

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. VI

HELSINKI 1969 HELSINGFORS

## CONTENTS

Kaarle Hirvonen	Cledonomaney and the grinding slave woman, Od. XX, 91—121 . . . . .	5
Jorma Kaimio	The nominative singular in -i of Latin gentilicia	23
Iiro Kajanto	Tacitus on the slaves. An interpretation of the an- nales XIV, 42—45 . . . . .	43
Saara Lilja	On the nature of Pliny's letters . . . . .	61
Olli Makkonen	Waldterminologie im Latein . . . . .	81
Päivö Oksala	Das Geschlecht des Attis bei Catull . . . . .	91
Tuomo Pekkanen	Finnicus Afnius . . . . .	97
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica . . . . .	101
Jaakko Suolahti	Legatio libera . . . . .	113
Holger Thesleff	Genitive absolute and Platonic style . . . . .	121
Toivo Viljamaa	Ciceros Bildersprache und die Quellenfrage von Tusc. disp. I, 26—81 . . . . .	133
Maarit Vuorenjuuri	Vocative singular addressing the chorus in Greek drama . . . . .	147

# VOCATIVE SINGULAR ADDRESSING THE CHORUS IN GREEK DRAMA

Maarit Vuorenjuuri

The vocative<sup>1</sup> singular addressing the chorus rarely occurs in conversation between the actors and the chorus or in choral parts. It is only natural that the vocative is usually in the plural, or the vocative word is a collective noun,<sup>2</sup> since the chorus is a group consisting of several members. Referring to the chorus by the second person plural, including vocative plural forms, is common in all plays. Similarly second person singular verb forms, including imperatives, and also pronouns, are quite commonly used with reference not only to the chorus-leader but to the chorus as a whole. It may be of interest to examine the corresponding use of the singular vocatives and consider whether they can tell us something about the dramatic and psychological technique of the dramatists.<sup>3</sup>

The vocative singular referring to the chorus is never used in an actor's rhesis, but it is found in stichic dialogue between an actor and the chorus-leader once in Aeschylus, once in Sophocles and once in Euripides (*A. Th.* 262, *S. OC* 465, *E. Med.* 1310). *E. Ba.* 1033 is also very similar. In lyrical dialogue between the chorus and an actor, Aeschylus never employs the vocative singular, Sophocles uses it three times (*OT* 1321, *Ph.* 1169, *OC* 530) and Euripides four times (*Tr.* 182, *Or.* 146, 167, 186). Sophocles has, moreover, a vocative singular (perhaps addressing the chorus) in the final anapaests of the *Trachinian Women* (1275). A vocative singular addressed to the chorus by another chorus is found in *E. Supp.* 1124, a vocative addressed by the chorus to itself in *E. Supp.* 271 and in *Ion* 193. The vocative singular in tragedy is, accordingly, limited to fifteen instances. There is no reference to the use of proper names in the chorus.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper I use the term »vocative», besides actual vocative cases, of nominatives used instead of vocatives.

<sup>2</sup> Such collective vocatives are for instance *S. Ai.* 357 γένος, *A. A.* 855 πρέσβος τόδε, *E. Hel.* 192 θήραμα βαρβάρου πλάτας.

<sup>3</sup> I am preparing a larger work which discusses the use of the singular and the plural in referring to the chorus.

In comedy, the only vocative singular addressed by an actor to the chorus is in *Ach.* 943. Otherwise only the leader of a half-chorus (seven times, *Ach.* 564, *Lys.* 371, 372, 378, 699, 797, 1017) or another chorus (eight times in *V.* 290ff.) employs this form. In these figures the vocatives of proper names are not included. From the fragments of satyr plays, Sophocles' *Ichneutae* 98, 177 ff., 191, 389, and Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* 90 should be mentioned.

In stichic dialogue the actor usually has no need to use a vocative to address the chorus, because he normally uses a vocative as a greeting when he comes on to the stage or during his rhesis. However, the vocative, if it is used in stichomythia, can be in the singular. In all such cases the actor has focused his attention on the words of the chorus-leader. These vocatives occur in expressions where the actor is referring to the words which the chorus-leader has just spoken, and the contents of the leader's words arouse a strong emotional reaction in the actor. Thus, the actor's vocative to the chorus-leader reflects a sudden rise in the intensity of the dialogue. In the *Seven against Thebes*, for example, Eteokles, after some preparation, flings to the chorus-leader a vehement imperative: A. *Th.* 262 σίγησον, ὦ τάλαινα, μὴ φίλους φόβει. Similarly, in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, Oedipus, when he has finally received from the Colonean elders a favourable answer to his requests, says gratefully: S. *OC* 465 ὦ φίλατθ', ὡς νῦν πᾶν τελοῦντι προξένει. Jason, having just heard from the chorus-leader that Medea has killed the children, exclaims: E. *Med.* 1310 οἴμοι τί λέξεις; ὡς μ' ἀπόλεσας, γόναι. Another near parallel occurs in E. *Ba.* 1032, although here the chorus-leader's words are partly in lyrics.<sup>1</sup> The messenger comes announcing Pentheus' death, the chorus-leader greets this message with an expression of great joy, and the messenger asks astonished: πῶς φῆς; τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; ἦ ἢ πὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς / χαίρεις κακῶς πράσσουσι δεσπόταις, γόναι; The vocative plural does not occur in similar contexts. In A. *Pers.* 231 Atossa begins a stichic dialogue with the leader, but addresses the whole chorus in the vocative plural ὦ φίλοι. In A. *A.* 1299, 1315 Cassandra addresses the chorus as ξένοι. The contact between the actor and the chorus is not as strong in these latter instances as in those illustrated above. Cassandra in her ecstasy does not take much notice of anything else but her visions.

The metre naturally can influence the choice between singular and plural

<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the speaker is continually the leader, cf. E. R. Dodds, Euripides *Bacchae*, Oxford 1960, 207.

forms. However, it is not sufficient to explain the choice of the number primarily from the metre.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes it does not matter in the context which number is used, and in such cases metrical convenience has perhaps influenced the choice, but often the number chosen is really relevant in the context, sometimes very strongly indeed, and the other form could not have had the same effect. In iambic trimeter the nouns most commonly used in addressing the chorus fit the metre very well in both numbers, and might often be interchanged from a purely metrical point of view, as for instance *φίλα* and *φίλοι*, *φίλοι* and *φίλοι*. *γύναι* and *γυναῖκες* are both very easy to manage in iambs, and the usual addressing of the chorus as »strangers» offers in tragedy many possibilities — *ξένος*, *ξεῖνος*, *ξένη*, *ξέν'*, *ξεῖνη*, *ξεῖν'*, *ξένοι*, *ξεῖνοι* — all with or without the particle *ὦ*. As the plural forms are almost always, and with only few exceptions, used in trimeters, we cannot regard the choice of the singular to be mainly influenced by the metre.

In comedy, the vocative singular occurs in stichic dialogue under the same conditions — the chorus-leader's words or actions calling forth a strong emotional reaction from another person. Here the second speaker is not an actor, but the leader of the other half-chorus. In the *Acharnians* the half-choruses begin to disagree about Dikaiopolis at v. 557. One leader behaves threateningly, and the other tries to stop him, shouting (564) *οὔτος σύ, ποῖ θεῖς; οὐ μνεῖς*; In the *Lysistrata* the vocative singular occurs as a word of abuse: when the women raise their water-pots menacingly, the leader of the men says: 371 *τί δ' ὦ θεοῖς ἐχθρὰ σὺ δεῦρ' ὕδωρ ἔχουσ' ἀφίκου*; and the leader of the women answers: 372 *τί δαὶ σὺ πῦρ ὦ τύμβ' ἔχων*; The leader of the women threatens to give a bath to the men, to which the leader of the men says: 378 *ἐμοὶ σὺ λουτρον ὦ σαπρά*; Aristophanes also has the vocative singular as a term of abuse in *Lys.* 1017 and 699. The latter instance is not in a stichomythia, but in the trochaic rhexis of the leader, which, in this comedy, corresponds to the parabasis.

Similar instances are found in satyr-plays, too. In Aeschylus' *Isthmiastae* a person brings to the satyrs some »new playthings».<sup>2</sup> The leader in his iambic verse rejects them emphatically, suggesting that he should give them to some-

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the relation of the metre to the choice of words see the pertinent remarks of G. BJÖRCK, *Das Alpha Impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache*, *Skrifter utgivna av Kungliga Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala*, 39, 1, Uppsala 1950—52, 95.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps small chariots, as K. REINHARDT suggested; for the interpretation of these lines cf. H. J. METTE, *Der verlorene Aischylos*, *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft* 35, Berlin 1963, 168—69.

one else, and the first person says: 90 μὴ ἄπειπε μηδ' ὄρν{ε}ινος οὐνεκ', ὦγαθέ. In Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, Kyllene and the leading satyr have a stichic dialogue. The satyr says something which astonishes Kyllene, and she answers: 389 τίς, ὦ πονήρ', ἔχει; I think that in all above-mentioned examples the fact that the speaking partner is only one person must have influenced the choice of the number, perhaps, indeed, have been the main reason for it, because we have seen how the vocative singular is mostly used explicitly in connection with an allusion to the words of the preceding speaker.

In comedy we have some passages where the third person singular is used about the chorus. This usage is even more rare than the vocative singular. In tragedy I have found no indisputable example: Though Athene in *A. Eu.* 950 says μέγα γὰρ δύναται πότνι' Ἐρινός, the vengeance-demons are here seen as an abstract power, and when in her following words she describes the concrete accomplishments of this power, Athene returns immediately to plural forms. Again, in *A. Eu.* 583—584 ὁ γὰρ διώκων πρότερος ἐξ ἀρχῆς λέγων / γένοιτ' ἂν ὀρθῶς πράγματος διδάσκαλος the word διώκων is a common technical law-term, which is naturally employed in the singular, although there are many accusers in this case, as the chorus-leader herself states in her next words. In tragedy there is never any reference to the words of the chorus-leader in the third person singular, but they are always thought of as the expression of the whole plural chorus. Aristophanes, on the other hand, has the third person singular in *Lys.* 352 ff., where the leaders of the half-choruses are arguing with each other — in the same situation where we have found the vocative singular. When the leader of the women threatens the men with a nuptial bath, their leader exclaims: 379 ἤκουσας αὐτῆς τοῦ θρόα σου; and in his next line he gives an order to his torch: 381 ἔμπρησον αὐτῆς τὰς κόμας. In the trochaic verses which in this comedy replace the habitual parabasis, the leader of the men imagines how he stands close by the statue of Aristogeiton, his fist clenched, and says: 634 + αὐτὸς + γὰρ μοι γίνεται / τῆς θεοῖς ἐχθρᾶς πατάξαι τῆσδε γραῶς τὴν γνάθον. This γραῶς can hardly be Lysistrata; it probably refers to the chorus of old women, to which there was also an allusion in the preceding strophe (622). Here, too, it is probable that the trochaic verses are spoken by the respective leaders of the half-choruses. Perhaps they are standing near each other, and so the words of the men's leader are directed mainly to the leader of the women, whom he threatens with his gesture.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the third person singular, referring to the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aristophanes Lysistrata*, Berlin 1927, 161—62.

chorus, occurs only where it can really mean just one speaker, favours the view that the case with the vocative singular is also the same.

Similarly the actor is likely to address his words only to the leader in those dialogues where the chorus answers with one or two trimeters to the lyrical strophe of the actor. In the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Oedipus comes at 1297 from the palace, and his appearance confirms the messenger's tale of his dreadful deed. The chorus, reciting anapaests, turns away from him (1303). Oedipus complains first in melic anapaests (1307—1311), probably taking some steps from the palace door towards the others. To his lament the leader answers with an iambic trimeter, possibly still not looking at him (1312 ἐς . . . οὐδ' ἐπόψιμον). Oedipus does not hear or take notice of this and starts his lyrical lament. The leader answers in trimeters, which he now addresses for the first time directly to Oedipus — by now he has probably also turned to him, because all his expressions in this dialogue contain an address to Oedipus. The leader's voice — the voice of one human being — at last brings Oedipus to take notice of the surrounding people and to burst into pathetically grateful words: S. OT 1321 ἰὼ φίλος, / σὺ μὲν ἐμὸς ἐπίπολος ἔτι μόνιμος· ἔτι γὰρ / ὑπομένεις με τὸν τυφλὸν κηδεύων· / φεῦ φεῦ· / οὐ γὰρ με λήθεις, ἀλλὰ γιννώσκω σαφῶς, / καίπερ σκοτεινός, τήν γε σὴν αὐδὴν ὄμωσ. Usually when the actor comes on to the stage, he addresses the chorus in the plural, because he sees a group of people before his eyes. Here Oedipus does not see, but hears, and since he hears only the voice of the leader, it is natural for him to address his words just to this one person. In this case the leader's words do not contain such meaningful information as we have seen in the vocative singular cases used in stichomythia in tragedy, but the mere hearing of a voice is enough to wake a strong reaction in Oedipus. At the beginning of the second strophe (1329) and in its antistrophe Oedipus again speaks to the chorus using the vocative plural φίλοι. After his first exceptional burst he thus returns to the conventional plural, thinking of the chorus-leader only as the representative voice of a larger group, which is also present.

In Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* 510 f. the chorus tries in a lyrical dialogue to compel Oedipus against his will to tell about his crime. At last they themselves suggest that the worst has happened and seek his confirmation of it: 527 ἦ ματρόθεν, ὡς ἀκούω, / δυσώνυμα λέκτρ' ἐπλήσω; To this disclosure Oedipus exclaims: 529 ὦμοι, θάνατος μὲν τὰδ' ἀκούειν, / ὦ ξεῖν'. We see the vocative singular used here in a similar situation as above: the actor reacts strongly to the words just spoken to him. Here, however, the question of the speaker is not so clear as before, because we have no sure way of knowing how

lyrical choral parts such as these were performed. It is better to start from the hypothesis that the strophic choral odes were sung by the whole chorus, since we have no evidence against it.<sup>1</sup> Such lyrical dialogues as this might, however, be performed by a single member of the chorus, i.e. the chorus-leader. As possible reasons for this there have been mentioned the similarity of the questioning theme to the questions generally posed by the chorus-leader in iambic parts, the rapid changes of speaker, the short answers which would be more appropriate to one person than to the whole body of the chorus, the fact that the actor's and the chorus' lines sometimes correspond to each other in strophe and antistrophe, which would speak for a similar method of delivery.<sup>2</sup> The vocative singular, compared with its use in the iambic stichomythia, could here be a possible indication of the same thing.

In Euripides' *Orestes*, when the chorus, sympathetic and curious, comes to the bed at which Elektra is watching Orestes' sleep, singular vocatives occur in a lyrical dialogue between the actor and the chorus. KANNICHT has recorded the fact that Elektra uses a second person singular imperative when she forbids the chorus to speak, but second person plural imperatives when she implies that the chorus should move.<sup>3</sup> He suggests that this, perhaps, indicates that the leader alone is singing the answers to Elektra. The difference between the use of the singular and plural, however, really is not quite so easily defined. In 149 and 171 the imperatives ordering movements are in the singular. It is true that Elektra does not refer in the plural to the singing or speaking of the chorus, but KANNICHT does not mention that three times in this dialogue Elektra uses a vocative singular to the chorus when she gives orders about talking or singing: E. *Or.* 145 ἄ ἄ σύριγγος ὅπως πνοὰ / λεπτοῦ δόνακος, ᾧ φίλα, φώνει μοι. 167 σὺ γάρ νιν, ᾧ τάλαινα, / θωῦξασ' ἔβαλες ἐξ ὕπνου. 186 οὐχὶ σίγα . . . ὕπνου χάριν παρέξεις, φίλα; Also in stichomythia, where the chorus-leader is speaking, one can see the tendency to use the imperative in the singular when referring to the conversation, but otherwise plural imperatives. It is of course impossible to reconstruct the choreography on the strength of some remarks in the text, but I think that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford 1968<sup>2</sup>, 245.

<sup>2</sup> These questions are discussed among others by U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Herakles II*, Berlin 1895, 189—190, D. L. PAGE, *The Chorus of Alcman's Partheneion*, *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1937, 94—99, R. KANNICHT, *Untersuchungen zu Form und Funktion des Amoibaion in der attischen Tragödie*, Diss. Heidelberg 1957 (typed), V. DI BENEDETTO, *Responsione strofica e distribuzione delle battute in Euripide*, *Hermes* 89, 1961, 298—321.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* 41.



the singular vocatives in this case speak in favour of KANNICHT's suggestion, and so Elektra's orders would give a rather clear picture of the movements. When the chorus enter the orchestra, Elektra bids them to stay away from the bed, and they obey (143—44). On hearing the chorus-leader's reply Elektra bids her to speak more quietly (145—46), the leader obeys (147—48) and Elektra is content (148). She then asks the leader alone to come nearer the bed and to tell her why they have come (149—50; in the last verse she mentions the leader alone as the representative of the chorus *λόγον ἀπόδος ἐφ' ὃ τι χρέος ἐμόλετέ ποτε*<sup>1</sup>). During the following strophes the leader apparently stands quite near the bed — Elektra uses singular forms in 157, 167, 171, 173, and the leader could not otherwise comment on the smallest movements of Orestes (166, 169, 173). The text, however, gives no indication as to what causes Elektra's words in 181 *κτύπον ἠγάγετ'* (perhaps this refers to the noise of the chorus' movements) and *οὐχὶ σίγα*. Coming after her own song to the Night, these reproaches are rather odd. BENEDETTO thinks that this lullaby belongs to the chorus and not to Elektra.<sup>2</sup> In this case, the question of whether the passage is sung by the whole chorus or by one member only is still open. The vocative singular in 186 perhaps speaks for the latter possibility.

In the parodos of Euripides' *Troades*, Hekabe greets the first half-chorus with a vocative plural: 159 *ὦ τέκν'*, *Ἀργείων πρὸς ναῦς ἤδη*, but the second half-chorus with a vocative singular: 182 *ὦ τέκνον*, *ὀρθροῦον σὰν ψυχάν*. The verbs in the singular which the chorus uses in the preceding verses have perhaps influenced this vocative form, too. If here also the dialogue is between Hekabe and the leader, the vocative singular would be easier to understand. In both verses either the text or the distribution of the lines between the speakers is not certain.

In comedy we find in similar lyrical dialogues only two instances of the vocative singular. In *Lys.* 797 the men sing *βούλομαί σε γραῦ κύσαι* — this is in a stichic trochaic dialogue, which is strophic, and it is again possible to think that the delivery is by one person only. The actor does not address a vocative singular to the chorus anywhere except in *Ach.* 943, where Dikaio-polis says to the chorus *ἰσχυρόν ἐστιν, ὦγαθ', ὅστ' | οὐκ ἂν καταγείη*. There is a possibility that this is not addressed to the chorus but to the Boeotian,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. KANNICHT *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> V. DI BENEDETTO, Euripidis *Orestes*, Firenze 1965, 41, and *Hermes* 89, 1961, 315—316.

while Dikaiopolis is offering him the wrapped-up informer. But his words seem to me rather to be a direct answer to the question of the chorus. This vocative is naturally a common idiom in everyday conversation, and then of course mostly used in the singular, which could account for the singular form here, too; however, it also occurs in the vocative plural — for instance in Aeschylus' *Isthm.* 23. In satyr-play we have a vocative singular in Sophocles' *Ichn.* 191 ἄ μιαιφόνε. The verses in this lyrical part are so badly mutilated that the sense and reference cannot be traced any more than the speaker. Anyway this is apparently a similar case of colloquialism.

In some cases the speaker is not an actor, or the opposing half-chorus as in the *Lysistrata*, but a separate second chorus. Thus, in Euripides' *Suppliant Women* the chorus consisting of the sons of the fallen heroes, as they bring the ashes of their fathers, sing to the chorus of mothers: 1123 φέρω φέρω, / τάλαινα μάτερ, ἐκ πυρός πατρὸς μέλη. It is quite unusual to address the chorus in the singular when one comes on to the stage and greets them. The very personal grief — the grief of a mother at her son's death — which is the subject of this song has possibly favoured the use of the singular. It is moreover possible that this song, too, is delivered only by one boy and one mother, because children usually are κῶφα πρόσωπα in tragedy and do not sing in chorus.<sup>1</sup> A corresponding dialogue is found in Aristophanes' *Wasps* 290 f., where the jurors and their sons are talking. On both sides we have several vocatives in the singular: ὦ παῖ, παιδίον, πάτερ, παππία (248, 252, 290, 293, 296, 297, 303).

In two cases in Euripides the vocative occurs in a choral part where there is no second chorus. In E. *Supp.* 271 ff. the chorus come to Theseus from the altar where they have begged Aithra for mercy: 271 βᾶθι, τάλαινα, ἱερῶν δαπέδων ἄπο Περσεφονείας, / βᾶθι καὶ ἀντίασον γονάτων ἐπι χεῖρα βαλοῦσα, / τέκνων τεθνεώτων κομίσαι δέμας, ὦ μελέα ἴγώ, / οὗς ὑπὸ τείχεσι Καδμείοισι ἀπώλεσα κούρους. MURRAY's text like the earlier HERMANN edition includes in this lyrical sequence several times the paragraphos indicating a change of speaker. Apparently he thought the first verses to be an exhortation by some members of the chorus to the others. The sentence ends, however, in the first person singular and it is, therefore, most natural to assume that the exhortations, too, are addressed to this person, i.e., here we really seem

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. GRÉGOIRE, *Les Suppliantes*, 147, note 1, in Euripide, Tome III, *Collection des Universités de France*.

to have a »Selbstanrede«. This pitiful lament is very similar to some cases in Euripides, where an actor speaks to himself.<sup>1</sup>

In the parodos of the *Ion* the women marvelling at the treasures of the temple of Apollo call on each other using the vocative both in the singular and in the plural: 193 φίλα, πρόσιδ' ὄσσοις, 208 ὦ φίλοι, ὦδε δευρόμεσθα. Apparently we have here the case of a chorus divided into several speakers, but we do not know whether there should be half-choruses, smaller groups or even individuals speaking.<sup>2</sup> If there are single speakers, the vocative could be influenced by this; if there are groups, the singular is only a variation instead of the more usual vocative plural.

The tendency to use the vocative singular principally when it is addressed to only one speaking partner could perhaps throw light on the following obscure passages in Sophocles. In *Ph.* 1169 ff. Sophocles uses a vocative singular in lyrical dialogue:

πάλιν πάλιν παλαιὸν ἄλ-  
 γημ' ὑπέμνασας, ὦ  
 λῶστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων.  
 τί μ' ὄλεσας; τί μ' εἴργασαι;

The situation is the same as before in so far as the actor, exasperated, refers to the words just spoken by the chorus. On the other hand this can hardly be addressed to only one member of the chorus. Even if the leader alone sings in the epode, which begins here, and the form of which is entirely different from the first part of the dialogue, the preceding strophe is probably sung by the whole chorus. The very strongly emotional vocative addressed suddenly to the chorus seems here to be a bit out of place. JEBB's explanation — »their words grieve him the more, because they have otherwise shown him so much sympathy, cp. 1125, 1165 f» — seems improbable to me, because Philoktetes has, before this, taken no notice at all of the words of the chorus. The preceding words of the chorus do not contain any clear allusion to Troy, and yet an allusion to Troy is commonly thought to be the cause of Philo-

<sup>1</sup> Usually one cannot explain for instance the singular imperatives of the chorus as referring to itself, »Selbstanrede«. We must always be aware of the plurality of the chorus, which prevents us from explaining its expressions in quite the same way as the single actors'. Real »Selbstanrede« occurs rather seldom in earlier Greek literature. Only Euripides' actors use it more commonly, cf. W. SCHADEWALDT, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, *Neue philologische Untersuchungen* 2, Berlin 1926, 201. Cf. for instance *El.* 112—113, *Med.* 1028, 1056—57.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. S. OWEN, *Euripides Ion*, Oxford 1939, 82.

ktetes' agitation.<sup>1</sup> However, even the chorus is at a loss when they hear his burst of emotions (1173).

I would like to change the usual punctuation a little:

πάλιν πάλιν παλαιὸν ἄλ-  
 γημ' ὑπέμνασας. ὦ  
 λῶστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων,  
 τί μ' ὄλεσας; τί μ' εἴργασαι;

In Sophocles a vocative as extensive and emphatic as this usually begins the clause instead of finishing it. More important, however, is the fact that if the vocative is linked with the verb ὑπέμνασας it does not make sense in the context. On the other hand it is in a logical connection with the questions τί μ' ὄλεσας κτλ. and so we have the contrast: »You, whom I thought to be so good, what have you done for me? Why have you ruined me?»<sup>2</sup> The question of what this παλαιὸν ἄλγημα is can be explained by Philoktetes' following questions and the vocative accompanying them: the treachery of Neoptolemos.<sup>3</sup> Of course Philoktetes, when he explains this to the astonished chorus, mentions in particular the fact that Neoptolemos intended to take him to the hated Troy, but this concrete fact is hardly here the most important thing. What words, then, does the chorus in the preceding strophe use to arouse this reaction in Philoktetes? To such remarks as the chorus makes in the end — »you should come to your senses, it is your own fault, you could avoid destruction if you wished» — Philoktetes has made no answer before.<sup>4</sup> But Philoktetes' words ὦ λῶστε τῶν πρὶν ἐντόπων seem to reflect the chorus' words 1164 ξένον . . . εὐνοία πάσα πελάταν. These words, it is true, have again

<sup>1</sup> This explanation has been given by the scholiast and also e.g. by JEBB in his commentary.

<sup>2</sup> I do not see any objection to this punctuation and interpretation from the point of view of the metrical construction of the verses. The particle ὦ concluding a colon, when the address continues in the next verse, occurs also e.g. in *S. Ai.* 697, *OT* 1194. An even stronger break in the continuity of the thought can occur in this way just before the end of a colon, as for instance in *A. El.* 847, *Ph.* 855, 1096, *OC* 1074, 1695. W. KRAUS (*Strophengestaltung in der griechischen Tragödie I, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte* 231, 4, Wien 1957) thinks that the period ends at 1171, but H. A. POHLSANDER remarks (*Metrical Studies in the Lyrics of Sophocles*, Leiden 1964, 129) that we have here no outward sign of the period-end. KRAUS has started his analysis from the contents and thought of the context, because in astrophic parts the periods tend to coincide with the thought units (28.) However, I think, as I said, that in this case the thought unit does not permit having the period-end at 1171.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the corresponding instances *S. Ant.* 857 and *E. Alc.* 878, where the actor's words »you have reminded me of a terrible pain» are instantly followed by an explanation of the nature of this pain.

<sup>4</sup> For instance to the chorus' words in 1095—1100.

been explained and corrected in many ways. I do not see any reason to alter the text.<sup>1</sup> Also I do not think, as among others JEBB does in his commentary, that the chorus refer to themselves with these words and at the same time step forward to him — the expression would remain very obscure, even if we could see the action — but rather that it is most natural that this ξένος is Neoptolemos. In the lyrical dialogue the part played by Neoptolemos in the plot has not as yet been emphasized at all; Philoktetes has only complained about his lot and cursed Odysseus. The words ἄσκοπα κρυπτά τ' ἔπη δολεράς . . . φρενός in 1111—12 can refer to Neoptolemos, but the following imprecations and abuses are surely directed to Odysseus (1113—15, 1123—27, 1134—39). And yet, the very conflict between Neoptolemos and Philoktetes is the most important theme in the tragedy, and in the very next scene Neoptolemos has changed his mind and reveals the whole plot. The address in 1170 is, in regard to the position of the vocative and the whole construction and sense, exactly paralleled by Philoktetes' words to Neoptolemos in 927—29: ὦ πῦρ σὺ καὶ πᾶν δεῖμα καὶ πανουργίας / δεινῆς τέχνημ' ἔχθιστον, οἶά μ' εἰργάσω, / οἶ' ἠπάτηκας. His tone towards Neoptolemos has already turned from hate to grief by v. 971 οὐκ εἶ κακὸς σὺ.

I think, thus, that in this instance Philoktetes reacts to the chorus, which is present, only as a speaker who recalls to his mind Neoptolemos, and that the vocative is really addressed to the absent young man; the same would apply to the second person singular in 1174—75, though here of course the master and his crew merge together. The chorus do not understand whom Philoktetes means, and they ask astonished (1173) τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; They have before this, when Philoktetes curses Odysseus, already felt that he reproaches them and tried to convince him of their friendship. Philoktetes speaks for the first time really to the chorus in 1777, where he tells them to go away. I think that the vocative singular and the second person singular at the beginning of the epode are intentionally ambivalent. When we think of this as performed on the stage, it is very easy for the audience to understand this properly, assuming that when he is speaking Philoktetes does not take notice of the chorus, but speaks over their heads, as he has done before in this dialogue, when talking to the rocks and birds.

Sophocles has another problematic vocative singular in the concluding anapaestic verses of the *Trachinian Women*: 1275 λείπου μηδὲ σὺ, παρθέν',

<sup>1</sup> I prefer MAZON's punctuation εἶ τι σέβη ξένον, πέλασσον to PEARSON's εἶ τι σέβη, ξένον πέλασσον.

ἐπ' οἴκων / μεγάλους μὲν ἰδοῦσα νέους θανάτους. The manuscripts give these words either to the chorus (as do, for instance, MAZON and KAMERBEEK) or to Hyllos (as do JEBB and PEARSON), and the order is in commentaries thought to be given either to the chorus-leader (JEBB), other members of the chorus (MAZON, KAMERBEEK) or Iole (BOWRA).<sup>1</sup> If this is an order from the leader to the chorus, the vocative singular is exceptional, as JEBB says. On the whole Sophocles' chorus-leader very seldom gives any orders to his fellow-choreutai, contrary to the practice of Aeschylus and Euripides. JEBB's suggestion that Hyllos gives this order to the leader only does not make the singular less difficult; firstly, there should be no reason for Hyllos suddenly to take notice of only one member of the chorus — in his concluding speech! — because the leader has remained silent since she made a short remark more than a hundred verses earlier (1112); secondly, we have seen how very rare the vocative singular is even in a dialogue with the chorus-leader. From the fact that this form usually does not appear when the actor is speaking with the whole chorus, we cannot draw the conclusion that it positively could not exist. We must, therefore, consider this instance as an exception from the general practice of using the plural or think of Iole as the receiver of the order.

The vocative singular appears, moreover, in two alterations of Aeschylus' text. In A. *Supp.* 739 and 753 Danaos addresses his daughters with the vocative plural and the verb in the singular. This incongruity has induced SCHÜTZ to correct the vocative into the singular form τέκνον. This is approved for instance by MAZON and included in his text. We have, however, similar incongruities elsewhere, e.g. in the parodos of Euripides' *Heraclidae*, 75 ff. In view of the scarcity of the vocative singular it is wise to avoid unnecessary corrections which would produce it. In this instance of the *Suppliant Women* we cannot defend the singular by saying that Danaos speaks in the first place to the chorus-leader, who, it is true, has two iambic verses before the chorus' lyrics. In the former instance the chorus-leader and the chorus have expressed very similar emotions, but in the latter, Danaos' words are clearly a response to the preceding words of the chorus, not so much of the leader, and it is so

<sup>1</sup> C. M. BOWRA, *Sophoclean Tragedy*, Oxford 1944, 158 note 2. MAZON declines this possibility emphatically in his »Notes sur Sophocle», *Révue de Philologie* III, 25, 1951, 11. He says that Iole was taken to the palace as early as about v. 333, and in the text there is no indication of her coming back. Verse 1222, where the pronoun ταύτην refers to Iole, proves neither her absence (MAZON) nor her presence (as J. ANDRIEU says, *Le dialogue antique*, Paris 1954, 197).

after the other choric strophes, too. Similarly the vocative singular in A. *Th.* 225 γόναι which is in two Triclinian manuscripts (TURYN'S FT), is not in my opinion to be preferred to the reading of the Mediceus, γόνη. It is true that Eteokles here is again reacting strongly to the preceding words of the chorus, but then the vocative would not belong immediately to this reaction — the prohibition μή . . . βουλεύου κακῶς — but would appear in the middle of a proverb.

In comedy proper names are sometimes used in the vocative singular in addition to the cases already mentioned. In tragedy proper names are avoided. Aristophanes, however, uses them differently from other vocatives: they occur where one chorus is speaking, either the leader to his own chorus or the whole chorus in lyrical parts, but not like the common nouns between two half-choruses or two different choruses, as in the *Lysistrata* or the *Wasps*. Moreover, where the proper names occur, the motivation given by the preceding words is completely lacking: when the leader says to his chorus for instance in *Lys.* 254 χῶρει Δράκης, ἡγοῦ βάδην or in *Lys.* 370 αἰρώμεθ' ἡμεῖς θοῦδατος τὴν κάλπιν ὧ ῥοδίππη, there is no preceding situation where Drakes or Rhodippe would have appeared, as is the case when the vocative of a common noun is used. These proper names are said completely *exempli gratia*, and we need not think that the leader has in mind any special member of the chorus, for instance the parastates.<sup>1</sup>

In the only passage where an actor uses proper names of the chorus, they have their special function: when Dikaiopolis asks Marilades, Anthrakyllos, Euphorides and Prinides if they have ever been to Ekbatana as envoys (*Ach.* 609 ff.). Again, when the chorus of the *Knights* is called in with proper names

<sup>1</sup> TH. ZIELINSKI, for instance, in his *Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, Leipzig 1885, 270, seems to know exactly where each person mentioned by name in the chorus of the *Lysistrata* stood. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF criticized this tendency in his commentary of the *Lysistrata* p. 138. Similarly the vocatives of the proper names and imperatives in the choral parts do not necessarily imply any dialogue between different members of the chorus. The person addressed is not in fact any better defined in these cases than when the second person imperative is used with πᾶς. This is apparent e.g. in *Lys.* 321 πέτον πέτον Νικοδίκη, | πρὶν ἐμπεροῆσθαι Καλύκη/τε καὶ Κρίτυλλαν, where the women named are only mentioned as two concrete examples of their friends on the Acropolis. No spectator knows anything more about them because they are not even seen in their fortress. It is easy to understand that proper names occur particularly often in the *Lysistrata* and the *Ecclesiazusae*, because proper names effectually emphasize the sex of the chorus, which is important in these dramas. This is very clearly seen in the parodos of the *Ecclesiazusae*, where the women with their artificial beards wander to the council meeting practising their parts by calling themselves with the vocative ὄνδρες (289) and fictitious masculine names until the vocative φίλοι accidentally slips from them and they hastily correct it into the masculine gender.

(242—34) ὦ Σίμων, ὦ Παναίτι,<sup>1</sup> we need not necessarily think that the leaders of the half-choruses were thus named,<sup>1</sup> although the scholiast says that such men really were hipparchs in this year. Names of famous persons are also elsewhere used to heighten the comical effect. For instance Trygaios is seeing Lamakhos among those who are preventing the rescue of the Peace (*Pax* 473).

I am inclined to think that the vocative singular of common nouns in both tragedy and comedy may be a reflection of the delivery by one single member of the chorus. The method of delivery is not always certain, and at the first glance one might consider that it is equally possible to address the whole chorus with a vocative singular as to employ second person singular verb forms when referring to it; however, it is important to notice the special conditions which usually accompany the vocative form. We can see in comedy and satyr-play that the vocatives used in the singular are clearly colloquialisms — abusing or friendly terms like ὦ πονηρέ, ὦ γαθή. This, their colloquial nature, is probably one reason for the number; since they appear so often in the speech of everyday life in the singular, it is easy to slip into singular in such cases also when speaking to the chorus. Similarly, we can assume that the singular as the commonest number in everyday conversation influenced the usage of tragedy, because vocatives occur here only in lively and emotionally loaded conversation parts. The vocatives of proper names in comedy are treated differently from the vocatives of common nouns, and I think that the proper names are no indication that the words are addressed to one special member of the chorus.

<sup>1</sup> As VAN DAELE remarks in his translation of the *Knights* in Aristophane, Tome I, *Collection des Universités de France*, 91 note 1.