88. A.P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971), 98 n. 18, remarks that the word commanding Theoklymenos to stop (*episches*) is 'the conventional one for the interruption of a catastophe.' Nor, as she also observes, is its use confined to divine speakers — cf. Peleus at *And.* 550.

89. Hourmouziades, 166–9, anticipated my argument in mentioning these four as 'instances where an announcement would ruin the impression of an unexpected divine intervention which the poet intends to convey by introducing an unexpected god to restrain a person from committing a violent act' (166). Arguing against Arnott, who thought that the absence of an announcement did not allow for the *mechane*, he went on to state that even among these four cases the device was certainly used in *Or.* and very probably in *Hel.*

90. Barrett (ed.), *Hipp.*, 396 n. 1, suggests that even in these two cases where there is an announcement, the announcements 'might have been easily interpolated to suit the practice of the later theater'.

91. Where the reaction to the earthquake 'announces' Athene.

3 PREPARATION AND SURPRISE

The element of surprise explains why several entrances that fall within an act, and therefore should be announced, are not. But the presence or absence of an announcement does not determine or indicate whether or not the entrance is surprising. Surprise is more subtle and less tangible; it is also more difficult to gauge. Surprise depends on preparation, and preparation varies in degree and kind. It is not a simple matter of a character's name, or even his impending arrival, being mentioned (although such specific reference can, of course, help to prepare for an entrance).[1] In a way, everything that precedes an entrance prepares for it.[2] The words, action, situation, mood, the whole movement of the drama leads up to and prepares in some way for that entrance. The degree of surprise that any entrance has, therefore, is unique.

In *Hel.*, after an initial recognition, Menelaos, unaware of the phantom Helen and distrusting his eyes, doubts that the woman before him is, in fact, his wife, and begins to head back to the ships. One of his servants arrives at this critical moment, explains what has happened, and brings about the true recognition of husband and wife. The messenger's entrance has not been specifically prepared for; he arrives at a crucial time; and his entrance turns about the course of events. All three factors add up to a clear example of a surprise entrance. Menelaos' entrance at *Or.* 356, on the other hand, is clearly and specifically prepared for. In the prologue, Elektra explains that he, the hope for Orestes and herself, has arrived and is expected (51ff), and her opening speech closes with her looking for his arrival (67–70). Later, in dialogue with her brother, she mentions their uncle's return and imminent arrival (241ff). His entrance, although perhaps a bit more pompous than expected, and not providing the desired help, is a surprise to no one.

The degree of surprise in some other examples is less clear cut. Theseus in *Hipp.* is away from the house, as we learn at 281. That he should return at some point is not unexpected, but the timing of his entrance — on the heels of Phaidra's suicide — is exciting and not predictable. We would not, however, call his a surprise entrance. The audience has no reason to expect Pheres' entrance

at *Alk.* 614, interrupting Alkestis' funeral procession. His unwillingness to die on his son's behalf has been made clear in the first half of the play (15ff, 290ff, 338ff, 516ff), but this scene puts his son's and his own actions in a new light, causing the audience to rethink their opinion of them, Alkestis, and the whole drama. He has, nevertheless, been mentioned several times in the play and he lives nearby; should his entrance at this juncture surprise us? Again, it is a matter of degree. His arrival does not have the impact of, e.g., the servant's in *Hel.*, nor is it as clearly prepared for as Menelaos' in *Or.*

These four examples give a rough idea of the variety of preparation for and the degree of surprise in entrances. This chapter looks at some of the ways in which Euripides prepares for such entrances and the role they play in his dramas. Inevitably, the cases discussed are selective: not every entrance that is surprising in some way or to some people is included, and some that are included perhaps to some do not seem surprising. An entrance begins a scene, and how Euripides joins together his scenes — how the arrival is prepared for or not prepared for and its effect — is our concern here. Although, as stated above, every entrance and what prepares for it are unique, for discussion and comparison, entrances are considered under various categories. Chapter 4 examines and discusses the links between exits, entrances, and the songs that they frame; this chapter, therefore, focuses almost exclusively on entrances *not* directly following lyrics. Divine entrances at the end of the plays, treated briefly in Chapter 2, are considered only if there is a special twist to their introduction.

One final preliminary matter: surprising to whom? Entrances that surprise the spectators also surprise the actors, but there are several entrances for which the audience is prepared, but the actors are not. (Even in these cases, as we will see below, the audience, though informed of someone's arrival, can be surprised by some aspect of the entrance.) In what follows we are concerned primarily with the audience's response, not the actors', although the latter helps to shape the former.[3]

1. Situational Preparation/Dramatic Necessity

Several times in Euripides an entrance is preceded by no specific preparation (the character who arrives is not even mentioned), but

a situation has developed that requires the arrival of this character. These entrances are surprises, and they also satisfy a dramatic need.[4]

Med. 663

The Aigeus scene in *Med.* has been criticised since antiquity.[5] The motivation he gives for his arrival (667ff) might be weak, but the audience has in a way been prepared for his appearance. No one has suggested that he might arrive; no one has even mentioned his name, but the situation in which he, or someone else to play this role, is needed has been created and dwelled on. Kreon's order of banishment has left Medeia in a quandary ('Where am I to turn?' she asks at 502 in the familiar tragic phrase). Both Medeia (387ff, 502ff, 603ff) and the chorus (359ff, 437ff, 441ff, 652ff) repeat that she is helpless and has no one to offer her shelter. Because she gave up everything for Jason, betrayed by him she has nothing left. Aigeus arrives and provides the protection that Medeia so dearly needs. The need that the drama has created and developed is met. Aigeus' entrance is a surprise, but the arrival responds to a well-defined tension in the drama and fits neatly and artfully into the play.[6]

The entrance does more than provide an answer to Medeia's plight; it suggests to Medeia her most brutal deed. Two scenes of confrontation between Medeia and Jason frame Medeia's encounter with Aigeus. After the first confrontation, Medeia threatens Jason as he exits (625–6):[7]

> Be married. For perhaps — with the god's help —
> You will renounce your marriage.

Although earlier in the play, the Nurse has expressed *her* concerns for the children's safety (36–7, 89–95), no threat against the children is heard here or elsewhere. Medeia's words from within at 112–14 are more a curse made in despair than an actual threat; she has used the same verb, the middle of *óllumi*, of herself at 97, and no one thinks she is contemplating suicide.[8] Her original plan for vengeance dictates the murder of Jason, his bride, and Kreon, not the children (374–5). In the second meeting with her husband, she is no longer threatening, but calmly conciliatory and deceitful. Aigeus has made the difference. Not only has he offered her a place of asylum, but he has put in her mind the murder of the

children. The latter effect is achieved only indirectly, since by an awareness of the importance of Aigeus' lack of children Medeia realises the potency of murdering hers and Jason's. (The first encounter with Jason showed the importance *he* placed on the children, but she does not plan their murder until after the Aigeus scene.) Once Aigeus has departed, Medeia, in a 'tailpiece to the act, turns her attention to her vengeance with this new twist. She gives to an incredulous chorus this reason for the children's slaughter (817): 'For in this way my husband would be most stung.' And she repeats the reason to Jason in the play's finale (1370): 'These [the children] are no more. *This* will sting you'.

Hkld. 474

The implicit preparation here is not as lengthy or as marked as in *Med.*, but the same need of someone to solve a difficult situation is created and vividly depicted in Iolaos' *rhesis* (427–60). 'Where are we to turn?' he asks (440), and 'We are ruined,' he laments (442). Demophon, it seemed, had saved the day and could rescue the offspring of Herakles. But he has been thwarted by the necessity of sacrificing a girl of noble birth, a sacrifice he can ask of no Athenian. The dilemma holds small hope of solution, and the previous hope Iolaos in fact attacks (433ff). At his wits' end (*amēchanos*, 472) Demophon implores Iolaos to come up with a plan. At this juncture, Makaria enters from the *skene* (she explains that she has heard them from within[9]) and offers her aid. When she learns of the crisis, she is willing to die.[10] A plan has been found, an impasse passed. The dramatic situation has found its resolution in an unprepared for, yet needed, entrance.

Ion. 1320, Hel. 597

Whereas in *Med.* the need of someone to save Medeia was heard many times and in *Hkld.* Iolaos' despair and the need of some new plan were forcefully and directly expressed before Makaria's entrance, in these two plays the implicit preparation is less marked. The frequent reminders of the need for asylum or the explicit appeal for aid are not found in these plays; rather, it is the general force of the drama that 'requires' someone's intervention to effect recognitions.

After her attempt on Ion's life, Kreousa rushes on stage and takes refuge at Apollo's altar. Soon Ion arrives and threatens to murder her in disregard of the altar's protection. Caught in the dilemma of exacting vengeance or respecting his patron's altar, he considers the injustice of the guilty being given the god's protection. The temple's priestess first found the infant Ion and reared him, Hermes explained in the prologue (41–51), and Ion refers to her in dialogue with Kreousa (318ff), but her entrance is not in any specific way prepared for, nor is the need for resolution explicitly stated. Apollo's entrance to set matters right *might* be expected by a member of the audience. Someone, the movement of the drama tells us, must intervene. Ion must not be allowed to murder his mother or to go limply off at such an impasse. The solution is provided by the priestess' entrance. 'Halt,'[11] she commands as she enters from the temple, bringing with her the tokens that allow (finally) for the recognition of mother and son.

Similarly, following the abortive recognition between Menelaos and herself in *Hel.*, Helen cannot simply be left there by her doubting husband and the couple be separated forever. Some solution must be found, we feel, but we do not know what it is. This scene is more complex than others: our expectations concerning their reunion seemed to have already been met. Euripides, however, only titillated us, raising these hopes in the first recognition only to dash them down in the doubting Menelaos. As Menelaos begins to exit (593), Helen despairs. Then the servant from the ship interrupts Menelaos' departure and informs him of the phantom Helen, who has vanished into the aether. Now Menelaos truly accepts this woman as his wife, and they enjoy a second and joyous recognition, appropriate to this strange play of doubled actions.[12]

Her. 523

In the preceding four plays, the entrance of the character was prepared for by the situation. Nothing directly prepares for the entrance, but the possibility of that entrance is not denied. In *Her.*, however, again and again we hear that Herakles' return from Hades to rescue the suppliants is impossible (e.g. 145–6, 296–97). The tension in the first third of the play lies, in part, in the conflict between the explicit denial of his arrival and the dramatic necessity of it. The almost palpable need of Herakles is created by the constant statements of his absence and inability to come back and save his family. On the level of plot, Herakles' absence in Hades has enabled Lykos to exert this power over the family. He does, of course, return in time to save his family from Lykos' butchery, an

entrance that marks the first *peripeteia* of the drama. His entrance both contradicts the statements that he cannot return and satisfies the need that he return.

Or. 729

Pylades' first entrance in *Or.* perhaps is most like the servant's entrance in *Hel.* In *Hel.* and *Or.*, just when safety and recognition respectively seem guaranteed, they fall through. The servant's news in *Hel.* sets things right, but Pylades' arrival, unlike that entrance and the others, does not achieve what it promised, or at least not in the way first supposed.[13] His entrance is marvellously juxtaposed to Menelaos' exit (716). Elektra and Orestes had awaited their uncle's return; in him, they felt, lay their hope for safety (see, e.g., 68ff, 380ff, 448, 722ff). But face to face with Tyndareus, Menelaos showed his true colours and abandoned his nephew and niece. Orestes has just finished casting words at his departing uncle and begun to realise that he has been betrayed with no hope remaining (722–4) when he espies and announces his approaching companion. This entrance surprises for more than one reason. Not only does it lack specific preparation, but the act seems to have ended. After Orestes' words follow Menelaos off stage, the audience expects this long act (it began at 348) to end and the chorus to reflect on the action.[14] But Pylades overturns this expectation and introduces a new scene (accompanied by a change in metre from iambic trimeter to trochaic tetrameter). Pylades, however, for all his eagerness, offers little help. He goes along with his friends and supports his weakened comrade, but the expectation of a rescue, suggested in part by the juxtapostion to Menelaos' exit, is not fulfilled. Similar in its timing to the entrance of the 'saviour' in other plays, Pylades' entrance seems intentionally manipulated to thwart the expectations it creates. A key feature of *Or.* is the many failed attempted actions.[15] Here the unexpected arrival that in other plays offers some solution to a crisis has little effect. The 'success' of Pylades' and Orestes' scheming comes about in another and unexpected way.

2. Some Other Unexpected Entrances

The entrances already discussed were prepared for by the situation and the force of the drama. The arrival at a critical moment turned

about the play's course, or, in the case of Pylades' entrance at *Or.* 729, played on the audience's expectations of its doing so. Some other unexpected entrances are not 'required' by the situation: no catastrophe is averted or recognition achieved. One could say that these unexpected entrances do not solve a puzzle but add new pieces to it.

And. 802, 881

The Nurse's[16] entrance (802) launches the second action of the drama.[17] Andromache has been rescued, and now the plot moves in a new direction: Hermione's distress and despair, her rescue by Orestes, and the murder of Neoptolemos. The new actions are punctuated by the unexpected entrances of the Nurse and Orestes. The degree of surprise in the first seems rather mild. Andromache, we do not doubt, has a Nurse (she may even be the same character as the servant seen earlier in the play — see n. 16 above); the news she has is surprising, but her entrance is only slightly so.[18] Orestes' appearance (881) is more unexpected,[19] as no mention of him has preceded his arrival *from abroad*, and the situation that developed prior to his entrance differs from what we find in other plays of rescue. The long implicit preparation that preceded, e.g. Aigeus' entrance in *Med.*, is missing. Hermione does, to be sure, feel abandoned and desires to die or to escape, but her situation does not have the same dramatic urgency as, e.g., Ion's and Kreousa's in *Ion*, especially when her lyric cries are met with the calm and sensible spoken iambics of the Nurse — she may even have begun to follow the Nurse's advice that she return to the house (876ff) when Orestes is announced. Furthermore, so soon after one rescue necessitated by her evil plots, Hermione cannot easily win the audience's sympathy and have them hope for *her* rescue. Orestes' entrance is a real surprise.

Hik. 990, 1034

Evadne makes a spectacular appearance near the end of *Hik.* (see above in Chapter 2). Her husband Kapaneus and the chorus' children are dead and the corpses have been returned, when she enters, mounts the cliff overlooking the pyre, laments her husband's death, and announces her suicide. With this entrance the focus shifts from the communal grief of the chorus to the individual sorrow of Evadne. Günther Zuntz (1955) succinctly comments: 'A short parallel within the drama, this episode echoes

in a different key that note of unending woe which resounds from the laments of the Chorus.'[20] Iphis, her father, enters (1034), concerned about his daughter's sudden exit from the house. His attempts to dissuade her from suicide fail and she jumps to her death, followed by her father's expression of grief. Evadne's entrance is not specifically prepared for, although the mention of Kapaneus' funeral pyre (980ff) provides some link, and Iphis', although in response to hers, is also unexpected. These two entrances do not mark off an action as distinct as the Nurse's and Orestes' in *And.* (and the former action is picked up again with the entrance of the children carrying the funeral urns at 1123), but these two entrances do move the play in an unexpected direction in order to include another view of the war's tragedy.

In these two plays, the unexpected entrances widen the scope of the dramas. To argue whether the plays are unified or not would require a much fuller discussion. But we should note that Euripides employs these surprise entrances to redirect the course of the plays — in one, to begin a second action that in part mirrors the first; in the other, to highlight an individual aspect of war's pain. In both plays, the new entrances force the audience to shift gears, as it were, and to reconsider the poet's design and their own response to the dramas.[21]

3. Entrance of the 'Wrong' Person

Sometimes Euripides prepares the audience and the actors for an entrance, but of someone other than the one who arrives. The entrance is that of the 'wrong' person.

Ion 1553, IA 819, 855

Near the end of *Ion.*, the young man, shocked by Kreousa's revelations and doubting her tale, heads towards the temple to question Apollo. Before the entrance of the priestess at 1320, we suggested above, one might have expected Apollo *ex machina* to end the dilemma; now it would not be unreasonable for an experienced theatre-goer to think Apollo might enter to manage things, as Hermes said he would in the prologue (67ff). As Ion heads for the door, he is startled by the appearance of a divinity. Not Apollo, though, but Athene, the 'wrong' god, appears on her brother's behalf.

Twice, in close succession, Euripides employs the same technique in *IA*. Achilleus enters at 801, impatiently looking for Agamemnon. He begins with these questions (801–3):

> Where is the leader of the Achaians?
> Who of the servants would tell him
> That Peleus' son Achilleus seeks him at the gates?

Such a question by an entering character is not unusual (consider, e.g., Teiresias in *Bakch.* and Menelaos in *Hel.*). But in these cases however, the persons sought enter, Kadmos and someone to open the door respectively. In *IA* Achilleus appears, seeking Agamemnon, but Klytaimestra, not the Greeks' leader, enters, explaining that she had heard his call (just as Kadmos and the old woman do).[22] This entrance is not as surprising as some others because Agamemnon, the audience knows, has left to consult with Kalchas (750). Nevertheless, there is a tension in this scene as we see Achilleus, anxious about military matters, expecting the Greeks' chieftain to appear at any moment. That Klytaimestra,[23] and not the sought Agamemnon, appears is crucial to the play's action: now Agamemnon's web of deceit begins to unravel as Achilleus reveals his ignorance of his 'engagement' to Iphigeneia. The shift in the play's movement is marked by the entrance of the 'wrong' person.

The discovery of Agamemnon's plans is still incomplete: the fraudulent marriage is clear, but the sacrifice of Iphigeneia is not. Achilleus persists in trying to find the Greeks' leader and, unaware that he is with Kalchas, declares that he will seek him inside his quarters (853–4). But an old slave stops him and bids him to wait.[24] Another surprise entrance[25] thwarts Achilleus' efforts to find Agamemnon, and more of the leader's scheme is revealed. Using the entrance of the 'wrong' person twice in such proximity, Euripides underscores the sudden turn of events, and creates a tension that builds up and reaches its peak in the inevitable encounter of husband and wife (1106ff).

Or. 71

Here both the identity and the location of the entering character are surprising. Elektra ends her prologue speech with these words (67–70):

I look down every road, hoping to see
Menelaos approaching. Since otherwise on weak
Strength are we anchored, unless we are saved
By him. A house in bad times is helpless.

She probably accompanies these lines with glances down the two *parodoi*, expectant of Menelaos' imminent return. Perhaps the audience follows suit, looking for and expecting Menelaos to arrive and save this helpless pair. But Menelaos does not at that moment enter down the *parodos*, nor does anyone else. From the *skene*, not the *parodos*, Helen, not her husband, appears. Elektra meets not with their potential rescuer, but the ultimate cause of all their suffering. In a play of many surprises, this entrance helps to establish the mood. It might also suggest that the hope that the children have in Menelaos will prove futile: just as here Elektra looks literally and figuratively to Menelaos and finds not him but Helen, so later when he does arrive, his presence is useless to his kin.

4. Surprises of Location

Helen's entrance at *Or.* 71 is surprising in both the character and the location. The place of entry at *Ion* 1553 also surprises the audience, since Ion heads for the temple doors (and the audience's eyes follow) and then Athene appears on high. On at least two other occasions Euripides surprised the audience with the place (and perhaps the timing) of the entrance; both involve someone moving towards and trying to enter the *skene* door, interrupted by the appearance of another from above.

Med. 1317, Or. 1567[26]

Jason, seeking to avenge Medeia's murder of Glauke and Kreon, rushes on stage, where he learns of the children's murder inside. He orders that the doors be opened and threatens to punish Medeia. Our attention has been drawn to the doors when Medeia appears on high in her chariot,[27] triumphant and in command (1317–18):

Why are you disturbing and monkeying with these doors,
Seeking the corpses and me, the murderer?

Page (ed.), *ad loc.*, observes that *anamochleúō* (which I translate 'monkey with' to suggest its unusualness) is a very rare word. It is first attested here and not found again until Lucian. The bold language, then, underlines the bold stage action of Medeia's sudden and remarkable appearance in her chariot.[28]

Or. presents a very similar situation. Menelaos arrives in response to what he has heard of Orestes' murderous activities. Like Jason, he demands that the doors be opened and threatens to kill his nephew and accomplice. As in *Med.*, our attention focuses on the door. What effect will Menelaos' efforts and threats have, we wonder? But before the doors can be opened, Orestes appears on the roof and gives *his* command (1567–8):

You, don't touch these doors with your hand.
I command you, Menelaos, who have built yourself up with daring.

Is there a pun in these words which, like the choice of *anamochleúō* in *Med.*, reinforces the striking entrance? *Pepúrgōsai* which is translated 'have built yourself up', comes from *purgóō* which literally means 'to fortify with towers'. Although almost always metaphorical in tragedy (but see, e.g., *Bakch.* 172), so close to *klḗithrōn* ('doors'), perhaps it should be taken paronomastically.

This scene has, of course, a visually spectacular finale, where the playwright goes one step beyond the impressive ending of *Med.* To the double-tiered action of Menelaos on the ground and Orestes and others on the roof is added a third level with Apollo's appearance (1625). Unlike Medeia, although Orestes may seem to have taken over the divine role, he has not, and his final action also turns out differently than planned. We might also observe a 'visual turnabout' in this scene. In the only other encounter between Orestes and Menelaos, Orestes lay on the ground as Menelaos entered in a pompous and indifferent manner. Here Orestes is elevated (literally and in terms of apparent power) and Menelaos is on the ground.

5. 'Talk of the Devil'

Athene's entrance at *Tro.* 48 is, we have seen, linked to the preceding scene by Poseidon's mention in his departing lines of her

destruction of Troy. Although her appearance is a great surprise, Euripides subtly joins together the two scenes with this verbal link. Other entrances, not all of them surprising, are similarly linked to the preceding scenes; we will call them 'talk of the devil' entrances.[29] Under this heading are included entrances that are preceded by the mention or hint of the new arrival's name, whether the arrival is expected or not, when this mentioning creates a special tension or highlights a surprise. Excluded are the many cases of someone asking, e.g., 'Where is the king?', and then that questioner or another announcing the arrival (e.g. *Hipp.* 1153ff, *IT* 1153ff). This is but a convenient way of introducing a new character and is of neutral value. Also excluded are such entrances that follow a lyric; they are treated in the next chapter.

IA 1106ff

Only once in Euripides does a character actually say something like 'talk of the devil'. In *IA* Klytaimestra, now aware of her husband's murderous schemes, comes forth from the *skene* looking for him, and, when she spots him says (1103–5):

> I was just mentioning him who approaches,
> Agamemnon here, who at once will be found out
> Plotting impious deeds against his own children.

The confrontation between the two has been inevitable since Agamemnon's plans unravelled in the previous scene (see above), and the audience awaits the conflict that his return brings. Unlike the examples mentioned above, this technique is not of neutral dramatic value: bringing the confrontation into sharper focus increases the tension in this scene.

Bakch. 1211ff

When Agave returns triumphant, displaying the head of her prey to the city, she asks for her father and, with painful irony, her son, in order to show off her prize (1211–12):

> Where is the old man, my father? Let him come near.
> And Pentheus, my son, where is he?

She then commands someone to fasten her booty to the triglyphs.

As if in response to her questions, Kadmos enters at 1216 with attendants carrying Pentheus' remains. The scene of false triumph is thus neatly linked to the scene of joyless revelation. The effect of the scene is prolonged as no contact is made between the two until 1231, when Kadmos sees his daughter.[30] In performance, Agave might look here and there on stage while Kadmos enters and relates his sad tale from the mountains.

Hel. 546

Menelaos goes into hiding at 514, before the chorus and Helen return from the *skene.* After a brief choral song (515–27), Helen begins her return to Proteus' tomb and reflects on Theonoe's predictions. Her husband is alive, even somewhere in the land, but where and in what condition, she does not know. Finally she turns to address the thought-to-be-absent Menelaos (540): 'Oh my! When will you come? Your return is greatly desired.' No sooner does she finish with her appeal to her husband than she notices someone and thinks she is being attacked. Of course, it proves to be Menelaos; her question and her wish are fulfilled. This 'entrance' does not surprise the audience — they have seen him go into hiding, and perhaps they smile as Helen wonders about him and wishes he would come. The clever link and the timing of the 'entrance' add to the light touch in this scene.[31]

Ion 1250

After the attempt to poison Ion fails and the plot is uncovered, the chorus in a brief astrophic song (1229–43) bemoans the punishment that awaits them and Kreousa. Then in anapests (1244–9) they turn to ask what more can Kreousa suffer (1246–47):

> What, poor mistress, remains
> For your spirit to suffer?

As observed in Chapter 2, these words do not address Kreousa, who rushes on stage immediately after the anapests. Rather they serve as a 'talk of the devil' link. What more remains for Kreousa to suffer? With her arrival the question begins to be answered.

El. 761ff

One 'talk of the devil' entrance clearly shows Euripides self-consciously playing with dramatic conventions. After her brother

has left to murder Aigisthos in *El.*, Elektra frets and worries that the venture will fail. She hears a shout and fears the worse, ignoring the advice of the cautious chorus (758–60):

> *Ch.* Hold on, so you may know your fortunes clearly.
> *El.* It's not possible. We are beaten. For where are the messengers?
> *Ch.* They will come. It's no small thing to kill a king.

If they were victorious, the messengers would have already arrived with the news, as they always do after such events, she reasons (and Euripides slyly reminds us). The messenger with the news immediately follows (761). The expectations of a messenger's entrance are met, but only after the playwright draws attention to those expectations.[32]

And. 1070

The messenger's entrance at *And.* 1070 is a sort of 'talk of the devil' in reverse. When Peleus learns of the plot to kill his grandson, he wants to send a messenger to Delphi (1066–9):

> Oh my! This is dreadful. Won't someone
> As quickly as possible go to the Pythian altar
> And tell friends there what is planned,
> Before the child of Achilleus is killed by his enemies?

One of Peleus' attendants may begin to exit; maybe he does not even have time for that. It is too late in any case. Instead of a messenger leaving for Delphi, one arrives from there exclaiming (1070–1):

> Oh my!
> Unhappy I am to announce such turns of fortune
> To you, old man, and to my master's friends.

No one will explain the events to friends there (*toîs ekeî léxei phílois* 1068), but someone will report to friends here (*angelôn ... phíloisi, 1070–1*). A further verbal echo links the scenes: both Peleus and the messenger begin with a cry of woe (*oímoi*, 1066 and *ṓmoi moi*, 1070).[33]

Notes

1. Taplin's discussions on preparation, *passim* and esp. the introductory remarks, 9–12, are very useful (see also the bibliographic footnote, 65 n. 3). He too points to the limitations of restricting preparation to the mentioning of a character, limitations well illustrated in T.B.L. Webster, 'Preparation and Motivation in Greek Tragedy', *CR* 47 (1933), 117–23.
2. We should also observe that what a character says and does *after* he arrives, including the motivation he might give for his entrance, also affects the way we view the entrance. In what follows we are concerned primarily with what precedes the entrance, the preparation for the action that begins with the new entrance.
3. One could say much more about the actors' responses, the ways in which they differ from the audience's and the connections between the two. Unfortunately, this extends beyond the scope of our study.
4. On 'dramatic necessities' and story patterns in Greek tragedy, see R. Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (Ann Arbor 1964). His approach is picked up to some degree by A.P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971). Taplin, *passim*, also discusses situational preparation, and (11 n. 1) points to Aigeus' entrance in *Med.* as an example in Euripides.
5. See Aristole, *Poetics* 1461b, 19–21 and the scholion at *Med.* 666. On the Aigeus scene, see T.V. Buttrey, 'Accident and Design in Euripides' '*Medee.*', *AJP* 79 (1958) 1–17.
6. Page (ed.), xxxix, reminds us that we do not know whether this encounter between the two was traditional or not. If not, it is noteworthy that Euripides underscores the innovation with a dramatic surprise.
7. On the convention of words cast at a departing character's back which he does not hear, see Taplin, 'Significant Actions in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 12 (1971), 42 and n. 39, *Stagecraft*, 221–2, D. Bain, *Actors and Audiences: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 1977), 34 and n. 4, and Mastronarde, 30, 110.
8. Cf. *óloito* at *Hipp*, 407 Barrett's (ed.), *ad loc.*, calls it, 'so stereotyped a formula'.
9. Taplin, 220, includes this entrance among those in response to cries of grief or distress. It resembles those to an extent, but, unlike the others, this entrance is a great surprise.
10. On the motif of self-sacrifice in Euripides, see the bibliography cited by Collard (ed.), *Supplices*, vol. 2, 354–5, and recently on human sacrifice in Greek religion, A. Henrichs, 'Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies' in *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 27 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1981), 195–22.
11. The word used is *epísches*; see Chapter 2 n. 88.
12. On this scene see W. Ludwig, *Sapheneia: Ein Beitrag zur Formkunst im Spätwerk des Euripides* (Diss. Stuttgart 1954), 105–9.
13. The 'failure' of Pylades differs from the actions of Herakles in *Her.* Herakles does accomplish what the situation required and his entrance promised — he rescues the family. Only later is there a violent *peripeteia* that turns rescue to catastrophe.
14. Burnett (above n. 4), 186, also observes this.
15. On this feature of the play and on this scene, see Burnett's articulate discussion, 183–204.
16. See Stevens (ed.), *ad loc.*, for the problems of this character's identification — Nurse or servant.

17. For a summary of the many attempts to solve the problem of unity in this play, see H. Erbse, 'Euripides' "Andromache"', *Hermes* 94 (1966), 276–97. See W. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilos*, Zetemata 5 (Munich 1953), 47 ff, for Euripides' blending of the two actions (one old, one new) in both *And.* and *Hek.*

18. Taplin, 11–12, observes that an entrance can be surprising if only *some* aspect of it has not been prepared for. While this is correct in principle, we should be careful not to consider surprising all entrances some aspects of which have not been prepared for; otherwise, the entrances of all messengers with their news and of many other characters would be thought surprising. Perhaps the best example in Euripides of an entrance not prepared for in all its aspects is the Phrygian's at *Or.* 1369. After Helen's shouts from within and the tricking of Hermione into the *skene*, a variation on a familiar pattern (see Chapter 4), the audience expects someone to enter with the report of what has happened within. But no one could have expected the unusual entrance of the Phrygian slave, his exciting aria, and the peculiar news that Helen has disappeared.

19. On Orestes' entrance Mastronarde, 26, makes an interesting observation: '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 conspicuously manipulating arrival-conventions in order to induce Hermione to welcome him as her savior.'

20. G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955), 12. See his sensitive discussion of the play, 3–25.

21. Other entrances might fairly be considered here: e.g. Pheres' at *Alk.* 614, touched on briefly in the opening of this chapter. An entrance very similar in some ways to those discussed in this section is Menelaos' in *Tro.*, which introduces a new element into the drama, marked by the 'second prologue' delivered by Menelaos; but this entrance and the Helen scene it begins are not particularly surprising. See the discussion of *Tro.* in Chapter 5.

22. This further suggests that Euripides plays on the expectations of the more usual entrance after someone knocks on the door or calls to those within.

23. Is it fanciful to see an echo here of her entrance at Aisch. *Cho.* 668? In *Cho.* another young man, a disguised Orestes, comes to the door, emphasising that he wants to talk to the *man* in charge; Klytaimestra then appears at the *skene* door. The switching of sex roles is a theme of the trilogy, first suggested in the prologue of *Ag.*, 10–11.

24. The staging of this scene raises problems: how many doors does the *skene* have? what does *pūlas paroixas* (857) mean)? See Hourmouziades, 21–2. However the scene is staged, the effect will be fundamentally the same.

25. Hamilton, as indicated in Chapter 2 n. 65, considers this an 'Ersatz' announcement. But its only proper parallel, someone coming from the *skene* in response to noise on stage, is Makaria's entrance at *Hkld.* 474, which is clearly surprising.

26. These two entrances, in addition to other 'unexpected' features in Euripides, are discussed in G. Arnott, 'Euripides and the Unexpected', G & R Second Series 20 (1973), 49–64.

27. N.E. Collinge, 'Medea *Ex Machina*', *CP* 57 (1962), 171, remarks, 'we are all — audience, chorus, Jason and attendants — wildly misled at the moment of Medea's final entrance.'

28. Page (ed.), *ad loc.*, comments on the mark this line left on posterity, as judged by parodies and imitations, and he suggests that the combination of the word with the context of its delivery, 'would make the innovation more noticeable and memorable'.

29. On 'talk of the devil' entrances and distinctions within them, see Taplin, 137–8, who uses the phrase somewhat differently from the way I do. With his more restricted definition, he grants for Euripides only three 'examples of a sort': *El.* 761, *Bakch* 1216, *IA* 1106. Add *Med.* 1121 to those I discuss in this section.

30. See Mastronarde, 25, on this entrance and the gradual contact.

31. On this 'entrance' and other 'clever' elements in Euripides, see R.P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Euripides: Poiētēs Sophos', *Arethusa* 2 (1969), 129–42.

32. Winnington-Ingram, 131–2, also discusses the self-consciousness of this passage.

33. Uncertainties mar discussion of two passages. The servant who addresses Hippolytos (*Hipp.* 88ff) comes from where — from the band that attends Hippolytos (Wilamowitz, ed.)? from the 'background' (Taplin, 90)? from the *skene*? Hourmouziades (18–19) makes a suggestion deserving serious consideration: the servant, hearing the returning hunters, opens the door for them, and, hence, comes into contact with Hippolytos. However the entrance is staged, it is not especially surprising and it does not greatly alter the course of events, although the servant's advice serves as a useful foil to Hippolytos' views on Aphrodite. The identity of the one who opposes Theoklymenos in *Hel.* remains unknown. Messenger (Campbell, ed.), coryphaeus (Kannicht and Dale, eds.), and servant (most recently, D.P. Stanley-Porter, 'Who Opposes Theoclymenus?', *CP* 72 (1977), 45–8) have all been put forth as candidates. Whoever it is, this sudden opposition is quite extraordinary. *If* this opposition involves an entrance, it certainly is a surprising one, and, although it does not stop Theoklymenos, it does offer, with the following appearance of the Dioskouroi, a contrast between human and divine power.

Stagecraft in **Euripides**

MICHAEL R. HALLERAN

BARNES & NOBLE BOOKS
Totowa, New Jersey