5 THREE PLAYS

1. Herakles

In his opening *rhesis* Amphitryon does not refer to his supplication at the altar until line 48. Thus readers of the text are ignorant of the setting until that point, but the audience is immediately aware of this setting, since they see Amphitryon and the others there at the play's beginning. Because no curtain unveils the tableau, the audience also sees the characters come on stage and assume their suppliant pose. This type of 'cancelled'[1] first entrance is not uncommon in tragedy; it permits at the opening of the play a tableau which the audience 'discovers' and by convention assumes to have been there for a certain length of time (not inconsiderable in this case; see 51–3). Significantly, we see Amphitryon, Megara and Herakles' children in this opening tableau; it suggests that they are immobile and passive — the altar is their only refuge. Amphitryon's *rhesis* verbally confirms and strengthens the visual suggestion of helplessness. Since Herakles has not returned from his final labour (in Hades) and the usurper Lykos has threatened to murder the family, they have taken refuge at the altar (22–41). Amphitryon himself can offer no defence: old age virtually excludes him from the ranks of men (41–2). They need someone to save them (54), since their friends are either incapable of providing aid or are not true friends after all: misfortune is the truest test of friendship (55–9).

Opening tableaux in Euripides, whether of suppliants or not (the others are *Hkld.*, *And.*, *Hik.*, *Tro.*, *Hel.*, *Or.*), always depict the helplessness and typically the isolation of the character(s) involved. Here the tableau, showing the family's plight, suggests the tension that is played out in the first part of the drama: Herakles' family needs someone to save them — who, if anyone, will be their saviour? Ironically, as it turns out, they are suppliants at an altar dedicated to Zeus the Saviour (48), an altar set up by Herakles himself (49–50). The family's special connection to Zeus, familiar from mythology and proudly emphasised in the play's opening lines, does not bring them any aid (as Amphitryon thinks it should; see 339ff), even when they supplicate at his altar.

Megara replies to Amphitryon's speech with despair and an acceptance of the inevitability of death (70ff), and Amphitryon concludes the scene with an exhortation to maintain hope, hope which even he will abandon in the next act. The chorus of old Theban men then enters, singing the *parodos*. In three other 'suppliant' plays (*Hkld.*, *And.*, *Hel.*) the chorus arrives with concern for the welfare of the characters on stage.[2] In *Her.* Euripides shows a chorus concerned with the suppliants' welfare, but he has them devote most of the *parodos* to a description of their own decrepit state. They are no more than words and dreams (111–12), they proclaim, and merely walking is an effort for them (118ff). By emphasising their debilitated condition, Euripides underlines the family's helplessness. These men are well-intentioned towards the suppliants and eager to help (114), but as their belaboured entrance and song tell us, they cannot. Amphitryon was right: those who are the family's friends are unable to come to their rescue. Later in the play the choristers can offer only *words* in response to Lykos' threats despite their talk of action (252ff, 312ff).[3] Help, if it is to come, must come from another source.

We noted in Chapter Two the anomaly of the chorus' entrance (107) not being announced despite the presence of more than one person on stage. Might this breaking of the convention serve to emphasise the suppliants' isolation and passivity? They appear on stage at the play's beginning, and, needless to say, they do not exit before the chorus arrives. We expect from them an announcement of the chorus, but find none. The family appears static and incapable of even the simplest action.

The end of the *parodos* leads into the following scene. The deictic pronoun *haide* (131) marks a transition towards the more specific concern with the children, and the closing appeal to Hellas at the loss of the children (135–7) implicitly prepares us for Lykos' entrance. Although Lykos is not actually named in the *parodos*, the prologue scene makes clear who is going to rob Hellas of these children, and almost at once upon arrival (140) he asks the suppliants why they seek to prolong their life (143). The juxtaposition of song and entrance underscores the imminence of the murders. (The reason for the announcement (138–9) of an entrance directly following the strophic song was discussed in Chapter 2.) The entrance after the *parodos* is often reserved for an important or dominant character — e.g. Medeia in *Med.*, Phaidra in *Hipp.*, Kreousa in *Ion.*[4] Lykos, the threat depicted in the prologue scene

and prepared for at the end of the *parodos*, enters, and the helpless family of Herakles is now confronted by their potential murderer. We have observed that an entering character usually initiates the action by speaking first when he enters, and Lykos is no exception in this regard, as he begins the conversation when he arrives. In fact, he begins by delivering a thirty-line speech.[5] Although this is not extremely unusual, it is not the normal pattern: generally an entering character establishes contact with those on stage by way of a dialogue, and then he might have a *rhesis*. *And.* provides a close parallel:[6] Andromache is a suppliant at an altar and, after the *parodos*, the persecutor, Hermione, arrives with threats. Hermione is aggressive and domineering, while Andromache, until she starts her reply, seems passive and powerless at the altar. In *Her.* not only do Lykos' words seem threatening, but the pattern of a long *rhesis* upon entrance also suggests his dominance.[7]

Although he loses the argument with Amphitryon, Lykos does not delay in carrying out his threats. He responds with actions, not words (238–9): he will burn them at the altar (242ff). The chorus of weak, old men can, we have noted, do nothing but verbally condemn Lykos. Fire is not needed, however, since Megara, faced with what she feels is the necessity of death (282ff) and sure that Herakles will not return from Hades (296ff), convinces Amphitryon of her decision to leave the altar and face death bravely. She does win from Lykos permission to enter the house in order to put on the proper garments for death (327ff).[8]

Lykos, claiming that he will return when the family has donned these garments, exits down one of the *parodoi* at 335. Megara bids the children to accompany her inside the house (336–8), while Amphitryon, before his departure, calls on Zeus and reproaches him for not aiding the family of his reputed son (339–47). This succession of three exits[9] has drawn the attention of no one, although it has only one close parallel in Greek tragedy — *Ion* 442ff, where Xouthos, Kreousa, and Ion leave the stage successively. What is the effect of the triple successive exits in *Her.*? A suppliant leaves the altar either when he has been saved or when he goes to his death.[10] Here the latter is the case (at least it seems to be) and the unusual exit pattern highlights this solemn moment. Secondly, as in *Ion*, the last one to exit, Amphitryon, has a brief soliloquy, in which he challenges Zeus and claims superiority as the mortal father of Herakles.[11] After the first two exits, the spotlight, as it were, falls on Amphitryon, and the questions he raises

about divine justice and Herakles' paternity[12] — major themes of the play — receive greater emphasis. That it is Zeus' altar that they are abandoning gives Amphitryon's remarks added point.

The first stasimon (348–441) begins after Amphitryon exits into the *skene*. His closing comparison to Zeus as the father of Herakles is echoed in the first strophe, as the chorus is uncertain whether to call Herakles the son of Zeus or the son of Amphitryon (353–4).[13] A further, more subtle connection is perhaps found in the juxtaposition of the exit to don the new garments and the description in the second stanza of the first labour, Herakles killing the Nemean lion — and wearing its skin (359–63):

> First he rid Zeus' grove
> Of the lion,
> And putting the skin on his back
> He covered his blond head
> With the dread beast's tawny jaw.

The Nemean lion, the canonical first labour, not surprisingly is related first; the emphasis in the song, however, falls not on the struggle, but on the donning of the lion skin. Herakles put on the lion skin, and this skin made him invulnerable. (Although the invincibility of the skin is not referred to here, it was sufficiently well known from mythological tradition and choral poetry[14].) His father, wife and children have just departed to dress in robes that mean their death (although ultimately from a different and unexpected source). The connection between these robes and the lion skin is not, we have noted, explicitly made, only suggested by the juxtaposition. Attention is drawn, however, to these funereal garments both before the ode (329ff) and immediately afterwards (442–3).

The ode in its conclusion moves towards the present situation: after singing of Herakles' 'final' labour, the descent into Hades, from which he has not returned (425ff), the old men return in the last stanza to their own inability to defend the children (436–41):

> But if I had the strength of my youth
> And could wield the spear in battle,
> With my Theban comrades,
> I would champion the children.
> But as things are now, I lack my blessed youth.

The old men's inability to defend the children, caused by their lack of youth (emphatically stated by the placement of *hḗbōn* and *hḗbās* at verse-final position, 436, 441), prepares us for the following entrance. And when the family enters from the *skene*, it is the children who receive the first individual announcement (444–5).

The chorus announces in anapests this entrance of the children, Megara and Amphitryon directly after a strophic song (442–50). In Chapter 2 we observed that the entrance was one of several 'moving tableaux' in Euripides — a slow, stately or solemn entrance, in this case of those condemned to die. The announcement, unusual according to the basic pattern of entrance announcements, draws attention to the entrance and highlights the pathos of these innocent victims. Their suffering is also reflected in the tears of the chorus (449–50). The vivid description of the children and Megara also underscores their pathetic entrance (444–7):

> The children of once-great Herakles
> And his wife dragging behind her
> The children who cling to her feet ...[15]

As suggested in Chapter 4, the scene following this ode and leading up to Herakles' arrival is, in a sense, an extension of the previous action, the final build-up to that entrance. We witness Megara's laments over the imminent murders and her wistful reminiscences of Herakles' (unfulfilled) promises to the children (451ff). Amphitryon issues his second challenge to Zeus and reflects on the uncertainties of life (497ff). (Note the repetition of *mátēn* in the two challenges to Zeus, twice in the first one (339–40) and once in the second (501).) The scene recreates their hapless situation, only now they are even closer to death as they appear in their funeral robes and no longer sit at Zeus' altar (still a visible stage property). Herakles is needed to save them, but, we have heard repeatedly throughout the first part of the drama, he is in Hades and cannot return.

The ode celebrating Herakles' labours makes it especially surprising that he appears, since, as Wilamowitz suggested,[16] the song is a type of *thrênos* in praise of the dead Herakles. The song thus embodies the tension that the playwright creates and plays with in the first third of the drama. Extolling Herakles' exploits, the chorus reminds us of how great a hero he was and (implicitly) how easily

he could right the situation in Thebes, but the *thrênos* form tells us that he is dead. And the song emphatically ends with his 'final' labour (*pónōn teleután*, 427[17]); he remains in Hades. Herakles cannot return to save his family, yet at the same time the force of the drama seems to demand that he do just that.[18] This paradox animates the first part of the play, as Euripides manipulates the audience both to deny the possibility and to feel keenly the need of Herakles' arrival. The arrival that one should expect on the surface level is that of Lykos, who said that he would return as soon as the victims had put on their robes (334–5), and this expectation (the murderer's entrance is overdue) adds to the tension of the scene.

Before Amphitryon's speech that immediately precedes Herakles' entrance, Megara ends her reflections with a final despairing call to Herakles, concluding with a *tricolon crescendo* that rhetorically emphasises the family's sore need (494–5):

> Help! Come! Appear to me even as a shadow!
> For it would be enough even if you came as a dream.

Amphitryon's final prayer, directed to Zeus, bespeaks resignation (esp. 502) more than a request for help. Overturning this despair and as if in answer to Megara's prayer, Herakles does (finally) arrive, a surprising entrance at the critical moment, producing the first major turnabout of the play. We do not find a simple two- or three-line entrance announcement followed by Herakles' initiation of dialogue with those on stage; the potential dramatic force of the moment is exploited fully by Euripides.

'*éa*', Megara exclaims, when she thinks she spots Herakles entering from the *parodos*. She says it may be a dream (517–18), echoing her prayer that he come even as a dream; but finally she realises that it is, in fact, her husband and she bids the children to cling to his robes.[19] The gradual realisation that Herakles has suddenly appeared effectively displays her confusion, disbelief and joy at his appearance. Herakles enters, but he does not at first notice his family before him. His first words, appropriately for one returning home, are a greeting to home and hearth (523–4). Then he sees his family in their death robes and, upon making this contact, he cries out *éa* (reminding us of Megara's cry when she first saw him arriving?). Mastronarde has formulated a scheme for this type of Euripidean entrance pattern, which he calls 'partial vision': (1) comment of newcomer in isolation from contact; (2) visual contact

parodos-to-stage (frequently marked, as here, by *éa* with comment out of contact); (3) initiation of dialogue. Both the atypical announcement and the use of 'partial vision' help to highlight the importance of the entrance and the emotion of the characters.

Reunited with his family and informed of Lykos' crimes, Herakles promises protection and revenge. At the end of the scene (636), Herakles, his children, wife and father exit into the *skene* together (not separately as the family did at the end of the previous act). Herakles describes how he and the children enter into the palace (631–2):

> Taking them by the hand I will lead these little boats
> And like a ship I will pull them in tow.

This description of the exit reminds us of the children's entrance at the beginning of the act. We recall that the chorus described the children's entrance with Megara in these words (445–47):

> And his wife dragging behind her
> The children who cling to her feet.

The chorus does not employ the nautical image, but *ephélkxō* (632) echoes *hélkousan* (446), and the descriptions of the entrance and exit are similar in other respects also. Tears accompany both entrance and exit: at the end of the announcement of the family (442–50), the chorus proclaims that it cannot hold back its tears (449–50) and Herakles tells the children to stop their tears as they all begin to exit (625). A comparison between entrance and exit, explicitly suggesting that they are 'mirror scenes', is made in fact by Herakles himself (622–4):

> But come, children, into your father's house.
> Fairer are your entrances into it
> Than your exits from it.

The entrance from the *skene* at the beginning of the scene seemed to mean the family's death and did not, while the exit which concludes the scene seems to indicate their safety and does not. The drama is only half-finished, and another and more surprising turnabout remains. 'Everyone loves his children,' (636) Herakles' final words as he exits, possess, as the audience will see, a very grim irony.

The famous hymn to Youth is sung in response to Herakles' return and rescue of his family. The previous song had been a *thrênos*, singing the praises of the (presumed) dead Herakles; this one functions as an encomium of the living and triumphant hero.[20] And it aids in the establishment of the victorious mood that will soon be shattered. The chorus concludes with emphatic praise of Herakles' *aretḗ*[21] (696–700):

> He is Zeus' son. Surpassing
> In excellence more than in birth,
> With much toil he made life
> Tranquil for mortals
> By destroying terrifying beasts.

This closing is connected to the following entrance. Lykos arrives as these words still ring in our ears. Following these words the tyrant, whose name, of course, means wolf, seems to be another beast whose terror Herakles will extinguish.[22] The ode, then, both extols Herakles' previous feats and leads into the next one.

Lykos and Amphitryon arrive almost simultaneously after the stasimon, the former appearing on stage only shortly before the latter emerges from the *skene*.[23] Lykos is informed that the family has taken refuge at the hearth within, and he is easily duped into entering the house, where, the audience well knows, Herakles lies in ambush. In his brief exchange with Lykos, Amphitryon employs ambiguous and occasionally false words; once Lykos exits, the ambiguities (last found in 727–8) give way to an explicit prediction of what awaits Lykos. The chorus follows with its prediction of the usurper's overthrow (734ff) and Lykos' cries are soon heard from within (750, 754). This pattern of events — entrance into the *skene*, 'words at the back', and choral prediction — is found several times in Euripides (see Chapter 4). The predicted murder does not always occur (cf. *Antiope*). Here the murder does take place, but a complete reversal follows. The scene between Amphitryon and Lykos is extremely brief in order not to disturb the mood of joy and celebration expressed in the two songs that frame it.[24] Lykos has to be killed, but he is treated as no more than another beast to be vanquished. The playwright focuses on Herakles' return and success.

After their immediate response to Lykos' death (755ff), the choristers begin the third stasimon proper (763–814). They continue in the ode the theme of divine justice that they have already pronounced (757ff). The ode sings not merely in joy and celebration, but in a belief in a theodicy as witnessed in Herakles' return and triumph.[25] The surprising entrance that follows not only ruptures the mood of joy but overturns the proclamations of divine justice.[26]

The ode complements the previous one: Herakles' homecoming is now complete with the punishment of Lykos. Together, and interrupted by only a very short scene, these two songs create the intense, almost palpable, mood of joy and faith. The third stasimon, however, ends with a trace of doubt in its final words, a rhetorical supposition (813–14):

> If justice still is pleasing to the gods.

The hint of doubt,[27] though, seems no more than a whisper in the context of this and the preceding song and actions. But the whisper is answered by shouts of fear as the chorus cries out at the apparition above the house (815–17):

> Ah! Ah!
> Do we all now have the same fear,
> Old men, since I see such a phantom above the house?

Iris and Lyssa have come to madden Herakles.[28] The joy of the ode has proved wrong: the gods are not just and Herakles' return is not triumphant after all. Not only is this appearance unexpected (perhaps it is the most surprising entrance in extant tragedy), it is unusual as well. The gods in Euripides, except for the special case of the 'mortal' Dionysos in *Bakch.*, appear only in the prologues, where they never interact with mortal characters, and at the end of the dramas. Secondly, this is the only instance of superhuman figures making a joint entrance. (The Dioskouroi, twins who always have only one speaking part, are different.) The unusual and sudden appearance of Iris and Lyssa completely reverses Herakles' fortune and the direction of the play.

After Iris returns to Olympos and Lyssa enters the house to wreak destruction on Herakles' family, the chorus predicts the death of the children (884–5). We experience this destruction in

many stages: first Iris and Lyssa explain that they will cause the murders; the chorus in lyrics then predicts them; Amphitryon's[29] cries are heard from within, interspersed with choral laments; a messenger enters from the *skene* with a full description; and, finally, the *ekkyklema* is rolled out with the corpses and the subdued Herakles, while Amphitryon follows in on foot (see 1039–41). Herakles' murder of the children echoes his murder of Lykos, thus emphasising his painful change of fortune. The echo is especially pronounced by the similarities in the lyrics that attend the murders.[31] In both cases the chorus sings predominantly in dochmiacs, first alone (734–48/875–85), then in response to the cries heard from within (749–62/886–908). The second scene is more spectacular with the mention of both the earthquake (905)[32] and the appearance of Athene (906ff).

Before the *ekkyklema* is rolled out, the chorus responds to the messenger's eyewitness account with a brief astrophic song (1016–38), in which they proclaim that these murders surpass even those of the Danaids and Prokne. Comparing these murders to a mythohistorical event immediately before the corpses are seen, the chorus emphatically underscores the barbarity and terror of the deed. This final song is brief (*after* the *ekkyklema* and Amphitryon appear, i.e. at the start of the *next* scene, there is a lyric duet between the chorus and Amphitryon) because, having built up our expectations by revealing the murders in several stages, the poet now hastens to the 'ocular proof'.[33]

When the *skene* door opens at 1028 and the *ekkyklema* is rolled out, the chorus describes the corpses of Megara and the children, and Herakles tied to a pillar.[34] The lyric 'announcement' of this contraption (1028ff) both allows for it to be brought into position and adds to the importance of the moment, since announcements in lyrics are quite rare (see Chapter 4). This tableau reminds us of the drama's opening scene. The play began with the tableau of Amphitryon, Megara and the children at the altar. Now, not Megara and the children, but their corpses surround Herakles, who is tied to a pillar, which, like the altar, is a striking stage property. The supplication at Zeus' altar failed, and Herakles' rescue also failed: the now barren altar has not very far from it on stage this scene of divinely-wrought carnage about Herakles and the pillar.

The ensuing scene between Amphitryon and the chorus creates tension about the moment of Herakles' waking, as Amphitryon,

fearful that his son may murder him as well, tries to quiet the chorus before they disturb the subdued hero.[35] When, however, it appears that Herakles is about to awaken, Amphitryon withdraws to one side of the stage (see 1081ff) and we wonder whether Herakles is still mad and will he attack his father.

As when he first entered at 523, Herakles, upon waking, has only limited vision of the stage, which in this case emphasises his confusion as he emerges from his sleep and attempts to get his bearings. *éa*, his first word (1089) marks his astonishment, and this is soon followed by confused questions when he does make contact with his surroundings, signalled by *idoú* at 1094. Just as Agave in *Bakch.* realises only in stages what she has done, so Herakles only gradually becomes aware of his murderous deeds. First he has only incomplete contact with the stage; then, when he makes fuller contact, he is shocked at what he sees; at last, in conversation with his father he learns of the murders. Ashamed of what he has done, Herakles decides on suicide, emphatically breaking off the stichomythia he had with his father in order to contemplate various methods (1146ff).

But the play does not end on this bleak note.[36] Theseus, who will rescue the rescuer, arrives and eventually persuades Herakles to live with him in Athens. Like Herakles and Iris and Lyssa, Theseus enters as a surprise. (He has been mentioned earlier in the play, 619–21, but we do not expect him at this point.) Thus the three *peripeteiai* of this play are all marked by surprise entrances. Herakles arrives after the possiblity of his arrival has been repeatedly denied; Iris and Lyssa appear completely out of the blue; and Theseus' entrance has had only the most minimal preparation. Herakles' first words when he sees Theseus approaching indicate that this entrance thwarts his suicide (1153–4):

> But interrupting my plans for suicide,
> Here comes Theseus, my kin and friend.

Theseus does not arrive after these two lines, but rather at 1163, about ten lines later. In the lines preceding this entrance Herakles expresses his shame at being seen by Theseus and his fear that his pollution will contaminate his friend. He veils his head (1159) in an attempt to hide his shame. Entering characters by convention do not hear the announcements that precede their arrivals,[38] and thus the poet here has the opportunity to display Herakles' reaction to Theseus' arrival — his deep fear and his shame — without Theseus' observing it.

Nowhere, I think, is the convention of 'partial vision' exploited more fully than in this play. Theseus upon his entrance does not notice the scattered corpses or Herakles. Like most entering characters, he initiates the dialogue, explaining to Amphitryon that he has arrived to bring aid to Herakles in return for the good deeds Herakles has done for him (1163–71). Then he notices the corpses, marking his recognition with the shout *éa*. Again we see the effectiveness of this convention. Taking Theseus by surprise in the middle of his speech, the scene of murder gains in its shock. While he enters and talks to Amphitryon, we are aware of the bodies and we await his recognition. When he does notice the bodies, our expectations are fulfilled. He does not notice Herakles until later (1189), and he does not actually see Herakles' face until the latter unveils himself at 1228. Like Herakles, Theseus makes contact and realises what has happened only in stages.

After a long debate, Theseus does persuade Herakles to continue living; and Herakles visually signals his acceptance of life when he decides to continue carrying his bow (1377ff). They will go to Athens and Amphitryon will remain and bury the children. Both stage actions and an unusual structure in the dialogue impress on us the impact of the separation of father and son. After Herakles accepts Theseus' invitation to be led to Athens, he desires to see the children and to embrace his father (1406ff). Theseus then reminds Herakles of his former valour, and finally Herakles bids farewell to his father and exits with Theseus, while Amphitryon exits into the *skene*.[39] Lines 1418 and 1420, spoken on departure, contain two changes of speaker, double *antilabḗ*, a striking feature that occurs only four other times in Euripides, and nowhere else in such proximity.[40] This unusual feature combines with the stage actions to add pathos to the departure. Amphitryon must go within and face the burial of the children, and Herakles is separated from the only member of his family he did not kill, the man whom he considers his 'real' father (cf. 1264–5).

Theseus leading Herakles off stage vividly recalls the exit before the second stasimon of Herakles, the protector of his family, leading them off to safety. The parallel between these two scenes is most striking: arriving in time to prevent their deaths at Lykos' hands, Herakles leads his family to apparent safety in the house, while Theseus comes on stage just in time to prevent Herakles

from suicide. A distinct verbal echo strengthens the link between Herakles' two exits. When Herakles escorts the children into the house he refers to them as 'little boats ... in tow' (*epholkidas*, 631), while, as he exits with Theseus, he remarks (1423–4):[41]

> I, having destroyed my house with shameful deeds,
> All ruined, I will follow Theseus, a little boat in tow
> (*epholkides*).

We observed above that the first exit echoed the family's earlier entrance after the first stasimon and that the language of the family's announcement (442ff) is picked up in Herakles' exiting words (622ff). Thus language re-enforces the link among all three stage actions: the entrance of the family in funeral robes; their exit with Herakles; and Herakles' exit with Theseus.

There is a real progression in these three stage actions: in the first, the suppliants who had left the altar enter to apparent death; in the second, they exit, rescued from death, but the exit to safety is illusory; at the end of the drama, the final exit of Theseus with Herakles provides true safety. Herakles' concluding statement on friendship (1425–6) is no idle *sententia*. It echoes the ending of Amphitryon's opening *rhesis* (57–9) and points to what does endure in this play of sudden and violent turns of fortune. Herakles' protection of his family was short-lived. Even (especially?) the sons of gods are subject to the harsh blows of fortune and Hera. Theseus' friendship, however, proving itself in the test of difficulties, offers some solace and strength. The conquerer of so many beasts has himself been brought low, but with Theseus' friendship, he has at least survived.[42]

2. Troades

Tro., like several other Euripidean plays, commences with a divine prologue speaker: Poseidon enters,[43] explains why he has come, and relates the history and present circumstances of Troy. *Tro.* seems to begin as several other Euripidean plays do, but in fact it is extraordinary.

Bidding farewell to his dear city, Poseidon begins to exit (45–7):[44]

> But, goodbye city that once was fortunate
> And the polished walls. You would still be standing
> If Pallas, Zeus' child, had not destroyed you.

Athene then appears,[45] delaying this exit; she wants to enlist his aid in punishing the Greeks. This entrance surprises, and the surprise underlines the turnabout in Athene's design: a former patron of the Greeks (alluded to in Poseidon's final lines, quoted above), she now wants to punish them because of their offence to herself and her temple (69). At the same time, Poseidon's farewell serves as a bridge to her appearance ('talk of the devil'). The effect of Athene's arrival is further highlighted by its abrupt delay of Poseidon's exit. The technique of delaying an exit by another arrival is not uncommon in tragedy.[46] At *IA* 855, e.g., Achilleus has begun to exit when the old man emerges from the *skene*, delaying his exit with the crucial information of the intended sacrifice of Iphigeneia; and the servant at *Hel.* 597 interrupts Menelaos' departure with the startling news of the phantom Helen.[47] In these cases, and in several others, the entrance that delays an exit is pivotal, as it changes the course of events. The power of Athene's entrance here has special point. By this forceful presentation of Athene's turning against the Greeks, Euripides emphasises the punishment that awaits them on their way home, and thus provides the backdrop of the entire play. The continual suffering of the Trojans that we witness on stage is only in seeming contrast to the victory of the Greeks; they, too, the prologue scene informs us, will suffer. This irony runs throughout the play, from Hekabe's opening laments to the collapse of the city in the *exodos*.[48] The frequent references to the Greeks' sailing home and the many nautical images (e.g. 102ff, 115ff, 137, 537ff, 686ff) remind us of this irony.[49] Athene's surprise entrance also underlines the fickleness of the gods, a theme of the drama: the gods, we repeatedly hear, have abandoned once-great Troy and they can turn against Greek and Trojan alike. (Poseidon himself draws attention to the inconstancy of his niece — 59–60, 67–8.)

The divinities depart at 97 (or perhaps Athene exits a little before — see 92), and Hekabe, alone on stage, prostrate in front of the doors to the tents (see 37), begins in anapests her tale of woe. Although she does not speak until this moment, she has been an object of the spectators' concern since before the play began. The actor playing Hekabe had to take up position on stage and then

later be 'discovered' by the audience, another example of a 'cancelled' first entrance. The situation in *Tro.*, however, is different from that of any other Euripidean play, because the discovery of the 'cancelled' entrance fully occurs only when Hekabe begins to speak at 98, not at the beginning of the drama. (*Or.* is dissimilar, because, although Orestes does not wake until 211, Elektra enters with him and delivers the opening monologue.) And only in *Tro.* is there another character on stage during the divine prologue scene. Perhaps we are reminded of Aischylos' famous silent characters, but in those cases a special emphasis is put on the silence or the breaking of it.[50] Here there is no mention of Hekabe's silence or her breaking it at 98, but she is the first person to catch the spectators' attention, Poseidon refers to her as prostrate and grieving (employing the deictic *tḗnd(e)* at 36) and she is visible to the audience throughout the divine prologue scene. Although she is not the explicit focus of attention, we cannot but see and wonder about the prostrate figure on stage. No one draws attention to Hekabe's silence for a very good reason — there is no one to do so. The divine prologue scene, even when another character is on stage during it, is detached in a sense from the action of the play. Poseidon does refer to her, but no dialogue can occur. The opening of this play is comparable to a 'split-screen' in film. On one 'side' we see the gods, while on the other we view the solitary and passive Hekabe.[51] Instead of bringing Hekabe on stage after this divine prologue scene (as he did in *Hek.*), Euripides with this staging from the very beginning presents her suffering and isolation.[52] The gulf between gods and mortals is also marked, as always in Euripidean prologue scenes, by the change in metre from the divinities to the mortal character who follows: Poseidon and Athene speak in iambic trimeter; Hekabe begins in anapests.

Hekabe is the dominant character of the drama: she is on stage from the very beginning to the closing moments, a sustained presence matched in extant tragedy only by Prometheus in *PB.*[53] Her pathos is given much attention, especially in this scene between the prologue and the entry of the chorus.[54] The chorus enters in two groups, at 153 and 176 respectively. The motivation for the first entrance, is their concern that Hekabe's cries, which they have heard from within (153–8) portend some new ill. The second group of Trojan women is called out (165–7), and they explain that they arrive to learn what awaits them (176ff). Perhaps Hekabe's final words before the first group enters help to prepare

for these entrances (146–52):

> But like a mother
> I will lead (*exárxō*) for the winged birds
> A piercing song, very different
> From the ones which at one time,
> Leaning on Priam's sceptre
> Leading the chorus (*archechórou*) in Phrygian rhythms,
> I used to lead (*exêrchon*) in honour of the gods.[55]

The repetition (*exárxō, archechórou, exêrchon*) is emphatic; Hekabe, like a mother bird with her young, will lead the duet that follows. These women of the chorus share Hekabe's plight, and in this song the lamentations already heard are given new expression and development.

At the conclusion of this song the choristers wonder whither they will be taken, what city will hold them, now that Troy is gone. Immediately after the song, they announce in anapests the arrival of Talthybios. That there is any announcement at all directly after a strophic song is exceptional,[56] and this and the excited questions at the end of the announcement ('What news does he bring? What does he say?' 233) heighten the expectancy of the entrance. We have witnessed the pathetic situation of Hekabe and the other Trojan women and listened to the speculations about their futures, and now Talthybios arrives with the answers.

Kassandra, the first captive to be led away, makes a striking entrance at 308. Following his exchange with Hekabe (he in iambic trimeters, she in lyrics), explaining the lot of the various captives, Talthybios begins to fulfil his commands: he orders some of his men to bring out Kassandra so that he can lead her to Agamemnon (294–7). This is not the first time that Kassandra has been brought to our attention: her 'marriage' to Agamemnon is mentioned in the prologue scene (41–4); Hekabe expressly tells the chorus not to send her out of the tents (168ff); and Hekabe calls to her offstage to throw off her religious emblems (256–8) when she learns that Agamemnon will have her as his mistress. Perhaps Talthybios' men begin to execute his order. If so, they do not proceed very far when the herald cries out (298):

> Ah! What blaze of a torch shines within?

The shout drives our attention to the *skene* door, and we wonder along with Talthybios what is going on within: are the captives burning their quarters and themselves in despair (299–302)? Finally the herald bids someone to open the door. At that moment Hekabe announces that the captives are not killing themselves, but Kassandra is running out in a frenzied state, carrying a torch.[57] We are prepared for the entrance from the *skene*, but the manner is surprising. Not led forth by Talthybios' men, but of her own accord, Kassandra enters. She is in control not only of her entrance from the *skene*,[58] but also of the ensuing scene, and, in a sense, of her captor's fate. She suggests in this stage action what she articulates in the scene. When the former priestess rushes out in song and dance, carrying a torch, celebrating her impending marriage to Agamemnon in a wedding hymn, this seems grossly inappropriate to Hekabe. But it makes more sense as Kassandra explains, with gradual clarity, that the wedding will mean her victory over the enemy.[59] She continues to suggest her control as it is she who has the final words before departure (her *rhesis* at 424–61), words that spell out the fates in store for Odysseus and Agamemnon.[60] When they do depart at 461, Hekabe collapses in response to this latest grief, the loss of Kassandra (see 462ff). Prone as she was at the beginning of the drama,[61] she delivers a *rhesis* before the first stasimon. Again the audience focuses on Hekabe, who reveals more of her sad tale and intense suffering.

Inspired by Hekabe's closing *sententia* before the ode ('Of the prosperous/Consider no one fortunate, until he dies' (509–10)), the chorus describes the night Troy fell. The connection between an image in this ode and the following entrance was discussed in Chapter 4. In the epode describing the horrors of Troy's fall, the chorus depicts the suffering of children (557–9):

> And dear infants
> Were throwing their frightened arms
> Around their mothers' robes.

The subsequent entrance vividly echoes this picture, as Andromache and her son enter in a wagon (568–71):

> Hekabe, do you see Andromache here,
> Carried in on the enemy's cart?

> And her own Astyanax, Hektor's son,
> Is at her heaving breast.

The suffering caused by the city's fall continues. (Later in this act Andromache, when she learns that her son is to be killed, asks the infant why he clings to her robes (750–1), another echo of the image in the ode.) Similarity in metre also links the end of the ode to this entrance. The epode is iambic, ending with syncopated iambic dimeters, and Andromache, after the announcement in anapests, begins with syncopated iambics as well.

This entrance of a 'moving tableau' (see Chapter 2) is impressive, and that it is a wagon not a chariot, which conveys the pair is significant. The Athenian spectators were not unfamiliar with chariots coming on stage with members of the royal household (e.g. Aisch. *Pers.* and *Ag.* and Eur. *El.*, probably produced not many years before). The simple wagon carrying Hektor's wife and son among other objects of spoil (573–4) deeply impresses the viewer, who makes the implicit comparison with the more usual chariot scene.

Talthybios' return (709) injects a new element into the action: not only is Andromache to be led away to serve Neoptolemos, but Astyanax, the herald reports, is to be killed in Troy. This entrance follows immediately after Hekabe has advised Andromache to yield to her new master, as distasteful as that might be, for one reason — so that she might rear Astyanax as the founder of a new Troy (697–705). The boy is held forth as the last hope for Troy; then Talthybios enters with the news to destroy this hope. The herald's ominous opening ('I wish I did not have to give this message', 711) and the gradual revelation of the news intensify the moment.

The conclusion of this scene visually presents the pathetic separation of mother and son. Towards the end of her attack on the Greeks, Andromache with bitter sarcasm invites the soldiers to kill and feast on her son (774–5). Perhaps Andromache, having handed over Astyanax as she made her invitation (or at the end of the speech), is carried off in the wagon. It is also possible that she does not leave the stage at this moment, and Talthybios[62] addresses Astyanax (782ff) while still in his mother's embrace. '*lambánet(e)*' ('Seize him', 786), then, is addressed to those who take the child from his mother directly. This is more economical in terms of stage actions — the infant is not passed from hand to hand

— and Talthybios' comments (786–9) are more forceful if he has at this moment separated mother and son, and not merely handed over the child to his men. The silence and passivity of Andromache while the herald calls the child to his death and the simultaneous exits in opposite directions (one to the ships, the other to the city) would be very affecting.[63] In either case, mother and son, both under someone else's power, are carried off stage while Hekabe remains. Again at the end of the scene we focus on Hekabe's sufferings in this 'tailpiece' to the act. She bewails her powerlessness to save Astyanax. Hekabe voices these laments in anapests. The act thus has a metrical frame: anapests announce the arrival and pronounce and lament the departure of Andromache and her child, while the body of the act, after the opening lyrics, is in spoken iambic trimeters.

After this most heinous act against Astyanax, the chorus in the second stasimon (799–859) declares that the gods have forsaken Troy. The city has been sacked twice, and even though Ganymede and Tithonos have had gods as lovers, the city has still been destroyed. The links between this song and Menelaos' following entrance (discussed in Chapter 4) are striking. His opening address to the sun's light (860) echoes the description of Eos in the ode's final stanza (847–50) and, following the narration of the two affairs with divinities that could not save Troy, Menelaos' arrival in search of Helen, whose affair with Paris led to the city's destruction, seems to confirm the validity of the song's closing line (858–9):

> Troy's love charms over the gods are gone.

Love, the juxtaposition of song and entrance suggests, has not only not helped Troy, but destroyed it. Menelaos brings a new focus to the play. Hitherto we have watched the sufferings of Trojans; entrances have been either of victims or of Talthybios, who is orchestrating their sentences. Now Menelaos comes on stage, looking for his wife, who, we have frequently heard, is the cause of all this suffering. Euripides suggests a new direction for the drama by giving Menelaos' entering *rhesis* some qualities of a prologue.[64] We also note that by not recognising those on stage until Hekabe addresses him, he indicates his distance from and indifference to the plight of the Trojan women.[65]

After this opening *rhesis*, Menelaos sends some of his servants to bring Helen forth (880ff). While this order is being carried out,

Hekabe pleads with him (890ff) to kill his wife lest she seize him with desire. This warning, echoed at the close of this scene, articulates the issue of the scene: will Helen be punished? Although Helen is escorted from the *skene* by Menelaos' men, there is no anapestic announcement as for a 'moving tableau'. As we saw above,[66] such a treatment would be inappropriate for Helen, since it is employed elsewhere to arouse the audience's sympathy.

Helen's entrance (895) parallels those of Kassandra and Andromache earlier in the drama.[67] In all three of these cases the entering character is a female prisoner being led to her new, or in this case former, husband or lover. Maybe there is a subtle link between Kassandra's entrance and Helen's. The entrance of the priestess, we recall, was preceded by Talthybios' fear that the prisoners were burning down their quarters or themselves (299–302), and as Helen is about to enter, Hekabe warns Menelaos of her destructive force (892–3):

> She captures the eyes of men, she captures their cities,
> And *burns* their homes.

The first two entrances differ, of course, from the third. The first two women are Trojans, victims of the war, one of whom will be killed when she arrives in Greece, the other of whom will be a concubine for the son of her husband's murderer. The third is a Greek, the cause of the war's suffering, who is supposed to be killed at Troy, but who, we learn (876–9), will be brought back to Greece for her punishment. We, aware of the myth, realise that she will get off scot-free. The difference upon entrance also suggests the difference between the women. The Trojan women enter in lyric metres, Kassandra in a predominantly dochmiac song, and Andromache in lyric iambic rhythms, while Helen enters speaking calm iambic trimeters.

After the *agon* between Helen and Hekabe, where we see Helen at her sophistic best, pleading her poor case, Menelaos orders Helen to be led away (1047–8). Before he himself departs, Hekabe warns him not to let Helen set sail in the same ship lest desire for her prevent the punishment she deserves. This request echoes Hekabe's earlier plea (890ff), and thus her warnings begin and end the contest, reminding us by the fear that they express, that Helen, much as she might deserve it, will not suffer at all.

In the following, third stasimon (1060–1117), the chorus com-

plains of the gods' abandonment of the city, its destruction and the women's present lot. The ending of this song is artfully juxtaposed to the next entrance: the chorus prays in the final stanza that Menelaos and Helen might meet their death on the deep (1100ff) (echoing the promise in the prologue of Greek disasters at sea), but directly following this wish is the entrance of the dead Astyanax, the antithesis of the prayed-for deaths. Talthybios, who enters with the corpse and speaks upon entering, is, contrary to the convention described in Chapter 2, not mentioned in the entrance announcement (1118–22). The break in the convention and the 'moving tableau', announced in anapests, both put the emphasis not on the Greeks' herald, but on the dead boy. Astyanax' exit to death and the return of his corpse surround the Helen scene. Effectively the death of the blameless child frames the sophistic and ultimately successful defence speech of the guilty Helen.

Talthybios exits at 1155 (having prepared for his return, 1153–5) to dig a grave for the boy, leaving Hekabe to make her long pathetic farewell to her grandson's corpse. After the lament and farewell of Hekabe and the chorus, the former bids servants to carry off the body for burial.[68] The chorus then sings a brief anapestic song (1251–9) in which they lament Andromache and her son. But the final blow has not yet been struck: the chorus now reports (1256ff) the sight of torches; the final destruction is at hand. These torches, as we observed in Chapter 2, do not appear on stage; the audience is asked to visualise the off-stage action when Talthybios, who enters at 1260, gives orders to those off-stage to put torches to the city (1260ff). Talthybios again is not announced, as attention is given to the incendiary destruction of the city and the thematically important torches. The destructive power of the torch has already been seen in the Kassandra scene, where we learn that her wedding torch will lead to the murder of Agamemnon. In the first play of the 415-group, *Alexandros*, the audience learned of Hekabe's dream that she would give birth to a blazing firebrand that would destroy the city and Helen clearly alludes to this at 919–22 of this play.[69] Hekabe's symbolic dream now comes to literal fulfilment with the incendiary destruction of Troy.

When the herald exits is uncertain. Either he departs at 1286 after his final commands to those who entered with him, or he remains on stage in silence and exits with Hekabe and the other Trojan women at the end of the play. I prefer the former staging.

The herald's final orders (1284–6) sound like exit lines and the last scene is better played out by the Trojan women alone, with the guards as unobtrusive mute characters.

Before considering this last scene, we should look at a famous passage from a preceding one, where Hekabe, in her lament over the dead Astyanax, takes solace in the fame of song (1242–5):

> If a god
> Had not upset us, turning things upside down,
> We would have disappeared and not be sung,
> Giving the themes for songs of future generations.

This passage, echoing Helen's remarks to Hektor in the *Iliad* (6. 357–8), must be heard in the context of the entire play. The royal house of Troy has been dissolved — one by one, Kassandra (who herself spoke of the fame brought by war, 394ff), Andromache, and Astyanax, the last hope for future Troy, are all led away to the ships or to be killed. Furthermore, in the contest with Helen, Hekabe won the argument, but lost her case. Now, as she sees her grandson's corpse and prepares it for burial, Hekabe reaches out for a new type of hope, fame in the song of later generations, traditional *kléos áphthiton*. The audience, watching *Tro.*, knows that the Trojan name has survived, but even this small solace is denied Hekabe. In response to Talthybios' orders to burn the city, Hekabe laments that Troy will be robbed even of its name (1277–8). And the chorus, in the final scene, twice echoes this despairing belief (1319, 1322–4).

In the play's finale, the chorus and Hekabe make their last laments, as they see and even feel (1325–6) the city's destruction. Visually this final scene recalls the opening of the drama: Hekabe returns to her original prone position, and the smouldering of Troy gives way to its fiery destruction. After the city's collapse, she rises (1327) and begins to exit, followed by the chorus. The drama, dominated by the continuous presence of Hekabe, the symbol of Trojan griefs, concludes when she makes her first, and last, exit. Although we, the audience, have been made aware in the prologue of the punishment that awaits the Greeks as they return home, and although Troy's fame will prove everlasting, Hekabe is unaware of the former and despairs of the latter. The irony of the Greek misfortunes and the knowledge of Troy's fame are enjoyed by the audience alone. No god descends to ameliorate the pain with a

vision of a different future, and the human friendship that concludes *Her.* is not seen here. It is the picture of Hekabe, a Trojan of endless suffering, that leaves the final and indelible imprint on our minds.

3. Ion

Hermes' prologue speech points to the role of divine providence in this play.[70] Acting as Apollo's proxy, Hermes both narrates Phoibos' concern for the infant Ion (28ff) and forecasts his future handling of the affair: Ion will be given to Xouthos and revealed to Kreousa in Athens (67ff). As the object of Apollo's concern is about to enter, Hermes explains that he will get out of the way (76–80):[71]

> But I will go into these laurel groves
> So I may learn well what awaits the boy.
> For I see Loxias' son coming forth,
> This one, so that he can make the temple's gateway bright
> With laurel branches.

We find this pattern several times in Euripides: a superhuman figure alone on stage explains that he is exiting to avoid contact with an approaching mortal character.[72] But Hermes' words contain a difference from those of similar scenes: not merely is he getting out of the way; he is going to learn how the child's fortunes are accomplished. He assumes the role of the spectator, as it were, waiting to learn the outcome of the drama.[73] Since events do not turn out precisely as Hermes predicts, his spectator role is not inappropriate. Even though the divine scheme does not go exactly as planned, the role of the divine is seen in the interruption of the poisoning of Ion (see 1563ff) and in the entrances of the priestess and Athene later in the drama. As in *Tro.*, the divine prologue creates an ironic backdrop for the play: this divine plan is unknown to Kreousa until the play's end and against it we witness her harsh and at times passionate attacks on Apollo. And yet even at the close of the drama with its 'happy' ending, the audience must weigh this divine plan against the earlier actions of Apollo, the many acts and near-acts of violence in the play caused by those actions, and the deeply felt and movingly expressed suffering of Kreousa.

Immediately before Ion enters, Hermes, in his final words, gives the boy his name (80–1):

> And with the name he is about to receive
> I first of the gods name him — Ion.

Later in the play (661ff) we learn that the name stems from Xouthos meeting Ion first when Xouthos emerged from Apollo's temple. This scene prefigures the later one: Ion is named at his entrance as later he will be 'found' and named at Xouthos. Verbal echoes, we have seen, also link Hermes' prologue to Ion's entrance. As described in Chapter 4, Hermes' use of 'bright' (*lamprá*, 79) is echoed in the three-fold repetition of words from that root in Ion's opening lines (82, 83, 87). When Ion enters with attendants (see 94ff) he speaks in anapests. Although the gods are exceptionally concerned with Ion's welfare, a gulf still separates gods and men: Hermes speaks in iambic trimeter, Ion in anapestic dimeter.

As is not infrequently the case (*Tro.* provides a clear example) the slot between the prologue speech(es) and the chorus' entry often focuses on the emotions of one character. Here we observe the joyful and carefree life of Apollo's servant. Ion's purity and naïveté will be threatened in the course of the drama, and this scene provides a contrasting picture for the subsequent events. Yet even here Ion's violence is suggested when he draws his bow against the birds (158ff).[74] Later he will draw his bow against Xouthos (524) and threaten to kill Kreousa.

The chorus enters (184) after Ion's monody without an announcement. Since only Ion is on stage, no announcement is expected, but it is striking that no contact is made between Ion and the chorus until the latter addresses him at 219.[75] The lack of contact is atypical but explicable. Euripides' elaborate description of the Delphic temple is unique in extant tragedy;[76] it is, among other things, a *tour de force.* The entering chorus is so caught up in the splendour of the sight that they make no contact with the temple's custodian, who presumably continues with his tasks. (Again we have a type of 'split-screen': Ion at his tasks and the 'tourists' enjoying the sights.) The excitement and joy of this scene continue until Kreousa enters.

Kreousa, the chorus' mistress, arrives at the end of the *parodos.* Most unusually,[77] she is announced in the lyrics (237), as the

chorus explains to Ion that Kreousa herself can answer his questions. Her entrance differs from that of the chorus. They did not address Ion at once because they were overwhelmed by the temple's decorations; Kreousa, on the other hand, reminded by the temple (249ff) of Apollo's treachery, is too caught up in her grief (241ff) to do so.[78] Euripides, by this arrangement, not only displays Kreousa's grief, but is also able to reveal Ion's sensitivity and compassion as he begins the dialogue. Upon first seeing Kreousa, he exclaims at her nobility (237–40), then he recognises that she is crying, and finally (244–6) he asks her questions to which she replies.

In their conversation, carried on mainly in a long and splendid stichomythia (264–368), Ion and Kreousa both reveal their sympathies for one another and marvel at the similarities of their situations (see, e.g., 320, 359–60). In fact, Kreousa — even with her false tale of her 'friend' — and Ion seem on the verge of a true recognition. The stichomythia (and the premature recognition) is broken off when Ion, defending his patron god, explains that the god will not answer the hostile questions that Kreousa would pose to him. Kreousa replies with an attack on Apollo for his offences against her 'friend', an attack which she must break off when she see Xouthos approaching (392ff).

Xouthos receives a long entrance announcement (392–400), during which Kreousa, as soon as she sees him coming, asks Ion to keep what she has revealed secret from her husband. The secrets between husband and wife will, of course, prove almost fatal to both Ion and Kreousa in the course of the play. At the moment of Xouthos' first entrance, these secrets are stressed. Kreousa's request for secrecy extends beyond the requirements of the plot, as it reveals both the natural rapport between Ion and herself and the distance she maintains from her husband. Xouthos' entrance comes relatively late in the act: it is more than three-quarters finished.[79] After the long scene between Kreousa and Ion, in which they show a mutual sympathy for each other, Xouthos appears like an outsider, which in many ways, the play reminds us, he is.[80] Xouthos, when he first arrives, notices Kreousa's disturbed state (402–03), but he shows less concern than did Ion, and Kreousa does not want to reveal her secrets and feelings to him. The information that Xouthos brings, that Trophonios has predicted that neither he nor Kreousa will leave childless, contrasts with Kreousa's statement before she announces his arrival that Apollo

will not answer her 'friend's' questions (387–9). Xouthos, who in the next scene will joyously embrace Ion as his son, takes no notice of the young man and neither refers to nor addresses him at any point in the scene. Xouthos' question 'Who is the interpreter for the god?' (413) is not directed to Ion and, as soon as he receives a reply from the temple's servant, he exits. Although Xouthos perhaps has no special reason to converse with this young man, Euripides allows no contact between these two in order to contrast their encounter with the just-observed Kreousa-Ion scene and to emphasise the reversal in the next act.

After Xouthos exits into the *skene* (424), Kreousa, after another, brief attack on Apollo, departs down one of the *parodoi* (428). She does not address these lines to Ion, but they are not an aside — he hears them.[81] Ion exits soon after Kreousa, at 451. As we saw above in the discussion of *Her.*, successive exits of three characters are extremely rare. Euripides here achieves two important effects with this pattern. First, it highlights Ion's 'tailpiece' at the conclusion of the act (429–51). The young man's staunch belief in his patron deity has been shaken, and this is the first opportunity to have him express his doubts about Apollo and the other gods. Secondly, the successive exits convey the separateness of the three persons involved. Xouthos and Kreousa are both looking for a son, but their mutual success in finding him involves the deception of Xouthos, and their devious machinations (as well as the god's) prevent any union of the three. This is the only scene in which all three characters appear together; they are on stage together for a scant twenty-four lines and then they exit severally — each perhaps in a different direction.[82]

In the following triadic ode (452–509) the chorus sings of childbirth and in the first stanza invokes Athene and Artemis to bring forth a child for the race of Erechtheus, Kreousa's family, and at the end of the song refers to the tale of the girl exposing the child, Kreousa's child. The subsequent scene, where we witness the false recognition of Xouthos and Ion, contrasts sharply with the song. Not Kreousa, but Xouthos, it seems, has received a child. The entries after the ode of Ion and Xouthos are virtually simultaneous, perhaps suggesting the fortuitousness involved.[83] Ion arrives on stage first, inquiring whether Xouthos has returned from the temple; the chorus replies negatively and then announces that he has just emerged from the temple (515–16):

But I hear a noise from these doors, like someone leaving,
And now one can see my master coming out (*exiónta*).

éxeimi is almost never used in entrance announcements; at most there is one other instance in Euripides.[84] After Hermes has named the boy at 80–1 and directly before the false recognition takes place, this might be a mild paronomasia for the audience. Xouthos, following Apollo's oracle (explained at 535–6), takes the first person he encounters when he leaves the temple as his son and so addresses him in his opening words (517). Xouthos, indifferent to the boy in the previous scene, is eager to embrace him. Shocked, Ion rebuffs the man and even threatens him with his bow (524). The recognition is finally achieved, but not without Ion's expression of many doubts and fears about leaving for Athens. 'Father' and 'son' then begin to exit to celebrate the 'birthday'. Near the end of this scene, Xouthos gives Apollo's servant the name Ion and explains the name (note *exiónti*, 662); thus this wordplay virtually frames the act (515–16, 661–3). Ion closes the act with the wish that his mother might be an Athenian so that he might enjoy the free speech of an Athenian. His mother enters at the beginning of the next act and therein plots his murder; when we next see Ion, he is pursuing his mother in order to stone her.

Xouthos and Ion depart at 675 (the former disappears entirely from the play). The choristers are upset at the turn of events. In their song (676–724), they sympathise with Kreousa, doubt the oracle's validity, and condemn the actions of Xouthos. The epode, although textually corrupt, clearly ends with a prayer for the boy's death and, in the final words, an emphatic reference to Erechtheus, from whom stems the proper succession to Athenian rule.[85] Kreousa, as the name Erechtheus still rings in our ears, enters with an old household servant, whom she addresses in her opening words (725–6): 'Old man, tutor of Erechtheus, my late father'. The verbal link is clear; and in this scene the Erechtheidai will take action against the apparent usurper.

Kreousa's and the old servant's entrance is drawn out, emphasising the age and sluggishness of movement of the latter.[86] This long entrance description increases the tension: although Xouthos has threatened the chorus with death if they reveal his discovery to Kreousa (666–7), in the subsequent lyric they expressed their evil wishes against the ursurper. Will they tell Kreousa what they have been commanded not to, but what they have suggested they would

in the lyric (695ff)? This is what the audience wonders when Kreousa and the family retainer enter, and the suspense is heightened when the chorus cannot decide whether to tell Kreousa or not (752ff).[87] Kreousa at last learns of Xouthos' child and deceit,[88] and the servant and she plot revenge by murdering Ion, a plot that is interrupted by Kreousa's impassioned monody (859–922). The two exit separately, Kreousa somewhat before (see 1039–40) and the servant at 1047, after a few closing remarks. His appeal to his aged foot to be young again (1041–2) might suggest that he exits at a quicker pace than when he entered. His exit then responds to his entrance: he is rejuvenated in the service of his mistress.[89]

A messenger comes on stage (1106) after the next stasimon (1048–1105) looking for Kreousa, and he reports the foiled attempted murder. In the stasimon the chorus had prayed for and urged on Ion's murder and concluded with a harsh condemnation of Xouthos. This prayer is answered negatively with the messenger's report. (We should note the juxtaposition of the song's end and the messenger's opening line: the chorus' final words condemned Xouthos for 'obtaining a bastard son' (1105) and the messenger begins by enquiring as to the whereabouts of *Erechtheus'* daughter (1106–7).) Just as the second messenger in *IT* reports the failed escape of Iphigeneia and comrades, this speech narrates the failed assassination attempt. Typically a messenger's speech reports a completed action, the results of which we see shortly thereafter. Here the report relates a failed action and serves as a foil to the exciting scene that follows: Ion will threaten to murder the one who tried to murder him, his mother. The messenger's purpose in coming on stage also is unsuccessful. He is looking for Kreousa but, not finding her, he exits to continue his search.

The pace of the drama now increases greatly. Only a brief astrophic song (1229–43) and a few lines of anapests (1244–9) intervene before the next entrance. There is no escape, the chorus proclaims. As we approach the climax of the drama, the poet gives little time to lyric reflection. The successive and rapid entrances of Kreousa and Ion and the use of trochaic tetrameters (1250–60) quicken the action. Kreousa enters at 1250 and Ion and allies at 1261, both entries on the run.[90] Kreousa's entrance, as we saw above in Chapters 2 and 3, is not announced in the preceding anapests, rather these anapests serve as a 'talk of the devil' link to her appearance. The chorus has asked what more Kreousa can suffer (1246–7) and wonders if they are not being punished justly

(1247–9). Kreousa then rushes on stage, crying that she is being pursued and threatened with death. The answer to the chorus' question now begins to be played out on stage.

Kreousa, although initially skeptical about the altar's value for her (1255ff), accepts the choral advice of supplication at the altar (repeated as an imperative at 1258) after she sees the approaching men (1257ff), and begins to head towards it. Her movement towards the altar and the subsequent motion of Ion's men to capture her (following Ion's command at 1266ff) are stylised, slow actions, the same kind that we observed at *Her.* 514ff.[91] As the men approach Kreousa, who is proceeding towards the altar, Ion continues his attack on her. By 1279 she has taken up her position at the altar, and Ion's words at 1279ff acknowledge this and implicitly refer to the non-performance of the order to seize her. After the rapid successive entrances at 1250 and 1261, Euripides slows down the tempo to stress the action of this moment:[92] Kreousa, who has been at odds with Apollo throughout the play, now puts her life in his hands by supplicating his altar (see 1283),[93] while Ion, her son, denounces her and threatens her with death.

Ion is stymied by this action: he is caught in the dilemma of punishing the woman who tried to murder him or reverencing the altar of his patron Apollo, where she has taken refuge. As much as he might condemn and argue with Kreousa, he cannot bring himself to violate the right of this suppliant. He ends the stichomythia with Kreousa (1312) in order to ponder the injustice of the altar offering protection to the unjust. The drama has reached an impasse: Kreousa has the altar's protection and Ion is at a loss about what to do. At this juncture we might expect a *deus ex machina* to break the deadlock. Apollo could appear to effect the recognition and to mend a few fences. If we anticipate this, we are frustrated in our expectations. The divine plan does take control, but it is the temple's priestess,[94] Apollo's proxy, not the god himself, who suddenly, without preparation[95] or announcement, emerges from the *skene* with Ion's birth tokens. (Her command to Ion as she enters, '*epísches*' (1320), is, we have seen, typical for preventing violent actions.) She explains (1341ff) that she both kept these tokens in silence and now brings them forth at Apollo's bidding. She instructs Ion to look for his mother and bids him farewell, exiting at 1368. After her departure, Ion is still confused and wonders what he should do with the tokens. Perhaps they will show that a slave was his mother, he fears (1382ff). He concludes

(1387ff), however, that the god wants him to search for his mother and he thus begins to examine the tokens. Kreousa recognises these tokens as the ones she left with her exposed child, and leaves the altar to claim her son. Although divine power precipitated the prophetess' appearance, a human act of faith — Kreousa risking her life in leaving the altar — achieves the recognition. Kreousa has not said a word since 1311. While Ion speculates about the injustice of the altar's protection and receives the tokens from the priestess and wonders about what to do with them, Kreousa is silent. We know that they are mother and son, and once the prophetess produces the birth tokens we expectantly await the recognition. But Euripides draws out the scene, as Kreousa, who can identify the tokens, remains at the altar without a word. When she does claim the tokens and her son, the breaking of this silence underscores the importance of the action.[96]

We thus witness the play's second, and true, recognition, a recognition that echoes in both actions and language the false recognition of Xouthos and Ion.[97] In each scene the parent claims the boy as his/her son (note the greeting *ô téknon* at both 517 and 1399) and attempts to establish this claim with an embrace (Xouthos tries to embrace the boy, 523ff, Kreousa the tokens, 1404ff). Ion thinks they are mad (520, 1402) and rebuffs them, threatening Xouthos with his bow (524ff) and Kreousa with seizure (and, as this implies, death, 1402ff), but each parent is willing to risk his life (527, 1401). Interrogated by Ion, each one is finally accepted by the convinced boy, and the acceptance is marked by an embrace (560ff, 1437ff). Striking verbal correspondences also help to connect these two scenes. When Xouthos goes to embrace Ion at 523, he explains:

> I will hold you. I am not confiscating property, but claiming my own.

Both the very rare (in tragedy) word *rhusiázō* ('confiscate another's property') and *heurískō* ('find, claim') are found also in the second recognition when Kreousa claims Ion with an embrace of the tokens (1406–7):

> Ion: Isn't this dreadful? I am confiscated (*rhusiázomai*) by stealth.
> Kr.: No, but you are found (*heuriskēi*) kin to your kin.

In this play of multiple ironies and reversals, this second and true recognition mirrors and corrects the first. The scenes differ in two important respects. The recognition of Kreousa and Ion is followed, as is typical after such recognitions in tragedy, by a lyric duet of celebration (1439ff). No such lyric rejoicing followed the false recognition. Secondly, the tone distinguishes the two recognitions. The audience can enjoy the somewhat lighthearted encounter between Xouthos and Ion (including the former's explanation of his youthful indiscretions). Xouthos' life is threatened only by his advances towards Ion,[98] while Kreousa's life is in real jeopardy because of her attempted murder. The recognition between Kreousa and Ion is filled with tension. We have heard again and again about her suffering at the hands of Apollo; she is, we know, the true parent of this young man; and now she most fully risks her life to claim her child. The lyric duet that follows this second recognition not only helps to distinguish it from the first but is an appropriate and welcome relief after this scene.

Ion, however, is not quite satisfied with Kreousa's story and decides to question Phoibos himself on these matters (as he had told Kreousa was impossible, 369ff). He heads towards the *skene* door in search of Apollo, and the seasoned theatre-goer might expect Apollo *ex machina*, but again the spectator is thwarted in his expectations. Ion announces the advent of the divinity (1549–52), and there is even a hint that the appearance is that of Apollo, since Ion describes the divine presence as follows (1549–50):

> Ah! What god shows forth above this temple
> A face like the sun?

antélion ('like the sun') might suggest Apollo, since he has been subtly associated with it throughout the play.[99] But Athene,[100] not Apollo, appears. Ion begins to exit into the *skene* to question Apollo, but a different god from a different place, Athene *ex machina*, arrives. For the third time in this play (Hermes' and the priestess' appearances are the first two) not Apollo, but a proxy for him, appears.

Again the gods have intervened. Athene, like Hermes, is acting on Apollo's behalf, and these two divine appearances thus neatly frame the action of the play. After explaining Apollo's designs and the greatness of Ion's future progeny, Athene bids Ion and

Kreousa to proceed to Athens, and thither they exit. The goddess departs and the choristers follow their mistress out after their coda (1619–22). Only twice in this play do two persons exit together; all other exits are of one person or of the chorus. Once Xouthos and Ion depart as 'father and son' after the false recognition, and now Kreousa and Ion, finally and firmly reunited as mother and son, exit towards Athens. This exit, like the second recognition, reverses the previous one. Ion has assured Athene that his doubts are gone (1606ff) and Kreousa has forgiven Apollo (1609ff). If the audience has not forgotten the previous griefs and violence, the characters, at least, seem satisfied. Kreousa has her son, Ion his mother and the rule of Athens. The gods, and mortals, have found a way.

Notes

1. See Taplin, 134–6, and the bibliography cited there.
2. Of course not only in 'suppliant' plays does the chorus arrive in such sympathy with a character on stage or about to come on stage; cf., e.g., *Alk.*, *Hipp.*, *Or.*
3. That they do nothing to prevent Herakles' murder of the chidren does not, *pace* Bond (ed.), 91, suggest their helplessness. The audience cannot expect any mortal to thwart that divinely-caused action.
4. See Taplin, 283–4.
5. On the structure of this speech, see Bond (ed.), 102.
6. On the parallels between these two scenes, see above, Chapter 4.
7. Wilamowitz (ed.), vol. 3, 38, correctly observes that Lykos' speech functions as a foil for Amphitryon's reply (170–235), and, as Bond (ed.), 101–2, notes, no other *agon* has such a disparity in the length of speeches. But the initial impression Lykos gives is, as I suggest, one of dominance, and, although he loses the verbal argument, he defeats the suppliants in actions.
8. That *all* of them are going to put on these clothes seems most probable from Lykos' remarks now (333ff) and later (702–3) and Megara's after Herakles return (549). See Bond (ed.), 204.
9. We cannot be certain that Megara and the children exit prior to and not with Amphitryon, but Megara's command that the children accompany her into the house strongly suggests a departure at 338. Wilamowitz, Parmentier-Grégoire, and Bond all concur; Bodensteiner does not.
10. On suppliants in general, see J. Gould, 'Hiketeia', *JHS* 93 (1973), 74–103; on Euripidean altar scenes, see the bibliography cited by Gould, 89 n. 76. A.P. Burnett in her interpretation of the play (*Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971, 157–82) makes too much of this act of leaving the altar. For a good response to her interpretation of the play and a proper appreciation of this important book, see B. Knox (rev.), *CP* 67 (1972), 270–9 = *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theater* (Baltimore and London 1979), 329–42.

11. See A.M. Dale, *Collected Papers* (Cambridge 1969), 180–4, on such 'challenging-nouthetetic' prayers.
12. For the motif of dual parentage and its importance in the play, see J. Gregory, 'Euripides' *Heracles*', *YCS* 25 (1977), 259–75.
13. Bond (ed.), 152, comments that *eite . . . eite* (353ff) is formulaic in such a context. But its formulaic nature does not lessen the echo of Amphitryon's challenge or, as Bond himself observes, its 'touch of rationalist speculation'.
14. The earliest references to the lion skin's invincibility are Pindar, *Isth.* 6, 47–8, and Bakchylides 13, 53ff. For more on the invincibility of the skin, see A. Henrichs, ('Zur *Meropis*: Herakles' Löwenfell und Athenas zweite Haut', *ZPE* 27 (1977), 69–75.
15. For the textual problem of 446, see Bond (ed.), *ad loc.* I translate the conjecture *hupóseira*. Whichever of the proposed remedies is adopted, the echoes of these lines later in the play are clear.
16. See Wilamowitz (ed.), vol. 3, 84–6.
17. *teleután* possesses, of course, an ambiguity, but the chorus emphasises only one side of the ambiguity.
18. See the discussion of this scene in Chapter 3.
19. They do not do so at once, as the text makes clear. Bain, *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama* (Oxford 1977), 63, comments, 'Actions on one half of the stage reaches a standstill so that all attention may be fixed upon Hercules' soliloquy. On 'slow' or 'frozen' movements on the tragic stage, see Mastronarde, 2–3, 110–12.
20. See H. Parry, 'The Second Stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles* (637–700)', *AJP* 86 (1965), 363–74.
21. *aretâi* (697) is Nauck's conjecture, accepted by, among others, Murray, Parmentier-Grégoire, and Diggle.
22. H. Parry. *The Lyric Poems of Greek Tragedy* (Toronto and Sarasota 1978), 160.
23. Lykos addresses Amphitryon in his opening line (adopting Heath's conjecture *perâis*).
24. As Wilamowitz (ed.), vol. 3, 159–60, comments, this scene is only a bridge between the two songs.
25. A. Lesky, *Greek Tragic Poetry*, (trans.) M. Dillon (New Haven 1983) 277, notes the symmetry of the ode: the two strophes cry out for celebration and the two antistophes announce the justice of the gods.
26. Bond (ed.), 263–4, points to the 'intellectual flavor' of the ode, which he finds lacking in the *parà prosdokían* odes of Sophokles.
27. Parry, above, n. 22,; 161–2, comments on what he feels are some ambiguities in the earlier section of the lyric and the ode proper (e.g. 736, 738, 740, 765, 766, 777), ambiguities which suggest that Herakles, like Lykos, is subject to a change of fortune. The ambiguities of these words might appear retrospectively, and the audience is certainly forced to realise that the theodicy expounded in this ode (and elsewhere) operates, if it operates at all, differently from the way they had first supposed. But it seems to me that at this point the emphasis falls strongly on the joy and celebration so that the subsequent reversal of Herakles' fortunes is that much more surprising and shocking.
28. On the problems of staging this scene, esp. that of the 'chariot', see Bond (ed.), 280, 299–300, and Hourmouziades, 162.
29. That the cries from within are meant to be Amphitryon's, see Wilamowitz, (ed.), *ad loc.*
30. On the use of the *ekkyklema* for this scene, see Hourmouziades, 98ff.
31. See Bond (ed.), 295, on these similarities.
32. Although it is possible, there is no reason to assume that this earthquake was staged or accompanied by noise offstage; see, e.g., Dodds (ed.), *Bakch.*, 148–9, and A.M. Dale, above n. 11, 124–5.
33. We observed above, Chapter 4 n. 50, that the final choral songs of a tragedy tend to be briefer than the earlier ones.
34. On this scene and a comparison between it and the similar one in Soph. *Aias*, see H. Ortkemper, *Szenische Techniken des Euripides: Untersuchungen zur Gebärdensprache im antiken Theater* (Diss. Berlin 1969), 93ff.
35. We should compare *Or.*, 132–210. On the verbal similarities between the two scenes, see Bond (ed.), 332–3.
36. Taplin, 180–4, includes this play among those containing a 'false ending'.
37. See Burnett, above n. 10, 173ff, on the final section of this play.
38. For the rare exceptions to this convention, see Taplin, 72–3.
39. See Hourmouziades, 104.
40. On double *antilabē* see W. Köhler, *Die Versbrechung bei den griechischen Tragikern* (Diss. Giessen, Darmstadt 1913), 42–3. He also observes (13–17) that *antilabē* is common in scenes of parting. We might also observe that 1418 contains not only two changes of speaker, but three different speakers; this is without parallel in Euripides.
41. The first to note this echo was, I think, Wilamowitz (ed.), vol. 3, 280. S. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides* (London 1971), 107–8, mentions the link among all three actions, as I do below.
42. I do not mean to suggest, as does H. Chalk, '*Aretē* and *bía* in Euripides' *Herakles*', *JHS* 82 (1962), 7–18, that Herakles replaces the old *aretē* with the new one of friendship; see e.g. A.W.H. Adkins' response to Chalk, 'Basic Greek Values in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Hercules Furens*'. n.s. 16 (1966), 209–19.
43. See Hourmouziades, 160–2, for a discussion of possible stagings of this and Athene's entrance.
44. Poseidon, predominantly pro-Greek in Homer (but see *Il.* 20, 290ff where he rescues Aineias) is pro-Trojan here (and at *IT* 1414–15); on Poseidon's sympathies in this play (with the Trojans or merely the walls he built with Apollo) see the exchange between J. Fontenrose and J.R. Wilson in *Agon* 1, 2 (1967, 1968), 135–41, 66–71.
45. See the discussion of this entrance above, Chapter 2.
46. For delayed exits caused by another's entrance, see Taplin, esp. 162–3, 299–300.
47. These entrances were discussed above in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively.
48. A full treatment of this ironic function of the prologue is E. O'Neill, Jr., 'The Prologue of the *Troades* of Euripides', *TAPA* 72 (1941), 288–320.
49. On the nautical imagery in this play, see S. Barlow, above n. 41, 29–30, 51–2, 118.
50. The character Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (911ff; and see the scholia *ad loc.*) criticised this Aischylean practice. A stimulating treatment of this practice is O. Taplin, 'Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus', *HSCP* 76 (1972), 57–97. He refers to the opening of *Tro.* at 96 n. 118 only to suggest the possibility of the influence of Aisch. *Niobe*; he concludes that the connection between the two plays is only remote.
51. W. Steidle, *Studien zum antiken Drama* (Munich 1968), 50–2, remarks on the passivity of Hekabe throughout the play, in part emphasised by her frequent prostrate position. See also J. de Romilly, *L'Evolution du pathétique d'Eschyle à Euripide* (Paris 1961), 80–1.
52. The prologue emphasises that Troy itself is deserted (note *érēma*, 15; *erēmia*, 26; *erēmiai*, 97), a description of the backdrop which parallels Hekabe's own isolation.
53. On the similarities between the early sections of these two plays, see H.

Schmidt, 'Die Struktur des Eingangs' in W. Jens (ed.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (Munich 1971), 26–7.

54. See Taplin, 246–7, for the pathos and isolation frequently depicted in the slot between the prologue proper and the chorus' entry that is characteristic of Euripides.

55. Diggle daggers 147–8; I translate Parmentier's text. For a discussion of the textual problems, see Lee (ed.), *ad loc.*, whose interpretations of the text I generally follow.

56. See our earlier treatment of this entrance and its announcement in Chapter 2.

57. *thoázei* (307) suggests her frenzied state; see *LSJ thoázō* (A) 2 and Lee (ed.), *ad loc.* On the importance Kassandra places on the torch, see Barlow, above n. 41, 53.

58. Cf. the control of the *skene* door in Aisch. *Ag.* (where it has greater significance), and Taplin's discussion of it, 306ff.

59. The pattern of lyrics followed by spoken iambics leading from confusion to greater clarity is found elsewhere in Euripides (cf., e.g., *Hipp.* 198ff) and is seen most dramatically in the Kassandra scene in Aisch. *Ag.*

60. Having the final words upon exiting often suggests control of the situation. Perhaps the best example of this in Greek tragedy is in Soph. *OT*, where Oidipous stands dumb while he listens to Teiresias, another prophet, forecast in riddles the soon-to-occur disastrous self-revelation (447–62); both men then exit after these riddling lines. See Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1978), 43–4.

61. Hekabe assumes another prone position at the end of this act (see 505ff). At what point she rises again is uncertain — perhaps as Andromache is announced. Hekabe's risings and fallings in this play are not always clearly indicated in the text. Steidle, above n. 51, basically following Wilamowitz (trans.), makes several suggestions for these stage actions. All are possible, some probable, but only of a few can we be certain.

62. Taplin, 91 n. 2, argues that we should retain the mss. reading *humetéras* (788) and give 782–9 to Andromache. Although I think that Andromache does not exit until 789, I am unconvinced that these final lines are hers. In addition to the dramatic reasons given above, we should also note that it would be unusual for Andromache to resume, after a brief choral buffer, this time in a different metre.

63. It is, of course, also possible that Andromache hands over the child at 775 (or 779) and remains silent during Talthybios' anapests. Possible, but, I think, less effective.

64. On the prologue qualities of this speech, see F. Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama: Ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römischen Poetik* Abh. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen phil-hist. Kl. N.F. 10.5 (Berlin 1908), 30, and W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der griechischen Tragödie*, Neue Philologische Untersuchungen 2 (Berlin 1926), 101 n. 1 and 241.

65. Mastronarde, 24–6, notes that Menelaos has no reason to address Hekabe or the chorus. True, but this does not lessen the effect of his ignoring them until Hekabe speaks.

66. Chapter 2 n. 51. Such an entrance announcement would be inappropriate, and any announcement is unnecessary, since, as already noted in the earlier discussion, Helen has been sent for; hers is an 'Ersatz' announcement.

67. Others have noted the parallels among these three scenes; see, e.g., W. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilos*, Zetemata 5 (Munich 1953), 73–5, and Steidle, above n. 51, 52–4.

68. These servants probably enter from the *skene* at 1207 and exit with the corpse later (see 1246ff); see Lee (ed.), 265–6.

69. See *Alexandros* fr. 1 Snell, and on the thematic image of the torch, R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, Hypomnemata 60 (Göttingen 1980), 76–8.

70. Among recent critics who have discussed the 'divine plan' at work in *Ion*, see A.P. Burnett, 'Human Resistance and Divine Persuasion in Euripides' *Ion*', *CP* 57 (1962) 89–103, and C. Wolff, 'The Design and Myth in Euripides' *Ion*', *HSCP* 69 (1965), 169–94. Of course, as the play demonstrates, not everything goes according to this plan. See R. Hamilton, 'Prologue Prophecy and Plot in Four Plays of Euripides', *AJP* 99 (1978), 279–83, on the differences between the divine prophecy and its fulfilment.

71. Whither Hermes exits is not clear. If he exits into the *skene*, he can avoid Ion, who is entering from it (*ekbainonta*, 78) only if there is more than one *skene* door (which seems to me probable for some plays in the last quarter of the fifth century). If he exits down one of the *parodoi*, how are 'these laurel groves' represented? As is evident from the discussion of divine prologues in Chapter 2, I do not think the prologue was delivered from the roof. With some reservations I opt for an exit into a side door of the *skene*, which would in part represent these groves. See Wilamowitz (ed.), 23 and *ad loc.*, and Hourmouziades, 157ff.

72. See our discussion above in Chapter 2.

73. The actor, of course, does not remain on stage; see n. 71 above.

74. See C. Whitman, *Euripides and the Full Circle of Myth* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974), 69–103, for a discussion of violence and purity, among other themes, in this play.

75. Owen (ed.), 82, suggests that Ion might exit at 183 and return in time for the chorus' questions at 219ff, and Verall (ed.), 18–20, gives those stage directions. There is no reason, however, for these assumptions: exits are almost always signalled or evident from subsequent action. See also Mastronarde, 32–4, on this and similar scenes.

76. On what the *audience* saw of this fine description, see Hourmouziades, 55–6.

77. See above, Chapter 4, for the circumstances of this announcement.

78. Typically, the entering character initiates the dialogue; see above, Chapter 2. The contrast between Kreousa's and the others' entrances is made explicit by Ion at 244ff.

79. His entrance is not unprepared for, however; see 299ff.

80. Xouthos' alien status is referred to many times in the play, from Hermes' prologue (63) on (see, e.g., 290 and 592, where he is described with the adjective *epaktós*, and 702, 721ff), and at the end of the play he is excluded from the divine explanation and prophecy and the shared secrets of Ion and Kreousa.

81. See Bain, above n. 19, 37–8. Xouthos, of course, does not hear these words; see above, Chapter 3 n. 7.

82. Xouthos exits into the *skene*, representing the temple, Kreousa exits to an off-stage altar (see Xouthos' order at 422–24), and Ion to the holy fountains (cf. 435–6). The off-stage areas reached by the *parodoi* are not clearly defined (see Hourmouziades, 134–5), and so it can only be *suggested* that Kreousa and Ion exit in separate directions. A.P. Burnett in her translation of the play (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1970) makes the same suggestion; in the Budé translation they are both sent off 'stage left'.

83. Proposed by Wilamowitz (ed.), 110.

84. Admetos employs it referring to Alkestis' corpse being carried away by the servants (*Alk.* 610); but this is not, properly speaking, an entrance announcement.

85. The verbal connection between the end of the song and the following entrance was discussed above in Chapter 4.

86. There are many other entrances that depict slowness and difficulty of

walking — e.g., the old man's at *El.* 487ff, the chorus' at *Her.* 107ff, and Teiresias' at *Phoin.* 834ff.

87. Nowhere else in tragedy does the chorus break its pledge of silence. See Barrett (ed.), *Hipp.*, 294.

88. This intervention by the chorus, unique in tragedy, propels the events of the second half of the drama and Apollo's rescue therein, as Athene explains (1563ff).

89. Taplin, above n. 60, 55, proposes this.

90. Kreousa declares that she is being pursued (*diōkómestha*, 1250) and announces that the men after her are hastening (*epeigontai*, 1258). On the speed of entrances, see the bibliography cited at Taplin, 147 n. 2, and for rapid successive entrances, Taplin, 351–2.

91. No account of the text and accompanying stage actions of 1261–81 is entirely satisfactory. For the most part I follow Mastronarde, 110–12, but, unlike M., I accept (tentatively) Diggle's deletion of 1275–8 ('On the 'Heracles' and 'Ion' of Euripides', *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974), 28–30). For other recent attempts to solve the problems of this scene, see D. Bain, 'Euripides, *Ion* 1261–81', *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979), 263–7, and *Masters, Servants, and Orders in Greek Tragedy* (Manchester 1981), 35–6, and Taplin, above n. 60, 187 n. 9.

92. In her review of Mastronarde (*CP* 77 (1982), 361–4), N. Rabinowitz objects that 'there is no dramatic or psychological reason for Creusa to linger'. The dramatic reason I suggest in the text. There might also be a psychological reason — fear (suggested obliquely by M. at 111). A close parallel for movements 'slowed down' by fear is *Hel.* 541ff, where, although Helen's return to the tomb and the escape from the not-recognised Menelaos is said to be at a fast pace (see 543, 546), she does not reach it until 556. Mastronarde, 111 n. 52, cites this parallel, but does not mention the fear expressed in both cases.

93. See Taplin, above n. 60, 72–3, on the significance of this act, although he does not think she reaches the altar until 1285.

94. This entrance was discussed above in Chapter 3.

95. As observed above in Chapter 3, she is referred to earlier in the play (41–51, 318ff), but her entrance is still quite unexpected. Schmid-Stählin (I.3, 554) calls her entrance the 'first *deus ex machina*'.

96. Taplin, above n. 50, holds that only silences that are commented on or referred to when they are broken are significant; obviously I disagree here. On this scene, see H. Strohm, *Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form* Zetemata 15 (Munich 1957) 30-1.

97. On the parallels between these two scenes, esp. the verbal echoes, see Taplin, above n. 60, 137–8.

98. Advances which Ion takes as pederasty; see Taplin, above n. 60, 138.

99. See Burnett, above n. 70, 95 and 102 n. 26.

100. Athene's entrance, however, is not entirely unprepared for: twice, not too long before this appearance, Kreousa swears by Athene that Apollo is Ion's father (1478, 1528–9), as Mastronarde observes in 'Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*', *CSCA* 8 (1975), 170. Also Athene's entrance can be seen as a very belated response to the chorus' plea in the first stasimon that she come. The surprise of this entrance was discussed above in Chapter 3.

6 APPENDIX: UNINTERRUPTED STROPHIC SONGS

In modifying Hourmouziades' formulation of the conventions that obtain for entrance announcements, Hamilton (1978) criticised him for assuming, *inter alia*, 'that it made no difference whether a "choral song" is strophic or astrophic, sung by the chorus alone or by the chorus with actor' (68–9). As is evident from Hamilton's study, the distinction between strophic and astrophic is fundamentally correct, but should we further distinguish between choral and not purely choral strophic songs?

Euripides has only a very few examples of the relevant sequence, a not purely choral uninterrupted song followed directly by an entrance. (An uninterrupted strophic song is one in which no non-responding lines, with the exception, of course, of an epode, intervene between the beginning and end of the song.) Several apparent examples are vitiated by either being interrupted by non-responding lines (e.g. *Hek.* 154ff and *Ion* 184ff) or being followed by such lines *before* the entrance (e.g. *El.* 167ff). Of genuine examples there are at most four. Jason arrives unannounced at *Med.* 1293, directly following an uninterrupted strophic song shared by the chorus and the children from within. (Hamilton in his appendix mistakenly lists this song as purely choral.) Theseus' final entrance in *Hik.* would provide another example, if he arrives at 1165 after the duet between the main and subsidiary choruses, and if such a duet is considered not purely choral, since not only the main chorus is involved. The latter point is open to debate, but it is perhaps moot, since it seems probable that Theseus arrives earlier with the others at 1123, as suggested in Chapter 2. Talthybios' entrance at *Tro.* 235 follows an uninterrupted strophic song shared by Hekabe and the chorus, and it is announced (230–4). Two points must be remembered about this case. First, the announcement is in anapestic dimeter, a metre which for entrances almost always signals an entrance that is in some way slow, solemn, or impressive, a 'moving tableau', and such anapests frequently herald entrances even directly after choral stasima. (The reason, however, for the anapests here is not clear.) Secondly, there is no exit before the *parodos* in *Tro.* and this structural anomaly might

Stagecraft in **Euripides**

MICHAEL R. HALLERAN

BARNES & NOBLE BOOKS
Totowa, New Jersey