**Audience Address in Greek Tragedy**

David Bain

*The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 25, No. 1. (May, 1975), pp. 13-25.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%28197505%292%3A25%3A1%3C13%3AAAIGT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M

*The Classical Quarterly* is currently published by The Classical Association.

---

# AUDIENCE ADDRESS IN GREEK TRAGEDY

ALL drama is meant to be heard by an audience, so that there is a sense in which any utterance in a play may be called audience address. It is possible, however, to draw a distinction between on the one hand the kind of drama in which the presence of an audience is acknowledged by the actors—either explicitly by direct address or reference to the audience, or implicitly by reference to the theatrical nature of the action the actors are undertaking, or by a combination of some or all of these elements—and on the other hand the kind of drama in which such a presence is not acknowledged, where the actors maintain the pretence that they are enacting a real as distinct from a theatrical event. In practice the first type of drama is described as 'illusion'-breaking and the second as 'illusion'-preserving. Although the term 'illusion' is not an entirely satisfactory one and of late has come in for criticism when applied to ancient drama, I shall continue to use it from time to time in what follows.[1] All that I mean when I say that an actor preserves the illusion is that he pretends to be a character other than himself and that his pretence is accepted by the audience. Once the actor abandons this pretence and admits or implies that he is an actor playing before an audience, the man playing Trygaeus rather than Trygaeus himself, he is breaking the illusion.

With regard to Greek drama, it is common to draw the kind of distinction mentioned above. Tragedy is supposed consistently to maintain the illusion, Comedy frequently to break it. Although such a view is often to be met in standard works on Greek drama (an exception as regards Tragedy sometimes being made for Euripidean prologues and end-pieces),[2] there are occasions when scholars have thought fit to question the strictness of its application and to assert of particular passages in *Tragedy* that they are addressed directly to the audience. It is proposed here to collect such evidence as is available on the topic and to re-examine the proposition that Tragedy consistently preserves the illusion. As it happens the examination will be a selective one. I propose only to deal with those passages of Tragedy (and, in an *epimetrum*, of Satyr-drama) which seem to afford evidence of direct address of, or reference to, an audience. Other aspects of the question, those concerning the less explicit ways of breaking the illusion, such as the use of anachronisms,[3] the possible employment of theatrical terms,[4] and the oblique references to the work of rival

[1] G. M. Sifakis (*Parabasis and Animal Choruses*, ch. 1) thinks the term completely inappropriate for Greek drama. I believe that he is fudging a distinction that is still valid and confusing 'realism' with 'illusionism' (cf. K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy*, 56). What is unsatisfactory about the term applied to any form of drama is the suggestion it carries that an audience may be in some way *deceived* so as to confuse stage fiction with reality (compare the characteristically robust judgements of Dr. Johnson on this subject in his 1765 *Preface to Shakespeare* [pp. 70–1 of *Dr. Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt]).

[2] See, for example, W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechische Literatur*, i. 4. 43 and M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie*[2], 432. On Euripidean prologues and curtain lines see below, p. 22.

[3] See Gudeman on Aristotle *Poet.* 1460[a] and the literature cited there.

[4] e.g. δρᾶμα A. *Ag.* 533, ἐπισκήνους γόους Soph. *Ai.* 579, ἐπείσοδος Soph. *O.C.* 730, καταστροφή Soph. *O.C.* 103. In none of these cases can it be convincingly shown that the poet is consciously employing theatrical terminology meant to be understood as such by the audience.

tragedians,[1] which are all alleged to occur in Tragedy, must be left for another occasion. I do not in fact believe that any of these instances provides evidence that should cause us to revise the traditional view of the illusion in Tragedy.

## I

Before examining those passages of extant Greek Tragedy which have been alleged to contain audience address, we must take account of some ancient testimony for the belief that such an effect was possible.

Aelius Aristides in his oration *περὶ τοῦ παραφθέγματος* defends himself against the charge of inappropriately introducing a personal allusion into his encomium of Athena.[2] After dilating upon countless personal references to be found in literature from Hesiod and Homer onwards, he turns to speak of dramatic poetry (Dindorf ii. 523 = Keil 28. 95–7). He makes this transition by pointing out how Isocrates (an allusion to the *Panegyricus*, Isocr. 4. 13 ff.) begins 'like a comic poet, promising to speak in a manner worthy of the matter on hand and of the time he had spent in preparing the speech and ends by challenging all to compete with him'. 'If this excess is allowed him', continues Aristides, 'why should I be prevented *μηδ' ὅσον λόγου ἔξω παραφθέγξασθαι*? Indeed, one might see the people who preside over dramatic contests and the spectators thereof allowing comedians and tragedians and such indispensable competitors as these to come forward and speak a little about themselves and often they remove their masks during the play and deliver pretentious speeches.'[3]

This implies that there was in Tragedy something similar to the parabasis (N.B. *παραβῆναι*) of Comedy, a place where the poet spoke directly to the audience outside the drama through the medium of his chorus. Confirmation appears to be provided by a curious passage in Pollux (4. 111). 'Among the *ἀίσματα* of Comedy', he says, 'is the parabasis where the chorus comes forward and communicates the poet's viewpoint to the audience. Though it is quite reasonable for comic poets to do this, it is not appropriate to Tragedy. Even so, Euripides did so in several of his plays, among them the *Danae* where the poet made the chorus who were portraying females sing something in addition on his behalf. . . . Sophocles did the same sort of thing, but only rarely and then out of rivalry with Euripides, as in his *Hipponous*.'[4]

[1] See Dio Chrys. 59. 3, Soph. *O.C.* 1116 ~ Eur. *El.* 907, Eur. *Phoen.* 751 ~ A. *Sept.* 375–652, Eur. *Hel.* 1056 ~ (?) Soph. *El.* On this topic see E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, 196 f., 208, 266–7.

[2] Dindorf ii. 12 (37 Keil). The passage in question has not been transmitted and perhaps the offence it caused was a fiction.

[3] *καὶ κωμωιδοῖς μὲν καὶ τραγωιδοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις τούτοις ἀγωνισταῖς ἴδοι τις ἂν καὶ τοὺς ἀγωνοθέτας καὶ τοὺς θεατὰς ἐπιχωροῦντας μικρόν τι περὶ αὑτῶν παραβῆναι καὶ πολλάκις ἀφελόντες τὸ προσωπεῖον μεταξὺ τῆς μούσης ἣν ὑποκρίνονται δημηγοροῦσι σεμνῶς.* It is difficult to be certain of the meaning of *καὶ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις τούτοις ἀγωνισταῖς*, but I cannot see much point in the translation offered by Sifakis (op. cit. 64), 'the performers necessary to them'. Aristides is surely being sarcastic as befits a holder of the Isocratean belief that all other literature must take second place to epideictic oratory (and also of the view shared by Plato and Isocrates that Comedy is *φορτικόν*: see speech 40 Dindorf *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν κωμωιδεῖν*). Keil is more apposite when he comments '*ἀναγκαίοις* qui non boni sunt sed Aristidis aequalium inscitiae et insulsitati necessarii'. I take it from this that he takes *τούτοις* as 'these, the ones you know about' rather than 'to them'. (Jebb translates 'atque illis necessariis athletis'.) Compare Hermogenes, *de id.* 2. 226 (p. 249. 1 Rabe) *τοῖς ὑποξύλοις τουτοισί* (*τούτοις* VcAc) *σοφισταῖς.*

[4] *τῶν δὲ χορικῶν ἀισμάτων τῶν κωμικῶν ἔν τι καὶ ἡ παράβασις, ὅταν ἃ ὁ ποιητὴς πρὸς τὸ θέατρον βούλεται λέγειν ὁ χορὸς παρελθὼν λέγει. ἐπιεικῶς δ' αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν κωμωιδο-*

Caution is required when facing the testimony of these authors. It should be remembered that Aristides is not a historian of the theatre but a rhetorician trying to argue a case, and that it is in the interests of the pseudo-argument he is attempting to develop that he should cite parallels from as many literary genres as possible. Having mentioned Comedy it is only natural that he should think of Tragedy too.

Nevertheless the Pollux passage shows that there is something behind what Aristides says, that it is not simply his own invention, and Pollux might be thought to have better credentials in a case like this. He does at least appear to provide hard evidence by mentioning two plays by name. Unfortunately we have no control over his statements with regard to Euripides' *Danae* and Sophocles' *Hipponous* and what he says about the confusion of gender in the former defies explanation.[1] When we bring evidence from other sources to bear on the passage, it is possible to cast doubt on Pollux's credibility.

The view expressed in Pollux (and perhaps implicit in Aristides, who does not mention any tragedian by name) that Euripides indulges in extra-dramatic digressions and disrupts the illusion is a commonplace of ancient criticism, frequently to be found in the Euripides and Sophocles scholia.[2] Plutarch echoes it when after quoting Eur. fr. 978N. he comments: *φορτικωτάτηι κέχρηται μεγαλαυχίαι συγκαταπλέκων τοῖς τραγωιδουμένοις πάθεσι καὶ πράγμασι μηδὲν προσήκοντα τὸν περὶ αὑτοῦ λόγον* (Plut. *Mor.* 539 c). Whether we should accept this critical orthodoxy without considerable qualification is questionable. Where we have any control over them, as in the Plutarch passage, the statements of ancient writers about Euripides' vainglory can be seen to be dependent on nothing more than speculative and arbitrary interpretation of Euripides' text.

It is well known that ancient scholars were anxious to acquire as much biographical detail as possible about important literary figures and that much of the detail to be found in ancient *βίοι* derives ultimately from the authors' own works and in some cases from what was said about the authors in Comedy.[3] Much of the biographical detail accumulated about Euripides comes from just these sources, the utterances of characters in his own plays and of characters in the plays of the comic dramatists who satirized him.[4] It can be seen that his reputation as a free-thinker and misogynist depends upon a process that was already under way in his own lifetime, the isolation from their dramatic context of remarks made by his characters and the assumption that such remarks represented the poet's own viewpoint.[5] When we bear in mind that ancient scholars approached dramatic literature in this pernicious manner and we set

*ποιηταί, τραγικὸν δ' οὐκ ἐστίν· ἀλλ' Εὐριπίδης αὐτὸ πεποίηκεν ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασιν. ἐν μέν γε Δανάηι τὸν χορὸν τὰς γυναῖκας ὑπὲρ αὑτοῦ τι ποιήσας παράιδειν ἐκλαθόμενος ὡς ἄνδρας λέγειν ἐποίησε τῶι σχήματι τῆς λέξεως τὰς γυναῖκας. καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δ' αὐτὸ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀμίλλης ποιεῖ σπανιάκις, ὥσπερ ἐν 'Ιππόνωι.*

[1] See Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1102–50.

[2] See the index analyticus to Schwartz's edition of the Euripides scholia s.v. *μυθοποιία*, A. Trendelenburg, *Grammaticorum Graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum reliquiae* (Diss. Bonn, 1867), 56 ff., and W. Elsperger, *Reste und Spüren antiker Kritik gegen Euripides* (Philologus Supplementband, xi [1907–10]), *passim*.

[3] See Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, 150; Ed. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*, 113; F. Leo, *Griechisch-römische Biographie*, 105 f. and *Plautinische Forschungen*[2], 71; and A. Momigliano, *The Development of Ancient Biography*, 70.

[4] See M. Delcourt, *Ant. Class.* ii (1933), 279 f. and P. T. Stevens, *J.H.S.* lxxvi (1956), 89.

[5] See Stevens, op. cit. 89 and n. 11.

beside this approach two observations, firstly that at times choruses (as well as characters) in Euripides express somewhat startling and apparently out-of-character sentiments, and secondly that it is a formal characteristic of all Greek choral lyric poetry for a chorus to express its hopes, opinions, likes, and dislikes using the first person singular,[1] we can see, I believe, what lies behind the assertions about a tragic parabasis to be found in Aristides and Pollux. The scholion on the famous ode beginning ἐγὼ καὶ διὰ μούcαc (Eur. *Alc.* 962 ff.) is relevant in this connection: ὁ ποιητὴc διὰ τοῦ προcώπου τοῦ χοροῦ βούλεται δεῖξαι ὅcον μετέcχε παιδεύcεωc. Like Pollux, the commentator assumes the poet is using the chorus as a vehicle to put over something to the audience on his own behalf, doing exactly what the poets of Old Comedy did. It is not merely the content of this ode that leads him to this view: the form in which the opening assertion is couched suggests a personal utterance by the poet. Few modern scholars would accept without question that ἐγώ in a case like this is to be interpreted as 'I, the poet' rather than 'I, the chorus-member'.[2] If this is all that lies behind the tradition of a tragic parabasis—and I suggest that it is—the statements of Pollux and Aristides deserve little respect and are not really relevant to our inquiry.

Using what we know of the practice of ancient biography and criticism of the tragedians, we may also explain away Pollux's statement that Sophocles too wrote tragic parabases.[3] Presumably the *Hipponous* contained an ode which because of its form and content lent itself to the kind of interpretation outlined

[1] In Tragedy compare Aesch. *Ag.* 472, Eur. *Andr.* 465, 766, Eur. *Hcld.* 926, *Ion* 485, *El.* 737, *Hel.* 1048, *Bacch.* 430, 1005, *Erectheus* fr. 60 Austin. (N.B. what Satyrus [Fr. 39 col. xvii. 20 ff.] makes of Euripides fr. 911.)

[2] The much-debated question of how far one is justified in identifying the views of the poet with those expressed by his chorus is too large a topic to discuss properly here. It is worth observing, however, that scholars are often misled by the formal characteristics of Greek choral lyric when they regard particular passages as expressing the poet's views and feelings (admiration for the passage often contributes to this view). This is particularly the case with Eur. *H.F.* 673–86 and the second stasimon of Sophocles' *O.T.* In the case of the former, Wilamowitz assures us that we are being 'vouchsafed a glimpse into the poet's heart' (cf. Pohlenz, op. cit., 304) and Dodds commenting on Soph. *O.T.* 896 τί δεῖ με χορεύειν asserts 'in speaking of themselves as a chorus they step out of the play into the contemporary world' (*G. & R.* xiii [1966], 46 = *The Ancient Concept of Progress*, 75) and goes on to argue from this that the real speaker is here the poet. But in neither case is it necessary to believe that the sentiments expressed are inappropriate for a collection of Theban old men and peculiarly appropriate to an Athenian poet. The aspects of the odes which seem to remove us from the imagined heroic age and place us firmly in the world of Athenian dramatic competitions, αἰεὶ δ' ἐν cτεφάνοιcιν εἴην Eur. *H.F.* 677 f., αἳ μ' ἐχόρευcαν ibid. 686, and τί δεῖ με χορεύειν Soph. *O.T.* 896, are not on closer inspection out of place in their dramatic context. Garlands are after all the appurtenance to any kind of celebration in the ancient world and so is dancing, and the *H.F.* chorus has reason to celebrate. It may strike people as absurd that a group of old men should describe themselves as dancing or contemplate that activity, but it happens quite often in Tragedy where there is no question of the poet using the chorus as a vehicle, e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 152–3, Eur. *Hcld.* 892 (for a collection of passages where choruses refer to themselves as dancing see M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the light of the Person and Number Used* [*Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, 46], 119. On the *H.F.* ode see the excellent article by H. Parry, *A.J.Ph.* lxxxvi [1965], 363–74).

[3] That is surely all that should be inferred from καὶ Cοφοκλῆc δ' αὐτό . . . cπανιάκιc (N.B. Εὐριπίδηc αὐτὸ πεποίηκεν ~ Cοφοκλῆc δ' αὐτό . . . ποιεῖ). We are no more justified in believing that in *Hipponous* there was a passage in which Sophocles sought to refute some statement made in a Euripidean chorus than in believing, as was once believed, that Sophocles like Euripides became confused about the sex of his chorus. Welcker

above. Since such odes were regarded as characteristic of Euripides, the ancient commentators would draw the conclusion that Sophocles' motive in writing such an ode must have been the desire to emulate his rival. Rivalry and mutual criticism between poets working in the same genre is an extremely common theme of ancient biography and literary criticism.[1] In this particular case we also have evidence of an ancient tradition that seeks to contrast unfavourably, not only Euripides' views (that is to say the view expressed by his characters and choruses) on religion and morality, but also his style and dramatic technique with those of Sophocles.[2] We read for instance in a comment on Soph. *O.T.* 264: *αἱ τοιαῦται ἔννοιαι*[3] *οὐκ ἔχονται μὲν τοῦ σεμνοῦ, κινητικαὶ δέ εἰσι τοῦ θεάτρου· αἷς καὶ πλεονάζει Εὐριπίδης. ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς πρὸς βραχὺ μόνον αὐτῶν ἅπτεται πρὸς τὸ κινῆσαι τὸ θέατρον.* Note that here, as in the Pollux passage, Euripides is blamed for the excessive use of an effect thought inappropriate to Tragedy: his superior rival can be defended because he shows restraint in such matters and when he indulges in such lapses he at least does so but rarely.

## II

We may leave aside 'the tragic parabasis'[4] and turn to a group of passages which from time to time have been adduced as providing evidence for audience

(*Griechische Tragödie*, 429) rightly rejected the latter view, but he propounded the first and was followed by Pearson in his edition of the Sophocles fragments.

[1] For an example concerning Sophocles and Euripides see ΣEur. *Phoen.* 1. Compare the allusions to Bacchylides and Simonides alleged to occur in Pindar (ΣP. *Ol.* 2. 88 [p. 99 Drachmann], Σ*Nem.* 4. 37 [p. 75 Drachmann]) and the dispute between Philemon and Menander (Athenaeus, 13. 594 = C.A.F. 2. 534 = Men. fr. 945 Koerte–Thierfelder). Literary rivals of any era are liable to be disputatious, but there is something excessively schematic about the way the poets of antiquity quarrelled.

[2] e.g. ΣSoph. *Ai.* 520, 1037, ΣSoph. *Ant.* 155, ΣSoph. *O.C.* 220. Much of this may derive from, or rather have been collected by, Didymus who was particularly interested in the piety of classical authors (see M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri Fragmenta*, 93 ff., A. Römer, *A.B.A.W.* xix [1892], 641, Trendelenburg, op. cit. 56 ff.). On the tendency to praise Sophocles at the expense of Euripides see A. Römer, *Philol.* lxv (1906), 50 ff., a section entitled 'Die Euripides-Kritiker und die Sophokles-Schwärmer'. Stevens (op. cit. 89) notes in Satyros' life the tendency for Euripides and Sophocles to be regarded as polar opposites, and it is tempting to see such a biographical tradition influencing the kind of comments we find in the dramatic scholia. Perhaps there lies behind this polarizing of the two poets a *σύγκρισις Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους*. (It is a pity we do not know more about Douris' *περὶ Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους F.Gr.H.* 76, fr. 29 [see Leo, *Griechische-römische Biographie*, 105] and Heraclides Ponticus' *περὶ τῶν παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ Σοφοκλεῖ* fr. 180 Wehrli. Even if they were not *συγκρίσεις*, the form of their titles does suggest that there was at least an element of comparison contained in them). It is interesting to note that the motif common to Pollux 4. 111 and ΣSoph. *O.T.* 264 (see above) is found also in the Plutarchean *Comparatio Menandri et Aristophanis* (Plut. *Mor.* 853. 1)—*ὁ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις*. No *σύγκρισις* is traceable back beyond the fourth century B.C. (see F. Focke, *Hermes* lviii [1923], 341 f., from whose examples one must exclude the Gorgianic work invented by Pohlenz), but there can hardly be any doubt that the germs of the *σύγκρισις* as a literary form already existed in the sophistic era (see M. L. West, *C.Q.* N.S. xvii [1967], 441) even though Pohlenz (*N.G.G.* 1920, 142–78 = *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 436 ff.) went too far in positing a *σύγκρισις Αἰσχύλου καὶ Εὐριπίδου* as a source for the contest in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (see R. Pfeiffer, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 47).

[3] For the phenomenon in question (double meanings) and its deprecation in ancient commentaries see L. Trautner, *Die Amphibolien bei den griechischen Tragikern und ihre Beurteilung durch die antike Ästhetik* (Diss. Erlangen, 1907).

[4] When Kranz (*Stasimon*, 172) called Aesch. *Eum.* 517–65 a tragic parabasis, I am sure he was speaking metaphorically.

address in Tragedy. What follows is necessarily a selection, but the passages have been chosen either because there appears to be a case to answer or else because they illustrate typical misinterpretations on the part of those who have adduced them and as such provide a warning and instruction which may be applied to the interpretation of other passages not discussed here.[1]

1. Aesch. *Ag.* 36–9:

> τὸ δ' ἄλλο σιγῶ· βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ μέγας
> βέβηκεν· οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι,
> σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειεν· ὡς ἑκὼν ἐγὼ
> μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι.

These are the exit lines of the watchman, alone on stage when he speaks them. His darkly expressed μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι has often been taken as a reference to the audience. It is not necessary, however, to believe that the lines have so specific a reference: this is just an enigmatic way of saying that the house has a secret which the watchman is reluctant to divulge. The mere admission by a speaker alone on stage that he is speaking does not seem to me sufficient to indicate that the speaker takes for granted the presence of a theatre audience; it is simply a stage convention.[2] Leo (*Der Monolog im Drama*, 8 n. 1), who is followed by Fraenkel in his *Agamemnon* commentary ad loc., described the words of the watchman as being addressed to an imaginary listener. As long as one is not seduced by this terminology into speculation about the nature of speech (as I think Fraenkel is inclined to be), it will serve to describe the phenomenon in question. If by convention a speaker on stage alone admits that he is speaking, by convention he may be allowed to imagine that his speech is liable to be overheard.

A passage such as this cannot of itself prove that tragic actors addressed the audience directly, but if firm evidence were to be adduced from elsewhere to show that such a thing was possible in Tragedy, then our view of what occurs in Aesch. *Ag.* 39 and passages like it (and also of passages in which speakers who are alone on stage made use of deictic pronouns)[3] would have to be revised.

2. Soph. *Aiax* 1028:[4]

> σκέψασθε, πρὸς θεῶν, τὴν τύχην δυοῖν βροτοῖν . . .

Teucer who has up to now been addressing the corpse of Ajax turns to address a plurality of people, asking them to reflect on the respective fates of Hector and

[1] Wilamowitz's suggestion (*Menanders Schiedsgericht*, 97) that Soph. *Aiax* 1083 οὐκ ἄν ποτ', ἄνδρες, ἄνδρα θαυμάσαιμ' ἔτι might be *ad spectatores* is unfortunate. Teucer is surely addressing the chorus after turning angrily away from his interlocutor. Soph. *O.C.* 1348 is exactly parallel.

[2] I do not agree with Kannicht (see also W. Nestle, *Die Struktur des Eingangs*, 5) when he argues that λέγοιμ' ἄν in Eur. *Hel.* 22–3 indicates that the speech is *ad spectatores*. For characters alone on stage admitting that they are speaking, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 43 ff.; Soph. *Tr.* 21 ff.; Eur. *Hipp.* 9; *I.T.* 37, 43 (where the character claims to be speaking to the aither); *Phoen.* 43; *Or.* 14–15, 26–8; *Telephus* fr. 102, 8 Austin, *Melanippe Sophe* p. 26 von Arnim, 11–12, *Phrixus* fr. 819N. (cf. also Aesch, *Sept.* 658, where Eteocles is soliloquizing).

[3] Common in all the dramatists, it can be traced back to the prologue of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* (fr. 8N.).

[4] The arguments adduced by Morstadt and Nauck for the deletion of Soph. *Aiax* 1028–39 (see Nauck in Schneidewin–Nauck) have never received a proper refutation. Whether or not Sophocles wrote the lines does not affect the point at issue.

Ajax, the men who exchanged gifts after that famous duel. This plurality has been taken by some[1] to be the audience despite the presence of a plurality of people, the chorus and Tecmessa, on stage at the time. One may admit that Teucer's appeal is meant for a wider group than those on stage—*πρὸς θεῶν* as Fraenkel (*Mus. Helv.* xxiv [1967], 192) points out argues for this[2]—just as Theseus' appeal *σκέψασθε δ' ἐς τόνδ' . . .* (Eur. *Hipp.* 943) is more likely to be meant for the world in general than for the chorus. That is not the same as saying that Teucer's speech is *ad spectatores.*

3. Eur. *Tro.* 36–8:[3]

*τὴν δ' ἀθλίαν τήνδ' εἴ τις εἰσορᾶν θέλει,*
*πάρεστιν Ἑκάβη κειμένη πυλῶν πάρος,*
*δάκρυα χέουσα πολλὰ καὶ πολλῶν ὕπερ.*

Poseidon the prologue-speaker is alone on stage except for the semiconscious Hecuba to whom he draws attention here. As often elsewhere[4] we find in the scholia the view that the audience is being addressed directly and as often happens Euripides is roundly censured: 'He ought to have brought Hecuba on stage lamenting her present troubles—that is the way to create pathos—as *ψυχρῶς τῶι θεάτρωι προσδιαλέγεται.*' This assumption has been shared by many modern scholars.[5] Schadewaldt for example argues that the unprejudiced listener could not but feel himself addressed when hearing the word *τις.* I am not sure that this is the case. One can as easily mentally supply *βροτῶν* as *ὑμῶν.* Compare Eur. *H.F.* 1[6] *τίς τὸν Διὸς σύλλεκτρον οὐκ οἶδεν βροτῶν;* The same holds good for Eur. *El.* 50 (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 56).

4. Eur. *Or.* 128 f.:

*εἶδετε παρ' ἄκρας ὡς ἀπέθριξεν τρίχας*
*σώιζουσα κάλλος; ἔστι δ' ἡ πάλαι γυνή.*

These lines are spoken by Electra immediately after an altercation with Helen who has just left the stage. Orestes is on stage but asleep and the chorus has yet to enter (it does so at 140). To whom then is *εἶδετε* addressed? The ancient commentators offer three alternative explanations.

i. *τὸ εἴδετε ἀντὶ τοῦ ἴδοι τις ἄν, ὡς τὸ φαίης κε ζάκοτον καὶ ἔνθ' οὐκ ἄν βρίζοντα ἴδοις.* This is obviously way off the mark, a desperate *αὐτοσχεδίασμα* by which the ancient commentator tries to explain something he does not understand by assimilating it to something with which he is relatively familiar.[7] The scholia on Tragedy often note the use of the second person singular as an indefinite, and the two Homeric passages here cited (*Il.* 3. 220 and 4. 223) are the *Musterbeispiele* they use to illustrate the idiom.[8] The inept adduction of a Homeric passage is not uncommon in the scholia on Euripides' *Orestes.*[9]

[1] e.g. Welcker (*Kleine Schriften*, ii. 327—he thinks that Teucer is holding up Ajax's sword for the audience's inspection), Radermacher, and Kamerbeek.

[2] Cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 410: 'videte, *quaeso*, quid potest pecunia.'

[3] The choice of variants in 37–8 does not affect the argument.

[4] Cf. ΣEur. *Andr.* 622 *διαλέγεται δὲ πρὸς τὸ θέατρον* and see Elsperger, op. cit., 153 ff.

[5] e.g. W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, 10 and most recently J. R. Wilson, *G.R.B.S.* viii (1967), 214.

[6] Actually this line too is taken as *ad spectatores* by W. Kraus (*W. St.* lii [1934], 67).

[7] See A. Römer, *A.B.A.W.* xix (1892), 650.

[8] This may be added to the testimonia Erbse prints below ΣHom. *Il.* 3. 220 (*Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, i. 400).

[9] See A. Römer, *Philologus* lxv (1906), 79.

ii. ἔνιοι δέ φαcι ταῖc δμωcὶ ταῦτα λέγειν. This will not do either. Admittedly in Tragedy the movements or more particularly the entrances of characters without speaking roles are not always clearly indicated in the text in the way those of the major characters are. For example, although Creon enters at Eur. *Med.* 271, it is not until 335 that we learn that he has a band of attendants with him.[1] But that is quite different from what is supposed to happen here. εἴδετε in 128 would be the only indication in the play of the presence of these serving girls on stage and there is no parallel for such extras, the sole purpose of whose presence is to hear two lines of indignant exclamation. Normal technique justifies the presence of extras by having one of the actors give them a command, send them on an errand or, as in the *Medea* passage, use them to back up a threat.

iii. οἱ δὲ πρὸc τὸ θέατρον, ὃ καὶ ἄμεινον. ἐφελκυcτικὸc γάρ ἐcτιν ἀεὶ μᾶλλον τῶν θεατῶν ὁ ποιητήc, οὐ φροντίζων τῶν ἀκριβολογούντων. At first sight this explanation is attractive. It is at least the obvious one and not surprisingly has found many adherents in modern times,[2] becoming as it were the prop on which the case for audience address in Tragedy rests.[3] Leo, however, (*Der Monolog im Drama*, 31) denied this explanation and applied to εἴδετε . . . κάλλοc the kind of terminology he used in discussing Aesch. *Ag.* 36–9: 'she addresses imagined listeners, in Comedy it would be the audience.' Fraenkel in a series of notes took up Leo's interpretation and provided illustrative parallels.[4] While I accept the Leo–Fraenkel explanation, I do not find that Fraenkel's parallels are uniformly apposite. Schadewaldt (*Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, 10 n. 2) was surely correct[5] to distinguish the *Orestes* passage from harangues introduced by second person plurals like Eur. *Andr.* 950 ff.: πρὸc τάδ' εὖ φυλάccετε / κλήθροιcι καὶ μοχλοῖcι δωμάτων πύλαc. The recipients of such tirades are of course 'imagined' in the sense that they are not physically present on stage, but in many cases they comprise a *particular* class of person,[6] in this case husbands (and possibly fathers). In some passages the section of humanity being addressed is clearly specified: in Eur. *Andr.* 622 μνηcτῆρεc, in Eur. *Suppl.* 744 f. the politically ambitious, in Eur. *Suppl.* 949 ὦ ταλαίπωροι βροτῶν (here of course genus equals species) and in Eur. *El.* 383–5 people who judge only by appearances. This form of utterance, which is very much a Euripidean mannerism and no doubt contributed to the reputation that Euripides acquired for indulging in extra-dramatic audience address and being ἐφελκυcτικὸc τῶν θεατῶν,[7] is different from another more relevant phenomenon noted by

[1] Compare also Soph. *El.* 516 ff., where there is no indication when Clytaemnestra enters that she is not alone. Only at 634 when she turns away from Electra do we learn that she has been accompanied by a serving girl. See J. Andrieu, *Le Dialogue antique*, 201–4.

[2] Of recent commentators, Biehl accepts that Euripides is here deploying a motif of Comedy: di Benedetto, however, follows Fraenkel.

[3] See W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, i. 3. 786 n. 1, W. M. Calder III, *Phoenix* xiii (1959), 126 and H. F. Johansen, *Lustrum* vii (1962), 235.

[4] See *S.B.A.W.* 1963 Heft 2, 111 f., *Mus. Helv.* xxiv (1967), 190–3 and xxv (1968), 179–80.

[5] But he is wide of the mark (10 n. 1) in adducing Alexis fr. 108 and Men. *Per.* 7 (127 Sandbach). The tone in which actors deliver expository prologue speeches in New Comedy is quite different from what we have here.

[6] Perhaps the famous *Melanippe*-fragment which begins δοκεῖτε πηδᾶν τἀδικήματα (fr. 560N.) was prefaced by something like 'O foolish men!'

[7] N.B. ΣEur. *Andr.* 622. Presumably we would have more such comments if the alphabetic plays were equipped with scholia. For an imitation of the mannerism in Comedy compare Apollodorus (of Carystus) fr. 5 Kock: ὦ πάντεc ἄνθρωποι τί τὸ ζῆν

Fraenkel. This is the angry or incredulous question of the type 'did you see/hear that?'. The form is that of a question: the effect is an exclamation, an alternative to 'look at/listen to that!'. In the case of such an idiom which clearly derives from the spoken language, one is not encouraged to speculate too deeply on the identity or existence of an addressee. It is possible that such a phrase became fossilized like for instance πῶc δοκεῖc[1] or εἰπέ μοι,[2] both of which may be used when a plurality is being addressed.

There we might leave the question, accepting with Fraenkel that the interpreters of *Or.* 128 have failed to recognize an idiom that cannot of itself be used as evidence for or against the possibility of audience address in Tragedy and that, failing any other convincing evidence, it is illicit to import a characteristic of Comedy into an explanation of a phrase in Tragedy. One doubt remains. Had Electra begun by saying εἶδεc no one would have considered the possibility of audience address here. She begins, however, εἴδετε, and it is disconcerting that in all Fraenkel's examples of the idiomatic 'did you see/hear that?'[3] the verb is singular:[4]

Eur. *Ph.* 1676: εἶδεc τὸ τόλμημ' οἷον ἐξωνείδιcεν;
Ar. *Eq.* 269: ὡc δ' ἀλαζών, ὡc δὲ μάcθληc. εἶδεc οἵ' ὑπέρχεται;

Ar. *Av.* 1211: ἤκουcαc αὐτῆc οἷον εἰρωνεύεται;
Ar. *Lys.* 379: ἤκουcαc αὐτῆc τοῦ θράcουc;

One might have thought that it was precisely the use of a singular verb that made such a phrase idiomatic. The plural in our passage requires explanation. I offer tentatively the suggestion that this may be a case where the tragic poet by slightly altering an idiomatic phrase raises the phrase on the stylistic scale, further from the level of ordinary speech and nearer to the level of tragic dialogue.[5]

## III

It should be clear by now that I do not believe that there is any evidence that compels us to reject the traditional view of audience address in Tragedy and to believe that there existed in Tragedy anything resembling the kind of direct appeal to the audience found so frequently in Old Comedy and which now that we have more of Menander we can see was also a prominent feature of New

ἡδέωc / παρέντεc ἐπιμελεῖcθε τοῦ κακῶc ποεῖν / πολεμοῦντεc ἀλλήλοιc; I am inclined to see the same practice in Men. *Dysc.* 746. Sandbach ad loc. takes it as audience address.

[1] On πῶc . . . δοκεῖc used by Dicaeopolis when presumably addressing the audience at Ar. *Ach.* 12 see K. J. Dover, *Q.U.C.C.* ix (1970), 15.

[2] Note e.g. Dem. 4. 10 βούλεcθ' εἰπέ μοι (cf. also Plat. *Prot.* 311 d, Plat. *Euthyd.* 283 b 4, and Ar. *Ach.* 328—Kühner–Gerth i. 84).

[3] In the analogous imperatival exclamation 'look at/listen to that!' there are plural instances, but it is difficult to be sure in a case like Ar. *Ach.* 770 θᾶcθε τῶνδε τὰc ἀπιcτίαc that the speaker is not addressing the audience. 'Spectate' in Ter. *Andr.* 231 might be a parallel. Plaut. *Stich.* 410 is different (see above, p. 19).

[4] One might add to Fraenkel's examples Cratinus fr. 6: εἶδεc τὴν Θαcίαν ἅλμην οἵ' ἄττα βαΰζει.

[5] There are parallels in Sophocles and Euripides for phrases attested in the dialogue of Comedy or Plato appearing in a slightly different, and one is tempted to think, more elevated form. For example Soph. *Phil.* 1260 seems to allude to the more colloquial expression κλαίων (you will do this) and Eur. *Med.* 472 to echo but not reproduce the phrase εὖ γε ποιῶν. See P. T. Stevens, *C.Q.* xxxi (1937), 188 and *C.Q.* xxxix (1945), 100 (for a similar sort of effect as regards pronunciation, see A. Platt, *C.Q.* iv [1910], 158 on Soph. *O.T.* 430).

Comedy.[1] The two parts of Tragedy which come closest to disrupting the dramatic illusion are the typical late Euripidean prologue-speech[2] (one would not say this of the prologues of *Medea* or *Heraclidae*) and the conventional tail-piece beginning *ὦ μέγα cεμνὴ Νίκη* which is found at the end of three Euripidean plays.[3] One has only to compare these phenomena with their New Comedy equivalents to see the difference between Tragedy and Comedy with regard to the illusion. The Euripidean chorus prays to Nike and to that extent we may say disrupts the illusion. The plays of Menander and his contemporaries ended with the expression of the hope that victory would attend them, but they also added direct appeals to the audience to applaud and thus ensure that victory.[4] The Euripidean prologues may convey a great deal of information to the audience in a dry and undramatic manner, so undramatic to some readers that they are often regarded as a kind of playbill.[5] The speaker of such a prologue, however, never admits the presence of an audience or makes reference or appeal to it in the course of his speech. One may compare the Euripidean Hermes at the beginning of *Ion* with the Menandrean Pan at the beginning of *Dyscolus*. After introducing himself Hermes says (Eur. *Ion* 6) 'I come to this land of Delphi.' Pan begins by asking the audience to *imagine* that the stage represents Phyle in Attica: *τῆc Ἀττικῆc νομίζετ' εἶναι τὸν τόπον / Φύλην*.[6] At the end of his speech Hermes departs into a thicket to observe the ensuing action. At the end of the *Dyscolus* prologue, Pan before withdrawing says (Men. *Dysc.*

[1] I mention here a curious notion entertained by H. J. Rose and W. M. Calder III that tragic actors occasionally addressed the audience *in lieu* of a stage crowd (Rose on Aesch. *Sept.* 1, and Calder with reference to Soph. *O.T.* 1 ff. in the article cited above). Such an idea cannot be accepted (it does seem to have parallels in other forms of drama—see Ann Righter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*, ch. 1) without firm evidence that audience address was a possibility in Tragedy, but in any case the difficulties of production which force Rose and Calder to their suggestion seem to me illusory and trivial when set beside the incongruities entailed by its acceptance. It would be a very odd kind of convention which demanded that an Athenian audience was to feel itself involved in the action of plays that began *Κάδμου πολῖται, χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια* or *ὦ τέκνα Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή* (one would be more sympathetic towards granting such an effect for a line like Eur. *Erectheus* fr. 65. 78 Austin). In *O.T.* the transformation the audience is supposed to make is particularly remarkable. They must become not merely the citizen body of Thebes, but an unrepresentative collection out of that citizen body (17 ff.). The effect produced by 78 ff. and 91 ff. would also be very strange if we had to take *οἵδε* and *τῶνδε* as references to the audience.

[2] Compare Pohlenz (*Die griechische Tragödie*[2], 436): 'Im Prolog wendet sich der Dichter unmittelbar an die Zuschauer.' (See also W. Nestle, op. cit. 4–5.)

[3] *I.T.*, *Phoen.*, and *Or.* (N.B. *Σ*Eur. *Or.* 1691 *τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ χοροῦ ἐcτι λεγόμενον ὡc ἐκ προcώπου τοῦ ποιητοῦ*). This ending is sometimes appended to other plays, and Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1462–6 doubts its authenticity.

[4] Men. *Dysc.* 966–9, Men. *Mis.* 464–5, Men. *Sam.* 733 f., Men. *Sic.* 420–2, Men. fr. 771, Posidippus, *P. Heidel.* 183, 6–7 (= *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta*, ed. Austin, 218, 12–13), Antiphanes, *P. Oxy.* 427 (= Austin fr. 3), Anon. *P. Oxy.* 1239 (= Austin 249, 17 ff.). Apparently Roman Tragedy followed Comedy in ending with a direct appeal to the audience (Quint. 6. 1. 52). This divergence from the norms of Greek theatrical convention is paralleled for the prologue of Roman Tragedy by what is implied by Plaut. *Amph.* 41 ff. (on this see H. D. Jocelyn, *Antichthon*, 1 [1967], 67).

[5] Criticism of Euripides' prologues and especially of the genealogies some of them contain is commonplace in antiquity: see e.g. *Σ*Ar. *Ach.* 47 and the Towneley scholion on Hom. *Il.* 15. 64 (it was not just in prologues that genealogies were to be found and criticized: see *Σ*Soph. *O.C.* 220).

[6] Closely parallel to the *Dysc.* passage is Heniochus fr. 5. 7–8. One shudders to think of the confusion that might have arisen if all we had of the prologue of Sophocles' *Electra* was 9–10.

45–6 ~ Men. *Sik.* 24–5): *ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ κεφάλαια· τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα δὲ / ὄψεσθ' ἐὰν βούλησθε· βουλήθητε δέ* . . . , a direct appeal to the audience to give the play a fair hearing. There is nothing like this in Tragedy.

## Epimetrum: Audience Address in Satyr-Drama

Any assertion about this genre is almost bound to be hazardous in view of the fragmentary nature of the evidence. One is bound to speculate, however, whether Satyr-drama kept company with Tragedy as regards audience address and rupture of the dramatic illusion. Although it might be natural to assume that this form of drama, being related to Tragedy and performed at dramatic festivals as an adjunct to it, would share the conventions and constraints of its kindred form, there exist in Satyr-drama certain features which would be admissible in Comedy, but unthinkable in Tragedy: the acceptance of 'anapaestic feet' within the iambic trimeter, the occasional failure to observe Porson's law, some comic vocabulary, and the use of the strengthened form of deictic pronouns. If the metre and vocabulary of Satyr-drama tended on occasions towards Comedy, might not the relationship between actors and audience have shared the same tendency?

Our one complete satyr play suggests a negative answer. The relationship between actor and audience in Euripides' *Cyclops* is in no way different from the relationship we found to exist in Euripidean tragedies. Silenus no more admits that there is an audience present during his prologue speech than does the nurse in hers in *Medea.*[1]

There are some passages elsewhere, however, which have been taken to show that Satyr-drama admitted audience address.

i. Achaeus fr. 3 Nauck–Snell:

> *πότερα θεωροῖς εἶτ' ἀγωνισταῖς λέγεις;*
> *πόλλ' ἐσθίουσιν, ὡς ἐπασκούντων τρόπος.*
> *ποδαποὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ξένοι; Βοιώτιοι*

Guggisberg in his useful dissertation on Satyr-drama[2] finds in *θεωροῖς* (actually by a Freudian slip the word he prints is *θεαταῖς*, itself a good tragic word) a reference to the audience. Given the subject-matter implied by the title of the play from which this fragment comes, *Ἆθλα*, and given that there is a satyr play by Aeschylus of which we possess considerable fragments which bears the alternative titles *Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἰσθμιασταί*, this is an improbable assumption. *θεωροῖς* obviously refers to a delegation attending some kind of games, possibly a group of satyrs.[3]

[1] Odysseus' comment (Eur. *Cycl.* 642) *ἄνδρες πονηροὶ κοὐδὲν οἵδε σύμμαχοι* might be taken as an aside and as such addressed to the audience (although this does not necessarily follow). I think it misleading, however, to describe such exasperated comments about an interlocutor delivered in the third person (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 740, Eur. *Hipp.* 1038) as asides. Only in cases where the speaker is trying to *conceal* his reaction is the term appropriate. Clearly this is not the case here and in any case it is clear from what follows that the satyrs hear the remark (Kaibel, *Hermes* xxx [1895], 74 took Eur. *Cycl.* 480–2 as an aside. The lines in question are clearly an interpolation: see O. Zwierlein, *Gnom.* xxxix [1967], 451).

[2] P. Guggisberg, *Das Satyrspiel* (Zürich, 1947), 41. Steffen in his edition of the fragments of Satyr-drama accepted that the illusion could be breached (p. xxvii). He apparently changed his mind when he produced his separate edition of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* (p. 69).

[3] Satyrs on a visit seems to have been a feature of Satyr-drama. Compare *Greek Literary Papyri*, 31. 14 where the chorus of satyrs asks *ἆρ' ἄκαρπος ἡ θεωρία;* (in this case the visit is to a king's court to seek his daughter's hand).

ii. There is a passage in the papyrus of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* which ever since its first publication has been interpreted by some as an address of the audience. Silenus, promised a reward by Apollo if he finds Apollo's stolen cattle, is clearly[1] asking if anyone has seen them and apparently offering a reward. It is generally agreed that he is not addressing the satyr-chorus since they are already aware of Apollo's proclamation. Hence many[2] have assumed that Silenus is asking the audience for their help, an effect that can be paralleled in Comedy (Ar. *Ach.* 206 ff., Plaut. *Aul.* 715 ff. [possibly reflecting a Menandrean original], and *Cist.* 678 [almost certainly Menandrean]).[3] I do not believe, however, that there is any indication of this in the text and see no difference between Soph. *Ichn.* 77 f. and Soph. *Aiax* 879 ff. (aptly adduced by Siegmann[4]) where the chorus asks: *τίς ἂν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἂν φιλοπόνων / ἁλιαδῶν ἔχων ἀύπνους ἄγρας / . . . ἀπύοι;* Silenus makes his proclamation to the denizens of the wood and anyone else who might be listening.

iii. The tenth book of Athenaeus begins with the following four lines:

> *ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δείπνου γλαφυροῦ ποικίλην εὐωχίαν*
> *τὸν ποιητὴν δεῖ παρέχειν τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν σοφόν,*
> *ἵν' ἀπίηι τις τοῦτο φαγὼν καὶ πιών, ὅπερ λαβὼν*
> *χαίρει ‹τις› καὶ σκευασία μὴ μί' ἦι τῆς μουσικῆς.*

On reading these lines without passing on to what follows the unprejudiced observer would conclude that he was confronted by a fragment of Old Comedy. The content[5] and metre[6] conspire to suggest nothing so much as a comic parabasis. What follows comes as a surprise: *Ἀστυδάμας ὁ τραγικὸς ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ σατυρικῶι, ἑταῖρε, φησί, Τιμόκρατες. φέρε εἴπωμεν ἐνταῦθα τοῖς προειρημένοις τὰ ἀκόλουθα*[7] *ὅτι ἦν καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἀδηφάγος. ἀποφαίνονται δὲ τοῦτο σχεδὸν πάντες ποιηταὶ καὶ συγγραφεῖς.* According to Athenaeus then the lines in question are from a fourth-century satyr-play.[8] If that is the case they are undoubtedly evidence to show that by the fourth century at any rate the writer of a satyr play was prepared to break the dramatic illusion.[9]

[1] Soph. *Ichn.* 77 ff. (*Greek Literary Papyri*, 7. 74 ff.). The exact wording cannot certainly be restored. See E. Siegmann, *Untersuchungen zu Sophokles' Ichneutai*, 40 f.

[2] Most notably C. Robert, *Hermes* xlvii (1912), 541. Hunt in the *editio princeps* thought that only 85 f. was addressed to the audience. A similar appeal to the audience has been seen in Aesch. *Dictyulci* 766 by M. Werre-de Haas (*Pap. Lugd.-Bat.* x [1961], 36 f.).

[3] Perhaps Men. *Epitr.* 265b–266a (Sandbach 441–2) is another example.

[4] Wilamowitz (*Kleine Schriften* i. 354 n. 3) seems to me to be quibbling when he argues against the use of this passage as a parallel.

[5] Metagenes fr. 14 is a very close parallel for the thought.

[6] The metre is Eupolidean, the metre in which the first section of the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Clouds* is written (see Dover's edition, p. 164 and P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, 33. 4). For the resolution at the beginning of the third line compare Ar. *Nub.* 539.

[7] A reference back to the previous book: *ἡμεῖς δ' ἐνταῦθα καταπαύσαντες τὸν λόγον ἀρχὴν ποιησόμεθα τῶν ἑξῆς ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἀδηφαγίας.*

[8] On the various Astydamantes and the problem of dating them see B. Snell, *Nach. Akad. d. Wiss. in Gött. Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1966 nr. 2, 33 ff. and *T.G.F.* i, p. 88. The four lines quoted are printed in the latter work as Astydamas II fr. 4.

[9] As well as the mention of *θεαταί* in what is obviously a dramatic context, the word *ποιητής* is disruptive of the illusion. The tragic poets when they wanted to refer to poetry described it as song. The word occurs only once in Tragedy (the second reference in Allen–Italie should be deleted: it depends on a misunderstanding of an entry in the Berlin Photius [Phot. Berolin. 139. 14 = Eur. fr. 955g Snell]. The right word *ᾠδός* is in Collard's supplement to Allen–Italie). This

Nauck initially rejected the ascription to Astydamas and assumed that the fragment was from an old comedy. He retracted this view (*Index Dictionis Tragicae*, xxvi) under the influence of Wilamowitz who argued that the content was no bar to ascription to a *fourth*-century satyr play and adduced arguments seeking to prove that the metre was possible in a satyr play.[1] Wilamowitz may be right, although I incline to the view that the text of the opening of book 10 of Athenaeus is unsound[2] (it seems rather too much of a coincidence that the lines cited by Athenaeus to form an introduction to the book should come from a play about Heracles, the subject of the ensuing discussion). Even if the ascription is correct I doubt whether we learn much about Satyr-drama as a whole from this evidence. It was stated at the outset that there were several elements common to Satyr-drama and Old Comedy. Even from the exiguous evidence we possess for the development of Satyr-drama through the fourth century and thereafter, it is clear that Satyr-drama continued and stepped up its borrowing from Comedy.[3] In particular the later Satyr-drama included such comic elements as topical allusion and personal satire. We have the evidence of the fragments of Lycophron's *Menedemus* and more strikingly of the remarkable *Agen* of Python.[4] It seems possible that another of Comedy's most characteristic ingredients, the parabasis, was borrowed in like fashion. Such a contamination of elements from different genres as a satyr play containing a parabasis or something resembling a parabasis would only be a late growth. One is not entitled to argue from Astydamas' *Heracles Satyricus* that audience address was a native constituent of Satyr-drama. That is a question that must remain open.

*University of Manchester* DAVID BAIN

is in the famous and often quoted *Stheneboia* fragment (Eur. fr. 663N.) ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα / Ἔρως διδάσκει κἂν ἄμουσος ἦι τὸ πρίν. I suspect that Plutarch's quotation Plut. *Amat.* 762 b may not faithfully reproduce what Euripides wrote (I do not think that μουσικήν in Plut. *Symp.* 622 c is what he wrote either—this is not really a variant, rather a deliberate alteration of the quotation) and that ποιητήν is due to the paraphrase of the line found in Plato *Symp.* 196 e (on the various allusions to the lines in antiquity see E. Stemplinger, op. cit., 249).

[1] In *Ind. Schol. Hib. Gott.* 1889, 24 (= *Kleine Schriften* iv. 690). See also *Griechische Verskunst*, 379 n. 2. His argument is that because the (rare) priapeum – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – was called by some the *satyricum* and because Old Comedy employed in addition to priapea related tetrameter lines of which the eupolidean was one, it is reasonable to suppose that Satyr-drama would have used the eupolidean. This is mere speculation but it would be arbitrary when we have so little of Satyr-drama to exclude any particular type of line or metrical pattern.

[2] Casaubon moved ὁ τραγικός . . . Τιμόκρατες so that it stood after τοῖς προειρημένοις τὰ ἀκόλουθα and governed ὅτι ἦν καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἀδηφάγος. In that case Astydamas' *Heracles Satyricus* would be adduced as evidence for Heracles' ἀδηφαγία, and we would be free to guess about the attribution of the decorative quotation that begins the book. The transposition certainly gives a clearer sequence of thought and stylistically smoother opening to the book. (Casaubon also integrated the opening quotation more closely into the next by inserting ἐπεί between ἀλλά and ὥσπερ and taking ἀλλά . . . μουσικῆς closely in conjunction with φέρε εἴπωμεν. One might note, however, that the opening of book 11 is a parallel for the way book 10 opens and might be thought to defend it against emendation.)

[3] See Guggisberg, op. cit. 41, Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, i. 1. 82, Steffen, op. cit. xxiii, K. Ziegler, *R.E.* zweite Reihe via 2, 1977–8.

[4] *T.G.F.* i. 259—it contains reference by name to Harpalus and his mistress Pythionike. Compare too Sositheus fr. 4. Snell.