6

Repetition: *Hippolytus*

> Alcmaeon declares that men perish because they cannot link together the beginning to the end.
>
> ARISTOTLE

If Henry James suggests that every novel should try to fashion a finite whole from the seamless web of human relations, Gerhart Hauptmann argues instead that every performance, despite its finite scope, should try to repeat the endless struggle of life. Because this is impossible, because drama's subject knows no beginning or end, every play has something conventional or pedantic about its conclusion. Obviously, this is not quite true. First, not every ending is conventional or pedantic, and certain authors, genres, and periods are more fond than others of such endings, and in particular of an overt display of conventionality. It is this that distinguishes Euripides from Aeschylus and Sophocles, and to a lesser extent the later from the earlier plays of Euripides. And second, these pedantic gestures need not reflect only a striving for realism that is doomed by the limitations of dramatic art. In Euripides, at least, such gestures betray a broader and more complex interest in problems of performance, authority, historical truth, and temporal succession. To pursue these problems more fully will take us from ways in which tragedy ends to the reinvention of drama—and the end of tragedy.

I begin by turning from closing gestures to structural tropes, from what we might call the vocabulary of Euripidean endings to revisions of the ending itself. In three different plays, the familiar markers of the end have been radically altered or displaced by repetition, reversal, or erasure. The result is not just to deploy closing gestures in striking and unusual ways, but to reexamine the nature of dramatic coherence. If the ending is not at the end—if somehow we end where we began, or we begin at the end, or the end fails to materialize—then in some fundamental way we must reconsider how the play works and must entertain new notions of what drama is and how it does (or does not) organize experience.

Beginning at the End

I begin with a play that would not seem to belong in this company. *Hippolytus* is generally considered unusually well-constructed, leading to a very effective and tragic

conclusion. The hypothesis, for example, tells us that this play is one of the best (τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν πρώτων); G. M. A. Grube says that its structure "is quite unusually excellent; every part of it, prologos, choral odes and exodos, blend into an almost perfect unity";[1] and Ann Michelini describes the play as an aberration in which Euripides adopts the Sophoclean norm that he elsewhere strives to subvert.[2] The formal perfection of *Hippolytus* seems to be confirmed, if not guaranteed, by its symmetry. Prologue and epilogue balance one another, framing the action between two epiphanies, between the yin of Aphrodite and the yang of the virgin Artemis. As Bernard Knox points out, if these two goddesses are temperamental opposites, the language they use is similar and their effects upon human affairs are "exactly alike."[3] Margarete Bieber even suggests that the staging was balanced and symmetrical. In her reconstruction, there was a projection, or paraskenion, at either end of the skene-building, one on the left representing a shrine of Artemis and one on the right representing a shrine of Aphrodite, thus allowing the play to begin and end with mirror epiphanies in which the goddesses descend from the machine onto identical façades.[4] The resulting impression of organic unity and tragic closure is reinforced, as we have seen, by the particular form of the play's closing gestures: this is the only surviving play that ends with the death of its protagonist,[5] it is the only one that ends with an extended explanation of what has happened, and we might add that it ends with the clearest aetiological connection between the outcome of the plot and its later commemoration. But if we look more closely, we shall find that this impression is misleading. This play is not more complete than others; it is *overly* complete and *doubly* finished.

Hippolytus begins at the end. As the play gets under way, it seems that the action is already finished, and the hero of the drama is as good as dead. In her prologue speech, Aphrodite begins by reminding us that gods require mortals to honor them and by vowing that she will make an example of Hippolytus' arrogant neglect of her (1–20). She goes on to say that on this very day she will punish him for his crimes (ἃ δ' εἰς ἐμ' ἡμάρτηκε τιμωρήσομαι / Ἱππόλυτον ἐν τῇδ' ἡμέρᾳ, 21–22) and proclaims that her vengeance is almost complete (οὐ πόνου πολλοῦ με δεῖ, 23). She foretells the manner of his death, struck down by his father's curses (43–46), and as she leaves the stage, she announces, with her very last words, that Hippolytus "doesn't know that the gates of Hades are open, and that this is the last light he will see" (οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ἀνεῳγμένας πύλας / Ἄιδου, φάος δὲ λοίσθιον βλέπων τόδε, 56–57). As the play begins, he is about to pay the penalty, poised on the threshold of death—and this is exactly where we find him at the end. The messenger who enters near the close of the play declares, "Hippolytus is no more, or virtually so; hanging in the balance he sees the light" (Ἱππόλυτος οὐκέτ' ἔστιν, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος· / δέδορκε μέντοι φῶς ἐπὶ σμικρᾶς ῥοπῆς, 1162–63). And shortly before his death, the hero gives satisfaction to Aphrodite and proclaims, "I am finished, and now I see the gates of the dead" (ὄλωλα καὶ δὴ νερτέρων ὁρῶ πύλας, 1447).

This doubling, or repetition of the end, is reinforced by striking verbal echoes (φάος δὲ λοίσθιον βλέπων and δέδορκε . . . φῶς ἐπὶ σμικρᾶς ῥοπῆς; ἀνεῳγμένας πύλας Ἄιδου and νερτέρων ὁρῶ πύλας) and by a doubling of the gestures of closure. *Hippolytus*, alone among all the surviving plays of Euripides, begins and ends with an aetiology. In the prologue, Aphrodite leads up to the present situation—the pathological love of Phaedra for her stepson—by telling how Phaedra fell in love with Hippolytus when he came to Athens to celebrate the mysteries (24–28) and how she commemorated her love for him by establishing a shrine to Aphrodite:[6]

> Before coming here to the land of Trozen,
> beside the rock of Pallas, this land's
> lookout, she set up a shrine of Aphrodite
> in her foreign passion; and she named the goddess
> as established hereafter in honor of Hippolytus.
>
> καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐλθεῖν τήνδε γῆν Τροζηνίαν,
> πέτραν παρ' αὐτὴν Παλλάδος, κατόψιον
> γῆς τῆσδε, ναὸν Κύπριδος ἐγκαθείσατο,
> ἐρῶσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκδημον, Ἱππολύτῳ δ' ἔπι
> τὸ λοιπὸν ὠνόμαζεν ἱδρῦσθαι θεάν. 29–33

The presence of an aetiology in the prologue is so anomalous that some editors have suspected interpolation.[7] But the anomaly is compounded. Not only do we have a closing device in the prologue, but we have one that promises future commemoration of the protagonist's death. On the Athenian acropolis, as at Trozen, a shrine of Aphrodite and a tomb, or *herôon*, of Hippolytus were closely associated with one another, and the epithet that Phaedra uses to record her love (Ἱππολύτῳ δ' ἔπι, "in honor of Hippolytus" 32) alludes to the Athenian shrine of Ἀφροδίτη ἐφ' Ἱππολύτῳ established "in honor of [the deceased] Hippolytus."[8] The play begins not only with a hero on the threshold of death, but with a shrine where in future ages Athenians will honor and remember this death.

This premature ending is administered by the premature entrance of a deus ex machina. The prologue is generally delivered by a human character who enters to describe the situation, review the past, and generate interest in the action that follows.[9] There are, of course, several gods and supernatural figures who deliver the prologue, but in two cases, a pair of gods engage in dialogue (Apollo and Death in *Alcestis*, Poseidon and Athena in *Trojan Women*); in two cases, a single god enters in the guise of a servant (Hermes as λάτρις in *Ion*) or a mortal (Dionysus as Stranger in *Bacchant Women*); and in one case, the prologue is spoken by a ghost (Polydorus in *Hecuba*). In *Hippolytus*, by contrast, Aphrodite enters as a deus, proclaiming at once her identity and divine authority (1–2), asserting her prerogative to reward and punish mortals (5–6), reminding the viewer of her active intervention in human affairs (21, 28, 42, 48), and delivering both an aetiology (29–33) and a detailed prophecy of events to come.[10] We have already noted that the prologue aetiology is unique, and so too is this prologue prophecy.

Typically, the prologue is spoken by a human character, whose fears or forebodings arouse suspense: what terrible vengeance will Medea take? the nurse asks herself (*Medea* 36–45), and how can Heracles possibly return to rescue his family? Megara asks Amphitryon (*Heracles* 73–81).[11] A god in the prologue can tease the viewer with partial hints of what is to come: Dionysus says he will make himself known at Thebes, but does not explain how (*Bacchant Women* 39–42),[12] Hermes says (correctly) that Ion will be presented as Xuthus' son, and (falsely) that Apollo's rape

will remain hidden (*Ion* 69–73), and Apollo warns that Heracles will save Alcestis, while Death contradicts him (*Alcestis* 64–76).[13] *Trojan Women*, as we shall see, is unusual in that Athena and Poseidon arrange the destruction of the Greek fleet sometime *after* the conclusion of the drama (78–91). But nowhere else in Euripides' surviving plays does the prologue give a detailed forecast of events to come: Aphrodite reports that Hippolytus and Phaedra will both die, Phaedra in a relatively noble manner (εὐκλεής 47) and Hippolytus killed by the curse of his father Theseus (*Hippolytus* 43–48). This opening prophecy, like the opening aition, helps to mark the difference between this play and Euripides' first *Hippolytus*.[14] But it also reminds us that we are beginning at the end: Aphrodite has intervened and all that follows will simply play out the sequel she has foretold. Finally, where the deus is usually greeted with a gesture of acknowledgement and acceptance, the speech of Aphrodite is answered instead by the entrance of Hippolytus, singing the praises of Artemis (58–60), yet the scene ends with a belated speech of acknowledgement from the servant, whose protest against excessive punishment ("pretend not to hear him: gods should be wiser than men," μὴ δόκει τούτου κλύειν· / σοφωτέρους γὰρ χρὴ βροτῶν εἶναι θεούς 119–20) seems directed to a deus whose intervention is already complete. In *Ion*, one intermediary of Apollo (Hermes) is replaced at the end by another (Athena), and in *Bacchant Women*, the god's entrance in disguise is answered at the end by his terrifying epiphany. But when Aphrodite leaves the stage at the beginning of *Hippolytus*, she is making her final exit, having finished everything she came to do.[15]

This impression that the play begins at an end is reinforced by a series of close correspondences between prologue and epilogue. As we have seen, the play begins and ends with the death of Hippolytus, and with verbal echoes reinforcing this similarity. It also begins and ends with the gestures of deus ex machina, aition, and concluding prophecy, and each of these involves further similarities. We have already noted that both aetiologies refer to a tomb and hero shrine of Hippolytus, but the parallels involve Aphrodite as well. In the prologue, Phaedra's love for Hippolytus is commemorated with a shrine of Aphrodite that looks toward Trozen ("a lookout of this land," κατόψιον / γῆς τῆσδε, 30–31), while the epilogue alludes to a shrine of Aphrodite the Spy (Κατασκοπίας) where the love-smitten Phaedra used to watch Hippolytus at his exercises.[16] In her opening prophecy, Aphrodite promises to punish Artemis' favorite Hippolytus (ἃ δ' εἰς ἐμ' ἡμάρτηκε τιμωρήσομαι, 21) just as Artemis in the epilogue promises to punish the favorite of Aphrodite (τόξοις ἀφύκτοις τοῖσδε τιμωρήσομαι, 1422), repeating the vow of vengeance in the same line-end position. The god's presence in the prologue is ignored by Hippolytus and is only acknowledged belatedly by the servant (114–20), just as Artemis' entrance at the end is not formally acknowledged until the dying Hippolytus is brought onstage more than a hundred lines later (ἔα· / ὦ θεῖον ὀσμῆς πνεῦμα· καὶ γὰρ ἐν κακοῖς / ὢν ἠσθόμην σου κἀνεκουφίσθην δέμας. / ἔστ' ἐν τόποισι τοισίδ' Ἄρτεμις θεά, 1391–93). And just as Aphrodite in the prologue withdraws at the approach of Hippolytus, who is about to die (56–57), and leaves events to play themselves out, Artemis in the ending makes an identical gesture, withdrawing from the scene as the hero is about to die (1437–39), and allowing Hippolytus and Theseus to play out their grief and sympathy. This early departure of the deus is unique in Greek tragedy and reinforces

the many similarities between prologue and epilogue, which create the disconcerting impression that the play begins at the end.

This premature sense of finality is heightened throughout the first half of the play. Aphrodite concludes her opening speech with the cold pronouncement that Hippolytus stands at the gates of death (56–57), and the servant ends the scene with an ironic comment upon the finality of her decision, asking the goddess to show forgiveness since gods should be wiser than mortals (117–20). In the next episode, the nurse finally discovers the cause of Phaedra's distress and concludes, "Cypris is no god after all, but some creature greater than a god, who has destroyed Phaedra, and me, and the whole house," Κύπρις οὐκ ἄρ' ἦν θεός, / ἀλλ' εἴ τι μεῖζον ἄλλο γίγνεται θεοῦ, / ἣ τήνδε κἀμὲ καὶ δόμους ἀπώλεσεν (359–61). The servant ironically, and the nurse directly, both acknowledge that Aphrodite's destructive scheme is already complete. The next two episodes likewise end, first with an ode on the destructive power of Aphrodite and Eros, "who destroys mortals and hurls them through all misfortune when he comes," πέρθοντα καὶ διὰ πάσας ἰέντα συμφορᾶς / θνατοὺς ὅταν ἔλθῃ (542–44), and then with Phaedra's recognition that the goddess has had her way: "departing life today, I shall give pleasure to Cypris who destroys me," ἐγὼ δὲ Κύπριν, ἥπερ ἐξόλλυσί με, / ψυχῆς ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα τῆδ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ / τέρψω (725–27). As the action of the drama gets underway, we are constantly reminded that it is already finished.

Ending at a Beginning

The formal symmetry of *Hippolytus* works both ways. If the prologue takes on the qualities of an ending, the epilogue is in some ways a beginning. This is clearest in the premature departure of the goddess. As previously noted, Aphrodite departs at the approach of the dying Hippolytus, leaving events she has set in motion to play themselves out in the course of the play. And in the epilogue, Artemis avoids association with death by leaving before the young man dies. This premature exit of the deus is unparalleled in Greek tragedy, handing over the stage to Theseus, Hippolytus, and the chorus for a brief closing scene (1440–66) of purely human pathos and human forgiveness. As Hippolytus remarks, it is easy for the goddess to leave behind a long friendship (μακρὰν δὲ λείπεις ῥᾳδίως ὁμιλίαν, 1441), but as the chorus says, mortals must struggle on, somehow finding the courage to forgive and the strength to endure their sufferings (πολλῶν δακρύων ἔσται πίτυλος, 1464). With his last words Theseus remembers Aphrodite, the speaker of the prologue (ὡς πολλά, Κύπρι, σῶν κακῶν μεμνήσομαι, 1461), and now, as then, the goddess's departure from the scene marks a new beginning to the action.

This shift of focus to the mortal sequel is accompanied by a certain ambivalence in the play's closing gestures. In *Hippolytus*, these gestures are more emphatically closed than in any other Euripidean drama—yet succeed in somehow remaining open. If every tragedy ends with a death, then Hippolytus is surely Euripides' most tragic play since it is the only one that ends with the death of its protagonist. Medea's children are dead at the end, but Medea herself is most emphatically alive. Neoptolemus' body is brought onstage, but Andromache is alive and will take her son to Molossia.

And Hecuba will die, but in a future foretold by Polymestor, while most other protagonists look forward to future adventures.[17] The only parallel is Pentheus in *Bacchant Women*, who dies at least 400 lines before the end of the play, ceding the stage to Cadmus and Agave. The action of *Hippolytus*, in other words, focuses in an exceptional way upon the hero's tragic end. But here there is a more perplexing parallel between prologue and epilogue. When Aphrodite withdrew, she announced that Hippolytus was virtually dead, standing before the gates of Hades and looking his last upon the light (56–57). When Artemis departs, the situation is the same: Hippolytus is almost dead and sees the gates of death before him (1447). So when does he die? Where is the climactic stroke that will distinguish the end from the beginning, that will make it clear that the hero does not linger on into yet another story or another drama? Strangely enough, the end is not marked.

Hippolytus is about to die when Artemis leaves in order to avoid being polluted by his death: "Goodbye. It is not right for me to see or defile my eyes with mortal death; I can see you are near this evil" (1437–39). Hippolytus bids her farewell and asks his father to lay out his corpse for burial (λαβοῦ πάτερ μου καὶ κατόρθωσον δέμας, 1445), and then Hippolytus announces that he is finished and can see death's door (1447). After several lines of dialogue, he again bids farewell to his father (ὦ χαῖρε καὶ σύ, χαῖρε πολλά μοι, πάτερ, 1453), and after another brief exchange, repeats that he is finished and asks Theseus to cover his body (ὄλωλα γάρ, πάτερ, / κρύψον δέ μου πρόσωπον ὡς τάχος πέπλοις, 1457–58). Theseus then exclaims "O famous bounds of Athens and Pallas, what a man you will have lost!" (1459–60), and the chorus departs, remarking that this pain is shared by all the citizens (1462–63) and looking forward to a sea of tears (πολλῶν δακρύων ἔσται πίτυλος, 1464). There is no mention of Hippolytus' death. We may assume that his body is carried out at the end, but we are never told this. And there is no mention of any preparations for the burial or funeral of the hero. Of course, in staging there must have been a significant silence and a significant gesture: between lines 1458 and 1459 (we can infer) the last words of Hippolytus are followed by silence, and slowly, without a word, Theseus covers the dead man's face. Yet all the more surprising that neither he nor the chorus acknowledge his death. Instead, Theseus speaks of a future loss: "what a man you will have lost" (οἵου στερήσεσθ' ἀνδρός, 1460), and the chorus speaks of future grief: "many tears will fall like oars" (πολλῶν δακρύων ἔσται πίτυλος, 1464); the chorus places in the past not the prince's death but an undefined suffering: "for all the citizens in common this suffering came unexpectedly" (κοινὸν τόδ' ἄχος πᾶσι πολίταις / ἦλθεν ἀέλπτως, 1462–63).

The problem of locating Hippolytus' death is not just a verbal quibble, nor a tendentious illustration of the slipperiness of language. In his tour of the famous sanctuary of Hippolytus in Trozen, Pausanias mentions a statue of the hero, a priest of Hippolytus, various sacrifices, and continues: "they [the Trozenians] won't have him dragged to death by his horses and they do not show his grave, even though they know it. Instead they believe that what is called the Charioteer in the sky is in fact Hippolytus, who receives this honor from the gods" (2.32.1). Pausanias is skeptical of this catasterism, but it had long been told that Hippolytus did not die—or rather that he was brought back to life by Asclepius.[18] And when Pausanias stubbornly identifies the site of Hippolytus' burial, he also notes the (apparent) presence of Asclepius:

"[near the shrine of Aphrodite the Spy and the myrtle tree] is the grave of Phaedra, not far from the tomb of Hippolytus, and this [the tomb of Hippolytus] is a mound near the myrtle. The statue of Asclepius was made by Timotheus, but the Trozenians say it is not Asclepius but an image of Hippolytus" (2.32.4). Did Hippolytus die or not? Perhaps he died and was restored by Asclepius. If so, did death claim him again at a later date? Or did he never die, as the locals in Pausanias believe, made immortal as a constellation by the gods? So in one respect the uncertainty surrounding the hero's death is negative: the absence of a definitive end leaves him lingering—just as he did in the prologue—on the threshold of death. Yet in another respect this uncertainty is more constructive: it leaves room for the possibility that Hippolytus does not die, that he is in fact ready to make a new beginning as a mortal saved from death, or as a constellation, or as a god, or even with a new identity as Virbius.[19]

This elision of the hero's death is assisted by the honors recently promised by Artemis; she makes no mention of death or burial and makes no allusion to the famous tomb in Trozen:[20]

> You who have suffered so much, I will give you
> for your sufferings great honor in the city
> of Trozen: unmarried girls before they wed
> will cut their hair for you, harvesting
> throughout long time a great sorrow of tears.
> You will always be musically remembered
> by virgins, and Phaedra's love for you
> will never fall silent or nameless.
>
> σοὶ δ', ὦ ταλαίπωρ', ἀντὶ τῶνδε τῶν κακῶν
> τιμὰς μεγίστας ἐν πόλει Τροζηνίᾳ
> δώσω· κόραι γὰρ ἄζυγες γάμων πάρος
> κόμας κεροῦνταί σοι, δι' αἰῶνος μακροῦ
> πένθη μέγιστα δακρύων καρπούμεναι·
> ἀεὶ δὲ μουσοποιὸς ἐς σὲ παρθένων
> ἔσται μέριμνα, κοὐκ ἀνώνυμος πεσὼν
> ἔρως ὁ Φαίδρας ἐς σὲ σιγηθήσεται. 1423–30

Artemis promises the living and suffering hero that his sufferings will not be forgotten, but neither here nor in the action that follows is the hero's death clearly acknowledged.

This brings us to another ambivalent gesture. In many respects, this aition is an exceptionally effective closing device: the hero dies at the end of the play, and a god proclaims that his tragic death will be commemorated in rituals performed at Trozen. We have already seen that only in *Hippolytus* does the protagonist die in the course of the play; and only here does the contemporary vestige directly commemorate the action. Later aitia tend to offer only a verbal relic: Orestes survives in the name of the town Oresteion, Helen in the name of the island Helene, adventures in the Crimea survive in the epithet Tauropolos, and so on. Many aitia, as we have noted, remember an event not in the action itself, but in its sequel: the exile of Orestes, the transformation of Hecuba, or the treaty between Argives and Athenians. And many are factitious to a greater or lesser degree: a new place of burial for Eurystheus, an

unusual cenotaph for the Seven against Thebes, or an amalgam of fact, fantasy, and literary revision at Halae and Brauron. Only in *Hippolytus* does the aition describe a familiar contemporary institution that directly honors the events of the play.

Lest it seem that I exaggerate the exceptional nature of the aition in *Hippolytus*, I offer a brief digression on *Medea*, which also concludes with a promise of rites in honor of the dead, in this case the murdered children. The children are not protagonists, but at least there is a direct connection between a climactic event of the play and rites performed in Corinth. When Jason pleads with Medea to let him bury the children, she answers:

> No! I shall bury them with this hand,
> taking them to Hera Akraia's shrine
> lest one of their enemies dishonor them,
> tearing up their tombs; and in the land of Sisyphus
> I shall establish for the future a holy
> festival and rites for this impious murder.
>
> οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεί σφας τῇδ' ἐγὼ θάψω χερί,
> φέρουσ' ἐς Ἥρας τέμενος Ἀκραίας θεοῦ,
> ὡς μή τις αὐτοὺς πολεμίων καθυβρίσῃ
> τυμβοὺς ἀνασπῶν· γῇ δὲ τῇδε Σισύφου
> σεμνὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τέλη προσάψομεν
> τὸ λοιπὸν ἀντὶ τοῦδε δυσσεβοῦς φόνου. 1378–83

The murder of the children in the course of the play will be commemorated in two ways: by their burial at the shrine of Hera Akraia and by rites performed in their honor in Corinth, the land of Sisyphus. Can we assume that this tomb and these rites were familiar to the audience, as the tomb and rites of Hippolytus at Trozen surely were? Yes and no. Although the close proximity of Trozen to Athens, and the close connection of Hippolytus with Athenian legend, would make the hero's commemoration more familiar, some account of the burial and honors for Medea's children in Corinth was well established. The problem is that there is no evidence for these as described by Euripides. Our sources for the story of the children's death are mostly late and often contradictory,[21] but the most prevalent account, and the one that most resembles Euripides' version, differs from him in important details. According to Parmeniscus, Creophylus, and other sources, Medea's children were killed not by their mother but by the people of Corinth, who wanted to hurt or punish Medea.[22] The children had sought refuge at the temple of Hera Akraia (in Perachora) and were murdered in her sanctuary. To atone for this sacrilege, Apollo ordered the Corinthians to establish rites in their honor. We cannot prove that Euripides knew this fuller and more widespread account, but his own aetiology suggests that he did. When Medea tells Jason she will bury the children herself, she gives as her reason, "lest one of their enemies dishonor them," ὡς μή τις αὐτοὺς πολεμίων καθυβρίσῃ (1380); this remark makes no sense in this play, in which their only enemy is Medea, but it makes complete sense in the story of their murder by the Corinthians. Again, Medea says she will establish rites "for this impious murder," ἀντὶ τοῦδε δυσσεβοῦς φόνου (1383)—a motive that does not ring true for Euripides' unrepentant Medea, but is

entirely appropriate to Corinthians chastised and punished by the oracle. These inconsistencies could easily have been avoided, but they were not. Instead, the Medea who dramatically murdered her children promises to protect them from their enemies at the temple, and the Medea who performed the hideous act of matricide prescribes atonement for their impious murder. The inconsistencies draw attention to Euripides' rewriting of Corinthian practice in particular, and of Medea's story in general. The death of secondary characters is honored in a way that seems to clash with viewers' knowledge of contemporary institutions, thus underscoring the poet's innovations.[23]

Hippolytus is different: the epilogue refers to rites established in honor of the play's central figure, and it does so without contradicting common knowledge of those rites. Yet given the exceptional nature of this aition, it remains to acknowledge its failings.[24] After all, if the aition commemorates the hero's death, it does so only by implication. As we noted, the play itself makes no direct mention of the death of Hippolytus. The aetiology likewise makes no mention of the hero's tomb in Trozen, nor does it refer to his death or burial. Instead it describes a custom associated with wedding ritual; as Pausanias reports, "each virgin cuts off a lock for him [Hippolytus] before marriage and after cutting, takes it to the temple as an offering" (2.32.1). The ritual connections between marriage and death are widespread and important,[25] both marking an important point of transition and using similar ritual gestures to confirm a successful passage from one stage to the next. But at least as Artemis describes it, the ritual of the virgins is as incomplete as the death it commemorates. The young women of Trozen are frozen in lamentation, harvesting tears "throughout long time," preserving forever a musical memory of Hippolytus in their capacity as *parthenoi* (ἀεὶ δὲ μουσοποιὸς ἐς σὲ παρθένων / ἔσται μέριμνα, *Hippolytus* 1428–29)—that is, as women who have not made the transition to married status. The hero who seems to linger forever on the threshold of death is commemorated by an endless succession of lamenting women, lingering forever on the threshold of marriage.

Perhaps this absence of ritual closure would be less troubling if we knew what they were singing, if we could hear their "muse-making concern" (μουσοποιὸς . . . μέριμνα). Are they singing about Hippolytus' suffering and death in what some have taken as an aetiology for Euripides' play?[26] Apparently not. What the virgins keep alive is not memory of the hero's death, but the passion of Phaedra: "and Phaedra's love for you will never fall silent or nameless," (κοὐκ ἀνώνυμος πεσὼν / ἔρως ὁ Φαίδρας ἐς σὲ σιγηθήσεται, 1429–30). The aition that ostensibly commemorates the death of the protagonist is not concerned with him after all. What lives on from the drama, what survives and is given a name (κοὐκ ἀνώνυμος, in a variation of the familiar formula) is the story of his antagonist. The substitution of Phaedra's love for Hippolytus' death prevents the honors in Trozen from pointing to the play's ostensible end. But it also suggests more actively the open or unresolved nature of the drama and the issues it raises.

First, in the plot of *Hippolytus*, Phaedra's love is not an end but the means to an end. Her passion is the instrument Aphrodite will use to punish Hippolytus, and her death is less important than the goddess's demand for revenge and satisfaction (47–50). It is Phaedra's tragedy that however nobly she deals with her affliction (εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως, 47), she must die to further Aphrodite's goals. Yet the aition undermines this

logic. What survives from the action, what lives on into the present day, is not the goal announced in the prologue and apparently fulfilled in the epilogue, but a prior means to that end. Incompleteness is immortalized; the in-between lasts forever.

Second, in the symbolic structure of *Hippolytus*, Phaedra's love bears the seeds of its own destruction. It is a curious reversal, as Froma Zeitlin reminds us, that punishes the abstinent Hippolytus by inspiring passion not in him but in someone else.[27] But the reversal has its own logic, a symmetrical logic in which the excessive desire of the temperate Phaedra and the excessive restraint of the hybristic Hippolytus feed on one another and destroy one another. From this point of view, the passion and death of Phaedra are necessary not in causal terms as means to the punishment of Hippolytus, but in symbolic terms as a counterpart to, and reflection of, her stepson's death. Yet after both mortals are dead, Phaedra's passion is neither spent nor destroyed. Her love for Hippolytus will return forever in the longing of Trozenian women, and a passion once hidden by her modesty and guarded by silence will finally have both a name and a voice: "Phaedra's love for you will not fall nameless and will not be silenced," κοὐκ ἀνώνυμος πεσὼν / ἔρως ὁ Φαίδρας ἐς σὲ σιγηθήσεται (1423–30). The problem of desire returns to its beginning.[28]

A final example of the play's ambivalent closing gestures is Artemis' explanation of events. We noted above that a full and coherent account of what has happened can allow the deus to close the action in a very effective manner; in the extant plays, however, such explanations tend to be universal ("all men must die," *Andromache* 1271–72), largely formal (the gullible Theoclymenus receives an explanation only after Helen and Menelaus have escaped), or irrelevant (Zeus' plan to reduce overpopulation, *Electra* 1278–83). Only in *Hippolytus* does the explanation of a deus ex machina play a major role in resolving the action: Artemis explains to Theseus (at considerable length, 1282–1341) Phaedra's love for Hippolytus, the role of the nurse, Phaedra's false accusation, the hasty curse of Theseus, and the responsibility of Aphrodite, and after Hippolytus enters she repeats her account of Aphrodite's role (1400–6). Yet as we saw in chapter 3, this exceptional explanation is too much: Artemis leaves us with so many conflicting justifications and contradictory motives that in the end we have no satisfactory account of events at all.

The formal similarities between prologue and epilogue, the premature departure of the deus from the stage, and the ambivalence of the otherwise emphatic closing gestures, all cast the play's conclusion as a new beginning. And for Artemis, at least, the end is literally a beginning, as she announces her intent to avenge the death of Hippolytus. A whole new drama is about to begin:

> Enough. Not even beneath the gloom
> of earth shall Aphrodite's willful anger
> hurtle against you unavenged,
> thanks to your good and pious heart.
> With my own hand and these relentless
> arrows I will be avenged on one of hers,
> whatever mortal is most dear to her. 1416–22

How will this next story proceed? The death of Hippolytus may offer a model, but we are left uncertain who the protagonist of this new plot will be and how he will meet his death.[29]

Yet in a sense it has already begun. The deus makes her premature exit, and as Theseus and Hippolytus share their grief, Artemis is presumably setting her revenge in motion. When Aphrodite in the prologue announced her plan to punish Hippolytus, the young man was already as good as dead, and as Artemis makes a similar pronouncement in the epilogue, we can be sure that the next drama of revenge is already under way. The goddess has given us a preview of this revenge in her treatment of Theseus. When she has finished with him, Artemis promises, he will wish he were dead, his body buried beneath the ground (1290–91). She insists that Theseus suffer by hearing the ghastly truth ("Hear, Theseus, how your evils stand, and if I gain no advantage, at least I will hurt you," ἄκουε, Θησεῦ, σῶν κακῶν κατάστασιν. / καίτοι προκόψω γ' οὐδέν, ἀλγυνῶ δέ σε 1296–97). When he cries out in pain (οἴμοι, 1313), she says he has more crying to do ("Does the story sting you, Theseus? Then wait and listen further, so you can cry in pain some more," δάκνει σε, Θησεῦ, μῦθος; ἀλλ' ἔχ' ἥσυχος, / τοὐνθένδ' ἀκούσας ὡς ἂν οἰμώξῃς πλέον, 1313–14). He responds by exclaiming δέσποιν', ὀλοίμην ("Lady, I wish I were dead," 1325); and Artemis concludes with grim satisfaction that gods punish wicked mortals utterly, together with their children and their houses (τούς γε μὴν κακοὺς / αὐτοῖς τέκνοισι καὶ δόμοις ἐξόλλυμεν, 1340–41). In Theseus, the angry goddess can take her revenge upon a surrogate victim onstage, before resolving eighty lines later to kill the unnamed favorite of Aphrodite.

The action stands poised at a single ambivalent moment: in prologue and in epilogue it stands poised at the moment of Hippolytus' end, just as it stands poised at the beginning of a goddess's revenge. There is no familiar ring-composition, no arc that unites beginning to end in a grand cycle of recurrence, but a fearful symmetry that immobilizes the action in a single, unredeemable situation. Without a beginning, there can be no closure, and without an end there can be no new beginning. This unusual play owes its strange and fascinating power to the fact that it lacks a beginning or a middle or an end.

Repetition and Repression

At the beginning of the play, Hippolytus concludes his prayer to Artemis by saying "May I run the course of life to the end just as I began" (τέλος δὲ κάμψαιμ' ὥσπερ ἠρξάμην βίου, 87). He wants his end to be just like his beginning, and because it is, because he cannot or does not change, he is destroyed. The play imitates Hippolytus' life, achieving an unlikely and impossible perfection by ending just as it began. One result of this mimicry is to produce a plot that is equally doomed. If the end repeats the beginning and the beginning anticipates the end, nothing can happen: there is no room for change, no space for progress or discovery. With horror and fascination we watch the hero being destroyed, just as Aphrodite promised he would. This is a rather perverse pleasure, one that does not carry us forward to a new understanding or a heightened awareness as does the destruction of Oedipus, but simply plays out its sordid and violent spectacle—and at the end promises more of the same.

This repetition inhibits or paralyzes the action by obliterating opposites, turning beginnings into endings and endings into beginnings, making Artemis into another Aphrodite, and vice versa. I want to look more closely at this dysfunctional repeti-

tion. After all, repetition can be fluid and therapeutic: Peter Brooks has shown that Freud's discussion of the instinctual process of repetition can serve as a useful model for the way in which narrative repeats its subject matter.[30] Narrative is always a retelling, and Freud's "masterplot" describes on a psychological level how repetition serves to bind the flood of threatening stimuli. The ultimate goal of repetition is sameness and death. But repetition with a difference, repetition through displacement or transference, postpones that end and allows memory to revisit experience and to rework what is past or repressed. Deviant or discursive repetition thus generates the interest and liveliness of a narrative middle. In *Hippolytus*, however, this process is cut short by the substitution of opposites. Artemis and Aphrodite become interchangeable: the second goddess replicates the first without introducing challenging differences; she simply takes us back to the initial situation without forcing us to work through the difference between beginning and end and revisit one in light of the other. Aphrodite's plot of revenge makes a similar exchange. When the goddess decides to punish Hippolytus, she does so through his opposite, substituting the unbridled desire of Phaedra, daughter of the monstrous Pasiphae, for the unnatural virginity of Hippolytus, son of the Amazon. In a sense, the punishment of Hippolytus is displaced onto another, but the result is not a pregnant shift or transference from Hippolytus onto another, but just a doubling: the excess of Aphrodite's revenge will destroy both the hero *and* his opposite. In the same way, Theseus in the epilogue does not become a meaningful scapegoat, a surrogate who takes the place of Artemis' intended victim and thus makes it possible to work through guilt or desire; his punishment simply repeats and multiplies the suffering of her victims. The pattern of repetition throughout the play signals a miscarriage in the process of transference, a deadly breakdown that has reached its end before it begins. Or, if metaphor is the ability of language to repeat with a difference, to transfer or shift meaning in a way that detains and delays us, *Hippolytus* stages the death of language, its inability to signify the other. (Or, shifting models again, we might say that the equivalence of opposites short-circuits the process of mimetic desire, which begins by collapsing the distinctions between opposites. By erasing the distinctions with which a community defines itself yet failing to reassert them, *Hippolytus* stages the end of culture.)[31]

Yet the most intriguing repetition is not *in* the play but *of* the play. The story of Phaedra and Hippolytus had already been told by Euripides, and the second *Hippolytus* that survives today seems to enact repetition with a difference. The story of Phaedra, her incestuous desire for Hippolytus, his angry rejection, and her false accusation leading to his death, were told again in the second version, with the scene perhaps displaced from Athens to Trozen and with a crucial change in the character of Phaedra. All that was unseemly and reprehensible in the first Phaedra (τὸ γὰρ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ κατηγορίας ἄξιον, Hypothesis) was apparently corrected by substituting her opposite.[32] Instead of the shameless woman who acknowledged her desire, who personally propositioned her stepson and then accused him to Theseus, we have a paradigm of restraint who denies and represses her desire, who makes no advances to Hippolytus, who conceals her accusation in the form of a letter, and who tries to hide and extinguish her passion by committing suicide. All that was shameful in the first enactment and was denounced by the critics is repressed in the second. Yet for all

the poet's attempt to contain this desire by displacing it onto Phaedra's chaste opposite, the result is the same. The same illicit desire destroys the same human victims in a similar way.[33]

We might conclude that this restaging gives Euripides the last laugh. He can have his cake and eat it too, yielding to the critics and repressing his licentious drama, while using the new, chastened version to repeat the first. This reenactment will have a lesson or moral: just as (within the action) desire cannot be repressed—or rather, when repressed, it simply finds new and more destructive channels—in the same way, what the poet has to say (within the theater) about passion and denial cannot be repressed, and public censure of a play that "makes a whore out of Phaedra" (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1043) will only result in a new and more effective staging. Unfortunately, since the earlier play does not survive, we cannot measure with any confidence the differences between the two versions. Yet there is good reason to believe that the formal repetition I have described, and the immobility that results from it, are peculiar to the second *Hippolytus*. As Froma Zeitlin reminds us,[34] the prologue speech of Aphrodite would have no place in the earlier play, in which Phaedra's illicit passion sets the drama in motion, but is required by the second, in which a chaste and unwilling Phaedra becomes a vehicle in the goddess's punishment of Hippolytus. And without a divine plan announced in the prologue, there is no place or need for a similar plan in the epilogue. If a deus appeared at the end of the first *Hippolytus*, he or she may have explained more or less of the preceding action (less if, as is likely, Phaedra's false accusation had already been exposed), but there would be no question of the deus announcing reciprocal revenge in particular, or future schemes in general.[35]

In the earlier play, the passion of Phaedra propelled the plot toward its destructive end, but the later play, in repressing this desire, in substituting a chaste Phaedra and a more seemly drama, blocks this movement and reduces the plot to a lifeless repetition. Yet in so doing it infects with shame and disgrace an even larger body of victims. The first Phaedra welcomes Desire as a teacher of daring and brazen courage, a god who makes the course easy for those who lack means or contrivance (ἔχω δὲ τόλμης καὶ θράσους διδάσκαλον / ἐν τοῖς ἀμηχάνοισιν εὐπορώτατον, / Ἔρωτα, πάντων δυσμαχώτατον θεόν, fr. 430 Nauck).[36] The second Phaedra, however, trapped and silenced by her desire, wants a contrivance that will turn shameful things into good (ἐκ τῶν γὰρ αἰσχρῶν ἐσθλὰ μηχανώμεθα, 331). But the attempt to repress this shame and hinder its course will only spread it more widely. Theseus, in his attempt to contain and punish the licentious behavior of Hippolytus, becomes an accomplice in his son's destruction, and in his shame he will want to die (πῶς οὐχ ὑπὸ γῆς τάρταρα κρύπτεις / δέμας αἰσχυνθείς; 1290–91). For her complicity in what has happened, Artemis is likewise tainted with disgrace:

> This is the custom of the gods:
> no one wants to oppose the zeal of
> another's will, but we always stand aside.
> Believe me, but for the fear of Zeus
> never would I have suffered the shame
> of allowing the mortal most dear to me
> to die.

θεοῖσι δ' ὧδ' ἔχει νόμος·
οὐδεὶς ἁπάντων βούλεται προθυμίᾳ
τῇ τοῦ θέλοντος, ἀλλ' ἀφιστάμεσθ' ἀεί.
ἐπεί, σάφ' ἴσθι, Ζῆνα μὴ φοβουμένη
οὐκ ἄν ποτ' ἦλθον ἐς τόδ' αἰσχύνης ἐγὼ
ὥστ' ἄνδρα πάντων φίλτατων βροτῶν ἐμοὶ
θανεῖν ἐᾶσαι. 1328–34

And it may be that the spectator, in viewing this corrected (διώρθωται according to the Hypothesis) and immobilized plot, is also in some sense an accomplice. In rejecting the unseemly Phaedra and in endorsing a new, chastened, and formally perfect drama, the spectator plays an important part in the death of the plot. The lifeless and repetitive action replicates suffering without transforming it, enacting *pathos* without *mathos*. And if Phaedra herself is no longer disgraced, those who pass judgment upon the action—Theseus who demands death for her death, Artemis who demands retribution for retribution, and the spectator who requires a barren perfection—all are disgraced in her stead.

7

Reversal: *Trojan Women*

The most beautiful order is a heap of random sweepings.
HERACLITUS

In *Hippolytus*, the unusual symmetry of closing gestures in prologue and epilogue is more than a curious detail. The repetition that seems to enhance the play's formal perfection succeeds instead in paralyzing the plot; an exceptional play that is often judged Euripides' best makes drama impossible. So it is with a certain sense of critical symmetry that I turn to a play that has often been considered Euripides' worst and that deploys its closing gestures in a decidedly unbalanced and asymmetrical manner. "The *Troades*, produced in 415, is perhaps the least interesting of the extant tragedies. The plot consists merely of unconnected scenes, depicting the miserable fate of the Trojan captives; and the execution is not in the best style of Euripides."[1] A. E. Haigh's condemnation is not entirely typical. More recent scholars, rather than dismiss the play out of hand, try to defend or justify its disconnected and episodic plot. Gilbert Murray, for example, argues that emotional intensity upstages dramatic coherence: this is "a study of sorrow, a study too intense to admit the distraction of plot interest."[2] G. M. A. Grube insists that pathos rather than plot or characterization gives the play "its beauty and appeal."[3] Gennaro Perrotta suggests that if we look not to Aristotelian notions of plot but to the "invisible" realm of feeling and emotion, we will find that "the unity of *Trojan Women* is perfect and absolute."[4] And Shirley Barlow argues that the play's unity consists in a network of recurring themes and in the central role of Hecuba.[5] This ambivalence is summed up in Richmond Lattimore's conclusion that "in candor, one can hardly call *The Trojan Women* a good piece of work, but it seems nevertheless to be a great tragedy."[6] Rather than plead for the play's redeeming virtues (which certainly exist), I want to begin with its defects, which are acknowledged by the scruples of its defenders no less than by the criticisms of Haigh: the plot is not a single action but a sequence of episodes, it contains no major reversal of fortunes, and it lacks movement or direction. Troy has fallen, the war is over, the city has been sacked and the women taken into slavery; pathos may remain, but no events worth telling. Whatever this play's virtues, they are not those of *Hippolytus*.

The use of closing gestures is also irregular and disruptive. *Trojan Women* ends more abruptly than any other surviving play of Euripides, with none of the familiar closing gestures, while it begins with a double deus ex machina that displaces those

to confirm his knowledge of her future, so this privileged knowledge imparted by Themis (873–74) gives authority to his following claim to know of a marriage that will destroy Zeus (907–14).

27. Compare Conacher, *Aeschylus' Prometheus* 61, and Griffith, *Prometheus Bound* 190.

28. It is often argued that the trilogy ends with the institution of the torch-race at the Promethia; see Thomson, *Prometheus* 32–38, and Herington, "Study in *Promethia*."

29. Schlesinger, *Gods in Greek Tragedy* 33–34 mentions possible prophecies in the fragmentary plays, but many are simply etymologies or vague allusions to the future, and no prophecy can securely be placed at the end of a play or trilogy. The most interesting is a fragment from *Psychagogoi* (F 275 *TrGF*), in which Teiresias apparently foretells the manner of Odysseus' death; unfortunately, we know little about this play (probably first in its trilogy), and nothing about the context of this prophecy.

30. Thus Pearson, *Fragments*, vol. 2, 214 suggests that the allusion may date *Teucer* before *Ajax*, a suggestion described as "interesting but scarcely conclusive" by Sutton, *Lost Sophocles* 139.

31. On subtler hints in other plays, see Roberts, "Sophoclean Endings."

32. A search for concluding prophecies among the fragments of Sophocles yields little. There is no evidence, for example, that *Polyxena* ended with a prophecy by the ghost of Achilles (compare Pearson, *Fragments*, vol. 2, 162), and while *Syndeipnoi* may have ended with Thetis ex machina (F 562 *TrGF*), we do not know whether or not she delivered a prophecy. On the different sequels in *Philoctetes*, see Roberts, "Different Stories."

33. Compare Roberts, "Sophoclean Endings" 192 who concludes that for Sophocles "there *are* natural endings to tragic actions and to tragedies" whereas "Euripides (especially in his later plays) suggests the arbitrariness or artificiality" of the end.

34. "The goddess appears not so much to extricate the tangles of the plot . . . as to give occasion for a prophecy about the future," Owen on *Ion* 1549.

35. Decharme, *Euripides* 272.

36. Grube, *Drama of Euripides* 77.

37. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* 285.

38. W. Schmidt, "Deus ex Machina" 202, my translation.

39. Translated from Chapiro, *Gespräche* 162.

Chapter 6

1. Grube, *Drama of Euripides* 177.

2. Michelini, *Euripides and Tragic Tradition*, chapter 9.

3. Knox, "*Hippolytus* of Euripides" 227.

4. Bieber, "Entrances and Exits" 280.

5. *Bacchant Women* has a dramatic climax in the death of Pentheus, but the first report of his death (1028 or 1030) is followed by more than 360 lines of text, plus a lacuna of at least fifty lines.

6. In line 33, Diggle emends to ὀνομάσουσιν, following Jortin. On the infinitive with ὠνόμαζεν, see Barrett, *Hippolytos* 161. On textual questions, see also the following note.

7. The lines have been suspected by Jahn (del. 29–33), Blomfield (del. 32–22), and others, and more recently by Wilson, "Etymology in *Troades*" 69 note 7; by Lewin, *Study of Prologoi* 87–90; and by Looy, "Observations sur l'*Hippolyte*." They are defended by Barrett, *Hippolytos* 161–62 and Erbse, *Studien zum Prolog* 36–37; see also Dunn, "Fearful Symmetry" 110–11.

8. On the shrine of Aphrodite, see *IG* i³ 369.66 = *SEG* x 227.66 (αφροδιτες εν ηιπολυ[) and *IG* i³ 383.233–34; compare *SEG* x 225 (Αφροδ]ιτες ει[πι Ιπ]πολυτο). On the Hippolyteion, see scholiast to *Hippolytus* 30 and Pausanias 1.22.1. For identification of their remains on the slope of the Acropolis, see Beschi, "Contributi" 514–15, and Walker, "Sanctuary of Isis" 248. For ἐπί with a proper name in the dative meaning "in honor of [the deceased]," compare *Iliad* 23.776, *Odyssey* 24.91, Lysias 2.80, Bion 1.81, *IG* vii 1880, and many examples in Schwyzer, *Dialectorum graecarum* §§ 348, 452.1–11, 456.99–100. On parallels between the opening and closing aetiologies, see Dunn, "Fearful Symmetry."

9. Thus the nurse in *Medea*, Iolaus in *Children of Heracles*, Andromache in *Andromache*, Polydorus (or rather, his shade) in *Hecuba*, Aethra in *Suppliant Women*, the farmer in *Electra*, Amphitryon in *Heracles*, Iphigenia in *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, Helen in *Helen*, Jocasta in *Phoenician Women*, and Electra in *Orestes*. The opening dialogue of *Iphigenia at Aulis* is often emended to give a prologue speech to Agamemnon. For recent discussions, see Erbse, *Studien zum Prolog* and C. Segal, "Tragic Beginnings."

10. In *Bacchant Women*, Dionysus as Stranger plays a similar role, although his attributes as deus are less pronounced, thus affording a clear contrast between the disguised epiphany of the prologue and the full epiphany to be staged at the end.

11. See Stuart, "Foreshadowing" and Hamilton, "Prologue Prophecy." Some of the nurse's lines in *Medea* probably have been interpolated (see Page on 37–44), but even if genuine, they constitute false foreshadowing, since Medea will not enter the palace and stab Jason with a sword (*Medea* 40–41).

12. The mention of armies coming together in battle (*Bacchant Women* 51–52) is thus a false lead.

13. On *Ion* and *Alcestis*, see especially Hamilton, "Prologue Prophecy" 279–83 and 293–301.

14. It is generally assumed that Euripides' first *Hippolytus* was set in Athens, and if so, it is quite possible that it ended with an αἴτιον for the hero's tomb by the Acropolis (see Barrett, *Hippolytos* 32–34). When he came to write the second *Hippolytus*, which he would set in Trozen and which he would end with an αἴτιον for the famous sanctuary there, the playwright needed somehow to set aside memories of the earlier version. By alluding in the prologue to the first aetiology and by consigning it to a minor episode in the past (when Hippolytus went to Athens to celebrate the mysteries), Euripides closes off his earlier treatment of the legend and allows a new plot to begin. A forecast referring to the noble Phaedra (47) just as clearly distances the second version from the shameless deeds of the first.

15. In *Trojan Women*, Athena and Poseidon also quit the stage forever at the end of the prologue scene; the difference is that they have not intervened in events onstage. See chapter 7.

16. Pausanias 2.32.3–4. Both sites also have some association with Asclepius (Pausanias 1.22.1 and 2.32.4).

17. *Suppliant Women* is an interesting case. Death and commemoration are central to the plot, and one could argue that the Seven are the play's main character, yet the Seven are dead before the drama even begins.

18. Philodemus περὶ εὐσεβείας 52 and Apollodorus 3.10.3 both cite an epic *Naupactia*; compare scholiast to Pindar *Pythian* 3.96, and scholiast to Euripides *Alcestis* 1.

19. See Callimachus fr. 190 Pfeiffer; Virgil *Aeneid* 7.761–82, and Servius *ad loc.*; compare Pausanias 2.27.4.

20. In 1427, Diggle emends to καρπουμένῳ, following Valckenaer, but it is just as plausible that future women will harvest these tears as that the dead Hippolytus will do so.

21. Sources are listed in the following note. See also Eumelus in Pausanias 2.3.11, scholiast to Pindar *Olympian* 13.74g, Eusebius *Contra Marc.* 3.1.

22. See Parmeniscus in scholiast to *Medea* 264, Pausanias 2.3.6–7; compare Creophylus in scholiast to *Medea* 264, Apollodorus 1.9.28, Diodorus 4.54–55, Philostratus *Heroicus* 53.4.

23. For a fuller discussion, see Dunn, "Euripides and Rites."

24. "Indeed the connection between the future rite and the present stage action is obscure," Craik, "Euripides' First *Hippolytos*" 139. For discussion of the ambiguity of the closing aetiology, see Goff, *Noose of Words* 113–29, and Pucci, "Euripides: Monument" 184–86.

25. Compare Brelich, *Paides e Parthenoi* 33 and note 79 to that page, and Rehm, *Marriage* 11–29.

26. Thus Pucci, "Euripides: Monument" 185, and Goff, *Noose of Words* 111.

27. Zeitlin, "Power of Aphrodite" 107.

28. C. Segal, *Euripides and Poetics* 120–26 refers to the ambivalence of this aition in an interesting discussion of gender and space in *Hippolytus*. Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled* 187 implies that the out-of-place aition underlines the irrelevance of women and marriage in a men's world represented by Theseus and Hippolytus.

29. If Aphrodite's favorite is Adonis, Euripides has promised a novel plot in which he is killed by Artemis' arrows; if we take these arrows literally, we must wonder if some favorite less well known will be Artemis' victim. Compare Barrett, *Hippolytos* 412.

30. Brooks, *Reading for Plot*, chapter 4.

31. In Girardian terms, *Hippolytus* enacts a mimetic crisis without enabling a rebirth of order. Mitchell, however, insists on finding a scapegoat that will rescue the play for Girard. The notion that Hippolytus is a scapegoat who displaces human violence and guilt onto the gods cannot be supported: Hippolytus, Phaedra, Theseus, "Adonis," and even Artemis (1338–39) are all victims, and as Artemis reminds us, Theseus, Aphrodite, the nurse, and Phaedra are all to blame. See Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* and Mitchell, "Miasma, Mimesis."

32. On the new Phaedra, see Zeitlin, "Power of Aphrodite" 52–54 and Reckford, "Phaedra and Pasiphae."

33. On shame as a thematic concern of the play, see C. Segal, "Shame and Purity." For a good discussion of the second Phaedra as a failed attempt to reenact the first, see Reckford, "Phaedra and Pasiphae."

34. Zeitlin, "Power of Aphrodite" 107–8.

35. On the first *Hippolytus*, see Barrett, *Hippolytos* especially 34–35 (on the prologue) and 44–45 (on the last scene).

36. Our source for these lines (Stobaeus 4.20.25) does not identify the speaker, but Phaedra is the only plausible one.

Chapter 7

1. Haigh, *Tragic Drama* 300.

2. Murray, "*Trojan Women*" 38.

3. Grube, *Drama of Euripides* 282.

4. "Intesa in questo senso, l'unità delle *Troiane* è assoluta e perfetta," Perrotta, "Le *Troiane*" 237.

5. Barlow, *Trojan Women* 32.

6. Lattimore, Introduction 124.

7. See the discussion of *Trojan Women* 1256–59, with note 14 of this chapter, on the verbal, and perhaps theatrical, gesture that fails to herald the entrance of a deus.

8. The satyr-play *Cyclops* ends in trimeters, with the last two parting lines spoken by the chorus.

9. The opening exchange (1287–1301) is followed by strophe (1302–16) and antistrophe (1317–32). As Lee, *Troades* 277 notes, "there is no justification for B[iehl]'s attempt to make 1287–1301 strophic by a process of wholesale rewriting."

10. The manuscripts assign 1325–29 to Hecuba and 1329–32 to Talthybius. All modern editors follow Seidler in giving the last two lines to the chorus, but his changes rest upon assumptions that need to be reexamined, namely that there should be exact responsion in change of speakers and that the closing lines should be spoken by the chorus. (Seidler assigns 1315–16 at the end of the strophe to the chorus, although the manuscripts assign them to Hecuba, and then assigns 1331–32 at the end of the antistrophe to the chorus, to produce responsion.)

11. Two other plays of Aeschylus end with lyrics, but *Suppliant Women* closes with a brief, gnomic antistrophe (1068–72) in which the chorus reflects upon the justice of Zeus, and *Eumenides* ends with a brief antistrophe (1044–47) in which the secondary chorus reflects on the power of Zeus and appeals to the audience. Given the similar content of *Persians* and *Trojan Women*, Euripides' finale seems designed to recall that of Aeschylus: another *kommos* between chorus and shattered protagonist, the same cries of woe (ὀτοτοτοῖ, *Persians* 1043, 1051, *Trojan Women* 1287, 1293), concluding with a similar brief escort offstage (πέμψω τοί σε δυσθρόοις γόοις, *Persians* 1077, ὅμως / δὲ πρόφερε πόδα σὸν ἐπὶ πλάτας Ἀχαιῶν, *Trojan Women* 1331–32).

12. On the authenticity of these lines (marked spurious by Diggle), see chapter 11, note 20.

13. The text is corrupt; hence my paraphrase.

14. What the chorus sees is not necessarily staged. The original production might have employed extras on the palace roof and might have left everything to the imagination. But the exclamation of the chorus suggests that something at least was visible to the audience. Wisps of smoke? A flaming torch?

15. Unfortunately, the mutilated epilogue of *Bacchant Women* and the spurious ending of *Iphigenia at Aulis* must be left out of account. *Alcestis* also concludes with no aition, Admetus commands that sacrifices and choral celebrations be established (1154–56).

16. Survival of the ὄνομα is central to the aition: ἐπώνυμος δὲ σοῦ πόλις κεκλήσεται *Electra* 1275; τύμβῳ δ' ὄνομα σῷ κεκλήσεται *Hecuba* 1271; *Hippolytus* 1429; *Iphigenia among the Taurians* 1452, 1454; *Heracles* 1329–30; *Ion* 1577, 1587–88, 1594; *Orestes* 1646; and compare *Erechtheus* fr. 65, line 93 (Austin).

17. Diggle follows Seidler in assigning alternating lines to Hecuba and to the chorus.

18. Sartre's adaptation *Les Troyennes* restores this type of balanced frame by adding a final epiphany of Poseidon; the film version of Cacoyannis, *Trojan Women* adds a more subtle frame by repeating the opening words of Hecuba's monody in her parting lines.

19. Compare Pohlenz, *Griechische Tragödie*, vol. 1, 435. I do not agree that the transposition is a make-shift expedient: "Das gewaltige Finale, das Bild des brennenden Troia, vertrug am Schluß keinen Deus ex machina."

20. See, for example, Stuart, "Foreshadowing"; Gollwitzer, *Prolog- und Expositionstechnik*, esp. 82–91; and Hamilton, "Prologue Prophecy". Wilson regards this unique prophecy as further evidence of interpolation (Wilson, "Interpolation" 205). O'Neill, "Prologue of *Troades*" 289 observes that "So wide a departure from his usual practice is significant," but nevertheless maintains that the prophecy in *Trojan Women* establishes a "Known End" to the action in the same manner as Aphrodite's prophecy in *Hippolytus* (293).

21. Helen and Menelaus, of course, belong neither among the Trojan women nor among the victorious Greeks and are immune to the suffering of the former and the punishment of the latter.

22. Lines 13–14 are deleted by Diggle, following Burges, but as Wilson points out, their "awkwardness" or "frigidity" does not warrant excision (Wilson, "Etymology in *Troades*" 67). Wilson gives very different grounds for suspecting interpolation: in its reference "to the future beyond the limits of the play" and its "almost formulaic use of κεκλήσεται" (71), the etymology resembles those usually found in the epilogue. Yet this finding suggests not interpolation but inversion of beginning and ending, and the only remaining anomaly, "the fact

Tragedy's End

Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama

FRANCIS M. DUNN

New York *Oxford*
Oxford University Press
1996