

University of Massachusetts Boston

From the Selected Works of Emily A. McDermott

2000

Euripides' Second Thoughts

Emily A. McDermott, *University of Massachusetts Boston*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/emily_mcdermott/6/

Euripides' Second Thoughts

The Hippolytus which has survived as a classic for over two millennia was one of Euripides' two dramatic presentations of Phaedra's love for her stepson and its disastrous results. The surviving play (called either "Stephanias" or "Stephanêphoros," to distinguish it from the lost "Kalyptomenos") is, by the testimony of the hypothesis, the later of the two, produced in 428 B.C.E.¹ In it, the ancient editor tells us, that which was considered *°aprep`ew ka`i kathgorfiaw çajion* in the earlier play has been corrected (*difvryvtai*).² From this evidence, it has reasonably (and all but universally) been inferred that the original production of the play had met with such public disfavor that the author was stung to the extraordinary course of presenting a "correction"; I will take this view of the two plays' chronology as a given.³ Attempts to reconstruct the differences between

¹ The second hypothesis to the Hipp., which passes on these "facts" of production, is generally attributed, on grounds of form and content, to Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose hypotheses are regarded as particularly valuable, as derived from Aristotle's didaskaliai. For simplicity's sake, I will assume this identification from now on and refer to the author of the second hypothesis as Aristophanes of Byzantium.

² Hypothesis 29. Quotations and line references from the Euripidean text are taken from Diggle. For the only exception to this rule, see n. 51.

³ The revision of Hipp. is the only known case in which a tragic playwright revisited the same mythic episode a second time. Several other cases of revisions (diaskeuai) have been asserted, but most have been discredited. See Pickard-Cambridge 99-101; Nauck 441, 627; Michelini 287; Webster 75, 131-32. See Michelini 1987: 287 for a careful discussion of the theory that the second

the play's two versions -- the earlier one preserved in fragments totaling only 41 lines -- have been plausible but highly speculative, and will undoubtedly remain so.⁴ Perhaps, however, if we listen hard, we may hear a word or two spoken on the subject by the author himself.

The purpose of the present study is to point out passages in the extant Hippolytus which seem designed to call attention, self-consciously, both to the fact that this play was a revision and to the nature of some of the changes made between the original and its correction. Euripidean critics have long been alert to the possibility that allusions to the play's lost precursor may be identified in the present Hippolytus. Working from a sense that, in Goff's words, "...the text and its

Hipp. was a correction (like Aristophanes' extant Nu.). A revisionist approach has recently been taken by Gibert, who argues that Aristophanes of Byzantium was simply "guessing" that the extant Hipp. was the later written. In an avowedly "negative project," aimed "only to replace dogma with appropriate skepticism", he stops short of arguing the case that the extant play was actually prior (Gibert 86). The observations I make in this study, at the same time as they proceed from the standard assumption that the existing play was a revision, may reciprocally provide further support for that hypothesis.

⁴ The evidence is usefully catalogued and evaluated by Barrett 6-45; by Webster 64-76; and by Halleran 24-36. Many of the studies dealing with the "Kalyptomenos" are primarily concerned with Seneca's Phaedr., e.g. Zwierlein, Dingel. The recent publication of fragments from the hypothesis to the lost play adds some new information, and perhaps points the way to a radically different understanding of the epithet "Kalyptomenos," but the fragments are regrettably problematic in themselves. Their net effect has been to open more questions than they have closed. See Luppe 23-39 and below.

activity are situated in a context of imitation, repetition and rewriting,"⁵ many have suggested particular loci in the extant play where the playwright seems to have been in dialogue with himself as author of the earlier play. A sure example rests in the pointed shift in the two Phaedras' attitudes toward Theseus. Whereas the first Phaedra, Plutarch tells us (p. 491N = fr. B Barrett), blamed her love for Hippolytus on Theseus' philanderings, the regenerate heroine of the second version virtuously declines to make any such excuses for herself even when specifically invited to by the Nurse: Tr. *Yhsefıw tin' ahmfarthken °ew s' aamartfian; / Fa. m`h dr\$vs' øegvg' °ekeşinon °ofyeİhn kakşvw* (320-21; cf. 151-154).⁶ Similarly, Zeitlin notes, the virtuous heroine "reserves her personal hatred [*misô*, 413] for the type of disgraceful wife the earlier Phaedra had exemplified, as if she were responding directly to and identifying with the audience's reaction to the previous play."⁷ More often, a lack of testimony from the "Kalyptomenos" leaves us on more conjectural ground. So, for instance, both Barrett and Webster surmise that Hippolytus' seemingly unmotivated self-defense against an imagined charge of ambition (at 1013) alludes cryptically to a major topic in the lost play, of which there may be remnants in fragments 432-434N.⁸

Methodologically, it is particularly difficult to demonstrate allusions of this type with persuasiveness. First, the sparsity both of the fragments from the

⁵ Goff 81.

⁶ Cf. Zwierlein 7; Friedrich 42.

⁷ Zeitlin 53.

⁸ Barrett 37-38 n. 3 is tentative in making this suggestion and connects it only to fg. 434N (= D Barrett). Webster 67 is more emphatic: "(and the charge of having attempted this is answered, although Theseus never made it, by Hippolytos in the surviving play, 1013)."

"Kalyptomenos" and of secondary testimony to its contents undermine our ability to speak definitively on almost any point of comparison between the two plays. As Barrett has said: "...we are for much of the time moving in the realm merely of the probable or possible; and although the account I give is that suggested by the evidence, the evidence is usually so tenuous that the truth may sometimes be very different."⁹ Second, the picture is further complicated by Sophocles' Phaedra, whose content and place in the chronology of the three plays remain a mystery.¹⁰

A third methodological problem arises because demonstration of metadramatic double meaning in a text is an intrinsically slippery enterprise. If the reader "buys" the idea that covert significance is couched in an author's words, argumentation is almost unnecessary; if not, elaborate citing of evidence falls on deaf ears. What matters most is the reader's sense of how predisposed a

⁹ Barrett 11.

¹⁰ Eleven fragments (26 lines) of the Phaedra survive. We have no direct evidence for either the date of the Phaedra or its order in the sequence of the three Hippolytus-plays. Theories about these differ widely. Barrett 12-13 inclines to the view that it appeared between the two Euripidean plays (and by its success added fuel to the flames of Euripides' resentment over the popular failure of his first Hipp.). He conjectures that Sophocles' Phaedra was characterized less offensively than her counterpart in the "Kalyptomenos" and that various plot elements (e.g. a Theseus missing and presumed dead) would have mitigated her actions. On the other hand, Zwierlein 54-68 assumes that Sophocles' play predated both Euripidean versions; through relation to Sophocles of Propertius 2.1.51-52 and Apuleius, Met. 10.2, he proposes a title-character with witch-like qualities, who attempts, after rejection by Hippolytus, to poison him.

particular author is to engage in word-play and metatextual communication to the audience. In Euripides' case, it can be asserted with confidence that he was exceptionally prone to such activity.

The "chestnut" which perhaps best illustrates Euripides' witty engagement with his literary models is the Electra's well-known parody and correction (518-84) of the anagnorisis of Aeschylus' Libation Bearers. There was a time not so long ago when this "malicious" swipe at Aeschylus was widely condemned as a "blot" and as an "artistically ruinous proceeding."¹¹ The assumption that parody could not coexist with tragedy was so stubborn that some were driven to excise the entire spoof (518-44).¹² More recent criticism, however, has rehabilitated both the transmitted text and Euripides' taste and artistic sense, viewing the hit at Aeschylus as "light-hearted burlesque" and arguing that there is no demonstrable reason to assume that tragedy necessarily precludes parody.¹³ Winnington-Ingram picks up from there, characterizing the Electra's parody as an "exhibition of cleverness" and presenting Euripides as an author whose dramatic purpose at times was "to amuse -- to amuse himself and his clever friends in the audience."¹⁴ Several subsequent studies similarly point to places where the

¹¹ The first two descriptions are found at Denniston 114 ad loc. The third is taken from Murray 89.

¹² E.g., Mau, Ed. Fraenkel, on whom see Lloyd-Jones 1961: 171-72, Bond 2.

¹³ Lloyd-Jones 1961: 179-80; Bond 7. Cf. Arrowsmith 17-19, who notes that comic and parodic "eruptions" mark not only Euripides' tragicomedies but even his most serious works; Arrowsmith views the incorporation of the comic into tragedy as a "dissonance" required by Euripides' view of reality.

¹⁴ Winnington-Ingram 129 and 128 respectively. Among the examples cited by Winnington-Ingram is Hipp. 575-79, where the playwright foregrounds the

author glances wittily at the dramatic conventions or mythic traditions within which he wrote.¹⁵

It has thus become increasingly evident that Euripides' plays are situated in a "constant interplay of reference and subversion of reference" to their models.¹⁶ Demonstration of particular allusions is obviously more straightforward when the related plays survive in toto, as is the case with the referentiality of Electra and Orestes to the Oresteia. However, it would be naive to assume that such references do not abound elsewhere as well, though as yet undetected.

As we approach the question of referentiality between Euripides' two Hippolytus-plays, we should strike a balance between prudent awareness of the methodological difficulties involved and due receptivity to the possibility of metadramatic commentary. Remember: for a tragedian to present a second play covering the same mythic episode as an earlier one was rare, perhaps even unparalleled (see note 3). When the audience of the second Hippolytus entered

awkwardness of the conventions that restrict the dramatic role played by the Chorus (130-31). For this phenomenon, cf. Kitto 346; Arnott 1962: 36-37; Méridier n.d.: 117.

¹⁵ See, e.g., examples of covert author-audience communication in Euripides' plays cited in Arnott 1973 and 1978, Gellie, and Nisetich (all on authorial "comments" on the dramatic conventions of the genre); and in McDermott 1987, 1989: 17, and 1991, on the flagging of mythic innovations. While Euripides was chief practitioner of these self-conscious commentaries, he was not alone in making them; for the other tragedians, see, e.g., Michelini 1974 and 1982: 66-67, 127-28, esp. 127 n. 2 et passim; and Ormand.

¹⁶ Nisetich 52, speaking specifically of the Orestes' relationship to Aeschylus; see also 52 n. 25 for bibliography.

the theater, they would presumably have known, at least since the proagon at the beginning of the festival, that they were about to see just such an extraordinary "re-production."¹⁷ At least the sophoi among them would surely be looking forward to seeing what novelties the playwright might offer here. If, in addition, the remake was prompted by unfavorable public reception of the first version, they would have been all the more abuzz with anticipation of authorial comment on the situation. In a comedy, they might expect polemical remarks in a parabasis, such as Aristophanes later gives them in his second Clouds. In tragedy, such polemic would have to be indirect and muted, but the "bookish" Euripides had already demonstrated a penchant for inserting metadramatic commentary into his plays.¹⁸ This would be an audience ripe for and receptive to double meaning. Euripides was not to disappoint their expectation.

There are few points of reconstruction of the first Hippolytus that can be asserted with any confidence. One which can, however, is the supposition that the original play, following the most fundamental outline of the folktale motif it is built upon (the Potiphar's-wife motif), had a more brazen Phaedra approach Hippolytus directly and proposition him on-stage. This reconstruction has been all but universally credited since it was proposed in the eighteenth century.¹⁹ The

¹⁷ On the playwrights' announcement of their plots at the proagon, see Haigh 86-88; Bieber 53; Pickard-Cambridge 67-68.

¹⁸ The quoted epithet is from Eisner 157. For metadramatic commentary in plays that predate the Hipp., see McDermott 1991: 127-29 (on Heracl.), assuming a date for that play of 430; and McDermott 1987 and 1989: 17-20 (on Med).

¹⁹ See Valckenaer xviii. Barrett 11-12, 30-31, 37-38 summarizes the evidence supporting this view and asserts persuasively: "The virtuous Phaidra of the second Hipp., who would sooner die than make any approach to Hippolytos, is

evidence supporting it -- beyond the fact that an in-person approach is an intrinsic part of the folktale motif and therefore more likely to be present than not²⁰ -- includes: (a) Aristophanes' linkage of Phaedra and Stheneboia as pornai at Frogs, 1043;²¹ (b) a fragment of the "Kalyptomenos" -- $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\omicron\lambda\mu\eta\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\iota\gamma\rho\phi\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ $\delta\iota\delta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ / °en tošiw °amhx£anoisin e°upor£vtaton, / φ Ervta (fr. 430N = fr. C Barrett) -- which may be attributed with some confidence to Phaedra anticipating a deliberate attempt to win her way with Hippolytus;²² (c) a second fragment (fr. 435N = fr. G Barrett), which has been supposed to issue from a stichomythia where a

clearly private to this one play. In all other accounts she makes a conscious attempt at seduction; this is so fixed a part of the tradition that it invades even the accounts which are otherwise dependent on the second Hipp." (30). Michelini 1987: 287-88 and 288 n. 48 sounds a cautionary note, but within a context of acceptance (78, 287). Gibert evinces dubiety that Phaedra's character was necessarily as shocking in the lost play as is normally assumed (Zwierlein 25 would agree) but does not address the probability of an on-stage approach, except (following Luppe 28-32 on fr. B of the new hypothesis) to question the provenance of the epithet "Kalyptomenos" (see esp. 94-95, 95 n. 42). The on-stage proposition and the veiling of Hippolytus have, to be sure, been integrally and causally connected in many critics' minds (for bibliography see, e.g., Luppe 29 n. 5); but, even though Luppe suggests a very different understanding of the epithet "Kalyptomenos," he remains unshaken in his assumption of an in-person approach by Phaedra to Hippolytus (Luppe 26).

²⁰ See secondary loci cited by Barrett, 26-27.

²¹ Barrett 26, 30-31.

²² Barrett 18, 31.

suppliant Phaedra exacts an oath of silence from Hippolytus.²³ Additionally, new, albeit conjectural, textual support for the on-stage encounter has been put forward with the recent publication of fragments of the lost play's hypothesis: Luppe, reading -o]usa d'e lo[in line 2 of fr. A, has proposed *prosf̄ero]usa d'e lfo[- / gouw a°ut\$vi per'i sunousfiaw °e]zfhthse[(n) / paragage\$in*. He notes: "Da...im Vorausgehenden und im Folgenden (dazu sogleich) Phaidra Subjekt zu sein scheint, dürfte auch - o]usa auf Phaidra gehen; sie unterbreitet also offenbar im ersten 'Hippolytos' den Antrag selbst, wie bereits seit langem allgemein angenommen."²⁴ Finally, a fourth textual suggestion of an on-stage seduction scene in the "Kalyptomenos" is found, paradoxically, in the "Stephanias." In a well-balanced discussion of the attempt to determine the chronology of Sophocles and Euripides' two Electra-plays, Denniston places special faith in the significance of "mechanical echoes," or "[phrases or motifs] taken over unconsciously by one dramatist from the other, in such a way as to seem alien in [their] new context...."²⁵ One can readily imagine that such echoes would be even more plentiful and natural in the case of self-quotation than in quotation of another author. Just such a mechanical echo occurs, I suggest, in our extant play when Hippolytus, learning of Phaedra's death, exclaims incredulously that he cannot believe she is dead -- she, *ϕϕ∞∞§∞TMTMϕTMhn °artfiwv ϕeleipon* (907). In fact, Hippolytus has not laid eyes on Phaedra throughout the course of the present play. This line, then -- strictly inapposite here -- may well have been quoted from the original version, where he was openly propositioned by her, supplicated, and sworn to silence before they separated.

²³ Barrett 19; Luppe 27.

²⁴ Luppe 26.

²⁵ Denniston xxxviii.

Once we posit an on-stage seduction attempt for the "Kalyptomenos," it follows logically that both Phaedra's resolve to die rather than reveal her illicit love and the Nurse's approach to Hippolytus in opposition to Phaedra's stated wish were plot elements introduced into the revision to ameliorate the queen's character. One further inferential step led Wagner to a supposition that the Nurse had played a role in the original drama that was effectively opposite to the role we know her in:

In qua si igitur Phaedra libidini nimis indulgens ipsa
Hippolyto se offerebat, nutricem non cohortantis ac
pellicientis, ut in superstite Hippolyto, sed dissuadentis
amicae partes tenuisse facile intelligitur.²⁶

The primary basis, beyond verisimilitude, for this hypothesized switch in Phaedra's and the Nurse's roles is the fact that the Nurse in Seneca's Phaedra plays the role of dissuader; if Seneca drew this motif from a Greek source, that

²⁶ Wagner 721. Although we have no direct evidence that the Nurse appeared in the first play, it is broadly assumed that she did: see, e.g., Kalkmann 27; Halleran 26 ("Phaedra's Nurse, a staple of the story, must have been a character in this play, even though she left no definite traces in the fragments"). Méridier 1927: 15 cites frs. 440N (= Barrett K) and 441N (= Barrett O) as possible indication that the Nurse and the Chorus argued against Phaedra's "passion effrénée." Webster 71 n. 50, citing the frequency in 1st and 2nd century C.E. art of the motif of a Nurse carrying a letter from Phaedra to Hippolytus, concludes that the source had to be either the "Kalyptomenos" or Sophocles' Phaedra.

source was most likely the "Kalyptomenos."²⁷ This argument is advanced strongly by Snell (he is "sure" that the dissuasion of Seneca's Nurse issues from the first Hippolytus) and endorsed even by Barrett, who generally cautions strongly against reconstruction from Seneca.²⁸

I will argue not only that the Nurse did appear in the "Kalyptomenos" in the role of dissuader, as suggested by Wagner, but that the playwright has also made a series of metadramatic comments on the partial interchange his second play has effected in these two characters' original roles. The Nurse's appearance in the "Stephanias" as seducer of a virtuous Phaedra is presented as a "change of mind" on her part. The character's second thoughts (to corrupt Phaedra, rather than dissuade her) mirror the playwright's decision to amend Phaedra's character by, conversely, degenerating the Nurse's. His covert comments on this strategy of reversal underline the oddity of his decision to correct a failed first try at the story.

The literary models thus corrected may, of course, have included Sophocles' Phaedra, as well as Euripides' own first Hippolytus. If so, there are probably many instances in the "Stephanias" where Euripides' correction is aimed at his competitor as much as at himself. Indeed, I will note below one locus in the present play which may imply an agonistic relationship to Sophocles' text. But in most of the passages I will discuss the playwright's primary strategy is

²⁷ Barrett 35 argues against Sophocles' lost Phaedra as a possible source: "the servant as confidant is a likely device for Euripides but less likely for Sophocles." See also Friedrich 112-17.

²⁸ Snell 27; Barrett 36 (on the likelihood of the Nurse as dissuader in the "Kalyptomenos"), 16-17 (on the intrinsic danger of reconstruction from Seneca); for the latter, cf. Michellini 1987: 288 n. 49.

clearly to comment on the process of self-correction in which he is engaged. He clusters his double meanings in key scenes between Phaedra and her Nurse (their initial entrance onto the stage, the Nurse's first attempt to win Phaedra's confidence, the old servant's re-entry to the stage announcing her change of mind, the queen's response to the Nurse's specious arguments for yielding to passion, and her response to the Nurse's unauthorized approach to Hippolytus) which highlight the switch in the two characters' roles. He then casts this switch as a change of mind, thus signalling unambiguously that it is his own first plot and characterization that are inverted here: he can correct Sophocles; he can contradict him; but the only mind he can change is his own.

The prologue of the play is spoken by Aphrodite, who reveals her pique at Hippolytus' failure to honor her and her determination to punish him for it. Right here in the prologue, the "fault" is laid squarely at the protagonist's door, and the first step is taken toward amelioration of Phaedra's character.²⁹ The goddess then goes on to a general forecast of the action to come, making clear to the audience that an unoffending Phaedra will be the tool (and ancillary victim) of her divine revenge. The details are for the most part left unspecified; in some respects, what she says may even be taken as misleading.³⁰ An element of the plot which she does underline, though, is Phaedra's silent, and ultimately doomed, struggle against her unwelcome passion: ...^ah tɛalain' °apɛollutai / sigʂhi, jɛunoide d' oɟutiw o°iketʂvn nɛoson. / °all' oɟuti taɬuthi tɛond' ɟervta xr`h peseʂin... (39-41). Barrett notes the stress laid on sigêi by the preceding line-break and suspects that the lines contain a pointed correction of the first Hippolytus, where the Nurse may have been in on the secret from the beginning and may even have spoken the

²⁹ Cf. Zeitlin 108.

³⁰ Barrett 164-65 ad loc.

prologue.³¹ Such a contrasting recall would certainly serve to underline the new play's major thematic emphasis on speech vs. silence, as expounded by Knox.³² It also leads naturally into the major topic of the physical illness which here besets and threatens Phaedra.

The nosos of love, a not uncommon conceit, is attested in the fragments of Sophocles' Phaedra, where a speaker (presumably Phaedra herself) muses to the Chorus that it is useless to fight against it: $\eta\lambda\omicron\sigma\omega\upsilon\omega\ \delta\prime\ \rho\alpha\nu\lambda\alpha\gamma\kappa\eta\ \tau\grave{\alpha}\omega\ \gamma\epsilon\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon\omega\ \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\eta$.³³ Euripides' play might be said, ultimately, to argue the same case, but not for lack of an attempt on Phaedra's part to oppose her disease. If Sophocles' play predated the "Stephanias" (and especially if it had intervened between the two Euripidean versions), this is a point on which Euripides' self-correction obviously encompasses correction of Sophocles as well: the new Phaedra, unlike both Sophocles' heroine and Euripides' own first drawing of the character, will do her utmost to resist her passion, not yield to it. It is, rather, the Nurse in the "Stephanias" who will echo the Sophoclean Phaedra's easy capitulation to expediency (Hipp. 437-81; see especially 476), while Phaedra specifically contradicts her Sophoclean counterpart by saying that her response to her illicit love has been $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \eta\eta\alpha\ \zeta\alpha\eta\omicron\iota\alpha\eta\ \epsilon\phi\iota\upsilon\ \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\eta\ / \tau\$\nu\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\phi\rho\omicron\eta\$\nu\epsilon\$\eta\eta\ \eta\iota\kappa\$\nu\sigma\alpha$ (398-99). Whereas Sophocles' heroine argues that one must "bear" (pherein) diseased loves (nosous) by not resisting them, Euripides' kicks against the traces: she resolves

³¹ Barrett ad loc. Interestingly, there may perhaps be a remnant of the phrase $\tau\iota\omega\ \omicron\prime\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\$\nu\eta$ preserved in fr. A to the hypothesis of the earlier play (Luppe 27).

³² Knox 1979: 205-30.

³³ Sophocles fr. 619 Nauck = A Barrett = 680 Lloyd-Jones. That love is the god-imposed illness under discussion is beyond doubt. Cf. Hipp. 767, Sophocles Tr. 491.

to "bear her madness well" (anoian eu pherein), by overcoming it with sôphrosynê.

A second fundamental and transforming change is made in the topic of the nosos erôtos in the extant play when the figurative illness of love is turned into a literal wasting disease. The emphatic introduction of this topic into the present play -- first in the Chorus' report at 129-40, then in Phaedra's arrival on stage (at 170) on her actual sick-bed -- is obviously motivated by the revisionist author's impulse to lessen the immorality earlier attributed to the heroine. Phaedra's present illness is occasioned by her decorous refusal to admit or yield to her desire; she chooses to die rather than give in to dishonor. Again, Euripides will highlight the new play's regeneration of Phaedra's character through metadramatic recall of his earlier, less morally scrupulous heroine.

Immediately after the parodos, the Chorus breaks into an anapestic announcement of the entrance onto the stage of Phaedra and her Nurse:

°all' °ohde trof ow gerai`a pr`o yur\$vn
 t£hnde kom£izous' ¢ejv melfayrvn≤
 stugn`on d' °ofr£uvn n£efow a°uj£anetai≤
 t£i pot' °est`i maye\$in ¢eratai cux£h,
 t£i ded£hlhtai
 d£emaw °all£oxroon basile£iaw.

(170-75)

This "stage direction" by the Chorus is made strangely conspicuous, first by the fact that technically it should not even be here, and then by peculiarities of its expression. Normal tragic practice was to omit verbal cues for conventional entrances (those that take place, as here, immediately following a strophic song);

this is a rule followed by Euripides 88% of the time.³⁴ His infrequent violations of the rule tend to involve anapestic announcements of unusually elaborate entrances (such as those of chariots or corpses).³⁵ The insertion of such an exceptional entrance announcement here, then, is one device by which the playwright puts the audience on alert that something momentous is about to happen. The expectation is quickly fulfilled as Phaedra appears -- not in a normal ambulatory entrance, but carried onto the stage on her sickbed. The particular content of the Chorus' announcement further reinforces the startling effect of this spectacle.

The text, though unambiguous in the codices, has troubled editors. Only Diggle and Kovacs leave it as is. Wilamowitz transposes line 172 to after 180; Barrett agrees, calling its placement in the manuscripts "impossible," since no one who sees Phaedra for the first time in the play can reasonably assert that "she is looking increasingly disgruntled."³⁶ Murray, followed by Stockert, excises the line. I will assert, however, that the anomaly of these words is a signal of double meaning, rather than an indicator of poor textual transmission. The cloud on Phaedra's brows as she is carried in on a stretcher is the cloud of illness, not disgruntlement; the Chorus' comments on her physical appearance are verbal cues to what will become visually apparent to the audience upon her entrance:

³⁴ Hamilton 70-72; Halleran (1985) 5-6, 27 n. 5. The conventional pattern, as posited by Taplin 1972: 84, is entrance -- dialogue -- exit -- song -- entrance ..., etc.

³⁵ Halleran (1985) 11-20 fits 11 of the 16 exceptions he cites into a rubric, broadly understood, of "moving tableaux"; cf. Hamilton 68-72.

³⁶ Barrett *ad loc.*

that her mask carries the permanent imprint of her illness.³⁷ We know that masks were differentiated not only by expression, but by skin color, with a sallow tinge indicating illness.³⁸ Thus, when the Chorus alludes to Phaedra's gloomy

³⁷ I owe the suggestion that the cloud of Phaedra's brows contains a reference to her mask to Prof. Marilyn Skinner. This passage is remarkably similar to the announcement of Ismene's entrance at Ant. 526-30 (a similarity noted by Stockert in excising Hipp. 172). Since in the Ant. passage the nephelê ophryôn obviously refers to grief, it might be objected that it cannot refer to illness here. But in each case the nature of the "cloud" on the brows is clarified by the second element of description given. In Sophocles, the cloud is accompanied by the bloody tracks left by violent mourning (which might have been graphically represented on Ismene's mask, as Pickard-Cambridge 192 has supposed for the Chorus' masks in Aeschylus' Supp. from the evidence of Supp. 69-71). In Hipp., the second element is the changed color (demās allochroon) of illness. In a narrow sense, allochroon refers to Phaedra's entire body (demās), rather than specifically her face. But demās here is more a generalized expression for physical appearance than a synonym for sôma. Beyond that, on the assumption that the long-sleeved chiton (whose purposes included the disguising of male forearms on female characters [Pickard-Cambridge 202]) had become a staple of tragic costume by this time, Phaedra's costume would preclude the Chorus from catching any glimpse of her body to base their perception on; the color of her body would then have to be extrapolated from the color of her mask. On the sleeved robe, see additionally Bieber 1961: 22, 24-26.

³⁸ Pickard-Cambridge 193-95; cf. Bieber RE, cols. 2077-82. In Pollux's list of Hellenistic-era tragic masks (iv.133-42), see particularly the xanthoteros (^αο δ`ε jany`ow ^οan`hr janyo`uw *ϕ*exei bostr^ϕuxouw...ka`i *ϕ*estin e^ϕuxrvw. ^αο δ`ε jany^ϕoterow t`a m`en *ϕ*alla

expression and changed skin color (allochroon), their words are deictic. Their stress on the startling physical appearance of the ailing queen glosses the novelty of bringing to the stage a Phaedra whose effort to subordinate her nosos erôtos to her moral will has reduced her to a physical sickness-unto-death. It is this innovation which explains the troublesome auxanetai of line 172: the "increase" in Phaedra's clouded expression, like the change in her skin color, has come between the author's first presentation of a healthy (though immoral) Phaedra and his present offering of a physically deteriorated (though morally improved) one. With a delicate breach of dramatic illusion, the Chorus alludes to the change in her appearance since her previous appearance on the Euripidean stage: the healthy heroine who brazenly sought gratification of her lust has here been metamorphosed into a self-tormenting anorexic on the road to death.

Thus, the Chorus first breaks tragic convention to alert the audience that the coming entrance will be important, then combines commentary on the visual presentation of the entering Phaedra with double meaning which points up the contrast between her appearance here and her appearance in the author's earlier version of the same play. They thus foreground the nosos theme which will play a prominent role in exculpating the present Phaedra. It may seem that this is too much to read into these few lines, but similarly complicated use of an extraordinary entrance announcement in combination with word-play can be demonstrated in other Euripidean plays as well. Just so, Halleran notes, the Nurse breaks with tragic convention in the Medea to place thematic emphasis on

οομοιοω, ουπυρω d`e m§allon, ka`i dhlo§i noso§untaw [135.17-20]), the ôchros, and the parôchros (ουρυρησα d' αvw dhlo§un noso§unta ih`er§vnta [137.4-5]); and (among women) the katakomos ôchra (characterized by sallow skin color and a blēmma luphr̄on [140.25]) and the kourimos parthenos (ουπυρω...t`hn xro§ian [140.2]).

the entrance of Medea's children, and reinforces this emphasis with syntactical word-play.³⁹ Similarly, the complex of double meanings that mark Euripides' innovative treatment of Eurystheus' fate in the *Heraclidae* includes an unusual entrance announcement following a choral song: *dēs pōin', ὅρσ' αἰὼν μὲν ὅλλ' ὀμνῶν* *εἰρήσεται* / *Εὐρύστειά σοι τῶνδ' ἐγὼν ἄγοντες ὄχκοι, / ἐκείτων ἐκείνων...* (928-30).⁴⁰ The initial break in normal entrance convention is wittily reinforced by the servant's explicit comment that his announcement is otiose ("You already see us, but I'm going to tell you anyway: here we are, bringing in Eurystheus, against expectation"). Again the combination of the unconventional entrance announcement with word-play serves to highlight a thematic purpose, for Alcmene's "unexpected" custody of this living captive creates the morally dubious situation whereby the Athenians are persuaded to abdicate their traditional stance as protectors of prisoners of war and put Eurystheus to death to satisfy Alcmene's lust for revenge.⁴¹

The recall of the "Kalyptomenos" by the Chorus' double-edged announcement of Phaedra's entrance is followed immediately by another pointed allusion to the earlier play. The Nurse, speaking for the first time, frets over the changeability of her sick mistress' desires and specifically over the hankering for fresh air which has brought them outside: *τῆδε σοι φέγγω, λαμπρὸν ὄδ' ἀειφύει* (178). Her words clearly constitute an ironic glance by the playwright at the invocation of

³⁹ Halleran 7. The convention broken is identified by Halleran as that by which an entrance announcement is made only when there is someone else on stage for it to be made to (this can include the Chorus).

⁴⁰ Halleran 16 discounts this passage as a "moving tableau," because it is not in anapests; but it is still a violation of the convention concerning announcement of entrances after choral songs.

⁴¹ See Conacher 117-20; McDermott 1990: 127-29.

the elements in the first Hippolytus: ¶v lampr`ow a`iy`hr `ahmferaw y' `agn`on ffaow, / `avw
 `ahd`u lefussein tošiw te prfassousin kalšvw / ka`i tošisi dustuxošusin, •vn pfebuk' `egfv (fr. 443 N =
 Barrett A). Barrett convincingly assigns these lines to the opening of a soliloquy
 by Phaedra upon her first entrance.⁴² Whereas there a healthy heroine had come
 outside to invoke the elements, here the sickly Phaedra can only indulge her
 craving for the same elements through the intercession and physical support of
 others.

The old servant's anapestic mutterings over the next hundred lines reveal
 genuine anxiety for her ill and semi-delirious charge, mingled with exasperation
 at the task of nursing her, embarrassment at her public displays of irrationality,
 and a fair degree of righteous self-importance. From lines 267-87, having quieted
 her feverish mistress, she chronicles Phaedra's illness and decline to the Chorus.
 To their queries about the causes of this condition, she responds that she has
 tried to find them out, but to no avail (284). She then turns back to Phaedra
 herself, who has finally come out of her delirium, with these words:

çag', ¶v ffilh paši, tšvn pfaroye m`en lfogvn
 layfvmev' çamfv, ka`i sfu y' `hdřivn genošu
 stugn`hn `ofr`un lfusasa ka`i gnřvmhw `odfon,
 `egfv y' ∞ophi soi m`h kalšvw tfoy' e`ipřomhn
 meyęšis' `ep' çallon e¶jimi beltřiv lfogon.

(288-92)

"Let us both forget our previous words," she says. But what words? Barrett
 glosses tôn paroithe...logôn, "her [the Nurse's] previous attempts to discover
 Ph.'s secret," and that surely must be the primary intent of the phrase. It follows
 that the conversations referred to must be imagined as having taken place before

⁴² Barrett 18.

the dramatic time of the previous play, for the Nurse's only addresses to Phaedra thus far in the play have been fretful grumblings; certainly the two have exchanged no words which would explain the implication here of an earlier quarrel that needs to be patched up. Indeed, the temporality of this vague allusion to a pre-play conversation is oddly emphasized when the original paroithe is reinforced by the tote of line 291. This emphasis is redoubled when the Nurse returns to temporal contrast a few lines later, repeats her earlier tote, and blows it up into a full tote...nyn contrast: *φῖσον δ' ἄπασι μὲν τῶν προῖον ὄτε γὰρ τῆτο / λογοῖω ἐτῆγεγυ' ὠνδε νῦν τ' οὐ πεφύεται* (302-3). Phaedra, she repeats, persists in listening to her no more now than she had in that vague, pre-play "then." The hint of specificity in the repeated references to a still unspecified occasion creates a slight sense of dislocation; one feels a little like Polonius: "Still harping on my daughter." What is it, we wonder, that makes the playwright keep alluding insistently to this nebulous pre-play rift? It is my contention that the playwright has concealed a secondary meaning in these lines.

After her first reference to this pre-play quarrel, the Nurse continues with an injunction to Phaedra to loosen her gloomy brow (stygnên ophryn) and become "gladder" (hêdiôn). This is a direct echo of line 172 (stygnon ophryôn nephos) and thereby assumes the many dimensions of the earlier phrase: it incorporates reference to Phaedra's mask, to the innovative introduction into the play of the physical illness motif, and, by indirection, to the contrasting Phaedra of the "Kalyptomenos." The allusion to the character's mask might in itself be enough to rouse a smile from some in the audience: Phaedra can hardly be expected to peel her mask off in mid-scene.⁴³ Again, then, Euripides glances

⁴³ On the question of whether mask-changes may have occurred between scenes, see Pickard-Cambridge 173-74. Several occasions on which playwrights

ironically at his prescribing conventions. The echo's evocation of the corrective function of the nosos-motif further suggests that more of the same type of metadramatic commentary may be expected here too. Coupled with the recurrent reference to a pre-play quarrel, this mention of the cloud on Phaedra's brow serves to alert the sophoi in the audience that these lines should be audited for double meaning.

In short, the Nurse's and Phaedra's truest "previous words" were not from the present story at all, but were found in Euripides' failed first version of the play. There, one may justly imagine a righteous Nurse and a reckless Phaedra set in more than one such quarrel (as they will be later in this play, though with their roles switched). On one level, then, the Nurse begs Phaedra to give up her self-imposed illness (stygnên ophryn lysasa) and her suicidal frame of mind (gnômês hodon).⁴⁴ On another she urges her to abandon the resulting characterization, which has set her on the path to death in the present play, and return instead to the simpler, more straightforward plot and characterization of the "Kalyptomenos."

seem to have called attention to the incongruity of the mask's unchanging expression have previously been noted (Pickard-Cambridge 172-73); see esp. Sophocles EI. 1296-1300; 1309-13.

⁴⁴ Barrett ad loc. glosses gnômês hodon, "this confined, constricted process of your thoughts." But a subsequent echo of the phrase makes it clear that it is integrally and specifically related to Phaedra's course toward suicide: at line 391, Phaedra, after proclaiming that she will now reveal her gnômês hodon, proceeds to outline the three steps which led her to her resolve to die (katthanein edoxe [401]) rather than give in to dishonor.

In return, the Nurse says, she too will change. Barrett translates the next pair of lines, "and I, where then I did not go with you aright, I will give that up and go to other words and better," but is uneasy about the anacolouthon achieved by the absence of a direct object of metheisa. The failure of easy construction of the Greek has led to efforts to emend. Blomfield, for example, following Wilamowitz, punctuated after lysasa and emended egô t' to °egôg', thus transferring the object gnômês hodon from lysasa to metheisa.⁴⁵ The odd Greek, however, may point not to corruption in the text, but to an incorporation of double meaning. Beneath the Nurse's promise to turn to less quarrelsome words, there lies an additional glance by the playwright at the reversal of his two characters' roles. Phaedra has already turned around by becoming moral; the introduction of the nosos-motif has made that evident. Now, the Nurse will do a concomitant flip. Taking the very path "where [she] did not then [i.e., in the previous play] follow [Phaedra] well," she will now urge capitulation to in chastity and pursue Phaedra's suit with Hippolytus herself.

There is also significant ambiguity in the Nurse's use of the word logos in these lines. Barrett takes both the word's appearances (288 and 292) to refer to the Nurse's conversational attempts (past and future) to find out the cause of Phaedra's wasting condition. He renders both as plurals, reading no significance, apparently, into the switch to the singular in line 292. But the latter instance of logos may be taken to refer not only to the words to be exchanged later between the Nurse and Phaedra, but to the two separate versions of the story presented by Euripides. A logos, after all, is a story.⁴⁶ More significantly, logos was a

⁴⁵ Barrett ad loc.

⁴⁶ LSJ V.3.

her error: *k'an brotošiw / a'i defuterafi pvw frontfidew soffvterai* (435-36). Again her words are fraught with double meaning. Not only has the character changed her mind within this play, but she will now reverse her role -- from dissuader to corrupter -- from the original version of the play to this one.⁴⁹ The second thoughts are not only the Nurse's, but Euripides'. Keeping in mind Valckenaer's hypothesis that the two versions of the Hippolytus shared a number of lines, either unchanged or only slightly so, one is tempted to speculate that the Nurse's initial expostulations against Phaedra's love (353-61) may even have been "quoted" from Euripides' first version of the play, where they were consistent with her characterization as dissuader -- only to be reversed in the later version by her own (and the author's) rethinking of her role upon her second entrance onto the stage.⁵⁰

⁴⁹The thematic importance of this and other changes of mind in the play have been masterfully explicated by Knox 1979: 205-30. But the centrality of the words in their primary meaning does not preclude their concealing a second message as well.

⁵⁰ Valckenaer xviii. I do not, of course, mean to suggest that the second Hipp. was simply an edited version of the first. Wilamowitz 42-43 n. 83 dismissed this simplistic idea (which is based on an overly literal construction of the diôrthôtai of the Hypothesis) early on, characterizing the play as "eine völlig neue Bearbeitung desselbes Stoffes." Even Valckenaer, in estimating that the two plays shared 100 lines (a number that seems both arbitrary and excessive), recognized that "totam dramatis oeconomiam in editione fuisse secunda mutata." Rather, I envision the second play as maintaining (through corrections, pointed allusions, and occasional quotations) a significant intertextual dialogue with the first. See also Emonds 342-43, Méridier 1927: 13-17.

When the Nurse finishes her long speech advocating an expedient approach to Phaedra's quandary, Euripides again turns to metadramatic double meaning. Phaedra responds to the Nurse's arguments by decrying their specious reasoning; the Nurse counters that Phaedra should give up her noble stance and concentrate on getting her man (490-91). She then continues: ³v w t f a x o w d i o i s t f e o n , / t ' o n e ' u y ' u n ' o e j e i p f o n t a w ' o a m f i s o s u l f o g o n (492-93). The sense of 492 is obscure.⁵¹ However, the Nurse's reference to telling the "straight story" about Phaedra clearly signals that a correction is in process. The correction proceeds as the Nurse continues with a contrary-to-fact condition (493-97), whose argument is essentially, "If your life were not in danger, I would not be counseling you this way; but it is, so I am." Here again there is hidden reference to the "Kalyptomenos." The Nurse's phraseology hammers the comparison home:

o'uk çan pot' e' unshw o' unex' a' hdonshw te sshw
 proshgon çan se dešuro≤ nšun d' 'ag`vn mšegaw

⁵¹ The manuscripts are divided between dioisteon and diisteon, and so are modern critics: see Barrett ad loc. In the 1984 OCT, Diggle has opted for the latter, over Murray's choice of the former; so also the 1994 Teubner (ed. Stockert). For reasons I have not discovered, Diggle emends euthyn in 493 to an adverbial euthys . The text as cited here is Murray's. I slightly prefer dioisteon because the differentiating force of the verb diaphero fits well with the introduction of the idea of changing to a straight story about Phaedra. The issue is not of revealing the truth to Hippolytus, as some editors have thought, but (with a slight breach of dramatic illusion) to the audience. Barrett considers a similar idea ad loc. but dismisses it as unlikely. My identification of a recurrent pattern of double meaning starting from the beginning of the play may make it seem more credible.

s§vsai b£ion s£on... (495-97)

She asserts emphatically that she would not be adopting an expedient approach if it were simply a question of helping Phaedra gratify her sexual desire (495). But as it is (*nyn d'*) she must -- in order to save Phaedra's life. The switch from contrary-to-fact to present reality suggests the contrast between the earlier and later versions of the play, much as the temporal references (tote, tote...nyn, artiôs...nyn) of lines 291 and 302-3 already have. In the "Kalyptomenos," Phaedra herself had approached Hippolytus in an effort to gratify her lust (eunês hounek' hêdonês te), while the Nurse, we have hypothesized, opposed her mistress by supporting the course of abstinence. But that version is, from the standpoint of the present play, contrafactual: it no longer pertains. When the ameliorated Phaedra of the "Stephanias" vows to die rather than give up her abstinence, the Nurse is impelled to shift from the honorable role to the practical one. The present reality, then, is that she must fight to keep Phaedra from dying of self-imposed starvation. It is for this reason that she opts to approach Hippolytus against Phaedra's stated wish.⁵²

⁵² Since the Nurse in Seneca is motivated by fear that Phaedra will carry through on a threat of suicide, one might suppose that this second plot-element (the Nurse swayed from her original opposition by fear for Phaedra's life) was drawn from the same source as the motif of the Nurse's appearance as dissuader: i.e. from the "Kalyptomenos" of Euripides. It is my sense, however, that the complicated patterns of the Nurse's behavior in Seneca represent that author's attempt to combine, reconcile, and thus to cap, two separate versions offered by Euripides: (a) that the Nurse was a simple dissuader ("Kalyptomenos"), and (b) that the Nurse's fear for Phaedra's life impelled her to approach Hippolytus against Phaedra's will ("Stephanias"). Seneca's marriage of these two versions

After the Nurse finishes this apologia, Phaedra -- sensing, perhaps, the fragility of her own $\lambda\omicron\gamma\nu\epsilon^{\circ}\upsilon\varsigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ (490) -- exclaims: $\Upsilon\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\ `a\ \lambda\epsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\prime, \omicron^{\circ}\upsilon\chi\ `i\ \varsigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\phi\eta\varsigma\epsilon\iota\omega\ \varsigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\ / \kappa\alpha\ `i\ m\ `h\ m\epsilon\gamma\phi\eta\varsigma\epsilon\iota\omega\ a\Upsilon\upsilon\iota\omega\ a^{\circ}\iota\varsigma\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\omega;$ (498-99). These lines too have a double force: when Phaedra begs the Nurse to let her base words (logous) go again (methêseis authis), she echoes ironically the lines where the Nurse pledges to let go (metheis') her earlier role as dissuader and come to a better word or story (ep' allon...beltiô logon). Her plea is thus twofold: her advisor is entreated not only to change her mind back to her first reaction (as embodied in her distraught outcry against Phaedra's love for Hippolytus at lines 353-61), but also to change her characterization back to the role she played in the "Kalyptomenos" as dissuader.

A final metadramatic double meaning is contained in Phaedra's horrified response to Hippolytus' expostulations against her: $\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\prime\ \eta\ \eta\varsigma\upsilon\nu\ \tau\epsilon\chi\nu\alpha\nu\ \zeta\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \eta\ \eta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ / \varsigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\varsigma\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\ \lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon;$ (670-71). Distraught at the foiling of her silent resistance to her love, Phaedra cries out against the knot (kathamma) she is caught in. Zeitlin elucidates thoroughly an elaborate image pattern of dêsis and lusis in which these lines play a central part.⁵³ But Phaedra's plight is also a metadramatic one. Now that her sickness has been revealed, in contravention of her staunch attempts to differentiate herself from the aggressive erôsa of the

results in a rococo sequence (a-b-b-a) of events, by which his Nurse initially attempts to dissuade her mistress (as in the "Kalyptomenos"); when a balked Phaedra threatens suicide, the Nurse, fearing for the queen's life (as in the "Stephanias"), approaches Hippolytus (as in the "Stephanias"), only to have her generalized counsel against celibacy interrupted by Phaedra, who comes on to proposition Hippolytus directly (as in the "Kalyptomenos").

⁵³ Zeitlin 58-64.

"Kalyptomenos," neither she nor the author has any devices (technas) or rationale (logon) by which to loosen the tangle of the plotline (logou).⁵⁴ Despite her best intentions, the morally improved heroine has no choice but to revert to the "bad" Phaedra of Euripides' first play, by bringing a false charge against Hippolytus.⁵⁵ The double meaning is reinforced just a few lines later when she states her need for new logoi (kainšvn lřogvn): she thus not only refers to the new words, or "story," she will light upon to acquit herself before Theseus (the fabricated assault by Hippolytus), but also laments her forced reversion to the traditional story-line.

When Euripides is attacked in Aristophanes' Frogs for picturing pornas like Phaedra and Stheneboea on-stage, the character defends himself by asking, in puzzlement, přoteron d' ořuk řonta lřogon tořuton per' i třhw Fařidraw junřeyhka; (Ra. 1052). The "truth" (onta logon) he refers to here, as Barrett properly notes, is the pre-"Stephanias" tradition by which Phaedra propositions Hippolytus in person.⁵⁶ The

⁵⁴ The text is troubled. As printed here, it is Diggle's; Barrett prints plurals in the first line: třinaw nřun třexnaw řexomen řh lřogouw. My own ideal text would maintain the plural logous, as given by Barrett: the resulting contrast between the plural logous in 670 and the singular logou in 671 would replicate the switch from plural to singular in the same word between lines 288 and 292, as discussed above. In both cases, the plural would refer to actual words, oral (at 288) or written (at 670, referring forward obliquely to her false suicide note), while the singular would evoke the idea of the story-line (the Potiphar's-wife motif). LSJ, citing this dubious locus only, construes kathamma luein logou metaphorically as "to solve a knotty point." Taking logou of the plotline makes for easier Greek.

⁵⁵ Cf. Zeitlin 53-54.

⁵⁶ Barrett 31. Cf. 6-7.

comic Euripides thus defends himself against the charge of putting an unseemly heroine on stage by protesting that all he did was tell the traditional story. The tragedian Euripides, on the other hand, responded to the criticism his first play generated by changing the "truth" of the story, to present his audience instead with a plot which came closer to meeting (in advance) the prescription of Aristophanes' Aeschylus that authors should "hide wickedness" ($\epsilon^{\circ}\text{apokrfuptein} \dots \tau^{\circ}\text{o p\o nhr\epsilon\o n}$ [Ra. 1053]). He offered his second version of the play as a kind of palinode, presenting his new Phaedra as a character who, like the Helen of Stesichorus and his own later play, had been slanderously portrayed in earlier literary representations. He introduced the nosos-motif and shifted responsibility for the seduction attempt onto the Nurse, to remove much that was morally repugnant in Phaedra's earlier characterization. He thus brought it about that, as Aphrodite predicted in the prologue, a regenerated Phaedra could die, as much as was possible within the fundamental outline of the myth, $\epsilon^{\circ}\text{ukle\epsilon}hw$ (47).

Euripides had proto-Alexandrian leanings. His impulse to encode comments on the conventions within which he wrote, both mythic and tragic, has come increasingly to critical notice. When he placed himself in the extraordinary position of presenting on the Athenian stage a "re-production" of his original Hippolytus, that was a situation he could not let pass in silence. He therefore conceptualized his modifications in plot and characterization as a change of mind and at several key points during the play invested his characters' words with double meaning reflective of the authorial "second thoughts" by which he had revamped his plot, rendered his heroine more palatable to his Athenian audience, and created the masterpiece that survives today.