UC Berkeley
Other Recent Work

Title

Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/21k0q422

Author

Mastronarde, Donald J.

Publication Date

1979

Peer reviewed

CONTACT AND DISCONTINUITY

Contact and Discontinuity

Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage

By Donald J. Mastronarde

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS CLASSICAL STUDIES

Volume 21

Contents

v

Preface

This study grew out of the constructive criticism offered by Richard Tarrant of the first draft of a single footnote of my dissertation *Studies in Euripides' Phoinissai* (University of Toronto 1974; Canadian Theses on Microfiche, no. 26070). After devoting time sporadically to preliminary research during 1975 and 1976, I eventually produced a manuscript during the 1976/77 academic year, aided in part by a quarter of sabbatical leave granted by the University of California at Berkeley. During July 1978 the manuscript received its final revision, during which 1 was able to take some account, at least in the footnotes, of the excellent books of David Bain and Oliver Taplin, which were unavailable to me during the original writing. I am pleased to find that we are in overall agreement in general principles as well as in a number of specific cases. There is naturally some degree of overlap between portions of my work and their books, but it seems to me a healthy sign that studies of a composite technical/literary nature are now receiving so much attention from students of Greek drama.

I wish to acknowledge here a general debt to my teachers T. C. W. Stinton and D. J. Conacher and a more particular debt to four San Francisco Bay Area colleagues, T. G. Rosenmeyer, M. McCall, M. Gagarin, and M. Griffith, as well as to O. Taplin, R. Hamilton, and a third, anonymous referee for their comments on my manuscript. In whatever places clarity or cogency is lacking in my presentation, the fault rests with me. Finally, I wish to thank the University of California Press for undertaking to produce a work containing so much Greek.

Berkeley
August 1978

INTRODUCTION

[Iokaste] scheint die Fragen uberhaupt nicht gehört zu haben, vielleicht mit ihren eigenen Gedanken beschäftigt? So etwas kommt im Alltagsleben zuweilen vor; auf der tragischen Bühne Athens ist es unerhört.

[quaero] ecquid in tragoedia Attica fiat non diserte monitum, ecquid diserte monitum non fiat.

If someone should object that this could be conversational realism, the answer is "Not in Euripidean stichomythia."

in many places in Euripidean dialogue a logically irregular sequence of thought is truer psychologically, and dramatically more effective, than a regular one. No question of principle is more important for an editor of Euripides, and more difficult of solution, than the question how far these logical irregularities are to be admitted.[1]

   Greek tragedy makes many demands upon its modern students in their quest for an adequate and apposite comprehension of the genre and of the individual works. Among these demands is the requirement that the modern critic free himself of preconceptions about theatrical technique which derive from familiarity with later forms of drama and that he face squarely the peculiar tension present in Greek tragedy between its mimetic function and its generic decorum. The quotations which head this chapter reflect scholarly controversies in which recognition of the formality and restraint of speech and action on the Greek tragic stage is in conflict with a willingness to see in tragic dialogue something close to the naturalistic disorder of spontaneous conversation, with its repetitions, dead-ends, misunderstandings, and unheralded transitions. It is easy enough for the formalist to declare "there is no parallel for this feature" or to ask "where is there any parallel for that feature?"; but critics who assume informality sometimes are not satisfied with an *ex cathedra* statement and proceed to postulate, with or without alleging parallels, mental processes and movements or gestures that support their interpretation of the text.

---

   1. The quotations are from Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 21 (on *Phoin.* 376-378); Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* 243 (on *Hel.* 892-893); Dale on *Hel.* 83-88; Denniston on *E.El.* 1107-1108.

  The present study was undertaken in the hope of clarifying, in at least some areas, the limits which the dramatists imposed upon themselves in their imitations of dialogue-communication and accompanying action and the limits within which the modern critic may legitimately postulate deviations from the most straightforward continuity of speech and action. Can a question be ignored or left unanswered, as conservative critics usually assume *Phoin.* 376-378 to be ignored (or at least unanswered) by Iokaste? Can a person with some authority give an order that fails to prompt any action and is never revoked, as some interpreters believe about Theonoe's lines at *Hel.* 892-893? Or do the strictures against such techniques proclaimed by Fraenkel and Wilamowitz retain their strength after consideration of all extant evidence? Indeed, can we ever believe that a truly significant gesture or movement took place which is not verbally marked in our texts? There is a long and continuing tradition of scholars who believe we cannot, with good reason.[2] It is of course logically impossible to have any evidence one way or another about something that is unmarked in the surviving texts; but when we observe the multitude of passages in which the words uttered by actors serve as stage-directions for the accompanying actions, it is reasonable to put forward the hypothesis that important actions are indeed never unmarked and to test that hypothesis against as many examples as possible.

  The unanswered question and the ignored or disobeyed command provided a starting-point for this investigation, but such problems could not be dealt with adequately by any simple listing of examples. It is necessary at every point to ask how an apparent abnormality is presented and how and whether it is exploited for dramatic effect. Our study thus becomes a more general one of contact and discontinuity. By *contact* is meant the alert relationship of one individual to his surroundings as a whole or to another individual. Contact may involve only the senses (hearing of an undifferentiated noise, or seeing), but in its fullest form it involves full communication—awareness, attention, and comprehension. Phenomena which have been discussed in terms of the monologue or the "aside," in terms of abstraction or preoccupation, can usefully be subsumed under the investigation of contact. The different types and degrees of contact are extremely important in assessing what is and what is not dramatically effective on the one hand or dramatically awkward or suspicious on the other. The conservative critic of *Phoin.* 376-378 must be asked what sort of contact he imagines there to be between Polyneikes and Iokaste in the disputed passage: if Iokaste is distraught and out of contact, her failure to answer would have one meaning; but if she is fully aware of the question addressed to her, her lack of response would have quite a different meaning. Likewise, in regard to *Hel.* 892-893 it is proper to bring up the question who is supposed to receive and execute Theonoe's order, since upon the nature of her contact with those around her depend the urgency of the command and, consequently, the oddity of non-execution. In the words of the text the most obvious manifestation of full contact is what I call continuity of speech and/or action: this involves both straightforward correspondence between speech and action and straightforward linking of the words of speaker B with the immediately preceding words of speaker A.

  Discontinuity is the term I have adopted, for convenience, to cover the opposite of contact and continuity. I use it to refer both to an actual lack of contact and the concomitant failure in communication between persons on stage, such as are caused by

---

2. The view that the action is explicit in the words of Greek tragedy is at least as old as d'Aubignac, *Le Pratique du Théâtre* (1657) Livre 1, Chapitre 8. Cf. also Wilamowitz's edition of Aischylos, xxiv; Sandbach on Menander, *Dysk.* 611-613; Taplin, *Stagecraft,* Chapter 1.

some violent alteration of the state of awareness which a character has of his surroundings, and to any departure from the simplest logical progression in the give-and-take of dialogue. This double use of the term is, I think, justified by the usefulness of considering together a wide range of disputed phenomena, including not only unanswered questions and ignored commands, but also the possibility that persons on the tragic stage literally misunderstand each other, the propriety of repetitions or round-about answers, the frequency, nature, and impact of interruptions, incomplete utterances, and pregnant pauses. Modern theater permits extensive use of almost humorously disjointed discourse, as the dramatist's perception of the futility of life is mirrored in the futility of attempted communication or the lack of correspondence between stated intention and actual behavior. In Greek tragedy, however, the major and minor discontinuities raise the question of how much flexibility and disorder was permitted in what was, at heart, a formal and decorous genre.

This study is conceived as a contribution to a long tradition of technical studies of the "grammar" of conventions.[3] In general my results weigh heavily on the side of such scholars as Wilamowitz and Fraenkel who seek to interpret and emend the tragic texts by establishing a "grammar" based on the economy and (deceptively) simple decorum of the tragedians' artistry. I have constantly borne in mind (and found confirmed again and again) the general principle, recently well presented by Taplin's writings,[4] that the Greek dramatists almost always are economical in their demands upon the audience's interest—they neither squander the audience's attention and comprehension on non-essentials nor allow essentials to lack the full attention and unambiguous comprehension they deserve. If a question is unanswered, or the answer postponed, or an order disobeyed or tardily obeyed, we must ask whether the delay or discontinuity is noticed and whether it has some dramatic point. If a discontinuity is obvious to the audience, yet has no conceivable dramatic point, we know enough about the artistry of Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides to be suspicious that something is amiss. On the other hand, it will also be clear at many points in this study that such "technical grammar" is not stifling or monotonous, but flexible and adaptable to the dramatic needs of each play, and that it should not be applied too rigidly to justify transpositions and deletions.

3. For more thorough bibliographies than that which I give see the recent books of Bain, Griffith, and Taplin. Here I wish to mention some studies especially relevant to contact, discontinuity, and dialogue-techniques in general. Wilamowitz's *Analecta Euripidea* contains sections on antilabe and unfulfilled orders. Leo's *Monolog* provided a pioneering study of speeches made out of contact, still important even though its usefulness is diminished somewhat by the author's preoccupation with judging the realism or lack of realism of monologues. Wolfgang Schadewaldt's *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* represented a significant advance on Leo's work because Schadewaldt made use of the concept of *Kontakt* and was interested in explaining the wider implication for *Geistesgeschichte* of the three dramatists' portrayals of self-expression. Eduard Fraenkel was perhaps the most important promoter of research into the "grammar" of dialogue- and stage-conventions, both in his own work and in the work of his students. (Although Fraenkel's work will be cited in the coming pages more often for disagreement than for agreement, I wish to record here how much I have learned and continue to learn from his writings.) In a useful and provocative article "Responsione strofica e distribuzione delle battute in Euripide," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 298-321, one of Fraenkel's students, Vincenzo di Benedetto, touches upon such problems as intervention, interruption, incomplete syntax, and aposiopesis. Among the numerous works on stichomythia mention should be made of A. Gross' *Die Stichomythie* and E.-R. Schwinge's *Venwendung des Stichomythie* (Schwinge's interest in stichomythia is so different from mine in this study that I have refrained from constant citation of or argument with his interpretations) and especially of the recent work of Seidensticker (both the chapter in Jens, *Bauformen,* and the excellent material in *Gesprächsverdichtung).* S. Ireland has produced an interesting article (*Hermes* 102 [1974] 509-524) on the relationship between the syntactic form and the dramatic force of the contact between speakers in Aischylean stichomythia.

4. Both *Silences* and *Stagecraft,* although it was the method of the former which was most helpful as I worked on this monograph (see Preface).

Two self-imposed limitations of this study deserve to be mentioned. First, there is no attempt to compare the dialogue-techniques of tragedy to those of Old or New Comedy. There is a marked difference between tragedy and Aristophanic comedy in the integrity of the dramatic illusion and in the formality of syntax, meter, style, and logic. In comedy it is interesting to examine the shifting relationship of the actor/character to the audience; in tragedy that relationship, it seems to me, is seldom important, but the relationship of contact (or the lack thereof) between a tragic character and other characters or the chorus or the imaginary locus created by the dramatist's words is frequently indicative of social and psychological forces important to the dramatic impact and meaning of a tragedy. Comparisons with New Comedy, on the other hand, would reveal more about New Comedy than about tragedy, which has been the object of study from the conception of this research. The second limitation is that I do not discuss (for its own sake, at any rate) the sort of discontinuity between speeches which occurs when two characters are unable to "communicate" in a deeper sense—when they are isolated from one another by the divergence of their basic assumptions about what is of value in human life. Such isolation is a fundamental ingredient of many tragic situations, and it is especially forcefully represented in the best of Euripides' *agon*-scenes. We shall see that such an intellectual and ethical breakdown in communication is sometimes underlined or reinforced by the sorts of emotional and mechanical breakdown which are the interest of this study. The former type of breakdown is better studied (and has been well studied) in interpretative essays on the individual plays.

The texts investigated include all the extant complete plays in the tragic corpus and whatever fragmentary passages possess enough continuously readable text to be of interest. In my research I went straight to the texts: the OCT's of Page, Pearson, and Murray, with secondary attention to the recent Teubner editions of Euripidean plays and (midway through my research) to Dawe's edition of the Sophoklean triad, and with selective consultation of a variety of commentaries. I did not rely on any previous lists of passages,[5] although I have checked myself at various points against the compilations of earlier scholars. As new problems presented themselves after the initial culling of examples, I was forced back to the texts in a less systematic way. Although I hope not to have omitted any important peculiarity or potential parallel from my discussions, it is possible that there are minor omissions that would not seriously affect the points I attempt to make.[6] A study of this kind inevitably becomes ensnared in problems of punctuation, distribution, and attribution of speeches and in textual cruces, many of which affect substantially one's view of the level and nature of potential discontinuities. (Indeed in the course of this work I comment on 50 problems of punctuation, refer to 70 emendations which, often for reasons related to my study of various conventions and techniques, I endorse or reject, and discuss in some detail the interpretation of 70 passages: cf. Index Locorum.) I have tried everywhere to work first with unproblematic passages and to move from them to more doubtful instances; and I normally make clear to the reader my preferences among proposed solutions and try to point out, where necessary, the implications of other views for the generalizations I make. It was of course impossible to treat all disputed passages with equal thoroughness of argument and doxographic reference.

I did not set out to establish chronological relationships (the approximate relative

---

5. For the danger of doing so see my note 3 to Chapter 4.

6. I have been saved from some omissions by the vigilance of the readers mentioned in the Preface and by having the books of Bain and Taplin at hand during final revision.

chronology which I assume for the tragedies of each author is, however, reflected in the order of the abbreviated titles at the end of the introduction). Nor was I seeking criteria for judging authenticity nor sharp distinctions between the techniques of the various playwrights, although certain tendencies have emerged in the discussions, and far more interesting and problematic passages come from Euripides than from Aischylos and Sophokles (and this is not merely because the Euripidean corpus is larger). I discuss *PV* along with the plays of Aischylos, but never apply Aischylos' name to it;[7] *Rhesos* I believe to be non-Euripidean; on rare occasions I cite passages from *Kyklops* (nothing in the dialogue-technique makes it significantly different from tragedy).

At the outset of my investigation (Chapter 1) I present a classification of questions according to their rhetorical force because one principal test of contact and continuity is the way in which a question is or is not followed up. The terminology proposed provides a useful shorthand and also serves to direct the critic's focus to important issues of dramatic interpretation. Chapter 2 is concerned with establishment of contact by characters entering the scene of dramatic action and the withdrawal from contact of a character departing from that scene. Certain refinements are made upon the technical observations of Leo and others, and emphasis is laid upon the connection between the spatial symbolism of the theater (parodos, door, *skene*/orchestra division) and contact. Of particular importance is the point made there about the imperfect contact of a person emerging through the door or turning away from those speaking in order to depart. Chapters 3 and 4 address a variety of problems related to continuity of dialogue, especially in stichomythia: in the former delayed and gradual or piecemeal answers to questions are studied; in the latter I examine suspension of syntax in stichomythia and its implications for contact and discontinuity as well as interrupted and incomplete utterances. These chapters try to establish how often (in fact, how rarely), and to what effect, the tragedians put in abeyance strict syntactic decorum and imitate the disordered brokenness of real conversation. Chapter 5, in turn, looks at emotional and psychological breaks in contact or continuity and covers the most important (and often most difficult) cases of discontinuity. In Chapter 6 the correspondence of words to action is explored with respect to some problems of address and command; disobeyed and tardily obeyed commands are thoroughly treated. Finally, Chapter 7 applies some of the results of the earlier chapters to a series of problems, ending with two passages in *Phoin.* which inspired this research. Whether or not the interpretations advanced there are accepted, it is hoped that the documentation of dialogue-techniques and contact-phenomena provided by the rest of the study will justify the effort.

In referring to the tragedies I have used abbreviations which I find convenient and which should be readily recognizable to students of Greek tragedy: namely, for Aischylos *Pe., Se.,* A.*Su., Ag., Choe., Eum., PV;* for Sophokles *Ai., Ant., Trach., OT,* S.*El, Phil., OK;* for Euripides *Alk., Med., Hkld., Hipp., Andr., Hek.,* E.*Su.,* E.*El., Tro., HF, IT, Hel., Ion, Phoin., Or., Ba., IA, Kykl., Rhes.* Only in the case of the titles *Su.* and *El.* do I bother to include A., S., or E. to indicate the author. In a few Greek quotations where attribution is in doubt a paragraphos alone is used to indicate change of speaker. Full bibliographic information about the editions, books, and articles referred to in short form in the footnotes will be found in the Bibliography.

---

7. See now the books of Griffith and Taplin.

1

THE RHETORIC OF QUESTIONS:
A PROPOSED TERMINOLOGY

As an act of speech, the posing of a question seems to involve automatically a listener or sounding-board (*das Gegenüber,* as the Germans sometimes call it) with whom the questioner intends to make contact or believes he already has contact. In fact, however, the sounding-board may be the self, or the gods, or the physical environment; and even when the sounding-board is another person present in the vicinity, there can be various degrees of contact. In studying instances of incomplete or imperfect contact or of outright discontinuity, it will be useful to have a terminology that represents the point of the act of questioning and the attitude of the questioner with more precision than is offered by the traditional dichotomy between "rhetorical question" and "true (non-rhetorical) question," for there are different kinds of questions which are not intended to elicit a verbal answer, there are responses other than verbal which a question may be intended to (and may fail to) elicit, and some ostensibly "rhetorical" questions do receive answers in certain contexts, so that the criterion implied by the usual definition of a rhetorical question is of limited value.

The terminology presented here is based on a process of transformation of the interrogative sentence into a declarative or imperatival form which brings to the surface the attitude and intent of the utterance.[1] The classification is useful in two ways: it provides a framework which forces us to be quite clear about what is going on rhetorically in a given passage (as we shall see, failure to be clear about this has often hindered both textual criticism and dramatic interpretation); and it brings to light many typical rhetorical patterns or typical situations and allows us to separate the normal and the unproblematic from the abnormal and the problematic. The terminology is designed to describe especially those cases in which a question is not followed in an obvious way by a verbal answer; but in such a complicated process as verbal communication it is not surprising that diverse intents may be combined in one utterance, so that a strictly rhetorical intent is occasionally combined with the information-seeking intent of a "true question." To meet this complication, I have established a limited number of standard pat-

---

1. The classificatory technique which I have evolved owes something to my (limited) knowledge of transformational grammar and something also to the analytic technique for moral utterances ("phrastic" vs. "neustic") developed by R. M. Hare in *The Language of Morals* (Oxford 1952). Philosophers (even of the modern school of "linguistic philosophy") seem to deal with questions only from the point of view of formal logic: cf. C. L. Hamblin, "Questions" in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* ed. Paul Edwards, vol. 7 (New York 1967) 49-53; Mary and Arthur Prior, "Erotetic Logic," *Philosophical Review* 64 (1955) 43-59; David Harrah, "A Logic of Questions and Answers," *Philosophy of Science* 28 (1961) 40-46. Richard Hamilton brings to my attention A. W. M. Whorter, "The Deliberative Type of Question as a Rhetorical and Dramatic Device in Greek Tragedy," *TAPA* 63 (1932) xlv-xlvi, an abstract which sketches a classification but offers no examples or discussion.

terns, but recognize hybrids or combinations of them. Where hybrids occur, the impor-
tant point is to determine the main intent(s) of the utterance. The terminology is there-
fore a tool, a useful shorthand, and not a mechanical substitute for interpreting the
dramatic text.

1. "TRUE" OR INFORMATION-SEEKING QUESTIONS

The process of transformation applied here is easily illustrated in the case of the most
straightforward kind of question, that which seeks information. The intent of a direct
information-seeking question may be brought out by substituting for it the correspond-
ing indirect question preceded by the imperative "tell me (us)." In a normal situation
the answerer immediately does tell:

> *Pe.* 727-728
> Δα. καὶ τί δὴ πράξασιν αὐτοῖς ὧδ' ἐπιστενάζετε;
> Βα. ναυτικὸς στρατὸς κακωθεὶς πεζὸν ὤλεσε στρατόν.

In fact, for the sake of variety, liveliness, or emphasis the "true" question is at times
expressed in the indirect form dependent on an imperative or its equivalent:

> *Pe.* 717
> τίς δ' ἐμῶν ἐκεῖσε παίδων ἐστρατηλάτει, φράσον.

> *Pe.* 230-231
>   κεῖνο δ' ἐκμαθεῖν θέλω,
> ὦ φίλοι· ποῦ τὰς Ἀθήνας φασὶν ἱδρῦσθαι χθονός;[2]

2. "RHETORICAL" QUESTIONS

(a) ASSENT-SEEKING QUESTIONS

(1) rhetorical transform questions

When we turn to questions other than information-seeking ones, the simplest trans-
formation involves those of the following sort:

> *Se.* 673
> τίς ἄλλος μᾶλλον ἐνδικώτερος;

> *OT* 895-896
> εἰ γὰρ αἱ τοιαίδε πράξεις τίμιαι,
>   τί δεῖ με χορεύειν;

> *Alk.* 942-943
> τίν' ἂν προσειπών, τοῦ δὲ προσρηθεὶς ὕπο,
> τερπνῆς τύχοιμ' ἂν εἰσόδου;[3]

---

2. The anticipatory demonstrative κεῖνο indicates that a colon should separate prefatory remark from actual question, but
Page and Murray both have a comma (Wilamowitz has the correct colon).

3. Murray is wrong to print Lenting's ἐξόδου. Cf. Dale *ad loc.*

In each case the question is equivalent to a declaration with a negative (or a zero-quantifier and relative clause) substituted for the interrogative: "who?" becomes "no one" or "there is no one who," "what need?" becomes "there is no need," etc. A question of this sort containing a negative is equivalent to a declarative with a universal quantifier ("who . . . not?" becomes "everyone"):

> S.*El.* 975-976
> τίς γάρ ποτ' ἀστῶν ἢ ξένων ἡμᾶς ἰδὼν
> τοιοῖσδ' ἐπαίνοις οὐχὶ δεξιώσεται;

The point of the interrogative form is to elicit the silent agreement or assent of the addressee and/or to emphasize, and involve the listener in accepting, the self-evident truth of the proposition. In a context of self-persuasion, the addressee may be the questioner himself. The simple rhetorical effect of this sort of question is perhaps what comes most readily to mind when one thinks of the traditional term "rhetorical question." Since no further elaboration is needed in explaining this type of question, it may be assigned the bland title *rhetorical transform* question.[4]

Rhetorical transform questions are often abbreviated in idiomatic usage. In dialogue or in rhesis confirmation of an affirmative proposition ("of course," "certainly") may be expressed telegraphically with πῶς γὰρ οὔ; or πῶς δ' οὔ; (= "there is no way in which X could not be true") or the like (e.g. *Choe. 754, Eum.* 435, S.*El.* 1307). After a negative proposition, πῶς γάρ; or πόθεν; (= "there is no way in which X could be true") or the like may express confirmation (e.g. S.*El.* 911, *Hek.* 613).[5] Sometimes the abbreviated idiomatic question is accompanied by a subordinate clause (e.g. *OT* 1015, *Ion* 1543).

2(a)(2) apodeictic questions

There are other assent-seeking questions which can be transformed into declarative propositions about particular facts, with no universal quantifier implied. These occur typically in a real or imagined argument when a speaker strongly compels assent to a particular statement by casting it in interrogative form (implying "you must agree that this is so . . ."; sometimes in a taunting tone). Such questions may be termed *apodeictic*. Many of the obvious examples of apodeictic questions are introduced by ἆρα (or ἆρ' οὐ or ἆρα μή)*,* a particle which introduces other types of question as well:

> *Choe.* 297
> τοιοῖσδε χρησμοῖς ἆρα χρὴ πεποιθέναι;

> *Se.* 208-210
> ὁ ναύτης ἆρα μὴ 'ς πρῷραν φυγὼν
> πρύμνηθεν ηὗρε μηχανὴν σωτηρίας
> νεὼς καμούσης ποντίῳ σὺν κύματι;

> *OT* 823
> ἆρ' οὐχὶ πᾶς ἄναγνος;

---

4. An instance of rhetorical transformation of this type is recognized and commented on in the verbose Σ *Med.* 500.

5. Cf. Stevens on *Andr.* 83; Denniston, *GP²* 85-86, where τί γάρ; and τί μήν; are also explained.

Alk. 771-772 (in a soliloquy)
ἆρα τὸν ξένον
στυγῶ δικαίως, ἐν κακοῖς ἀφιγμένον;

In other cases a simple οὐ (*OK* 838 οὐκ ἠγόρευον ταῦτ' ἐγώ;) or μὴ (*Pe*. 344) or μὴ οὖν = μῶν (A.*Su*. 417, *Med*. 567) may suffice.

2(b) APORETIC AND DELIBERATIVE QUESTIONS

2(b)(1) aporetic questions

For the purposes of this study a distinction will be made between questions in which possible courses of behavior are viewed *en masse* with an attitude of *aporia* (i.e. uncertainty, indecision, or embarrassment at the wealth of possibilities) and those in which the adoption of a particular course of behavior is debated. The former type will be designated *aporetic:* the declarative transformation implied is "I am at a loss (*or* I don't know) what to do, what to say, how to do X, etc."[6] The following examples illustrate the class of aporetic questions:

Ag. 648
πῶς κεδνὰ τοῖς κακοῖσι συμμείξω . . . ;

Choe. 997
τί νιν προσείπω, κἂν τύχω μάλ' εὐστομῶν;

Ai. 457
καὶ νῦν τί χρὴ δρᾶν;

OT 1419
οἴμοι, τί δῆτα λέξομεν πρὸς τόνδ' ἔπος;

Alk. 912-914
ὦ σχῆμα δόμων, πῶς εἰσέλθω;
πῶς δ'οἰκήσω μεταπίπτοντος
δαίμονος;

Phoin. 1172
Καπανεὺς δὲ πῶς εἴποιμ' ἂν ὡς ἐμαίνετο;

2(b)(2) deliberative questions

The term *deliberative* question, on the other hand, will here be limited to those cases in which a person asks himself about a specific course of action: "Am I to do X?" (declarative transformation: "I am deliberating, am uncertain, whether to do X").

Choe. 998-999
ἄγρευμα θηρός [νιν προσείπω], ἢ νεκροῦ ποδένδυτον
δροίτης κατασκήνωμα;

6. For the actual use of the declarative form cf. *Med.* 376-377: πολλὰς δ'ἔχουσα θανασίμους αὐτοῖς ὁδούς, / οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποίᾳ πρῶτον ἐγχειρῶ.

Ai. 460-461
πότερα πρὸς οἴκους, ναυλόχους λιπὼν ἕδρας
μόνους τ᾿ Ἀτρείδας, πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον περῶ;

Deliberative questions are the natural follow-up to an aporetic question, as is clear from the examples from *Choe.* and *Ai.* given above and from the frequent occurrence of sequences like the following:

Hek. 737-738
Ἑκάβη, τί δράσω; πότερα προσπέσω γόνυ
Ἀγαμέμνονος τοῦδ᾿ ἢ φέρω σιγῇ κακά;

Ion 756 and 758
εἶεν· τί δρῶμεν; θάνατος ὧν κεῖται πέρι . . .
εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν; ἢ τί δράσομεν;

Aporetic and deliberative questions usually occur in contexts featuring some degree of abstraction from close contact with a listener, whether this be actual physical solitude or temporary withdrawal from contact or merely the mild distance created by self-conscious rhetoric (*Phoin.* 1172, above). There are, however, questions which are identical in form to aporetic and deliberative questions, but which appeal directly to a listener for advice; that is, they establish (or presuppose) close contact. When the advice-seeking function is uppermost, the question operates in the manner of a "true" question and may be explicated through transformation to an imperatival rather than declarative form: "Tell me what I am to do" or "Tell me whether or not I am to do X." For example, in *Choe.* 84-105 the long series of questions which are aporetic and deliberative in form (87-99) is framed by appeals for help in reaching a decision (84-86 and 100-105): the degree of contact and the consequent difference in rhetorical and dramatic force distinguish these from the sequences illustrated above.

2(c) AGNOETIC QUESTIONS

Contact between questioner and listener(s) is also low or non-existent when the speaker is in ignorance or confusion about what has happened, what is happening, or what will or may happen and asks a question either with no expectation that anyone will answer (because no one knows the answer or no one able to answer is present) or with no certain expectation of an answer (because the speaker has not previously established contact with the potential answerer). Such questions may be viewed as convertible to declarations such as "I don't know whether (who, what). . ." or "I wonder whether …" and may be termed *agnoetic,* since the main point is the speaker's ignorance or incomprehension of some state of affairs. When an agnoetic question refers to a prospective state of affairs, it may be quite similar to an aporetic or deliberative question, but the latter forms refer only to the speaker's own actions. The following are prospective agnoetic questions:

Se. 93-94
τίς ἄρα ῥύσεται, τίς ἄρ᾿ ἐπαρκέσει
θεῶν ἢ θεᾶν;

Choe. 1075-1076
ποῖ δῆτα κρανεῖ, ποῖ καταλήξει
μετακοιμισθὲν μένος ἄτης;

Tro. 1188-1189
τί καί ποτε
γράψειεν ἄν σε μουσοποιὸς ἐν τάφῳ;

Agnoetic questions referring to the present or past are especially common in contexts of minimal contact, such as in choral odes, in "throw-away" choral couplets, and upon the entrance of a character.

(choral ode) *Ag.* 681-687
τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν ὧδ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως . . . ;[7]

(choral ode) A.*Su.* 1045-1046
τί ποτ' εὔπλοιαν ἔπραξαν
ταχυπόμποισι διωγμοῖς;

(entrance) *PV* 114-115
ἆ ἆ ἔα ἔα·
τίς ἀχώ, τίς ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής;

(entrance) E.*Su.* 87-89
τίνων γόων ἤκουσα καὶ στέρνων κτύπον
νεκρῶν τε θρήνους, τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων ἄπο
ἠχοῦς ἰούσης;

(choral couplet) *Tro.* 292-293
τὸ μὲν σὸν οἶσθα, πότνια, τὰς δ' ἐμὰς τύχας
τίς ἆρ' Ἀχαιῶν ἢ τίς Ἑλλήνων ἔχει;

Just as an aporetic question may be followed by a narrower deliberative question, so a broad agnoetic question may be followed by narrower or more specific agnoetic questions, especially alternative ones:

Pe. 144-149
πῶς ἄρα πράσσει Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς
Δαρειογενής;
πότερον τόξου ῥῦμα τὸ νικῶν,
ἢ δορικράνου
λόγχης ἰσχὺς κεκράτηκεν;

IT 576-577
φεῦ φεῦ· τί δ' ἡμεῖς οἵ τ' ἐμοὶ γεννήτορες;
ἆρ' εἰσίν; ἆρ' οὐκ εἰσί; τίς φράσειεν ἄν;

7. The main question is agnoetic: "we are amazed and in ignorance as to who did it so truly." Parenthetically, or as a change of direction in mid-sentence, an apodeictic question is intruded: "Was it not someone ...?" = "indeed, it was someone ..."

2(d) INDIGNANT AND SURPRISED QUESTIONS

2(d)(1) apistetic questions

Sometimes the primary purpose of uttering a question is to express disbelief, surprise, shock, or dismay at what has happened, is happening, or is about to happen. Assuming the declarative transformation "I can hardly believe (I am shocked at) X," we may coin the term *apistetic*[8] to describe such questions.

> *Choe.* 909
> πατροκτονοῦσα γὰρ ξυνοικήσεις ἐμοί;
>
> *Eum.* 717-718
> ἦ καὶ πατήρ τι σφάλλεται βουλευμάτων
> πρωτοκτόνοισι προστροπαῖς Ἰξίονος;
>
> *Ai.* 1226-1227
> σὲ δὴ τὰ δεινὰ ῥήματ’ ἀγγέλλουσί μοι
> τλῆναι καθ’ ἡμῶν ὧδ’ ἀνοιμωκτεὶ χανεῖν;[9]
>
> *Trach.* 1133
> οἴμοι· πρὶν ὡς χρῆν σφ’ ἐξ ἐμῆς θανεῖν χερός;
>
> *Hipp.* 415-416
> αἲ πῶς ποτ’ . . .
> βλέπουσιν ἐς πρόσωπα τῶν ξυνευνετῶν . . .;
>
> *Tro.* 978-981
> πότερον ἀμείνον’ ὡς λάβῃ Διὸς πόσιν;
> ἢ γάμον Ἀθηνᾶ θεῶν τινος θηρωμένη,[10]
> ἢ παρθενείαν πατρὸς ἐξῃτήσατο,
> φεύγουσα λέκτρα;

The most frequently-used apistetic questions in tragedy are the short exclamations τί φῄς;, πῶς φῄς; and τί (πῶς) εἶπας; These occasionally express (a) a real inability to assimilate what has just been said and a real need for repetition or clarification; but more commonly they express (b) dismay or surprise at what has just been said and clearly comprehended (it is then equivalent to a strong "What!" or "Oh, no!"):

> (a) *Ag.* 268
> πῶς φῄς; πέφευγε τοὖπος ἐξ ἀπιστίας.
>
> *Trach.* 349-350
> τί φῄς; σαφῶς μοι φράζε πᾶν ὅσον νοεῖς·
> ἃ μὲν γὰρ ἐξείρηκας ἀγνοία μ’ ἔχει
>
> (b) *PV* 773
> πῶς εἶπας; ἦ ’μὸς παῖς σ’ ἀπαλλάξει κακῶν;

---

8. Cf. Σ *Med.* 695: ἀπιστῶν τοῦτο λέγει.

9. Dawe prints a semicolon instead of a question mark; I prefer the latter, with Jebb and Pearson.

10. I return to the interpretation of the old editions; Murray, Biehl, and Lee print τίνος.

Phil. 1237
τί φής, Ἀχιλλέως παῖ; τίν᾽ εἴρηκας λόγον; (cf. 1238-1240)

E.El. 556
τί φής; ὅδ᾽ ὃς σὸν ἐξέκλεψε σύγγονον;

Ba. 1032-1033
πῶς φής; τί τοῦτ᾽ ἔλεξας; ἦ 'πὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς
χαίρεις κακῶς πράσσουσι δεσπόταις, γύναι;

2(d)(2) epiplectic questions

An apistetic question may, in addition to implying "*I* am shocked, *I* am unable to believe . . .," carry the implication "I can't believe that *you* mean X or are doing Y," or *"You* can't possibly mean X or be doing Y," from which it is a small step to "You shouldn't mean X or be doing Y." When the attitude of disbelief or shock is thus used to rebuke, browbeat, or admonish another person, the question may suitably be called *epiplectic.*[11]

Ag. 1543-1546
ἦ σὺ τόδ᾽ ἔρξαι τλήσῃ, κτείνασ᾽
ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς ἀποκωκῦσαι
ψυχῇ τ᾽ ἄχαριν χάριν ἀντ᾽ ἔργων
μεγάλων ἀδίκως ἐπικρᾶναι;

Ai. 288-291
κἀγὼ 'πιπλήσσω καὶ λέγω· τί χρῆμα δρᾷς,
Αἴας; τί τήνδ᾽ ἄκλητος οὔθ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀγγέλων
κληθεὶς ἀφορμᾷς πεῖραν οὔτε του κλύων
σάλπιγγος;

OT 1391-1393
ἰὼ Κιθαιρών, τί μ᾽ ἐδέχου; τί μ᾽ οὐ λαβὼν
ἔκτεινας εὐθύς, ὡς ἔδειξα μήποτε
ἐμαυτὸν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔνθεν ἦ γεγώς;

S.El. 328-329
τίν᾽ αὖ σὺ τήνδε πρὸς θυρῶνος ἐξόδοις
ἐλθοῦσα φωνεῖς, ὦ κασιγνήτη, φάτιν . . .;

Hipp. 439-440
ἐρᾷς· τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν.
κἄπειτ᾽ ἔρωτος οὕνεκα ψυχὴν ὀλεῖς;

E.El. 1107-1108[12]
σὺ δ᾽ ὧδ᾽ ἄλουτος καὶ δυσείματος χρόα
λεχὼ νεογνῶν ἐκ τόκων πεπαυμένη;

Hipp. 490
τί σεμνομυθεῖς;

11. For the name, cf. *Ai.* 288 (quoted below), *OK* 1730.
12. The force and position of this couplet are discussed below, Chapter 5, section 7.

Alk. 551-552
τί δρᾷς; τοιαύτης συμφορᾶς προκειμένης,
Ἄδμητε, τολμᾷς ξενοδοκεῖν; τί μῶρος εἶ;

HF 975-976
. . . ὦ τεκών, τί δρᾷς; τέκνα
κτείνεις;

A..*Su.* 911-913
οὗτος τί ποιεῖς; ἐκ ποίου φρονήματος
ἀνδρῶν Πελασγῶν τήνδ’ ἀτιμάζεις χθόνα;
ἀλλ’ ἦ γυναικῶν ἐς πόλιν δοκεῖς μολεῖν;

As the examples above show, the epiplectic force of such utterances can be directed to past actions as well as present or prospective behavior, and a sharp epiplectic question may be the equivalent of a severe admonition or even a prohibition ("What are you doing?" implying "Don't do that!"). The effect of prohibition is also noticeable in certain brief idiomatic epiplectic questions which dismiss a topic or a word, whether one's own or someone else's:

PV 101
καίτοι τί φημί;

E. *Su.* 750 and *Phoin.* 382
ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτα;

PV 766
τί δ’ ὅντιν’ (*sc.* γάμον); οὐ γὰρ ῥητὸν αὐδᾶσθαι τόδε.

OT 1056
τί δ’ ὅντιν’ εἶπε; μηδὲν ἐντραπῇς.

Phoin. 1726-1727
τί τλάς; τί τλάς; οὐχ ὁρᾷ Δίκα κακούς,
οὐδ’ ἀμείβεται βροτῶν ἀσυνεσίας.

IA 460-461
τὴν δ’ αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον — τί παρθένον;
Ἅιδης νιν, ὡς ἔοικε, νυμφεύσει τάχα.—

2(e) IMPERATIVAL AND OPTATIVAL QUESTIONS

  2(e)(1) imperatival questions

There are two major classes of questions that may be treated as equivalent to imperatives. The first features the very common use of οὐ + fut. ind. to express an exhortation, recommendation, or command (or οὐ + μή + fut. ind. for a prohibition):

Se. 250
οὐ σῖγα μηδὲν τῶνδ’ ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν;

Eum. 124
οὐκ ἀναστήσῃ τάχος;

Ant. 885
οὐκ ἄξεθ’ ὡς τάχιστα;

Hipp. 498-499
ὦ δεινὰ λέξασ’, οὐχὶ συγκλῇσεις στόμα
καὶ μὴ μεθήσεις αὖθις αἰσχίστους λόγους;

The second class includes questions which contain verbs of perception like κλύω, ἀκούω, ὁράω, λεύσσω. In some cases the poets choose to create a formal counterpointing of question and answer (e.g. ὁρᾷς; . . . ὁρῶ, *Hek.*760-761, *Hipp.* 1395-1396). But many interrogative sentences containing such verbs are used to invite or command someone to direct his attention to something. Such questions are common in appeals to the gods or to some other sympathetic audience not physically within range of one’s voice, but even if the addressee is physically present no verbal answer is needed:

Med. 160-161
ὦ μεγάλα Θέμι καὶ πότνι’ Ἄρτεμι
λεύσσεθ’ ἃ πάσχω . . .;[13]

Phoin. 611
ὦ πάτερ, κλύεις ἃ πάσχω;

Med. 168 (nurse to the chorus)
κλύεθ’ οἷα λέγει . . .;

2(e)(2) optatival questions

Questions containing τίς (πῶς, etc.) ἄν + opt. may have either agnoetic force or the force of rhetorical transform questions (e.g. *Ag.* 1341-1342 τίς ἂν ἐξεύξαιτο βροτῶν ἀσινεῖ / δαίμονι φῦναι τάδ’ ἀκούων; = οὐδεὶς ἂν . . .). When an element of wishing is added to the agnoetic element (“I don’t know who might do X, but I wish someone would do X”), the question may be termed *optatival*:

Ag. 1448-1451
φεῦ, τίς ἂν ἐν τάχει μὴ περιώδυνος
        μηδὲ δεμνιοτήρης
μόλοι τὸν αἰεὶ φέρουσ’ ἐν ἡμῖν
μοῖρ’ ἀτέλευτον ὕπνον . . .;

Phil. 1213-1214
ὦ πόλις ὦ πόλις πατρία,
πῶς ἂν εἰσίδοιμί σ’ἄθλιός γ’ ἀνήρ . . .;

Hipp. 208-209
πῶς ἂν δροσερᾶς ἀπὸ κρηνῖδος
καθαρῶν ὑδάτων πῶμ’ ἀρυσαίμαν . . .;

---

13. It is possible to interpret this as imperative rather than indicative interrogative, but the number of parallels for what might be called perception-appeals and the heightened liveliness favor the interrogative interpretation. There is also the dramatic gain of parallelism (with reversal of roles) between Medeia here and Iason at the close of the play (note especially *Med.* 1405-1407).

It should be possible to assign virtually all questions in tragic dialogue and tragic lyric to one of the classes described above *or* to some hybrid of these classes. The classification is especially useful for the preliminary work of separating and setting aside the hundreds of non-problematic and (for our purposes) uninteresting cases in which a question does not evoke a response in either words or actions. In all cases, but especially in the problematic ones, rhetorical classification must be combined with a consideration of the context of the act of communication, in particular, of the degree of contact.

Two examples will show the need for such an approach. The question uttered by Herakles in *Trach.* 1010ff. has been a subject of confusion and disputation from the time of the scholiasts to Kamerbeek's commentary.

> *Trach.* 1010-1014
> ἧπταί μου, τοτοτοῖ, ἥδ᾽ αὖθ᾽ ἕρπει. πόθεν ἔστ᾽, ὦ
> πάντων Ἑλλάνων ἀδικώτατοι ἀνέρες, οἷς δὴ
> πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πόντῳ, κατά τε δρία πάντα καθαίρων,
> ὠλεκόμαν ὁ τάλας, καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τῷδε νοσοῦντι
> οὐ πῦρ, οὐκ ἔγχος τις ὀνήσιμον οὐκετι τρέψει;

The question πόθεν ἐστέ; is an indignant one; it may be classified as apistetic/epiplectic because Herakles is expressing his outraged disbelief ("I can scarcely believe that you come from any Greek stock, since you behave this way.") and is in fact belaboring those present in the hope of stirring them to show gratitude by releasing him from his suffering. The point of the question is in its asking, and the context is not one of prosaic contact between Herakles and his addressees (cf. Chapter 5, section l[a]).[14] Apparently some ancient commentator (Σ *Trach.* 1010) did assume a normal, prosaic form of contact between Herakles and those on stage with him; then, presumably finding a literal reading illogical, he insisted that the question is addressed over the heads of those present to all Greeks whom Herakles had ever benefitted and that πόθεν here means ποῦ. Likewise, when Kamerbeek suggests that the interpretation favored above "yields an almost comic effect," he seems to be treating the question as a prosaic true question seeking information. He is willing to follow Campbell in assuming a rhetorical transform question ("whence?" implies "because none appeared from any quarter" (Campbell), i.e., "there is no place from which anyone appeared"), but fails to recognize the possibility of an apistetic/epiplectic question in which the Greek words are not tortured into artificial meanings. Excessive faith in the judgment of the scholiast may, as often, be a major cause of the persistence of the false interpretation, but both the ancient commentator and his followers did not make sufficient allowance for the variety of rhetorical forces which the uttering of a question may have.

Attention to the degree of contact in the context is especially important because on occasion a question which is identical in outward form to one of the types of "rhetorical" question described above and which does carry the same sort of rhetorical force nevertheless functions as a "true" question because in context it demands an answer ("tell me"). For example, consider:

---

14. Jebb surely recognized this, but adduced a very prosaic πόθεν-question (*Od.* 17.373) as a parallel (solely for the sense of πόθεν εἶναι); see also R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *BICS* 16 (1969) 47 n.12.

Ant. 921
ποίαν παρεξελθοῦσα δαιμόνων δίκην;

Phoin. 1655-1656
Αν. τί πλημμελήσας, τὸ μέρος εἰ μετῆλθε γῆς;
Κρ. ἄταφος ὅδ᾽ ἀνήρ, ὡς μάθῃς, γενήσεται.

The former is part of a monologue-like rhesis in which Antigone is out of contact with Kreon and the chorus; ποίαν is a rhetorically stronger substitute for τίνα, and the question itself is a rhetorical transform question equivalent to declarative οὐδεμίαν παρεξελθοῦσα κτλ. In the *Phoin.* stichomythia a question of similar meaning and form implies the declarative transformation οὐδὲν πλημμελήσας, but in a context of close contact there is also an apistetic/epiplectic force. The question implies that Kreon is unlikely to produce a satisfactory answer to this particular argument and challenges him to do so. The line is also a "true" question in the sense that, with this degree of contact, it does demand a response ("Tell me!"). Kreon's response is not an answer, but a refusal to answer[15] expressed by the act of breaking off from the argument (but not breaking contact with Antigone, as he later does for a short time at 1676).

APPENDIX: OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION

The following outline summarizes the classification proposed in this chapter:
1. "True" or information-seeking questions
   e.g. "What is X?" = "Tell me what X is."
2. "Rhetorical" questions
   (a) assent-seeking questions
      (1) rhetorical transform (universal quantifier implied)
         e.g. "Who is more appropriate?" = "There is no one who is more appropriate."
      (2) apodeictic (no universal quantifier implied)
         e.g. "Am I not utterly unholy?" = "Indeed, (you must take it as demonstrated that) I am utterly unholy."
   (b) questions expressing doubt about contemplated action (action within the power of the speaker)
      (1) aporetic (possible courses viewed *en masse)*
         e.g. "What ought I to do?" = "I am at a loss what I ought to do." "How am I to do X?" = "I am at a loss (to pick among many possibilities) how to do X."
      (2) deliberative (one possible course debated)
         e.g. "Shall I do X?" = "I am deliberating, am uncertain, whether to do X."
   (c) agnoetic questions (implying ignorance, confusion, incomprehension)
      (1) prospective (about a future action beyond the control of the speaker)
         e.g. "What will become of me?" = "I do not know what will become of me."

15. See Chapter 5, section 3.

       (2) other (present or past reference)
          e.g. "What noise do I hear?" = "I do not know what noise it is that I hear."
  (d) indignant and surprised questions
       (1) apistetic
          e.g. "Will you, the murderer of my father, live in the same house with me?"
          = "I can't believe, I am shocked, you can't mean to propose, that you will
          live . . ."
       (2) epiplectic
          e.g. "Will you dare to do X?" = "I admonish, rebuke, browbeat, you strong-
          ly not to do X" or "Do not do X!"
  (e) imperatival and optatival questions
       (1) imperatival
          (α) οὐ + fut. ind. = command; οὐ μὴ + fut. ind. = prohibition
          (β) perception-appeals
          e.g. "Do you hear this, Zeus?" = "Hear this, Zeus."
       (2) optatival
          e.g. "How might someone do X?" = "I wish that someone would do X."

2

CONTACT:
ESTABLISHMENT AND
PHYSICAL WITHDRAWAL

Before one can isolate discontinuities and breakdowns in awareness and effective communication between speakers on the tragic stage, it is necessary to be certain that the speakers have established contact or maintained mutual contact. There are conventions related to entrances and exits which govern the degree and nature of the contact, and these deserve to be studied here. Leo and Schadewaldt discussed some of them in describing the Euripidean *Auftrittsmonolog,* and more recently Bain has examined various relevant conventions with the help of the concept of "asides." Nevertheless, the concept of contact provides a slightly different and (I think) more fruitful approach to the same issues, and it is still possible to make refinements and useful distinctions beyond those offered in earlier studies.

The two sites of normal entry and exit on the Greek stage, the parodoi and (at least from the *Oresteia* onwards)[1] the *skene-door,* need to be considered separately. Whenever a character proceeds along a parodos and enters the imaginary dramatic locus already occupied by characters on the acting-stage or by chorus in the orchestra[2] or by both, there is need to establish contact. As we shall see, convention allows gradual establishment of contact (visual contact before dialogue-contact, sometimes both preceded by complete lack of contact), and there seems to be a certain "etiquette" applicable to partial contact (that is, awareness or acknowledgment of only the chorus or only the actors or only part of the tableau on stage). Similar conventions, less frequently exploited by the dramatists and not always recognized by scholars, exist for the door-space, or more accurately, for the act of emerging from the door and the act of turning to depart through the door.

---

1. Wilamowitz's theory (*Hermes* 21 [1886] 597-622) that the plays earlier than the *Oresteia* presuppose a *Pagos-Bühne* without defined acting-area or fixed *skene*-building directly opposite the auditorium is attractive and probably correct (only "probably" because it is conceivable that for a while after a transition from *Pagos-Bühne* to the later form plays were written making no use of the new *skene*-building and treating a slightly raised acting-stage as equivalent to a *pagos).* His theory is endorsed by Graeber, 4ff.; Bodensteiner, 645ff.; Siegfried Melchinger, *Das Theater der Tragödie* (München 1974) 12-36; and most recently Taplin, *Stagecraft* Appendix C. N. G. L. Hammond, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 387-450, comes to the same conclusion, using evidence and arguments of mixed value.

2. I believe the probabilities are in favor of recognition of a demarcation between choral dancing-area and actors' acting-space, at least for the *Oresteia* and later, although it must be recognized that movement between the two was readily possible and was exploited on occasion by the tragedians. Cf. Hourmouziades, 58-74. The question whether the acting-stage was on the same level as the dancing-floor or higher by a few feet is strictly a separate one, but my own opinion is that a raised stage is more probable than the alternative. Cf. again Hourmouziades, and the Appendix to this chapter.

1. PARODOS-ENTRANCES IN AISCHYLOS AND SOPHOKLES

 The most fully developed exploitation of the possibilities of delayed or partial contact is to be found in Euripides, who combines, here as elsewhere, a self-conscious striving for naturalism or verisimilitude with a ready acceptance of non-naturalistic conventions. But simpler techniques are already present in Aischylos and Sophokles. Because a character is actually in view for some time before reaching center-stage and because in Greek drama there appears to be a tendency to preserve a continuum of sound,[3] all the poets may elect to cover the time required for the movement with comments made in incomplete contact (the announcer sees but does not address the newcomer, and the newcomer does not hear the announcement). In Aischylos the majority (by almost 2:1)[4] of entrances via the parodoi are unannounced, and whether announced or not the newcomer normally initiates the dialogue. The sequence in which one already present announces preliminary visual contact and then initiates dialogue-contact is rare: *Pe.* 150ff. (visual) and 155ff. (dialogue); *Se* 861ff. (visual) and 871ff. (dialogue)—spurious?[5] The situation is similar in Sophokles, although announced entrances are slightly more common than unannounced, announcement by actor rather than by koryphaios gains somewhat in frequency, and it is less exceptional for an actor already present to initiate dialogue-contact with the newcomer after the announcement (but this is always a mark of eagerness).[6]

 On a few occasions Aischylos and Sophokles allow fairly extensive passages to cover the gradual approach of a newcomer along the parodos (without dialogue-contact: *Ag.* 489-502, *Choe.* 10-21, *PV* 114-127, S.*El.* 1428-1441, *OK* 310-323; with contact: *Ag.*

---

 3. Cf. Taplin, *Silences* 57 and n.2.

 4. For parodos-entry by chorus or actor upon a stage already occupied by chorus or actor, my figures for Aischylos (including *PV)* are 11 announcements in 30 instances. With regard to these figures and others to be given later, note that others may easily arrive at slightly different numbers because several of the instances counted or rejected depend on judgments made about continued presence vs. departure and re-entry. I am interested here in entrances and announcements only insofar as contact-phenomena are revealed; therefore I do not give complete lists and discussion, for which see esp. Bodensteiner, 703ff., 725ff.; Hourmouziades, 137-145; Taplin, *Stagecraft* 71-72 and passim; 1 understand that Richard Hamilton has an article on the subject forthcoming.

 5. Contrast *Pe.* 246-248, *Se.* 369-374 (two announcements), *Ag.* 489ff. (see note 9 below), *PV* 941-943 (and also 114ff. with preliminary aural rather than visual contact). In *Choe.* 10 Orestes sights the chorus and Elektra, but withdraws to hide. In *Su.* 180, of course, the sighting must be assumed to be imaginary (like that in *Su.* 713) since so much intervenes between the sighting and Pelasgos' first words.

 This is perhaps the appropriate place to record my view of Apollo's (re-)entrance for the trial-scene in *Eum.*, the technique of which is so unusual that Taplin, *Stagecraft* 395ff., assigns 574-575 to Athena and posits extensive reworking. I would have Apollo enter at 566, simultaneously with Athena and the herald and the other mute extras (but perhaps from the opposite parodos), and go immediately to stand by Orestes: he is unannounced because his entrance is well-prepared for by his own statement (64, 81-83) and Athena's instruction to call witnesses (485-486), because Athena enters giving instructions to a servant (cf. E.*Su.* 381ff.; Stevens on *Andr.* 146; Taplin, *Stagecraft* 363-365) and so preempts immediate announcement, and because the chorus here is not a normal group of observing bystanders such as could give a normal announcement. The first acknowledgment of Apollo comes as soon as possible, at 574, and the unusual technique of abrupt address by the chorus (the lines seem to me too brusque, even impolite, to be spoken by anyone else) is deliberately exploited to express the chorus's keen interest in Apollo's arrival and the hostility it feels for him. Such a representation of eagerness would be a forerunner of Sophoklean and Euripidean technique (notes 6 and 16 below).

 6. For entry upon a scene already occupied by chorus or actors, my figures for Sophokles are 28 announced out of 46 instances. An actor already present initiates dialogue after an announcement at *Ant.* 632, *Trach.* 61, 227, *OT* 85, 300, 1121, *OK 33*; *Ai.* 1171 is similar, but the newcomers addressed are mute characters. Initiation of the dialogue by the chorus is still very rare: *Ai.* 1316 (no announcement; eagerness evident); *Ai.* 979 (the chorus initiates only because Teukros' grief makes him immune to normal contact; see below); if Dawe is correct in adopting Morstadt's treatment of *Ai.* 1223, the choral couplet could be made to combine announcement and address to Teukros; and probably *Ant.* 379ff. (after an announcement; surprise evident)—see Chapter 5, section 8.

783-809). But newcomers are not allowed to speak in a conventional isolation (i.e. with the pretence that they do not yet see those present or are not yet in earshot)[7] at some point between coming into view and reaching center-stage, at least not in the way Euripidean characters do.[8] The herald in the second episode of *Ag.* delivers a long rhesis (503-537) which appears to take no notice of Klytaimestra and the chorus, even though Klytaimestra had commented on the messenger's approach.[9] An exchange is initiated only at 538, by the koryphaios. The absence of direct dialogue-contact prior to 538, how-ever, seems to be due not to an emotional transport which prevents the herald from notic-ing those present,[10] but rather to a combination of emotion, "etiquette," and general Aischylean rhesis-technique. The rhesis is directed at the house and the gods and the entire environment, which includes the other actor and the chorus (and the audience) without emphasizing a personal "horizontal" relationship[11] between the human charac-ters.[12] Moreover, there are other passages which suggest that it is conventional "eti-quette" for a newcomer to address the house before greeting the chorus and to deal with a chorus before addressing a female character on stage (especially, but not solely, if the newcomer is a stranger). In *Pe.* 249ff., for instance, the messenger invokes his homeland before addressing his report to the chorus, and then engages in an epirrhematic ex-change with the chorus through line 289, paying no heed to the queen. Similarly, in *OT* 924ff., the Korinthian herald speaks to the chorus and is referred by it to Iokaste, in S.*El.* 660 the old man directs his inquiry to the chorus before addressing Klytaimestra, and in *El.* 1098 Orestes converses first with the chorus, which refers him to Elektra.[13] The "etiquette" which allows a woman to be "ignored" is perhaps relevant to *Ag.* 810ff. as well. There is no lack of contact or lack of respect when Agamemnon addresses Argos and the gods first before responding in 830 to the chorus's greeting. And if Klytaimestra is already present (and does not emerge from the house at 855, having exited at 614, as I

7. The apparent isolation of newcomers such as Xerxes at *Pe.* 908 and Kreon at *Ant.* 1261 (cf. the sisters in *Se.* 875ff. or 961ff., if one assigns either passage to them) is emotional rather than conventional.

8. The Aischylean passages I discuss are also treated by Bain, 67-70; see note 12 below.

9. The length, content, and tone of 489-500 as well as the probability of change of speaker at 501 and the apparent refer-ence to 475-487 in 590-593 persuade me that Klytaimestra is present from 350 on and speaks 489-500; in this 1 agree with Denniston/Page *ad loc.* and A. M. Dale, *Collected Papers* (Cambridge 1969) 215, against Fraenkel *ad he.* Taplin, *Stagecraft* 285-290 and 294-297, argues ably for Klytaimestra's departure before the stasimon and for attribution of 489ff. to the kory-phaios; but I still believe there is good dramatic point in her continued presence and personal attendance at her triumph over the doubting, feeble male chorus. The point I make about Aischylean rhesis-technique holds true even if Klytaimestra is not present.

10. Interpreting the lack of contact in terms of emotional self-absorption, Schadewaldt, 51, saw in this rhesis a new exten-sive form of *Selbstäusserung;* but he exaggerates the emotions and neglects the formality and occasional sombre details of the speech. Leo, 8, is also inclined to interpret the speech as being given before the character notices the chorus. Emotion plays a role in shaping the scene, but other factors are involved.

11. For the concept of "horizontal" vs. "vertical" relationships, cf. Seidensticker, *Gesprachsverdichtung* 66-67; Schade-waldt, 53; K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles³* (Frankfurt 1948) 10ff.

12. The same characteristics can be observed in e.g. the rhesis of Aigisthos, *Ag.* 1577-1611, which Schadewaldt, 53 n.2, correctly distinguishes from Euripidean entrance-monologues (cf. Leo, 30 n.4). Similarly, although Athena does not refer to visual contact with those present until *Eum.* 406 or directly address the Erinyes and Orestes until 408, her lines 397-404 are not, in my judgment, spoken without awareness of the situation on stage (as Leo, 8, and Bain, 69-70, believe): there is none of the surprise so clearly marked in Euripidean examples; it is reasonable for an audience to assume that the goddess, responding to a summons, arrives "with her eyes open"; and the self-introduction may be read as a proem to explicit contact (cf. *Med.* 131ff. and *Hyps.* fr. I.iv.15ff. Bond) rather than as a self-revelation preceding visual contact.

13. Also of interest are *Ant.* 988, where Teiresias (admittedly a blind character) addresses the chorus rather than beginning with ποῦ Κρέων; ; *El.* 1442 (Aigisthos does not pay Elektra the compliment of addressing her before the chorus); *OK* 728 (Kreon seeks to conciliate the chorus before addressing Oidipous). Graeber, Chap. I, notes that in Aischylos actors almost always address themselves on arrival to the chorus rather than to another actor. See now Taplin, *Stagecraft* 86-87.

prefer to believe), the fact that the king deals with the public as represented by the chorus and fails to address his wife seems to accord with conventional stage-etiquette. Consequently, it is improper to infer, at any rate from this aspect of his behavior, psychological traits in Agamemnon (such as tactlessness or lack of love) or motivation in Klytaimestra (a final spur to her plans).

Three further passages in Aischylos and Sophokles deserve mention in connection with isolation of entering characters from full contact with the stage-situation. In *Ai.* 974ff. Teukros sights the body of Aias from the parodos and in his grief pays no attention to Tekmessa or the chorus: the couplet 977-978 fills a brief moment of self-absorption, and it is the koryphaios who initiates dialogue-contact. This is clearly a non-conventional, pathos-generated moment of isolation.[14] More conventional, or (one might say) more illusionistic in the exploitation of the parodos/orchestra space, are the search-scenes in *Eum.* 244-253 and *Ai.* 866-890: the movements and gaze of the choruses re-entering on the parodoi are choreographed so that they do not immediately reach a point (whether actual or imaginary) from which they can detect what they seek. The Salaminian sailors, in fact, are directed to the right spot only by Tekmessa's cries.

2. PARODOS-ENTRANCES IN EURIPIDES

Statistically, the technique of parodos-entrance in Euripidean tragedy is much the same as for Sophoklean. Slightly fewer than half the arrivals are announced (somewhat more often by chorus than by an actor already present); and in the vast majority of cases it is the newcomer, whether announced or not, who initiates dialogue-contact with those already present.[15] In the few cases in which an actor already present on stage initiates the dialogue, this is a mark of eagerness or some other special circumstance,[16] as it is in Sophokles. There are, however, two significant innovations in Euripides' treatment of entering characters that involve a creative use of the spatial realities of the theater: the newcomer can speak in isolation from contact while still approaching the main scene of action; and the newcomer can have "partial vision" and make contact with only part of the tableau that awaits him. The effect of both innovations is to allow glimpses of self-revelation prior to contact and to heighten dramatic moments of surprised realization.

In allowing the newcomer to speak in a conventional isolation, Euripides is transfer-ring to the entering character a sequence previously applied to those on the stage or in the orchestra. Instead of the sequence (1) dialogue or song, (2) visual contact stage-to-parodos, with comment out of contact, (3) initiation of dialogue, we now have (1)

14. Cf. the passages in note 7 above and *OT* 1297ff., where the blinded Oidipous *emerges from the door* singing in grief and acknowledges the chorus only in 1321ff., after the chorus's third speech.

15. For entry upon a scene already occupied by chorus or actors, my figures for Euripidean tragedy (excluding *Rhesos)* are 49 announced entrances (19 announced by actors, 30 by chorus) in 107 instances.

16. This occurs in at most 13 (out of 107) instances. Eagerness of the actor already on stage (combined sometimes with reluctance on the part of the newcomer) is evident in *Hkld.* 52 (hostility), 381; *El.* 880; *IT* 467; *Or.* 136 (I hope to present arguments elsewhere for Biehl's retention of *Or.* 136-139 and for assignment of 140-141 to the chorus, against di Benedetto), 1018, 1321 (eagerness to make good the stratagem); *Ba.* 1233. Somewhat different are the cases in which the newcomers do say something, but do not address those present: *Hipp.* 1389 (Hippolytos up to this point distraught with pain); *Hek.* 1109ff. (partial vision and perhaps pretence on Agamemnon's part; see below); *Phoin.* 845 (blind Teiresias); *Or.* 470-476 (the imper-ative in 474 shows that Tyndareos is addressing himself to his own attendants). Compare also *Hel.* 179ff., where the chorus's first stanza provides self-presentation, but no contact with Helen, who, herself, initiates contact at 191 (eagerness to share news); Murray's version of the parodos of *Or.* (136-139 deleted) produces a comparable pattern.

comment of newcomer in isolation from contact, (2) visual contact parodos-to-stage (frequently marked by ἔα), with comment out of contact (frequently one or more agnoetic questions), (3) initiation of dialogue. The earliest extant example of an entering character gradually attaining contact through these three stages is in E.*Su.* In the first episode Theseus enters commenting on the sounds of mourning he had heard from afar and expressing his concern for his mother's absence (87-91). Establishment of visual contact with the tableau on stage is marked by the exclamation ἔα (*extra metrum* after 91) and is followed by several lines which are self-addressed, featuring the agnoetic question τί χρῆμα; (92-97). Theseus initiates dialogue-contact with his mother on stage at line 98. A more intricate example is the arrival of Herakles in *HF* 514ff.: stage-to-parodos visual contact is marked by Megara's ἔα, and is followed by aporetic and agnoetic questions addressed to self and to others on stage; as the characters on stage apparently begin to move toward him, Herakles greets the house from the parodos in 523-524, unaware of the tableau on stage or the chorus in the orchestra; parodos-to-stage visual contact comes in 525 with ἔα and agnoetic τί χρῆμα; before Herakles attempts to establish dialogue-contact in 530.[17] This is an especially striking example because speeches which in the real world would take place simultaneously must be spoken one after the other on the Greek tragic stage, and natural movement must some-how be frozen for a moment or stylized into an artificial slowness.[18] Other examples of such exploitation of the parodos-space are *Hel.* 68ff. (Teukros), 1165ff. (Theoklymenos), *Phoin.* 261ff. (only the chorus is present; but despite lack of ἔα, it is clear that Poly-neikes becomes aware of the emptiness of the stage and the nearby presence of the chorus only around line 274). The longest speech delivered in the conventional isolation of a new arrival is Pentheus' tirade, *Ba.* 215-247: since the characters on stage do not withdraw to conceal themselves and eavesdrop (as those of New Comedy[19] often do), the poet lends a greater degree of verisimilitude to the extended theatrical artifice by refer-ring in advance to Pentheus' agitation (ὡς ἐπτόηται, 214).

Leo long ago listed these passages along with several others in discussing Euripidean developments of the *Auftrittsrede*,[20] but he approached the problem with a special interest in the justification (or lack thereof) of the monologue-form in terms of the pathetic impulse of the speech, and he failed to make needed distinctions. What we are dealing with is a conventionalized exploitation of the separate areas of the theater-space and a new use of the time which precedes contact, whether visual or oral. Likewise, these passages are perhaps better handled through study of contact-phenomena than through the concept of the "aside."[21] The three-step process for establishing contact is not con-fined to parodos-entrances. Occasionally it is applicable to characters emerging (unsum-moned) from the scene-building: when Helen follows the chorus out the door in *Hel.* 528ff., neither does she see Menelaos nor, apparently, are her lines heard by him until the usual ἔα (541); Pentheus' isolation is much briefer when he emerges from the gate at

---

17. On the delay in establishing successful communication, see Chap. 4, section 6(b).

18. On this subject see Chapter 6, section 2(e). I cannot agree with Bain, 63, when he states that the children *disobey* their mother's command.

19. New Comedy is of course adapting the motif found in *Choe.* 20-21, E.*El.* 107-111 (cf. S.*El.* 80-85), *Ion* 76-77, *OK* 113-116.

20. Leo, 31.

21. Bain, 61ff., treats the same passages and suggests that the comment which follows visual contact but precedes address might be viewed as an "aside."

Ba. 642 (two lines out of contact; ἔα ἔα and half-line comment; direct address). These two passages demonstrate that the space around the door and the moment of emergence are potentially just as isolated from visual and aural/oral contact as the parodos-space. This important point will receive confirmation in the next section of this chapter. The convention is also applicable to a certain kind of entrance on the *mechane:* the scene of *Andromeda* reflected in fragments 124, 123, 125, 128, and 127 N^2 (= Arist. *Thesm.* 1098ff.) contains comment prior to contact, visual contact and agnoetic question, and then dialogue-contact (although we cannot be quite sure that Perseus initiated the dialogue).

To be distinguished from the three-stage *Auftrittsreden* are those entrance-speeches which involve only two stages of discourse: (1) comment made out of contact or with non-specific address to the total environment (a revival of Aischylean technique); (2) dialogue with specific direction. In many cases it is hard to determine whether the newcomer is actually not yet in contact or simply not required by "etiquette" to acknowledge more clearly those already present. Whereas in Aischylos the newcomer had normally directed his remarks first to the chorus, in later tragedy, and especially in Euripides, actors on stage normally take precedence over the chorus as addressee, even if the chorus is the one who announces the approach of the newcomer. Thus, despite the fact that Medeia is a woman, it is to her and not to the chorus that newcomers address themselves (*Med.* 271, 446, 663, 866, 1002, 1121; the number of times this happens in the play is an index of Medeia's strength as the focus of dramatic interest). And even when no actor is present, the house or those indoors rather than the chorus may be the recipient of the newcomer's remarks.[22] This "etiquette" conforms to the general tendency of the late classical tragic chorus to be quite remote from the activity and discourse on stage and (especially in Euripides) to lack the element of public presence which formerly demanded the attention of those on stage and of new arrivals (cf. Appendix to this chapter). The rarity and nature of the exceptions serve to confirm this rule for Euripides: at *Hkld.* 120 Demophon naturally seeks information from his fellow-citizens rather than from the as yet unidentified strangers; at *Hek.* 484 Hekabe is not readily visible to Talthybios (cf. *Or.* 375 and cases of "partial vision" discussed below); at *Su.* 399 the herald's abrupt questions without vocative, whether addressed to the chorus or non-specifically to the whole environment, seem in fact to characterize him as brash and impolite; at *Su.* 634 the messenger addresses the chorus rather than Adrastos because its members are most intimately concerned (but this very fact could be viewed as an archaiz-ing detail);[23] at *El.* 761 it is hard to see a reason for the address to the chorus (is Elektra near the door and so relatively obscure to the arriving messenger?); at IA 607 (authen-ticity quite problematic) Agamemnon may have withdrawn slightly, and in any case there is a dramatic point in his silence and in postponing direct contact between the new-comers and him; *Andr.* 881 is discussed below.[24]

What this "etiquette" means for contact is that some passages classified as *Auftritts-reden* with monologue-like character by Leo may have the appearance of isolated utter-ance only because the newcomer need not condescend to address specifically the chorus

---

22. E.g. *IT* 1284, *Hel.* 1165, *Phoin.* 1067, *Or.* 356 (house addressed before chorus, 375), *Ba.* 170, 1024, *IA* 1532.

23. Cf. also Taplin, *Stagecraft* 205-206, on the unusual treatment of Adrastos.

24. Cf. also *Rhes.* 808, where it is not surprising that the foolish, precipitous Hektor inveighs against the feeble soldiers of the chorus without noticing or without caring about the wounded charioteer.

and occasionally even actors on stage. Menelaos, for instance, at *Tro.* 860 has no need to address the captives; his speech is to the general environment and is heard by Hekabe, so that it is not an isolated parodos-rhesis. Menelaos' speech in the presence of the chorus at *Or.* 1554 is comparable, as is the rather aloof speech of Klytaimestra at *El.* 998, made in the presence of the chorus and Elektra.[25] Likewise, Leo is wrong to classify *Hek.* 1109ff. along with *Su.* 87ff. and *HF* 523ff., for the latter have the distinctly Euripidean three-stage technique, whereas Agamemnon's self-announcement in *Hek.* 1109 seems to be directed at the entire environment—stage, orchestra, and audience—in the Aischylean manner. The Euripidean innovation here is "partial vision"—Agamemnon's failure to take in a particular detail of the stage-tableau, namely the presence of the blinded Polymestor, presumably because the actor begins to speak while moving toward center-stage. (Or could an audience suspect that Agamemnon is deliberately feigning "partial vision" in order to seem surprised, thus establishing his feigned impartiality for the coming quasi-legal debate?) Partial contact of this kind can be paralleled in the *Hekabe* itself and in later plays: *Hek.* 484 (Talthybios fails to see Hekabe lying on the ground); *Hek.* 726ff. (Agamemnon fails to notice the corpse until 733);[26] *HF* 1163ff. (Theseus fails to notice the ravage on stage until 1172); *Hel.* 597ff. (messenger fails to notice Helen until 616); *Or.* 356ff. (Menelaos fails to notice Orestes, who had been abed; discussed below); *Or.* 476-477 (Tyndareos sees only Menelaos at first).[27]

When Euripides does not exploit the isolation for some effect, it is often impossible to determine the exact degree of isolation. Is the passage *El.* 487-492 an undirected agnoetic question and comment spoken entirely out of contact, or are the lines directed to the chorus before the old man simultaneously sees and addresses Elektra in 493? Presumably the former, in view of parallels like *Or.* 470, *IA* 801. Iphis in *Su.* 1034ff. and Kreon in *Phoin.* 1310ff. are both distraught with grief, and their distraction accounts for the lack of address to the chorus, but Iphis at least seems to be aware of the chorus as his audience (there is no sign of shift or transition when he addresses them at the end), and the same probably holds for Kreon.[28] In *Ba.* 1216-1232, on the other hand, the audience is perhaps supposed to assume that Kadmos makes visual contact with Agave only in the last two lines (. . . οὐδ' ἄκραντ' ἠκούσαμεν· λεύσσω γὰρ αὐτήν, ὄψιν οὐκ εὐδαίμονα). Prior to visual contact, however, Kadmos is speaking to his own audience of attendants and is not in solitary isolation on the parodos,[29] although the explanation which follows the command has the character of a rhesis directed non-specifically to the entire environment and intended for the spectators.

25. This passage also points up another index of the chorus's lack of strong presence in Euripides: the great rarity of cases in which the chorus initiates dialogue with the newcomer (also rare in Aischylos and Sophokles). The three cases (out of 107 instances) are *El.* 988-997, a ceremonial address functioning simultaneously as announcement (cf. *Ag.* 783ff.), but not acknowledged by Klytaimestra (contrast *Ag.* 830ff., *Or.* 375, *IA* 607f.)—it is Elektra who really gets the dialogue going, since she is eager as ever to shame her mother; *Or.* 348ff., a ceremonial address preceded by announcement; *IT* 1288, which contains an apology for speaking without being spoken to.

26. On the difficulty in establishing mutual contact in this passage see Chapter 5, section 1(d).

27. "Partial vision" is used for the comic effect of the "double-take" in *Kykl.* 96ff. and 203ff.

28. Likewise the messenger in *Phoin.* 1335ff. fails to address Kreon explicitly until 1339, but is playing to his audience from the start. Grief and distraction take complete precedence over awareness of one's surroundings in the lyrical effusion of Antigone's woe in *Phoin.* 1485ff. (the lyrical mode of course favors such extended isolation, and the technique is traditional: cf. notes 7 and 14 above and add *Hipp.* 1347 and *Rhes.* 728).

29. For comparable supervision of action before dialogue-contact with those present, cf. *Tro.* 1260ff., *Hel.* 865ff. (from house-door), *Ion* 1261ff., *Phoin.* 834ff. (blind Teiresias). Cf. also E.*Su.* 381, *Phoin.* 690, where contact is subsequently made with a newcomer.

Two final examples of establishment of contact by entering characters suggest Euripides' ability to play with the conventions. Menelaos is welcomed in *Or.* 348ff. as the returning conqueror of Troy in a manner deliberately reminiscent of Agamemnon's entrance in *Ag.* 783ff., and his address to the palace takes precedence over contact with the chorus, just as the invocations of the herald and of Agamemnon himself had in *Ag.*[30] Menelaos' surprise when Orestes identifies himself indicates that he had not taken note of his nephew's presence before. Orestes had returned to his bed at the end of the first episode (*Or.* 311-313) and must have remained there through the stasimon. The actor presumably rises from the bed during the chorus' announcement or during Menelaos' rhesis; in any case he must traverse the space between himself and Menelaos in only two lines in order to touch the newcomer's knees in supplication at 382. A very traditional entrance is thus combined with a partial visual contact which is strongly Euripidean. Since Orestes is not during the whole time prior to line 380 so out of the way as the prostrate Hekabe in *Hek.* 484ff. or Evadne above the pyre in *Su.* 1034ff., the partial contact bears some resemblance to that of the messenger in *Hel.* 597-615, although the messenger may have spoken from the parodos (toward which Menelaos in *Hel.* had already started), whereas Menelaos in *Or.* is presumably on stage or close to it (on the opposite side of the door from Orestes' bed?).[31] A similar effect is present much earlier in *Andr.* 881ff.: Orestes enters in haste (σπουδῇ . . . βημάτων) and immediately asks whether he is at the palace, thus giving the impression of a true stranger (cf. *OT* 924-926, S.*El.* 660-661, 1098-1099); after Orestes' identification-speech (884-890), Hermione rushes toward him to supplicate (891-895), and only at 896 (ἔα and τί χρῆμα;) does Orestes indicate visual contact. P. T. Stevens speculates in his commentary about where Hermione must be in order to be unnoticed by the entering Orestes. In view of the Euripidean convention of partial visual contact, however, we need not assume that Hermione is in any way difficult to notice: Orestes adopts the traditional behavior of a stranger when he initiates contact with the chorus before paying attention to what is happening on stage. When Orestes later reveals that he had been aware of the situation at the palace and had been waiting "in the wings," some members of the audience might perhaps assume that Orestes himself had been consciously manipulating arrival-conventions in order to induce Hermione to welcome him as her savior.

3. THE DOOR-SPACE AND CONTACT

Entrances through the *skene*-door upon a scene already occupied by a chorus or actor(s) are rarely announced in Aischylos and announced in about one in every three instances in Sophokles and Euripides.[32] Whether announced or not, the newcomer normally opens dialogue-contact with those already present; if the newcomer does not initiate the dialogue, there is usually a dramatic and/or psychological reason.[33] Although

---

30. On ceremonial address see note 25 above.

31. Stevens on *Andr.* 881 ascribes Menelaos' failure to notice Orestes to absorption in his own emotion, citing *Ba.* 215-247 as comparable. I am arguing that Menelaos' partial vision is more conventional than emotional.

32. In Aischylos the sole announcement (out of about a dozen instances, all in *Oresteia*) is *Choe.* 730 (but some would look upon *Ag.* 256-257 as a kind of "announcement"). For Sophokles, out of approximately 30 instances, 12 are announced (7 by the chorus, 5 by actors, the latter all later than *Ai.* and *Ant.*). For Euripides, out of about 70 instances, 23 are announced (15 by the chorus, 8 by actors, the latter dating from *Hek.* onwards).

33. The chorus takes the initiative in *Ag.* 258 and *IT* 137 as a sign of respect (against Taplin, *Stagecraft* 194 n.3, I agree

there are very few cases in which a newcomer with a choice elects to address the chorus rather than an actor already present, one may perhaps see archaic technique or "etiquette" in those examples: this lack of "horizontal" interrelation between actors is brilliantly exploited in Klytaimestra's speech at *Ag.* 855; cf. also *Ai.* 348 (the slighted actor is a woman), *Ant.* 802 (*if* Kreon is still present; but I think he goes in at 780 to attend to the details announced in 773ff. and comes out again at 883), *Ant.* 1180, and perhaps *Ai.* 787 and *Ant.* 387 (unless one or both involve "partial vision"—see below). The only relevant Euripidean example, apart from cases of partial vision, is *Hkld.* 474, where Herakles' virgin daughter finds it necessary to excuse immediately the boldness of her uninvited appearance in public.

The newcomer through the door often emerges with a question on his lips, expressive of an agnoetic stance. In early tragedy his visual and aural/oral contact with the situation on stage (and in the orchestra) is immediate. But the door-space became, like the parodos, a locus of potentially imperfect visual and aural contact, to be exploited where appropriate to highlight the ignorance or confusion of the emerging character for dramatic effects of irony, surprise, or the like. We already noted in the previous section of this chapter that in *Hel.* 528ff. and *Ba.* 642ff. Euripides applied the three-stage sequence for establishment of contact to characters entering through the door. There are also scenes in which the newcomer has "partial vision," that is, sees at first only part of the tableau which awaits him, then notices the rest. The oldest example would be *Ai.* 787, if Tekmessa is supposed not to notice the messenger until he is pointed out by the chorus; but it may simply be that since the chorus summons Tekmessa and is on familiar terms with her she addresses it first. The case for "partial vision" at *Ant.* 387, where Kreon emerges opportunely to hear the guard's news, seems even weaker. It is noteworthy that in neither case is the possible moment of new visual contact marked (Tekmessa's οἴμοι is a reaction to the hint of bad news). We should therefore probably acknowledge the Euripidean paternity of this contact-convention related to entering through the door. He makes use of partial vision (without the full three-stage process) in *Phoin.* 301ff. (full contact marked by ἰὼ τέκνον in 304) as well as *IT* 1307 (discussed in section 4 below) and *Or.* 1506, where there is dramatic point in the way the messenger and the Phrygian make their presence known without waiting for Thoas or Orestes to reach the stage of full contact. Also of interest is the scene E.*El.* 54ff.: if the farmer stays on after line 53 somewhere to the side of the door (and why should he go down a parodos only to return before line 64?),[34] Elektra, in her self-absorption, fails to notice him for ten lines until he makes his presence known. Sophokles uses the technique once in *Phil.*

with editors who assign *IT* 123-125 to the chorus; Iphigeneia enters during 126-136, in response to the chorus's arrival-song). In *Choe.* 730 the nurse is both emotionally distraught and occupied on an errand that does not require her to speak to the chorus. At *Ant.* 531 Kreon is naturally aggressive and Ismene naturally reticent; at *OT* 1297 the chorus speaks immediately at the shocking appearance of Oidipous; and at S.*El.* 1466 Orestes' silence fits the needs of the stratagem. Eagerness or surprise is evident in *Alk.* 136, *Hipp.* 1157, *Hek.* 667, *HF* 701, *IT* 1157, *Hel.* 1186. As in the case of parodos-entrances, so here the newcomer may fail to address those present because he is speaking with a companion or distraught or both: *Alk.* 244, *Hipp.* 176, *Andr.* 825, *Hek.* 1056 (blindness), *HF* 451; cf. *Hek.* 1044, where Hekabe addresses her words indoors. At E.*El.* 552 and *IA* 1122 two actors on stage have been awaiting the emergence of a third and one of those already present thus addresses the newcomer first.

34. Denniston on E.*El.* 64-66 assumes that the farmer was not on stage during Elektra's speech, apparently because he thinks Elektra's remarks would preempt the question asked in 64-66. This is entirely too literal-minded a reading, one which treats the question as purely information-seeking and fails to take into account the largely epiplectic import of the question. (The same point is made by Bain, 33.)

1263-1266, where the first couplet (three agnoetic questions with a single import) is addressed to the chorus as Philoktetes emerges in response to the summons, and only in 1265 (note ὤμοι) does he see that Neoptolemos is again present and address an epiplectic question to him and the chorus.

The imperfect contact of the character emerging from the *skene* may also be of an aural nature. It is obvious in most of extant tragedy that the newcomer is not expected to hear the announcement of his emergence or any comment appended to it. Hence the conspiratorial appeals often made when someone is heard at the door (e.g. *Trach.* 594-597, S.*El.* 1322, *IT* 723, *Hel.* 1385ff.).[35] But this may not always have been the case: *Choe.* 730 is phrased with the assumption that the newcomer will hear the first words of the announcement (cf. Σ: ὁ ξένος is used to maintain the pretence);[36] Kreon's response in *Ant.* 387 (ποίᾳ ξύμμετρος . . . τύχῃ) suggests that he has heard the phrase ἐς δέον in the announcement-line 386; *Alk.* 136-141 could conceivably be another example, since the woman answers the question implied by εἰδέναι βουλοίμεθ’ ἄν without being addressed explicitly in 138-140, but perhaps this is due rather to an indistinct gliding from announcement to dialogue.[37] It is unusual technique, cleverly applied, when at *El.* 1322-1325 Sophokles follows up the silence-command and comment, not intended to be heard, with words intended to be heard by, and to deceive, the as yet unidentified new-comer (εἴσιτ’, ὦ ξένοι κτλ.).[38]

The convention is, then, that the comments which follow announcement or summons are uttered out of contact with the character in the doorway. Such lines may serve an obvious time-filling function, preserving the continuity of sound while the newcomer is opening the door and emerging into a theatrically viable position,[39] but the poets skill-fully exploit them to convey suggestions of emotion, attitude, and characterization as well. A notable instance of simple time-filling is *Ba.* 170-177, where Teiresias summons Kadmos from indoors: the last four lines are spoken for the audience's information and cover the time it takes for the opening of the door. The time-filling utterances in *Choe.* 875-884 are used very dramatically to convey urgency, panic, and suspense. The comment in 883-884, which is not addressed to anyone and which the emerging Kly-taimestra clearly does not hear, is important, in particular, as an unproblematic fore-runner of the phenomenon to be discussed next.

One peculiarity of the context of emerging is that a character not yet in full contact with those on stage can both hear and not hear, that is, both hear the summons and not

---

35. Note also the comment made by the old man in E.*El.* 550-552a, clearly not expected to be heard.

36. Some scholars believe that *Ag.* 256-257 is not only an "announcement" of an emerging Klytaimestra, but also phrased with the assumption that she will hear what is said.

37. Dale *ad loc.* notes how unusual the technique of the dialogue is. A case like *HF* 1039ff. is different from the examples cited in the text: Amphitryon need not have heard what the chorus had been saying in order to insist on silence. In *HF* 701 Heath's correction περᾷς is surely necessary; in Murray's text the γὰρ-clause addressed to Amphitryon follows on a third-person announcement of Amphitryon's appearance, so that γὰρ would imply that Lykos expected line 701 to be heard, contrary to the convention.

38. Dawe's grounds for assigning all four lines to the chorus (*Studies* 1.198) are of little or no force. Division of the lines, as in Pearson's OCT, should be retained: cf. Bain, 80 n.3.

39. A striking exception is the treatment of the mute Hermione in *Or.* 112ff., where the instruction καὶ λαβὲ . . . follows so quickly on the summons-command ἔξελθ’. . . δόμων πάρος. It is possible that the interpolated line 111 was meant to ease the difficulty: if Helen had an attendant (but she should not, for Hermione must be sent alone so that she can return alone), she could say πέμψομαι ("I'll summon") and send the attendant in with a gesture, speaking 112ff. only when Hermione is seen in the doorway.

hear the details of lines that are ostensibly addressed to the emerging character. In *Ai.* 784ff., for instance, Tekmessa hears the call for her to come out of the tent, but does not hear the details—the tone of δυσμόρων γένος, the information that someone is present to tell her something, and the comment ξυρεῖ γὰρ ἐν χρῷ κτλ., which is addressed to her (compare *Choe.* 883-884). Earlier in the same play the second line of Athena's summons (*Ai.* 89-90) seems not to register with Aias when he emerges from his tent in the prologue-scene, but the line has dramatic significance far beyond mere time-filling. Aias is first summoned in 71-73, but he cannot come out until a 15-line stichomythia has made certain points about Odysseus' attitude and that of Athena; the summons is repeated in 89 and is followed by an epiplectic question: τί βαιὸν οὕτως ἐντρέπῃ τῆς συμμάχου; That question provides a passing recognition of the slowness of Aias' appearance, but more importantly reveals the attitude of dreadful playfulness which the goddess adopts toward the crazed Aias. The suggestion of slighting behavior is meant for the audience more than for Aias; it fits with other expressions of divine displeasure with the hero (e.g. 127ff., 756ff.).

More striking are the examples found in Euripides. In *Hkld.* 642ff. Iolaos summons Alkmene from the temple; she emerges with agnoetic questions and has clearly not heard the details of 643-645.[40] Wilamowitz, unaware of the convention involved and determined to prove interpolation by a *Bearbeiter,* scores the passage as tasteless and makes an entirely too naturalistic argument as follows: Iolaos had only called to her softly enough for her to hear, indeed so softly that she failed to hear 644-645; yet she nevertheless speaks of a loud noise filling the temple in 646; and whereas this soft/loud noise now causes her to come out, earlier in the play loud cries had not done so.[41] The latter part of Wilamowitz's argument is worthless in any case (Alkmene comes out here and not earlier because she is summoned by name), but the whole argument collapses once the convention of incomplete contact is understood. A similar sequence occurs in *Phoin.* 1067ff., where line 1071 in particular (λήξασ᾽ ὀδυρμῶν πενθίμων τε δακρύων) is not heard by Iokaste, who immediately suspects that something bad has happened to Eteokles.[42] Lines 1070-1071 are needed to cover the time of Iokaste's emergence, and if Reeve's unspecified suspicion of the couplet has anything to do with Iokaste's failure to hear the details in them, such suspicion is not justified.[43] The interpolated line *Phoin.* 1075, evidently meant to replace 1072-1074, was perhaps deemed necessary by someone who was unaware of the convention and wished to remove the discontinuity between 1071 and 1072ff. Later in the same play lines 1265-1269 cover Antigone's emergence from the palace and clearly do not register with her (she enters with the usual reference to the noise outside—αὐτεῖς 1271). These five lines were considered spurious by Fraenkel,[44]

---

40. The punctuation of Garzya's Teubner text at *Hkld.* 646-647 (question mark after χρῆμ᾽, colon after στέγος, comma after Ἰόλαε) is far superior to Murray's, since it produces the standard agnoetic question and an undirected comment preceding the establishment of contact with the vocative.

41. *Hermes* 17 (1882) 341-342 = *Kl. Schr.* 1.86-87.

42. Cf. also *IA* 314-316, where the cry brings Agamemnon out, but he has not heard the detail ἐπιστολὰς ἐξαρπάσας.

43. M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 253 n.21 (for Reeve's reliance on such an argument, cf. next note); ΣV *Phoin.* 1069 (about the absence of *one* line in some copies) is misplaced and applies to 1075 (cf. ΣB); the older suggestion of Bruhn and Jachmann that *Phoin.* 1070 be deleted is methodologically unsound and had nothing to do with the convention I am discussing (cf. *Stud. E. Ph.* 483 n.1). Addendum: Schwartz misleads; the scholion is "misplaced" in B too.

44. E. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoenissen* 69 (giving credit to Reeve for the observation); in his review, H. Diller, *Gn.* 36 (1964) 644-645, cited only *Hkld.* 642ff. in making the counter-argument which I am developing at length here.

but recognition of the convention removes one of his major arguments. Although line 1266 is still in need of exegesis or emendation,[45] there is no argument from dramatic technique which forbids us to consider the lines Euripidean.

One further instance in which an emerging character seems to fail to hear something deserves to be mentioned. The Phoenician maidens call Iokaste forth from the palace in *Phoin.* 296ff., and much of their utterance is a time-filler for the opening of the door and for Iokaste's slow movement. That movement is accompanied by and described in lines 301-303, addressed to the chorus (with partial visual contact), until with the exclamation ἰὼ τέκνον in 304 Iokaste notices and addresses Polyneikes.[46] Presumably τεκοῦσα τόνδε μᾶτερ in 298 and θιγεῖν . . . τέκνου in 300 do not register with Iokaste. Here we have a definite instance of the combination of imperfect hearing of the summons with partial vision upon emergence.

Confirmation of the potential of the door-space to be treated like the parodos in regard to incomplete contact is provided by another convention shared by the two spaces. Characters who turn and head down the parodos often have taunting or threatening lines directed at their departing backs, as Taplin and Bain have recently shown.[47] The departing character either does not hear the remark or elects not to reverse his course in order to respond to it. In a few cases similar remarks are directed at the retreating back of a character who has broken off dialogue-contact and turned to enter through the door, and it seems to me clear that the departing actor is assumed by the speaker not to be able to hear (*Ant.* 327-331, E.*El.* 1142-1146, *HF* 726-728, *Ion* 425-428).[48] It might be more correct to speak here in terms of the action of departing from dialogue-contact rather than in terms of the physical door-space or the parodos, since we do not, I think, need to believe that Kreon or Klytaimestra or Lykos or Xouthos have actually reached the threshold (or that characters heading down the parodos are actually very far from center-stage) when remarks are made behind their backs. Recognition that turning from dialogue-contact to depart conventionally renders aural contact void or imperfect, regardless of the actual physical proximity of the departing character, will prove a powerful tool for interpretation of at least two problem-passages: *Trach.* 335ff., to be discussed in the next section; and Medeia's monologue, discussed in Chapter 6, section 2(e)(1).

4. TWO PROBLEMS

4(a) *IT* 1307FF.

Platnauer and other editors have expressed approval of Tournier's emendation ὅδε for τόδε in *IT* 1307-1308:

45. Following up Fraenkel's suggestion that κατάστασις and προχωρέω may refer to choral dancing (*Zu den Phoenissen* 68) I hesitantly suggest νῦν σὸν προχωρεῖν δαιμόνων κατάστασιν, with κατ. internal acc. to προχ.: "not in choral dances and maidenly amusements is it now your role to step forth, accomplishing the ordering of the dances (?) belonging to the gods."

46. The colometry should reflect the sudden awareness of her son's presence: that is, a new period must begin with ἰὼ in 304 (cf. e.g. Wilamowitz, *GV* 570-572, against Murray's treatment).

47. Bain, 34 n.4, 70f.; Taplin, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 42 n.39, and *Stagecraft* 221-222.

48. Also *Ba.* 515-518, if Dodds is right in assuming that Pentheus turns at 514 and goes in ahead of Dionysos and the guards. Von Arnim (*Suppl. Eur.* 20) creates another instance in *Antiope* fr. IV C 1 (lines 19-20), but Page's reconstruction is superior (*GLP* 66-67). A related phenomenon may be present in *Hipp.* 523-524: see Bain, 28-29, for speculation on whether the nurse's turning to the door marks a break in contact which renders her own words conventionally inaudible to Phaidra. A possible parallel for this is offered by *IT* 639-642, where Iphigeneia seems to have turned away from contact with the other actors, although it is not really crucial that her words not be heard by them.

τίς ἀμφὶ δῶμα θεᾶς τόδ' ἵστησιν βοήν,
πύλας ἀράξας καὶ ψόφον πέμψας ἔσω;

For a question with τίς . . . ὅδε; editors refer to E.*Su.* 395, but they pay insufficient attention to the problem of establishing contact. In the cited passage of *Su.* Theseus sights a herald approaching (ἔα and ὅδε mark one-way visual contact); he surmises an answer to his own (undirected) agnoetic question; the herald arrives and speaks without specific addressee, i.e., seeking contact, unaware that he has already been noticed by the king. In the *IT* passage, the messenger is seeking contact with his king. The king emerges with an agnoetic question about the noise which has brought him forth; he is not yet in direct contact with anyone specific outside (he is thus like Alkmene in *Hkld.* 646 or Philoktetes in *Phil.* 1263-1264). The messenger then establishes contact rather obliquely (but normally) by commenting on the chorus' attempt to deceive him.[49] With Tournier's ὅδε, the king emerges and at once makes visual contact with the messenger, but not dialogue-contact: in such a context the question τίς . . . ὅδε . . . ; calls very strongly for a response, either from the chorus (in other circumstances) or from the man himself (e.g. "Your servant, bringing bad news from the shore . . . ").[50] Since the messenger is seeking the king and the king would (with ὅδε) be seeking contact with someone, there would be no reason[51] for the messenger to remain aloof from direct contact; indeed, it might be a breach of etiquette to do so vis-à-vis a superior. The obliqueness of *IT* 1309-1310 fits only with a situation in which the king is still out of contact and not yet focussed on the messenger—i.e. the situation provided by the manuscript reading τόδε (for δῶμα . . . τόδε cf. *Hkld.* 646 τόδ' . . . στέγας).

4(b) *TRACH.* 335FF.

The conventions of contact are also relevant to the problem of *Trach.* 335ff. (more specifically 336-338):

Αγ. αὐτοῦ γε πρῶτον βαιὸν ἀμμείνασ', ὅπως   335
μάθῃς, ἄνευ τῶνδ', οὕστινάς τ' ἄγεις ἔσω
ὧν τ' οὐδὲν εἰσήκουσας ἐκμάθῃς ἃ δεῖ.
τούτων ἔχω γὰρ πάντ' ἐπιστήμην ἐγώ.
Δη. τί δ' ἐστί; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν;
Αγ. σταθεῖσ' ἄκουσον· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὸν πάρος   340
μῦθον μάτην ἤκουσας, οὐδὲ νῦν δοκῶ.
Δη. πότερον ἐκείνους δῆτα δεῦρ' αὖθις πάλιν
καλῶμεν, ἢ 'μοὶ ταῖσδέ τ' ἐξειπεῖν θέλεις;

There are minor and soluble textual problems in the loss of τ' in 336 and the appearance of θ' or γ' before ἃ δεῖ in 337; the syntax of line 338 is scarcely credible (Jebb's parallels for the use of πάντ' are not all apt). But one of the most striking features of the passage is that ἄνευ τῶνδ' in 336 seems to preempt the question Deianeira later asks in 342-343.

49. In *IT* 1309 I accept Wilamowitz's brilliant restoration, printed by Murray, but if one repairs the text in some other way, my point will still be valid.

50. Cf. *Hkld.* 658-659, E.*El.* 765-766.

51. Contrast *Hek.* 674-675, where withdrawal from contact is psychologically and dramatically motivated: see Chapter 5, section 1(c).

For this reason Reeve revives the proposal to delete 336 (omitting τ' in line 337) and himself deletes 338 along with it.[52] For line 338 I offer no defense, but it seems to me that the stage-action and the conventions of contact explain the presence of 336. There is a whole band of captive women to be marched through the palace-door with Lichas leading and probably a few male attendants overseeing the group. Movement begins at 333 (χωρῶμεν ἤδη πάντες) and is complete at 345 (καὶ δὴ βεβᾶσι). When Deianeira speaks 334 she presumably turns to the door herself and in so doing breaks contact with those remaining outdoors. Lines 335-337 serve as a summons which checks Deianeira's departure and brings her back into dialogue-contact: when they are spoken, she is in an imperfect form of contact, for she hears the request to halt, but not the details which fill out the request. The details fill time and are meant to have their effect on the audience (οὕστινας ἄγεις ἔσω is an important point and the allusive plural is worthy of Sophokles).[53] To emphasize fully the irony of Deianeira's ignorance, Sophokles has her bring up the same point in 342-343. The technique is exactly analogous to that of the summons yelled indoors which is obeyed, but the details of which are not taken in (cf. section 3 above). There is apparently no parallel for a checked departure through the door of just this sort (but see the discussion of Medeia's monologue, Chapter 6, section 2[e][1]), but there is a parallel for a checked departure along the parodos which clinches the case:

> *IA* 829-834
> Αχ. καλῶς ἔλεξας ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ καίρια.
>   αἰσχρὸν δέ μοι γυναιξὶ συμβάλλειν λόγους.
> Κλ. μεῖνον· τί φεύγεις; δεξιάν τ' ἐμῇ χερὶ
>   σύναψον, ἀρχὴν μακαρίαν νυμφευμάτων.
> Αχ. τί φής; ἐγώ σοι δεξιάν; αἰδοίμεθ' ἂν
>   Ἀγαμέμνον', εἰ ψαύοιμεν ὧν μή μοι θέμις.

Achilles, overcome with modesty, turns away to depart along the parodos at 830. He is called back into dialogue-contact by Klytaimestra's appeal, but the word νυμφευμάτων does not register, even though μεῖνον and δεξιάν clearly do. Only in 835-838 does Achilles react with shock and disbelief at the *second* mention of marriage.

APPENDIX: THE ORCHESTRA AND CHORAL CONTACT

In late fifth-century tragedy the chorus has so little presence at times that there seems to be a conventional barrier separating it from the stage-dialogue and stage-action.[54] Choral technique is tending in the direction not only of *embolima*[55] but also of a theater in which there is a real physical separation between acting-area and dancing-area through the raising of the stage high above the orchestra-level. In *IA* the maidens from Chalkis are remote from the stage-action for most of the play: in the first episode Agamemnon's perfunctory command of silence (542) is the only acknowledgment of

---

52. M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 14 (1973) 166-167.

53. For discussion of simplex/complex repetition (μάθῃς/ἐκμάθῃς), cf. R. Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts* (Hypomnemata 43 [Gottingen 1976]) 11-27.

54. In general see Hourmouziades, Chaps. III and IV, and Kranz, 203ff.

55. I hasten to add that there are no *embolima* in the extant plays.

their presence; later they build up a relationship of sorts with Klytaimestra and Iphigeneia, but it is much less intense than those which bind Helen in *Hel.* or the Iphigeneia of *IT* with their choruses. More striking still is Pentheus' failure to show much awareness of the chorus of maenads in *Ba.,* despite his interest in suppressing the new cult. In *Ba.* 215-247 his lack of awareness is natural in terms of the conventions of entering (he is out of contact with those on stage as well); but after line 248 the only reference to them is in 511-514, and it is as though the chorus inhabited a separate space irrelevant to Pentheus' city. These are the extreme cases, but it is worthwhile to consider to what extent a similar separation between stage and orchestra appears earlier.

As far as the entry of the chorus is concerned, the most common forms are entry while the stage is empty (perhaps the more archaic technique—to which Euripides appears to "return" in *Phoin.*, *Ba.*, and *IA)* and entry with more or less immediate establishment of contact with someone present on stage.[56] *Trach.* 94-140 presents a delayed establishment of contact: the first three stanzas are sung without any indication of awareness of or greeting to Deianeira; only in the second antistrophe and epode does the chorus use the second person pronoun to address consolation to the wife of Herakles. A conventional separateness of the choral space or at least of the choral utterance from persons on stage is probably present in *OT* 151-215 and *Ion* 184-218; it is unnecessary to have Oidipous go in at *OT* 150 and re-emerge somewhat before 216 (he must hear some of the chorus' prayer); and it seems permissible for Ion to continue his cleaning-chores somewhere on stage while the Attic maidens admire the temple-sculptures, oblivious for the moment to his presence.[57] A much earlier and more striking example may be present in the parodos of *Se.* (78-180). Most scholars[58] have assumed or stated that Eteokles exits at 77 and returns at 181, believing that he must leave immediately to do what the messenger recommends in lines 57-58. But Eteokles announces in 282-286 that he is then going off to do this; an earlier exit is thus unmotivated, and it is worthwhile to consider whether Eteokles himself remains on stage during the parodos.[59] If he does, then there would here be a large degree of respect for the separateness of the choral role: one may feel that the chorus itself is too panic-stricken to notice Eteokles, but the absence of contact works both ways, and one would have to assume that Eteokles' failure to break in earlier than line 180 (as a concerned king in the real world might do) is due to a conventional separateness of the choral role and the choral space, and not to clumsy technique.[60] On balance, however, it may be best to accept exit and re-entry.[61]

Choral isolation in the parodos may be compared to the ability of the chorus to withdraw from what is happening on stage to sing a stasimon. The shift of mode from iambic

---

56. For tabulation of the formal patterns, see H. W. Schmidt, "Die Struktur des Eingangs" in Jens, *Bauformen,* esp. 11ff.

57. Owen on *Ion* 180 is troubled by the lack of naturalism and is inclined to believe that Ion goes in.

58. E.g. Sidgwick, Verrall, Paley, Mazon. See now the skillful argument of Taplin, *Stagecraft* 139-141, in favor of departure and re-entry.

59. Schmidt in Jens, *Bauformen* 11 n.45, assumes without argument that Eteokles is present during the parodos. It is, however, improper to group the ignoring of Eteokles with the lack of reference to Danaos and Elektra in the parodoi of A.*Su.* and *Choe.*, since they enter with the choruses (and Danaos is in fact referred to in *Su.* 11ff., and the reference would suffice to identify the only male in the group).

60. *Puerilis ars rudisque spectator:* such is the explanation of the lack of contact given by Graeber, 42.

61. Against Taplin (note 58 above) I would suggest that the silent, calm figure of Eteokles would provide a dramatic and meaningful visual contrast to the chorus; but, as Taplin suggests, the easiest interpretation of *Se.* 191-192 is that it provides the motivation for Eteokles' re-entry. Also, Eteokles' presence is perhaps easier to believe in if there are a stage and a *skene*-background to define visually his position, but at the date of *Se.* there may not have been a background (see note 1 above). I do not discuss here the parodos of *Ag.* because other issues are involved: see Chapter 6, section 1(d).

to lyric, the spatial separation, and the turning of the chorus (in some cases, at least) toward the audience conspire to effect a degree of isolation. Again there is room for uncertainty as to whether the actor stays on stage during certain stasima; but in any case the detachment of the choral utterance should not be considered evidence for the departure of the actor. Here one may mention *Ag*. 355-487 (if Klytaimestra remains on stage, as I believe), *Ant*. 582-625, 944-987.

During the episodes of a drama the chorus can appear to be quite isolated from the conversation on stage, whether because the actors are so involved in their own dialogue as to take no notice or because convention finally sanctioned an invisible barrier, as it were, between the orchestra and the stage. In *Se.* the dochmiacs of the chorus separate the pairs of rheseis in the second episode. In this case the opening words of the messenger's rhesis are closely connected to Eteokles' final words before the choral intervention, which appears not to register with the actors (λέγ' ἄλλον 451 ∼ λέξω 458; κόμπαζ' ἐπ' ἄλλῳ 480 ∼ τέταρτος ἄλλος 486; σωτὴρ γένοιτ' ἂν Ζεύς 520 ∼ οὕτως γένοιτο 526).[62] It is well known that in later tragedy choral interventions, especially couplets and triplets (for the most part conventionally vacuous in sentiment) used for structural articulation between long rheseis or between monody and iambic dialogue, are often virtually ignored: e.g. S.*El*. 610-611, 1015-1016, *Med*. 520-521, *Andr*. 642-644, *Tro*. 292-293. The convention is so well established in Euripides in particular that we should not hesitate to follow Elmsley in rejecting the transmitted attribution of the couplet *Hkld*. 179-180 and give the lines to the chorus: assignment to Demophon in the manuscript is perhaps due to the assumption that vocative ἄναξ in 181 is appropriate only if Demophon has just spoken; but the vocative is quite appropriate if Iolaos is not even aware of the chorus' couplet, and the way Iolaos introduces and claims the right of speaking in his turn implies that he is indeed unaware of 179-180, which he could not be if the king had spoken them. Likewise *Hel*. 944-946 should be restored to the chorus: the vacuousness of these lines is natural in a chorus, ruinous in Theonoe's mouth.[63] Finally, the weakness of the chorus' presence (and not interpolation)[64] is probably responsible for the momentary oblique self-revelation of Orestes in *IT* 714-715, despite Euripides' care elsewhere in the play to forestall such revealing statements (compare and contrast the discussion of secrets in front of the chorus in *IA*).[65]

---

62. It is uncertain whether *Se.* 422 is supposed to acknowledge Eteokles' lines 415-416 or the chorus's 417-419.

63. I here agree with Kannicht, II.247 and 444 against Dale *ad loc.*

64. So Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* 245.

65. I decline to discuss the whereabouts of, or the lack of contact exhibited by, the chorus during the Okeanos-scene of *PV*. The technique there has no parallel. Cf. Griffith, 115; Taplin, *Stagecraft* 252-262.

3

CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY I:
PATTERNS OF DELAYED AND
PIECEMEAL ANSWERS

When characters start out in contact with one another, deviation from a straight-forward continuity between one utterance (especially a question) and the next may arise for a variety of reasons. It is the purpose of the next three chapters to investigate how and why the Greek tragedians represent such deviations and to what degree a reflection of realistic conversational informality is sought or attained and, conversely, to what degree formal conventions of dialogue-technique operate in contexts of discontinuity. This chapter concentrates on delayed, piecemeal, and gradual responses to questions. We shall see that while it is salutary to recognize the nature and extent of formal, stereotyped patterns and the distance between tragic dialogue and realistic informality, the existence of such patterns does not preclude variety and suppleness in the dramatic use of dialogue.

1. DELAYED ANSWERS

The absence of an immediate answer to a question constitutes at least a mild form of deviation from simple continuity. Such a deviation need not be considered either abnormal or illogical, since the delay may serve a legitimate conversational and dramatic function in allowing a topic to develop gradually, giving it needed emphasis and rendering that emphasis readily comprehensible to the theater-audience, who cannot, like the reader, pause over a particular line or turn back the page.

1(a) QUESTIONER CAUSES DELAY

The questioner himself may be responsible for the delay by heaping together a series of questions (see section 2[a]) or by appending a comment of some sort to his inquiry. The first speech of the ghost of Dareios in *Pe.* 681-693 neatly illustrates the latter. As a newly-arrived character, Dareios reflects in his speech his ignorance of the situation on stage, just as do other newcomers (from parodos or door) who utter one or more agnoetic questions (often with appended comment) in reaction to the tableau they find on stage. He is in contact from his first words, as the vocative to the chorus indicates, but the delaying comment performs the same sort of function as the out-of-contact comments made in the Euripidean *Auftrittsrede*: it provides a capsule-sketch of Dareios' feelings and situation, revealing his concern and sympathy and lending weight and urgency to his

participation in the dramatic action. As often in contexts of postponement, the original question is here resumed after the detour:

Pe. 681-682
ὦ πιστὰ πιστῶν ἥλικές θ' ἥβης ἐμῆς,
Πέρσαι γεραιοί, τίνα πόλις πονεῖ πόνον;

Pe. 693
τί ἐστὶ Πέρσαις νεοχμὸν ἐμβριθὲς κακόν;

The resumptive question gives Dareios' rhesis a clear ring-structure typical of Aischylos; a more informal progression away from the original question characterizes a Euripidean example—*Med.* 1293-1305. Jason's initial query ("Is Medeia still in the house?") is followed by comments leading to the topic of the children, and the latter topic determines the course of the dialogue in 1306ff. The appearance of Medeia at 1317 supplies a non-verbal answer to the original question. One may compare the way agnoetic questions spoken out of contact by a newcomer are implicitly answered by the subsequent course of the dialogue and action. Sophokles combines informal progression and resumption of the question in *OK* 1-24; the true question appears in 1-2, but is followed by an agnoetic question present for the sake of the exposition (3-6) and a request for a resting-place (in which the original question is resumed in indirect form in a purpose-clause); Antigone describes the site in general terms as a preliminary to showing her father to a seat, but the main question is then repeated in 23.

1(b) ANSWERER CAUSES DELAY:

1(b)(1) long proem

The questioner is likely to append a comment to his question only when he is newly arrived and the poet needs to expose the character's situation. The answerer, however, may delay an answer in various contexts by prefacing the response with a long proem or general comment. The examples for this type of delayed response come mainly from Aischylean rheseis. It is dramatically important in *Se.* that Eteokles counterbalances the reported strengths and threats of the attackers with rheseis of equal weight. Apart from the effect of enacting Eteokles' self-entrapment, this great central scene serves as a substitute (by verbal anticipation) of the physical battle and its description. The pattern is set by the first two responses (397ff., 437ff.), in which Eteokles does not immediately reply to the specific question which precedes each rhesis ("Who will fight for our side?"), but instead utters long proems which demonstrate his ability both to counter in words the threats reported in words and to disarm the danger by detecting favorable omens and by offering countervailing interpretations of the situation. These rheseis in fact respond in parallel order to the news and the query brought by the messenger. In subsequent pairs the pattern is varied and the beginning of Eteokles' answer is more closely related to the final words of the messenger, but long proems are exploited again in the last two speeches (597ff., 653ff.), although the preceding question "whom will you send?" is not framed so directly as earlier.

In *PV* 823ff. Prometheus delays a promised answer by displaying knowledge that is not asked for: the "favor" asked for in *PV* 821-822 (cf. 784-785) is given in 844ff., only after Prometheus fills in a part of Io's wandering that would otherwise have been

omitted. He explicitly motivates the delaying element as a guarantee of the accuracy of his knowledge (824-826), but the technique should also be viewed as part of a larger pattern of gradual or piecemeal revelation of hidden knowledge which runs throughout the play and makes a major contribution to the dynamics of the drama.[1] A final long, delaying proem from Aischylos is *Ag.* 636-647, in which the messenger prepares his audience for bad news by expressing reluctance to tell it; in *Ant.* the guard's proem to presentation of Antigone as culprit is a comparable ploy, albeit expressing an attitude of relief rather than reluctance (*Ant.* 388-394).

1(b)(2) brief comment

Briefer delaying comments usually focus attention on the weight of the eventual answer by combining a retarding effect with expression of reluctance or with exhortation addressed to the listener. Hesitation before relating painful news is a motif exploited for the first time[2] in *Ag.* 620-621 (cf. 636-647):

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλά
ἐς τὸν πολὺν φίλοισι καρποῦσθαι χρόνον.

The force of preliminary exhortation is well illustrated by *Ant.* 992, but a similar effect may be attained by the common ἄκουσον- or ἄκουε-motif:[3]

Ant. 991-992
Κρ. τί δ' ἔστιν, ὦ γεραιὲ Τειρεσία, νέον;
Τε. ἐγὼ διδάξω, καὶ σὺ τῷ μάντει πιθοῦ.

Trach. 339-341
Δη. τί δ' ἐστί; τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν;
Αγ. σταθεῖσ' ἄκουσον· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὸν πάρος
    μῦθον μάτην ἤκουσας, οὐδὲ νῦν δοκῶ.

In two cases the delaying comment refers to the questioner's behavior in asking the question: *PV* 758 (Prometheus notes Io's pleasure at the thought of Zeus' fall), *IT* 528 (Orestes is surprised at Iphigeneia's thirst for details about the Greek expedition to Troy).[4]

1(b)(3) counter-question

The commonest delaying element is a counter-question in which the answerer seeks clarification or further information before replying to the original question. Vague or

---

1. Other relevant details are discussed in Chapter 5, section 2(a).

2. Later instances: *Ant.* 238-240 and 243 (there is also an element of exculpation in advance in these statements of the guard); *OT* 1169; *Hel.* 661-664 (in a lyric mood Helen has to be asked three times before she consents to answer!); *Ba.* 1287 (the invocation of an abstraction also implies a slight withdrawal from contact: cf. Schadewaldt, 124). The motif of reluctance to utter bad news is also found in some cases of refusal to answer: cf. *Phoin.* 1209-1218 and Chapter 5, section 3.

3. The same motif in S.*El.* 889-890 and in many *ab ovo* answers (see section 2[b] below). Other brief exhortations: *Phoin.* 850-851, *Ba.* 647.

4. Similar in effect to a delaying comment is an ambiguous, or reluctant, or opaque answer which spreads out the answering process. In *Med.* 674-681 Aigeus' initial opaque answer (675) focusses attention on the oracle, on its obscurity and on Aigeus' vulnerability to Medeia's sympathy and persuasion. In *Alk.* 518-529 Admetos' ambiguous answers heighten the irony of the dialogue and the boldness of Admetos' deception of his friend.

general questions evoke either a neutral counter-question or one with a tinge of surprise: e.g. *Choe.* 766-769, *OK* 652-653, *Hipp.* 99-102,[5] *Hek.* 658-666 (with an epileptic element in the counter-question), *Tro.* 260-264. In some stichomythic cases the vague phrasing of the question is intended to focus attention, via retardation, on the topic or on some aspect of the character's condition. For instance, the vagueness of Orestes' entrance-lines in S.*El.* 1098-1099 is both attention-seeking and cunningly disarming:

ἆρ', ὦ γυναῖκες, ὀρθά τ' εἰσηκούσαμεν
ὀρθῶς θ' ὁδοιποροῦμεν ἔνθα χρήζομεν;

Or in *IA* 522-523 the vague anticipatory demonstrative ἐκεῖνο[6] helps convey Agamemnon's almost preoccupied sense of conviction that there is no way to avoid the sacrifice (a mood here contrasted with Menelaos' hopefulness):

Αγ. ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐ δέδοικας ὃ ἔμ' ἐσέρχεται;
Με. ὃν μὴ σὺ φράζεις, πῶς ὑπολάβοιμ' ἂν λόγον;

Special effects of other kinds are sought in *Ai.* 101-106, where the counter-question ἦ τοὐπίτριπτον κίναδος ἐξήρου μ' ὅπου; is evidently present to reveal Aias' vicious contempt for Odysseus and to confirm that Aias is not in normal control of his faculties, and in *IT* 543-546, where Orestes' pessimism and reluctance to reveal himself as well as the irony of the situation are played upon. Surprise, precaution about potential listeners, and attempts to divert the dialogue from an unpleasant topic occasion other delaying counter-questions.[7]

1(b)(4) emotional causes

Self-absorption and other strong emotions produce the most interesting cases of broken contact or discontinuity. The major examples will be discussed in Chapter 5, but some instances of transient or relatively weak emotion-caused discontinuity which account for delayed answers may be mentioned here. *Pe* 693ff. is remarkable for the incompleteness of the dislocation: the chorus is unable to enter into the iambic mode and is too awe-stricken to answer Dareios' question in a normal way; yet their response is not self-addressed (σέθεν in 696 maintains contact with the questioner); in this case Dareios has to readdress his question to the queen.[8] A simpler delaying break is illustrated by *Ag.* 1306-1309: Kassandra turns suddenly in revulsion away from the door, prompting the chorus' query in 1306, and she is momentarily too absorbed in her own perceptions to answer, but she is back in normal contact at 1309. There is a similar delay

---

5. In *Hipp.* 99 I retain the mss. reading with Barrett, against Murray.

6. The vague pronoun is used in a like manner in a statement in *IA* 516; preoccupation and puzzlement are highlighted by the similar ταὐτὸ in *IT* 658; in *Ion* 275 τόδε is similarly used to convey Ion's bubbling curiosity; cf. also *Ion* 1023 (τοῦτ'), *Or.* 790 (ἐκεῖνο), and *Ion* 942 (vague relative clause). A similar ploy with the demonstrative in vague questions (or statements) eliciting counter-questions is found in Platonic dialogue, esp. at points of transition or summation (e.g. *Laws* 719b9ff., 752b2-6).

7. Cf. *OT* 359-362, S.*El.* 1346-1350, *IT* 549-552; *OT* 89ff., S.*El.* 1202-1204; *OT* 1128-1131, *Trach.* 402-407, 419-425. In Sophokles fr. dub. 1130 Radt, answer to the chorus's question is delayed first by a counter-question and then by the arrival of a new character.

8. For a comparable inability to express a coherent answer, cf. *Hek.* 177-190, where in a lyric duet the answer is delayed by grief-stricken exclamations and the question has to be resumed several times; also S.*El.* 829-836, where the articulate explanation asked for in 829 and given in 831-836 is delayed by an exclamation.

in *Med.* 1005-1011:[9] first lack of communication marked by distraught silence, then exclamations marking isolation from dialogue-contact. Lines like *Ag.* 1306 and *Med.* 1005 demonstrate the tendency (almost a necessity, in fact) for all significant movements, gestures, and even silences to be referred to explicitly on the tragic stage. A sudden access of joy or a sense of *aporia* is involved in other cases of delay through self-absorption.[10] An intricate case, typical of the suppleness of late Sophoklean dialogue, is *Phil.* 895-913: Neoptolemos' *aporia* causes him to slip out of contact in 895 and prompts Philoktetes' question in 896; 897 is spoken out of contact, 899 apparently in contact, and 902-903 and 906 more out of contact than in; the youth is so self-absorbed at 908-909 that Philoktetes finally concedes the break by using the third person[11] to refer to him in 910-911; 912-913 do, however, answer the original question of 896. Perhaps the most unusual exploitation of self-absorption as a delaying factor is in the anapaestic prologue of *IA*:[12] Agamemnon, preoccupied and self-pitying, twice overlooks the old retainer's question (*IA* 2-3, 12-13) and pursues his own topic,[13] answering only after the third request (43-44).

2. GRADUAL AND PIECEMEAL ANSWERS

2(a) AFTER MULTIPLE QUESTIONS

Gradual and piecemeal answers are sometimes occasioned by the questioner, who may heap together a number of queries. Heaping of questions is very common in the tragic texts, but in fact the asking of more than one true question is a relatively infrequent phenomenon. On the one hand, many multiple questions are of such a kind or occur in such a context that they do not require an answer. For instance, the agnoetic questions of an entering character are often multiple, expressing excitement or confusion or simply covering the time necessary for movement into full contact (e.g. E.*El.* 341-344; likewise for a character just orienting himself to his surroundings, such as the awakening Herakles in *HF* 1094ff.). When contact is established, the agnoetic questions may be ignored, or only one may give rise to the dialogue. In an emotional or argumentative rhesis a heaping of apistetic/epiplectic questions is natural: e.g. *OT* 532-542, *Andr.* 387ff., S.*El.* 1354-1360. On the other hand, multiple questions very commonly have only a single import: for depiction of character, for fullness of expression, or for purely formal reasons (such as maintenance of stichomythia)[14] a question is often

---

9. *Med.* 1006-1007 are to be deleted, and the mss. attribution of ἔα to Medeia is of course erroneous: cf. Page *ad loc.*

10. Joy operates in *HF* 530-534; amazement on both sides in *Hel.* 557-560 allows the two characters to hear each other without feeling compelled to answer the essential question "who are you?"; *aporia* and fear operate in *Ion* 747-762 (first exclamations, then self-addressed iambics; the denial of contact is made manifest by the syntactic suspension—cf. Chapter 4, section 4[b]).

11. Cf. Bain, 72, 80.

12. Authenticity is of course a problem here, but I think the anapaests were designed to surround the trimeters or something like them, as in the transmitted order: for discussion see C. W. Willink, *CQ* 21 (1971) 343-364; B. M. W. Knox, *YCS* 22 (1972) 239-261; D. Bain, *CQ* 27 (1977) 10-26.

13. Haste in pursuing one's own topic is responsible for the delay in reaching the answer to the question with which Aineias enters in *Rhes.* 87-89; Hektor leaps forward to action in 90 and further questions are needed to slow him down and to establish the facts for Aineias.

14. Gross, *Die Stichomythie* 87ff., discusses this phenomenon (and other conventional patterns which I am about to discuss) in terms of *Füllverse* and is strongly critical of such techniques; but as Schwinge, passim, and Seidensticker, *Gesprächs-verdichtung* 31 n.55, indicate, Gross pays far too little attention to the possible dramatic and psychological relevance of such apparent "stop-gaps" in a large number of passages.

repeated in slightly different form, and the two or more questions so created look forward to only one response. The tendency toward heaping of questions with a single import is seen in several kinds of questions. A general epiplectic question may be followed by a more specific one, or a broad aporetic question may be followed by a more specific deliberative question:

Hipp. 325
τί δρᾷς; βιάζῃ χειρὸς ἐξαρτωμένη;

OK 1254-1256
οἴμοι, τί δράσω; πότερα τἀμαυτοῦ κακὰ
πρόσθεν δακρύσω, παῖδες, ἢ τὰ τοῦδ᾽ ὁρῶν
πατρὸς γέροντος;

A true question may be followed by what I call a "surmise-question," that is, one presenting a suspected answer to the question[15] (or an alternative surmise-question presenting several possible answers):

Kykl. 129
αὐτὸς δὲ Κύκλωψ ποῦ ’στιν; ἢ δόμων ἔσω;

E.*El* 558-559
τί μ᾽ ἐσδέδορκεν ὥσπερ ἀργύρου σκοπῶν
λαμπρὸν χαρακτῆρ᾽; ἢ προσεικάζει μέ τῳ;[16]

If a double question has a single import, the answer may either (a) be attached to the latest and most specific question (especially a surmise-question) or (b) be directed toward the original question, the later part of the utterance being more or less ignored as a filler:

(a) *IT* 1168-1169
Θο. ἡ δ᾽ αἰτία τίς; ἢ τὸ τῶν ξένων μύσος;
Ιφ. ἥδ᾽, οὐδὲν ἄλλο· δεινὰ γὰρ δεδράκατον.

Ag. 272-273
Χο. τί γὰρ τὸ πιστόν; ἔστι τῶνδέ σοι τέκμαρ;
Κλ. ἔστιν, τί δ᾽ ουχί; μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ.

(b) *IT* 1164-1165
Θο. τί τοὐκδίδαξαν τοῦτό σ᾽; ἢ δόξαν λέγεις;
Ιφ. βρέτας τὸ τῆς θεοῦ πάλιν ἕδρας ἀπεστράφη.

OT 360-361
Τε. οὐχὶ ξυνῆκας πρόσθεν; ἢ ’κπειρᾷ λόγων;
Οι. οὐχ ὥστε γ᾽ εἰπεῖν γνωστόν· ἀλλ᾽ αὖθις φράσον.

---

15. Not all cases are easy to assimilate to this pattern: e.g. *Med.* 52 is somehow subordinate in intent to the main question in 50-51; it expresses another aspect of the paidagogos' surprise at the nurse's appearance outdoors; but 52 is not really answered in the answer to 50-51; the question's value lies in the light it throws on Medeia's frame of mind and it is thus a dramatically effective "throwaway."

16. I read ἦ for mss. ἢ. Denniston *ad loc.* refers to K-G II.532 to justify ἢ, but concludes "perhaps read ἦ." The passages with ἢ in K-G feature a sharp shifting of emphasis (from strong uncertainty among a multitude of possibilities to relatively confident contemplation of one possible answer) which seems to me quite pointless in Orestes' mouth at this moment.

When a double question has a double import, there are at least three ways to give a more or less complete answer.[17] The two answers may be (1) closely combined in one clause (*Trach.* 242-245, *Alk.* 482-483, *Hel.* 1202-1203, *Hyps.* I.iv, 33-34).[18] Or if the answers are given separately, they may be (2) in parallel order or (3) in chiastic order, and in either case the course of the dialogue may sometimes require a resumption of one of the questions before the full answer is reached.

Answers in parallel order are comparable in technique to answers preceded by comments which look back to parts of the questioner's rhesis that precede the question (e.g. *Se.* 397ff., discussed in section 1(b)(1) above). Direct parallel answers are given in *Ai.* 797-799 (separate sentences), *Hel.* 1206-1207 (one answer in apposition to the other), and *OT* 99-101 (ἀνδρηλατοῦντας ἢ . . . λύοντας answers ποίῳ καθαρμῷ; while the participle absolute with ὡς answers τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς συμφορᾶς;). The need to repeat the second question is noticeable in stichomythia in such cases as *Kykl.* 113-118, where the double question τίς δ' ἥδε χώρα καὶ τίνες ναίουσί νιν; receives an answer to the first half in 114, but the second half is refashioned into the related question of 115 and then repeated in 117 (τίνες δ' ἔχουσι γαῖαν;) before it is answered; and *Ba.* 1286ff., where after the double question (τίς ἔκτανέν νιν; πῶς ἐμὰς ἦλθεν χέρας;) there is a delaying apostrophe to Truth, then the answer to "who?" and then further questions in three couplets (1290-1295) which cover the ground of the original question "how?" In both cases the person who asked the question reacts to the first part of the answer and carries the dialogue on from there. *Or.* 1186-1188 provides a briefer example: 1188 resumes the second question in 1186, where it serves as a line-filler after the question in participial form which is answered in participial form in 1187:

Ορ. τί χρῆμα δράσουσ'; ὑποτίθης τίν' ἐλπίδα;
Ηλ. χοὰς κατασπείσουσ' ὑπὲρ μητρὸς τάφῳ.
Ορ. καὶ δὴ τί μοι τοῦτ' εἶπας ἐς σωτηρίαν;[19]

The same phenomenon occurs on a larger scale in *PV* 593ff., with an added element of lyrical heaping of questions and lyrical distraction. Io begins with an apistetic πόθεν-question and the first true question ("who are you?") in 593-597; then there is an access of pain (ἒ ἔ), and upon recovery a second question to Prometheus ("what is going to happen to me?") in 605-608. Prometheus promises a full answer, but his answer to "who?" prompts an exclamation and a brief dialogue on his sufferings (613-621). Io's second question has to be repeated in 622-623. A psychologically natural flow of dialogue takes precedence in these cases over formal continuity.

Chiastic responses to double questions feature a linking of the reply to the last words of the question, comparable to the linking in some answers to double questions with single import or to the linking in some passages featuring comments by both questioner

---

17. *Eum.* 408ff. is different from other cases in that the two halves of the double question are addressed to different parties and therefore are answered separately (chiastically) for technical reasons; the first part of the question is in fact resumed in 436ff. before Orestes gives his answer.

18. Cf. *Hkld.* 661-663, which constitute an excited triple question with double import ("why absent?", "where absent?"); line 664 as a whole tells why, and the opening word στρατὸν implies where.

19. Cf. also *Kresphontes* fr. 66.15-20 (Austin): the double question in 15 is answered in parallel sequence in 16 and 18 (17 resumes the second half); the second answer is also cast in the οἶσθα-form (cf. section 3 below) and helps carry the dialogue forward.

and answerer.[20] Some stichomythic examples are *Ant.* 1174-1175, *OK* 893-895, E.*Su.* 758-759, *Hel.* 459-460.

> *Ant.* 1174-1175
> Χο. καὶ τίς φονεύει; τίς δ’ ὁ κείμενος; λέγε.
> Αγ. Αἵμων ὄλωλεν· αὐτόχειρ δ’ αἱμάσσεται.

In *OT* 935-942 the chiastic sequence is extended slightly when the second answer (corresponding to the first question) is delayed by a comment on the possible effects of the answer (τὸ δ’ ἔπος οὑξερῶ τάχα, ἥδοιο μέν, πῶς δ’ οὐκ ἄν; ἀσχάλλοις δ’ ἴσως), which requires a resumption of the question in 938. In rheseis which respond to multiple questions the possibility of a chiastic linking is also present. In *Hkld.* 381ff. the initial question about Demophon’s worried appearance is followed by a question about the enemy’s arrival: although there is a process of inference connecting the two, the second question does not obviate the need for an answer to the first. Demophon’s answer links itself directly to the final form of the multiple question (ἥκει 389 ~ πάρεισιν 383), but as the rhesis proceeds the first question is eventually answered. Chiastic linkage seems also to account for a slight discontinuity between question and answer in E.*El.* 503ff. Elektra’s main question is “why are you crying?” (503), to which she adds a surmise-question (504-507) suggesting three possible objects of pity and concluding with a pathos-evoking relative clause attached to the final alternative; the old man’s response picks up the final comment, and apparently moves from it to a narrative of his journey, a narrative which explains his tears almost *en passant*:

> Ηλ. τί δ’, ὦ γεραιέ, διάβροχον τόδ’ ὄμμ’ ἔχεις;
>   μῶν τἀμὰ διὰ χρόνου σ’ ἀνέμνησεν κακά;
>   ἢ τὰς Ὀρέστου τλήμονας φυγὰς στένεις   505
>   καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμόν, ὅν ποτ’ ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων
>   ἀνόνητ’ ἔθρεψας σοί τε καὶ τοῖς σοῖς φίλοις;
> Πρ. ἀνόνηθ’· ὅμως δ’ οὖν τοῦτό γ’ οὐκ ἠνεσχόμην·
>   ἦλθον γὰρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τάφον πάρεργ’ ὁδοῦ
>   καὶ προσπεσὼν ἔκλαυσ’ ἐρημίας τυχών,   510
>   σπονδάς τε, λύσας ἀσκὸν ὃν φέρω ξένοις,
>   ἔσπεισα, τύμβῳ δ’ ἀμφέθηκα μυρσίνας.

“Useless indeed. But nevertheless this at least is a hardship I did not endure: For I did visit his tomb . . . .”[21]

---

20. E.g. *OT* 1073-1079: chorus directs a question to Oidipous and adds a comment; the king prefaces his answer to the question (1078-1079) with a reaction to the comment (ἀναρρήξει ~ ῥηγνύτω).

21. It is very odd that Denniston has no note *ad loc.* explicating these difficult lines. The above translation assumes (with Seidler and Paley) that τοῦτο is the (internal) object of ἠνεσχόμην and refers to the suffering which would have been endured if the old man had failed to pay his respects to the tomb. This view makes good sense of δ’ οὖν, γ’, and γὰρ and accounts for the lack of emphasis on ἔκλαυσ’ among the actions enumerated. Another view takes τοῦτ’ as adverbial accusative (“for the following reason”) and translates οὐκ ἠνεσχόμην as “did not forbear (to cry). “ If that is the meaning, δ’ οὖν would appear to have a dismissive force rather than the expected force of emphasis (“but this is the essential point”—*GP²* 460-462), γ’ is hardly necessary, and one might expect asyndeton after 508 rather than γὰρ. Some scholars emend 508 (e.g. Parmentier: δ’ οὐ τοῦθ’ ὅ γ’ οὐκ ἠνεσχόμην).

2(b) STICHOMYTHIC CONVENTIONS PRODUCING GRADUAL ANSWERS

Heaping of questions is not the only pattern of speech which may create gradual answers in stichomythia and an appearance of momentary dislocation between question and immediate response. Another significant factor is the practice of beginning an answer from some fixed point of origin and forcing the dialogue-partner to participate in the unfolding of the answer. This procedure may be termed the *ab ovo* technique. The starting point is often a topographical or personal proper name, appearing either in a statement of existence (ἔστι . . . or ἦν . . .; a technique borrowed from epic narrative and also used in narrative rheseis in tragedy)[22] or in a formulaic οἶσθα-question or equivalent expression[23] which directs attention to the person or place.[24] The *ab ovo* formula is usually followed up with a demonstrative pronoun or adverb referring to the starting point (οὗτος, ὅδε, ἔνθα, etc.).[25] In stichomythic adaptations of the *ab ovo* technique the real answer may come (a) in the very next couplet or (b) after several couplets in which the speakers gradually return to the original point.

> (a) *OT* 102-107
> Οι. ποίου γὰρ ἀνδρὸς τήνδε μηνύει τύχην;
> Κρ. ἦν ἡμίν, ὦναξ, Λάιός ποθ’ ἡγεμὼν
>   γῆς τῆσδε, πρὶν σὲ τήνδ’ ἀπευθύνειν πόλιν.
> Οι. ἔξοιδ’ ἀκούων· οὐ γὰρ εἰσεῖδόν γέ πω.
> Κρ. τούτου θανόντος νῦν ἐπιστέλλει σαφῶς
>   τοὺς αὐτοέντας χειρὶ τιμωρεῖν τινα.

> *Med.* 682-685
> Μη. σὺ δ’ ὡς τί χρῄζων τήνδε ναυστολεῖς χθόνα;
> Αι. Πιτθεύς τις ἔστι, γῆς ἄναξ Τροζηνίας.[26]
> Μη. παῖς, ὡς λέγουσι, Πέλοπος εὐσεβέστατος.
> Αι. τούτῳ θεοῦ μάντευμα κοινῶσαι θέλω.

> (b) E.*Su.* 115-118 and 125-126
> Θη. τί χρῆμα θηρῶν καὶ τίνος χρείαν ἔχων;   115
> Αδ. οἶσθ’ ἣν στρατείαν ἐστράτευσ’ ὀλεθρίαν;[27]

22. Cf. Jebb on *Trach.* 752 and Barrett on *Hipp.* 125; Fraenkel, *de med. et nov. com.* 46, discusses this phenomenon in connection with messenger-speeches in comedy, lists ten instances in tragic rheseis, and notes that the formula is perhaps inherited from early Indo-European poetry. Despite commentators’ references to the technique, it seems to be insufficiently recognized. E.g. Diggle supports his emendation of *IT* 257 (τόπῳ θ’ ὁποίῳ—cf. below Chapter 4, section 6[a]) by noting the emphasis on place in the opening of the narrative; but ἦν τις … ἀγμὸς … / ἐνταῦθα …. is a thoroughly conventional pattern and cannot support the emendation. Cf. notes 23 and 25 for similar lack of awareness of *ab ovo* conventions.

23. E.g. *Ba.* 462 τὸν ἀνθεμώδη Τμῶλον οἶσθά που κλύων, if it is a statement (as Murray and Dodds take it), is at any rate equivalent to an οἶσθα-question; but I think Roux is correct in her recent edition to return to the punctuation of the older editions (as a question). *IT* 517 is, however, probably a statement (ἴσως οἶσθ’). The question with νοεῖς in *OT* 1054-1055 functions according to the οἶσθα-question pattern: it betrays a lack of awareness of the conventional pattern to conjecture νοεῖς εἰ κεῖνον (A. Spengel) or to record this conjecture in a modern apparatus criticus (Dawe’s Teubner text).

24. Fraenkel, *de med. et nov. com.* 54-56, discusses this technique as one borrowed from Euripidean stichomythia by New Comedy; he interprets it as a borrowing from everyday speech intended to relieve the tedium of a long question-and-answer sequence. Since the formula is usually at the start of a sequence (as Fraenkel notes), the intention cannot be relief from tedium; the point is rather focussing of attention and compelling the dialogue-partner’s participation.

25. J. Andrieu, *Le dialogue antique* 197, seems to be unaware of the conventional rhetorical force of the demonstrative when he assigns a concrete deictic force to ταύτην in *Trach.* 1222 (“ce qui semble impliquer sa [Iole’s] présence”).

26. The conventionality of the pattern indicates that *Med.* 683 is not a suspended or interrupted statement and that Murray’s use of dots is unjustified. The same is true of *Ion* 294. Cf. Chapter 4, note 7.

27. I agree with Collard that *Su.* 116 is a question.

Θη. οὐ γάρ τι σιγῇ διεπέρασας Ἑλλάδα.
Αδ. ἐνταῦθ’ ἀπώλεσ’ ἄνδρας Ἀργείων ἄκρους.

Θη. ξύμβουλον οὖν μ’ ἐπῆλθες; ἢ τίνος χάριν;   125
Αδ. κομίσαι σε, Θησεῦ, παῖδας Ἀργείων θέλων.

Other passages[28] show considerable flexibility in the use of the formulas, combining them with retarding preliminary comments, attention-focussing exhortation (usually the imperative ἄκουε),[29] and even self-conscious references to the artificiality of the οἶσθα-question (similar artificiality was probably present in everyday conversation, but the self-conscious comment is typical of Euripidean rhetoric). Self-conscious comments appear in *Ion* 998ff. (999: Ἐριχθόνιον οἶσθ’ ἤ—; τί δ’ οὐ μέλλεις, γέρον;) and *Or.* 1179ff. (question, comment, exhortation-couplet with ἄκουε . . . λέγε . . ., then 1183: Ἑλένης κάτοισθα θυγατέρ’; εἰδότ’ ἠρόμην.). The οἶσθα-formula is also employed when no specific question has preceded but some piece of information or argument is awaited: Sophokles, for instance, creates a deliberate parallelism when he has Herakles terminate browbeating stichomythic passages with similar οἶσθα-questions (*Trach.* 1191 and 1219) before expressing his two commands to Hyllos in rheseis; Euripidean examples include *Hek.* 239-241 and *Hek.* 1008-1009 (sequence shortened by Polymestor's quick surmise, which features the appropriate demonstrative).[30]

It is important to note that these formulas, albeit frequent in Euripides, are not simply a mechanical mannerism. In many uses there is excellent dramatic and psychological justification for the retarding function and concentration of attention. It is a wise and tactful move for the servant to obtain Hippolytos' assent to a universalized maxim before applying it to the youth himself (*Hipp.* 88ff.). Likewise, in *Hek.* 239ff., Hekabe strengthens the force of her appeal (in the eyes of the audience if not in Odysseus') by compelling his assent to the first detail with an οἶσθα-question and by continuing to extract admission of the details of her benefaction in the subsequent lines.[31] Even in the long stichomythic passages of *Ion* the formulas contribute something in terms of articulation and lend variety and liveliness to the exchanges. One must admit, however, that in certain cases the gradual conveying of information *ab ovo* seems to be due mainly to enjoyment of the stichomythic form for its own sake: the *ab ovo* genealogy of *IA* 697ff. and the similar genealogical explanation apparently present in *Hyps.* I.v.3-11[32] betray such a nature.

28. Cf. *Ion* 293-298 (ἔστι-formula; Murray's dots at the end of 294 are unjustified—cf. note 26; Ion's cooperative surmise-question in 297 shortens the sequence slightly); *Ion* 931ff. (preliminary comment, ἄκουε and οἶσθα-question in 936, and extra weight lent to starting-point by irregularity of the incipient stichomythia); *Hel.* 97-102 (οἶσθα-question); *Kresphontes* fr. 66.18-20 Austin (οἶσθα-question).

29. Fraenkel, *de med. et nov. com.* 57 n.1, notes the survival of this collocation with the imperative "hear" in Latin comedy.

30. Also *Ion* 987ff. (note preceding ἄκουε), *Hipp.* 91 (a question, as Barrett has it), *IT* 812. An *ab ovo* answering technique is also possible without the οἶσθα- or ἔστι-formulas. In *Or.* 749-752, it is the latter half of 752 which answers the question of 749; 750-751 provide Tyndareos' arrival as the starting-point for the answer, and the true answer is linked to the starting-point by the demonstrative τοῦδε. Cf. *OK* 1170-1174, where 1171-1173a are preliminary to the relative clause 1173b-1174 which contains the implicit answer to the original question; and *Phoin.* 408ff., discussed in section 3(c) below.

31. For a comparable accusatorial interrogation, cf. *Eum.* 201-206.

32. Bond rightly forbears to fill out the lines, but von Arnim's bold restorations seem to be on the right lines as far as content is concerned.

3. THREE PROBLEM-PASSAGES

3(a) A.*SU.* 289-324

One of the most famous gradual answers in Greek tragedy is the revelation by the chorus in A.*Su.* of their origin and claim to kinship with the Argives. The question ποδαπόν is first phrased in the opening agnoetic lines of the king upon his arrival on stage (*Su.* 234ff.). The question is followed by a comment, and the comment ends with an implied request that the chorus answer the original question (the sense of 244-245 is clear despite corruption). The chorus replies with a counter-question (246-248) which is answered in a long rhesis, ending with a renewed request for an answer from the chorus (271-273). The maidens boldly provide a brief and (to the king) incredible answer (274-276); the form of the answer in fact occasions a further delay, as the king expresses his surprise in another rhesis and asks for a detailed answer (277-290). This is provided gradually in a stichomythia (291-324), the nature of which has often been obscured by the hypothesis of an implausible series of separate lacunae—all because of the simplistically logical assumption *regis est interrogare*, *chori respondere*, that is, that the king is here conducting an examination of the chorus's detailed knowledge.[33] But as the convention of the *ab ovo* οἶσθα-question and several instances of cooperative advancement of an information-conveying stichomythia[34] indicate, a character who is to be "taught" something (διδαχθείς 289) does not have to be the interrogator. The koryphaios can "teach" the king socratically[35] by taking him through the details of the story, as Tucker and Murray (2nd ed.) realized. The chorus begins *ab ovo* in the couplet which serves as "basis" for the stichomythia (291-292). The king lends his assent to that starting point in 293, and the chorus then adopts the strategy of seeking the king's agreement and cooperation at each stage. Line 295 follows 293 perfectly (φάτις ~ λόγος) and there is no lacuna:[36]

> Βα. ἦν ὡς μάλιστα, καὶ φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ.
> Χο. μὴ καὶ λόγος τις Ζῆνα μειχθῆναι βροτῷ;

The assumption that the king is examining the chorus's knowledge of Argive myth receives no support in the words of the text: lines 289-290 do not suggest it; it is widely agreed that it is the chorus and not the king who asserts at 310 καὶ ταῦτ' ἔλεξας πάντα συγκόλλως ἐμοί (καὶ ταῦτ' implies that the chorus has found the king to be in agreement with her earlier as well); line 300 makes little sense as an examination-question, but is perfectly natural in a cooperative stichomythic effort to cover the details of the story. No lacuna is necessary after 307 or 310.[37] By line 313 the chorus and the king, by

---

33. The view that the king is testing the maidens had the support of Hermann and Wilamowitz (cf. also Jens, *Stichomythie* 13-14); I know the Latin tag from Friis Johanssen's *app. crit.* but it may be older (cf. Page's *interrogat rex, respondet Chorus*).

34. Cf. the list given on page 47 below and Schmid's examples of *Katechese* in stichomythia, *Geschichte der griechische Literatur* 1.2 (Munchen 1934) 120.

35. I have no parallel on the scale of the passage in A.*Su.,* but cf. *IT* 810ff., where Orestes is told to λέγειν so that Iphigeneia can μανθάνειν, but Orestes conveys his knowledge by posing a series of οἶσθα-questions to his sister. *Or.* 778-780 is a much shorter passage featuring socratic questioning-technique. The μὴ καὶ-question in A.*Su.* 295 is also similar in strategy to *Hek.* 239-241, and in both passages the technique is felt to be advantageous enough to be continued in use.

36. The standard numeration includes no 294 or 297.

37. I take A.*Su.* 309 as a statement (again indicative of the cooperativeness of the stichomythia), not as a question.

cooperative effort, have brought Io to Egypt and the chorus speaks of an offspring. At this point it is appropriate for the king to ask the questions, for the chorus has shown him the origin of an Egyptian family of Argives. He now needs only to hear the genealogy which connects the distant forebear to the maidens before him. The transmitted text presents a lively and interesting dialogue (not the boring interrogatory so often assumed) without transpositions or multiple lacunae (one verse has of course fallen out after 315). Up to 313 the chorus and the king are covering common ground, and they share the task of advancing the story: the king adds new details at 296, 299, 303, 307; the chorus advances the narrative at 295, 300, 308, and 313. The text printed in Murray's OCT (2nd ed.) presents what 1 conceive to be the correct punctuation, distribution, and attribution of the passage *Su.* 289-324.

3(b) *HEL.* 83-88

> Ελ. τίς δ᾽εἶ; πόθεν γῆς τῆσδ᾽ ἐπεστράφης πέδον;
> Τε. εἷς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, ὦ γύναι, τῶν ἀθλίων.
> Ελ. οὐ τἄρα σ᾽ Ἑλένην εἰ στυγεῖς θαυμαστέον.
>   ἀτὰρ τίς εἶ πόθεν; τίνος δ᾽ αὐδᾶν σε χρή;
> Τε. ὄνομα μὲν ἡμῖν Τεῦκρος, ὁ δὲ φύσας πατὴρ
>   Τελαμών, Σαλαμὶς δὲ πατρὶς ἡ θρέψασά με.

The dialogue between Helen and Teukros in the second prologue-scene of *Hel.* presents an interesting example of gradual answering in an exchange which evidently strives for the ethos of conversational naturalism. The degree of naturalism has, however, been disputed because of textual difficulties in *Hel.* 78 and 86 and the objections of scholars to repetitious elements in the exchange. The problem has led Miss Dale, for instance, to propose that an interpolation has displaced the genuine text in the quoted passage and to reject the notion that realism may be an explanation for the repetitions. Such an alteration of the text is assumed principally for three reasons:[38] the textual problem of line 86, the repetitiousness of the received text, and the irregularity of the stichomythia. To determine how suspicious the repetition and irregularity are, it is essential to examine the ethos of the dialogue as a whole, looking first at the unsuspected parts.

In line 83 Helen asks a double question ("who are you? whence have you come here?") and the answer she eventually receives (in the problematic lines) leads naturally to the question of the motive of Teukros' visit to Egypt (89).[39] Teukros begins his answer with the fact of exile, which leads in turn to his father's instrumentality (92). The question ἐκ τοῦ; (*sc.* σ᾽ ἐκβάλλει ὁ πατήρ) prompts an opaque answer (94) which requires further clarification. A false lead (95) gives way to mention of suicide (96), again in such bald terms that clarification is needed. Clarification comes gradually, starting with an *ab ovo*

---

38. Two other reasons are in my view of little or no weight: (1) Telamon "seems" to some to be named for the first time in 92 (a thoroughly unreliable criterion: see my *Stud. E. Ph.* 340, where I cite *Andr.* 4 and 8, *Hek.* 3 and 30-31, *El.* 9 and 13, *Ion* 28 and 36-37, *Ba.* 1-3, 6, 28, 41; in *Hel.* 92 the repeated ὁ φύσας has a pathetic point—"*my own father*"); (2) the triple-identification formula in 87-88 is easy to imitate since Euripides uses it elsewhere (but it is equally easy for Euripides himself to use a formula he uses elsewhere!).

39. I confess to a strong temptation to interpret πόθεν in 83 as "from what motive?" (endorsed by Kannicht II.43 on *Hel.* 89), producing a double question in 83 which is answered in parallel order, with the second question (πόθεν . . . ἐπεστράφης;) resumed in 89 (τί δῆτα . . . ἐπιστρέφῃ;). But passages like *Med.* 666, *El.* 780, *Ion* 258, *IT* 479, *Kykl.* 106 demonstrate that the pattern "who? whence?" is a standard one; therefore, despite the use of πόθεν in *Ba.* 465 and 648, the presence of τίς in *Hel.* 83 suggests that an audience would automatically assume the meaning "whence?" here.

οἶσθα-question (98). The question of line 97 ("Why did Aias kill himself?") is resumed in 101, and the more essential question of 95 ("How did his death ruin you?") is finally answered in full in 103-104. The original question ("Why are you here in Egypt?") is left hanging, however, as the dialogue pursues its own natural course from 105 on; it is answered only after the dialogue is cut off, in 144ff.

The intricate pattern of gradual answering and repetition or resumption of questions is different from many comparable stichomythic passages and seems to me to have a definite, intended dramatic effect. The comparanda are passages in which complex explanatory narratives are cast in stichomythic form: A.*Su.* 289-324; E.*Su.* 113-162; *Hyps.* I.v.3-11; *Ion* 265-300, 936-969, 987-1019; *Phoin.* 408-427, *IA* 697-715. In seven of these eight passages the explanation or narrative is developed in chronological order, from the earliest ancestor or the earliest significant event. In all these cases there is a sense of cooperation and ease of communication between the dialogue-partners. The one exception is E.*Su.*, where Theseus is cold and hostile to Adrastos' story and his appeal: the explanation is extracted as if by cross-examination of a reluctant witness; Theseus moves back gradually from the expedition to the sons-in-law and then returns to the expedition. The point of the non-chronological, intricate pattern of the Helen-Teukros dialogue is somewhat different. Teukros' treatment of Helen foreshadows in many ways Menelaos' initial contact with her. In both cases there is a screen of illusion preventing easy communication, a subjective certainty in both men that Helen cannot be Helen (*Hel.* 117-122 ~ 571-581). Both men therefore maintain a certain distance from Helen, a distance which further injures and frustrates her. Teukros in particular gives in the first half of his scene an impression of hesitation, with perhaps a tinge of self-pity and a measure of embarrassment, by the gradualness and self-reference of some of his responses. For instance, he turns away at 77 rather than establish contact, line 84 is an indirect answer or preliminary to an answer, and line 92 is partly self-directed. The contrast between this dialogue and the others suggests that Euripides is aiming for a certain kind of conversational ethos in this dialogue and that Miss Dale is overhasty in rejecting such a possibility.

We may now apply this interpretation of the ethos of the whole context to the earlier portion of the passage. The received text of line 78, although accepted by Dale, cannot, I think, be correct,[40] but two easy emendations are available in Hartung's ὡς τίς ὤν for ὅστις ὤν and Kessels' redivision of the transmitted reading as ὦ ταλαίπωρός τις ὤν.[41] With Hartung's emendation Helen's question is double in form but in fact has a single apistetic/epiplectic force because the question "who are you?" is subordinated to the request for an explanation ("who are you that you behave this way?"). With Kessels' text there is no subordinate "who?" but only the epiplectic "why?" It is to the epiplectic force that Teukros replies in his apologetic lines 80-82. Helen now seeks his identification in the normal tone of an information-seeking question: her multiple question now asks both "who?" and "whence?" Teukros' response in 84 is a deliberate, self-pitying delay. That is, it is not merely a conventional start to a gradual answer (for Teukros had

---

40. I reject ὅστις ὤν because the indirect interrogative cannot replace the direct in a direct question (K-G II.517 n.1) and because I cannot accept that ὅστις ὤν represents an indefinite relative clause with verb attracted into participial form.

41. *Mn* 28 (1975) 63-65. Kessels' solution is neat, but I feel the vocative (and hence the whole question) becomes milder and I find the stronger epiplectic force of Hartung's reading more suitable. And it may be suggestive that the vocative singular of ταλαίπωρος occurs in 9 other passages in tragedy, always in the same position and always with elided ending (and 8 of 9 times preceded by ὦ).

already implied his Greek origin in 73-76 and 81),[42] but rather expressive of an attitude
—diffidence, self-pity, an almost sentimental awareness of one's role as an exemplum of
senseless misfortune (again Teukros foreshadows Menelaos). Helen reacts with the
appropriate sympathy in 85 and repeats the question "who?" for the final time in line
86, now receiving Teukros' formal triple answer.[43] The pattern of gradual answering
with repetitions within 78-88 conforms to the ethos detected in the dialogue as a whole,
and the absence of strict regularity in the stichomythia is another index of that ethos.
Here, as elsewhere, it is illegitimate to insist on thoroughly strict stichomythia (as e.g.
Dale does) when the stichomythia has not yet established itself firmly as such.[44] Far from
being "clumsy and repetitious" and "breaking up the stichomythia just getting under
way" (Dale), these lines exhibit dialogue-techniques attested elsewhere and portray skill-
fully the initial dissonance between the characters and their difficulty in attaining a
productive conversational contact.

There remains, nevertheless, the difficult textual problem of *Hel.* 86. Murray's text
(ἀτὰρ τίς εἶ πόθεν; τίνος δ' αὐδᾶν σε χρή; with δ' αὐδᾶν for L's ἐξαυδᾶν) has the
apparent advantage of being a triple identity-question, to which Teukros' triple answer
is a neat complement (although such neatness is not mandatory: cf. note 27 of Chapter
5). But mid-line caesura without elision has often been doubted in Euripides. Were
Sophokles the author, one would accept such a line as deliberately expressive and
emphatic (cf. *OT* 738, *Phil.* 101);[45] but most of the Euripidean parallels seem to
evaporate on inspection.[46] Consequently Kannicht approves Jackson's reading, which
eliminates the anomaly and also retains the transmitted ἐξαυδᾶν:[47] ἀτὰρ τίς εἶ ποθ',
ὅντιν' ἐξαυδᾶν σε χρή; The flatness[48] of this line, however, may convince one that the
corruption is still uncured, or that line 86 alone is to be deleted, or that the median
caesura is after all tolerable and deliberate. I hope at any rate to have shown that neither
stichomythic pattern nor repetition should be adduced to justify a more violent
alteration of the text.

3(c) *PHOIN.* 408-415

The stichomythic narration of how Polyneikes came to be Adrastos' son-in-law
(*Phoin.* 408ff.) provides another problematic example in which multiple questions and

---

42. Miss Dale's reconstruction seems to me to misinterpret or underestimate the ethos of the dialogue: she views line 84 as
the beginning of a reply split by Helen's intervention (see Chapter 4, note 22 for a possible objection). I view line 84 as self-
contained and deliberately opaque, and line 85 as a calm expression of Helen's sympathy for the victims of her phantom-self,
not as a hasty intervention.

43. For the form see Kannicht *ad loc.*

44. For imperfect regularity at the start or end of a stichomythic passage, cf. Kannicht II.220 and Denniston on *El.*
651-652.

45. Further examples in Descroix, 273.

46. List in Descroix, 90. Willingness to recognize mid-line caesura without elision in Denniston on *El.* 545-546 and Page,
GLP², p. 115 note; rejection of the possibility in Maas, *Greek Metre*, ¶ 103, and Kannicht *ad loc.* The manuscripts and papyri
seem to confirm Elmsley's ostensibly artificial expedient of writing an elided long dative ending in *Hek.* 1159 (*scriptio plena* in
part of the tradition has led, as often, to an intrusive *nu,* creating a "split anapaest," wrongly accepted by Daitz) and *Ba.* 1125
(*scriptio plena* in papyrus), and the same expedient can be applied to fr. 495.6 N². *El.* 546 is corrupt and *IA* 630 of uncertain
authorship (*IA* 1578 and 1593 definitely spurious), leaving only *Su.* 303 and 699, on which see Collard, who strongly favors
acceptance of the anomaly.

47. But corruption from *scriptio plena* δεαυδαν to δεξαυδαν and εξαυδαν is possible, especially if the scribe read the latter
part of the line as "you must speak it openly."

48. Contrast *Kykl.* 548, which Kannicht cites as a parallel for the construction of the second clause.

gradual answering are significant. After a well-rounded exchange in which Iokaste explores with her exiled son the hardships of exile and his love for his homeland (*Phoin.* 388-407), the dialogue shifts to narration (408ff.):

<div align="center">

Ἰο. πῶς δ’ ἦλθες Ἄργος; τίν’ ἐπίνοιαν ἔσχεθες;   408

Πο. ἔχρησ’ Ἀδράστῳ Λοξίας χρησμόν τινα.   409

Ἰο. ποῖον; τί τοῦτ’ ἔλεξας; οὐκ ἔχω μαθεῖν.   410

Πο. κάπρῳ λέοντί θ’ ἁρμόσαι παίδων γάμους.   411

Ἰο. καὶ σοὶ τί θηρῶν ὀνόματος μετῆν, τέκνον;   412

Πο. οὐκ οἶδ’· ὁ δαίμων μ’ ἐκάλεσεν πρὸς τὴν τύχην.   413

Ἰο. σοφὸς γὰρ ὁ θεός· τίνι τρόπῳ δ’ ἔσχες λέχος;   414

Πο. νὺξ ἦν, Ἀδράστου δ’ ἦλθον ἐς παραστάδας.   415

</div>

In 1796 Friedrich Jacobs[49] proposed to transpose the couplet 413-414 to precede line 409. He remarked that he could not see how line 409 answers the questions of 408 and that οὐκ οἶδα in 413 is disproved as an answer to 412 by the couplet 420-421:

<div align="center">

Ἰο. τί θηρσὶν ὑμᾶς δῆτ’ Ἄδραστος ᾔκασεν;

Πο. στρωμνῆς ἐς ἀλκὴν οὕνεκ’ ἤλθομεν πέρι.

</div>

The transposition produces, it must be admitted, a superficially attractive sequence, and it is not surprising that it has been accepted by Matthiae, Hartung, Kirchhoff, Wecklein, Pearson, and Powell. But the transmitted order was defended long ago by Augustus Naeke,[50] who recognized in *Phoin.* 409 an *ab ovo* answer to Iokaste’s question and correctly ascribed any “disturbance” in the dialogue to the conventions of sticho-mythic dialogue.

In the traditional order *Phoin.* 408ff. contain an explanatory narrative in sticho-mythia in strict chronological order, comparable to others in which there is, as here, a sense of sympathy and cooperation between the dialogue-partners.[51] The pattern of question and answer conforms to dialogue-conventions. In line 408 the essential question is the first one, and the second question fills out the line by rephrasing the main question with an emphasis on a subordinate aspect of the “how?” There are a large number of passages in which such filler-questions are more or less ignored as the answer attaches itself to the first question: attachment of the answer to the first question may be marked by syntactic continuity;[52] the filler may be a dispensable alternative question or surmise-question;[53] or, as here, the filler-question is merely a repetition of the main question in slightly different form.[54] In answering 408, Polyneikes starts *ab ovo*[55] with

49. *Exercitationes criticae in scriptores veteres I: curae secundae in Euripidis tragoedias* (Leipzig 1796), 40-43.

50. *Opuscula philologica* (ed. F. T. Welcker) I (Bonn 1842) 112-115 (a lecture given in 1824).

51. See section 3(a) above.

52. In *Pe.* 735 and *Hel.* 826 the first question continues the syntax of the previous line and the next line follows suit; an add-on continuity is created in the following passages when the first question adds an interrogative element to the previous line: S.*El.* 390, 1191; *Ant.* 42, 1049; *Trach.* 1186 (Pearson’s period is wrong); *HF* 1407; *Phoin.* 410.

53. Alternative questions: S.*El.* 1343, *IT* 511, 1164, and seven other cases. Surmise-questions: *Hkld.* 795, *Hipp.* 1160-1161, *Tro.* 1050, and 15 other cases.

54. *OK* 1474, *HF* 712, *IT* 734, and 18 other cases.

55. For an *ab ovo* beginning without οἶσθα- or ἔστι-formula, cf. *IA* 697 and *Hyps.* I.v.3, as well as the passages cited in note 30 above.

the earliest event and moves gradually forward in chronological order, with some cooperative contributions from Iokaste. From the oracle Iokaste moves in 412 to her son's connection with it; in fact she is resuming the original question and picking up the subordinate detail τίν’ ἐπίνοιαν ἔσχεθες; when she asks: "And what part (interest) did *you* have in the beasts named?" This is a different question from "Why did Adrastos liken you to beasts?" (420) and may legitimately be answered "I don't know": Euripides is trying to show that Polyneikes was (as he wandered to Argos) and is now unaware of why he was so specified in the oracle; or, in other words, why and how Apollo contrived to put him in his present situation.[56] To him it was a matter of incomprehensible fate. Line 414 makes excellent sense in the transmitted position (less good sense in Jacobs' order) because with 409 in the background ὁ θεός can be referred to Apollo. Moreover, Iokaste's transition to the topic of the marriage is perfectly natural after 411, but unmotivated in Jacobs' order. The answer to the question in 414 is, of course, introduced by an *ab ovo* formula (ἔστι-type).

The superficial attractiveness of Jacobs' order will not stand up to scrutiny once dialogue-patterns are taken into account. In his version, the answer to the double question with single import in 408 must be considered to attach itself to the second member of the pair. Such attachment is found in a large number of cases of various kinds: the second question may be a narrower surmise-question which supersedes a broader or more open question and either points to the expected answer or limits the range within which it will fall;[57] the second question may be an alternative question following an incorrect surmise.[58] Of the cases that do not feature the above schemes,[59] only three contain rephrased questions comparable to *Phoin.* 408, and in each case the answer is syntactically related to the second question but also fully answers the first of the pair as well:

> *Phoin.* 390-391
> Ιο. τίς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ; τί φυγάσιν τὸ δυσχερές;
> Πο. ἓν μὲν μέγιστον, οὐκ ἔχει παρρησίαν.

> *Phoin.* 1706-1707
> Αν. ποῦ; τίς σε πύργος Ἀτθίδος προσδέξεται;
> Οι. ἱερὸς Κολωνός, δώμαθ’ ἱππίου θεοῦ.

> *Or.* 401-402
> Με. ἤρξω δὲ λύσσης πότε; τίς ἡμέρα τότ’ ἦν;
> Ορ. ἐν ᾗ τάλαιναν μητέρ’ ἐξώγκουν τάφῳ.

The problem for Jacobs' transposition is that although *Phoin.* 408 is a double question with single import (and not two distinct questions), the answering pattern does not conform to any of these patterns, particularly the last. The answer οὐκ οἶδα satisfies only the second question and not πῶς δ’ ἦλθες Ἄργος; Even if one were to view 408 as a true

---

56. Such emphasis is to be related to the theme of blindness which permeates the play; the brothers are in many ways blind to the way in which they are fulfilling the curse they hoped to avoid.

57. *Pe.* 237, *Ag.* 549, S.*El.* 921, *Kykl.* 539, *Phoin.* 388 and about 30 further cases.

58. *Kykl.* 121, *Andr.* 913, E.*Su.* 125, *Ion* 303, 948, *Or.* 441.

59. In *OT* 437, *Phil.* 918, *OK* 388, *Ion* 1012 the first question borrows the syntax of the previous line while the second question rephrases the first in a syntactically independent form. *Pe.* 793, *Hipp.* 1066-1067, and *Hel.* 456 (on which see Chapter 5, section 5) involve apistetic, aporetic, and epileptic elements.

double question with a chiastic response, the sequence of dialogue is strained, for Iokaste would be leaping forward to the marriage instead of pursuing the inquiry into how her son went to Argos.

Naeke's defense of the traditional order was based on an understanding of the conventions of stichomythia, and Jacobs' first objection was based on failure to acknowledge the convention. Naeke's case is now further strengthened by the information assembled here about the answering of double questions in stichomythia.[60]

60. Since writing this I have been able, through the kindness of the author and of J. M. Bremer, to see John A. Butterworth, *A Commentary on the Phoenissae of Euripides* (*Lines 1-637)* diss. Univ. of London 1972. On pp. 146-147 he too defends the transmitted order of *Phoin.* 408ff., adding the observation that the rhetorical contrast of οὐκ οἶδα vs. ὁ δαίμων κτλ. in 413 needs the σοὶ of 412 immediately before it. (He is wrong, however, to adduce against Jacobs' transposition the charge that 415 would not answer 412, since it could be taken as an *ab ovo* response.)

4

CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY II: SUSPENSION OF SYNTAX, INTERRUPTION AND *SERMO FRACTUS*

It is characteristic of real, informal conversation that more than one person may speak at once, that a speaker may fall silent in mid-sentence, and that speaker B may begin to speak in the middle of A's utterance. Theater-dialogue, in most traditions, dispenses with much of the chaos of real conversation in the interests of clarity. For instance, in Greek tragedy and in many other stage-traditions, two or more voices do not present separate utterances simultaneously. The degree to which aposiopesis and interruption occur in Greek tragedy, however, is a matter of dispute. Most scholars would agree that Gilbert Murray (often under the influence of the ever over-ingenious Verrall) went much too far in trying to solve apparent or real textual or exegetical difficulties by the hypothesis of aposiopesis or of gestures and actions not alluded to in the words of the text. But since the bare texts are our only evidence, there will always be some uncertainty and disagreement. My inclination will be to assume no more than the texts seem to *require,* in the belief that if a certain kind of point is made quite often explicitly, then we should hesitate to accept an inexplicit example just because the bare text might *allow* that interpretation. The phenomena studied in this chapter are relevant to our overall investigation because of our interest in contact between the speakers and in continuity of logical sequence in discourse on the stage. We shall examine various types of deviation from an utterly orderly sequence of one syntactically complete speech by another, with attention to the degree of contact present in the situation and the degree of violation of the integrity of each utterance.

One responsibility of a modern editor of a Greek tragedy is to punctuate the text, to give some indication through typographical conventions of how he believes the text was meant to be enunciated in performance. Although it is clearly dangerous to place any great weight upon novel and artificial forms of punctuation,[1] the absence of punctuation in the oldest Greek texts (and probably in the author's original copy) need not deter the modern editor: the poets themselves were, after all, able to direct the actors in the original performances.[2] One of the weaknesses of Murray's punctuation of the Euripidean corpus is that he used a string of dots for several different phenomena as well as for certain textual lacunae. Perhaps no system can be found that will cover all cases and be totally consistent, but it would be helpful to have forms of punctuation that would dis-

---

1. All too numerous are the examples of this fault in Biehl's suggestions on the text of *Or.*: see his Teubner edition. *adnotationis criticae supplementum* on *Or.* 182, 335, 382, 439, etc.

2. Thus di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 318 (cf. his note on *Or.* 140-141: "si ricordi che Euripide non usava nostri segni di interpunzione"), is overstating the case when he cites the lack of punctuation in early texts as an argument against a non-obvious punctuation.

tinguish between cooperative suspension, sharp intervention, and true aposiopesis. When the flow of dialogue has an established rhythm that facilitates suspension of an utterance followed by a cooperative continuation of the syntax by the dialogue-partner or by a comment which does not deflect the original speaker from completing the syntax after suspension, it is probably best to use no punctuation (or a comma or colon, if that is appropriate): many stichomythic passages and lyrics with antiphonal structure are to be punctuated (and performed) in this way. When speaker B intervenes sharply and more or less cuts off speaker A's utterance, a dash is suitable. (It would also be appropriate to mark self-interruptions such as *Ion* 1384-1385.) The string of dots may then be confined to cases in which a speaker allows his voice to trail off or falls silent with his syntax somehow incomplete, creating a pause which invites intervention.

Since there has been disagreement among editors about when an utterance is to be considered syntactically incomplete, I shall make clear my criteria for decision. I do not consider an utterance in stichomythia incomplete simply because one can add on to it a relative (or other) clause in the next utterance in response to a question, as happens in *Ion* 330-332:

> Κρ. πέπονθέ τις σῇ μητρὶ ταῦτ' ἄλλη γυνή.
> Ιω. τίς; εἰ πόνου μοι ξυλλάβοι, χαίροιμεν ἄν.
> Κρ. ἧς οὕνεκ' ἦλθον δεῦρο πρὶν πόσιν μολεῖν.

Kreousa is deliberately vague in 331, and the vagueness prompts Ion's question, which in turn causes Kreousa to add on the relative clause: Murray is right to use a period in 330 rather than the comma used by Nauck. Nor do other forms of elliptical linkage (especially using the participle) require the assumption that the original line is incomplete:

> *Ag.* 542-544
> Χο. τερπνῆς ἄρ' ἦτε τῆσδ' ἐπήβολοι νόσου.
> Αγ. πῶς δή; διδαχθεὶς τοῦδε δεσπόσω λόγου.
> Χο. τῶν ἀντερώντων ἱμέρῳ πεπληγμένοι.

The period printed by Fraenkel and by Page at 542 is appropriate since the demonstrative is deliberately vague (comparable to the use discussed in note 6 to Chapter 3) and the sentence complete: the vagueness prompts the request for clarification and that request prompts the add-on syntax. To be considered incomplete, the line itself must in general lack something syntactically and semantically vital.[3] An exception exists, however: sometimes a non-vital addition is made after an intervention and must be considered part of the original utterance because the intervention in no way prompts the addition. Examples of this occur especially in passages of antilabe, e.g. *Ion* 561-562:

> Ιω. χαῖρέ μοι, πάτερ,   Ξο. φίλον γε φθέγμ' ἐδεξάμην τόδε.
> Ιω. ἡμέρα θ' ἡ νῦν παροῦσα.   Ξο. μακάριόν γ' ἔθηκέ με.

---

3. For study of interruption and suspended syntax the list provided by Schmid, *Geschichte der griechische Literatur* I.3 (München 1940) 812 n.10, is without value. It is based for Euripides on Nauck's old Teubner texts, contains no less than four misprints (for *HF* 578ff. read perhaps 555ff.; for *Hek.* 578ff. read *Tro.* 578ff.; for *Alk.* 165 read 105; for *Or.* 715 read 775), and several cases which I cannot accept as belonging to the class (*Ag.* 542, *Trach.* 1185—see Kamerbeek, S.*El.* 1190, *Hkld.* 794, *Hek.* 421, *Ion* 330, *Phoin.* 743).

1. COOPERATIVE COMPLETION OF SYNTAX

Although we are primarily interested in the degree of contact and discontinuity in iambic passage, most of the phenomena about to be discussed occur both in stichomythia and in rapid lyric exchanges, and it is worthwhile to consider the lyric examples alongside the iambic ones, even though we cannot, on present evidence, determine with certainty in which context a particular technique may have originated.[4]

1(a) IN DIALOGUE

The form of intervention which implies full contact and the highest degree of cooperation in the advancement of the dialogue occurs when speaker B finishes speaker A's syntax. The earliest example in dialogue occurs in *PV* 255-256, where γε is used, as often, to mark the continuity of syntax across the change of speaker. Failure to comprehend the dialogue-technique caused the scribe of M (or its ancestor) to omit the change of speaker:

> *PV* 255-256
> Χο. τοιοῖσδε δή σε Ζεὺς ἐπ᾽ αἰτιάμασιν
> Πρ. αἰκίζεταί γε κοὐδαμῇ χαλᾷ κακῶν.

Many modern editors emend *Kykl.* 541 (after Porson and Kirchhoff), but recognition of completion of Kyklops' syntax by Silenos (with Murray) permits retention of the transmitted reading:

> *Kykl. 541-542*
> Κυ. καὶ μὴν λαχνῶδές τ᾽ οὖδας ἀνθηρᾶς χλόης
> Σι. καὶ πρός γε θάλπος ἡλίου πίνειν καλόν.
> [541 τ᾽ L: γ᾽ Porson | ἀνθηρᾷ χλόη Kirchhoff]

It is difficult to say whether *PV* 255 was meant to be the opening of a question, but in *Ion* 271-272 the question begun by Ion has its syntax cooperatively completed by Kreousa (note γε):

> *Ion* 271-272
> Ιω. δίδωσι δ᾽, ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ νομίζεται,[5]
> Κρ. Κέκροπός γε σῴζειν παισὶν οὐχ ὁρώμενον.

In other cases a surmise-question by speaker B completes speaker A's remark: *Hipp.* 351-352 (in which the intervention has more dramatic importance than usual), E.*Su.* 934-935, E.*El.* 664-665, *Hel.* 835-836, *Ion* 551-552 (tetrameter antilabe; read ἐν τοῦ in 551), *Or.* 775 (tetrameter antilabe),[6] *Phil.* 1232-1233, and *Hek.* 1259-1261 (in which

---

4. On theories about the origin of stichomythia see Seidensticker, *Gesprächsverdichtung* 19 n.3.

5. I do not know how to indicate the interrogation typographically in accordance with the system I have proposed, but I think it would be misleading to suggest in this context of established stichomythia either that Ion lets his voice trail off (. . .) or that Kreousa intervenes sharply (—).

6. Since Pylades finishes Orestes' question in 775b and 776a is a statement confirming that Pylades' surmise is correct, 776a should be printed as a statement, not a question (Murray, Biehl). Kirchhoff's γ᾽ would make things clearer, but is not necessary. I interpret the lines: "What if I should go and say to the citizens"—"that you acted justly?"—"Yes, in avenging my own father."—"(We must fear) that they'll be overjoyed to get their hands on you."

an erroneous surmise necessitates a corrective continuation preserving the original syntax).[7]

<blockquote>

Hipp. 351-352

Φα. ὅστις ποθ᾽ οὗτος ἐσθ᾽, ὁ τῆς Ἀμαζόνος . . .

Τρ. Ἱππόλυτον αὐδᾷς;   Φα. σοῦ τάδ᾽, οὐκ ἐμοῦ κλύεις.

Hek. 1259-1261

Πο. ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τάχ᾽, ἡνίκ᾽ ἄν σε ποντία νοτὶς

Εκ. μῶν ναυστολήσῃ γῆς ὅρους Ἑλληνίδος;

Πο. κρύψῃ μὲν οὖν πεσοῦσαν ἐκ καρχησίων.

</blockquote>

The punctuation chosen in the *Hipp.* passage is important. A series of dots well suggests typographically Phaidra's hesitant revelation: after line 336 the nurse no longer manipulates the dialogue, and in 352 she does not, I think, cut in sharply; rather her mistress is manipulating the dialogue to induce the nurse to utter the name itself. The actor's delivery was perhaps slow in the ὅστις-clause, becoming slower still toward the end of the line. A similar technique is deployed in *Tro.* 713 (ἔδοξε τόνδε παῖδα . . . πῶς εἴπω λόγον;). The whole passage *Tro.* 713-719 skillfully portrays Talthybios' reluctance and human sympathy: he hesitates to finish the horrible revelation and so lets the syntax hang and utters an aporetic question; Andromache is thus invited to complete the syntax with surmise-questions in 714 and 716; the herald himself never returns to his suspended syntax, but is finally brought to make an outright statement in 719.

1(b) IN LYRIC PASSAGES

Cooperative completion in lyric passages (usually of shared lament) is attested mainly in Euripides, but the number of examples is somewhat uncertain because of doubts about the reliability of the manuscripts' distribution of lines on the one hand and of scholars' insistence upon absolutely symmetrical response on the other. Di Benedetto has provided a valuable discussion of the problem and argued, with varying degrees of persuasiveness, for wider recognition of asymmetries in the division of corresponding lyrics.[8] Relatively non-problematic cases include the following:

<blockquote>

E.*Su.* 807

Αδ. ἐπάθομεν ὤ   Χο. τὰ κύντατ᾽ ἄλγη κακῶν.[9]

E.*Su.* 1153-1154

Πα. ἔτ᾽ εἰσορᾶν σε, πάτερ, ἐπ᾽ ὀμμάτων δοκῶ

Χο. φίλον φίλημα παρὰ γένυν τιθέντα σόν.

Tro. 1326

Εκ. ἔνοσις ἅπασαν ἔνοσις   Χο. ἐπικλύσει πόλιν.

</blockquote>

In *OK* 534-535 correspension and the use of γε both justify the corrected distribution between two voices (Oidipous picks up after the chorus' τε καὶ),[10] and the same use of γε

---

7. I do not count *Med.* 683 or *Ion* 294 as examples of incomplete or suspended syntax (cf. Chapter 3, note 26): the add-on phrases supplied by the dialogue-partners are quite dispensable.

8. "Responsione strofica e distribuzione delle battute in Euripide," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 298-321.

9. Correctly emended and divided by Hermann.

10. The division of the γὰρ-clause between two voices at S.*El.* 844-845 is not marked by γε, but is confirmed by symmetry.

seems to be present in the non-Euripidean passage *Phoin.* 1740-1742, if we follow the manuscripts, which give 1740 to Oidipous and 1741f. to Antigone.[11] Another probable instance arises in *IT* 832-833 if we follow the indication of the meter and assign 832 to Iphigenia and 833 to Orestes, rather than emending 832 into an iambic trimeter or tolerating the anomaly of a lyric line in the male role in the duet:[12]

> Ιφ. κατὰ δὲ δάκρυ, κατὰ δὲ γόος ἅμα χαρᾷ
> Ορ. τὸ σὸν νοτίζει βλέφαρον, ὡσαύτως δ' ἐμόν.

Several other potential examples are likely to remain disputed.[13]

2. SUSPENDED SYNTAX WITH INTERVENTION

2(a) INTERVENTION ENCOURAGING COMPLETION (LYRIC AND IAMBIC)

An equal degree of contact but a lesser degree of cooperation are featured in numerous passages in which speaker A's utterance is suspended while speaker B encourages A to finish what he has to say. The intervening remark in lyric examples is usually a simple question introduced by τί (what?) or an elliptical question which borrows its syntax from the interrupted utterance. E.g.:

> *OK* 208-211
> Οι. ὦ ξένοι, ἀπόπτολις· ἀλλὰ μή,
> Χο. τί τόδ' ἀπεννέπεις, γέρον;
> Οι. μὴ μὴ μή μ' ἀνέρῃ τίς εἰμι, μηδ' ἐξετάσῃς πέρα ματεύων.

> *OK* 1725-1727
> Αν. ἵμερος ἔχει με   Ισ. τίς; <φράσον.>

---

11. Murray here follows the distribution proposed by (or known to?) τινες, as reported in the scholia. Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 1903, 594 (=*KL Schr.* VI. 352), would give 1740-1742 as a whole to Oidipous, with σε for με in 1742. I prefer to follow the mss. and assume that the original με in 1742, combined with lack of familiarity with the use of γε and the technique of cooperative completion, produced the ancient suggestion that 1740 was sung by Antigone.

12. So R. Lohmann, *Nova Studia euripidea* (Diss. phil. Halenses, 15:5 [1905]) 422-423; and (independently) P. Maas, *Hermes* 61 (1926) 240 (= *Kleine Schriften* [München 1973] 49).

13. On E.*Su.* 1144-1145 and 1151-1152 see di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 303, and Collard's edition II.392-395 and *ad loc.*: Murray's interpretation of 1145 is incredible; Collard produces a symmetrical text, but the second person reference of σόν (you, my dead child) is very odd in view of the second person reference implied by the vocative τέκνον (you, grandson)—contrast 1154. In E.*Su.* 818 one could delete the punctuation after ἔχεις ἔχεις; and treat the chorus' words as syntactic completion (Collard allows for completion in assuming a play upon the meaning of ἔχεις). In *Tro.* 159-160 the only reason to assume (against the mss.) a change of speaker and cooperative completion is the desire for symmetry. Here one should keep 159-160 together in Hekabe's mouth (so Biehl and K. H. Lee), even at the expense of symmetry: it is most appropriate for the chorus to hear from Hekabe the news they have asked for and then to react with an exclamation. Symmetry may be reestablished if, with earlier editors and di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 320, followed by Biehl in his Teubner text, we make 182-183 (with ὀρθρεύουσαν) a unitary utterance in the mouth of Hekabe: but the reference to terror suits the chorus and not Hekabe, and ἦλθον likewise applies well in a literal sense to the chorus, cannot apply literally to Hekabe, and is unlikely, I think, to have the transferred sense assumed by di Benedetto, who interprets ἦλθον φρίκᾳ as a periphrasis equivalent to διὰ φρίκας ἦλθον. I assume Hekabe is trying to calm and cheer the chorus (cf. Σ) and suggest that the text be emended to ὀρθεύου (which is read, by emendation or accident, in the ms. Copenhagen [Haun.] 417). (I now find that K. H. Lee *ad loc.* also adopts this reading and gives 183 to the chorus.) The ms. provides cooperative completion at *Ba.* 1180 and 1183 (rejected by most editors, but now accepted by Roux), but fails to make divisions in *Ba.* 1194-1199 (now variously divided by editors; I favor Murray's treatment, but cf. Roux and di Benedetto, op. cit.). Di Benedetto also rejects the cooperative interlacing of syntax assumed by most editors (with some ms. support) in *Tro.* 582-586 (there seem to be no grounds on which to base any firm decision).

Αν. τὰν χθόνιον ἑστίαν ἰδεῖν
Ισ. τίνος;   Αν. πατρός, τάλαιν’ ἐγώ.[14]

In dialogue passages the most common intervention is a question which borrows its syntax from the interrupted remark and so leads smoothly into a continuation of the original remark:

> *Pe.* 734-736
> Βα. μονάδα δὲ Ξέρξην ἐρῆμόν φασιν οὐ πολλῶν μέτα
> Δα. πῶς τε δὴ καὶ ποῖ τελευτᾶν; ἔστι τις σωτηρία;[15]
> Βα. ἄσμενον μολεῖν γέφυραν, ἓν δυοῖν ζευκτήριον.

> *OT* 558-560
> Οι. πόσον τιν’ ἤδη δῆθ’ ὁ Λάϊος χρόνον
> Κρ. δέδρακε ποῖον ἔργον; οὐ γὰρ ἐννοῶ.
> Οι. ἄφαντος ἔρρει θανασίμῳ χειρώματι;

> *Med.* 679-681
> Αι. ἀσκοῦ με τὸν προὔχοντα μὴ λῦσαι πόδα
> Μη. πρὶν ἂν τί δράσῃς ἢ τίν’ ἐξίκῃ χθόνα;
> Αι. πρὶν ἂν πατρῴαν αὖθις ἑστίαν μόλω.[16]

Occasionally the intervention is a question of the type τί λέγεις;, as in *Ion* 265-267, 275-277, *Hek.* 1271-1273, *Hel.* 315-317 (cf. *IA* 115ff.). In one passage self-interruption is combined with an intervening question that encourages the resumption of the suspended syntax: *Ion* 949 is both a suitable conclusion to the suspended verb of 947 in answer to 946 and a chiastic reply to the double question in 948 ("where?" and an alternative question with dominant second member):

> *Ion* 946-949
> Πρ. κᾆτ’ ἐξέκλεψας πῶς Ἀπόλλωνος γάμους;
> Κρ. ἔτεκον — ἀνάσχου ταῦτ’ ἐμοῦ κλύων, γέρον.
> Πρ. ποῦ; τίς λοχεύει σ’; ἢ μόνη μοχθεῖς τάδε;
> Κρ. μόνη κατ’ ἄντρον οὗπερ ἐζεύχθην γάμοις.

2(b) INTERVENTION SUPPLYING VITAL SYNTAX

Much rarer than the types of intervention already discussed are those which actually deflect speaker A from finishing his syntax in the way he originally intended to. Such

---

14. Cf. also *Pe.* 1020-1022, S.*El.* 855-856, 1275-1277, *Phil.* 210 (Pearson wrongly prints a period in place of a comma after τέκνον), *OK* 512-514, 530-533, 542-544, 545-546, 1731-1732, 1739-1740, *Alk.* 105-107 (in this context 105 is probably to be taken as incomplete), *HF* 1178-1180 (see however note 36 below), *Ion* 769-772 (second intervention; the first is of a different kind), *Ba.* 1177 (where di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 318, wrongly rejects the division) and 1181f., *Rhes.* 724-725, 726. E.*Su.* 598-601 is probably not an example (see Collard); I prefer a full stop after λίσσομαι in *OT* 650 (with Jebb and Dawe, against Pearson). An example with the main voice iambic and the intervening voice lyric is *Tro.* 1238-1240, where one could punctuate 1238 with a comma rather than dots (Hekabe is in control of herself, as her use of iambic shows).

15. The second question in *Pe.* 735 is a filler which does not affect the continuity of syntax.

16. Cf. also *Se.* 807-811 (exclamation in 808, surmise-question with borrowed syntax in 810), *Ant.* 1048-1050, *Phil.* 1230-1232 (where in fact the statement is completed by the surmise-question in 1233), 1405-1407 (tetrameter antilabe; the first intervention is a question with borrowed syntax, the second an agnoetic πῶς λέγεις;), *OK* 644-646, *Hek.*1001-1003. E.*Su.* 142-144, *HF* 713-717 (the second intervention is a syntactically continuous comment tacked on with γε), *Ion* 319-321, 534-536 (tetrameter antilabe), 1001-1003, 1331-1333, 1347-1349, *Hel.* 825-827, 1241-1243, *Or.* 1332-1334 (cf. note 19), 1582-1584, *IA* 727-729, 1346-1347 (tetrameter antilabe), 1349-1350 (tetrameter antilabe). *Ion* 1011-1013 contain an interesting oddity: the intervention (1012) is a double question, the first part of which reaches back to 1010 for its syntax (χρῆσθαι depending on κέκρανται), while the second part employs an independent construction leading smoothly into 1013 as a continuation of 1011.

deflection need not be a matter of discontinuity, however; in several cases the interven-
tion by speaker B cooperatively provides a vital element of the syntax for the continua-
tion of A's statement:

> *Choe.* 117-119
> Χο. τοῖς αἰτίοις νυν τοῦ φόνου μεμνημένη
> Ηλ. τί φῶ; δίδασκ' ἄπειρον ἐξηγουμένη.
> Χο. ἐλθεῖν τιν' αὐτοῖς δαίμον' ἢ βροτῶν τινα.

> *Phil.* 1225-1228
> Οι. . . . ἡ δ' ἁμαρτία τίς ἦν;
> Νε. ἣν σοὶ πιθόμενος τῷ τε σύμπαντι στρατῷ
> Οι. ἔπραξας ἔργον ποῖον ὧν οὔ σοι πρέπον;
> Νε. ἀπάταισιν αἰσχραῖς ἄνδρα καὶ δόλοις ἑλών.

In *Choe.* 119 the infinitive is the indirect form of the imperative, depending on εὔχου (or
the like) understood from τί φῶ; in 118; in the *Phil,* passage Neoptolemos is able to leave
the verb ἥμαρτον unexpressed in 1228 because Odysseus has provided him with an equiv-
alent finite verb in 1227 (≈ ἥμαρτες ποίαν ἁμαρτίαν;).[17]

2(c)　INTERVENTION CAUSING MODIFICATION OF SYNTAX

In those instances in which speaker A modifies his syntax after the intervention, the
deflection appears to be due to the agitation of speaker A himself rather than to the
strength of speaker B's intervention. In other words, an interruption of this kind is still
relatively mild and cooperative and does not fully convey the disorder of real conversa-
tion:

> *Choe.* 174-176
> Ηλ. καὶ μὴν ὅδ' ἐστὶ κάρτ' ἰδεῖν ὁμόπτερος
> Χο. ποίαις ἐθείραις; τοῦτο γὰρ θέλω μαθεῖν.
> Ηλ. αὐτοῖσιν ἡμῖν κάρτα προσφερὴς ἰδεῖν.

> *Ai.* 106-110
> Αι. . . . θανεῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὔ τί πω θέλω.
> Αθ. πρὶν ἂν τί δράσῃς ἢ τί κερδάνῃς πλέον;
> Αι. πρὶν ἂν δεθεὶς πρὸς κίον' ἑρκείου στέγης
> Αθ. τί δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ἐργάσῃ κακόν;
> Αι. μάστιγι πρῶτον νῶτα φοινιχθεὶς θάνῃ.

In the former passage the koryphaios' intervention is not particularly sharp or forceful
(note the bland filler-expression which fills out line 175); it is rather Elektra's amaze-
ment which causes her to repeat much of the syntax of 174 in 176. Although Athena's
question in *Ai.* 109 is spoken with feeling, it is perhaps in order to highlight Aias'
ghoulish ferocity that Sophokles puts in his mouth the illogically modified syntax of line
110. He had begun to say πρὶν ἂν . . . νῶτα φοινιχθῇ, but after the intervention the
content of the πρὶν-clause is converted to participial form (πρῶτον φοινιχθείς) and

---

17. Other examples: A.*Su.* 461-463, where the infinitive of 463 depends on the phrase περαίνει μηχανή provided by the
intervening line; *Phoin.* 980-981 (Menoikeus' intervention allows the imperative μόλε to be understood to complete Kreon's
utterance); perhaps *Phoin.* 737-739 (although Eteokles' προστετάχθαι may impose a modification on Kreon's syntax; I am
assuming that the infinitive ἀνάσσειν has intruded from 742). On *IT* 1217-1218 see section 6(a) below.

θάνῃ is made the verb of the πρὶν-clause instead, throwing emphasis on the word "die." It is interesting that the one sure case of modification of syntax in Euripides occurs in the agitated confrontation between a half-crazed Orestes and a reluctant Menelaos:

Or. 1610-1611
Με. οἴμοι, τί δράσω;   Ορ. πεῖθ' ἐς Ἀργείους μολὼν
Με. πειθὼ τίνα;   Ορ. ἡμᾶς μὴ κτανεῖν αἰτοῦ πόλιν.

Murray eliminates this example by adopting θανεῖν for κτανεῖν from A and placing a semicolon after the word, leaving αἰτοῦ πόλιν as a rather clumsy filler: but di Bene-detto[18] and Biehl have rightly returned to the reading and punctuation usually preferred in earlier editions. The modification of syntax is not due to the force of Menelaos' intervention, but fits the herky-jerky rhythm of the antilabe and the agitated mood of Orestes.[19]

2(d)   INTERVENTION WITH A COMMENT

When the interposed utterance is a comment on what has been said so far rather than an encouragement to the completion of the syntax, one of the dialogue-partners may be on the verge of departing from normal contact under the influence of emotion. Discontinuity is not quite present in Ion 769 and Hyps. fr. 64, 95-98 (Bond), despite the contrast between speaker A's iambics and the lyrics of B. The pattern is comparable to that found in iambics at Pe. 299-302, where suspension is hardly felt at all (Murray and Page, at any rate, use a period in 299):

Ion 769-770
Πρ. μήπω στενάξῃς—   Κρ. ἀλλὰ πάρεισι γόοι.
Πρ. πρὶν ἂν μάθωμεν—   Κρ. ἀγγελίαν τίνα μοι;

Hyps. fr. 64, 95-98
Ευ. ἐπεὶ δ' Ἰάσων ἔθαν' ἐμός, μῆτερ, πατήρ,
Υψ. οἴμοι κακὰ λέγεις, δάκρυά τ' ὄμμασιν,
      τέκνον, ἐμοῖς δίδως.
Ευ. Ὀρφεύς με καὶ τόνδ' ἤγαγ' εἰς Θρᾴκης τόπον.[20]

Pe. 299-302
Αγ. Ξέρξης μὲν αὐτὸς ζῇ τε καὶ φάος βλέπει·
Βα. ἐμοῖς μὲν εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα
      καὶ λευκὸν ἦμαρ νυκτὸς ἐκ μελαγχίμου.
Αγ. Ἀρτεμβάρης δὲ κτλ.

18. But the parallels for the phenomenon offered by di Benedetto *ad loc.* are not apposite, three being of another type entirely and the fourth being of the supplication-type, for which see section 3 below.

19. Through incorrect punctuation Murray creates an instance of deflected syntax of extraordinary form in *Or.* 1332-1334: he has Elektra respond to an intervention-question and then pick up the suspended syntax. There should be no punctuation at the end of 1332, and no punctuation in 1334 except the comma after θανεῖν (cf. di Benedetto; Porson is the first editor I know of who interpreted the passage correctly). The suspension is then of a common type (cf. note 16 above). The suspension and resumption assumed by Murray is similar to that assumed by Jebb and Pearson in *OT* 1128-1130, but I think Dawe's text is superior there; Jebb's note on *OT* 1130 does not face the oddity of the technique he assumes.

20. The ms. presents an apparent interposed iambic comment in a lyric context in *IT* 865-867. But Iphigeneia seems to be in full contact (868 reacts to 866), and there is thus no emotional/psychological motivation for suspended syntax or an intervention. Monk's transposition therefore appears to be justified both in terms of dialogue-conventions and in terms of metrical structure (867 belongs metrically with 864-865, not with 868ff., where Iphigeneia shifts to dochmiacs).

Among other examples in dialogue-contexts, the comment in *IT* 1040[21] expresses impatience and incomprehension and has the same sort of dramatic effect as an interposed question encouraging completion of the suspended syntax, while *Or.* 399, despite its contribution to the characterization of Menelaos, is more formal than dramatic. The second of two interventions in HF 713-717 is a comment put in the form of appended syntax and has some similarity to ironic comments made more or less out of contact (discussed in section 4 below).[22] Comments present mainly for the sake of form appear often in tetrameter antilabe (Ion 561-562, Or. 784-785, IA 1345-1346, 1347-1348, 1353-1354,[23] 1355-1356); a comparable phenomenon is the artifice of responding twice to a suspended question in tetrameter antilabe (Ion 548-549, 558-559, Or. 1602-1603). In the trimeter antilabe at E.El. 579-580, however, the suspension across an antiphonal comment helps convey the emotion of the condensed recognition/reunion scene. Euripides also makes brilliant use of interposed comments in trimeter antilabe in *Ba.* 966-970,[24] where the technique dramatizes Pentheus' submission to the god's spell and the awful dichotomy between his illusion and Dionysos' awareness of, and explicit reference to, the coming disaster.

3. SUPPLICATIONS: IS THE SYNTAX COMPLETE?

A special problem of punctuation and interpretation of dramatic staging arises in four Euripidean passages which feature supplication of one actor by another (*Med.* 336ff., *Hek.* 752ff., *Hel.* 1237-1239, *Phoin.* 923-925). Murray's use of a series of dots (or a dash in *Hel.* 1237) might suggest that either aposiopesis or sharp interruption is responsible for the appearance of incomplete syntax:

> *Med.* 336-340
> Μη. μὴ δῆτα τοῦτό γ', ἀλλά σ' αἰτοῦμαι, Κρέον . . .
> Κρ. ὄχλον παρέξεις, ὡς ἔοικας, ὦ γύναι.
> Μη. φευξούμεθ'· οὐ τοῦθ' ἱκέτευσα σοῦ τυχεῖν.
> Κρ. τί δαὶ βιάζῃ κοὐκ ἀπαλλάσσῃ χερός;
> Μη. μίαν με μεῖναι τήνδ' ἔασον ἡμέραν κτλ.

If one pays attention to the ethos and rhythm of the dialogue, however, it is evident that neither sharp interruption nor aposiopesis is dramatically appropriate in the *Hek.* and *Hel.* passages, and the form of Kreon's remark in *Med.* 337 is fairly deliberate (ὡς ἔοικας rather than a prohibition or epiplectic question). The lines in question should probably be interpreted not as in any way irregular or incomplete or interrupted, but as

---

21. I approve of Murray's punctuation of 1039, but prefer to adopt Reiske's σοῦ θιγόντος, ὡς ἐρῶ in 1041 (*Ad Euripidem et Aristophanem animadversiones* [Leipzig 1754] 81). Other interpretations: (a) Platnauer considers ἐρῶ an intrusive gloss, displacing e.g. χερί; (b) read ὥς, ἐρῶ and interpret the verb as parenthetic with Wecklein (cf. εἰσορᾶς Trach. 394, which is much easier); (c) read ὥς, ἐρῶ and interpret it with Seidler as governing νίψαι (apparently modified syntax, βούλεσθαι being understood in 1041 because in 1039 βουλήσομαι = βούλεσθαι ἐρῶ).

22. Lykos' comment is, however, acknowledged by Amphitryon, who uses γ' in 717 to mark the return to his own statement and perhaps adds μάτην in reaction to Lykos' ἀνόνητα. *Hel.* 85 becomes an intervening comment if one accepts Dale's reconstruction of *Hel.* 83ff. (a possible objection to the technique of the resulting passage is that elsewhere the rhythm of the stichomythia is more firmly established in advance of the suspension and intervention; see Chapter 3, section 3[b]).

23. Unaccountably the editors who print a comma at the end of *IA* 1355a fail to put one at 1353a, although 1354a must be viewed as an unprompted continuation of 1353a.

24. I punctuate *Ba.* 966a with a comma rather than a period.

self-sufficient performative utterances, the explicit "stage-directions" which accompany the actual movements of the actor. The omission of the verb of supplication governing σε in *Hel.* 1237 and *Phoin.* 923 is idiomatic and not evidence of suspension of syntax. A colon would perhaps be the best form of punctuation to represent the completeness of the syntax and the attitudes of the interlocutors. Even in *Phoin.* 923-925, where Teiresias' epiplectic τί-question is sharper in tone than the other interventions, the established rhythm of the dialogue would probably prevent any impression of sharp intrusion on Kreon's syntax, and a colon could be used.

4. INTERVENTION IN CONTEXTS OF REDUCED CONTACT 4(a) IN

LYRIC

Intervention or syntactic suspension occurs in various contexts of less than full contact. Either speaker or both may be self-absorbed or uttering a self-directed exclamation or lament not intended to affect the dialogue-partner. In some contexts self-absorption and cooperative completion alternate. *Se.* 961-1004 (whoever sings these lines) exemplify the extreme of artful interlacing of syntax in an antiphonal lament: in 963-964 and 989-992 the first voice seems to be absorbed in her own performance, while the second voice follows closely with corresponding words that apply to the other brother; in other parts of the passage each utterance seems self-contained, but the same pattern of one-sided contact is evident. Andromache plays a similar role as the second voice in *Tro.* 578-581, with Hekabe the self-absorbed lamenter.[25] Most other lyric examples also come from laments: *Pe.* 1009-1013 (exclamation 1010),[26] S.*El.* 839-842 and 866-869 (exclamations), *OK* 198-201 (exclamation of pain or discomposure, not of grief), *HF* 1051-1052 (exclamation + comment), *Tro.* 587-590 (comment)[27] and 1310-1311 (comment).[28] In *Alk.* 872-877 and 889-894 Admetos is out of contact much of the time as he expresses his grief in exclamations at the end of each colon, but there is no suspension of syntax except at 891-893.[29] Briefer passages of the same technique occur in *HF* 1065-1067 and *Tro.* 1229-1230, which differ, however, in that the lamenter is initially invited to express his grief. Despite textual uncertainty, there seems to be another example in *OK* 220-222, where I would interpret Oidipous' words as a single question punctuated by the exclamations of the chorus:[30]

25. On *Tro.* 582-586 see note 13 above. The same sort of alternation between self-absorbed leading voice and following second voice is apparently present in *Tro.* 595ff. and 601ff.; although di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 309, endorses Seidler's assignment of the entire strophe to Andromache and the entire antistrophe to Hekabe, the interlacing of syntax in 601-602 is, I think, undeniable (note asyndeton after δακρύω; and what can the syntax of καὶ ἐμὸν δόμον κτλ. be except additional object of [καταλειπόμενον] δακρύω?), and it is probably no accident that the same pattern makes sense in 595-597. (K. H. Lee does divide 595ff., but in 601ff. follows Wilamowitz in giving 601-602 to the chorus; but Wilamowitz can get away with this attribution only because his translation is very loose.)

26. Cf. *Pe.* 568ff. for self-interruption in a choral ode by means of exclamations; one could, of course, assign the exclamations to a different voice or voices within the chorus.

27. Perhaps *Tro.* 589 should be punctuated with a question-mark; the epiplectic question would still be equivalent to an interposed comment.

28. Comparison of these passages with the iambic/lyric exchange at *Hipp.* 565-600 confirms Barrett's view that the exclamation at *Hipp.* 594 is a self-interruption by the chorus, not an isolated cry of anguish by Phaidra, who (after 569) is calm enough to speak iambics.

29. Murray's dots after οἶδα in 874 are wrong; note that Admetos has collected himself sufficiently in 878 to refer to the chorus' final remarks (876-877).

30. Pearson, on the other hand, punctuates it as three separate questions, assuming that οἶσθα is understood with each

> Οι. Λαΐου ἴστε τιν' ἔκγονον   Χο. ἰού.
> Οι. τό τε Λαβδακιδᾶν γένος   Χο. ὦ Ζεῦ.
> Οι. ἄθλιον Οἰδιπόδαν;   Χο. σὺ γὰρ ὅδ' εἶ;

4(b) IN DIALOGUE

Iambic contexts involving suspension of syntax across an intervention with one of the speakers not fully in contact are more varied. The only non-Euripidean example is *Ai.* 981-982, where a grief-stricken Teukros behaves in trimeter antilabe much as one might in a lyric passage:

> Χο. ὡς ὧδ' ἐχόντων   Τε. ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, τάλας.
> Χο. πάρα στενάζειν.   Τε. ὦ περισπερχὲς πάθος.[31]

The remaining examples are from Euripides, who appears to have adapted the lyric technique to dialogue in order to heighten the effect of a withdrawal from contact under the force of emotion. The expression of grief is prominent in the artful stichomythic dialogue *Hek.* 414ff., where Byzantine commentators[32] noted Polyxena's self-absorbed continuation of her own thoughts across Hekabe's interventions: *Hek.* 414 and 416 should, like 426, be punctuated with commas to indicate that the maiden pursues the course of her lament without showing true awareness of Hekabe's lines until at least 419 (perhaps until 421). What Polyxena does sincerely, Phaidra does by deliberately adopting a pose: in *Hipp.* 337-343 she laments as if self-absorbed in order to convey indirectly what she hesitates to utter from her own lips. Although the nurse at first cooperates as expected with Phaidra's withdrawal from full contact, as the surmise-question with borrowed syntax in 338 indicates, the ploy works too well, and the old woman's common-sensical inability to follow her mistress' meaning forces Phaidra to try another tack. Suspended syntax marks Orestes' withdrawal from contact in his apostrophe to Apollo (E.*El.* 971-973) and combines with exclamations and repetition of questions in *Ion* 750-760 to convey the chorus' fear and reluctance (suspension 756-758). Interventions by two other voices are possible in a context of collaborative prayer in which the leader of the prayer is self-absorbed: *Or.* 1235-1237 (ἔκτεινα μητέρα . . . [interventions by Pylades and Elektra] . . . σοί, πάτερ, ἀρήγων) is a clear case; E.*El.* 671ff. can be divided up to produce the same sort of withdrawal, but attribution and distribution are disputed.[33] Finally, there is an interesting mixture of exclamation and full contact in *Tro.* 719-725:

---

question (a parallel for such technique is *IT* 812-820). As three separate questions the queries are in the wrong order. Translate "Do you know a certain son of Laios—and the scion of the Labdakids—(namely) wretched Oidipous?" (Cf. J. T. Sheppard's translation.)

31. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea*, 195, on the dramatic force of this technique.

32. Schwartz, *Scholia* 1.42, lines 15-24 and 1.43, lines 8-16.

33. Suspension of the leading voice's syntax occurs if we have four triplets (with ἐμῶν kept in 671, θ' emended to γ' in 672, and 683 following 681) all divided Orestes-Elektra-old man: although vocative phrases are capable of standing by themselves and so do not create a strong impression of suspension, Orestes' prayer would consist of 671 + 674 + 677 + 680 (the most notable suspension occurring between the last two); the old man would complete Elektra's syntax in 679 and tack on an additional relative clause in 683. This is the order I would prefer (and I would give 682 to Orestes and 684ff. to Elektra); see Denniston *ad loc.* for arguments in favor of symmetrical division, except that he assigns 674 and 680 to Elektra, whereas I prefer a consistency of leading voice and view 680 as definitely a continuation of 677 by the same voice. Di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 320-321, eliminates any possibility of suspension by assigning 671-672 and 677ff. to Orestes, 673 and 676 to the old man, and 674-675 to Elektra.

whereas the continuity of Talthybios' syntax in 721 + 723 + 725 (with a slight modifica-tion of syntax in the shift from λέγων in 721 to λέξας in 723) and the exclamations of Andromache in 720 and 722 suggest that she has withdrawn from contact in reaction to the bad news, her second intervention in 724 is a curse on Odysseus, belatedly showing awareness of what the herald had been saying three lines earlier.

Euripides also employs suspension of syntax with imperfect contact in contexts of tetrameter antilabe to convey the anger and mockery of the hostile repartee. In *Hel.* 1630-1634, the impassioned Theoklymenos presses on with the syntax of his utterance while his interlocutor[34] accompanies physical resistance with verbal correctives to each phrase the king utters:

Θε. ἀλλὰ δεσποτῶν κρατήσεις δοῦλος ὤν;   — φρονῶ γὰρ εὖ.
Θε. οὐκ ἔμοιγ', εἰ μή μ' ἐάσεις   — οὐ μὲν οὖν σ' ἐάσομεν.
Θε. σύγγονον κτανεῖν κακίστην   — εὐσεβεστάτην μὲν οὖν.
Θε. ἥ με προύδωκεν   — καλήν γε προδοσίαν, δίκαια δρᾶν.
Θε. τἀμὰ λέκτρ' ἄλλῳ διδοῦσα.   — τοῖς γε κυριωτέροις.

Likewise in *Phoin.* 604-610, Polyneikes' seven utterances form two sentences, with insulting capping comments interposed by Eteokles at every turn: Polyneikes appears to ignore the comments, although it is possible that the γε of line 608 is prompted by Eteokles' most recent objection[35] and that the heightened exasperation of lines 611ff. is due to Eteokles' skill at capping every line. The similarity of the exchange at *Or.* 1613-1616 (trimeters) is noteworthy:

Με. ὦ τλῆμον Ἑλένη,   Ορ. τἀμὰ δ' οὐχὶ τλήμονα;
Με. σὲ σφάγιον ἐκόμισ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν,   Ορ. εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἦν.
Με. πόνους πονήσας μυρίους.   Ορ. πλήν γ' εἰς ἐμέ.
Με. πέπονθα δεινά.   Ορ. τότε γὰρ ἦσθ' ἀνωφελής.

It is clear that Menelaos withdraws from contact in 1613 and continues his utterance down to 1616 without attending to Orestes' interventions. Canter was clearly right to correct transmitted σοι in 1614 to σε, and Biehl's decision to return to σοι in his recent Teubner text betrays an insensitivity to the ethos of this variety of Euripidean dialogue.

5. INTERRUPTIONS AND TRUE BREAKS IN SYNTAX

If we now turn to cases in which an interruption by speaker B (or some other circum-stance) actually deters A from immediately or ever finishing what he intended to say, we find that the formality of tragic dialogue is such that the poets rarely create harshly incomplete or obscure utterances. There are no Aischylean examples and the Sopho-klean examples are all from the poet's last two extant plays. The earliest Euripidean instance is in *Hipp.* 310:

34. With Dale and Kannicht I believe that the interlocutor is the koryphaios; I am not convinced by the arguments to the contrary offered by D. L. S. Stanley-Porter, *CPh* 72 (1977) 45-48.

35. Denniston, *GP*² 138 (cf. his comment on page 1), says that "the first speaker ignores an interruption by the second"; I think it is rather the case that γε reasserts Polyneikes' viewpoint in reaction to the interruption.

Hipp. 308-310

(Τρ.) ἢ σοῖς τέκνοισι δεσπότην ἐγείνατο
        νόθον φρονοῦντα γνήσι', οἶσθά νιν καλῶς,
        Ἱππόλυτον—   Φα. οἴμοι.   Τρ. θιγγάνει σέθεν τόδε;

The mid-line exclamation is striking, but it should be noted that the nurse's utterance is not damaged by the interruption, that she was in any case running on with syntactically non-essential parenthetic and appositive phrases. One of the most remarkable interruptions in all tragedy occurs in E.*Su.* 513 when Adrastos begins a reply to the Theban herald's rhesis: the five-syllable vocative ὦ παγκάκιστε[36] is all that Adrastos can say before Theseus silences him (and it comprises the only break in almost 500 lines of silent presence on stage from 263 to 733); the interruption is both well-marked and explained. The impact of Herakles' shocked disbelief is heightened in *HF* 556 when his question breaks off Megara's incipient partitive apposition at the end of the μὲν-phrase and the dialogue moves on without returning to supply the δὲ-phrase:

HF 554-557

Ηρ. τί δ' ἐξελείπετ' οἶκον ἑστίαν τ' ἐμήν;
Με. βίᾳ, πατὴρ μὲν ἐκπεσὼν στρωτοῦ λέχους,
Ηρ. κοὐκ ἔσχεν αἰδῶ τὸν γέροντ' ἀτιμάσαι;
Με. αἰδώς γ' ἀποικεῖ τῆσδε τῆς θεοῦ πρόσω.

The surprised interruption of Orestes in *IT* 772 likewise falls at a syntactic pause (a colon at the end of 771 is preferable to dots); Iphigeneia resumes her message in 774, so that this is almost a case of suspended syntax, but the way in which Iphigeneia takes notice of the intrusion of Orestes justifies its classification here.[37]

IT 770-774

(Ιφ.) Ἡ 'ν Αὐλίδι σφαγεῖσ' ἐπιστέλλει τάδε
        ζῶσ' Ἰφιγένεια, τοῖς ἐκεῖ δ' οὐ ζῶσ' ἔτι—
Ορ. ποῦ δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνη; κατθανοῦσ' ἥκει πάλιν;
Ιφ. ἥδ' ἣν ὁρᾷς σύ· μὴ λόγων ἔκπλησσέ με.[38]
        Κόμισαί μ' ἐς Ἄργος κτλ.

Two of the five non-problematic Sophoklean examples involve a neat break at a syntactic pause, with explicit reference to the act of interruption. In *Phil.* 331 Neoptolemos begins his narrative with an ἐπεὶ-clause (a standard opening) and continues the narrative in 343ff. in a form which supplies the apodosis to the suspended ἐπεὶ-clause. In between Philoktetes interrupts and inquires about Achilles' death (332-342). Beginning and end of the interruption are clearly marked, rendering the extended suspension easy to understand. In the prologue-scene of *OK* Oidipous can finish only the exordium of his appeal before the Athenian interrupts him:

36. This interrupted utterance is clearly different in nature from the isolated vocatives often found in laments or greetings, which are often independent utterances and may be punctuated with a period (e.g. *Alk.* 244-245, *Hek.* 180, *HF* 910, 1178, *OK* 327b, 330).

37. A further possible Euripidean example comes from satyr-drama: in *Kykl.* 674 ὡς δὴ σὺ has been variously emended or interpreted, but Murray and Denniston, *GP²* 229, assume a broken utterance; Denniston assumes an ironic force, but I wonder whether the line could be spoken as a threat left incomplete by aposiopesis (of which *Rhes.* 686 provides an example).

38. I accept Seidler's λόγων for L's λόγοις.

OK 33-37
Οι. ὦ ξεῖν’, ἀκούων τῆσδε τῆς ὑπέρ τ’ ἐμοῦ
  αὐτῆς θ’ ὁρώσης οὕνεχ’ ἡμὶν αἴσιος
  σκοπὸς προσήκεις ὧν ἀδηλοῦμεν φράσαι,—
Ξε. πρίν νυν τὰ πλείον’ ἱστορεῖν, ἐκ τῆσδ’ ἕδρας
  ἔξελθ’· ἔχεις γὰρ χῶρον οὐκ ἁγνὸν πατεῖν.

The interruption immediately throws an effective emphasis on the sacredness of the ground upon which Oidipous surprisingly insists he will remain; and the exordium contains so much information that the actual appeal (φράσον or the like) is semantically and dramatically, if not syntactically, superfluous.

The only certain Sophoklean case of incompleteness due to interruption shows the poet exploiting brilliantly the possibilities of antilabe in iambic trimeter. Theseus parries Oidipous’ fears with his own confidence, not even permitting Oidipous to complete his warnings:[39]

OK 652-657

Οι. πῶς οὖν ποήσεις;	Θη. τοῦ μάλιστ’ ὄκνος σ’ ἔχει;
Οι. ἥξουσιν ἄνδρες.	Θη. ἀλλὰ τοῖσδ’ ἔσται μέλον.
Οι. ὅρα με λείπων–	Θη. μὴ δίδασχ’ ἃ χρή με δρᾶν.
Οι. ὀκνοῦντ’ ἀνάγκη.	Θη. τοὐμὸν οὐκ ὀκνεῖ κέαρ.
Οι. οὐκ οἶσθ’ ἀπειλὰς–	Θη. οἶδ’ ἐγώ σε μή τινα
ἐνθένδ’ ἀπάξοντ’ ἄνδρα πρὸς βίαν ἐμοῦ.	

There are also incomplete utterances in *Philoktetes,* caused not by interruption of one speaker by another, but rather by an attack of sickness which prevents Philoktetes from expressing himself successfully or rationally.

Phil. 751-754
Νε. τί δ’ ἔστιν οὕτω νεοχμὸν ἐξαίφνης, ὅτου
  τοσήνδ’ ἰυγὴν καὶ στόνον σαυτοῦ ποῇ;
Φι. οἶσθ’, ὦ τέκνον,–   Νε. τί ἔστιν;
Φι. οἶσθ’, ὦ παῖ,–;   Νε. τί σοί;
  οὐκ οἶδα. Φι. πῶς οὐκ οἶσθα; παππαπαππαπαῖ.

Many editors have interpreted Philoktetes’ utterances in 753 as statements; but the dramatic point of the passage lies in the fact that Philoktetes is trying to communicate something and is unable to finish his utterance, not in the fact that he is exasperatingly telegraphic from the start. Thus Pearson’s decision to print the phrases as questions is to be approved, although it is best to add some indication that Philoktetes is unable to complete his questions, leading first to Neoptolemos’ invitation to continue, then to a mutual feeling of exasperation at the lack of communication.[40] Later in the same scene Philoktetes is again the victim of debilitating pain:

---

39. Pearson and other editors print 653a as an interrupted phrase as well; it may be, but one cannot be so certain as in the other cases. I would prefer 653b to be pronounced in the same relaxed manner as 652b rather than in the assertive manner adopted in 654b after Oidipous has hesitated to accept Theseus’ casual assurance. Schneidewin-Nauck unnecessarily print 655a also as an unfinished utterance.

40. See Seidensticker, *Gesprächsverdichtung* 92, for similar comments; on pp. 87-92 he offers useful remarks about the dramatic force of dividing a verse between two speakers.

Phil. 813-816

Φι. ἔμβαλλε χειρὸς πίστιν.   Νε. ἐμβάλλω μενεῖν.
Φι. ἐκεῖσε νῦν μ᾽, ἐκεῖσε—   Νε. ποῖ λέγεις;   Φι. ἄνω . . .
Νε. τί παραφρονεῖς αὖ; τί τὸν ἄνω λεύσσεις κύκλον;
Φι. μέθες μέθες με.   Νε. ποῖ μεθῶ;   Φι. μέθες ποτέ.

Campbell believes that Philoktetes is already in a semi-conscious and irrational state when he says ἐκεῖσε in 814 (he is to be understood to be referring to Oita and other heights); Webster assumes that, stricken by pain, he is asking to be thrown into the volcano (ἐκεῖσε . . . ἄνω . . . μέθες are then one sentence broken up by the pain). I agree with Paley, Jebb, and Schneidewin-Nauck in believing that ἐκεῖσε refers to the cave[41] and that Philoktetes begins to say something which he is unable to finish: he apparently wants to suffer and sleep in the privacy and security of the cave; μέθες in 816 does not go with ἐκεῖσε but is prompted by the pain of Neoptolemos' contact with his flesh and goes closely with 817, although Sophokles underscores the breakdown in communication by making Neoptolemos slow to understand the transition. Better sense is thus made of μέθες, and the broken utterance of line 814 is comparable to that in 753.

6. PROBLEM-CASES AND FALSE INDICATIONS OF *SERMO FRACTUS*

6(a)   SOME PASSAGES IN *IT*

IT, with its many stichomythic passages, provides several problem-cases related to suspension of syntax and interruption. The retention of L's πῶς in *IT* 252 produces the following sequence in Murray's text:

IT 252-257

Ιφ. πῶς δ᾽ εἴδετ᾽ αὐτοὺς κἀντυχόντες εἵλετε;
Βο. ἄκραις ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖσιν ἀξένου πόρου . . .
Ιφ. καὶ τίς θαλάσσης βουκόλοις κοινωνία;
Βο. βοῦς ἤλθομεν νίψοντες ἐναλίᾳ δρόσῳ.
Ιφ. ἐκεῖσε δὴ ᾽πάνελθε, πῶς νιν εἵλετε
     τρόπῳ θ᾽ ὁποίῳ κτλ.

Lines 253 + 255 do not form a single continuous statement answering the question of 252, for the locative ἐπὶ + dative does not consort well with ἤλθομεν.[42] Furthermore, as a continuous answer to *IT* 252, the lines would form a sort of *ab ovo* beginning of the full answer, and Iphigeneia's appeal for a return to the story in 256f. would involve an apparent ignorance of the convention and thereby throw great emphasis on her eagerness to hear the story—a lively eagerness which is not, I think, suitable to the ethos of this stichomythia or consonant with the somewhat forced motivation of the rhesis (an

41. I agree with Webster and others that the cave-entrance was somehow slightly higher than the normal acting-surface. Webster objects to referring ἐκεῖσε to the cave here because he assumes the actors are still at the entrance; but they could have (and must have, on my interpretation) stepped down during 730ff. I interpret Philoktetes' upward glance not as an attempt at communication, but as a conventional symptom of the pain that wracks his body, misinterpreted by Neoptolemos as an attempt to communicate.

42. Proleptic locative ἐπὶ + dative with πίπτω (*Med.* 1270) is not, in my view, an adequate parallel, nor is ἐπὶ + dative of direction with a compound verb in ἐπι- (*Alk.* 269).

obligatory element) given in 257-259.[43] If 253 + 255 do not form the usual sort of suspended continuous utterance, then Iphigeneia's question in 254 must be viewed as an outright interruption, or as an intervention which causes the herdsman to modify his syntax (from ἐνίπτομεν to ἤλθομεν νίψοντες). But again there is neither the agitation in the herdsman nor any sufficiently-motivated eagerness in Iphigeneia to render this case comparable to those studied previously. I therefore believe that Musgrave was correct when he altered πῶς to ποῦ in 252. The use of ἐπάνελθε in 256 does not necessarily support πῶς in 252, as many critics have assumed:[44] ἐκεῖσε may refer forward to the indirect question, not back to 252,[45] and ἐπάνελθε seeks not a return to 252, but a detailed review (in rhesis) of the whole story, the highlights of which have been given in the preliminary stichomythia[46]—a standard request at this point in a messenger scene. The dialogue is thus calm and orderly; the "naturalness" detected in the received text is neither natural in context nor supported by parallels.

An unusual suspension of syntax is present in *IT* 1035-1037 if the received text is retained:

> *IT* 1033-1037
> Ιφ. φονέα σε φήσω μητρὸς ἐξ Ἄργους μολεῖν.
> Ορ. χρῆσαι κακοῖσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς, εἰ κερδανεῖς.
> Ιφ. ὡς οὐ θέμις γε λέξομεν θύειν θεᾷ,
> Ορ. τίν' αἰτίαν ἔχουσ'; ὑποπτεύω τι γάρ.
> Ιφ. οὐ καθαρὸν ὄντα· τὸ δ' ὅσιον δώσω φόβῳ.

As it stands, line 1035 requires the audience to understand from the context that the object of θύειν is σε (this is not difficult after the explicit second-person references in 1031 and 1033) and to carry over this understood pronoun as the substantive to which ὄντα in 1037 is attached. To make the continuity of syntax easier Reiske proposed χὠς οὐ θέμις σε in 1035 and ἔχονθ' in 1036, and many editors have adopted part of the emendation.[47] Although the force of γε here is hard to categorize,[48] it is probably unnecessary to posit such a complicated corruption at all, since αἰτίαν ἔχειν need not always mean "be subject to a charge,"[49] and the feminine nominative participle in 1036 throws the desired emphasis on Iphigeneia's role in the stratagem. Murray is perhaps correct to retain the anomaly of an understood pronoun carried over in a syntactic suspension.

There are two unusual phenomena in the long passage of tetrameter antilabe *IT* 1203-1221, which includes six cases of suspended syntax. In 1206 Thoas interposes his

43. These lines should be kept in Iphigeneia's mouth, but emended: cf. note 15 to Chapter 5.

44. Cf. Platnauer *ad loc.* and Diggle, *PCPS* 195 (1969) 56-59. Nor does the emendation in 252 require ποῦ in 256; πῶς is commonly the question which asks for the messenger's rhesis.

45. Cf. 77 904-905 κἀπ' ἐκεῖν' ἐλθεῖν . . . ὅπως . . . , *HF* 1221-1222 ἐκεῖσε ἀνοιστέον, ὅτ' ἐξέσῳσας . . ., *Ion* 1370, *Tro.* 61; forward-looking ἐκεῖσε is in fact assumed for this passage by Allen-Italie in their *Concordance to Euripides*.

46. The verb ἐπανέρχομαι may, of course, denote a return to a previous topic (Dem. 18.66, 18.211); but it can also mean "go back over the details," as in Xen. *HG* 1.7.29 (cf. ἄνελθε πάλιν in *Phoin.* 1207, which requests a rhesis with more details).

47. Reiske, *Ad Euripidem et Aristophanem animadversiones* 80-81; σε is accepted by Kirchhoff, Nauck, Wecklein, and Platnauer; ἔχονθ' by the last three, and χὠς by Platnauer.

48. Denniston, *GP*² 143, erroneously classifies *IT* 1035 with instances of ὡς . . . γε = "because, for"; but ὡς here means "that" introducing indirect discourse after λέγειν. Perhaps γε in this position can mark the whole sentence as a limiting modification of 1033, which refers quite generally to the matricide.

49. Cf. μέμψιν (μομφὴν) ἔχειν, which in various contexts can mean (a) "be subject to reproach" or (b) "have a reproach to make (against someone)." I also find the position of enclitic σε in Reiske's reading rather odd.

consent between Iphigeneia's request and her addition of a circumstantial participle in 1207a. Line 1209b is a normal intervention-question with borrowed syntax, as is 1215b. The intervention in 1217b (τί χρή με δρᾶν;) supplies vital syntax to Iphigeneia's continuation in 1218a (χρὴ understood with προθέσθαι). Line 1219b, however, is an unusual intervention in that the question is almost a throw-away filler:

> *IT* 1219-1220
> Ιφ. ἢν δ' ἄγαν δοκῶ χρονίζειν,   Θο. τοῦδ' ὅρος τίς ἐστί μοι;
> Ιφ. θαυμάσῃς μηδέν.

If Thoas is indeed asking "What is to be the limit of that (i.e. of your spending too much time)?"[50] Iphigeneia's continuation skirts the issue; nevertheless, the order "don't worry" implies that it does not matter what ὅρος is adopted. Although in tetrameter antilabe the intervention is often so vacuous as to be negligible (as in cases of a double answer to a single, broken-apart question: section 2[d] above), here there is a dramatic point in Iphigeneia's oblique acknowledgment of Thoas' query. Even more unusual in terms of technique is 1211b-1212a, where Iphigeneia completes the syntax of Thoas' order to an attendant.[51] Iphigeneia must be addressing her addendum to the attendant, and this diverges from the "etiquette" by which she otherwise suggests orders for the king to endorse and pass along. In his school edition Wecklein deleted 1211b-1212a without mentioning this unique technical feature: he considered 1212a + 1211b (in that order) to be a doublet of 1210a + b and was not certain which was the original, but claimed that a hand-gesture would suffice to indicate Thoas' assent. That such a gesture should not be referred to in words is, however, a more serious exception to what we know of dramatic technique than is Iphigeneia's address to the attendant. The command in 1211b is surely necessary to put Iphigeneia's request into operation. Neither 1210 nor 1211b-1212a is dispensable; the transmitted text and the unusual "etiquette" should be accepted.

IT also contains examples of a fault which, as mentioned earlier, is very common in Murray's text of Euripides—the needless printing of a string of dots implying a pause or *sermo fractus*. There is no pause or discontinuity at *IT* 473 (print a comma), 638 (print a period),[52] 779a (print a comma at the end of 778 and after Ὀρέστα and assign 778-779 as a whole to Iphigeneia). Some other Euripidean instances which do not require discussion may be mentioned briefly here: *Kykl.* 559 (print Nauck's τέ τι with a period); *Hipp.* 91 (a complete question: see p. 44 above) and 99 (cf. Barrett); *Andr.* 257 (print a period), 512 and 534 (print a period), *Hek.* 185 (print a period or question-mark),[53] 698 (print a period), *El.* 63 (her lament is complete at 63), *HF* 1090, *Ion* 959 (Murray's hypothesis of a tearful breakdown by Kreousa conflicts with the ethos of the stichomythia; adopt Matthiae's reading and punctuation), *Ion* 1417 (delete Murray's

---

50. On the sense of this line, see Platnauer *ad loc.*

51. It is also the only place in the dialogue where the break occurs at the end of the line rather than within the line, but for this procedure cf. *Ion* 534-536.

52. The stage action might be indicated typographically by a space between 637 and 638 (Iphigeneia turns to the attendants) and a space between 638 and 639 (Iphigeneia withdraws from contact as she moves toward the door; cf. Chapter 2, note 48).

53. In *Hek.* 186, however, Hekabe seems to be coming into contact with Polyxena (cf. 187), and the vocative seems to be not an isolated exclamation (note 36 above), but the lead-in to 188ff.; therefore a comma at the end of 186, as in Daitz' Teubner text, is appropriate.

colon after σκέψασθ' and print a period at the end of the line), *Or.* 1050 (1051 should not be deleted—see di Benedetto; but even if it is, 1050 should not be considered incomplete—cf. Biehl's text).[54]

6(b) FURTHER EURIPIDEAN PASSAGES

Murray creates a very odd case of *sermo fractus* in his constitution of *Tro.* 709ff.:

> Τα. Φρυγῶν ἀρίστου πρίν ποθ' Ἕκτορος δάμαρ,
> μή με στυγήσῃς· οὐχ ἑκὼν γὰρ ἀγγελῶ.
> Δαναῶν δὲ κοινὰ Πελοπιδῶν τ' ἀγγέλματα . . . .
> Αν. τί δ' ἔστιν; ὥς μοι φροιμίων ἄρχῃ κακῶν.
> Τα. ἔδοξε τόνδε παῖδα . . . . πῶς εἴπω λόγον;

The four dots could indicate either that Talthybios falls silent in mid-sentence or that he is interrupted by Andromache. The latter staging seems to be ruled out by the text itself, since Andromache's intervention would occur one line too late. But the former staging is no more likely to be correct: line 713 shows the proper technique for making a dramatic point of aposiopesis; and it is conventional for a messenger to enter with a vague comment or an apology for bad news and to allow the proem to have its effect before beginning the actual report.[55] Murray's text also robs κοινά of its point, since the word is essential to Talthybios' attempt at exculpation and apology. A normal text and normal stage action are easily obtained by accepting the reading of V and printing as one sentence οὐχ ἑκὼν γὰρ ἀγγελῶ / Δαναῶν τε κοινὰ Πελοπιδῶν τ' ἀγγέλματα (so correctly Biehl and K. H. Lee).

Another awkward interruption of syntax occurs in Murray's version of *Ion* 525-527:

> Ξο. ὡς τί δὴ φεύγεις με; σαυτοῦ γνωρίσας τὰ φίλτατα . . .
> Ιω. οὐ φιλῶ φρενοῦν ἀμούσους καὶ μεμηνότας ξένους.
> Ξο. κτεῖνε καὶ πίμπρη· πατρὸς γάρ, ἢν κτάνῃς, ἔσῃ φονεύς.

In the context of misunderstanding of which this passage forms a part, it would not be surprising if Ion at some point cut off Xouthos' utterance in mid-sentence; as Murray has it, however, Ion is apparently answering in 526 the first half of 525 and so is accidentally, rather than deliberately, cutting in on Xouthos' final words. The anomaly is easily removed by punctuating with a comma after με and placing the question-mark at the end of 525.[56] Later in *Ion* there seems to be a remarkable case of an interruption leaving a truly incomplete utterance, and even though the line is corrupt, the broken syntax seems assured unless we assume a lacuna of one verse. The interruption occurs when Ion opens the basket containing his recognition-tokens:

---

54. In *Ion* 803 I would follow Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz in assigning the whole line to the koryphaios (cf. Köhler, 28 n.3). I see no reason to use a dash rather than ordinary punctuation at E.*Su.* 599 and 619; on E.*Su.* 45 see Collard's edition. It is uncertain what Murray intends by his arrangement of *Tro.* 1226-1227, but the passage can and should be printed without dots or division among choral voices (cf. Biehl and K. H. Lee).

55. Cf. (with the question τί δ' ἔστι;) *Trach.* 734-737, *Hipp.* 1157-1159, *Ion* 1106-1108, *Hel.* 597-599, 1512-1513, *Ba.* 1024-1027; (without the question) *Ant.* 1155ff., *OT* 1223ff., *Andr.* 1070-1071, *Hek.* 667-669, *Phoin.* 1335 + 1337, *Or.* 852-854.

56. Cf. Owen *ad loc.*; another solution is to accept Hermann's γνώρισον, creating an unobtrusive filler. I believe the position of με is against Page's suggestion με . . . γνωρίσαι (*apud* Owen).

Ion 1395-1397
Κρ. τί δῆτα φάσμα τῶν ἀνελπίστων ὁρῶ;
Ἰω. †σιγᾶν σὺ πολλὰ καὶ πάροιθεν οἶσθα μοι†
Κρ. οὐκ ἐν σιωπῇ τἀμά· μή με νουθέτει.

Verrall attempted to interpret the transmitted text: he imagined that Kreousa fell silent for some time after 1395 and that Ion finally commented on her silence in 1396. This fantastic theory is neither psychologically credible nor legitimate in terms of the Greek dramatists' use of silence for dramatic effect (a silence, and the surprise of other characters at the silence, must be referred to immediately). The text of 1396 is clearly defective, and at least Hartung's σίγα σύ· should be accepted. The remainder of the line seems to be giving a reason for the command, to which Kreousa perhaps refers when she says μή με νουθέτει. Since no satisfactory emendation has been found,[57] there is a chance at least that Murray is correct to postulate interruption (which I would punctuate with a dash rather than a series of dots). Kreousa's emotion and the subsequent stage-action preclude a return to the incomplete utterance. There is enough in Ion's unfinished sentence for the audience to realize the sort of statement he was trying to make.

Two possible cases of *sermo fractus* in E.*El.* are probably to be ascribed to textual corruption. There is no parallel or internal dramatic justification for the ill manners which would be required for the old man to interrupt Elektra in mid-sentence at *El.* 546, as Murray (in his apparatus) suggests he does. It is, in any case, probable that line 546 is corrupt; and if λαβὼν were sound, it would be no easy task for an audience to understand that Elektra was about to say what Murray proposes, whereas ease of comprehension is one characteristic of most of the certain cases of interrupted syntax.[58] Murray again endorses a break at *El.* 1209, in a lyric context. In what he calls the *pulchra aposiopesis* of τὰν κόμαν δ’ ἐγώ . . . , Orestes is supposed to be too pained by the image of seizing his mother's hair (to prepare for the blow to her throat—cf. *Or.* 1468ff.) to continue his utterance. Since his other utterances are complete, however, and he is able to complete sentences containing details just as painful, aposiopesis intrudes in this one place upon the dramatic consistency of the scene. (Nor would hasty interruption of Orestes' utterance by a chorus eager to substitute the vague δι’ ὀδύνας ἔβας conform to the chorus' role in this scene.) It is prudent, therefore, to accept Seidler's τακόμαν, which is an easy change and which produces both a smooth join to the chorus' lines 1210-1212 and a parallelism of theme between the corresponding lines 1209 and 1217 (both describing the effect on Orestes of his mother's actions).[59]

An interesting problem of interruption and "etiquette" is provided by a passage in *HF* which has already been discussed in connection with gradual establishment of contact:

HF 530-535
(Ηρ.) γύναι, τί καινὸν ἦλθε δώμασιν χρέος;
— ὦ φίλτατ’ ἀνδρῶν, ὦ φάος μολὼν πατρί,
ἥκεις, ἐσώθης εἰς ἀκμὴν ἐλθὼν φίλοις;
Ηρ. τί φής; τίν’ ἐς ταραγμὸν ἥκομεν, πάτερ;

57. Cf. Owen and Wilamowitz *ad loc.*
58. Cf. Denniston *ad loc.,* who wisely assumes a lacuna.
59. Di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 308, accepts the incomplete utterance.

Με. διολλύμεσθα· σὺ δέ, γέρον, σύγγνωθί μοι,
εἰ πρόσθεν ἥρπασ’ ἃ σὲ λέγειν πρὸς τόνδ’ ἐχρῆν.

[531 *Megarae tribuit* L, *Amph.* Elmsley *et* Wil.; 531b *Amph. tribuit* Frey
et Murray (*et* 532 *Meg.* Murray “*idque habuisse* L *arguit rasura ante versum*”)]

The attribution of the couplet 531-532 as a whole to Megara (L *post rasuram)* is possible, but 531b then brings a specification unexpected in Megara’s mouth at this point, since the children are uppermost in her mind at 537. To assign the whole couplet to Amphitryon, however, does not improve matters, for we then have Amphitryon answering Herakles when he has addressed Megara and Megara answering when he has addressed Amphitryon. The latter breach of “etiquette” is explicitly noted and exploited for dramatic effect, but the former would be both unexplained and unexploited. Frey’s assignment of 531b + 532 to Amphitryon[60] creates the same anomaly, rendered even stronger by Amphitryon’s intervention after Megara has said something. Murray’s solution is excellent. The almost antiphonal vocatives portray the common excitement of the saved; and the apistetic and uninformative utterance in 532 is best spoken by the emotion-stricken Megara. When his wife’s excitement renders her unable to answer the question of line 530, Herakles appeals instead to Amphitryon;[61] and it is consonant with the woman’s emotion that she then seizes the opportunity to answer from Amphitryon. Murray’s interpretation is thus both most effective and most probable in dramatic terms. There is room to wonder, however, whether the changes of speaker within 531-532 would be felt by the audience as interruptions (and so suitably punctuated with dashes) or whether the vocatives in 531 would be received as independent exclamations (cf. note 36) accompanying symmetrical gestures of welcome or embrace (and so suitably punctuated with periods).

Two final problematic passages in Euripides require at least brief discussion. One seems to be a non-example: *Hel.* 1226 is a complete question (we must accept Jacobs’ λαθεῖν in 1227); the aposiopesis assumed by Murray is improbable because ὀρθῶς μὲν κτλ., as a statement, concedes too much for Helen (and the audience) to be able to understand that Theoklymenos meant to finish the sentence with some expression of scepticism or reserve that would prompt 1227.[62] *Hel.* 447-449, however, is probably to be accepted as a case of interruption:

Με. ἄγγειλον εἴσω δεσπόταισι τοῖσι σοῖς—
Γρ. πικρῶς †ἂν οἶμαι γ’ ἀγγελεῖν τοὺς σοὺς λόγους.†[63]
Με. ναυαγὸς ἥκω ξένος, ἀσύλητον γένος.

Dale suggests that line 447 may be complete and that ἄγγειλον may simply mean “announce me”; but in the other passage in which such a meaning is possible (*Choe.* 658) there is also a relative clause which at least implies what the servant is to tell his masters. It is therefore justifiable to assume that Menelaos was going to continue his

---

60. Frey’s solution is approved by Listmann, 60-61, and by Kohler, 12 n.1, who believes that Herakles would not address his father in 533 if Megara had spoken 532.

61. The apistetic τί φής; is thus addressed to Megara, but the rest of line 533 is addressed to Amphitryon: for a parallel cf. *Hek.* 1122 and note 49 to Chapter 5.

62. I thus agree with Kannicht and not with Dale, who posits a lacuna between 1226 and 1227.

63. For two different views on the soundness of *Hel.* 448 see Dale and Kannicht.

syntax, but that the old woman interrupts him. After the interruption Menelaos says in an independent sentence more or less what he would have added, but there is a modification of tone as well as syntax, since (as Kannicht notes) his words are now meant to rebut the old woman's hostility as well as to provide information. The brusqueness of the dialogue at this point is in agreement with the relatively undignified tenor of the whole exchange.

6(c)   SOME SOPHOKLEAN PASSAGES

The conventions of interrupted discourse are relevant to five problem-passages in Sophokles, at least three of which turn out to be non-examples when inspected with care. The certain cases of interruption in Sophokles were confined to two neat breaks, two dramatically significant breaks in the sickness-scene of *Phil.*, and Theseus' confident rejection of Oidipous' fearful admonitions in *OK* 652ff. (section 5 above). None of these provides an adequate parallel for the interruption alleged to exist by some interpreters of *Ant.* 215-216:

> Κρ. ὡς ἂν σκοποὶ νῦν ἦτε τῶν εἰρημένων—
> Χο. νεωτέρῳ τῳ τοῦτο βαστάζειν πρόθες.

There is clearly no dramatic justification for Kreon to fall silent, but neither is there any reason to believe that this chorus, so noteworthy for its caution and submissiveness to authority, would interrupt their ruler in mid-sentence. Those editors who punctuate *Ant.* 215 with a period (and interpret ὡς ἄν + subj. as equivalent to ὅπως + fut. ind.) are fully justified by the evidence of dialogue-conventions. Similarly, at *OT* 622ff., no dramatically sensible sequence of dialogue can be produced by the hypothesis of aposiopesis or interruption (assumed in Pearson's text). One must either abandon strict stichomythia (which is unnecessary in such a short passage) and follow the treatment of Campbell and Jebb (emend ὅταν, alter attributions, posit lacuna after 625) or preserve stichomythia and postulate (less probably) two lacunae (so recently Dawe). Either solution gives the proper sense to φθονεῖν and οὐχ ὑπείξων κτλ. and involves no interruption. The third non-example is *OK* 1249, which may just as well be printed with a period, even if one accepts Housman's unnecessary transposition;[64] Antigone's sentence is complete and there is no point in assuming a swift interruption causing abandonment or modification of the original syntax.

The dramatic interpretation (and hence punctuation) of *OT* 325 has been analyzed in three different ways:

> *OT* 324-327
> Τε. ὁρῶ γὰρ οὐδὲ σοὶ τὸ σὸν φώνημ' ἰὸν
>   πρὸς καιρόν· ὡς οὖν μηδ' ἐγὼ ταὐτὸν πάθω
> Οι. μὴ πρὸς θεῶν φρονῶν γ' ἀποστραφῇς, ἐπεὶ
>   πάντες σε προσκυνοῦμεν οἵδ' ἱκτήριοι.

---

64. The transposition seems to me not only unnecessary, but ruinous as well: it makes πάρεστι δεῦρο precede ὧδ' ὡδοιπορεῖ, whereas in the traditional order the phrases fit the stage-action of entering perfectly. Housman, *AJP* 13 (1892) 164, in fact claims there is a dramatic merit in the broken dialogue; but there is no reason to posit the requisite excitement in Oidipous at this point.

Campbell, Jebb, and Dawe use a period at the end of 325 and consider the isolated purpose clause to be due to rhetorical ellipsis. Schneidewin and Nauck assume that it is Oidipous' interruption which prevents Teiresias from finishing his sentence. But if three couplets were enough to establish for the audience the rhythm of the distichomythia, interruption would probably not be felt here. Most attractive is Kamerbeek's suggestion that this is a case of aposiopesis, for such performance of the line would be supported in the staging by the actor's action, as Teiresias turns away to leave (cf. ἀποστραφῇς in 326) and tries to withdraw from contact. Stage-actions collaborating with unusual conditions of dialogue have previously been observed in supplication-scenes with elliptical syntax (section 4 above) and in instances of imperfect contact accompanied by the movements of turning or departure (Chapter 2, section 4).

In the final Sophoklean example, Jebb posits aposiopesis, as indeed one must if one believes the transmitted reading to be sound:

> *OK* 813-815
> Κρ. μαρτύρομαι τούσδ', οὐ σέ· πρὸς δὲ τοὺς φίλους
>   οἷ' ἀνταμείβῃ ῥήματ', ἤν σ' ἕλω ποτέ . . .
> Οι. τίς δ' ἄν με τῶνδε συμμάχων ἕλοι βίᾳ;
>
> [813 δὲ LA rec.: γε rec.]

But line 813 can scarcely be sound as it stands (cf. Schneidewin-Nauck). The use of δὲ is inconsistent with the colon after σέ (and it makes no sense to alter that to a period). The Byzantine conjecture γε should be accepted: the οἷα-clause is the object of μαρτύρομαι, and ἤν here means "in case" (LSJ s.v. εἰ B.VII.1). The couplet 813-814 then would still express a veiled threat, but a syntactically complete one, so that it is no longer necessary to assume aposiopesis.

CONCLUSION

The import of this chapter is that truly incomplete utterances, whether due to aposiopesis or hasty interruption by the dialogue-partner, are exceedingly rare in Greek tragedy. Breaks and suspensions of syntax normally occur at semantic breaks, and if anything is left unsaid, it is quite obvious to the audience exactly what is omitted. Although there are occasional nods toward the chaotic informality of real conversation, Greek tragic dialogue deliberately maintains a high degree of formality in terms of the completeness of each utterance. Some editions of the poets made in the early twentieth century give a misleading impression through overuse of the string of dots. Many modern English translations which, in assimilating Greek poetry to a modern style, introduce incomplete utterances and other informalities badly misrepresent the ethos of the Greek tragic stage.

5

BREAKS IN CONTACT,
FAULTY COMMUNICATION,
AND INTERVENTION

In Chapter 2 we observed some breaks in contact which were externally motivated by the spatial symbolism of the stage or the physical symbolism of the act of turning, and in Chapter 4 we touched upon breaks motivated internally by some emotion in the isolated character. In this chapter internally-motivated breaks are again the subject of interest, but we now turn to those which are not marked by syntactic clues (suspension or interruption) or isolated in terms of patterns of answering. In the first five sections we look at involuntary and voluntary breaks caused by emotion, preoccupation, self-will, and the like. In the final three sections we consider various forms of partial contact (when more than two significant voices are present), naturalistic diversion of the topic of dialogue, and abrupt interventions by a third party.

1. BREAKS FEATURING STRONG EMOTIONS

1(a)   BREAKS CAUSED BY DISEASE OR TRANCE

A character has the least possible control over his contact with his surroundings when he is a victim of an onslaught of disease, mental disorder, or trance. The most impressive dramatization of such an onslaught is Aischylos' Kassandra-scene. The trance itself is preceded by a scene of unexplained silence (*Ag.* 1035-1071)—unexplained in the sense that the audience cannot arrive at any firm sense of what is going on, despite the interpretations of the silence offered by Klytaimestra and the chorus. This situation serves both to mystify the audience and to heighten the effect of the following exchange. In the first part of the trance (up to line 1113) the barrier to communication is underlined by the difference in metrical mode, as the chorus maintains a prosaic iambic stance in contrast with Kassandra's lyrics. The difference in "wave-length" is also marked by the chorus' literal answer to a question which is meant by Kassandra as an exclamation of protest (apistetic/epiplectic):[1]

> *Ag.* 1085-1089
> Κα.   ὤπολλον ὤπολλον,
>   ἀγυιᾶτ᾽, ἀπόλλων ἐμός·
>   ἆ, ποῖ ποτ᾽ ἤγαγές με; πρὸς ποίαν στέγην;
> Χο. πρὸς τὴν Ἀτρειδῶν· εἰ σὺ μὴ τόδ᾽ ἐννοεῖς,
>   ἐγὼ λέγω σοι· καὶ τάδ᾽ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ψύθη.

1. Cf. *Ba.* 506f. with Dodds' comment *ad loc.* and the examples of skewed answers, section 5 below.

The commentators have noted that, despite the trance, at two places Kassandra apparently links her lyrics to the comments of the chorus (μὲν οὖν 1090; γὰρ 1095). If this is correct, then there is a mixture of partial contact and non-contact that can be paralleled in other highly emotional lyric exchanges (Chapter 4, section 4[a]). In the second half of the trance-scene (*Ag.* 1114-1177) Kassandra is consistently out of contact with the chorus, which now is itself sufficiently affected emotionally to depart from the iambic mode. Full contact is finally established in 1178ff. when Kassandra speaks in iambics. Her explicit reference to the clarity of what she is about to say confirms once again the tragedians' tendency to have the actors explain or at least refer to any unusual development in emotion or stage-action.

Later portrayals of the onslaught of pain or mental disturbance are less extensive. In *PV* 566ff. (cf. 598-604) the onset of the *oistros* is marked by exclamations, description of the pain, and a protesting apostrophe to Zeus. A second attack is exploited in *PV* 877-886 to break Io's contact with Prometheus and the Okeanids and move her off stage. Herakles too exclaims, apostrophizes to Zeus, and describes his pain in *Trach.* 983ff.; he awakens out of contact with the speaking actors, establishes a fragile contact with the mute attendants in 1004ff. and then with Hyllos in 1024ff. Even after the hero attains the calm needed for iambic utterance, he is wrenched out of contact again at 1081, and no real communication is possible until 1114 (where Hyllos explicitly refers to the change: ἐπεὶ παρέσχες ἀντιφωνῆσαι, πάτερ, / σιγὴν παρασχών κτλ.). In *Phil.* 730-820 Philoktetes struggles to maintain contact with Neoptolemos despite his pain: in addition to the broken utterances in *Phil.* 753-754 and 814-815 (see Chapter 4, section 5), there are involuntary exclamations at 732, 736, 739 (which Philoktetes initially tries to explain away) and two references by Neoptolemos to Philoktetes' silence and pained appearance (730-731, 740-741). The standard descriptions of pain are present in 743-750 and 783-803.

The Euripidean examples are Alkestis' death-trance (*Alk.* 252-263), Phaidra's hysteria (*Hipp.* 208-231), and Orestes' hallucination (*Or.* 253-276). Alkestis' vision is preceded by an apostrophe to the elements which reveals that she and Admetos are already on different wave-lengths before Alkestis has her vision:

> *Alk.* 244-247
> Αλ. Ἅλιε καὶ φάος ἁμέρας,
>   οὐράνιαί τε δῖναι νεφέλας δρομαίου.
> Αδ. ὁρᾷ σὲ κἀμέ, δύο κακῶς πεπραγότας,
>   οὐδὲν θεοὺς δράσαντας ἀνθ' ὅτου θανῇ.

Admetos' prosaic addition of a verb to go with Alkestis' self-sufficient vocative is ignored by Alkestis. Both Admetos' manner of comment and Alkestis' failure to attend to it are signs of the lack of true communication between the two, caused largely by Admetos' inability to comprehend what is happening (note the foreshadowing remarks of the nurse in *Alk.* 145 and 201-203). The failure of communication is further reflected in the contrast between Admetos' iambics and Alkestis' lyrics and in the outright break of contact occasioned by the trance.[2] Phaidra's hysteria is introduced with a single exclamation,

---

2. Admetos' unusual emotional posture is revealed in another way as well: whereas an interlocutor normally comments on the strangeness of the stricken character's behavior and tries to re-establish contact, Admetos merely comments on the visions of the trance without seeking to communicate with his wife.

but her condition is clarified and interpreted (after a fashion) by the nurse's three apistetic/epiplectic interventions, and Phaidra herself refers to her shameful behavior upon recovering (*Hipp.* 239ff.). In *Or.* 253-276 Euripides develops the hint of hallucination present in *Choe.* 1048-1062 (where Orestes nevertheless maintains contact with the chorus in a distichomythia) and portrays a true onset of madness, with its beginning announced by Elektra in 253-254 and its end marked by the ἔα of recovery. The only indication of contact within the passage (οὔτοι μεθήσω ~ μέθες 262-264) serves only to confirm that Orestes is out of touch with reality.

1(b)   BRIEFER INVOLUNTARY BREAKS

A momentary surrender to emotional absorption produces a milder (but still involuntary) break in contact. The earliest instance is a brief stretch of stichomythia in *Se.* in which the chorus works itself up into a state of panic; the breakdown in communication is marked by the ignoring of two commands of silence and by the exasperated fashion in which Eteokles links his comments to the chorus' cries; at 257 the chorus returns into contact, as the borrowed syntax of the adjective μοχθηρόν indicates:

> *Se.* 250-257
> Ετ. οὐ σῖγα μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν;
> Χο. ὦ ξυντέλεια, μὴ προδῷς πυργώματα.
> Ετ. οὐκ ἐς φθόρον σιγῶσ' ἀνασχήσῃ τάδε;
> Χο. θεοὶ πολῖται, μή με δουλείας τυχεῖν.
> Ετ. αὐτὴ σὲ δουλοῖς κἀμὲ καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν.
> Χο. ὦ παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ, τρέψον εἰς ἐχθροὺς βέλος.
> Ετ. ὦ Ζεῦ, γυναικῶν οἷον ὤπασας γένος.
> Χο. μοχθηρόν, ὥσπερ ἄνδρας ὧν ἁλῷ πόλις.

The only other Aischylean example involves the Erinyes, who, distraught with anger at the result of the trial of Orestes (*Eum.* 778-880), do not even acknowledge three rheseis of Athena addressed to them. Their imperviousness to communication is indicated in three ways: by the contrast of lyric vs. iambic modes; by the unique verbatim repetition of two stanzas; and by Athena's references to the situation (794, 848, 881). The Sophoklean examples present a more complex relationship between the characters who fail to communicate, and an element of deliberate refusal to maintain or respond to contact is introduced. Iole's silence in *Trach.* 307-332 seems to be a deliberate reminiscence of Kassandra's in *Ag.* Whereas the audience of *Ag.* is mystified by Kassandra's initial silence, the audience of Sophokles' play must realize that the beautiful girl is Iole and hence feel more forcefully the terrible irony of Deianeira's sympathetic inquiry. The staging implied by the text has been disputed,[3] but a consistently sensible solution is

---

3. There are two main possibilities. (1) Iole distinguishes herself by her self-control and silent forbearance: specifically, she stands firm and silent at 307-309 (Mazon, Kamerbeek); φρονεῖν in 313 is more or less equivalent to σωφρονεῖν and refers to Iole's self-control (Mazon, Kamerbeek); Iole is silent again after 321, and 322 is spoken after a pause (Mazon), with οὐδὲν modifying διήσει; Kamerbeek also reads imperfect δακρυρρόει in 326 for consistency with this interpretation. (2) Iole distinguishes herself by some silent action implying more grief than is felt by the other captives: in this case, φρονεῖν implies that Deianeira finds Iole to be acting in a way which "shows a due feeling for her plight" (Jebb; for Deianeira's association of grief with understanding cf. *Trach.* 141-152); there is not necessarily any pause after 321, but rather Lichas intervenes to forestall any answer (cf. section 8 below); οὐδὲν modifies ἐξ ἴσου (Jebb, Kamerbeek); and present δακρυρροεῖ is to be read in 326. It should be noted that although Iole is necessarily a mute character Sophokles has provided an inner motivation for her silence and treated her failure to speak in just the way he would have treated the silence of a speaking character (cf. Listmann, 27-28).

provided by assuming not that Iole stands inexplicably firm and silent (or even defiantly silent)[4] among a group of captives who are more demonstrative (how? what could they do that would not be intolerably distracting and disturb the true focus of the scene?), but that Iole bows her head in shame or performs some other gesture which causes Deianeira to believe that the girl is distraught with grief, so that she addresses her inquiry to Lichas in 310 out of respect for Iole's suffering. Sophokles therefore plays with the irony of a situation in which Iole's failure to communicate may be at least partly voluntary, but Deianeira believes it to be wholly involuntary. The failure to answer after *Trach.* 321 is again ascribed by Lichas to emotional distraction (and Deianeira accepts that view), although there is also an element of third-party intervention (see section 8 below).

A different mixture of self-absorption and conscious refusal to maintain contact occurs in *Phil.* when Neoptolemos finally finds the deception which he is practicing unbearable. The revelation is prepared for by a dialogue which begins with a momentary withdrawal from contact[5] (labeled as such by Philoktetes):

> *Phil.* 895-896
> Νε. παπαῖ· τί δῆτ᾽ ἂν δρῷμ᾽ ἐγὼ τοὐνθένδε γε;
> Φι. τί δ᾽ ἔστιν, ὦ παῖ; ποῖ ποτ᾽ ἐξέβης λόγῳ;

The dialogue from 897 to 914 rests on a very tenuous sort of contact, in which an answer to Philoktetes' worried question is delayed (cf. Chapter 3, section 1[b][4]) while Neoptolemos engages in a self-directed debate, paying minimal attention to the requirements of genuine communication. After line 926 Neoptolemos is not really in communication with Philoktetes again in this scene: he ignores the appeals in 929-933, 950-951, and 961-962—apparently at first in a conscious refusal to be swayed by Philoktetes (cf. 934-935), but probably in the end truly absorbed in his own internal struggles (as he continues to be in 965-966, 969-970, and 974 before Odysseus breaks in). The breakdown of contact is an effective representation of the power of Neoptolemos' *aidos,* which will ultimately compel him to return the bow.

One definite case of emotional absorption causing break of contact in Euripides is *Or.* 1381-1392, where, after addressing the chorus in 1376, the Phrygian slave is prevented by a transport of terror from answering their query the first time it is posed.[6]

1(c) DELIBERATE WITHDRAWAL FROM CONTACT

Deliberate withdrawal from contact occurs after *Hipp.* 296 and 300 (Phaidra ignores the appeals of the nurse; her silence is explicitly marked), in *Hipp.* 616-650 (Hippolytos' tirade against women), and in *Hek.* 674-675 (the servant-woman's comment, almost an

---

4. The view that Iole is defiant and proud of her position (cf. T. B. L. Webster, in *Greek Poetry and Life* [Oxford 1936] 168) receives no support from anything in the text, adds nothing of value to the impact of the scene, and obscures the parallelism between Iole and the terrified young maiden Deianeira (described in 4-17, 497-530). Moreover, it seems to me obvious from lines 325-332 that Iole's mask showed grief (and probably weeping), and of course her mask's expression could not change.

5. S.*El.* 1174 contains an exclamation with aporetic question very similar to *Phil.* 895, but it occurs at the end of a period of minimal contact rather than at the beginning.

6. Cf. *Rhesos* 736ff., where the grief- and pain-stricken character, singing lyrics, shows no awareness of the chorus's iambic question.

aside,[7] is a deliberate postponement of the conveying of bad news[8] and provides one detail in the deft thumbnail characterization of this officious and talkative woman). The withdrawal in *Hipp.* 616-650 is preceded by an exchange in which communication is already breaking down, for Hippolytos answers the nurse's epiplectic question in a slightly skewed fashion, rejecting the very terms of the question rather than explicitly stating his intention:

> *Hipp.* 613-614
> Τρ. ὦ παῖ, τί δράσεις; σοὺς φίλους διεργάσῃ;
> Ιπ. ἀπέπτυσ᾽· οὐδεὶς ἄδικός ἐστί μοι φίλος.

In two cases it is not easy to decide whether the withdrawal is deliberate or not: in *Med.* 328, 330, 332 Medeia turns away from dialogue with Kreon (who nevertheless unsympathetically tacks on to her complaints two comments in 329 and 331), probably consciously, if we judge from the rhythm of the dialogue and the form and content of her lines; *IA* 1136 may be either a conscious delaying tactic or an involuntary outburst of grief (the former seems more likely, but there is unfortunately room to doubt the authenticity and the soundness of the text in the general context).

1(d)   REFUSAL OF CONTACT

Closely related to the above examples are the scenes in which a character will not allow contact to become established, despite the appeals of the would-be partner in dialogue. Fear and *aporia* momentarily prevent contact in *Ion* 752-760 (a case marked by suspension: Chapter 4, section 4[b]). Absorption in a self-directed debate allows Hekabe to ignore Agamemnon's attempts to engage her in dialogue (*Hek.* 733-751). Contempt for a dialogue-partner considered somehow objectionable is dramatically conveyed in two scenes by an extended refusal to deign to converse with or address the other actor: Theseus thus shows contempt for his son in *Hipp.* 905-945; and in the fourth episode of *OK* Oidipous treats Polyneikes in a similar way, first refusing to respond in 1271-1283[9] and then, after his son's long rhesis, referring to him in the third person in 1348-1353 before loosing his condemnation directly upon Polyneikes. *IA* 1122-1123 feature a much briefer deliberate refusal; and, finally, *Ag.* 1035-1071 contain a refusal whose motivation, as we have seen, is allowed to mystify the audience. It is again noteworthy that in every case the failure of contact is made explicit by references to silence or turning away (*Ion* 758; *Hek.* 739-740; *Hipp.* 911, 915; *OK* 1271-1274, 1279, 1283, 1351; *IA* 1123) or by an ignored apistetic question (*Ion* 755, 757; *Hek.* 740; *Hipp.* 905, 909; *IA* 1122) or order (*Ag.* 1035, 1047-1049, 1053) or by some other comment upon the lack of communication (*Hek.* 743, 747; *Ag.* 1050-1051, 1060-1061). In the *IA* passage Klytaimestra even announces that she will speak for Iphigeneia (perhaps arousing in the audience a false expectation that the maiden will be a mute character in this scene), and Agamemnon's confused isolation is increased by his wife's self-directed aporetic proem.

---

7. See Bain, 31-32, for discussion. I say "almost an aside" because although Hekabe does hear what is said the woman by her use of the third-person refrains from normal contact and simply gives vent to her own reaction.

8. Cf. *Ba.* 1287, *IA* 1136, *OT* 1169.

9. A similar refusal was apparently enacted at the opening of *Hyps.* fr. 60 (silence marked in line 7).

2. PREOCCUPATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ONE'S OWN TOPIC

There are scenes in Greek tragedy in which the join between one speech and the next is noticeably less than perfect, but in which a break in contact of the sort just discussed either does not occur or is not so obviously marked in the words of the text. It is left to the modern reader to posit some sort of preoccupation in one of the dialogue-partners, and it is necessary to consider to what extent the theater-audience was required to make on its own the same sort of assumption.

2(a)   A DRAMATIC PLOY IN *PV*

A curious accumulation of uncomfortable joins occurs in *PV* 259ff. A brief sticho-mythia revealing Prometheus' "sin" ends in 258, and the chorus reacts to it with rhetor-ical transform and epiplectic questions, apologizes for the epiplectic tone, dismisses the topic, and introduces a new one:

> *PV* 259-262
> δόξει δὲ πῶς; τίς ἐλπίς; οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὅτι
> ἥμαρτες; ὡς δ' ἥμαρτες, οὔτ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν
> καθ' ἡδονὴν σοί τ' ἄλγος. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν
> μεθῶμεν, ἄθλου δ' ἔκλυσιν ζήτει τινά.

Prometheus, however, ignores the dismissal of the topic and the suggested new topic; instead, he replies to the epiplectic import in 263-270 and then suggests his own new topic in 271-276, which is welcomed by the chorus (282-283). But the arrival of Okeanos forestalls the proposed revelation, and his departure is followed by a stasimon and then two long rheseis by Prometheus on his benefits to mankind before the topic of the future course of events reappears (511ff.) only to be terminated a few lines later. Within the Okeanos-scene there is also a noticeable disjunction between stated intention and action, between address and reply. Okeanos asks Prometheus to tell him what he can do to help (294-295), but in his next speech he moves quickly into the role of (unwanted) adviser. And on the other side, Prometheus replies to Okeanos' greeting and offer of help in a remarkable way: ἔα· τί χρῆμα; is usually the opening formula in a speech marking the sudden establishment of visual contact with something new and surprising, but here Okeanos has addressed Prometheus by name more then ten lines earlier, and (according to the usual practice) the audience must take this as a successful communica-tion establishing oral/aural contact with Prometheus. Thus Prometheus is again preoc-cupied with, or willfully maintaining, his own topic and brushing aside something an interlocutor has said to him. The unusual use of the formula ἔα· τί χρῆμα; heightens the genial irony of Prometheus' handling of Okeanos, an irony which is given full play throughout the scene. It is natural to wonder whether all these uncomfortable joins and misdirections are a matter of artistic clumsiness and an index of non-Aischylean author-ship. As to the former, the misdirections seem to be deliberately intended by the author, whoever he may be. Prometheus' manner of conversing with others is indicative of a cer-tain degree of αὐθαδία (a quality brought to the audience's attention both by the taunts of Prometheus' enemies and by Prometheus' insistence in 436-437 upon exonerating himself of any such charge). Furthermore, the repeated false starts in getting particular

topics actually discussed function as part of the pattern of piecemeal revelation which leads up to the climactic scenes in which Prometheus refuses to satisfy Zeus' curiosity, which he has deliberately piqued, and is punished for his refusal. As to the matter of authorship, one can say that such sophisticated manipulation of contact-phenomena is not to be found in the six extant plays which are undoubtedly Aischylean; but the probative value of such an observation is reduced both by the smallness of the corpus which is extant for comparison and by the fact that the technique can be tied to the plot-dynamics of this particular play.

2(b) PREOCCUPATION AND FAILURE TO HEAR

The most famous instance of a failure to hear because of preoccupation is Oidipous' failure to take note of *OT* 717ff. because he is so surprised at the mention of the triple crossroads in 716. Oidipous' failure to hear becomes dramatically important in his stichomythia with the Korinthian: he there learns of the injury to his feet which he had as an infant,[10] but it is the silent Iokaste and not Oidipous himself who makes the logical connection between lines 717-719 and 1026-1034, while Oidipous' realization is delayed for another 150 lines. Iokaste herself finishes her speech 707-725 calmly, complete with paraenetic conclusion, and makes no reference to any odd behavior on Oidipous' part, and Oidipous addresses a reply to her immediately. It is therefore unlikely that Oidipous evinces his perturbation too noticeably *during* his wife's speech, although the masked actor could indicate to the audience some alteration in Oidipous' state of mind by some gesture of the hands or movement of the head at line 716. Preoccupation is at any rate made clear verbally in 726-727 (οἷον . . . ψυχῆς πλάνημα κἀνακίνησις φρενῶν). It is possible that Oidipous' *aporia* is also expressed by a turning of the body (away from Iokaste?) as he utters 726-727, but many commentators believe that ὑποστραφεὶς in 728 refers solely to a mental shift.

Other examples of not hearing are more problematical, and the assumption of pre-occupation as cause of the breakdown is not always justified. In two cases the apparent failure to hear has prompted some to assume interpolation. Fraenkel[11] argued that Odysseus' expression of fear and concern that Aias may see him (*Ai.* 84) entails that he has not heard *Ai.* 68-70, and that this failure to be noticed is an important element in the argument that those lines be deleted. Dawe[12] has defended the lines (adequately, I believe). If the lines are genuine, we have not a case in which Odysseus fails to pay attention to them, but a case in which his fear prevents him from relying on Athena's

---

10. Jebb and many other translators translate τί in *OT* 1033 as "why?" and assume that Oidipous somehow knew of his wound. On that view, Oidipous' failure to attend to lines 717-719 is even more critical, since he should have been able to pursue that clue immediately. Kamerbeek notes that τί may also be read as predicate accusative substantive and declines to decide between the two possible constructions. But I find the latter reading more idiomatic and its implications for the prehistory of the play more natural: interrogative τίς is often used as predicate accusative to an object accompanied by demonstrative ὅδε or οὗτος, especially after a verb of saying (cf. S.*El.* 328, 388, *Trach.* 184, *OK* 209, *Ant.* 7, 218, 1172; Ellendt s.v. τίς classifies *OT* 1033 accordingly, and M. L. Earle in his school edition of the play thus explains the passage); and, since Sophokles gives not the slightest hint of Oidipous' knowledge of his early life, it is natural for the audience to assume that he remembers nothing about his infancy (thus line 1031 is a question prompted by sincere ignorance, not a question designed to test the Korinthian's story).

11. *Mus. Helv.* 20 (1963) 103-106.

12. *Studies* I. 127-128.

assurance until her power to affect Aias' sight is explained more precisely (for the audience as well as for Odysseus, as Dawe well implies). The words ἀποστρόφους and ἀπείρξω in 69-70 are vague enough to sound like less of a precaution than Athena explains them to be in 85. The fact that Deianeira has not heard the phrase ἄνευ τῶνδ' in *Trach.* 336 when she speaks 342-343 is used by Reeve in an argument favoring a deletion; in chapter 2, section 4, we saw that the failure to hear is explicable in terms of the imperfect contact created by turning to enter the door-space. The unawareness thus has a mechanical rather than a psychological cause.

A problem of a somewhat different sort is presented by *Hipp.* 656-660: near the end of his tirade against womankind Hippolytos reverses the impression created by lines 612 and 614 and states explicitly his intention to abide by his oath of secrecy. Nevertheless, thirty lines later we hear Phaidra asserting that Hippolytos will reveal all and deciding that she must protect herself from such a revelation. The usual (and best)[13] assumption about the staging of this scene is that Phaidra cowers at the side somewhere (beside or behind a herm or statue next to the door?) and so hears Hippolytos' speech. It is uncertain from the text whether Hippolytos is shown to be aware of her presence or not.[14] But for Phaidra herself there are three possibilities in such a staging. Her spatial remoteness from the actor who is speaking might be interpreted as a physical cause of imperfect contact. Or the audience may assume (or be made to assume) an emotional cause—namely that Phaidra is too distraught at the moment when lines 656-660 are spoken. Or the audience is to understand that Phaidra hears but does not accept those lines: she reacts overwhelmingly to the hostility of the rhesis, including the very ominous threat in 661-662, which would especially alarm a woman with Phaidra's sense of shame (cf. 415-418). The last interpretation is surely the best, since it is essential to the tragedy of Hippolytos and Phaidra that neither is able to come to an understanding of the goodness of the other. If this is correct, we have a non-example of discontinuity of dialogue, but a powerful dramatic example of an even more important (and typically Euripidean) type of failure of communication.

Brief mention should be made of a final example, in which the partner in dialogue surely hears what is said, but does not make the logical inference from it and is later more surprised than would be reasonable in the real world. In the confused confrontation between Odysseus and the chorus of watchmen in *Rhes.* 675-691, Odysseus blurts out ἦ σὺ δὴ 'Ρῆσον κατέκτας; (686). The chorus parries this accusation, but does not recall it later when Rhesos' death is actually reported to them. One can well imagine the application of the motif "Ah, now I see, this is what was meant by X"; but this dramatist prefers to concentrate on different sorts of effects in the later scene.[15]

13. W. D. Smith, *TAPA* 91 (1960) 162-177, argues that Phaidra exits at 600 and returns at 680 (669-679 being sung by the nurse); such a staging would eliminate the "problem" of Phaidra's not hearing, but I am not convinced by the staging itself or by the arguments in favor of it. (See now D. Sider, *AJP* 98 [1977] 16-19, who agrees with the staging I endorse.)

14. I consider the words ἦν ἀρτίως ἔλειπον in 907 too vague and too late to allow modern scholars to infer with any safety that the actor playing Hippolytos showed some awareness of Phaidra by glance or gesture in the earlier scene (*contra,* Barrett on *Hipp.* 616ff.). If Hippolytos does see her, his failure to address her expresses contempt (cf. section 1[d] above). If he is unaware of her presence (as I prefer to believe), then the audience is the only one who can feel the terrible effect of the dialogue and rhesis on the silent bystander—a dramatic effect more typical of Sophokles (cf. Iole in *Trach.* 298-332, Iokaste in *OT* 1032-1053, Elektra in *El.* 678-787).

15. This odd detail depends on acceptance of Murray's attribution of the first half of the line to Odysseus, which seems to me correct. I believe that some sort of discontinuity arises at *IT* 246 if one follows Wecklein and Platnauer in transposing *IT*

2(c) MAINTENANCE OF ONE'S OWN TOPIC

In some cases of imperfect join between speeches one may detect a self-willed main-tenance of one's own topic rather than an almost involuntary preoccupation. Elektra responds to Chrysothemis' rhesis (S.*El.* 417-430) without paying the slightest attention to the concluding appeal in 428-430, for she is totally obsessed with vengeance against her father's murderers and is eager to deflect from its purpose her mother's attempt at propitiation. Her reply attaches itself smoothly to the sentence which precedes *El.* 428; in concentrating on that topic and deliberately ignoring what follows it, she is compara-ble in her behavior to Prometheus in *PV* 263ff. It is presumably the skewed nature of the join between the rheseis that prompted the assignment of 428-430 to the beginning of Elektra's speech rather than the end of Chrysothemis' in most of the early Byzantine and Palaeologan manuscripts.[16] When the parallel for the dialogue-technique is added to the observations on style and content made by Jebb and Dawe,[17] the case against the majority assignment (recently favored by Heubner)[18] becomes insurmountable.

A self-willed maintenance of her own topic is exploited by Iphigeneia in *IT* to mystify Thoas and initiate the deception necessary for escape. Iphigeneia does not refuse to establish contact, but will engage in dialogue only on her own terms; she thus takes the initiative away from Thoas:

> *IT* 1157-1161
> Θο. ἔα·
>   τί τόδε μεταίρεις ἐξ ἀκινήτων βάθρων,
>   Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖ, θεᾶς ἄγαλμ' ἐν ὠλέναις;
> Ιφ. ἄναξ, ἔχ' αὐτοῦ πόδα σὸν ἐν παραστάσιν.
> Θο. τί δ' ἔστιν, Ἰφιγένεια, καινὸν ἐν δόμοις;
> Ιφ. ἀπέπτυσ'· Ὁσίᾳ γὰρ δίδωμ' ἔπος τόδε.

In the amoibaion in *Tro.* 235ff. Hekabe inquires in succession about the fates of Kassandra, Polyxena, Andromache, and herself. The subjective importance of her own topic as well as the difference in wave-length conveyed by the lyric/iambic contrast is reflected in the dialogue-technique when she ignores Talthybios' apodeictic/epileptic question in line 259:

> *Tro.* 256-260
> Εκ.　　　　　ῥῖπτε, τέκνον, ζαθέους κλῇ-
> 　　　　　　δας καὶ ἀπὸ χροὸς ἐνδυ-
> 　　　　　　τῶν στεφέων ἱεροὺς στολμούς.

258-259 (with Seidler's οἵδ' ἐπεὶ for οὐδέ πω) to follow 245 as the conclusion of the herdsman's speech: the herdsman's mention of Hellenic blood would surely imply that the strangers just captured are Greek, thus preempting Iphigeneia's question in 246, unless she is supposed to be "preoccupied." The improbability of the discontinuity seems to me to rule out transposition as a solution. The lines should be left in the transmitted position (with Seidler's emendation) and in Iphigeneia's mouth, as a further motivation of her request for the messenger-rhesis. For further discussion (reaching a different conclusion) cf. J. C. G. Strachan, *CPh* 71 (1976) 131-140.

16. We cannot determine whether the diverging assignments were inherited from Hellenistic scholarship. Only GRT have S.*El.* 428-430 in Chrysothemis' mouth: Dawe, *Studies* II.64.

17. Dawe, *Studies* I.179.

18. In *RhMus* 104 (1961) 152-156, H. Heubner objects to Kaibel's suggestion that Elektra had hardly heard 428-430 by complaining that the ignored lines would then be "leer und überflussig" and by asking "Wo gäbe es Aehnliches in der attischen Tragödie?"

Τα. οὐ γὰρ μέγ’ αὐτῇ βασιλικῶν λέκτρων τυχεῖν;
Εκ. τί δ’ ὃ νεοχμὸν ἀπ’ ἐμέθεν ἐλάβετε τέκος, ποῦ μοι;

3. REFUSAL TO ENTERTAIN A QUESTION

Similar to the discontinuity created by preoccupation or maintenance of one's own topic is that created by a deliberate refusal to entertain or to answer a question. Full contact is maintained in such a context, but one of the dialogue-partners consciously blocks discussion of a topic, or at least creates a delay in answering. Refusals generally involve one of four circumstances: fear, secrecy, display of superiority, or dramatic convenience. Fear or pain is involved when a character is reluctant to utter bad news (*PV* 624, 628; *OT* 685-686; *Med.* 64; *Phoin.* 891-894,[19] 1209) or when he is hesitant to speak too frankly (*Ag.* 548, *Choe.* 113, *OK* 208ff.).[20] In *PV* secrecy motivates several refusals, the orchestration of which is a major feature of the drama (*PV* 520-525, 766, 953-963). Elsewhere secrecy is maintained in order to accomplish some stratagem or conceal guilty knowledge.[21] Social, psychological, or political superiority can be displayed by refusing to entertain a question and thus dismissing the other person's topic from consideration. For instance, Teiresias' riddling refusal to answer Oidipous' question in *OT* 438 represents a triumph over his would-be rival; in *OK* 1475 the refusal to answer underlines Oidipous' special knowledge, not to be shared, that confers on him a heightened status; in *Alk.* 813 the servant snubs Herakles by refusing to let him be concerned with Admetos' grief.[22] Finally, a refusal to answer may serve dramatic convenience by blocking repetition of details already covered in the audience's presence earlier in the play. Io, for instance, raises the question of the origin of Prometheus' punishment in *PV* 613-621 after the audience has already heard all the details. There is a hint of a possible psychological reason for not satisfying Io in line 615 (ἁρμοῖ πέπαυμαι τοὺς ἐμοὺς θρηνῶν πόνους); but the true reason is dramatic convenience, and there is no way to psychologize the flat refusal that finally dismisses the topic (621: τοσοῦτον ἀρκῶ σοι σαφηνίσας μόνον). Psychological probability and dramatic convenience are married more skillfully by Sophokles in S.*El.* 1343-1366: the paidagogos twice puts off until a later time (outside the drama) the answers to questions posed by Orestes and Elektra, and in so doing both displays his own character and saves the playwright from covering in detail topics that need no further development.[23] A different sort of convenience is

19. This refusal comes as a deliberate surprise after a rhesis apparently leading up to an answer; the dramatic effect is spoiled and the speech itself mutilated if one accepts the excisions advocated by Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoenissen* 37-44, and Reeve, *GRBS* 13 (1972) 458-459.

20. Cf. *Choe.* 917, where shame prevents an explicit answer.

21. Cf. *Choe.* 779-780 (revenge-stratagem); *Hipp.* 323 and E.*Su.* 1050-1051 (both suicide-stratagems); *Trach.* 412, 414, 429-430, *OT* 1056-1057, *Phil.* 576-577, *IA* 677-680, 1132ff. (concealment of guilty knowledge). In *IT* 500-504 Orestes keeps his name secret: this is dramatically essential, but is rendered psychologically understandable as well. In *OT* 1129 it is possible that the herdsman is genuinely confused rather than concealing his knowledge. In *IA* 1132ff. Agamemnon also resorts to exclamations and a withdrawal from contact to avoid answering: note that the refusal and withdrawal from contact (with the usual exclamations) are referred to by Klytaimestra as τὸ σιγᾶν . . . καὶ τὸ στενάζειν (1142f.). Bain, 53-55, considers line 1140 (only) an "aside"; but I do not think we need assume that any of Agamemnon's remarks are "aside" and unheard by his wife (σιγᾶν refers to Agamemnon's failure to openly admit what she accuses him of).

22. Further examples: A.*Su.* 512 (confident rejection of suppliants' fears; for the motif cf. *OK* 653ff.); A.*Su.* 938 (verbal triumph over the herald); *Choe.* 658ff. (social superiority, but also a stratagem); *PV* 953ff. (the secrecy-motif becomes a matter of personal triumph); *Ai.* 586, *Trach.* 395, 1183, *Phil.* 1065 (Odysseus' refusal to answer is an important part of what I interpret as his bluff); *Hek.* 663-664, *Phoin.* 1656, *Antiope,* line 63 Page.

23. Cf. also *OK* 1115-1118 and 1148-1149. For a Euripidean instance, cf. *Ion* 1456, discussed in Chapter 6, section 1(e).

served by Aithra's refusal to answer in E.*Su*. 109 (οἶδ᾽· ἀλλὰ τῶνδε μῦθος οὐντεῦθεν, τέκνον): it creates the dramatically more important dialogue between Adrastos and Theseus.

4. SKEWED QUESTION AND ANSWER

Uncomfortable joins occasionally obstruct the smooth give-and-take of stichomythia, and at times it is hard to determine whether the skewing of question and answer is due to textual corruption, to psychological or dramatic motivations, or to an actual misinterpretation by one character of what the other is saying. A mild form of skewing, one that can easily be understood in psychological terms, has already been noticed in *Hipp.* 613-614:

> Τρ. ὦ παῖ, τί δράσεις; σοὺς φίλους διεργάσῃ;
> Ιπ. ἀπέπτυσ᾽· οὐδεὶς ἄδικός ἐστί μοι φίλος.

The expression of contempt and the rejection of the very terms used by the nurse obviate any need for an outright declaration of intention. The logic is similar in *Andr.* 79-80, when the slave-woman emphasizes to Andromache the weakness of Peleus as a potential rescuer rather than give a reply about the possibility of his coming:

> Αν. οὐδ᾽ ἀμφὶ Πηλέως ἦλθεν, ὡς ἥξοι, φάτις;
> Θε. γέρων ἐκεῖνος ὥστε σ᾽ ὠφελεῖν παρών.

Reluctance to face the conveying of an unhappy truth (a motivation already noticed in refusals to answer and withdrawals from contact) causes a skewing of the answer in *HF* 1111-1113, where the straightforward (vague) answer "Because you are faring so badly!" is contained only as a *parergon* in the emotional vocative and its explanatory γὰρ-clause:

> Ηρ. πάτερ, τί κλαίεις καὶ συναμπίσχῃ κόρας,
> τοῦ φιλτάτου σοι τηλόθεν παιδὸς βεβώς;
> Αμ. ὦ τέκνον· εἶ γὰρ καὶ κακῶς πράσσων ἐμός.

A somewhat different reluctance is involved in *Hipp.* 801-804:

> Θη. τί φής; ὄλωλεν ἄλοχος; ἐκ τίνος τύχης;
> Χο. βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνης ἀνήψατο.
> Θη. λύπῃ παχνωθεῖσ᾽, ἢ ἀπὸ συμφορᾶς τίνος;
> Χο. τοσοῦτον ἴσμεν. κτλ.

The chorus' answer in line 802 assumes a deliberately narrow and evasive interpretation of Theseus' question, which is asking more than "What was the medical cause of her death?",[24] the outright lie in 804 is the logical next step after the skewed answer of 802.

---

24. A very minor disjunction of a similar kind is present in *OT* 1236ff.: the messenger's αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς is not the full answer to πρὸς τίνος . . . αἰτίας, but as the rhesis continues (after a proem in 1237b-1240) the question is answered.

One Sophoklean example in which a skewed answer seems probable involves a deliberate mystification and refusal to be more specific. Oidipous has secret knowledge which makes him master of the situation in several scenes in *OK,* including his conversation with the Athenian in the prologue (cf. 44-46):

> *OK* 70-72
> Οι. ἆρ᾽ ἄν τις αὐτῷ πομπὸς ἐξ ὑμῶν μόλοι;
> Ξε. ὡς πρὸς τί; λέξων ἢ καταρτύσων μολεῖν;[25]
> Οι. ὡς ἂν προσαρκῶν σμικρὰ κερδάνῃ μέγα.

—Would one of you please go as a messenger to him?
—With what purpose (do you wish someone to go)? To tell (him something) or to arrange for his coming here?
—So that by giving but a small assistance he (Theseus) may reap a great profit.

The dramatic situation (note the puzzled καὶ τίς . . question in 73) is such that Oidipous' deliberate shifting of topic in his answer (marked by the unusual shift from the understood subject πομπὸς in 71 to the understood subject Θησεύς in 72) is to be accepted.

Or. 1610 contains a dramatically-motivated skewing of a different sort. In a passage of trimeter antilabe, Menelaos utters a self-pitying aporetic οἴμοι, τί δράσω; with the intention of withdrawing from dialogue-contact with Orestes (as he later does in 1613ff.). Orestes jumps in to answer what is clearly a self-directed question: one is reminded of *Ag.* 1085-1089 (where there was, however, no firmly-established contact), but the ethos of the exchange is far different in *Or.* 1610, where Orestes engages in a browbeating, cat-and-mouse, verbal humiliation of Menelaos, one element of which is this violation of Menelaos' privacy of utterance. Another instance of treating a non-informational question as though it were a prosaic informational question also deserves mention:

> *IA* 872-875
> Κλ. ἐκκάλυπτε νῦν ποθ᾽ ἡμῖν οὕστινας λέγεις λόγους.
> Πρ. παῖδα σὴν πατὴρ ὁ φύσας αὐτόχειρ μέλλει κτενεῖν.
> Κλ. πῶς; ἀπέπτυσ᾽, ὦ γεραιέ, μῦθον· οὐ γὰρ εὖ φρονεῖς.
> Πρ. φασγάνῳ λευκὴν φονεύων τῆς ταλαιπώρου δέρην.

Klytaimestra's πῶς; is surely an apistetic question equivalent to πῶς λέγεις; or φής; The old servant, in self-defense, stolidly answers as though the question were a real one ("how will he kill her?").[26] The skewing of question and answer here is an effective means of portraying the gulf between the unsuspecting attitude of the mother and the painful sobriety of the servant's knowledge (an inversion of the situation in *Ag.* 1085-1089, where it is the ignorant partner who possesses a prosaic sobriety).

25. Both text and punctuation of *OK* 71 are in doubt, but Pearson's version in the OCT seems best to me, since it (1) makes best sense of the disjunction λέξων ἢ καταρτύσων, (2) does not require λέξων to mean "command" and to share the governance of μολεῖν, (3) does not separate ὡς from its idiomatic connection with πρὸς τί or force πρὸς τί into an uncomfortable closeness with λέξων. Line 71 is thus a double question with single import (general question and alternative surmise-question). Jebb takes the line as a single question and translates: "With what aim to speak, or to prepare his coming?" This eliminates the element of skewing, but at the expense of great clumsiness of expression.

26. A more playful instance of this is Plato, *Symp.* 202c5ff., where Diotima parries Sokrates' apistetic πῶς τοῦτο λέγεις; with ῥᾳδίως.

5. DELIBERATE MISCONSTRUING OF A QUESTION OR COMMENT

Most of the skewed answers noted above are occasioned by some psychological dis-location in the relationship between the speakers.[27] Even in *OK* 71-72 Oidipous is not misconstruing the Athenian's question so much as insisting upon answering in his own way, skipping intermediate steps in order to get to the point which is essential to him. Similarly, in *IA* 875 the misconstruing of the question is probably a matter of self-defense rather than of inability to understand the apistetic idiom. There are, however, two problem-cases in which the possibility of a deliberate misconstruing must be considered. The first occurs in the dialogue between Herakles and Hyllos in *Trach.* 1122-1128:

> Υλ. τῆς μητρὸς ἥκω τῆς ἐμῆς φράσων ἐν οἷς
>   νῦν ἐστιν οἷς θ᾽ἥμαρτεν οὐχ ἑκουσία.
> Ηρ. ὦ παγκάκιστε, καὶ παρεμνήσω γὰρ αὖ
>   τῆς πατροφόντου μητρός, ὡς κλύειν ἐμέ;
> Υλ. ἔχει γὰρ οὕτως ὥστε μὴ σιγᾶν πρέπειν.
> Ηρ. οὐ δῆτα τοῖς γε πρόσθεν ἡμαρτημένοις.
> Υλ. ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ τοῖς γ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐρεῖς.

Lines 1127-1128 are translated by Jebb as follows:

>   —Unmeet, truly, in view of her past crimes.
>   —And also of her deeds this day, —as thou wilt own.

In his note he explains that Herakles' line is spoken bitterly, but he does not remark on the fact that, if this is so, Hyllos' connective ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ does not recognize the irony of Herakles' utterance, but rather takes the negation at face value. What is more, Hyllos must then be imagined either (a) to be deliberately ignoring the bitterness of Herakles' statement and artificially creating an antithesis between τοῖς γε πρόσθεν ἡμαρτημένοις and τοῖς ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν (pretending that the former refers to something other than the use of the poisoned robe) or (a′) to have totally misinterpreted Herakles' utterance. A different interpretation (b) is possible if one takes *Trach.* 1127 as a concession that is neither ironical nor bitter.[28] In this view, ἡμαρτημένοις follows up ἥμαρτεν in 1123, but the whole phrase τοῖς πρόσθεν ἡμαρτημένοις implies the opposite of the normal meaning of the verb: "her *previous* crimes (of which there were none)," i.e. "her previous innocent behavior." Interpretation (b) has in its favor the fact that πρόσθεν then makes sense both in its own clause and in juxtaposition with τοῖς ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν in 1128, whereas under interpretation (a) it must imply "the crimes she's done *so far* (not to mention any that she may yet do)"—which is a conceivable meaning for an enraged

---

27. A more mechanical skewing occurs in some multiple questions seeking identification: the questions may be redundant or the answer may give more than is asked for (cf. the passages listed by Kannicht II.42 on *Hel.* 84-86, esp. E.*El.* 779-780 and E. fr. 1N² and note also *OK* 551ff. and 571-572). *Ion* 258-261 is a problem-case. There is a strong temptation to emend ποίας πάτρας in 258 to ποίου πατρὸς (L. Dindorf, approved by Nauck, Wecklein, and Wilamowitz) because one thus both eliminates the unparalleled locution ἐκ πάτρας (= fatherland) πεφυκέναι and creates a perfect chiastic relationship between the three detail-questions (which restate the general question τίς δ᾽ εἶ;) and the three clauses of Kreousa's reply. Dindorf's correction seems to me necessary, even though the corruption is not an obvious one, there are other instances of redundancy, and a father's name can be offered when not asked for (cf. *Phoin.* 288-290). One can have perfect chiasmus, keep the text, and avoid the unexampled locution if one can believe that here alone in Euripides πάτρα means "clan" (against some four dozen instances meaning "fatherland"), as Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.* I. 485, (and earlier Verrall) proposed.

28. Cf. Campbell *ad loc.*; Kamerbeek *ad loc.* seems to favor this view.

Herakles, but fits very uncomfortably with the antithesis which Hyllos makes in 1129. On the other hand, the strengthening force of οὐ δῆτα fits interpretation (a) better than (b), and if (b) is accepted one has a momentary concession in an otherwise harsh Herakles and an admission of Deianeira's virtue, both of which many critics are hesitant to recognize in this terrifying character. The choice is difficult, but it seems to me that interpretation (aʹ) can safely be eliminated: an audience could not easily imagine that Hyllos had failed to understand the hostility that would be expressed unambiguously in the actor's performance of line 1127. The choice is between (b), which involves no skewing but a, to me, unwelcome reasonableness in Herakles so soon after 1124-1125, and (a), in which Hyllos deliberately ignores his father's anger and shifts the terms of the discussion (but why Sophokles has him develop an antithesis with τοῖς γ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν still seems to me a serious problem).

A misconstruction is considered a possibility in some interpretations of a couplet in the unfriendly stichomythia between Menelaos and the woman-slave at the door of Proteus' palace:

> *Hel.* 455-458
> Με. ὦ δαῖμον, ὡς ἀνάξι᾽ ἠτιμώμεθα.
> Γρ. τί βλέφαρα τέγγεις δάκρυσι; πρὸς τίν᾽ οἰκτρὸς εἶ;
> Με. πρὸς τὰς πάροιθεν συμφορὰς εὐδαίμονας.
> Γρ. οὔκουν ἀπελθὼν δάκρυα σοῖς δώσεις φίλοις;

The most natural interpretation of πρὸς τίν᾽ is "to whom (are you appealing for pity by your tears)?"[29] Line 457 has sounded to many scholars like an answer to the question "In regard to what circumstances (are you in a pitiable condition)?"; and many have therefore favored Matthiae's emendation πρὸς τί δ᾽. But Dale rightly points to the continuity in thought between lines 457 and 455. In terms of contact, Menelaos, by invoking his *daimon,* is withdrawing from contact in a standard way. One aspect of the humor of the scene lies in the old woman's intolerance of this conventional move: the questions of 456 are epiplectic/prohibitory, but there is also an element of the apistetic, for "To whom?" (when acted out on stage) is not only an interdict against appealing to her ("Not to me, I hope!") but also a commonsensical inquiry ("Who is it you're talking to now?"). Line 457 may then be read as a direct answer, if Dale is right in interpreting τὰς . . . συμφορὰς as an equivalent of "my *daimon.*" If one is uncomfortable about this identification (as I am), then it is worth considering whether Menelaos, agitated and embarrassed by the old woman's intrusion upon his apostrophe, does try to cover his embarrassment by deliberately misconstruing πρὸς τίνα (acc. sing. masc.: "before whom?") as πρὸς τίνα (acc. pl. neuter: "with regard to what circumstances?")—a technique worthy of comedy,[30] but perhaps allowable in this scene. Misconstruction is possible despite the fact that the woman seems to ignore it in 458. She is so hostile in any case that one need not have a logical join between 457 and 458: the latter line is a further rejection of dialogue, like 454.[31]

---

29. See Kannicht and Dale *ad loc.* Kannicht's alternative to this interpretation of the transmitted text is "in comparison with whom?" I find that sense highly unlikely in context, since it has no point in the epiplectic tenor of the old woman's remarks.

30. I have in mind comic sequences like *Frogs* 649-654.

31. *Pace* Kannicht, I take *Hel.* 458 to mean "Go present your tears to your friends (and let them pity you)."

6. PARTIAL AND UNEVEN CONTACT

In Chapter 2 we examined the conventions of gradual establishment of contact with those on stage by a new arrival (from the parodos or the door). We now turn to cases in which there may be a refusal to establish equal contact with all persons on stage, creating at times a dislocation similar to those produced by refusal to entertain a question or by a skewed answer. The certain examples are all Euripidean. After the opening monologue of Iolaos in *Hkld.* an Argive herald enters and, after verbal threat and verbal rebuttal, engages in a physical tugging-match with the old man, who eventually falls to the ground (65-72). The chorus, responding to Iolaos' cries for aid, rushes in: two lines (73-74) cover the time when they are not yet in visual contact with the stage; in the next lines (75-76) they catch sight of the old man on the ground, and in 76a-77[32] they enter into contact with him and converse with him through line 98. During all this time there is no acknowledgment by the chorus of the presence of the herald, although Iolaos points to him in 78. The question in line 77 implies that the herald had already stepped back from the fallen Iolaos before the chorus made visual contact. The chorus seems to be dealing with one stranger at a time, treating Iolaos first because he is obviously in need of aid. The herald's willingness to be ignored is odd, however, unless we assume that by his stance and gesture he shows himself to be voluntarily aloof from contact with the chorus. Such staging would conform well with the manner in which the herald finally does enter into contact with the chorus: in 99-100 he intervenes in the exchange (cf. section 8 below) with a threat addressed to Iolaos, ignoring the chorus, and is then brought into conversation with the chorus by the mild reproof given to him in lines 101-104.[33]

Euripides' *El.* provides two scenes with peculiar partial contact among the characters on stage. A deft portrayal of the different social etiquettes which characterize the farmer and Orestes is attained by the distance and lack of contact between the two when they share the stage. The farmer enters at E.*El.* 341, immediately noticing the strangers and commenting on them in lines which do register with Elektra (345 responds to αἰσχρόν in 344). Elektra acts as an intermediary. She apologizes to Orestes for the farmer's suspicion and then is engaged in a dialogue by her "husband" in 349-357. The farmer finally addresses Orestes and Pylades with an invitation in 358-359 and gives an order to their attendants in 360, but the attendants apparently do not move (see Chapter 6, section 2[a]). Nor does Orestes address himself to the farmer at all; instead he asks Elektra a question, monologizes, and then tells the attendants to go in (393-394). This remarkable lack of contact reflects both the farmer's hard-headed suspicions and the young aristocrat's aloofness and naive acceptance of traditional values.[34] A somewhat different effect

---

32. The loss of one verse (76a) is indicated by responsion and the need for the chorus to establish contact by addressing a vocative to Iolaos.

33. I consider the reading ἀπολείπειν σ' in 103 (now printed by Garzya) impossible not only because the meter is wrong but also because of the dialogue-technique it implies. If the chorus addresses Iolaos in 101-103, there are two unparalleled features: (1) they continue to ignore the herald's presence after he has forcefully injected himself into the conversation; (2) 105-106 become a *second* third-party intervention in an exchange between Iolaos and chorus. It is much smoother to have the herald intervene (directing himself to Iolaos) and the chorus then establish dialogue-contact (ξένε) in a reproof which prompts the herald finally to address the chorus in 105. As for the text, one may either delete σ' (with Murray) or emend to σφ' with Musgrave, and the meter requires ἀπολιπεῖν (cf. Nauck, Pearson, and Meridier's Budé text); some critics keep σ' (referring to the herald) but alter the verb (e.g. τάδ' ἀλιτεῖν Schmidt), but I do not think the herald need be the subject of both infinitives or that an explicit pronoun is required with the vocative. Garzya reports that L originally had γ' or τ', not σ'; at whatever period σ' originated, it may well have been a conscious change influenced by the mistaken belief that ξένε refers to Iolaos.

34. On these values see Denniston on *El.* 253 and 367-372.

is created later by the distance maintained between Orestes and the old retainer. They exchange a line and a half (552-553), but thereafter each speaks only to Elektra until the recognition is effected; the old man's withdrawal from contact from line 553 to 562 is accompanied and explained by the stage-action, whereas his failure to address Orestes from line 563 on is dramatically (rather than psychologically) motivated by Euripides' decision to draw out for fullest effect the revelation of Orestes' identity to his sister.[35] In two problematic cases there may be a different sort of uneven contact: those already present are, it is assumed by some, not equally aware of the approach of a new-comer. Usually a newcomer is announced for the benefit of all present or the newcomer himself establishes contact by initiating dialogue. But the transmitted text of A.*Su.* 903-911 implies an unusual procedure:

Κη.	εἰ μή τις ἐς ναῦν εἶσιν αἰνέσας τάδε,	903
	λακὶς χιτῶνος ἔργον οὐ κατοικτιεῖ.	904
Χο.	ἰὼ πόλεως ἀγοὶ πρόμοι, δάμναμαι.	905
Κη.	πολλοὺς ἄνακτας, παῖδας Αἰγύπτου, τάχα	906
	ὄψεσθε. θαρσεῖτ’, οὐκ ἐρεῖτ’ ἀναρχίαν.	907
Χο.	διωλόμεσθ’· ἄεπτ’, ἄναξ, πάσχομεν.	908
Κη.	ἕλξειν ἔοιχ’ ὑμᾶς ἀποσπάσας κόμης,	909
	ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀκούετ’ ὀξὺ τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων.	910
Βα.	οὗτος τί ποιεῖς; κτλ.	911

In this sequence the threat uttered in 903-904 prompts the βοή for human help from the city (905), and the next cry (908) continues the appeal for human aid by invoking the king (ἄναξ). Unless this is a highly unusual use of a bare vocative to call upon someone not present,[36] the cry ἄναξ implies that the chorus sees the king approaching; if so, we have a unique instance in which one character (here the chorus) is aware of an arriving character (and indeed is addressing him) while the other character continues to speak and act in ignorance of the imminent arrival. (In contrast, *Hkld.* 73ff. illustrate the expected technique: suppliant and attacker become aware of the approach of the new-comer at the same time, and the attacker accordingly desists.) But the order of the lines has been disputed. Murray and Page mention only Wilamowitz' interchange of 905 and 908, which brings πολλοὺς ἄνακτας in 906 into a convincing capping relationship with the ἄναξ of 908. Such a sequence increases the length of time during which the herald is unaware of the approaching king while the chorus is aware; moreover, the vague invoca-tion of πόλεως ἀγοὶ πρόμοι follows strangely on the specific appeal of ἄναξ. The smoothest sequence is produced by Heath's transposition of the couplets 906-907 and 909-910: in this order, the transition from general appeal (ἀγοὶ πρόμοι) to sighting and invocation of the king is natural and the herald seems also to be made aware of the king's approach, for he substitutes a verbal threat for physical action (cf. the threat in *Hkld.* 99-100).[37] If Heath's transposition is accepted, then the unusual form of partial contact disappears.

---

35. A somewhat different form of uneven contact among three actors is exploited by Sophokles in *Phil.* 573ff., where the false merchant tries to engage in a dialogue with Neoptolemos that will be unheard by Philoktetes, but of which he will be suffi-ciently aware that he will become suspicious. See Bain, 81ff., for discussion.

36. For an appeal for rescue addressed to an absent character cf. the vocative in *Hyps.* fr. 60, 15 (ὦ μάντι πατρὸς Οἰκλέους) which has the usual, requisite specificity; also *OK* 1491-1499, where the context makes παῖ and ὦναξ quite different from the vocative in A.*Su.;* other examples are listed by D. P. Stanley-Porter, *BICS* 20 (1973) 89 n.89.

37. The transposition is accepted by Hermann, Weil, Friis Johansen, and most recently by R. Merkelbach, *Kritische*

A second possible example also does not stand up to examination. A. P. Burnett has recently explained away the much-debated problem of why in *Or.* 1618 Orestes suddenly orders the burning of the palace after Menelaos has apparently given in to him. She suggests that a body of armed Argives appears on the parodos, unnoticed by Menelaos in 1617a as he looks up at Orestes, but noticed by Orestes during 1617b. Burnett believes that Orestes calls for a conflagration because he believes that these reinforcements have defeated his plan; she also assumes that Menelaos turns and addresses the approaching Argives in 1621.[38] This staging is rendered thoroughly unlikely, however, by the conventions of contact and the text itself: first, there is no parallel for a character acting on the basis of just-established visual contact *without an explicit reference* to the new perception; second, Menelaos' appeal for aid, with its elaborate vocatives ὦ γαῖα Δαναῶν ἱππίου τ' Ἄργους κτίται reads more like a summoning of potential helpers[39] than a rallying of men already present; third, Apollo makes no reference to Argive attackers in speaking to Menelaos and Orestes (contrast *IT* 1435-1437, 1484-1485). It is prudent to assume that no extras dressed as Argive soldiers appear at the close of *Or.*, and that no unevenness of visual contact exists there.

7. DIVERSION OF THE DIALOGUE

Breakdown of normal contact and disturbance of the orderly progression of speech and action are perhaps most naturalistically portrayed when a speaker creates a diversion of the dialogue from its topic. A masterful example, both psychologically and dramatically effective, is the diversion which takes place in the Kassandra-scene at *Ag.* 1252ff. When the chorus asks what *man* will kill Agamemnon, Kassandra comments on their inability to follow her warnings (which are all too clear to the audience). The diversion of the dialogue prevents the chorus from ever receiving clarification on this point: the next few lines debate the failure of communication and lend further emphasis to the tragic isolation of Kassandra and to the reluctance of the old men to face the harsh truth directly, and then a new access of demonic possession wrenches the prophetess out of contact for a time. Both the unanswered question and the diversion of dialogue which follows it have ample dramatic impact to ensure that no confusing discontinuity is felt by the audience, which nevertheless can still appreciate the frustration of the chorus' yearning for simple clarity.

Euripides exploits diversion of dialogue in two late plays to heighten dramatic effect, in one case toying with the ignorance of a character, in the other toying with the expectations of the audience. In *Hel.* 470ff. the old woman begins her answer as if about to give a gradual stichomythic reply, but the ἔστι-element of the *ab ovo* response[40] is so shocking to Menelaos that he initiates a new series of questions, and the old woman then leaves him to his puzzled reflections:

Beiträge zu antiken Autoren (Beiträge zur klassische Philologie, 47 [Meisenheim 1974]), 8, who makes the same sort of argument I have made—in terms of the order of the two appeals and in terms of visual contact with the king.

38. A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* (Oxford 1971) 193.

39. Cf. Stanley-Porter's examples (note 36 above).

40. The old woman would have used a demonstrative connection to continue her answer: e.g. "Wishing to marry *this* woman, he kills all Greeks, lest her husband take her away."

Hel. 468-471

Γρ. οὐκ ἔνδον· Ἕλλησιν δὲ πολεμιώτατος.
Με. τίν' αἰτίαν σχὼν ἧς ἐπηυρόμην ἐγώ;
Γρ. Ἑλένη κατ' οἴκους ἐστὶ τοῦσδ' ἡ τοῦ Διός.
Με. πῶς φῄς; τίν' εἶπας μῦθον; αὖθίς μοι φράσον.

The reason why Helen's presence prompts enmity against Greeks is not revealed to Menelaos until 300 lines later (777-788): Euripides saves it in order to throw the couple into new danger immediately after their joyous reunion. In *Phoin.* 621ff., when Polyneikes introduces the notion of face-to-face combat with his brother, a counter-question[41] is used to initiate the diversion of the dialogue:

Phoin. 621-623

Πο. ποῦ ποτε στήσῃ πρὸ πύργων;
            Ετ. ὡς τί μ' ἱστορεῖς τόδε;
Πο. ἀντιτάξομαι κτενῶν σε.
            Ετ. κἀμὲ τοῦδ' ἔρως ἔχει.
Ιο. ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ· τί δράσετ', ὦ τέκνα;

Iokaste's intervention in 623 assists the forward movement of the dialogue, leaving the essential question (where and how the brothers will meet) dangling. Thereafter the audience is reminded of the mutually-desired duel in *Phoin.* 670-675 (a mythical proto-type of the fratricide), 754-755, 765, 775, 880, and 1051-1054.[42] But the second episode of *Phoin.* is designed to warn the audience that Euripides' plot will differ from that of Aischylos' *Septem* and to leave them in suspense as to how the brothers will meet. Their curiosity can only grow when the first messenger reports the course of the battle in 1067-1207 without any indication of a meeting of the brothers. The psychologically credible dialogue at *Phoin.* 621ff. therefore also serves the dramatist's manipulation of audience-interest.

The transmitted text of E.*El.* 1105-1135[43] presents an unusually naturalistic treat-ment of dialogue in terms of psychologically-motivated shifting of topic. Klytaimestra reacts with surprising mildness to Elektra's contribution to the *agon* and confesses to a certain regret about her past actions. This confession is evidently meant to close off the discussion of the past, and with lines 1107-1108 Klytaimestra takes a good look at her daughter and utters an apistetic question (σὺ δ' ὧδ' ἄλουτος καὶ δυσείματος χρόα / λεχὼ νεογνῶν ἐκ τόκων πεπαυμένη;). The shock which she receives from really looking at Elektra and thinking of her (alleged) condition prompts a much stronger and more pained outburst of regret about the past; and Elektra's comment on this outburst leads to further dialogue on the strained relations of the family's members (1111-1122). At 1123 Klytaimestra dismisses that topic quite firmly and returns to the reason for her visit. Elektra then explains what she wants, beginning with a sort of *ab ovo* formula (ἤκουσας . . . · τούτων . . . .) tempered by a mockingly polite οἶμαι (1124-1126). This naturalistic progression of dialogue has, however, been doubted, and deletions and

---

41. For such use of a counter-question, cf. *Ant.* 317ff.: the question of 317 is never answered directly, but the course of the dialogue does make the intended point and there is no need for return to the question.

42. The iambic lines cited have been suspected, but I believe them all to be Euripidean: see my diss. for discussion.

43. Gomperz's emendation πόσει must be accepted in line 1110; cf. Denniston *ad loc.*

transpositions have been proposed. But acceptance of the naturalism is by far the most economical and most reasonable course. Lines 1107-1108 are unimpeachable stylistically and provide the necessary bridge between the mild regret of 1105-1106 and the *stenazein* of 1109-1110.[44] If the lines come after 1131, their tone and intent simply do not make sense: there is no connection with the previous couplet or the following decision to act; there is no point in a sympathetic apistetic question since the situation has already been described in detail; and an isolated (unsympathetic) epiplectic question is gratuitous at this point.[45] There remains the problem seen by some critics in having Elektra speak line 1124 after she had heard 1107-1108. Denniston honestly admits that οἶμαι is odd even with transposition. That is, transposition does not solve the problem which it was intended to solve. It is better to leave 1107-1108 in place and to recognize in line 1124 a type of *ab ovo* formula and in οἶμαι a particular tone of irony.

Less important diversions of dialogue may be mentioned in a few words. *IA* 825ff. presents a case of abortive diversion, as Achilles, in somewhat exaggerated obedience to *aidos,* starts to leave once he has heard only half of the answer:

> *IA* 825-831
> Αχ. τίς δ᾽εἶ; τί δ᾽ ἦλθες Δαναϊδῶν ἐς σύλλογον,
>   γυνὴ πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀσπίσιν πεφραγμένους;
> Κλ. Λήδας μέν εἰμι παῖς, Κλυταιμήστρα δέ μοι
>   ὄνομα, πόσις δέ μοὐστὶν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ.
> Αχ. καλῶς ἔλεξας ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ καίρια.
>   αἰσχρὸν δέ μοι γυναιξὶ συμβάλλειν λόγους.
> Κλ. μεῖνον—τί φεύγεις;—κτλ.

Euripides is playing with the audience's expectation that Agamemnon's deception will be discovered. The course of the dialogue prevents the completion of *HF* 555 (see Chapter 4, section 5), but its completion is dramatically non-essential anyway. Likewise in *Ai.* 1322 the literal answer to Odysseus' brief ποίους; (sc. αἰσχροὺς λόγους ἐκλύετε;) is dramatically non-essential (the audience has heard them): the question in fact has a dismissive apistetic/epiplectic force, which is then explained by the γὰρ-clause, from which the dialogue proceeds.[46]

8. INTERVENTION OF A THIRD PARTY

Another form of diversion is occasioned by the intervention of a third party, who may actually change the course of the dialogue or may merely supply the answer expected from someone else. The diversion caused by the sudden arrival of Okeanos at *PV* 284

---

44. In rejecting the "naturalness" of the transmitted text, Denniston is in fact rejecting Murray's interpretation of the staging. Murray recognized that Klytaimestra abandons the previous topic at 1107, but in order to explain 1109 he posited either *impotens dolor* (cf. his *app. crit.*) or some unnecessary (and unreferred-to) by-play between Klytaimestra and Elektra. If one recognizes the apistetic force of 1107-1108, line 1109 is not illogical after them and there is no need for Murray's hypotheses.

45. Whereas σὺ δ᾽ ὧδε easily introduces a sympathetic apistetic question in a context in which Klytaimestra is changing the topic (after 1106), I believe the same phrase positioned after 1131 would more naturally be taken as sharp and unsympathetic (epiplectic).

46. Cf. Stanford *ad loc.*; he compares *Trach.* 427, but in that case the question has no "true" force and is entirely apistetic/epiplectic. Here, on the contrary, it seems to me that Odysseus is too tactful to use quite that tone; he must give the impression of being interested in the answer to his question, but he himself diverts the dialogue from that answer.

and the dramatic effect of that diversion were discussed in section 2(a) above. Two simi-lar interventions (but not involving a new arrival) occur in the Prometheus-Io scene, as the playwright again deliberately separates and delays various elements of Prometheus' revelations. The first intervention is the more marked one: Prometheus uses a formula of consent and a formula which normally introduces a lengthy rhesis or extended sticho-mythic explanation (ἐπεὶ προθυμῇ, χρὴ λέγειν· ἄκουε δή· *PV* 630), but the chorus blocks the rhesis with μήπω γε (631). The second intervention is less striking (partly because the audience is now used to this sort of progress in the dialogue): Prometheus offers Io a choice of two favors, but the chorus cuts in to claim both favors, one for Io and one for the chorus (*PV* 780-785).

An intervention sometimes coincides with the establishment of contact by someone who has not been noticed. In *Phil.* 974 it is the swiftly-entering Odysseus who breaks in upon Neoptolemos' *aporia* at mid-line. Neoptolemos has already withdrawn from contact with Philoktetes and is asking the chorus (and himself) what is to be done when Odysseus supplies an answer (epiplectic question and imperatival question, 974-975).[47] Something comparable to this third-party intervention may occur between only two speakers: in *Aias* 974ff. the chorus makes its presence known to Teukros in a similar way by answering the apodeictic question which Teukros has addressed to his dead brother; likewise in *OK* 138-149 when the chorus is too shocked by Oidipous' appearance to enter into dialogue with him, he forces contact by supplying an answer of sorts to an agnoetic question addressed apotropaically to Zeus.

In Euripides such interventions are usually exploited for an effect of surprise. In E.*Su.* 1045 Evadne does not permit the chorus to answer her father (who had entered with normal expressions of ignorance and inquiry), but cuts in to reveal herself high on the rock over her husband's pyre.[48] In *Phoin.* 845 the blind Teiresias directs a question to Menoikeus, but Kreon answers him, welcoming him into contact. This intervention has the further effect of suggesting to the audience that Menoikeus may be a mute character: that impression is heightened when Menoikeus is still and silent during lines 911-969; then there is a surprise when he does speak, and a greater surprise when he delivers his rhesis (*Phoin.* 991ff.) after Kreon's departure from the stage. This manipu-lation of stage-convention is a mild one, however, compared with the virtuoso ploy staged in the finale of *Orestes* when Euripides deliberately calls attention to the mute-ness of Pylades:

Or. 1591-1592
Με. ἦ καὶ σύ, Πυλάδη, τοῦδε κοινωνεῖς φόνου;
Ορ. φησὶν σιωπῶν· ἀρκέσω δ' ἐγὼ λέγων.

Although Menelaos' appeal to Pylades is not totally devoid of dramatic interest (it emphasizes for one last time the perversion of the *philia* which unites Orestes and his partners, and it allows Pylades' silence to stand as a symbol of the dumb bestiality of

---

47. Cf. *Phil.* 1293-1298, where Odysseus, unnoticed by Philoktetes (because Odysseus is still part way down the parodos, it seems), suddenly enters the dialogue to forbid the return of the bow and then answers a question addressed to Neoptolemos in order to threaten Philoktetes directly.

48. For discussion of this sort of "scenic" surprise, cf. the finales of *Med.* and *Or.* and the comments of G. Arnott, "Euripides and the Unexpected," *G&R* 20 (1973) 49-64. Compare the technique of *Or.* 380 and *Andr.* 891, discussed on p. 26 above.

the behavior of the "conspirators"), there is clearly a theatrical delight in flaunting the unrealistic aspect of the convention and in warning the alert members of the audience that the third speaking actor is yet to appear as *deus ex machina*.

An intervention of a more emotional sort has been discussed in another context: Megara answers for her father-in-law at *HF* 534, but she apologizes for the intervention, and she had been asked in the first place and had failed to answer at first because of absorption in the joy of welcome (Chapter 4, section 6[b]). The formal pattern of *Hek.* 1116-1126 is somewhat similar: Agamemnon reacts to Polymestor's accusation of Hekabe with an apistetic τί φής; and then turns to Hekabe for confirmation;[49] but the blinded man cuts in to ask where his tormentor is. In this case it is impossible to tell from the text whether Hekabe stands smug and silent with no intention of answering Agamemnon anyway. Less emotional, but dramatically very significant is the intervention of Elektra in E.*El.* 647 at a vital point in the stichomythia in which vengeance against Aigisthos and Klytaimestra is planned. Orestes has reached a point of *aporia,* and the pattern of the dialogue suggests that his aporetic question is addressed to the old man if it is addressed to anyone; Elektra intervenes (note emphatic initial ἐγὼ in 647), and there is a shift in the dialogue-partners, clearly marked by the transitional passage *El.* 647-652, with the intervention at one end and the "intrusive" couplet at the other.

Four Sophoklean passages present interventions of varying strengths and silences variously marked. In *Ant.* 379-385 it is difficult to tell whether the chorus' anapaests are a purely emotional (apistetic) apostrophe to Antigone or an actual attempt to enter into dialogue with her.[50] The latter interpretation may be deemed the more probable in view of two features of the passage: the guard's words in 384-385 seem to answer the chorus' question; there is a natural pause after 375, during which visual contact is made, and 376-378 (or 376-380) may cover the time during which Antigone is led along the parodos into range of dialogue-contact.[51] If this view is correct, both the guard's readiness to answer and Antigone's silence are important characterizing details. In the staging of *Trach.* 320ff. argued for earlier (section 1[b] above) Lichas quickly intervenes to comment on the long-standing silence of Iole—so quickly as to ensure that she does not break her silence now and tell Deianeira what he does not want her to know.[52] Another intervention intended to prevent the addressed character from answering is Odysseus' at *Phil.* 1068-1069, where Philoktetes appeals to Neoptolemos to break his long silence and Odysseus forbids the youth even to look at Philoktetes for fear he be won over. The silence of Neoptolemos here is a continuation of the portrayal of the internal struggle which started at *Phil.* 895 (section 1[b] above).

The fourth Sophoklean example of intervention has a uniqueness which has recently led to the assumption of a silence not explicitly marked in the text. It is suggested that in *Trach.* 402 the intervention of the messenger picks up the pieces after Deianeira falls

49. The shift in addressee between τί φής; and the following question is exactly paralleled in *HF* 533 in the interpretation argued for in Chapter 4, section 6(b).

50. Taplin points out to me that the description of Antigone in 441f. may also support the view that Antigone is addressed but refuses to answer.

51. Compare the problem posed by *Ion* 1246-1249: does the vocative in 1246 mark visual contact, and (if it does) does the chorus expect Kreousa to hear the lines, or is this just an emotional apostrophe with agnoetic question? Kreousa does not hear, so I suspect this is just an apostrophe.

52. In the alternative staging ([1] of note 3 above), Iole is silent and Deianeira does not react to her silence (contrast 307ff., where she turns to Lichas when Iole appears too grief-stricken to answer), and then Lichas ends the embarrassing situation by commenting on the girl's silence. But it is psychologically and dramatically improbable either for Deianeira to fail to react or for Lichas to wait to see whether Iole will speak.

silent, incapable of continuing the interrogation of Lichas.[53] It may be conceded that Deianeira is a passive sort of person relative to the energetic activity of her heroic husband; but a perplexed silence after only one question and an expected lie is hardly natural behavior, and it is hard to imagine how an audience would infer with any ease or unanimity Deianeira's state of mind from a silence not otherwise explicated in the actors' words. It is better, therefore, to follow the hints provided by the text (namely, the sharpness of οὗτος, βλέφ' ὧδε and the surprise expressed by the counter-question in 403) and to assume that the messenger intervenes without pause and without prompting. Sophokles appears to have tolerated what seems (on extant evidence) to be a break of the etiquette of social hierarchy[54] in order to carry out the entrapment of Lichas in the most lively fashion (Deianeira, after all, is too much of a "lady" to treat Lichas with the roughness required); since the messenger is defending Deianeira's own interests, the intervention may indeed have struck the audience as helpful rather than impolite.[55]

Not all third-party interventions consist of answers to questions addressed to someone else or attempts to prevent an answer. A non-problematic example of third-party utterances interjected in a two-way dialogue[56] is provided by S.*El.* 674 and 677: at the (false) report of Orestes' death to Klytaimestra, Elektra utters two exclamatory laments which are basically self-addressed and not intended as a contribution to the dialogue; her interventions are noticed, however, by the interlocutors, for Klytaimestra first tells the messenger not to pay attention to Elektra and then tells Elektra to mind her own business while she listens to the rhesis. One may compare with this the passage *Hkld.* 95-110, discussed earlier: the Argive herald, who has not participated in the dialogue since the appearance of the chorus, breaks his silence to address a counter-assertion to Iolaos in 99-100. In the emended text argued for in section 6 above, the herald's intervention is clearly noticed and immediately responded to.

Those who have followed the Aldine edition in attributing *Ant.* 572 to Antigone instead of Ismene have created a very unusual example of intervention. The line is an apostrophe to Haimon and so not uttered in normal dialogue-contact with those on stage, but nevertheless it is an outgrowth of the dialogue up to that point. The apostrophe evokes an immediate reaction from Kreon, but the text is not such as to suggest a turning to a new addressee (contrast the vocative in *Hkld.* 101, the vocative and demonstrative in S.*El.* 675, and the careful separation of σύ's in S.*El.* 678). Nor can one see what prompts Antigone to break her silence *at just this point* (contrast S.*El.* 674 and *Hkld.* 99). Therefore, an argument based on dialogue-technique[57] confirms the view

53. Cf. M. McCall, *AJP* 93 (1972) 149.

54. There are, however, so few cases similar to this one that it is unwise to be excessively confident of the validity of any "rule" of social etiquette.

55. For helpful intervention of a third party cf. the Korinthian messenger in *OT* 989 and 1132 (in neither case does he delay the set course of the dialogue). Listmann, 28, also views the intervention at *Trach.* 402 as a sudden one.

56. Cf. also instances such as *Phoin.* 623 (Iokaste's emotional intrusion at the end of the antilabe between her sons) and E.*Su.* 513 (Adrastos' attempt to respond to the Theban herald's rhesis; Theseus explicitly refers to the intervention when he cuts it off). There is an unnoticed lyric intervention on the part of the chorus in *Phoin.* 1350-1351 (also 1340-1341 if we follow all mss. other than L in giving the exclamation and dochmiacs to the chorus); but see Chapter 2, Appendix, on the weakness of the chorus' presence. *IT* 798-799 may be an instance of an unnoticed iambic intervention by the chorus, but I am strongly attracted to Monk's proposal that the couplet be given to Iphigeneia: in other recognition-scenes the chorus (appropriately) takes no part and the motif of refusal to be recognized is played out between the actors; it is also odd, I think, for Iphigeneia's verbal reaction to be postponed to 803 (but quite acceptable for her initially to protest the attempt at embrace and turn away and then to reject the claim of kinship).

57. These observations are to be viewed as a refinement upon, or replacement for, the formal arguments based on stichomythia-technique made by Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 114 with n. 2, and declared inconclusive by G. Müller in his note *ad loc.* and Lloyd-Jones, *CR* 19 (1969) 29-30.

strongly supported by other arguments already available: ἄγαν makes most sense if Ismene is still speaking on the same subject; Antigone's characterization is not favorably affected (except in the eyes of sentimental critics) by this sudden affectionate outburst; in this scene Antigone does not, after line 523, condescend to speak to Kreon, react to his statements, or defend herself against them—she has nothing to say to him. The transmitted assignment of *Ant.* 572 to Ismene should not be altered.

An intervention which is truly ignored by the characters on stage is present in the transmitted text of *Ba.* 1368-1387. After his *ex machina* rhesis, Dionysos engages in a very brief stichomythic dialogue with Kadmos and Agave (*Ba.* 1344-1351), ending with an epiplectic question urging the humans to depart forthwith into exile. Father and daughter then exchange laments in iambics (1352-1367) and mutual farewells in anapaests (1368-1387) as they move off the stage.

Ba. 1372-1379
Αγ. στένομαί σε, πάτερ.   Κα. κἀγὼ <σέ>, τέκνον,
    καὶ σὰς ἐδάκρυσα κασιγνήτας.
Αγ. δεινῶς γὰρ τάνδ᾽ αἰκείαν
    Διόνυσος ἄναξ τοὺς σοὺς εἰς
        οἴκους ἔφερεν.
Δι. καὶ γὰρ ἔπασχον δεινὰ πρὸς ὑμῶν,
    ἀγέραστον ἔχων ὄνομ᾽ ἐν Θήβαις.
Αγ. χαῖρε, πάτερ, μοι.   Κα. χαῖρ᾽ κτλ.

Dionysos' intervention is uttered in self-defense and parallels his reply to Kadmos' criticism in lines 1346-1347; the god speaks from above, while the human characters are already in motion; their failure to take any note of his contribution may be viewed as an effective portrayal of their self-absorption in their grief for the human family's demise and of the gulf which separates gods from humans—the god's excuse rings hollow in the context of human suffering and human sympathy. There is no intervention at all, however, if one follows Hermann in emending to ἔπασχεν in 1377 and assigning the couplet to Kadmos. There is, however, no reason to suppose that Dionysos has disappeared after 1351 (and there is no parallel for such an unmotivated departure of the *deus*); there is no justification for insisting on "responsion" in a passage of this sort; and, most important, to have Kadmos individualize the blame with πρὸς ὑμῶν is contrary to his character (note 1344 and 1346 as well as his earlier expressions of family-loyalty) and spoils the impact of the final tableau, whereas the statement is perfectly consonant with the attitude of the god. Therefore, *pace* Dodds *ad loc.*, the balance of probability seems to me strongly in favor of the transmitted text.[58] The form of intervention is unique, but readily understandable in psychological terms and in the spatial terms of the Greek stage (the characters are moving or have moved out of contact).

A final problem involving intervention is posed by Murray's distribution and attribution of the lines *Hkld.* 961-974. In the OCT the koryphaios informs Alkmene that Eurystheus must not die (961), the attendant addresses an apistetic/epiplectic question to the chorus (962), and Alkmene utters a real question which initiates a regular stichomythia between her and the koryphaios. In terms of "etiquette" this intervention is

---

58. J. Roux leaves the couplet in Dionysos' mouth and notes only that it is "peu probable" that the god departs before the end of the play. Some scholars have posited interpolation and/or conflation in the anapaestic portion of the exodos, and athetesis would of course remove the unusual technique: see Dodds on *Ba.* 1372-1392.

unlike any other discussed, even *Trach.* 402. There the messenger intervenes after a statement, here after an implied prohibition which must evoke from Alkmene some reply; there the messenger acts for Deianeira, here Alkmene acts for herself and the attendant's intervention draws unnecessary attention to a minor character who, in Murray's constitution of the text, is dramatically unimportant. The Greek tragedians simply do not waste the audience's attention in such a way.[59] The unusual technique in the OCT version rests on two foundations: retention of the chorus as disputant (the choice, perhaps, of early Byzantine scholars), and belief that δὲ δὴ in 963 requires a change of speaker (no change is attested in the mss.). The second ground can be eliminated by assuming that 962-963 are spoken by Alkmene alone and that δὲ δὴ is due to the shift from a generalized (perhaps self-directed) apistetic stance in 962 to a direct epipletic attack on the opponent's position in 963;[60] or (more convincingly) it can be circumvented by assuming that a verse has dropped out between 962 and 963.[61] Under either assumption there is no longer any offense in the dialogue-technique, but there remains for the critic the decision as to Alkmene's interlocutor, which should, I think, be decided in terms of content and characterization in favor of the attendant, as Tyrwhitt suggested.[62] The essential points in the argument are the discrepancy in attitude between lines 972/974 and 981-982; Alkmene's use of τοισίδ' in 965, which is sensibly addressed only to the attendant;[63] and the couplet 967-968, in which Alkmene seeks information known to the attendant,[64] but not the chorus.[65]

---

59. With others I infer from line 967 that Barnes was indubitably correct to assign the combative role as a whole to Alkmene instead of the attendant (as in LP); P. Burian, however, in *CPh* 72 (1977) 16 n. 44 contemplates allowing the attendant to carry the argument up to 973.

60. This is apparently the assumption of Garzya in his Teubner text. But cf. Denniston *GP²* 259 on the use of δὲ δὴ: δὲ δὴ normally introduces a new and crucial question at the beginning of an utterance in continuous dialogue (exceptions: it follows dispensable εἰπέ μοι in Arist. *Peace* 227; in *Birds* 155 and *HF* 206 there is a change of topic, in the latter case prepared for by μὲν).

61. So Zuntz, *Pol. Plays* 126-127, and Burnett, *CPh* 71 (1976) 11 n. 12.

62. So too Zuntz, *Pol. Plays* 125-126, and Garzya in his Teubner text.

63. The demonstratives in 964 and 968 and the third-person verb in 966 also make better sense when spoken by the attendant, although they *could* be spoken by the koryphaios (yet the accumulation of all three creates a strange impression of lack of identification of the koryphaios with his own city, an impression contrary to the previous behavior and statements of this chorus).

64. The koryphaios as interlocutor has recently been defended by Burnett, *CPh* 71 (1976) 11 n. 12, and Burian *CPh* 72 (1977) 16 n. 44. Burnett assumes (without cause) that the attendant leaves after 940, finds his behavior "extraordinarily arrogant and pro-Athenian" for a Heraklid servant (but he is a soldier, not a servant, and the firm dichotomy Heraklid/Athenian is an element of Burnett's own interpretation), and explains away 967-968 by suggesting that the koryphaios is there being sarcastic because he cannot answer the question asked (this does not explain why Alkmene would address such a question to the koryphaios; the same objection can be made to the sort of defense offered by D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure* (Toronto 1967) 119 n. 17, who ascribes the chorus' knowledge to their general familiarity with Athenian customs).

65. I append here brief mention of another phenomenon involving insertion of a third party into a dialogue. In *Eum.* 678-680, Athena addresses a question to the Furies, but the Furies direct their somewhat oblique response to the Athenian jurors, foreshadowing their inclination to be satisfied only with the verdict they want and to vent their wrath on Athens if they are crossed. (Cf. however Taplin, *Stagecraft* 395ff., esp. 399 n. 3.) In *Ion* 763-807 the old retainer serves as an iambic-speaking intermediary between the grief-stricken, lyrically-exclaiming Kreousa and the koryphaios: he rephrases Kreousa's excited πῶς φής; (782) in 785-786, but the chorus addresses the reply to Kreousa (787-788); he asks his own question in 792-793, but the answer in 794-795 is again addressed to Kreousa. The technique well reflects the dramatic and psychological situation: Kreousa is too distraught to articulate her queries and then too distraught to react at length; after the escape-wish in 796-799 she is silent until her monody at 859ff., and she does not return to iambic utterance until 934; the old man is also shocked, but all too capable of seeking the facts and inventing a conspiracy-theory and an assassination-plot.

6

PROBLEMS OF ADDRESS AND COMMAND

1. SOME PROBLEMS OF ADDRESS

To address a vocative to a specific person[1] usually involves either the desire to establish contact with that person (or lend some special ethos to the contact if contact has already been established) or the attempt to gain the attention of a noncorporeal or supernatural being believed to be capable of hearing from afar. In certain circumstances, however, the act of invocation arises from emotional excitement and creates a consciously artificial contact with some person absent or dead who is not expected to hear. In some passages featuring address the relationship between speech and action is in doubt and the nature of the contact uncertain. It is appropriate to consider these in connection with our overall investigation of contact and discontinuity.

1(a) *HKLD.* 353FF.

The chorus, in accordance with its traditional generalizing and reflective function and with the characteristics of its lyric mode, is the speaker most often in a position to indulge in the artificial contact created by invocation of someone not present on the stage. It may invoke a person remote from the scene of action: e.g. Telamon is addressed in *Ai.* 641, providing a climax after the invocation of Salamis (596-620) and the evocation of the absent mother's reactions in a third-person description (624-634). Or it may create an artificial contact with a character who has gone indoors (e.g. *Choe.* 827ff. to Orestes, *IT* 1123ff. to Iphigeneia) or offstage (e.g. *Med.* 990-995 to Jason, *Hipp.* 1131ff. to Hippolytos). In most cases the establishment of artificial contact follows a portion of lyric which already features the withdrawal from normal contact usual for a choral interlude.

In a stasimon with an exceptionally mimetic opening (*Hkld.* 353ff.) a chorus of Athenians apostrophizes at the outset the Argive herald who had departed at line 284. Wilamowitz believed that the dramatic technique of this unusual address following a speech of Iolaos was one piece of evidence for the mutilation of the Euripidean *Hkld.*[2] The shift from iambic to lyric by itself, however, marks a break of normal contact between the chorus and the stage (where Iolaos remains during the ode), so that no ambiguity of reference need arise in performance. The ode presents an elaboration of the

---

1. I omit from consideration here vocatives addressed to non-specific groups of people (e.g. E.*Su.* 745, *Hipp.* 916) and vocatives addressed to concepts or things (e.g. *OT* 380), on which see Schadewaldt, passim.
2. *Hermes* 17 (1882) 346-347.

chorus's reaction to the herald's behavior and threats. This reaction is necessarily post-poned from 288 to 353 so that the actors (more intimately involved in the action) may complete what they have to say: Iolaos must eulogize his benefactors, and Demophon must explain what he intends to do. Furthermore, the confident tone of the ode is an extension of the confidence expressed by Iolaos immediately before the stasimon (347-352).[3] There is therefore nothing suspicious in the dramatic technique of this passage. *Hkld.* 353ff. is merely a very excited, mimetic way of countering in an ode the Argive threat as represented by the herald. In the epode (371-380) the use of artificial contact is extended to an address to Eurystheus, who has not yet appeared on stage: one may compare the shift from third-person comment to second-person warning in *Med.* 990-995 cited above and (also at the close of a stasimon) in *Andr.* 492-493 and E.*El.* 745-746.

1(b) *ANDR.* 1041 AND *IA* 1080

The technique just referred to, by which a chorus apostrophizes someone near the end of a stasimon either as a climax to the emotional development or as a means of anchoring generalities to a particular case,[4] is involved in two further problematical instances of address. In *Andr.* 1009ff. the chorus sings of the destruction caused by the Trojan War and its aftermath and in the concluding stanza emphasizes one function of this evocation of ruin by employing the standard consolation-motif οὐχὶ σοὶ μόνᾳ (1041).[5] The extraordinary thing about this example is that there is no preceding third-person reference to the addressee, no vocative accompanying the address,[6] not even the presence of Andromache on stage in the scene preceding the ode, any one of which would render the unaccompanied σοὶ more normal.[7] In fact, Hermione was the woman on stage in the preceding scene, but she cannot, I think, be the imagined addressee,[8] for the sympathetic tenor of the description of Troy's sufferings and the losses for which consolation is offered (children and husbands) indicate clearly that Andromache is in the chorus's mind. Indeed, the ode takes up Andromache's own topics of lament (cf. 394ff., 461-463). The chorus is thus deliberately dissociating itself from the bargain struck by Hermione and Orestes in the previous scene and reasserting the importance of Andromache's plight in a part of the play in which the episodes no longer deal with it directly. The audience, it appears, is expected to understand the reference of σοὶ merely from the topics of consolation. A possible parallel for such a non-explicit identification of an imagined addressee is provided by *IA* 1080: from the implicit contrast between the happy marriage described in the strophe and antistrophe and the false marriage/sacrifice which currently threatens Iphigeneia, the audience is apparently expected to

3. Cf. Kranz, 212.

4. Cf. Kranz, 206-207 and 251, for the frequency of this technique in Euripides. Kranz refers to neither *Andr.* 1041 nor *IA* 1080 as in any way problematic.

5. Burges eliminates the problem I discuss by emending to οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνᾳ, a form of self-consolation. This conjecture is worth bearing in mind, but consolation of another is a much more common motif in tragic lyric, and Kranz (see previous note) demonstrates the great frequency of second-person references at this point in a Euripidean stasimon.

6. Although there is corruption in strophe and antistrophe, there seems to be no room to incorporate a vocative in the emendation.

7. Contrast *OT* 1186ff., *Ant.* 944ff., *Andr.* 789ff., and the passages cited by Kranz (note 4 above).

8. That σοὶ refers to Hermione has indeed been argued by W. Steidle, *Studien zum antiken Drama* (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 4 [1968]) 118-121. Steidle's arguments support the view that the chorus does not see Andromache approaching at 1041 (see section 1[c]) and indeed that she is not present during the exodos, but do not persuade me that the reference can be to Hermione (cf. Stevens' addendum on *Andr.* 1041).

understand that the unaccompanied σε at the opening of the epode refers to Iphigeneia. The maiden was not on stage during the previous episode, but she was the main topic of the dialogue, unlike Andromache in the scene which precedes *Andr.* 1041. It is unfortunate that the pronoun occurs in a non-correspondive lyric in *IA,* that the text of the ode is less than certain at many points (indeed several scholars introduce a vocative to accompany σε),[9] and that we can never be certain that *IA* in all respects reflects Euripides' own technique. It is possible, however, that *Andr.* 1041 and *IA* 1080 afford each other mutual support and that the unusual form of address to an absent person is to be accepted in both cases.

1(c) *ANDR.* 1041 AND REFERENCE TO NEW ACTIVITY DURING ANTISTROPHIC LYRIC

The oddity in *Andr.* 1041 just discussed is removed if we can assume that the chorus sees Andromache approaching with Peleus as the final stanza is sung. This is the view which P. T. Stevens favors in his commentary. But such an hypothesis removes one unique technical feature by introducing another:[10] visual contact with Andromache and an address to her would break the integrity of the withdrawn, non-mimetic stance normal for a chorus when singing a generalizing, reflective antistrophic lyric of this kind.[11] In an addendum Stevens concedes the problem and admits that he can offer no exact parallel for such an overlapping of choral ode and contact with an entering character. But he does cite the close of the parodos of *Phoin.,* describing it as follows: "the Chorus see Polyneices approaching and in the last lines describe his appearance, but do not address him." This suggestion must be due to an oversight,[12] since *Phoin.* 286-287 prove that the chorus does not know who the entering character is and the text of lines 258-260 themselves refutes such a reading. It is true that Euripides here (as in *Phoin.* 83 and 196ff.) prepares for the next scene by referring to someone who will appear in it at the end of the scene,[13] but lines 258-260 are completely general, not descriptive of an individual's appearance.[14] It is also unlikely, I believe, that a Greek dramatist would divide the audience's attention between the chorus's song and the highly mimetic movements of the entering Polyneikes.

There are, nevertheless, other passages which might be adduced as approximate parallels for what Stevens envisages at *Andr.* 1041; but all of them tend to reinforce the impression of oddness which attaches to *Andr.* 1041. Normally a correspondive choral ode[15] is followed either by an unannounced entry or by an announcement of an entry.[16]

---

9. Hermann, *Opuscula* 8 (Leipzig 1877) 237 (published 1848), emends ἐπὶ κάρα to ὦ κόρα without explanation (followed by Weil and O. Schroeder); Musgrave had earlier suggested δὲ τί, κόρα; and Hartung in his 1852 edition reads κόρα, mentioning the need for a vocative in the transition between topics. But Nauck, Wecklein, and Murray do not print any emendation, and Wilamowitz, *GV* 260, accepts the unaccompanied pronoun (reading ἐπὶ κάρᾳ and scanning iamb + choriambic dimeter).

10. Steidle (note 8 above) also perceives a violation of etiquette if the chorus sees Andromache with Peleus but addresses the slave-woman and not the kingly man.

11. Of course it is quite normal for a chorus to turn to address a person *already present* and inactive toward the middle or end of a reflective stasimon (as in the odes of *Med.*).

12. I now find the same "oversight" in Taplin, *Stagecraft* 174, in an otherwise useful discussion of entry announcements within act-dividing songs, a discussion which is comparable to my own in this section.

13. Cf. *Hkld.* 924-925, which comment on Eurystheus just before he is brought on stage.

14. In *Phoin.* 258-260 the ἀγών is the war, not the coming *agon* of speeches; ἔνοπλος means "with the armed might of an army," not "wearing armor"; μετέρχεται δόμους means "comes to recover his patrimony," not "approaches the house."

15. Cf. Taplin's emphasis on the connection between act-dividing song and entry (*Stagecraft* 48-60 and passim).

16. *Ant.* 155ff. is a by-form of the standard pattern: an anapaestic system has followed each lyric stanza of the parodos, but the final system is adapted to the typical anapaestic function of announcing visual contact with an entering character.

But in *Trach.* 962ff. visual contact is announced in the second antistrophe of a very short stasimon in which the earlier stanzas have already anticipated the arrival of the stricken Herakles (*Trach.* 951, 955-961); the ode is, however, mimetic rather than reflective.[17] Similarly at *Alk.* 233 (ἰδοὺ ἰδού κτλ.), the fourth of five well-defined major periods in the antistrophe announces the appearance of Alkestis and Admetos from indoors; the ode is again short and highly mimetic. *Ion* 219ff. offers another example of establishment of contact within an antistrophic ode, but Ion may never have left the stage after his monody (cf. Chapter 2, Appendix), and the song is again highly mimetic. All three examples are less than perfect parallels because *Andr.* 1009ff. is a reflective stasimon and especially because in the other cases the visual contact or the initiation of dialogue-contact has point (Herakles and Alkestis are brought on stage, Ion replies to the chorus), whereas here it hangs in the air.

One final potential (imperfect) parallel[18] which does occur at the end of a reflective antistrophic song should be mentioned. Some scholars (most notably, Fraenkel) believe that Klytaimestra emerges from the house shortly before *Ag.* 258 and that τόδ' ἄγχιστον Ἀπίας γαίας μονόφρουρον ἔρκος (256-257) is a reference to her. If this is true, it is quite unusual; but such a "gliding" establishment of contact still differs from the posited address without follow-up in *Andr.* 1041.[19] It seems to me likely, however, that τόδ' . . . ἔρκος is to be understood as a self-reference to the chorus itself (as Denniston/Page argue) and that the potential parallel therefore evaporates.

A sudden address to an absent Andromache, mediated neither by vocative nor by previous explicit reference within the ode nor by recent presence on stage, may in the end be easier to accept (along with the similar address in *IA* 1080) than a real address within the antistrophic lyric to a character just appearing on the parodos. If *Andr.* 1041 involves only an artificial contact, it is still possible that Andromache appears with Peleus in the exodos, but the only textual support for her silent presence is the use of τόνδε in *Andr.* 1246, from which it has often been inferred that the child is present and (by further inference) that Andromache must be present if the boy is. I hesitate to judge the strength of these inferences.[20]

1(d) *AG.* 83FF.

Perhaps the most famous problem of choral address in Greek tragedy is that posed by the chorus's address to Klytaimestra in the parodos of *Ag.* (lines 83ff.). Fraenkel gives a brief history of the interpretation of the passage and favors the view that the queen is not present; Page counters with arguments intended to prove that the queen must be present. In an important article Taplin argues once again for Fraenkel's view.[21] The

---

17. On this distinction see Jurgen Rode, pp. 90-99 of "Das Chorlied" in Jens, *Bauformen*.

18. Other examples brought to my attention by Taplin, *Stagecraft* 174, do not provide parallels: *Phil.* 201ff. is mimetic and occurs in a "parodos" already broken up by alternation with an actor (likewise *Ai.* 984, S.*El.* 1422, *OK* 138, E.*Su.* 794); some (e.g. Jebb) believe that *Phil.* 719-729 by its content acknowledges the appearance of Philoktetes at the door, but I do not believe it (cf. Kranz, 221; Taplin, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 33 n. 18).

19. There is no parallel at all if Klytaimestra is believed to have been on stage long before line 258.

20. See Stevens' commentary, p. 219 on *Andr.* 1047-1288, as well as his note on *Andr.* 1243. The standard article on ὅδε used in reference to persons or things not physically present (H. Hunger, *WSt* 65 [1950/1951] 19-24) is unfortunately vitiated by insufficient attention to the rhetorical context of the pronoun (e.g. the usage in *Hel.* 100 is quite different from the one Hunger envisages in *Hkld.* 793). Perhaps the demonstrative in *IA* 72 may serve as a parallel for that in *Andr.* 1246, unless the two passages differ too much in tone. On the problem of demonstratives on stage cf. also Dale, *JHS* 84 (1964) 166; Taplin, *Stagecraft* 150-151. A new comprehensive study of the problem is clearly needed.

21. *Silences* 90-91; cf. now *Stagecraft* 280-288.

nature and number of the parallels adduced and the ambiguous tenor of the text itself create a situation in which an informed consensus will probably never be reached, but it is worthwhile to consider whether the concept of contact and the technical conventions related to it can contribute to the weighing of probabilities. A. N. Michelini[22] has in fact recently attempted to explain away the apparent anomaly of the address at *Ag.* 83 by subsuming it under a dramatic convention by which a character present on stage is not obligated to hear an anapaestic address by the chorus. We have seen earlier (Chapter 2) that an actor in the process of entering or emerging from the scene-building may not yet be in full contact with the chorus or with those on stage and so may not hear what they say. The rule proposed by Michelini is different and more surprising; but it is also based ultimately on the single disputed passage, *Ag.* 83. The other example adduced, A.*Su.* 972-979 ~ 991-995, is not an example at all, since Danaos is not present before 980 (the two actors having played the herald and the king): the anapaests bridge the time needed for a rapid change of costume. In *Ag.* 783ff., moreover, the way in which Agamemnon comes to acknowledge the anapaestic comments of the chorus is normal (Chapter 2, section 1) rather than an exception that has to be noted explicitly in line 830, as Michelini suggests. Michelini's rule therefore does not solve the problem of the staging and technique of *Ag.* 83.

Elements which have been or might be considered to favor Klytaimestra's presence at 83ff. include (1) the form of the questions in 85-87; (2) the reference to her sacrificial activity; (3) the elaborate address (contrast 258?); (4) the polite formula attached to the request in 97-98; (5) the imperatives in 98. Some of these can be discounted. (1) The form of the questions is completely inconclusive, since a heap of agnoetic questions expecting no answer is a common phenomenon. (2) The internal accusative περίπεμπτα militates strongly against the view that sacrifice is being carried out on stage: the reference is to the fires throughout the city which have aroused the curiosity of the old men, as Kranz noted.[23] (3) The elaborate address can perhaps be ascribed to the anapaestic style (cf. *Ai.* 134-135). But (4) polite formulae conceding a person's right not to answer are most naturally used in the presence of the person (cf. *Ag.* 263, *PV* 765, *OT* 993, *Med.* 676, *IT* 938, *Hyps.* I.iv.38 Bond),[24] and (5) the almost hymnic force which παιὼν γενοῦ acquires if Klytaimestra is not present is quite different from imperatives addressed to persons indoors in other parodoi.

It must be conceded, therefore, that some force resides in certain arguments for the queen's presence. Nevertheless, considerations of contact militate against her presence. In *Aias* 134ff. it is clear that the chorus sings to the tent as the symbol of its leader and refers to him in the second person with no expectations of making contact. The agnoetic questions of lines 172-181 are surmise-questions not addressed to Aias, and the prohibition in 190-191 is merely a lively way of expressing a fervent wish. Only in 192ff. does the chorus seriously mean to establish contact with someone indoors; it is awaiting some response, and Tekmessa's appearance suffices. In the parodos of *Medeia* (131ff.) the chorus establishes contact with the nurse, and it is clear from Medeia's first shouts and the chorus's reaction to them that she is out of contact and that sympathetic words addressed to her are not expected to establish contact or evoke a response. In *Hipp.*

22. *Hermes* 102 (1974) 531 n.18.
23. *Hermes* 54 (1919) 301 n.3.
24. Somewhat similar is *Ag.* 1049, on which see Fraenkel.

121ff. the chorus first speaks of Phaidra and then shifts to imaginary contact in a series of agnoetic surmise-questions. Again no demand for real contact is implied. The agnoetic questions in *Ag.* 83ff. are of a different kind: that is, they are not surmise-questions. But Page is wrong to suggest that this difference favors the queen's presence. The questions in *Ag.* 83ff. make a much stronger appeal for contact *if Klytaimestra is present* (and the joining of a vocative to such a question makes the appeal still stronger). The appeal remains even though the chorus goes on to comment on the motivation of the questions in 88-96: this comment could delay an answer, but not cancel the appeal for an answer. Likewise, if the queen is present, the imperatives renew the appeal for contact in a normal manner (see Chapter 3, section 1[a]), and the comment which follows in 100-103 only delays the moment when an answer is to be expected. The unmistakable break in the continuity of thought and the obvious shift in the mode of utterance (from astrophic anapaests to antistrophic lyrics) which occur between lines 103 and 104 provide a space during which Klytaimestra must be expected to answer if she is present. There is no parallel for some distracting activity[25] keeping the queen otherwise occupied (if she were busy and remote, the chorus would not appeal for contact). Nor is there a parallel for a rude refusal to speak, which would remain incomprehensible to an audience without some explicit reference and reaction to it, as Taplin well demonstrates.[26] Nor can the queen emerge during 83-103, for if she appears in response to a summons, whether she hears the details of the summons or not, the chorus must take advantage of the opportunity for contact which it has itself requested. It is just because the forms used in *Ag.* 83-103 are so lively and demanding of contact that it is so difficult to believe that Klytaimestra can be present to receive the demand. Therefore it seems to me likely that these lines represent only an artificial establishment of contact—an apostrophe.

1(e) *ION* 1453 AND *CHOE.* 434

Apostrophes uttered by actors have a noticeable effect of directing the character's comments or expression of emotion toward some sounding-board other than the chorus or the characters present at the time, and so they naturally involve at least some degree of withdrawal from contact ascribable to strong emotion. Leo and Schadewaldt have collected and discussed examples of this phenomenon. One curiosity and one problematic case nevertheless deserve to be noted here. The curiosity occurs in the recognition duet of *Ion:*

> *Ion* 1453-1457
> Κρ. ἰὼ γύναι, πόθεν πόθεν ἔλαβες ἐμὸν
>   βρέφος ἐς ἀγκάλας;
>   τίν' ἀνὰ χεῖρα δόμον ἔβα Λοξίου;
> Ιω. θεῖον τόδ'· ἀλλὰ τἀπίλοιπα τῆς τύχης
>   εὐδαιμονοῖμεν, ὡς τὰ πρόσθε δυστυχῆ.

---

25. Furthermore, although later directors may have favored pantomime and pageantry, we know of no case in which the classical author/producers staged a significant action simultaneously with an unrelated speech or song. The conditions and etiquette of the Greek tragic theater did not permit such a dividing of the audience's attention.

26. *Silences* 89-90.

The "woman" to whom Kreousa addresses her lyric question is the *prophetis,* who left the stage after 1368 (note χαῖρ' in 1363 and the *Schlussformel* ἔχεις ἄπαντα in 1367-1368; the actor must change costume to appear as Athena).[27] If the woman had not left, we would have a real question left unanswered because of a shunting intervention by Ion (whose pious non-answer saves the poet from repeating what the audience heard in the prologue—cf. Chapter 5, section 3). As it is, the address to the *prophetis* merely lends a special liveliness to Kreousa's expression of wonderment, just as the address and lively questions and imperatives must do if Klytaimestra is not present in *Ag.* 83ff.[28] Another passage with a fairly similar effect is *Tro.* 256-258, which features an imperative addressed by Hekabe outdoors to Kassandra indoors in a violent expression of despair:

> *Tro.* 256-258
> ῥῖπτε, τέκνον, ζαθέους κλῇ-
> δας καὶ ἀπὸ χροὸς ἐνδυ-
> τῶν στεφέων ἱεροὺς στολμούς.

A problematic case of address to an absent person is created by D. L. Page's acceptance of Herwerden's treatment of *Choe.* 434-438:

> Ορ. τὸ πᾶν ἀτίμως ἔλεξας, οἴμοι,
> πατρὸς δ' ἀτίμωσιν ἆρα τείσει
> ἕκατι μὲν δαιμόνων,
> ἕκατι δ' ἀμᾶν χερῶν·
> ἔπειτ' ἐγὼ νοσφίσας ὀλοίμαν.

[ἔλεξας . . . τίσει M, ἔρεξας . . . τείσεις *conj.* Herwerden, *recepit* Page; *post* νοσφίσας <σ'> *suppl.* Page]

The emendation is occasioned by an inflexible approach to the language of Aischylos, an approach which insists that ἀτίμως must modify ἔλεξας (*'inhoneste locuta es' contextui minime aptum*—Page). With the emendation, Orestes enters freely into the evocation of the past which Elektra initiates in 418ff. and in which the chorus shares. In fact, Orestes is made not only to pick up Elektra's address to her mother in 429-433 but also to convert that address from the past to the present by directing his threatening promise directly at his mother. One may question, however, the psychological and dramatic propriety of such an intervention by Orestes. The six stanzas surrounding 434-438[29] are intended by Elektra and the chorus to evoke images of the past for Orestes' benefit (they are scenes he could not personally experience), and it would be much more in accord with this intention and with the pattern of statement and reaction visible elsewhere in the kommos (cf. 324, 372, 380, 410, 444) if Orestes acknowledged Elektra's description with ἔλεξας than if he summarized the action he did not witness with an address to Klytaimestra. It is also odd that Orestes combines two forms of artificial contact: he first

---

27. No sensible critic will follow Verrall's imaginative stage-direction allowing the woman to hover near the door before going in at 1425.

28. The peculiar liveliness of *Ion* 1453ff. can better be appreciated if one compares other invocations of persons absent but in the vicinity of the action: *Ai.* 944-945 (exclamation to Eurysakes), *Ant.* 572 (exclamation to Haimon), *Ai.* 340-341 (question to Eurysakes, but clearly agnoetic in form), *Phoin.* 611 (imperatival κλύω-question to Oidipous indoors, in context little different from the similar appeal to the gods in 604ff.). The summons to Amphiaraos in *Hyps.* fr. 60, 15-19 is rather different, since Hypsipyle is really trying to make herself heard.

29. I assume the order of the stanzas as transmitted in the mss.; the arguments for moving 434-438 to follow 455 seem to me insufficient.

enters into the established situation in which the past is the sounding-board for comment, but he immediately shifts to a hypothetical direct relationship with the Klytaimestra of the present who now waits at the palace, whereupon the chorus ignores the shift and continues with the process of informing Orestes.[30] These problems disappear if ἔλεξας is retained; in addition, both ὡς τόδ᾽ εἰδῇς in 439 and κλύεις in 443 make much better sense if preceded by the acknowledgment of information received which is provided by ἔλεξας. The most probable interpretation of the syntax is, in my opinion, that τὸ πᾶν is adverbial and that ἀτίμως is "directly quoted" ("You mean, in sum [she did it] dishonorably").[31] Herwerden's defacing conjecture may be returned to the class of the *minus probabiles*.

2. COMMAND AND EXECUTION

The presence or absence of full contact and the conventions of correspondence between words spoken and action performed are relevant to several problems involving tardy execution or non-execution of a command uttered on stage.[32] Wilamowitz argued for the deletion of *Hel.* 892-893 with the rhetorical question *ecquid in tragoedia Attica fiat non diserte monitum, ecquid diserte monitum non fiat.*[33] Wilamowitz addressed this question to the shade of Hermann, who had explained the non-execution of the order implied by τίς εἶσι κτλ. by reference to stage action which is not described. The passage has remained a debating-point in subsequent scholarship. It is worthwhile to consider the circumstances which may accompany non-execution of a command and to decide whether Wilamowitz's rhetorical question is cogent or whether Dale's matter-of-fact acceptance of the couplet is justified. Most of the interesting and problematic cases to be discussed involve commands addressed to mute characters, since commands addressed to another speaking character may be rejected in an obvious and uninteresting manner (e.g. *Med.* 1377-1378; *Hkld.* 341).[34]

2(a) DELAY IN EXECUTION

In general one finds either an immediate comment on the non-execution of the order or a development in the course of action which turns aside or renders unnecessary the execution of the command; often both elements are present. Delay in execution may be treated as the first of five types of situation where a command is, in some way, ignored.

30. The shift from past reference to present threat (to Helen) in E.*El.* 479-486 is not comparable because there it is the chorus singing and the vengeance described is quite remote from the action of the play.

31. This is, in essence, the view of Mazon and Headlam/Thomson; *contra,* Wilamowitz and Groeneboom. Paley and Wecklein assume a sort of brachylogy which produces a similar sense. There is a similar necessity *not* to take an adverb stolidly with the verb standing next to it in *Ag.* 1244 (κλύοντ᾽ ἀληθῶς), on which see W. L. Lorimer, *CR* 11 (1961) 187-188.

32. For lists of unfulfilled commands see Zuntz, *Euripide* (Fond. Hardt, Entretiens 6 [1960]) 207, and Reeve, *CQ* 22 (1972) 54 n. 1 and 53 n. 1. Such lists, however, combine examples of very different kinds, mixing interesting and significant instances of non-execution with obvious and insignificant ones. I should perhaps record here my judgment that there is nothing problematic in the interval between Kreon's order to his attendants at *Ant.* 760 and the emergence of Antigone from the palace at 802: cf. the interval between 491 and 526 when Ismene is summoned. There is therefore no reason to postulate an earlier emergence for Antigone, as does W. J. Ziobro, *AJP* 92 (1971) 81-85, even apart from the fact that Ziobro's proposed staging is ruled out by the text itself (lines 802-805 are an announcement of new visual contact).

33. *Analecta Euripidea* 243. Cf. Kannicht 11.236 *ad loc.*: "wo in der attischen Tragödie bliebe ein solcher Befehl ohne ausdrücklichen Widerruf unbefolgt?"

34. Somewhat more interesting, but still dramatically obvious is the use of deception by Menoikeus to delay obedience to his father's commands in *Phoin.* 986-990 (on the distribution of the lines, see Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 47-50).

In the first episode of A.*Su.* Danaos tells his daughters at line 180 that he sees and hears signs of the approach of a delegation from Argos; at 191 he says ὡς τάχιστα βᾶτε; but the next twelve lines contain further advice, and it is to this advice that the chorus replies in 204-206. Not until the couplet 207-208 (whatever is correct position)[35] does the chorus actually begin to move. Two features of the scene are noteworthy: first, the chorus responds chiastically to the topics of Danaos' speech (A: move, B: behave prudently; B′: we'll behave, A′: movement), a procedure also observed in replies to questions followed by lengthy comments; second, the tragedian does not permit a major movement of persons during the rhesis, but postpones the movement to the end.[36]

The delayed response of Aias to Athena's summons in *Ai.* 71-73 is covered by the dialogue between Athena and Odysseus (74-88) and is then commented on when the order is repeated in 89-90 (cf. Chapter 2, section 3). Likewise the inaction of Orestes and his attendants after the invitation/order addressed to them in E.*El.* 358-363 is noted at least obliquely in the farmer's addition of καὶ μηδὲν ἀντείπητε (361);[37] but there may be more stage-action not described in the text (do the attendants, for instance, turn to Orestes for a sign of approval of the order?). In any case from 364 to 392 Orestes' lack of contact with the farmer represents a course of action which postpones specific reaction to the invitation, until at 393 he endorses the original order (χωρεῖν χρεών, δμῶες). It would be very welcome to know whether in the original production the attendants moved immediately in response to these words or waited until Orestes' rhesis came to an end (in which case the relatively insignificant triplet 401-403 spoken by the koryphaios covers the movement). In view of the example from A.*Su.* and the instance about to be discussed, the latter staging is perhaps the more probable.

One of the arguments deployed in some attempts to identify alleged *Bearbeitung* and contamination in the iambic exodos of *Phoin.* (esp. in 1625-1682)[38] is the fact that Kreon's order that the corpses be moved from their position on stage (1627-1630) is not immediately executed by the attendants on stage. In order to perceive the insufficiency of this argument, one need only reconstruct the staging and consider as parallels the passages discussed above. The ensemble is developed as follows: Kreon enters alone at 1310[39] and remains on stage until 1682; at 1480 Antigone enters mourning, with the three corpses (Iokaste, Eteokles, Polyneikes) carried by attendants;[40] once the corpses are placed center-stage, the attendants presumably withdraw and stand several feet out of the way, giving free access to Antigone for the mimetic gestures that accompany her monody and not obstructing the audience's view of the important tableau; when

---

35. I refer to the lines by their traditional numbers, which are unfortunately not printed in brackets as they should have been in Page's OCT. The order of the lines following A.*Su.* 206 is of course disputed. If one is willing to abandon the obsession with making ἴδοιτο δῆτα follow ἴδοι (for this is not the only possible use of δῆτα in Aischylos—cf. *Se.* 813, *Su.* 359), the mss. order may be retained, with a perfectly acceptable irregularity at the start of the stichomythia (3:1:2:1:1, etc.). I believe that μηχανῆς δ' ἔστω κράτος is sound and that it means "let the device (of taking refuge at the altars) take effect" (the genitive is subjective rather than objective).

36. Cf. *IA* 678-685, where Agamemnon's comments and actions delay Iphigeneia's departure, first ordered at 678, re-ordered at 685.

37. This phrase may be related to the polite formula καὶ μηδαμῶς ἄλλως ποιήσῃς (cf. Fraenkel, *Beob. zu Arist.* 69-71), but I do not think it is so formulaic in this context that reference to inaction is ruled out.

38. For discussion of other arguments, see my *St.E.Ph.*, Chapter 27.

39. Or perhaps with two mute attendants, as D. P. Stanley-Porter, *BICS* 20 (1973) 72, assumes. In any case, Kreon does not carry with him Menoikeus' body—a very old erroneous assumption still made by Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 82.

40. Six, according to Stanley-Porter (see previous note).

Oidipous comes out he too must be closer to the bodies and to Antigone than the attendants are; Kreon reasserts his presence at 1584. At line 1627 Kreon believes that he is ready to go indoors: Oidipous has accepted (after suitable protestations) the decree of exile, and Kreon himself now wishes to announce the punishment of Polyneikes and to move Antigone indoors along with himself and the bodies of Eteokles and Iokaste. Two important points about the form of his commands are that his orders are accompanied by and followed by comments (relative clause 1628-1629, decree 1631-1633) and that the order concerning the corpses is conjoined with an order to Antigone (1635-1636).[41] The attendants would not, as we have seen, move into action while Kreon is still explaining his wishes, and they would probably wait until Kreon himself moves toward the door. Furthermore, Antigone and Oidipous are still standing by the three bodies, and the last order was directed to Antigone. Both in terms of the physical movements on stage and in terms of etiquette it seems to me unlikely that the attendants would move into action before Antigone has shown her obedience to Kreon's instruction by abandoning her position near the bodies. But the course of the action turns out to be that Antigone does not move: she addresses a few sympathetic lines to Oidipous (cf. Orestes' longer preliminary remarks in *El.* 364ff.), and then instead of obeying Kreon's order to herself[42] engages him in argument on the topic which preceded that order; she gives in to Kreon on the matter of burial, but defeats him in turn on the question of marriage to Haimon. The course of the dialogue leads to Kreon's somewhat ignominious departure at 1682, with Antigone still close to the corpses and thus preventing a dramatically-distracting execution of Kreon's order by the attendants until she and Oidipous move away from the bodies at 1710ff. Even then we cannot tell whether the attendants act or stand still, clearing the stage only after the play ends at line 1736.[43] Because of the nature of the command, the arrangement of the actors on stage, and the course of the dialogue and action, the lack of an immediate action in response to Kreon's χρεὼν . . . κομίζειν is neither unique nor unnatural. It therefore presents no obstacle to believing in the authenticity of the main dramatic developments of the iambic part of the exodus of *Phoin.*, despite the undoubted spuriousness of line 1634 and the grave suspicions that attach to 1596, 1606-1607 and 1637-1638.

2(b) REJECTION OF AUTHORITY

A second type of situation in which a command is disobeyed or ignored is that in which the command is either verbally rejected or actively resisted as the command of an enemy whose authority is denied. A.*Su.* 836ff. provides a straightforward example: the maidens resist the herald with panic-stricken exclamations and inaction until the king arrives at 911. In *Ai.* 361-362 the chorus verbally rejects Aias' order that they kill him;

41. 1 would also suggest that the phrase χρεὼν ἤδη κομίζειν without a vocative implies ἡμᾶς as the subject of the infinitive, and so the phrase expresses in context something less urgent than the same phrase with vocative (cf. E.*El.* 393) or an imperative with personal ending (I am assuming that the variant δμῶας in 1628 is secondary); for the action in which he will not personally participate Kreon does, of course, use an imperative in 1630 (ἐκβάλετε). Compare E.*El.* 959-962, where Elektra does use a vocative with the order κομίζειν . . . χρεών and is apparently about to go in with the body when Orestes stops her with ἐπίσχες (presumably the attendants do carry out the command immediately).

42. Cf. *Andr.* 433, where obedience is delayed by about 30 lines of protest and argument, and *Tro.* 419, where Kassandra's departure is delayed by her long farewell-rhesis.

43. For discussion of the end of the play see *St.E.Ph.,* Chapter 28.

the explicit rejection shows that there is a high degree of contact in the exchange, whereas in *Trach.* 1015-1017 and 1031-1037 similar requests uttered by Herakles are not explicitly rejected because of the low degree of contact between the anguished hero and those around him. Execution of an order by mute attendants is forestalled in *Hipp.* 1084-1086 by an explicit counterthreat and in *Andr.* 577-580 by an explicit contradictory order; action is delayed momentarily in *Ba.* 503ff. by a comparable prohibition (the attendants probably, but not certainly, lay hands on Dionysos as the actors go indoors); and imminent issuance of an order is forestalled by word and gesture of supplication in *Med.* 335-336:

> Κρ. τάχ' ἐξ ὀπαδῶν χειρὸς ὠσθήσῃ βίᾳ.
> Μη. μὴ δῆτα τοῦτό γ', ἀλλά σ' αἰτοῦμαι, Κρέον·

In the light of such examples it is surely not a dubious dramatic technique (as Fraenkel alleges)[44] when Antigone in *Phoin.* 1660-1661 forestalls execution of an order by word and gesture (clinging, and perhaps also an arm-gesture to the attendants):

> Κρ. λάζυσθε τήνδε κὰς δόμους κομίζετε.
> Αν. οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεὶ τοῦδ' οὐ μεθήσομαι νεκροῦ.[45]

Word and action surely suffice to cause the attendants to pause, and then Kreon continues to engage in stichomythia with the girl, thus countenancing the continued inaction of the attendants (moreover, the point of contention which prompted λάζυσθε is surrendered by Antigone in 1667). The disobedience of Antigone herself with regard to Kreon's order in 1635-1636 is of course no problem at all, although her contemptuous postponement of contact with Kreon himself is noteworthy.[46]

2(c)   EXECUTION FORESTALLED BY INTERVENTION OF A NEWCOMER

A third group of examples is characterized by the intervention of a newly arrived character. In *Ai.* 328-330 Tekmessa asks the chorus to enter the tent with her in order to deal with Aias. Fulfillment of her request is delayed first by a comment on the rhesis which preceded the request and then by startling shouts from within; soon Aias himself is revealed to the chorus and audience, and Tekmessa's request is rendered inoperative (as, technically, it had to be to keep the action in front of the audience's eyes). *Andr.* 1066-1069 is more straightforward: Peleus' order (via the question οὐχ . . . χωρήσεταί τις . . . ;) need not be carried out by anyone because a messenger immediately makes known his approach by his exclamation and self-introduction. This is a more telegraphic form of the pattern of command-arrival-cancellation of command which is to be ob-

---

44. *Zu den Phoen.* 106.

45. Antigone's οὐ δῆτα is of course not exactly the same as Medeia's μὴ δῆτα, since an imperative is understood with the latter, but an indicative expressing intention (e.g. κομισθήσομαι) with the former. In most other cases οὐ δῆτα rejects an order or suggestion directed to the person who utters it (cf. the passages cited by Denniston *GP²* 275, v). But here Antigone rejects the suggestion κομίσθητι implicit in Kreon's order to the attendants: cf. *Kykl.* 198, where Odysseus' οὐ δῆτα replies to the suggestion φύγετε implicit in line 197.

46. At *OT* 1432 Oidipous' appeal to Kreon (πρὸς θεῶν κτλ.) forestalls execution of the order ἐσκομίζετε (directed to attendants in 1429) by requesting a different disposition of his case: this is comparable to rejection of authority. The course of the dialogue then occasions further delay before Oidipous actually goes in.

served in E.*Su.* 381-398 and *Phoin.* 690-696. *Ai.* 192 is perhaps a by-form of this type of unfulfilled request: if ἄνα is to be interpreted as a real invitation to Aias to show himself rather than as a simple exhortation addressed to a character not intended to hear (cf. *Ai.* 190-191), then Tekmessa's emergence from the tent is a sufficient response from within to satisfy the expectation aroused by such a request.

A possible example of intervention by a character already on stage may be mentioned here. Pentheus orders his attendants at *Ba.* 809 to bring out his armor for an on-stage donning of armor (cf. *Se.* 675-676, *Phoin.* 779).[47] If Dionysos' ἆ stops the attendant from going in, there would probably have to be some gestures not referred to in the text; but it is hard to imagine that Pentheus would tolerate non-execution in his current state of mind. Presumably, therefore, the attendant does go indoors, and non-execution of the order is no problem because Pentheus himself exits into the palace with another reference to the armor (*Ba.* 845-846):

$$\text{στείχοιμ' ἄν· ἢ γὰρ ὅπλ' ἔχων πορεύσομαι}$$
$$\text{ἢ τοῖσι σοῖσι πείσομαι βουλεύμασιν.}$$

Pentheus' course of action demonstrates to the audience that once indoors he has countermanded the request for armor and decided to don a disguise.[48]

2(d)   LACK OF CONTACT

In a few cases, failure to heed an order is part of an overall break of contact or refusal to establish contact (fourth class of examples). Silence, that is, failure to engage in full contact, is explicitly noted: passages such as *Ag.* 1035ff., *Phil.* 799ff., 932ff. have already been discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

2(e)   GRADUAL MOVEMENT AND STYLIZED MOVEMENT

2(e)(1) two examples in *Med.*

The fifth group of examples features a phenomenon which cannot be verified in the words of the text and hence is open to suspicion: artificially gradual movement on stage, creating for the reader the appearance that someone fails to obey an order. A non-problematic example is available in the second prologue-scene of *Med.*: the nurse instructs the children to go indoors at line 89, but they seem to be still in the process of entering at line 105. A few seconds of delay may be occasioned by the fact that the nurse addresses advice to the children's escort in 90-91; but it is nevertheless likely that there is a starting and stopping, the stopping caused by Medeia's first cry from within. The repetitiousness of line 105 after σπεύσατε θᾶσσον (100) is perhaps a verbal clue implying that further mimetic actions of fear and hesitation occur before the children pass through the palace door.

---

47. Dodds on *Ba.* 810-812 is correct to say that "Pentheus has broken off negotiations" but wrong to add "and turned to leave the stage": Pentheus is awaiting his armor, and his posture and behavior suffice to create the attempted break in contact with Dionysos.

48. Somewhat different is the loose end created by Pentheus' order at 780-785; there an attendant surely goes off bearing the king's decree, but the off-stage action is thereafter forgotten by poet and audience. Cf. also *Pe.* 832ff.: Dareios tells the queen to fetch clothes for Xerxes and meet him, but she never does (cf. Taplin, *Stagecraft* 119f.).

The staging of *Med.* 1021-1080 has traditionally been a matter of dispute because the children are dismissed at 1053 and then summoned again at 1069. To some the stage-technique seems so extraordinary that it is used as one of the arguments for excising a large chunk of Medeia's monologue.[49] It would require, however, an overly rigid (and overconfident) attitude to assert that the transmitted text could not be staged in the fifth-century theater simply on the basis of the uncertainty of the correspondence between word and action. Medeia sends the paidagogos indoors ahead of the children at 1019-1020; but unless the children are unaccompanied at 1053 (which seems unlikely), one must assume either that a mute character had escorted the children along with the paidagogos and remains near them after line 1020 or that a mute character appears at the door to await them when the paidagogos leaves them. The children move toward the door at 1053; their movement and Medeia's (probable) turning away from the door and toward the audience mark the break in contact, so that the children and their attendant can be considered not to hear the details of lines 1054-1068. Medeia's exclamation ἆ ἆ is nevertheless strong enough to attract their attention, and it apparently creates enough alarm to cause them to halt,[50] so that they are still nearby when Medeia swings around and tells the attendant παῖδας προσειπεῖν βούλομαι (1069). Such staging (approved of by Page) is surely superior to actual departure indoors of the children (with pause at 1069 to allow for their re-emergence), the staging assumed by Murray. The dramatic technique of start-and-stop is confirmed by *Med.* 89-105, and the possibility of an artificially uneven contact (hearing and reacting to the exclamation but not being in the sort of contact required to hear the content of 1054-1068) is supported by other phenomena of contact related to entering or exiting through the palace- (or temple-) door and to the act of turning away (cf. Chapter 2, section 3, esp. note 48).

2(e)(2) *Ion* 1261-1281

One example of an unexecuted order remains to be discussed before we return to the original problem posed by *Hel.* 892-893, and it is the only example referred to by Dale in her defence of the *Hel.* passage. The staging which accompanies *Ion* 1266 (or in fact *Ion* 1261-1281) is, however, itself a difficult problem: the passage has prompted at least two suggestions for transpositions, two artificial explications, and one major excision. The act of pursuing and arresting Kreousa is an unusually "busy" one for a crowd-scene on the tragic stage, and difficulties arise because we are uncertain how and when the required movements take place and to what degree such movements are either realistically portrayed or artificially stylized. The received text (as in Murray's OCT) implies that Kreousa hastens in, almost in panic, at line 1250. In the brief passage of trochaic tetrameters, which reflects her haste and fear, Kreousa is advised to seek refuge at the altar, and at 1257 (καὶ μὴν) she announces visual contact with a group of armed men hastening in along the parodos which she herself has just used. The chorus recommends ἵζε νυν πυρᾶς ἔπι (1258), and then at 1261 Ion establishes visual contact with Kreousa and points her out (τήνδ' 1262) to his men as he begins to declaim. By the time he speaks he must have reached a fringe-area of the scene of dramatic action (perhaps a portion of

---

49. See most recently M. Reeve, *CQ* 22 (1972) 51-61.

50. Bain, 26-27, acknowledges the "stopping" function of the exclamation, but insists (unconvincingly, to my mind) that the technique here must be post-Euripidean.

parodos close to the stage), a spot from which it was technically possible for an actor to be seen and heard. Since Ion and his men enter seeking Kreousa, it is surely inconceivable that Ion can be imagined to invoke an Athenian river-god and refer to Kreousa with a simple demonstrative without having caught sight of Kreousa on stage (as Wilamowitz and Owen assert).[51] It is surely the sight of Kreousa that evokes Ion's declamatory apostrophe and the use of the deictic pronoun. The unanswerable question is how far Kreousa has moved toward the altar during lines 1258-1265. If her movement is artificially slow (delayed, for instance, by mimetic gestures of terror), there is no problem (except that such gestures are not described in the text—but how could they be in this scene?). But if she has reached the altar, then we require a forced explanation such as Murray's (1266 *nondum conspexit Ion ad aram confugisse Creusam:. . . v.* 1279 *tandem rem intellegit*), which is quite unsatisfactory.

   The order of seizure comes in line 1266, and the men with Ion presumably do at least approach Kreousa, while she continues to move toward the altar. If one can accept a stylized and hence unnaturally slow pursuit, perhaps Kreousa comes near to the altar only at 1275, occasioning Ion's threat, and by 1278 Kreousa has clasped the altar and her pursuers have come to a stop, with a posture indicating hesitation. Ion's protest (ἴδεσθε κτλ. 1279-1281) is then a verbal acknowledgment of the failure of his companions to continue with the execution of his command of 1266.

   The received text, in short, seems to presuppose both a stylized, slow pursuit once the crowd of pursuers has reached the stage-area and a very oblique reference to the actions and non-execution of the order. The slowness of movements on the stage itself is not totally unexpected if one considers the reluctance of the tragedians to diminish the decorum of the performance in the interests of realistically rapid, highly mimetic movements (cf. *HF* 514ff., *Andr.* 547ff., A.*Su.* 836-910, *Ag.* 1649-1654, *OK* 819-847).[52] There have, moreover, been a few indications in other scenes discussed above of actions and gestures undescribed or only obliquely referred to. It is possible, therefore, to imagine Kreousa reaching the altar only after 1275 and gesturing to the men not to touch her (an arm extended straight out with palm toward the men would suffice); the comment which would naturally go with such a gesture cannot, on the Greek stage, be spoken simultaneously with Ion's utterance and so is postponed to 1282. Comparable postponement to allow for the autonomy of each utterance is to be observed in passages like *HF* 514ff. (note Megara's silence between 522 and 531) or *OK* 819ff. (note Antigone's slowness to seek refuge and silence during most of the pursuit and abduction). But even with such parallels, the *Ion*-passage deserves to be considered an unusual one in terms of correspondence between words and action.

   Several scholars take a further step and declare the technique not merely unusual, but impossible for Euripides. Musgrave believed that 1279-1281 should follow 1274, so that there would be a logical progression from demonstration of Kreousa's *techne* to the threat that such a ploy won't work. With such an order of the lines, the retreat of

---

51. Wilamowitz on *Ion* 1261-1281, Owen on *Ion* 1262. Wilamowitz's explanation of the passage is in other respects too brief and inadequate, like so many of his comments on this play.

52. The point of the cited passages is not precise parallelism of situation, but the unnaturalistic slowness of movement which the texts seem to require. Note also *Hel.* 541ff., where speed is implied in 543 and 546 but Helen does not reach the tomb until 556. A.*Su.* 836ff. is especially instructive: Aischylos presumably choreographed a stylized confrontation which drew out the conflict, so that at 903ff. the herald is still only *threatening* physical action (I agree with Taplin, *Stagecraft* 216).

Kreousa may be less gradual and she may reach the altar at some time between 1266 and 1274. Line 1275 is then well-motivated by the line which precedes it (ὡς οὐ δίκην δώσουσα τῶν εἰργασμένων), whereas in the received text it is motivated only if one finds in 1275 an oblique reference to the fact that Kreousa is approaching the altar at that moment.[53] Kirchhoff added a further transposition to Musgrave's, transferring the command (1266-1268) to the very end of Ion's speech (i.e. his order is 1261-1265, 1269-1274, 1279-1281, 1275-1278, 1266-1268). With this order Kreousa may be already at the altar at 1261, and the order is unfulfilled because it is immediately followed by an explicit rejection. But Kirchhoff's order has a harsh consequence for Ion's character: in other versions Ion threatens seizure but acknowledges (either before or after the threat) that Kreousa's ploy is an obstacle (likewise in 1312-1319 Ion finds fault with the custom, but does not act), whereas in Kirchhoff s order there is the actual impiety of ordering seizure in contravention of religious custom, an action which renders unnecessary Ion's request in 1306 that Kreousa leave the altar voluntarily and his contemplation of the proprieties of the custom in 1312-1319. This fact, together with the strange inaction of Ion's companions for 19 lines before the order and the complexity of the corruption assumed, renders Kirchhoff's hypothesis unattractive.[54] Diggle has recently revived Musgrave's proposal in the interest of logic,[55] but finally decides that the fault of dubious sense in 1276-1277, when added to the illogicality, justifies deletion of 1275-1278 as a whole. Unfortunately, this deletion also eliminates both the typically Euripidean forced exploitation of dramatic irony in 1277-1278 and the welcome anticipation of Ion's readiness to contemplate violating the custom of asylum. Whether one follows Musgrave or Diggle or the received text, one must assume a certain amount of action not explicitly referred to; and one should give serious consideration to the possibility that the received text is correct and that it must have been accompanied by stage-actions such as those proposed above.

2(f) *HEL.* 892-893

We have indicated some limitations that are relevant to the law of technique implied by Wilamowitz's rhetorical question *ecquid diserte monitum non fiat.* Do these limitations offer parallels for the kind of correspondence between word and stage-action which is created if we assume τίς εἶσ' ἀδελφῷ τόνδε σημανῶν ἐμῷ to be the original reading[56] of *Hel.* 892? A question of this form constitutes an imperative which is relatively mild because not directed to a particular agent (cf. *IA* 1458, *Rhes.* 149).[57] Who are the

---

53. Murray's interpretation of the motivation ("*sed v.* 1275 *videt suos nihil facere, suspicit illam ad aras quasdam fugere velle*") should not satisfy anyone. Wilamowitz's paraphrase seems to imply that line 1275 follows from 1269ff. (and thus has no reference to stage-action); but if that is so, then the passage falls prey to the charge of "silliness" (see note 55) when Ion speaks 1279-1281.

54. Another disadvantage of Kirchhoff's order is that it produces a confused shifting of forms of address, whereas the traditional order has a typical sequence: more abstract, generalized forms at beginning (indignant apostrophe) and end (appeal to everyone present to observe Kreousa's ploy), with more concrete, specifically-directed forms in the middle (order to men, indignant statements aimed at Kreousa herself).

55. *PCPS* 200 (1974) 28-30: "Ion could not have been so silly [as the received text implies]." But the degree of silliness depends on the staging that accompanies the lines, and Diggle does not even discuss it.

56. I consider the acceptable alternatives to be (1) this text (Scaliger's, adopted by Murray and others) or (2) a lacuna after 891 (Zuntz, Kannicht) and irreparable corruption in 892 (Kannicht's εἴσειμι for τίς εἶσ' will hardly do). I consider Reiske's τί φής; with LP's σημανῶ γ' (printed by Alt) impossible for Euripides: the γ' is so obviously a metrical stopgap which adds no meaning (contrast *Ion* 1290 and *GP²* 128, iii) that if this were the original reading the couplet would be suspect on stylistic grounds alone.

57. Cf. also *Hel.* 435 and Dale's note; but summoning someone to the door from inside is rather different.

potential agents of Theonoe's command? She had emerged with female attendants; those carrying the religious paraphernalia re-enter almost immediately, and it is probable, but not certain, that Theonoe is then unattended (for the secret is thus known only to her and the chorus). Dale therefore takes the line to be an invitation to the chorus, a technique which involves two oddities: the suggestion that a member of the chorus leave on an errand (but compare the suggestion in *Ai.* 329 that the chorus enter the tent; neither action is performed), and the use of a woman as a message-carrier (otherwise only in *Choe.* 730ff., *Andr.* 83ff., *Hek.* 888ff., each involving special circumstances; *OK* 324ff. is different). It is, on the other hand, not likely to be a purely agnoetic question like Achilles' in *IA* 802ff., since it is the context of the latter (empty-stage, opening of an entrance-monologue) that makes the agnoetic stance possible. We must therefore imagine mimetic gestures of hesitation performed by the chorus while Helen rushes to embrace Theonoe's knees, an action which presumably precludes Helen herself from gesturing "no" to the chorus in some way, as Antigone perhaps does to the attendants in *Phoin.* 1661. The difficulty which Dale does not face in accepting such a staging is that Helen makes no direct appeal for Theonoe to rescind the request. The rhesis-style of *Hel.* 894ff., however earnest, is much calmer than what is found in other contexts of arrested commands. To stop execution of the order Helen should begin with μὴ . . . κατείπῃς, not with a formal proem of four lines; her speech is constructed like an appeal to someone still undecided rather than one who has just decided adversely. Nor does Theonoe speak again soon and by her participation in dialogue countenance the suspension of the order (*Phoin.* 1660ff.; cf. *Med.* 335ff.), nor is there any other acknowledgment of the failure to obey (*Ion* 1279-1281; *El.* 361). Finally, *Ion* 1266 is not a cogent parallel because in that scene the attendants do, probably, at least move toward execution of the order. The staging favored by Dale cannot perhaps be declared inconceivable; but the strong peculiarity of the correspondence between word and action together with the psychological[58] and moral frivolity of such a sudden decision in this context makes other treatments of the passage far more attractive. That the couplet is an interpolation is the most economical hypothesis, although it remains possible that the text is a gravely corrupt, lacunose version of what Euripides wrote.

---

58. Dale of course admits that this factor does not matter to her, but it does matter (and, I believe, should matter) to most readers of Euripides.

7

SOME CONCLUDING PROBLEMS

We have now examined in detail many aspects of the rhetoric and the dramatic conventions of contact and have tried to identify the limits of naturalistic disorder or illogical continuity in the flow of discourse and action on the Greek tragic stage. We have seen that when the tragedians want their audience to make inferences about psychological motivations and processes which lie behind words or action (or behind silence or inaction), they are careful to give in almost every case explicit clues as to what inferences should be made. Their technique is superbly adapted to their theater, with its huge "auditorium," uncurtained stage and parodoi, unchanging facial masks, and minimum of naturalistic decor. It also stands as a barrier against dramatic interpretations of stage-action which rest on the lucubrations of an armchair critic or on the creativity of a would-be director with anachronistic assumptions.

1. TECHNICAL CONVENTIONS AS AN AID TO DRAMATIC AND
TEXTUAL INTERPRETATION: A MISCELLANY

Effective silences and gestures must be brought to the audience's attention. In *Eum.* Orestes has acquired a new sense of confidence when he arrives at Athens and clings as a suppliant to the image of Athena; he is therefore able to defy the Furies by refusing to respond to the threat contained in lines 299-302. The dramatist does not, however, let the silence stand by itself, but underlines it and exploits it for the characterization of the chorus (303-304):[1]

> οὐδ᾽ ἀντιφωνεῖς, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποπτύεις λόγους,
> ἐμοὶ τραφείς τε καὶ καθιερωμένος;

The dramatic technique assumed by a whole school of critics in the finale of *Ion* is quite different—and quite anachronistic. Any inferences about disillusionment which Ion may have undergone during the course of the play must be read from what the youth actually says, not from an assumed silence. If Ion were in fact silent after *Ion* 1608, there would have been no way for an audience to detect doubt, disappointment, or disapproval as he stood by during the ceremonial envoi: his mask cannot change, no one refers to his

---

1. Other marked silences which have not been discussed or listed in earlier chapters: *Ant.* 1244-1256, *Trach.* 813-814, *OT* 1073-1075. Cf. Taplin, *Silences* 79.

behavior, and a significant action separate from the envoi would be an unparalleled distraction.[2] Likewise, although the Greek tragedians did make use of pathetic and meaningful tableaux as background for dialogue (Tekmessa and Eurysakes over the body of Aias as Teukros argues with Agamemnon; Alkestis' corpse on the bier as Admetos and Pheres debate which of the two was most to blame), the audience cannot be expected to infer something important from a silent tableau that is not intimately related to what is being said. Yet this is what is assumed in an interpretation which puts any considerable weight on the assumed silent presence of Andromache in the exodos of *Andr.*[3] Likewise, when an editor tries to explicate a textual crux by reference to dumb-show gestures not indicated by the words themselves, the attempted solution must be suspect. For instance, whatever the correct solution of the textual problems of E.*El.* 684-693,[4] it is not legitimate to postulate an emotional embrace[5] to fill a pause between lines 688 and 689, as Murray does. It is also contrary to ancient technique to argue, with Paley (following Hermann), that at *IT* 59-60 Iphigeneia pauses and "mentally enumerates those whom the dream might fit" and "after rejecting two or three, she adds, 'nor *again* does it apply to Strophius.'"[6]

There is at least one passage in which a dramatist seems to have lent special emphasis to a pregnant pause by referring to the silence as significant only when it is ended. In *PV* 436-438[7] Prometheus asks the chorus not to misinterpret his silence as unfriendly or impolite:

> μή τοι χλιδῇ δοκεῖτε μηδ' αὐθαδίᾳ
> σιγᾶν με· συννοίᾳ δὲ δάπτομαι κέαρ
> ὁρῶν ἐμαυτὸν ὧδε προυσελούμενον.

The most closely comparable passage is *Pe.* 290, where the queen reenters the dialogue with σιγῶ πάλαι δ ύστηνος ἐκπεπληγμένη / κακοῖς. As Taplin points out,[8] her silence from 246 to 289 would not otherwise have impressed the audience since the messenger carries on with the chorus an exchange that dominates the audience's attention. The announcement of silence in 290 merely confirms the strength of the queen's emotion and underlines the contrast in social standing and dramatic function between the chorus and

---

2. Cf. my discussion in *CSCA* 8 (1975) 175-176, n. 49, where I also give reasons why one should not even assume Ion to be silent in that passage.

3. Such as that of H. Erbse, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 295.

4. Cf. Denniston on E.*El.* 689-693; but he fails to face Wilamowitz's perhaps justified indictment of the antilabe in 693 (*Analecta Euripidea* 66 and 197: he deletes 688-693). I am inclined to delete only 693 and explain the repetitiousness and looseness of the speech as typical of certain kinds of farewell speeches (*Ai.* 815-865, *Ion* 1357-1368, *Phoin.* 991-1018, etc.); I also assume that Elektra speaks line 684.

5. Embraces are as a rule accompanied by spoken "stage-directions": e.g. *Or.* 1047-1051, *Hel.* 624-635, *Phoin.* 306-317, etc. Another kind of gesture accompanied by explicit description occurs in *HE* 1218 (Herakles, his head covered, silently points to the bodies around him).

6. The couplet was correctly deleted by Monk; it seems to be a pedantic, non-histrionic interpolation.

7. Cf. Taplin, *Silences* 83-84; he also discusses (*Silences* 78-79) Prometheus' silence in the prologue and notes that little is made of it. The silence there seems to convey dignity rather than defiance, since there is no point at which anyone really expects him to say anything. Hephaistos addresses *PV* 18-35 to him (and an exclamation in 66) without seeking any sort of reply, and in any case Kratos intervenes sharply with epileptic questions which preclude any dialogue with Prometheus and throw the emphasis instead upon the contrast between Hephaistos and Kratos. Kratos' parting taunts (82-87) also make no demand for dialogue. Griffith, 117, rightly calls the silence in *PV* 1-87 "effective and dramatically successful."

8. Taplin, *Silences* 80.

the queen. The *PV*-passage is sufficiently different for Taplin to contemplate major interference with the text (lacuna, or mechanical or deliberate interpolation). He is correct to argue that Prometheus' σιγᾶν cannot refer solely to his silence during the choral ode *PV* 397-435, since it would not strike a Greek audience as in any way odd. But perhaps it is not necessary to postulate a very long pause between *PV* 435 and 436 to make sense of the text on stage. The choral ode addressed to Prometheus makes a very strong claim for contact between the chorus and the actor. If the actor were to hang his head and show no reaction to the song, his behavior could require comment, provided he continued his withdrawn stance for at least a short time after 435, and such behavior (a refusal of, or withdrawal from, contact) could be referred to by σιγᾶν.[9] Of course, even if this staging is correct, the dramatic technique remains an unusual one.[10]

Two much-discussed textual problems in Euripides deserve to be mentioned here, as textual corruption appears to be proved by the conventions of contact. Hermione enters at *Andr.* 147, delivering an emphatic proem on her right to independence from her husband, manifested especially in complete license to speak as she chooses (ἐλευθεροσ-τομεῖν 153),[11] before she addresses Andromache. The final line of her proem is ὑμᾶς μὲν οὖν τοῖσδ' ἀνταμείβομαι λόγοις, and it is the reference of ὑμᾶς that creates the problem. Two efforts at a conservative explication of the text fail because of the stage-action they assume. First, Hermione cannot be supposed to have heard the final words of the chorus (141-146): not only is such a procedure abnormal and the connection in content between 141-146 and 147-153 less than obvious (as Stevens points out), but (a much stronger objection) lines 145-146 clearly imply that Hermione has not yet emerged, and a Greek playwright would have had to make clear in Hermione's own words that she had been eavesdropping from inside the door[12] if he wanted his audience to interpret her words as a response to 141-146. Likewise, if Hermione is interpreted to be rebutting some admonition or restraint imposed upon her by her own attendants, we must object both that the assumed action is not readily inferrable from the words of the text, as it should be, and that it is a violation of the social etiquette of the stage for servants to restrain a princess without explicit motivation (contrast *Andr.* 811-824, 845; *Hel.* 1627ff.). Since it is hard to imagine the content of lost lines (to follow 146) that, in introducing Hermione, would both prompt 147-153 and be consistent with the timidity expressed in 141-146, Hunger and Stevens[13] seem to be justified in deleting *Andr.* 154 as an interpolation, although it is perhaps a pedantic reader's addition rather than histrionic.[14] Difficulties with address and establishment of contact also confirm that a conservative interpretation of E.*Su.* 838-840, such as that offered by Murray in his *apparatus,* cannot be right. Not only is the treatment of Theseus' alleged silent companion far too obscure in comparison with comparable non-problematic passages,[15] but

---

9. Cf. σιγᾶν in *IA* 1142 and my comment, note 21 to Chapter 5.

10. See now Griffith, 116-118.

11. For the connection between an independent source of wealth and παρρησία in the mind of an aristocratic Greek, cf. Polyneikes' attitude in *Phoin.* 391-395, 404-405, 438-442.

12. For eavesdropping cf. *Ant.* 1183-1189, *Hipp.* 565ff.

13. H. Hunger, *RhMus* 95 (1962) 369-373; Stevens *ad loc.*

14. An actor playing the scene on the stage does not need such a clarification: a reader who is thinking too little of the stage-action does feel such a need (cf. *Phoin.* 778, which I would also classify as a non-histrionic interpolation).

15. Cf. E.*Su.* 381-394 (with Collard's note *ad loc.*) and *Phoin.* 690-696 (where, in my opinion, Eteokles emerges from the house).

with εἰσορῶ in 840 the transition from dialogue-contact with the putative silent companion to dialogue-contact with Adrastos in 841ff. is too abrupt, since 840 then marks only visual contact and does not establish dialogue-contact with Adrastos. Even with ἱστορῶ in 840, the problem of the reference of σε in 838 is unsolved, and the obelos is appropriate.[16]

2. *PV* 588-589

In previous chapters and earlier in this one we have noted unusual examples of delayed answers, preoccupation, and silence in *PV*. There remains one puzzling treatment of address and contact in the opening of the Io-episode. Taken in isolation, *PV* 588-589 appear to have the most straightforward possible relationship between question and answer:

> (Ιω) κλύεις φθέγμα τᾶς βούκερω παρθένου;
> Πρ. πῶς δ' οὐ κλύω τῆς οἰστροδινήτου κόρης κτλ.

Yet in context, at the end of Io's strophe 574-588, the relationship is not straightforward. Io enters with agnoetic questions marking visual contact (561-562), but soon addresses a second-person question and an imperative to Prometheus, thereby seeking dialogue-contact (563-565). But an access of pain wrenches her from normal contact (cf. Chapter 5, section 1[a]), and in her pained state she appeals to Zeus, first protesting (577-581), then asking for death (582-583), then reinforcing and justifying her appeal (584-587). After such a withdrawal from contact and such an appeal to Zeus, it would be normal technique for any return to contact with the people on stage to be explicitly marked; but if 588 is addressed to Prometheus, there is no such transition, and Io must baldly turn from impassioned apostrophe to matter-of-fact inquiry (contrary to the ethos of the meter). The text and meter of 584-588 make better sense if there is no transition, if after the vocative ἄναξ in 585 Io continues to address Zeus in the κλύεις-question (a type of question frequently used in appeals to the gods—Chapter 1, section 2[e][1]). But if Io addresses Zeus, Prometheus' πῶς δ' οὐ κλύω is extraordinary, whether it is taken to be a deliberately contrived intervention or an unconscious reflection of the preoccupation of an enormous ego. With this text and this distribution of lines, we are presented with a dilemma: either an unmarked (and dramatically unconvincing) transition in address or a peculiar skewing between the lyric and iambic utterances, in which the iambic voice behaves more strangely or more distractedly than the lyric voice. There are two ways to prevent this dilemma from arising at all.[17] The manuscripts in fact present one of the escapes: they give *PV* 588 to the chorus. Page remarks *fortasse recte* and logically extends the hypothesis to cover line 608 as well. With such a distribution the chorus acts as an intermediary between Io and Prometheus, but in a clumsy and unnecessary fashion. Whereas the κλύεις-question is idiomatic as an appeal to Zeus or

---

16. Cf. Collard on E.*Su.* 838-840.

17. Three ways, if one counts the hypothesis that 584-587 are already addressed to Prometheus (ἄναξ, being directed to him, not to Zeus); but although Io could ask Prometheus not to feel shock or wonder at her prayers, φθόνος could only be felt by Zeus.

even as an appeal for contact addressed by Io to the Titan, it is flat and prosaic when spoken by the chorus. And again the meter is an obstacle to such flatness: indeed, there is no emotional justification for the chorus to maintain the iambo-dochmiac meter of Io's lyric (contrast *Ion* 763-807, where both the old man and the chorus speak iambics in between Kreousa's lyrics). The assignment of 608 to the chorus also introduces a false note by creating and calling attention to a dramatically useless delay in Prometheus' reply and by conveying a sympathy which the chorus should not yet have. As self-references, however, the phrases τᾶς βούκερω παρθένου and τᾷ δυσπλάνῳ παρθένῳ strike the right note. In view of all these factors, I doubt that the ascription of 588 to the chorus reflects the author's wishes: it was probably created by a scholar or scribe, ancient or Byzantine, to simplify the continuity between 588 and 589.[18]

A second escape from the dilemma is to emend κλύω in 589 to κλύει. The sequence is then comparable to that found in at least two other passages:

> E.*El.* 682 + 684
> —ἤκουσας, ὦ δείν' ἐξ ἐμῆς μητρὸς παθών;
> —πάντ', οἶδ', ἀκούει τάδε πατήρ· στείχειν δ' ἀκμή.
>
> *Phoin.* 611
> Πο. ὦ πάτερ, κλύεις ἃ πάσχω;   Ετ. καὶ
>   γὰρ οἷα δρᾷς κλύει.

In all three cases[19] the first speaker is appealing for a hearing from someone who is distant and who has authority of some kind. The reply in *El.* is a confident conclusion to the shared stichomythic prayer that precedes the couplet. In *Phoin.* the reply is a mocking rejoinder. In *PV* Prometheus' rhetorical transform question would serve a triple function: it underlines Zeus' apparent indifference to Io's sufferings, displays the Titan's knowledge, and thereby invites a resumption of normal contact with Io. An intervention with a comment of this kind is, of course, no problem in terms of contact. The form and detail of the relative clause (especially the genitive Διὸς instead of a pronoun) might be considered to stand in the way of emending to κλύει, but if Prometheus is coyly displaying his knowledge to impress Io, there is no reason why he could not utter the clause in these terms with that in mind. The change from κλύει to κλύω could easily have occurred when someone unconcerned about contact-conventions interpreted 588 as a question to Prometheus and adjusted the ending of the verb in 589 accordingly. Those who do not emend will have to be content with the clumsy technique of the transmitted text.

3. *TRACH.* 874-895

In Chapters 4 and 5 we have observed various kinds of breakdown in communication caused by strong emotion. It is almost a tragic cliché for someone to react to the report of

---

18. For the introduction of erroneous paragraphoi or erroneous ascriptions due to short-sighted reading of the text, cf. the passages listed by di Benedetto, *Hermes* 89 (1961) 307. Taplin, *Stagecraft* 266 n.1, also rejects assignment of the lines to the chorus.

19. Cf. also *Tro.* 1288-1292 (an appeal to Zeus with δέδορκας in 1290 answered by δέδορκεν in 1291) and *Phoin.* 605 (where the imperative is used: Πο. κλύετέ μου, Ετ. τίς δ'ἂν κλύοι σου κτλ.;).

an unexpected death with apistetic questions demanding a repetition of the indigestible news. Nowhere is such an apistetic reaction carried further than in the traditional text of *Trach.* 874-895, where the nurse informs the chorus of Deianeira's suicide. The apistetic protestations of the chorus are in fact excessive and dramatically unconvincing; Jebb suspected as much, but insisted that there was a conscious purpose in the heavyhandedness.[20] Detailed analysis reveals the problem. The sequence in 874-877 is unobjectionable: the nurse tells of Deianeira's death in vague, euphemistic terms, and then is matter-of-fact as the chorus first surmises that death is meant and then indulges in a brief moment of apistetic amazement:

> *Trach.* 876-877
> Χο. οὐ δή ποθ᾽ ὡς θανοῦσα;   Τρ. πάντ᾽ ἀκήκοας.
> Χο. τέθνηκεν ἡ τάλαινα;   Τρ. δεύτερον κλύεις.

When the chorus asks how she died, the nurse is again at first vague, then specific after the question is repeated (878-881):

> Χο. τάλαιν᾽, ὀλεθρία· τίνι τρόπῳ θανεῖν σφε φής;
> Τρ. †σχετλιώτατα πρός γε πρᾶξιν.   Χο. εἰπὲ τῷ μόρῳ,
>   γύναι, ξυντρέχει;
> Τρ. αὑτὴν διηΐστωσε.

Most editors (but not Pearson) correctly follow Hermann's reconstruction of 882ff. as a single utterance by the chorus down to μόνα; Maas and Dale continue the chorus' question all the way to σιδάρου (887).[21] Their reasons are primarily metrical (the nurse thus sings no lyrics), but a supporting argument in terms of contact can be offered. If *Trach.* 884-887 are divided between chorus and nurse, then there is a definite skewing of question and answer: the chorus' apistetic πῶς-question is taken literally by the nurse, who tells by what instrument Deianeira died. A similar skewing was noted in *IA* 874-875 (Chapter 5, section 4), but the skewing there has a psychological and dramatic point. Here it is only boneheaded: since the nurse is calm enough to speak iambics when she comes out, it is not really convincing to claim that she is so distraught that she "can hardly seize the full meaning of the questions" (Jebb).[22] The disjunction in the exchange is even more marked (but still insufficiently pointed) in Pearson's text, when the nurse is not even able to understand the metaphors of 882. In any case, the chorus' agnoetic/ apistetic questions in 882-887 imply that they understand that Deianeira killed herself. The apistetic τί φωνεῖς; (892) would be appropriate immediately after a first mention of

---

20. Note this embarrassed explication in Jebb's note on *Trach.* 891: "the exclamation which follows implies that these words add something to the disclosure made in 881, αὑτὴν διηΐστωσε. They certainly state more precisely that the blow was dealt by her own hand (and not by a slave's); also that the deed had its origin from her own mind (πρὸς / αὑτῆς), and not from any external influence. But it should also be recognized that, throughout this passage (871-898), the dramatic aim is to express profound horror and amazement. The messenger can hardly seize the full meaning of the questions; the hearers, on their part, find it hard to realise the answers."

21. P. Maas, *Kleine Schriften* 47 (=*Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 65 [1911] 253); *Greek Metre,* ¶ 76; A. M. Dale, *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses* fasc. I (*BICS,* Suppl. 21.I) 32-33. (See now in addition L. D. J. Henderson, *Maia* 28 [1976] 19-24.)

22. Kamerbeek on *Trach.* 884 records without further comment that "the Nurse's answer is not what the Chorus is asking for."

suicide; but a relapse into incredulity is thoroughly inappropriate ten lines later, especially when 891 does not add anything new. Miss Dale's diagnosis, published post-humously without detailed argument,[23] is thus on the right lines. At least 891-892 (and probably more) must be transposed to an earlier position, and the text should be restored not only to preserve the iambic/lyric contrast between nurse and chorus but also to pro-vide mention of the weapon before it is referred to by the chorus.[24] The traditional text offers a massing of oddities which lacks the sort of dramatic point which normally justifies a discontinuity.

4. TWO PASSAGES IN *PHOIN.*

4(a) *PHOIN.* 1644

We come finally to the two problem-passages in *Phoin.* which have prompted both this and earlier investigations of irregular or discontinuous patterns of question and answer. We have already (Chapter 6, section 2[a]) referred to the way in which Antigone delays execution of Kreon's orders (*Phoin.* 1627-1636) by maintaining her position by the corpses and by engaging Kreon in an argument. It is a sign of contempt for her adversary that she postpones addressing Kreon in order to commiserate with Oidipous first (1639-1646):

> Αν. ὦ πάτερ, ἐν οἵοις κείμεθ᾽ ἄθλιοι κακοῖς.
> ὥς σε στενάζω τῶν τεθνηκότων πλέον·
> οὐ γὰρ τὸ μέν σοι βαρὺ κακῶν, τὸ δ᾽ οὐ βαρύ,
> ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἅπαντα δυστυχὴς ἔφυς, πάτερ.
>   ἀτὰρ σ᾽ ἐρωτῶ τὸν νεωστὶ κοίρανον·
> τί τόνδ᾽ ὑβρίζεις πατέρ᾽ ἀποστέλλων χθονός;
> τί θεσμοποιεῖς ἐπὶ ταλαιπώρῳ νεκρῷ;
> Κρ. Ἐτεοκλέους βουλεύματ᾽, οὐχ ἡμῶν, τάδε.

Antigone's disrespectful stance is conveyed by her manner of establishing contact with Kreon: not only is νεωστὶ taunting, but the idiomatic apposition σε . . . τὸν . . . κοίρανον is far from polite.[25] The sharp address is followed by a pair of epileptic τί-questions (the anaphora contributes to the vehemence of the lines), and Kreon's self-defense is attached chiastically to the latter of the two. Valckenaer was the first to object to *Phoin.* 1644: among other less important and less cogent grounds for suspicion,[26] he emphasized the lack of a response to 1644 as most important (*illud . . . hanc in rem sufficit: si duas Antigone quaestiones posuit, ad unam duntaxat respondet Creon*). This has remained the principal objection in reformulations of Valckenaer's case by Geel in 1846 and by Fraenkel in 1961.[27] Two other arguments are offered to support excision:

23. In *Metrical Analyses* (note 21 above).

24. Awareness of this problem is evident in Pearson's assigning of 883 to the nurse; Kamerbeek on *Trach.* 882-884 acknowledges the difficulty of assuming that the chorus just takes it for granted that a sword was used. For suicidal women in tragedy, hanging is in fact just as common as (or more common than) use of the sword.

25. Valckenaer *ad loc.* (his line 1637) notes the idiom and cites *PV* 944, *Ai.* 1228, *Ant.* 441, S.*El.* 1445, *Med.* 271.

26. The Budé editors (p. 220, n. 3 of their edition of *Phoin.*) repeat Valckenaer's mistaken argument that ἀτάρ should divide Antigone's mention of exile from her mention of burial; Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 105 n. 3, rightly rejects the argument.

27. Jakob Geel, *Euripidis Phoenissae cum commentario* (Leiden 1846) *ad loc.*; Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 105.

Antigone says no more in protest against the exile later in the scene, and her asking of the question is preempted by Kreon's explanation of his action earlier in the scene.

As long ago as 1840 a scholar attempted to refute Valckenaer's objections by collecting examples of unanswered questions.[28] It was in fact easy for Geel to reject the alleged parallels, because they were of various kinds in contexts of varying degrees of contact; the only significant example of discontinuity in the group (*IA* 825-830; cf. Chapter 5, section 7) is not similar enough to be of any use here. But the information marshalled in previous chapters—about the rhetoric of questions, about patterns of dialogue involving multiple questions, and about discontinuities due to the course of the dialogue and to dramatic convenience—does have a bearing on *Phoin.* 1644. First, in terms of rhetoric, the question is epiplectic: that is, it expresses Antigone's indignation and disapproval of Kreon's action. Therefore it is illegitimate to argue that Kreon's explanation in 1589-1594 preempts the utterance of such a question: Oidipous found it possible to protest the cruelty of Kreon's decree, and there is every reason to expect Antigone too to make her attitude known. That she does not raise the issue again with Kreon is presumably a matter of dramatic convenience (Oidipous has said what needed to be said); and contrary to the deleters' claim, she does later express disapproval of the exile-edict in the genuine part of the lyric exodos (1710-1736, esp. 1710, 1726-1727, 1734-1736).

Many epiplectic questions receive no verbal response. In context Antigone's epiplectic attack does demand that Kreon defend himself against the implied condemnation, but his defense need not consist of information (he could simply assert his authority and refuse to debate, as later at lines 1656 and 1660). Moreover, in responding to a double question, the answerer has several options, one of which is to deal with the subjects chiastically (Chapter 3, section 2[a]). Here Kreon begins his defense with the second point, and the course of the argument (and dramatic convenience) prevents a return to the first point.[29] This is legitimate technique for the Greek tragic stage, however odd *Phoin.* 1644 may seem to a reader who pauses to ponder the point. The playwright economically displays Antigone's sympathy for Oidipous and indignation against Kreon, heightens the rhetorical force of 1643-1645, and yet allows the dialogue to proceed to the important argument which causes the innovative Euripidean Antigone to abandon the burial-argument and accompany her father instead.

4(b) *PHOIN.* 376-378

Phoin. 376-378 contain an unanswered question which has met with extraordinary tolerance from a great number of scholars.[30] It is worthwhile to discuss the passage in

---

28. C. G. Firnhaber, *Die Verdächtigungen Euripideischer Verse beleuchtet und in der Phoenissen und der Medea zurückgewiesen* (Leipzig 1840) 121-127. Others tried to get around Valckenaer's objection by emendation: Hermann in his edition and Erbse, *Phil.* 110 (1966) 26, accepted Siebelis' ruinous conjecture εἰ for τί in 1644 (it spoils the anaphora, and it makes Antigone acknowledge acceptance of Kreon's *hybris* rather than attack it); Paley's καὶ for τί in 1645 both spoils the anaphora and fails to address Valckenaer's objection.

29. Without being able to cite parallels such as I have offered, B. Heath, *Notae . . .* , Eur. section, 39, nevertheless provided two centuries ago the basic elements of a defense of *Phoin.* 1644 (chiastic order, course of the dialogue, inappropriateness of Antigone's saying nothing to Kreon about the exile-decree). The defense in R. Klotz' 1842 edition of the play is less forceful because partly dependent on Firnhaber's treatment.

30. Subsequent to Usener's condemnation of the lines in *RhMus* 23 (1868) 155-156 (=*Kleine Schriften* I [Leipzig 1912] 141), the lines have nevertheless been accepted by Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 1903, 589 n. 2 (=*Kl. Schr.* VI [Berlin 1972] 346 n. 2); C. Robert, *Oedipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915) II. 145-146 (n. 45); Schade-

terms of contact and continuity of dialogue because excision of the triplet (if adopted) should, in my opinion, depend solely on the dialogue-technique.

Phoin. 371-374 + 376-383[31]

(Πο.) ἀλλ᾽, ἐκ γὰρ ἄλγους ἄλγος αὖ, σὲ δέρκομαι
κάρα ξυρῆκες καὶ πέπλους μελαγχίμους
ἔχουσαν. οἴμοι τῶν ἐμῶν ἐγὼ κακῶν
ὡς δεινὸν ἔχθρα, μῆτερ, οἰκείων φίλων.
τί γὰρ πατήρ μοι πρέσβυς ἐν δόμοισι δρᾷ,
σκότον δεδορκώς; τί δὲ κασίγνηται δύο;
ἦ που στένουσι τλήμονες φυγὰς ἐμάς;
Ιο.   κακῶς θεῶν τις Οἰδίπου φθείρει γένος·
οὕτω γὰρ ἤρξατ᾽, ἄνομα μὲν τεκεῖν ἐμέ,
κακῶς δὲ γῆμαι πατέρα σὸν φῦναί τε σέ.
ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτα; δεῖ φέρειν τὰ τῶν θεῶν.
ὅπως δ᾽ ἔρωμαι κτλ.

Before examining the dialogue-technique, we must consider an internal linguistic fault which has been alleged by Fraenkel and which, if conceded to be present, would remove any doubt about the spuriousness of the lines.[32] Fraenkel follows Wecklein[33] in believing that the question τί . . . δρᾷ; here means "how is he faring?" or "how is he?" and not "what is he doing?" But Fraenkel adds that such a use of δρᾷ as equivalent to (πῶς) πράττει is "falsches Griechisch oder jedenfalls falsches Attisch." There are two reasons why this objection must be set aside. First, as Fraenkel himself states, the distinction between δρᾶν and πράττειν (= "fare") is firmly established in Greek idiom; it is therefore proper to doubt whether a Greek (Attic or not) who was capable of writing a metrically correct and (as many have justifiably believed) psychologically apt triplet could make such a mistake in the usage of his native tongue. Fraenkel perhaps shows some awareness of this difficulty when he adds "oder jedenfalls falsches Attisch." What is needed for the allegation of linguistic anomaly is evidence that some non-Attic Greeks or postclassical Greeks did come to lose the firm distinction between δρᾶν and πράττειν (= "fare");[34] but I know of no such evi-

---

waldt, 144 n. 1; G. M. A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides* (London 1941) 361 n. 1; M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*² (Göttingen 1954) II. 153.

31. The combination of the loose and clumsy connection of *Phoin.* 375 to the previous line and the scholiastic evidence of uneven attestation at some point in the tradition persuades me that *Phoin.* 375 is spurious, even though I consider neither irrefutable (cf. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoin.* 20 n. 6) nor cogent Usener's objection to the phrase δυσλύτους . . . διαλλαγάς. The relationship between adjective and noun is related not to the direct object construction (δια)λύειν ἔχθραν but to a hypothetical internal accusative construction (δια)λύειν διαλλαγήν (cf. ῥιπτὸς μόρος, *Trach.* 357, and φόνος δ ἡμόλευστος, *Ant.* 36). On the text of *Phoin.* 371-373 I agree with Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 18-20.

32. Fraenkel, *Zu den Phoen.* 22-23. Fraenkel, 21-22, also expresses stylistic disapproval and suspicion of the phrase σκότον δεδορκώς; I take it to be a sympathetic reference to Oidipous' plight (cf. note 42 below) and do not assign it any weight in the judgment of authenticity.

33. Wecklein's note is repeated by Powell, who misplaces it under his note on *Phoin.* 372.

34. M. D. Reeve has suggested there may be another interpolator's misuse of δρᾶν in *Or.* 938: in *GRBS* 14 (1973) 155 he remarks that nothing in the context helps an audience to understand whether ἐμὲ κατακτείναντες or δουλεύοντες is to be understood as the conditional participle with δράσετε (in other words, whether line 938 looks forwards or backwards); if the latter is understood, then δράσετε appears to be used for πράξετε ("fare"). No matter who wrote *Or.* 938-942, I believe the Greek audience would have taken *Or.* 938 with the following lines because there is guidance (*pace* Reeve) in the context for doing so—an easily recognizable type of rhetorical structure: a vague τοὐναντίον precedes and prepares for an explanation neatly divided by μὲν γὰρ . . . δὲ . . .—a pattern typical both of colloquial discourse (cf. *Ag.* 1629 and Fraenkel's excellent comment; Plato, *Laws* 966e6) and formal oratory (e.g.: Lysias 12.2, 12 and 64; 20.35; Isokrates 18.66; Dem. 10.30). The

dence.[35] Secondly, the rhetorical structure of the three lines militates against the interpretation "how is he faring?" The verb δρᾶν, like ποιεῖν,[36] can be used as a generalized verb of doing substituting for a verb which identifies the action more specifically. Moreover, in pairs of questions a specific question is often preceded by a more general question containing δρᾶν: for instance, epiplectic: τί δρᾷς; προλείπεις; (*Alk.* 391); or aporetic and deliberative: τί δρῶμεν; ἀγγέλλωμεν ἐς π όλιν τ άδε; (*Or.* 1539); or true question with surmise-question: τί δρῶντα; δουλεύοντα δουλείαις ἐμαῖς (*Ba.* 803); or two true questions with single import: τί δρῶσι; ποίας μηχανὰς πλέκουσιν αὖ, / κτεῖναι θέλοντες τ ὴν παναθλίαν ἐμέ; (*Andr.* 66-67). Patterns like these suggest that the author of *Phoin.* 376-378, whoever he may have been, intended to use the verb in a normal way: τί ... δρᾷ; ... τί ... [δρῶσι]; ἦ ποῦ στένουσι . . .; combines "what are my father and sisters doing?" with the surmise-quesion "they are, I suppose, bemoaning . . . ?"

There are two problems of continuity in the passage: the connection created by γὰρ between 376-378 and what precedes, and the apparent failure of Iokaste to answer. The standard interpretation among those who accept the lines is that γὰρ in 376 is progressive rather than inferential: that is, Polyneikes is casually changing the subject.[37] Progressive γὰρ within a rhesis is in fact not otherwise attested, but the use of γὰρ is occasionally so hard for the modern student of the language to explain that we cannot firmly rule out progressive γὰρ.[38] The second discontinuity is usually[39] ascribed to Iokaste's emotion: she is apparently so preoccupied with contemplation of the wretched state of her family that she does not really notice lines 376-378. Although we have observed passages in which emotion prevents contact or prevents awareness or acknowledgment of some detail, the hypothesis of emotional distraction does not make the right sort of sense of the text and staging of *Phoin.* 376ff. Iokaste is no longer in the excited lyric state she was in during her monody, and her bitter generalization in 379-381 is a response to Polyneikes' speech as a whole and especially to his generalization (374). She must be assumed by an audience to be in normal (iambic-style) contact during her son's rhesis; and Polyneikes must be assumed to feel that he is in normal contact with her as he speaks 357, 365 and 371ff. If Polyneikes then uses progressive γὰρ, which seems to entail a very casual tone, his stance must suddenly be far out of phase with the alleged distraction of his mother; but such psychological disjunction between the two actors is suspect both because it is not established in the words of the text and because no dramatic point is made of it. The assumption that Iokaste's failure to answer is involuntary is, as Usener and Fraenkel argued, unacceptable in terms of dramatic technique.

---

rhetorical structure is obscured by modern editors' punctuation: the colon should be at the end of 938, not 937; the colon at 937 perhaps derives from the pernicious influence of the scholia. In any case, it seems to me certain that δρᾶν is used normally in *Or.* 938. Addendum: I am unable to view as successful A. Dihle's recent attempt to interpret δρᾶν in *Med.* 1078 as meaning "fare, suffer," and the parallel he alleges (idiomatic phrase δράσω τάδε) is quite unacceptable: cf. *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976) 180 n. 17 and *Euripides' Medea* [Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1977, 5. Abh.] 14 and 37 n. 22.

35. Perhaps a Byzantinist will be able to supply some. I am not sure whether E. Schwartz intended δρᾶν = "fare" when he emended Σ *Med.* 112 to read ὦ παῖδες <μητρὸς> στυγερὰ δρώσης (δρῶσα ms.). The intent of the scholion was to explain the word order, not, it seems, to gloss στυγερᾶς ματρὸς. I wonder whether δρῶσα represents a mistranscribed abbreviation of μητρὸς.

36. LSJ s.v. δράω I.1, s.v. ποιέω B.I.4.

37. Cf. Hartung's translation, Wecklein's note, the indentation in the OCT and Budé text, and Denniston, *GP²* 84.

38. Cf. the sober comment of Dover in his note on Arist. *Clouds* 191.

39. A surprising number of commentators, however, say nothing at all about the lack of an answer.

A conservative critic could, however, resort to the hypothesis that Iokaste deliberately refuses to answer Polyneikes' question.[40] But again all possible parallels suggest that there has to be some easily inferrable point in such a refusal. Eagerness to pursue her own topic, for instance, does not provide a plausible ground for Iokaste to dismiss this question, especially if it is uttered in the tone assumed by most critics. A more promising hypothesis, at first sight, is that Iokaste begins her reply with the intention of answering Polyneikes. Lines 379-381 could be considered a delaying proem responding (in parallel order) to the topics touched on by her son prior to the question. The phrase ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτα; in 382 is a cut-off formula and could, on this hypothesis, mark the abandonment of a specific answer to 376-378.[41] But the lack of an answer still protrudes uncomfortably as long as 376-378 are uttered as a new topic in a casual tone. It is therefore worthwhile to consider whether γὰρ in 376 could not be somehow inferential and 376-378 somehow more closely tied to what precedes. The ὡς-clause of line 374 expresses a conclusion drawn from Polyneikes' knowledge of his own sufferings and from observation of his mother's condition. A further ground for the generalization could be the grief of other family members (alluded to by Iokaste in 320, 327-336): that is, Polyneikes could conceivably have added "for my father and sisters are wretched because of my exile." With inferential γὰρ, the connection of 376-378 with 374 could be as follows: "what a dreadful thing is enmity between family members; for what is my old blind father doing indoors? and my two sisters? The unhappy creatures, they are probably bewailing my exile, are they not?"[42] Polyneikes' surmise-question invites an affirmative answer, and there is at least implicit confirmation of his surmise in Iokaste's opening generalization, although Iokaste cuts herself off before referring to any present suffering. This interpretation avoids the two major objections raised by Usener and Fraenkel, but whether it will be able to convince anybody other than its originator is far from certain. At least two possible objections must be weighed: whether it is probable or possible that an inferential γὰρ-clause mentioning father and sisters be appended to a generalization already adequately grounded in the previous lines with reference to Iokaste and Polyneikes himself; and whether the process of questioning and answering assumed could have been staged unambiguously before a Greek audience.[43]

40. Such a view was apparently contemplated by H. Leidloff, *de Euripidis Phoenissarum argumento atque compositione* (Holzminden 1863) 15, when he suggested as one alternative *vel quasi de misera patris et sororum conditione loqui vereatur;* but since he immediately quotes ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτα;, he may have been thinking of self-interruption.

41. I developed this viewpoint in *St.E.Ph.* 390-391. Schwinge, *Verwendung des Stichomythie* 206 n. 23, interprets Iokaste's answer similarly (cf. next note).

42. Schwinge (see previous note) also argues that γὰρ is inferential: he accepts line 375 and suggests that Oidipous' presence indoors is viewed by Polyneikes as an obstacle to a peaceful solution (because of the power of his curse). (Schwinge agrees with Erbse, *Phil.* 110 (1966) 24, in interpreting *Phoin.* 376 as an unsympathetic reference to Oidipous.) The question about Oidipous contains nothing to suggest such an inference to the audience; and in any case Schwinge's view fails because the question about Oidipous is followed by a coordinate one about the sisters, who are certainly not an obstacle to peace.

43. J. A. Butterworth (cf. Chapter 3, note 60) discusses *Phoin.* 376-378 on pp. 135-138 and agrees with my analysis at several points: rejection of Fraenkel's interpretation of δρᾷ, rejection of Schwinge's interpretation, and admission that Polyneikes to a certain extent answers his own question by adding the surmise-question in 378. He concludes in the end that the lines are not Euripidean, but that it is hard to see a motive for interpolation. (Indeed it is worth asking how an actor/producer interpolating such lines meant them to be performed.)

Bibliography

Abbreviations. Abbreviations used in the text and notes will be familiar to users of this book. See the end of the Introduction for play-titles. Note also that *St.E.Ph.* refers to my dissertation (see Preface).

I. EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES (listed alphabetically by editors' names)

A. AISCHYLOS

Denniston, J. D. and Page, D. L. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* Oxford, 1957.
Fraenkel, E. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* 3 vols. Oxford, 1950.
Groeneboom, P. *Aeschylus: Choephoroi.* Groningen, 1949.
Headlam, W. and Thomson, G. *The Oresteia of Aeschylus.* Amsterdam, 1966.
Mazon, P. *Eschyle.* 2 vols. Paris, 1925-1931.
Murray, G. *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae.* 2nd ed. Oxford, 1955.
Page, D. L. *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae.* Oxford, 1972.
Paley, F. A. *The Tragedies of Aeschylus.* 4th ed. London, 1879.
Tucker T. G. *The "Supplices" of Aeschylus.* London, 1889.
Verrall, A. W. *Aeschylus: Seven against Thebes.* London, 1887.
Wecklein, N. *Aeschylos: Orestie.* Leipzig, 1888.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Aeschyli Tragoediae.* Berlin, 1914.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Aeschylos: Orestie. 2. Stuck: Das Opfer am Grabe.* Berlin, 1896.

B. SOPHOKLES

Campbell, L. *Sophocles.* 2 vols. 2nd ed. London, 1879-1881.
Dain, A. and Mazon, P. *Sophocle.* 3 vols. Paris, 1955-1960.
Dawe, R. D. *Sophoclis Tragoediae. Tom. I.* Leipzig, 1975.
Earle, M. L. *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles.* New York, 1901.
Jebb. R. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments.* Parts I-VII. Cambridge, 1892-1900.
Kamerbeek, J. C. *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries. Part II. The Trachiniae.* Leiden, 1959.
    Part IV. The Oedipus Tyrannus. Leiden, 1967. Mazon: see Dain
Müller, G. *Sophokles: Antigone.* Heidelberg, 1967.
Pearson, A. C. *Sophoclis Fabulae.* Oxford, 1924.
Radt, S. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 4: Sophocles.* Gottingen, 1977.
Schneidewin, F. W. and Nauck, A. *Sophokles* 9. Aufl. 7 vols. 1886-1899.

Stanford, W. B. *Sophocles: Ajax.* London, 1963.
Webster, T. B. L. *Sophocles: Philoctetes.* Cambridge, 1970.

C. EURIPIDES

Alt, K. *Euripides: Helena.* Leipzig, 1964.
Arnim, H. v. *Supplementum Euripideum* [Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 112]
   Berlin, 1913.
Austin, C. *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* [Kleine Texte . . . , 187] Berlin, 1968.
Barrett, W. S. *Euripides: Hippolytos.* Oxford, 1964.
Benedetto, V. di *Euripides: Orestes* [Bibl. di studi superiori, 51] Firenze, 1965.
Biehl, W. *Euripides: Orestes.* Leipzig, 1975.
Biehl, W. *Euripides: Troades.* Leipzig, 1970.
Bond, G. W. *Euripides: Hypsipyle.* Oxford, 1963.
Collard, C. *Euripides: Supplices. 2* vols. Groningen, 1975.
Daitz, S. G. *Euripides: Hecuba.* Leipzig, 1973.
Dale, A. M. *Euripides: Alcestis.* Oxford, 1954.
Dale, A. M. *Euripides: Helen.* Oxford, 1967.
Denniston, J. D. *Euripides: Electra.* Oxford, 1939.
Dodds, E. R. *Euripides: Bacchae.* 2nd ed. Oxford, 1960.
Garzya, A. *Euripides: Heraclidae.* Leipzig, 1972.
Hartung, J. A. *Euripides Werke.* Leipzig, 1848-1853.
Hermann, G. *Euripidis Tragoediae.* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1831-1841.
Kannicht, R. *Euripides: Helena. 2* vols. Heidelberg, 1969.
Kirchhoff, A. *Euripidis Tragoediae.* Berlin, 1855.
Klotz, R. *Euripidis Tragoediae. Vol. II, sect, iv: Phoenissae.* Gotha, 1842.
Lee, K. H. *Euripides: Troades.* London, 1976.
Matthiae, A. *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta.* 10 vols. Leipzig, 1813-1837.
Méridier, L. *Euripide. Tome I: Le Cyclope—Alceste—Medée—Les Héraclides.* Paris, 1925.
Méridier, L. and Chapouthier, F. *Euripide. Les Phéniciennes* [in *Euripide. Tome V*] Paris, 1950.
Murray, G. *Euripidis Fabulae.* 3 vols. 1901-1913.
Nauck, A. *Euripidis Tragoediae.* 2 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1869-1871.
Nauck, A. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* 2nd ed. (1888), *Supplementum* adiecit B. Snell.
   Hildesheim, 1964.
Owen, A. S. *Euripides: Ion.* Oxford, 1939.
Page, D. L. *Euripides: Medea.* Oxford, 1938.
Page, D. L. *Greek Literary Papyri,* vol. 1. 2nd ed. London, 1942.
Paley, F. A. *Euripides with an English Commentary.* 3 vols. 2nd ed. London, 1872-1880.
Parmentier, L. *Euripide: Electre* [in *Euripide. Tome IV*] Paris, 1925.
Pearson, A. C. *Euripides: The Phoenissae.* Cambridge, 1909.
Platnauer, M. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris.* Oxford, 1938.
Powell, J. U. *The Phoenissae of Euripides.* London, 1911.
Roux, J. *Euripide: Les Bacchantes.* 2 vols. [Bibl. de la Fac. des Lettres de Lyon, 21] Paris,
   1970-1972.
Stevens, P. T. *Euripides: Andromache.* Oxford, 1971.
Valckenaer, L. C. *Euripidis Tragoedia Phoenissae.* Franequer, 1755.
Wecklein, N. *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides . . .* Leipzig, 1879-1914.
Wecklein, N. and Prinz, R. *Euripidis Fabulae.* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1883-1902.
Weil, H. *Sept tragedies d'Euripide.* 2nd ed. Paris, 1879.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Euripides: Herakles.* 3 vols. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1895.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Euripides: Ion.* Berlin, 1926.

II. BOOKS AND ARTICLES REFERRED TO BY AUTHOR'S NAME
(or name with short title) IN THE NOTES

Allen, J. T. and Italie, G. *A Concordance to Euripides.* Berkeley, 1954.

Andrieu, J. *Le dialogue antique. Structure et présentation* [Collection d'Études latines: série scientifique, 29] Paris, 1954.

Bain, D. *Actors and Audience. A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama.* Oxford, 1977.

Benedetto, V. di "Responsione strofica e distribuzione delle battute in Euripide," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 298-321.

Bodensteiner, E. "Szenische Fragen über den Ort des Auftretens und Abgehens von Schauspielern und Chor im griechischen Drama," *Jahrb. f. class. Phil. Suppl.* Bd. 19 (Leipzig 1893) 637-808.

Dawe, R. D. *Studies on the Text of Sophocles. 2* vols. Leiden, 1973.

Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles.* 2nd ed. [= *GP*[2]] Oxford, 1954.

Descroix, J. *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la comédie nouvelle.* Macon, 1931.

Ellendt, F. and Genthe, H. *Lexicon Sophocleum.* 2nd ed. Berlin, 1872.

Fraenkel, E. *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes.* Roma, 1962.

Fraenkel, E. *de media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae.* Diss. Gottingen, 1912.

Fraenkel, E. *Zu den Phoenissen des Euripides* [Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., Sitzungs-berichte, 1963, Heft 1] Munchen, 1963.

Graeber, P. *de poetarum atticorum arte scenica quaestiones quinque.* Diss. Gottingen, 1911.

Griffith, M. *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound.* Cambridge, 1977.

Gross, A. *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie und Komödie.* Berlin, 1905.

Heath, B. *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum graecorum . . . dramata deperditorumque relliquias.* Oxford, 1762.

Hourmouziades, N. *Production and Imagination in Euripides. Form and function of the scenic space* [Hellenike anthropistike hetaireia, seira 2, 5] Athens, 1965.

Ireland, S. "Stichomythia in Aeschylus: The Dramatic Role of Syntax and Connecting Particles," *Hermes* 102 (1974) 509-524.

Jens, W. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* [Beiheft zu Poetika, 6] München, 1971.

Jens, W. *Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie* Zetemata, 11 München, 1955.

Köhler, W. *Die Versbrechung bei der griechischen Tragikern* (diss. Giessen) Darmstadt, 1913.

Kranz, W. *Stasimon: Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie.* Berlin, 1933.

Kühner, R. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache,* 2. Teil, besorgt von B. Gerth [= K-G] 2 vols. Hannover, 1898-1904.

Leo, F. *Der Monolog im Drama: Ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römischen Poetik* [K. Gesellschaft d. Wiss., Göttingen. Abhandlungen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., n.F. Bd. 10, nr. 5] Berlin. 1908.

Listmann, G. F. K. *Die Technik des Dreigesprächs in der griechischen Tragödie* (diss. Giessen) Darmstadt, 1910.

Maas, P. *Greek Metre,* trans, by H. Lloyd-Jones. Oxford, 1962.

Reeve, M. D. "Interpolation in Greek Tragedy," *GRBS* 13 (1972) 247-265, 451-474, and 14 (1973) 145-171.

Schadewaldt, W. *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* [Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, Heft 2] Berlin, 1926.

Schwinge, E.-R. *Die Verwendung des Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides.* Heidelberg, 1968.

Seidensticker, B. *Die Gesprächsverdichtung in den Tragödien Senecas* [Bibl. d. klass. Altertum-swiss., n.F., 2. Reihe, 32] Heidelberg, 1969.

Taplin, O. "Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus," *HSCP* 76 (1972) 57-97.

Taplin, O. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: Observations on the Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy.* Oxford, 1977.

Wackernagel, J. *Kleine Schriften.* 2 vols. Gottingen, 1955.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Analecta Euripidea.* Berlin, 1875.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. "Die Bühne des Aischylos," *Hermes* 21 (1886) 597-622.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. "Excurse zu Euripides' *Herakliden,*" *Hermes* 17 (1882) 337-364.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Griechische Verskunst.* Berlin, 1921.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Kleine Schriften.* 6 vols. Berlin, 1935-1972.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. "Der Schluss der Phönissen des Euripides," *Sitzungsberichte der k. Preussischen Akad. d. Wiss.* (Berlin) 1903, 587-600.

Zuntz, G. *The Political Plays of Euripides.* Manchester, 1955.

Index Locorum

Page references in bold-face type indicate places where dramatic and/or textual exegesis is given in some detail; an asterisk (*) indicates that a comment is made on the choice of punctuation; an obelus (†) indicates that a comment is made on the choice of reading. A reference of the type "57 n." means "the passage is referred to both in the text of page 57 and in one or more footnotes to which that text refers"; a reference of the type "20 n. 5" means "the passage is referred to in footnote 5 on page 20."

129

Subject Index

This brief index is intended only to facilitate reference to items whose location would not be obvious from the headings given in the Table of Contents.