat, and lustral water? What is funny about the spectacle of the comings and goings of dramatically neutral figures like mute attendants? I think that there are two complementary answers to these questions. One is simply that a part of Old Comedy's humor seems to lie in its violation of the dramatic norms of tragedy.⁹⁰ The second, more basic, answer, however, is that comic openness can extend beyond absurdity to meaninglessness and utter triviality. This degree of openness is probably attained only in pure clowning, emancipated from any but the loosest relationship to a specific fictional situation. It is an art that stands nearer to that of the tumbler or acrobat than that of the actor.

Pure clowning never is found in Aristophanes, of course. The mindless movement of in/out scenes almost always is qualified by some comic point: the pacifist messages of Ach. 1097–1133 and Pac. 255–82, the sexual innuendoes of Lys. 917–51, the toilet humor of Pac. 1–18. But Av. 1312–36, which is an athletic tour-de-force,⁹¹ seems to me to come very close to purity: the mute attendant Manes, told to bring out wings, runs into the skene probably five times and out again four in the course of 26 brief lyric lines. In these routines, if not in other passages discussed in this paper,

88) Henri Bergson, *Le Rire* (Paris 1913), Chapter 1, pt. 4, p. 30: "Les attitudes, gestes, et mouvements du corps humain sont risibles dans l'exacte mesure où ce corps nous fait penser à une simple mécanique."

89) Lowe (above, note 8) 45 suggests that "... the comic momentum deriv[es] either from a cumulative visual absurdity or from the harassment of one involved character by another."

90) Both Muecke (above, note 68) 59 and Chapman (above, note 68) 22–23 and note 10 conjecture that breaking the dramatic illusion in comedy may have been funny in part because of its violation of the rules of tragedy.

91) Cf. *Entrances Comedy* (above, note 46) 202.

I think that we can see confirmation of the existence of comic ineffability. It is true that in Ach. 1097–1133, Pac. 255–80 and Lys. 918–47 the purpose of each trip inside is announced before it is made; in Pac. 1–18 the dialogue plays with the idea of eating, handling and smelling ordure. That is, communication is partly verbal, and the text brings a second dimension to the humor of the scene. But surely the ‘messages’ conveyed by the words and those conveyed by the movements are complementary rather than synonymous. At Av. 1312–36 the complaints that accompany the action, about Manes’ slowness, do little more than call attention to the visual joke. This passage goes one step further, to a point of nonsensicality that lies beyond the reach of words.⁹²

The same abundance that characterizes activity of persons in Aristophanic comedy is naturally reflected in the objects which they manipulate. In a quick and, I am sure, incomplete survey of two comedies, *Peace* and *Ecclesiazusae*, I have found 73 references to portable objects or groups of objects which are visible to the spectators.⁹³ For the 17 extant plays of Euripides, whose use of

92) Aristophanes is full of absurd verbal humor, and there are places where the dialogue is almost nonsensical. At Ach. 1097–1139, where most of Dicaeopolis’ commands and comments echo those of Lamachus verbally and all do so phonetically, the jingle-effect of the repetition is almost more important than the words themselves. Cf. Jacques (above, note 59) 12–13. R. Harriott, *Acharnians* 1095–1142: *Words and Actions*, BICS 26 (1979) 98, complains that the scene cannot be played rapidly “... without blurring the effect of the language,” and asks rhetorically, “Was the scene as amusing to watch at its first performance as it is to read now?”

93) Here I am concerned only with stage-properties in the narrower sense, since only they are objects of action. The only items of clothing included in the list are those that are manipulated. This distinction, of course, is somewhat arbitrary: some objects manipulated, such as the staves of old men are hardly more than costume, while items of costume serve some of the same functions as properties: Pac. 2, 5, 12 (duncakes), 18 (ἡ ἀντλία), 192 (meat), 238 (mortar), 287 (τὰ σκεύη ... ταυτί), 361 (stones), 424 (τήνδ’: libation bowl), 433 (σπονδή), 458 (ropes), 566 (mallet), 567 (pitchforks), 729 (τάδε τὰ σκεύη), 886 (τὴν σκευήν), 942 (altar), 949 (basket, barley, knife, fire), 956 (lustral water), 959 (brand), 1018 (sheep), 1026 (firewood), 1032 (table), 1039 (sheep’s thighs), 1040 (σπλάγχν’... καὶ θυλίματα), 1053 (loin of the sheep), 1054 (tail), 1059 (σπονδή), 1060 (tongue), 1074 (salt), 1121 (stick), 1124 (sheepskins), 1193 (ταυτή), 1195 (two kinds of pastry, thrushes, rabbits), 1203 (sickles), 1204 (τῶνδε), 1204 (ταυτί), 1214 (crests), 1224 (cuirass), 1240 (trumpet), 1251 (τῶνδε), 1261 (spears); Ecc. 1 (lamp), 27 (another lamp), 40 (himation), 47 (men’s shoes), 50 (torch), 68 (beards), 74 (Laconian shoes), 74 (staves), 75 (himatia), 88 (ταυτί), 122 (garlands), 269 (chitons), 318 (woman’s dress [cf. 332]), 319 (woman’s ‘Persian’ shoes [cf. 346]), 382 (bag), 502 (beard), 507 (χλαίνας), 507 (man’s shoe), 508 (Laconian shoes), 508 (staves), 512 (himation), 730 (sieve), 732 (black pot), 737 (an object referred to as the ‘lady’s maid’), 738 (hydria), 739 (rooster), 742 (bowl of

properties is more lavish than that of his fellow-tragedians, I have found in Dingel's survey⁹⁴ only 82 comparable references. While I make no claim for the accuracy of either count, I think that they give us an adequate idea of relative frequency and relative importance.

While everything that the spectators see in a drama is a sign⁹⁵ of greater or lesser significance, an object that is manipulated is, for two reasons, a particularly effective conveyor of information: because of its direct association with action and with the agents of dramatic action, and because it becomes, at least momentarily, the focus of the spectators' attention.⁹⁶ Objects, for instance, and the ways that they are used in tragedy, often connote the status of a character or his state of mind.⁹⁷ Thus the torches that purify Theonoe's way indicate her special sanctity (Hel. 865–72), Electra's water-jar her poverty (Eur. *El.* 55–56). Phaedra is rolled out on a couch (Hipp. 179–80); Agamemnon removes his shoes before he walks on the tapestry (Ag. 944–45), expressing the conflict between his pride and his apprehension. When employed by an important agent, such a property may, as Hans-Günther Schwarz has observed, capture the essence of a scene's action.⁹⁸

Properties can, of course, be tools: the bonds with which Menelaus' servants secure Andromache (And. 425–26) or Ajax' sword (Aj. 815–16, 865).⁹⁹ Veltruský has observed that a property creates an expectation of use as soon as it appears, if it is not already being employed, and that some properties become more than pas-

honeycombs), 743 (garlands), 744 (tripods), 744 (oil flask), 785 (strap), 833 (yoke), 978 (torch), 1013 (decree).

94) J. Dingel, *Das Requisit in der griechischen Tragödie* (Diss. Tübingen 1967) 1–77. I have excluded from consideration references both in *Rhesus* and in fragments.

95) J. Veltruský, *Man and Object in the Theater*, in: P. Garvin (ed.), *Prague School Reader in Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style* (Washington 31964) 84; Elam (above, note 4) 7; R. C. Ketterer, *Stage Properties in Plautine Comedy*, *Semiotica* 58 (1986) 207.

96) Costume, of course, may convey a great deal of information as well, and it is worth noting that tragedy not-infrequently calls verbal attention to significant items of costume.

97) Cf. Ketterer (above, note 95) 208; Fischer-Lichte, *Semiotics* (above, note 4) 108.

98) H.-G. Schwarz, *Das stumme Zeichen* (Bonn 1974) 15–16. Schwarz offers as examples the throne of the introductory scene of *Lear* and the rough bench of the court-scene.

99) A property can, of course, serve more than one function. The bonds confirm Andromache's helplessness.

sive tools, generating action which drives the plot.¹⁰⁰ Examples of such significant objects might be Philoctetes' bow, the poisoned gift of Deianeira, and, in New Comedy, the κόσμος of *Epitrepontes* which was exposed with the child.

Although most properties cannot be said to be direct causes of the action, even those which only connote status or situation inspire at least a general expectation that the person associated with them will act in a certain way. More importantly, when a property is manipulated it becomes the object of a character's intention¹⁰¹ and, like the action itself, helps to put the audience, at least to some small degree, inside his (fictive) mind. Thus, when we see Electra carrying the water-jar on her head we interpret her need or her willingness to burden herself so, and, to the extent that we accept this jar as the object of a plausible intention, our interest is engaged.

In Aristophanes' comedy properties can serve very similar functions. Properties like Dicaeopolis' wood-shavings (Ach. 927) or Strepsiades' goad (Nub. 1297) are instruments facilitating the confounding of enemies. These happen also to indicate status: that is, they characterize Dicaeopolis and Strepsiades as comic heroes of a certain type. A property may, and I think often does, in Schwarz's sense capsule the comic idea of a scene. So the men's clothes and false beards of Ecc. 266–79, the chair and table at which Demos sits at Eq. 1165, the wings with which Peisetaerus at Av. 1397–1401 probably (cf. 1402: οὐ γὰρ σὺ χείρεις πετροδόνητος γενόμενος; see Appendix I) strikes the rather swishy poet, or the arms-dealer's cuirass which Trygaeus, testing its usefulness as a chamber-pot, sets upright, props up with stones, and sits on, evidently thrusting both hands through the arm-holes below (Pac. 1230–33).

In two important ways, on the other hand, Aristophanes' employment of properties differs from that of the tragedians. In the first place the repeated presentation of objects which are mostly homely, everyday things establishes – as has often been remarked – what might be called a comic perspective: a reduced level of concern.¹⁰² Instead of high moral issues the audience of comedy is

100) Veltruský (above, note 95) 88–91. See also Ketterer (above, note 95) 209.

101) Fischer-Lichte, *Semiotics* (above, note 4) 107 defines stage-properties as “the objects upon which [a character] focuses his intentional gestures.”

102) B. A. Sparkes, *Illustrating Aristophanes*, JHS 95 (1975) 122 remarks that, “Old Comedy more than most Greek literature is rooted in contemporary life”

asked to ponder nothing more profound, or emotionally charged, than farm-tools, cooking-utensils, food, and warm cloaks.¹⁰³

The second difference, which is more pertinent to what we have been talking about, is that in comedy's employment of properties the element of plausible intentionality often is missing. An object in the theater, or at least one which has been called to the spectators' attention, arouses an expectation which is based on their own experience. When Peisetaerus, notified of the approach of Iris, asks for a bird-sling (Av. 1187) or Strepsiades, confronted with a creditor, shows him a kneading-tray (Nub. 1247–48), they are defying that expectation. Such defiance of reasonable expectation accounts in part for the frequent employment of props in Aristophanic comedy. Since absurdity in these cases cannot be carried further without lapsing into nonsense, properties normally are soon put down or carried away and, like the scenes in which they appear, quickly forgotten.

In the instances cited above, and in many others in Aristophanes' comedy, properties are put to a purposeful use, but the purpose is a comically inappropriate one. A characteristic feature of Aristophanes' work, however, is the introduction of objects which are put to no real use at all: an object or series of objects is shown to the public, most commonly through their presentation by one character to another. At Plut. 1056 the young man gives nuts to the old lady, the sickle-maker and jar-maker at Pac. 1203–04 offer their wares to Trygaeus, the best man offers Dicaeopolis meat from the wedding feast (Ach. 1051–53). In these situations the object very briefly is made the center of dramatic activity. When the spectators witness such a transaction, because they recognize the convention, they harbor no expectation that the object which they see will find any employment that will advance the plot. When they see the sickle-maker hand over his wares their political sympathies may be engaged, and when they see Prometheus, who is holding a parasol, take the stool (Av. 1552) they may be tickled by the incongruent similarity to a *κωνήφορος* in a Panathenaic Procession. Aristophanic comedy aims at a variety of ef-

103) The logical extension of this materialism is the materialization of abstractions: the *σπονδαί* of Ach. 186 ff. as wine-flasks, the scales at Ran. 1370 ff. to measure the weightiness of poetry. See J. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane* (Paris 1965) 505, who observes only that these are realized metaphors; H.-J. Newiger, *Metapher und Allegorie* (Munich 1957) 46–49, 104–178, who is mostly interested in personification; É. Fraenkel, *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome 1962) 166–68; G. M. Sifakis (above, note 66) 98; Dover (above, note 43) 45–48.

fects. But their engagement in the fictional situation will be weakened. At some point in every play except *Frogs* and *Plutus*, the low expectation generated by the appearance of a stage-property is confirmed by a new presentation of a similar or related object, and often by another and another.¹⁰⁴ The effect of this repetition, then, is similar to that of the repeated exits and entrances with which such presentations often are associated.

It is true that procedures of this kind often involve more than mere burlesque. Newiger has emphasized that visually-presented objects, in collaboration with verbal images, may take on a figurative significance.¹⁰⁵ The shoes, for instance, at Eq. 871 and the chiton at 886 convey the sausage-seller's concern for the individual Athenian and contrast with the boastfulness of the Paphlagonian, which is associated with political "Heldentaten."¹⁰⁶ This enhanced significance, however, is directed not toward something inside the plot but toward something outside, in the real world. Aristophanic comedy can accommodate such earnestness because of its openness. But we should be aware that when the slaves of Lamachus and Dicaeopolis at Ach. 1097–1133 run in and out with supplies for fighting and festivity, the effectiveness of the clowning is in no way reduced by the pacifist message. The cumulative presentation of stage-properties embodies, in some instances at least, a contradiction that is built into the structure of Aristophanic comedy. Aristophanes' plays are full of political, social, and cultural criticism. But the seriousness is usually balanced, or even de-natured, by signals to the audience that the whole procedure is absurd.¹⁰⁷

104) Here I exclude routines which require a character or characters to run repeatedly into the skene to fetch the items which they present. To the following list should be added most of the passages cited in note 86. I cite only passages in which more than two successive presentations are made: Ach. 434–70 (Euripides to Dicaeopolis/items of costume and other accoutrements of tragedy); Eq. 105–23 (second servant to first servant/pouring wine), 871–909 (sausage-seller and Paphlagonian to Demos/shoes, chiton, leather cloak, salve, hare's tail), 1164–99 (sausage-seller and Paphlagonian to Demos/chair, table, and items of food); Vesp. 805–15 (Bdelykleon to Philocleon/'courtroom' equipment); Pac. 1203–04 (sickle-maker to Trygaeus/sickles and two unspecified items), 1214–52 (arms-merchant to Trygaeus/military equipment); Lys. 602–04 (Lysistrata and two old women to the proboulos/?)garlands twice and ταῦτασι; Thes. 253–62 (Agathon to Euripides and the kedestes/items of female dress); Ecc. 730–45 (Chremes directly to the audience/household-items).

105) Newiger (above, note 103) 23–49.

106) Newiger 39–41.

107) This paper was written in large part during stays in Göttingen in the summers of 1997 and 1998. I would like to thank the members of the Seminar for Classical Philology at Göttingen and the staff of the University Library for their generous hospitality during that time.

Appendix I

What follows is a representative list of passages in which actors' movements or elements of the spectacle are not indicated in the text, or at least go unmentioned for some time after they would have been seen by the spectators. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. In particular, I omit reference to the frequent deictic pronouns or adverbs which point to an unspecified object or movement unless the lack of specification contributes to further uncertainty about what the actors are doing.

Acharnians

110: Dicaeopolis says to the ambassador, ἄλλ' ἄπιθ' ἐγὼ δὲ βασιανῶ τοῦτον μόνος. Dover (above, note 10) 290 says that he must here make a threatening gesture and drive the ambassador completely away because the actor has to reappear as Amphitheos at 129 or Theorus at 134.

117–18, 122: Dicaeopolis has to do something to lay bare the disguises of first Cleisthenes then Straton. Dover 291–92 says that he pulls away clothing with which the men's lower faces were covered. Starkie (above, note 10) ad 120 suggests that he takes off masks.

1121: When Dicaeopolis, mimicking Lamachus, says to a slave, "Hold this," it is unclear what "this" is, or what D. subsequently does. Since at 1119, mimicking Lamachus' call for a spear, he has asked for a sausage, and at 1120–21 L. pulls the cover from his spear, both Starkie and Alan Sommerstein (*Aristophanes: Acharnians*, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster 1980) indicate in their translations ad loc. that D. pulls the sausage off of a spit.

Knights

784–909: The sausage-seller Demos offers Demos various gifts, including what is probably a cushion, shoes, a chiton, a salve for his shins, while the Paphlagonian tries to put a diphtherion around his shoulders. Where do these things come from? Do they take the items of clothing off of themselves? At 872 and 883 does the sausage-seller put the shoes and chiton on Demos?

919–22: The sausage-seller must produce some object and make some kind of motion with it when he says, "The man is boiling . . . The boasts must be skimmed off ταυτήι."

1326–28: What exactly appears (ὄψεσθε 1326, φαινόμεναισιν 1327) when Agoracritus says that the Propylaea are being opened?

Clouds

1, 11, 18, 58, 80: Strepsiades probably sits up and lies back down at 1 and 11. At 18 he is surely sitting up again. Does he get out of bed when he threatens the slave at 58? He must approach Pheidippides at 80 when he wakes him up.

200–203: What are 'astronomy' and 'geometry'?

497: When Strepsiades is told by Socrates to take off his cloak, does he take off his shoes as well? Or does he simply emerge from the skene at 635 without shoes? We discover at 856–58 that he has lost both.

1102–04: What does Better Argument do when he addresses the κινούμενοι and says, "Take my cloak, I'm deserting to you?" Dover (above, note 38) ad 1103,

1104 says that he throws the cloak to Strepsiades and Pheidippides, and runs up among the audience. Sommerstein's stage-directions (*Aristophanes: Clouds*, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster 1982) transl. ad loc. indicate that he throws the coat to Worse Argument and runs inside.

1482: Strepsiades must make a gesture of listening. Does he pretend that Hermes is whispering in his ear? Cf. Pac. 661, Ach. 1058.

Wasps

1: There must be a net covering a window, but it is not mentioned until 164. Bdelykleon is sleeping on the roof but he is not mentioned until 67.

399–402: Sommerstein, commentary (above, note 56) ad 399–415: "The staging ... is not made entirely clear by the text." Sommerstein makes Xanthias climb partly up the wall to beat Philocleon with harvest-wreaths while Bdelykleon goes inside to haul Philocleon back up through the window. MacDowell (above, note 9) ad 398 believes that Xanthias goes inside to beat Philocleon from the window.

415: Sommerstein, translation (above, note 56) ad loc. causes Bdelykleon and Philocleon to emerge through the door. MacDowell ad 414 imagines that Philocleon has descended by the rope.

about 437: Bdelykleon and Xanthias must go into the skene, but that is unannounced.

452: Bdelykleon is still inside but must emerge immediately after. What he and Xanthias bring with them is not described.

756: Philocleon's $\sigma\pi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\omega}\ \psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ seems to indicate an attempt at suicide. Sommerstein's translation indicates that he falls on the sword which he called for at 522. See, however, W.J.M. Starkie (*The Wasps of Aristophanes. With introd., metrical analysis, critical notes, and commentary, London 1897*) ad 714, MacDowell ad 522, ad 714.

820, 844: The hero-shrine of Lycus and the pig-pen of Hestia are purely sight-gags. What the audience will have seen is entirely conjectural.

1341–42: Philocleon to flute-girl: "Come up, taking this rope ..."

Peace

661–62: Hermes must approach Peace, although there's no clear indication in the text that he does so, and assume a pose of listening carefully. Cf. Nub. 1482.

947–56: Although the slave has been told at 937 to fetch the sheep, at 947 he seems to have brought other things out instead. Does the slave return to the skene for the sheep, or is it brought out by a mute? Somehow at 956 lustral water has appeared, as well as the sheep.

1105: Hierocles says, "Pour some (wine) for me," probably holding out a bowl. Trygaeus refuses, but at 1110 Hierocles cries, $\sigma\pi\omicron\nu\delta\acute{\eta}$. Trygaeus, angered, cries, "Take $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}$ with the wine!" It is unclear what "these" are or what he does.

1315: At 1305, before entering the skene, Trygaeus offers an invitation to eat. Sommerstein, commentary (above, note 61) ad 1315 believes, since the chorus responds, that the members of the chorus take pieces of food before Trygaeus returns. But has the invitation, instead, been made to the theater-at-large?

Birds

463 ff.: Does Peisetaerus actually have water poured over his hands as he has demanded or receive a garland? Cf. Dunbar (above, note 56) ad 463–64.

1055: When Peisetaerus says, “Somebody catch him (the decree-seller),” does a mute take up the chase?

1397: Obviously Peisetaerus picks up something, says Dunbar ad 1387, but it is unclear whether a wing or a whole basket. He probably does not strike Cinesias with a basket because C. doesn’t cry out. It is likely, as A. Sommerstein (Aristophanes: *Birds*, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster 1987), transl. ad loc. indicates, that he flicks wings at C.’s head.

1567–73: At 1567 Poseidon notices that the Triballian is adjusting his dress and doing it wrong. With ὄδ’ at 1568 he tries to show him how, either by helping him or by demonstrating how his own is done. Perhaps the Triballian tries again, then Poseidon attempts to help, since at 1572 he says, “Will you hold still?” Cf. Dunbar ad 1567–69.

1579: Peisetaerus at 1579, without preliminary orders indicating that his servants are bringing out cooking-equipment, asks for the cheese-grater and silphium. Has there been a pause while these things are brought out? Or have Peisetaerus’ servants appeared and set up the equipment before the arrival of the gods? In either case, the audience will have been presented, at least momentarily, with the spectacle of cooking-preparations without there being any verbal reference to them. (The gods will have stopped some distance away from the skene-door so that there can be some pretence that for a brief time the one group does not see the other.)

Lysistrata

567–70: When Lysistrata uses the metaphor of spindles and yarn, it is clear from the deictic adverbs that she mimics the process of unraveling. It seems a plausible conjecture that she takes wool from the basket which the proboulos is holding, but that is not specified in the text.

951: How was the scene played so that Myrrhine is able to depart before Cinesias realizes it? Henderson (above, note 82) ad 916 conjectures that she runs away as he lies back. But has he been turned away? At 950 she says, “I’m taking off my shoes,” which must not really be true.

1216: When the Athenian delegate emerges and says, presumably to the doorkeeper, “You ought to have gotten out of the way,” has he run him over? Since this is a comic reversal of knocking at the door for entrance (cf. Henderson ad 1216–38), does the doorkeeper open the door from outside the skene?

1217: It is unclear when the bystanders have appeared who are chased away by the Athenian delegate.

Thesmophoriazusae

617–18: After Cleisthenes has become impatient at 617, saying, “Come here,” in the next line the kedestes exclaims, “Why are you dragging me?” Is he talking to an attendant or to Cleisthenes? Someone must hold him at 637, when Cleisthenes orders him undressed. After his στρόφιον has been removed, but not his dress, one of the women must run her hands over his body, because she exclaims (639–40) that he is strong and has no breasts. By 643 the dress has been removed without comment, because the kedestes has trouble concealing his phallus.

after 654: The kedestes puts the dress back on because at 938–42 he begs not to be exposed in women's clothes.

1083–97: How the Scythian's attempt to pursue Echo is staged is uncertain (see above, p. 258).

1135: The Scythian must lie down to sleep, but there is no indication in the text until he says at 1176 that he has been woken up.

1160: Euripides appears carrying a lute, but we hear of it only at 1217, after he has left.

1214: When the Scythian says, "Run after [the old woman]!" to whom is he talking?

Frogs

1–47: The stage-picture does not come completely into focus for the reader for almost 50 lines. See Arnott (above, note 8) 15.

830: Both Dover (above, note 59) ad 830–74 and Sommerstein (Aristophanes: *Frogs*, ed. with transl. and notes, Warminster 1996), transl. ad loc. assume, since Euripides enters declaring, οὐκ ἂν μεθείμην τοῦ θρόνου, that Aeschylus sits on the throne of poetry. But, as W. B. Stanford (Aristophanes: *The Frogs*, ed. with introd., rev. text, comm. and index, London ²1963) ad 830 points out, the verb can mean no more than, "I give up my claim to." Since at 765 the throne of poetry is said to be next to the throne of Pluto, Sommerstein and Dover assume that Pluto sits beside him. If this is true, however, Pluto merely maintains a majestic presence, since he neither speaks nor is spoken to until 1414, where he intervenes rather abruptly. Dover says that he cannot enter here, because that would be an unprecedented "unmarked" entrance. Pluto's failure to use a vocative, if it really is Pluto speaking, is a little surprising, but we should remember that there is no need to identify him verbally. (Cf. Pl. 1097 where Hermes enters without identifying himself.) See, however, D. MacDowell, *Aristophanes, Frogs* 1407–67, CQ 53 (1959) 261–66. L. Radermacher (Aristophanes' „Frösche“, Einl., Text u. Komm., Vienna ²1954) 334 proposes that Pluto is announced by a thunderclap. This, of course, is pure speculation.

1323: "Do you see this foot?" Dover ad 1323, 1324 suggests that Aeschylus is dancing. Radermacher 322–23 thinks that Aeschylus kicks Euripides.

1478: Euripides must depart, probably with gestures of distress. But, as Dover ad 1481 points out, there is no indication of how he goes.

Ecclesiazusae

57: Where do the women sit down? See Ussher (above, note 59) ad 57–59.

156: With her exclamation of disgust does Praxagora take the garland from the second woman's head? The woman asks for it back at 163.

478: Where is Blepyrus when the chorus re-enters? At 477 Chremes has announced his own departure. Has Blepyrus left as well? Ussher ad 520–70 speculates that at 520 Blepyrus again emerges just as Praxagora starts to enter the house.

570: Ussher ad 571–729 believes that Praxagora here gives her husband back his clothes. But there is no indication in the text.

884: The reader does not know until 961–62 that the girl has been speaking from above.

938: Here the young man enters, but not until 978 does the text indicate that he is carrying a torch.

Plutus

1: Cario and Chremylus are following a blind man, who isn't mentioned until 13. Cario wears a garland which is not mentioned until 21. He carries a piece of meat from the sacrifice which is not mentioned until 227.

885: Cario must examine the ring of the Just Man, but this is not indicated in the text.

1097: Hermes arrives in silence to an empty stage. He must be recognized by his dress alone (cf. K. Holzinger, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos*, Vienna 1940 [SB Wien 218.3] ad 1097). At 1097 Cario opens the door but does not see Hermes immediately. Holzinger imagines that Hermes knocks on the door, then runs around "the next corner." But at 1102 Hermes denies that he has knocked.

Appendix II

*A. Objects which may be removed from the playing-area by mutes without dramatic motive**Acharnians*

280: Stones of chorus.

331: Basket of charcoal and sword.

365: Chopping-block.

719: Boundary-stones, leather straps brought out by Dicaeopolis.

749 (cf. 727): Stele on which the treaty is posted.

Knights

152: Table which is taken from the sausage-seller's back.

488–89: Intestines and knives, which the sausage-seller sets down in preparation for departure to the boule.

after 784: Items given to Demos.

Clouds

1: (?)Couches, bed-coverings (10) where Strepsiades and Pheidippides are sleeping.

18: Account-book which slave gives to Strepsiades.

254: A "sacred couch" which Socrates tells Strepsiades to sit on.

498: Cloak which Socrates tells Strepsiades at 497 to lay down. Does he also take off shoes, which are missing at 858?

633: Bed brought out by Strepsiades.

847: Rooster and hen. Dover (above, note 38) ad 847 believes that they are held by a slave since they have to be gotten off the stage soon after.

Wasps

456–57: Stick and fire (to create smoke) with which Bdelykleon and slaves ward off wasps.

529: Box with writing-tools.
after 805: Equipment for court.
860: Fire, myrtle, incense.

Peace

886: Apparel of Theoria which Trygaeus tells her to put on the ground.
after 937: Equipment for sacrifice and cooking, including sheep's parts.
1102: Bowl and wine for libation.
1121: Stick with which soothsayer is attacked.
1193: (?)Tables, thrushes to be cooked, other food.
1202: Sickles, pots, and τὰυτί, given to Trygaeus. Sommerstein, translation (above, note 61) ad loc., on the evidence of line 1318 (καὶ τὰ σκεύη πάλιν εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν νυνὶ χρῆ πάντα κομίζειν), believes that these should be distributed among the members of the chorus. If that is true, the distribution must be carried out by mutes who have come into the playing-area.

Lysistrata

199: Kylix and stamnon.
255, 292: Logs and coals of men's chorus.
328: Water-jars of women's chorus.
after 920: Equipment brought on by Myrrhine.
1217, 1221: Torches brought on by Athenians. These must be given at 1279 to attendants who perhaps do not depart until the exodus.

Thesmophoriazusae

after 238: Razor, mirror, fire.
778: Votive tablets which the kedestes seems to throw from the altar (783–84).

Frogs

27: Xanthias' donkey.
340: Torches of chorus.
830: (?)Throne(s).
1365: Balance and scales.

Ecclesiazusae

1: Lamp.
88: Carding-wool. See Ussher (above, note 59) ad 311–26.
131: Garland.
506–509: Men's clothing, false beards, staves, which the chorus are told to remove before they are caught. See Ussher ad 520–570.

*B. Objects which may be brought into the playing-area by mutes
without dramatic motive*

Knights

- 784: A cushion given to Demos by the sausage-seller.
 871: Shoes given to Demos by the sausage-seller. Since the latter says, ἐγώ . . .
 ζεύγος πριάμενος ἐμβάδων, we can assume that he does not remove them from his
 own feet.
 883: A chiton given to Demos by the sausage-seller.
 891: A leather cloak given to Demos by the Paphlagonian.
 906, 909: A bottle of salve and a hare's tail given to Demos by the sausage-
 seller.
 1384: A folding chair given to Demos by the sausage-seller.
 1406: A βατραχίς given to the sausage-seller by Demos.

Clouds

- 254: A sacred couch which Socrates tells Strepsiades to sit on. (See note
 63.)
 255–56: A wreath given to Socrates by Strepsiades.
 261–62: Meal which Socrates sprinkles on Strepsiades.

Wasps

- 208: The net which Bdelykleon calls for. MacDowell (above, note 9) ad loc.
 assumes that the net isn't produced.
 854–55: Ladles which Philocleon produces.
 1211: (?) Couch on which Philocleon reclines. (At 1212 does Bdelykleon
 recline as well?) Both MacDowell ad 1211 and Sommerstein, commentary (above,
 note 56) ad 1208 assume that Philocleon lies on the ground.

Peace

- 424: Golden bowl which Trygaeus gives Hermes for libation.
 431: Wine which Trygaeus pours into bowl.
 566–67: Farm-tools which seem to have been given to members of the chorus.
 1102: Trygaeus' libation bowl and the wine poured into it.
 1121: The stick which Trygaeus tells the slave to hit the soothsayer with. Som-
 merstein, translation (above, note 61) ad loc. suggests that it comes from a wood-
 pile at the altar.

Birds

- 981: The oracle which Peisetaerus suddenly (τοῦτοῦ) has in his hand, show-
 ing it to the oracle-seller.
 1552: The stool which Peisetaerus gives to Prometheus.
 1579 ff.: Cooking-equipment. See Appendix I.

Thesmophoriazusae

221: The chair which the kedestes must sit on at Euripides' behest.
655: Fire to light the torches of the chorus. (Cf. *Ran.* 1524–25.)

Frogs

830: (?)Thrones for Aeschylus and Pluto. See Appendix I ad loc. and Dover (above, note 59) ad 830–74.

1365: The balance and scales with which the poetry of Euripides and Aeschylus is weighed. See Jacques (above note 59) 14–15.

1524–25: The blazing torches of the chorus (or the fire to rekindle those mentioned at 340). See Dover ad loc.

Ecclesiazusae

118: The wreaths which Praxagora puts down at 122. See Ussher (above, note 59) ad 121–23.

Plutus

1197: Pots which the old woman is given to carry in the processional exit.

New Orleans

Joe Park Poe