XXII.—The Prologue of the *Troades* of Euripides [1]

EUGENE G. O'NEILL, JR.

YALE UNIVERSITY

A detailed analysis of *Troades* 1–97 discloses the central meaning of the play; a brief statement of this meaning will be found in the last three paragraphs of this paper.

The scene is Troy, the time early dawn. In the background, silhouetted against the bright sky, rise the walls and towers of the city. A haze of smoke hangs over them, and slightly softens their sharp outlines. In the foreground, but dimly visible, is a number of squalid huts, and before one of them, prostrate on the earth, lies a woman, robed in mourning, her hair cut short, her face buried in her arms; except for occasional paroxysms of sobbing she is motionless with grief. A distant sound of women's voices is heard, wailing continually. The sound is not loud, but broad and vibrant like the pianissimo of a large choir. For a brief moment nothing happens on the stage; the tableau is allowed to make its full impression on the spectators.[2] Then the god Poseidon appears, suddenly, as if materialized out of nowhere, and speaks the monologue with which the *Troades*, like most Euripidean plays, opens.

He first identifies himself, and then explains why he has come to Troy; he has loved that city ever since he and Apollo built it. Now it has been sacked by the Greeks. It has fallen before the Horse, which Epeius built, by Athene's devising. There is general desolation: deserted groves, blood-drenched temples, Priam slain by an altar of Zeus, the rich Phrygian spoils being taken to the Greek ships. As soon as the wind is favourable the Greeks will set sail

[1] The conclusions and evaluations presented in this paper are primarily the results of independent study of the text of the *Troades*, but I have subsequently found some confirmation and considerable correction in the following works: H. D. F. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* (London, 1939); Gilbert Murray, *Euripides and his Age* (New York, 1913); L. Parmentier's introduction to his edition of the *Troades* in the Budé series (Paris, 1925); J. A. K. Thomson, *Irony* (London, 1926); G. G. Sedgewick, "Of Irony, especially in Drama," *Univ. of Toronto Studies, Phil. and Lit. Series*, 10 (1935); I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1936).

[2] In this description of the scene I have envisaged an ideal production, as I believe one should in reading plays. How the scene was represented in Athens in 415 B.C. cannot be accurately determined, but the question has only an archaeological interest.

for home, to see again their wives and children. As for Poseidon, he too is leaving, defeated by Hera and Athene. The wailing women of Troy are being allotted to Greek masters. The noblest are here in these huts, selected for the generals. Helen is with them, a captive like the rest, and justly so. The wretched creature lying here is Hecuba, who has lost everything: husband, sons, and her daughter Polyxena, although she has not learned of *her* fate yet. Agamemnon will impiously take Cassandra to his bed.

Poseidon then bids formal farewell to Troy, and is about to leave, when Athene suddenly appears, like Poseidon, out of nowhere. The remainder of the Prologue consists of a dialogue between her and Poseidon.[3] She speaks first, and asks whether he can forget old enmities and listen to her. He indicates his willingness to do so, and she reveals what she has in mind. She has turned against the Greeks, her erstwhile favourites, because of their failure to punish Ajax for the rape of Cassandra, and is bent on harming them by a destructive storm on their homeward voyage. Zeus has promised to lend her his lightning, that she may strike the Greek ships, while he will belabour them with terrible rain and hail and winds. Poseidon is asked to provide great waves and whirlpools. He agrees to do so, and Athene departs. Poseidon philosophizes briefly on the foolishness of sacrilege in conquest, and then departs also.

Such, in brief outline, are the contents of the Prologue. Its chiefly remarkable feature is the prediction given in the dialogue. The play ends before the Greeks set sail, and the storm that meets them on their homeward voyage is therefore ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας, and no part of the Plot, in the conventional sense. The *Troades* is the only extant Greek play in which an exotragic prediction is made in the Prologue. Euripides often includes such predictions in his plays, but elsewhere only in Epilogues. So wide a departure from his usual practice is significant,[4] and we must undertake to determine

[3] I regard the Prologue as ending at 97. The definition in the *Poetics* (1452b.19) would include the *Threnos* of Hecuba (98–152), but the substance, the style, and the metre of the *Threnos* equally evince that it belongs with the Parodos, as a solo introduction to it.

[4] A possible objection should here be dealt with. One might argue that the ending of the *Troades* was so spectacular that a prediction of future events would have been quite out of place. If this were so, we should perhaps have to regard the presence of the exotragic prediction in the Prologue as purely accidental, and hence questionably significant. It is, however, not so. In the *Prometheus Vinctus* ascribed to Aeschylus

just what the presence of the prediction in the Prologue contributes to the play as a whole. When we have done this, we not only understand the central meaning of the *Troades*, but also find that Euripides has here written a far greater play than has generally been supposed.

The *Troades* has been grossly misjudged by many critics,[5] and in every case their false valuations result from a failure to grasp the full significance of the Prologue. The usual interpretation of the *Troades* represents it as an anti-war play. This is correct enough, so far as it goes, but it is only the beginning. Usually the critic contents himself with telling us that Euripides attacks war by putting his audience on the side of the vanquished, by making all but two of his characters Trojan, i.e., representatives of the vanquished. In other words, instead of extolling the splendid triumph of Greeks over "Aliens," Euripides makes us sympathize with those "Aliens." He achieves this, we are told, by a lugubrious succession of scenes, which monotonously inform us that it is a sad thing to be defeated, especially for the females of the unlucky state. The judgement of such critics may be fairly summarized, in contemporary clichés, by calling the *Troades* better than average pacifist propaganda, on the tear-jerking side, but a very bad play by any other standard.

Such an interpretation must regard the dialogue between Poseidon and Athene as entertaining but superfluous. To the Exposition it contributes only the detail of Ajax' sacrilege, and the superficial reader will regard this as questionably relevant and unquestionably unimportant. A number of facts previously brought out in the monologue are again mentioned in the dialogue, but the superficial reader will regard this as merely repetitious. Aristotle frequently takes the superficial view, and we may be sure that he would condemn the dialogue as superfluous. The main information that it provides is the fact that punishment awaits the Greeks, but since this punishment is ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας, there is no evident reason for mentioning it in the Prologue. Nothing in the play itself

we have an exotragic prediction immediately preceding the most spectacular ending in extant Greek drama. In Euripides' own *Medea* the heroine makes an exotragic prediction from her magic chariot, right in the midst of a highly spectacular ending. In the *Troades* Euripides might have followed either of these models, and the final scene would certainly not have lost, and might well have gained, in effectiveness.

[5] Most egregiously by A. E. Haigh, in a museum-piece of criticism, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (Oxford, 1896) 300f.

is directly motivated by the dialogue, and if the play is merely a pageant of the pathos of defeat, it can get along quite well without this part of the Prologue. The monologue gives us all the Exposition we need, and the *Threnos* of Hecuba (98–152) could and should begin at its conclusion; she has been identified in 36–44, whereas in the dialogue she is not even noticed.

The error of such a view is that it insists on regarding Greek plays as though they were modern plays. More specifically, it fails to realize the importance of the Known End in Greek tragedy. We cannot be sure, in some cases, just how much of the plot of a Greek tragedy was known to the audience in advance. In general it seems safe to conclude that the myths used for plots were reasonably familiar to the Athenian spectators, or at least to many of them.[6] Sometimes (e.g., in the *Hippolytus* and the *Ion*) Euripides makes a point of outlining the plot in the Prologue. In other cases we may assume that he regarded a thorough exposition of the antecedent and present circumstances as sufficient to make clear to the spectators what familiar myth his plot would follow. In some plays (e.g., the *Andromache*), however, he seems to have combined a highly innovative plot with a Prologue that told nothing of what was to develop. One cannot therefore assume the Known End for every Greek tragedy, but the fact remains that in many, if not in most, of the tragedies, the audience knew, in general, what was coming.

The significance of this has not been sufficiently understood. The spectator, at the performance of a tragedy that either used a familiar myth for a plot, or outlined the plot in the prologue, watched the action of the play move toward a Known End. This experience was inevitably double. On the one hand the spectator identified himself, to a greater or lesser extent, with the leading characters of the play. He thus participated sympathetically in their lives, their joys and their sorrows, their πράξεις and their πάθη. This participation is the psychological *sine qua non* of all drama. It may conveniently be called the Immediate Experience of the play. Its limitations are those of the particular part of the play in which the spectator participates; both spatially and temporally it is confined to the Here and the Now of the play. The spectator knows no more than do the characters with whom he identifies

[6] In my opinion Antiph. 191K is better evidence than Arist. *Po.* 1451b.25f.

himself, and this is his Immediate Knowledge. The Immediate Experience of a play consists basically in a vicarious living of the lives of the characters; if the dramatist knows what he is about, it has all the characteristic limitations of actual life.

On the other hand, the spectator's knowledge of the outcome of the plot gives him another experience of the play, which far transcends the vicarious life of actuality, and may be called his Universal Experience. This has few, or none, of the limitations of the Immediate Experience. It knows the End toward which the world of the play is moving, and it accordingly sees the full significance and the true value of every single step toward that end. Its knowledge, relatively to the world of the play, is a Universal Knowledge. It sees the present from the vantage point of the future, with the perspective of an ideal historian.

The spectator's double experience of the play is therefore a kind of ideal living. It is at the same time both prospect and retrospect. It lives the life of the play as present, while it understands it as past. It enjoys the excitements of human life, while it views that life with superhuman insight. It is at one and the same time perfectly subjective and perfectly objective. Inevitably many contradictions arise between the two knowledges, and the spectator may sympathetically participate in the ignorance or false opinion of the hero, while he clearly perceives the truth. The same thing, therefore, can be at once right and wrong, or good and bad, and the same plot (e.g., that of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*) can simultaneously illustrate both Free Will and Determinism. All this is possible because the Immediate Experience is mainly emotional, the Universal largely intellectual. The combination of the two provides the richest possible aesthetic enjoyment.[7]

We may take the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles as an example of a play with a familiar myth for a plot. The story had been told epically in the *Oedipodeia*, the *Cypria*, and the Cyclic *Thebaid*. It had been dramatized by Aeschylus, and perhaps by other dramatists, before Sophocles. Hence the spectator knew in advance the truth about Oedipus; his real identity, his parricide, and his incest. All that Sophocles had to do was to tell him where in the story the

[7] It will be readily observed that the Multiple Experience comprehends not only what has, since the early nineteenth century, been called "Dramatic Irony," but much else. I have reluctantly eschewed "irony," in its dramatic sense, because of its sardonic connotations, which awkwardly restrict its utility in literary criticism.

play began, and he knew that Oedipus was a doomed man. When Creon reports the oracle's message that Thebes will not be delivered from the plague until the murderer of Laius is discovered and punished, and Oedipus undertakes the search, we know that he will be the agent of his own doom. Hence our experience of the play is multiple and contradictory. We participate sympathetically in Oedipus' efforts to save Thebes, and for our Immediate Knowledge these are right and good, but we also know that these efforts are dreadfully wrong, and will ultimately bring Oedipus to the horrible realization of the truth about himself. It is the Known End that makes this rich experience possible.

In the *Hippolytus* Euripides has Aphrodite inform us in the Prologue of the fate that awaits Hippolytus. That excessively virginal youth is therefore doomed when he enters the stage, and our experience of his entrance is double. He has just returned from hunting, full of the exhilaration that follows hard and healthy exercise. He happily dedicates a garland to Artemis. Our Immediate Experience is to share his feelings as fully as our natures permit, but at the same time we know him to be a doomed man, precisely because of his exclusive love of non-sexual activities. We thus simultaneously feel happy with him and sorry for him. When the Servant advises him to show reverence to Aphrodite also, our Immediate Experience is to respond as he does, coldly and haughtily, and this response seems eminently right. On the other hand, our Universal Knowledge realizes that he is here justifying his doom by his own acts, and for our Universal Experience these acts are terribly misguided and wrong. They intensely move us because they are at the same time both right and wrong, according to whether we evaluate them in the narrow horizon of our Immediate Knowledge or in the wider one of our Universal Knowledge. It is the Known End that makes this rich experience of Hippolytus' words and actions possible. If Aphrodite had not told us of his fate we should have only the Immediate Experience of these acts.

In the *Troades* the Known End is the storm that will assail the homebound Greeks. The play itself presents a highly pathetic pageant of the woes of the defeated, specifically of their women. Our experience of these woes is made double by the Known End. Immediately, in the narrow horizon, we participate sympathetically, and sorrow with Hecuba, with Andromache, and with the Chorus of Trojan women. At the same time, however, our knowledge of

the doom that awaits the Greeks makes us experience the woes of the Trojan women in a wider horizon. They appear as not merely the results of conquest, but as caused by conquerors who will themselves suffer in their turn. For our Universal Experience the pageant of misery becomes far sadder and more deeply moving, because we know that there is no real or lasting joy on the other side; even that cruel compensation is lacking. Hence the woes of the defeated are more terrible, because they serve no purpose, effect no good, accomplish no permanently beneficial end. "Why should such sorrows be?" we ask, but no satisfactory reason is discernible. It is this dreadful sense of waste that makes the pathetic pageant of the *Troades* transcend mere pathos, and this is possible only because of the Known End revealed in the dialogue between Poseidon and Athene. This dialogue is therefore anything but superfluous, because our Multiple Experience of the play entirely depends on the information which it conveys. Viewed in the light of the Multiple Experience, the *Troades* turns out to contain more powerful pacificism and more effective dramaturgy than has generally been appreciated.

So much by way of introduction to the Prologue. We must now turn to the text itself. The views so far advanced must ultimately find their justification in the detailed analysis that follows.[8]

1 Ἥκω λιπὼν Αἰγαιον ἁλμυρὸν βάθος
πόντου Ποσειδῶν, ἔνθα Νηρῄδων χοροὶ
κάλλιστον ἴχνος ἐξελίσσουσιν ποδός.

At first sight these lines seem slow and stiff. As Exposition they serve only to identify Poseidon and to announce his entrance. If this were their only function, we might justly tax Euripides with pompous verbosity. The lines are laden with ornament that has no expository value. It is not, however, inorganic. The Aegean is to be the scene of the storm; the name Αἴγαιος occurs both in Athene's picture of what she wishes Poseidon to do (82) and in Poseidon's account of what he is going to do (88). The storm is thus lightly prefigured[9] in the third word

[8] I should like to apologize in advance for what may seem an excessive use of jargon in this analysis. The employment of *termini technici* has been wholly enjoined, and may be partially excused, by the need of clarity and the worth of brevity.

[9] Prefiguration is one of the most important and most frequently used of the technical devices whereby a poem is integrated into an organic unity. It basically depends on the psychological fact that one does not fully grasp anything important the first time one hears it. Good writers of poetry and of prose, as well as good composers of music, have always been aware of this, either intuitively or consciously, and have taken pains to tell in advance a certain portion of anything important that they were

of the Prologue. The word ἀλμυρόν denotes "salty," but its derived sense of "bitter" is connotatively present also, and it too prefigures the storm.[10] In 66 Athene says that she wishes στρατῷ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν πικρόν. There the bitterness is in the denotative horizon, and πικρός is therefore used; ἀλμυρός here connotatively prefigures πικρός. We may possibly see, in the choice of the word βάθος, a nice prefigurative touch; the synecdoche emphasizes that part of the sea which is the most terrifying. Furthermore βάθος, immediately following ἀλμυρόν, develops and extends its connotations, so that ἀλμυρὸν βάθος suggests "depth of bitterness."

Thus the words Αἴγαιον . . . πόντου, which are grossly redundant if taken purely denotatively and for themselves alone, all have their values in the wider horizon of connotation and prefiguration. Such ornament is entirely right and good. It is completely integrated into a wider dramatic context, and is hence quite organic.

The phrase as a whole serves to implant deep in our minds the picture of the Sea, so that we shall not forget it. We are thus prepared for the rôle that the Sea is to play in the punishment of the Greeks. Even denotatively, then, the redundancy of the phrase is functional; by being repetitious it becomes emphatic, and, so to speak, underlines what it denotes. The Greek dramatists employ such "repetitive emphasis" very frequently, and with great skill and effectiveness.

The word πόντου is purely denotative. Its function is to bring us back from the connotative suggestiveness of Αἴγαιον . . . βάθος to a

going to convey. In music this technical device has long been recognized, and the perfection of its conscious exploitation is heard in the *Musikdramen* of Wagner and in the symphonies (after the First) of Sibelius. In literature it was sporadically recognized by the critics, especially the Classicists, of the late nineteenth century, but it is only recently that its extension and importance have been properly appreciated, with the realization that words and phrases in literature have functions analogous to those of themes or *Leitmotive* in music.

Greek poetry illustrates the values of prefiguration better than any other, and the tragic dramatists of Athens are the consummate masters of the device. The analysis here made of *Troades* 1–97 is but one of many that could be presented to document this statement.

Literary prefiguration may best be elucidated by a striking example, which should simultaneously serve to convince anyone who is inclined to question the validity or the importance of this poetic device. The accusative singular of δίκη can be used adverbially, as a quasi-preposition, with the genitive, meaning "like, in the manner of." In this sense, however, δίκην is rare. Sophocles uses it twice, Euripides once (to judge from the Beck Index), Pindar once, Homer and Bacchylides never. Aeschylus, on the other hand, uses it 27 times. The astonishing thing is that no less than 23 of these cases occur in the *Oresteia*. Now the climax of the *Oresteia* is a δίκη and the whole trilogy is deeply concerned with Δίκη. I cannot believe that the frequency of prepositional δίκην has no connexion with the important rôle of the other senses of δίκη in the *Oresteia*. I rather believe that we here have a proof that every sense which a word might bear is potentially operative in any use of that word. In the *Oresteia* prepositional δίκην always *denotes* "like," but at the same time it *connotes* "justice, punishment, trial." It thus prefigures both the climax and the central meaning of the trilogy.

[10] In δ 511 ἀλμυρός is used in both the senses here mentioned.

plain picture of the Sea. The Greek dramatists seem to prefer the initial position in the second line of an *enjambement* for words serving this purpose.[11] The final position in a line is frequently occupied by words of rich connotative value.[12]

The clause ἔνθα . . . ποδός is obviously ornamental, but organically so, I believe. It presents the idyllic and peaceful life of the deep sea, as the mythological imagination of the Greeks envisaged it. This is in sharp contrast with the connotations of ἀλμυρὸν βάθος, and with the pictures of the storm that constitute the climax of the Prologue. Here we have an instance of a poetic device closely related to prefiguration. If an important motif is more effective for having been connotatively suggested, or partially expressed, beforehand, then a particular quality or aspect of such a motif may acquire additional intensity from having had its opposite suggested or expressed beforehand. In such a case we may speak of the important motif as being "pre-contrasted." Here the storm is pre-contrasted by the mention of the calm and beautiful dances of the Nereids. The word χοροί has a more specific function of the same sort; it pre-contrasts the wretched χορός of Trojan women, who will soon sing of their terror and their misery. Since the clause ἔνθα . . . ποδός has two-fold pre-contrast values it requires full expression, to make it emphatic. Its lush diction, which looks at first like mere τραγικὴ λέξις, in the pejorative sense, thus turns out to be quite functional.

Poseidon has told us who he is and whence he has come; he now goes on to explain why he has come.

4 Ἐξ οὗ γὰρ ἀμφὶ τήνδε Τρωικὴν χθόνα
Φοίβός τε κἀγὼ λαΐνους πύργους πέριξ
ὀρθοῖσιν ἔθεμεν κανόσιν, οὔποτ' ἐκ φρενῶν
εὔνοι' ἀπέστη τῶν ἐμῶν Φρυγῶν πόλει·

These lines do not merely provide the conventional motivation of an entrance; they also have the more important function of explaining why in this play Poseidon appears as a friend of Troy. This friendliness is in direct contrast with the hostility to Troy which Poseidon usually manifests in the *Iliad*.[13] Later poetry may have altered the Homeric picture, but the Athenian spectators probably remembered the *Iliad* best, and hence might assume that Euripides' Poseidon entertained the same sentiments as Homer's. It is perhaps significant that Poseidon has not yet

[11] A particularly fine example of this is Sophocles, *OT* 545f.:

λέγειν σὺ δεινός, μανθάνειν δ' ἐγὼ κακὸς
σοῦ.

The words μανθάνειν . . . κακός *connote* something terribly true for our Universal Knowledge; Oedipus is "bad at learning." The word σοῦ, however, makes the clause *denote* a narrower truth for our Immediate Knowledge.

[12] Of the 16 cases of δίκην "*instar*" in the iambic trimeters of the *Oresteia*, all but one occur at the end of the line.

[13] The Homeric Poseidon is not entirely anti-Trojan. In Υ 292–340 he pities Aeneas, and rescues him from Achilles. Cf. also Η 445ff., Θ 198ff., and δ 499ff.

told us that this is Troy. The identification of the city is made simultaneously with the expression and with the explanation of the god's feelings toward it. Euripides thus seems to have been fully aware of the danger of initial misconception on the part of his audience, and to have taken subtle and effective measures to obviate it. Evidently the Greek dramatists regarded the previous knowledge of the audience as an important matter, and composed their plays with it in view.

In the basic fact of presenting Poseidon as friend of Troy Euripides sharply breaks with Homeric tradition, but in the reasons given by the god for this attitude we can detect a certain deference to that tradition. Poseidon ascribes his feelings to the fact that it was he and Apollo who originally built Troy. The dishonesty of Laomedon is simply ignored. For his friendship Poseidon uses the remarkably cool word *εὔνοια*. He does not explicitly speak of himself as having *fought* for Troy, although this is gently implied in his naming of Apollo, that strenuous champion of Priam's city. It is more strongly implied by Poseidon later (23), when he says that he has been *vanquished* by Hera and Athene. This is dramatically quite correct. In 4ff. a Poseidon benevolent to Troy has been made acceptable to spectators trained in a different tradition. Once this has been done we are prepared for a Poseidon who fought for Troy and lost.

The diction of 4ff. is notably lush. Every point is expressed quite fully. The use of *πέριξ* after *ἀμφί* is actually redundant. *Τρωικὴν χθόνα* is fulsome, and *τῶν ἐμῶν Φρυγῶν πόλει* even more so; coming so soon after *Τρωικὴν χθόνα* in the same sentence it is denotatively almost superfluous.[14] The phrase *οὔποτ' . . . ἀπέστη* is a very wordy presentation of the simple fact that Poseidon has always been friendly to Troy. The adjectives *λαΐνους* and *ὀρθοῖσιν* contribute nothing of importance in the denotative horizon. Here again, as in 1ff., we might have the initial impulse to write *τραγικὴ λέξις* in the margin.

Again, however, a wider view and a more careful examination of the lines in question reveals that their fulsomeness is quite justified, because it is functional and organic. Two basic facts are presented, namely, that the scene of the play is Troy and that Poseidon is an old friend of Troy. The latter is new to the spectator in whose mind the attitude of Poseidon in the *Iliad* is dominant. Hence it was subject to misunderstanding; to avoid this Euripides had to have his Poseidon express his pro-Trojan feelings fully and clearly. The necessity of obviating ambiguity completely justifies *οὔποτ' . . . ἀπέστη* and the fulsomeness of 4ff. in general.

The scene of a play is one of the facts that a prologue must convey to the spectators as soon as possible, and this information must be made clear and unforgettable. The dramatist is therefore wise to mention the scene more than once in his prologue. The immediate dramatic necessity of a foolproof identification of the scene fully justifies the occurrence

[14] The words *χθόνα* and *πόλει* may be a significant differentiation. Before the walls were built Troy was merely *χθών*; then she became a *πόλις*. This suggests that when the Greeks have finished with her she will again be *χθών*.

of both Τρωικὴν χθόνα and τῶν . . . πόλει in the same sentence. This repetition, however, has wider values. The basic tragic fact is that this vanquished city is *Troy*. Throughout the Prologue, and even more notably in the Parodos,[15] Euripides is at pains to impress us with this fact over and over again. The name Τροία, and its derivatives Τρῶες, Τρωικός, κτλ., and its variants Ἴλιος, Φρύγες, κτλ., which sound the tonic note of this important motif, occur remarkably often. The repetition in 4ff. is only the beginning of a long and effective series.

These lines have still other values in relation to what follows them. With 8 Poseidon begins a graphic account of the general desolation in newly sacked Troy. The picture is powerfully drawn in itself, as we shall see, but it acquires additional force, and becomes concretely relevant to the basic tragic fact, because we have previously been told that the sacked city is *Troy*.

Verses 4ff. have important values in the field of contrast also. Before the desolation of the city is presented to us we are not only told that this is *Troy*, but also that *gods* built it, that they constructed the towers of *stone*, and used *straight* rules to build them. The fall of such a city comes to seem an event of cosmic significance. Thus Poseidon's mention of the fact that he and Apollo built Troy acquires new values; it not only motivates his pro-Trojan feelings, but also by contrast heightens the effectiveness of his picture of the desolation in Troy fallen. The apparently superfluous adjective λαΐνους is completely functional because of its contrast rôle. The adjective ὀρθοῖσιν serves a like purpose, and has even more pointed connotative values; it basically means "upright," and is used of buildings that are "standing." Some of Troy's buildings, we may be sure, are no longer ὀρθά; at the end of the play we witness the final razing of Troy, which leaves nothing ὀρθόν.[16]

Poseidon now begins to describe the scene of Troy fallen.

> 8 ἦ νῦν καπνοῦται καὶ πρὸς Ἀργείου δορὸς
> ὄλωλε πορθηθεῖσ'·

The verb καπνοῦται, which is the key word of this sentence, stands in splendid contrast with what has preceded it. We have been given a picture of the building of Troy, of gods working carefully, using the strongest materials. Now the product of their labours is being converted into unsubstantial smoke.[17] Thus the first word that portrays

[15] Cf. 99, 100, 123, 130, 143, 145, 151, 157, 166, 173 (twice), 189, 195, 199, 213.

[16] Still another contrast value may be felt in ὀρθοῖσιν. In its meaning of "upright" it is used of the erect posture of human beings. The only human being visible to us now is Hecuba, prostrate on the Trojan earth, the exact opposite of ὀρθή.

[17] In the ancient production this may have compensated verbally for mechanical deficiencies in the stage-set. In a modern production it will serve to emphasize the opening spectacle; what we have been witnessing with our eyes is now communicated aurally to our minds, and the effect of both is heightened by the identity of that which is described and that which is seen.

The verb καπνοῦται is followed by ὄλωλε and πορθηθεῖσα. Logically this is a hysteron proteron, but poetically it is quite unobjectionable. The vague and general

the fall of Troy is one which most powerfully emphasizes the destructiveness of that fall. This is entirely in character; Poseidon is conveying what impresses him as most deplorable, the annihilation of what he had helped to build. The diction of the sentence is notably terse, and its values are largely denotative. The substantial contrast between the construction of Troy and her destruction is thus reinforced by a sharp stylistic contrast between ἥ . . . πορθηθεῖσα and the fulsome and highly connotative lines that precede. The sentence ἥ . . . πορθηθεῖσα contributes significantly to the Exposition also, and Euripides skilfully tells us at exactly what point in the Trojan story the play begins, simultaneously with a presentation of the largest and most immediately impressive features of the basic fact of Troy fallen.

The word δορός at the end (the connotative position) of 8 is particularly significant. The immediate meaning is "spear," and the context demands that we understand this in the expanded sense of "military force," which "spear" bears in English poetry also. The Greek δόρυ, however, basically means "timber," and this sense clearly inheres in the present passage. The meaning "timber" suggests the Wooden Horse, and thus prefigures the contents of the five and one-half lines that follow.

ὁ γὰρ Παρνάσιος
Φωκεὺς Ἐπειός, μηχαναῖσι Παλλάδος
ἐγκύμον' ἵππον τευχέων ξυναρμόσας,
πύργων ἔπεμψεν ἐντὸς ὀλέθριον βρέτας·
ὅθεν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὑστέρων κεκλήσεται
δούρειος ἵππος, κρυπτὸν ἀμπίσχων δόρυ.

Tradition forbade a poet to ignore the Horse when treating the fall of Troy. In the *Troades* Euripides devotes a large part of the first Stasimon (516ff.) to a brilliant lyric account of the entrance of the Horse into Troy. He therefore clearly regarded the Horse as an important motif, and it is natural that he should have wished to prefigure it in the Prologue. Connotatively he has already done so, in δορός (8). The demands of tradition and the desire to prefigure one of the powerful passages in the first Stasimon suffice to explain why Euripides was not content with the connotations of δορός, and explicitly mentioned the Horse thereafter, but we still wonder why he devoted so many words to it. The answer, I believe, lies in the peculiar values of the αἴτιον in 13f. Euripides here refers, not merely to a later designation of the Horse as δούρειος, in the two senses of "wooden" and "speary," but more specifically to a bronze statue of the Trojan Horse, by the artist Strongylion, which had recently been erected at Athens, and which was called ὁ δούρειος ἵππος.[18] By this reference, which short-sighted critics might condemn as improper to tragedy, Euripides succeeded in conjuring up to the minds of the spec-

ὄλωλε is specified by the preceding καπνοῦται, and the combined impression created by all three verbs is one of destruction, with the elements of fire and rapine brought into prominence. The word πορθηθεῖσα prefigures πολύς . . . πέμπεται in 18f.

[18] On this see L. Parmentier, *REG* 36 (1923) 45ff.

tators a concrete picture of just what the fatal device looked like, which encompassed the ruin of Troy. This is clearly one of the main functions of 13f., and to athetize them is to betray one's insensibility to Euripidean poetics. The fulsomeness of diction in these lines is largely justifiable as repetitive emphasis of a motif that is very important to the play as a whole.

A further justification is to be found in the lines themselves. The key words are Παρνάσιος . . . Παλλάδος. The juxtaposition of Παρνάσιος and Φωκεύς is denotatively redundant, and seems superfluous anyway, since all that we might wish to know is that it was Epeius who built the Horse. Organically, however, the triptych of proper names is repetitively emphatic,[19] and the effect is a sharp emphasis on Epeius as an individual. Then come the words μηχαναῖσι Παλλάδος, and the great Epeius is suddenly deflated. The contrast is effective and significant. It is the gods, and especially Athene, that have defeated Troy; the Greeks have been merely the mortal implements of divine purpose. As victors, however, they have been guilty of arrogant sacrilege, just as if they had really *won* their victory. This is the most important motif in the Prologue, for it reveals the central meaning of the whole play. It is subtly, but unmistakably, prefigured in 9f., in the contrast between the great individual Epeius and the divine contrivances that operated through him.

The Horse is therefore the trick whereby the gods gave the Greeks victory over Troy. Euripides' mention of it may be a mere conventionality, but the language in which he mentions it is organically integrated into the whole Prologue and into the whole play. First we see Epeius; immediately thereafter Athene, the real creator of the Horse. The importance of this contrast abundantly justifies the four lines that follow. The Horse has now become a symbol of the fact that the victory was really won by the gods, and only apparently by the Greeks. As such it deserves full treatment. It is first effectively designated as ἐγκύμονα τευχέων, a fine phrase which connotes the pains of childbirth and hence the woes of Troy and of the Greeks. Then it is referred to as ὀλέθριον βρέτας,[20] another fine phrase, which prefigures the statue referred to in 13f. Finally the Horse is made completely graphic in 13f. by the reference to Strongylion's statue.

In 15 Poseidon returns to his picture of the desolation in Troy fallen, and the tempo of the diction quickens again.

15 Ἔρημα δ' ἅλση καὶ θεῶν ἀνάκτορα
φόνῳ καταρρεῖ· πρὸς δὲ κρηπίδων βάθροις
πέπτωκε Πρίαμος Ζηνὸς ἑρκείου θανών.

The climactic development in these lines is noteworthy. Three pictures

[19] Local adjectives very nearly constituted second personal names in Greek; this was especially true for the Athenians, because of the legal importance of adjectives formed from the names of demes.

[20] I wonder whether for the Athenian ear the word βρέτας could have suggested βρέφος, and hence have connotatively carried out the metaphor of ἐγκύμονα τευχέων?

are presented: deserted groves, shrines running with blood, and Priam slain at the altar of Zeus Herkeios. There are three places; they are mentioned in order of decreasing size, but this order is at the same time, and more significantly, that of increasing sanctity and closeness to the gods. The gods are merely implied, and not explicitly mentioned, in connexion with the ἄλση; they are mentioned generally, though none is named, in connexion with the ἀνάκτορα; the κρηπίδων βάθρα, however, are connected not only with Zeus, but specifically with Zeus Herkeios. Thus we are led from the universal to the particular, from the general and vague to the concrete and intense. The same process is observable in what is predicated of each place. The groves are merely "deserted," but the shrines "run with blood"; at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, however, none other than the king of Troy has met his death. The desertion of the groves is the *result* of the slaughter of the populace; the blood in the shrines is the *sign* of that slaughter; Priam fallen at the altar of Zeus Herkeios *is* the slaughter itself, and the slain man is the noblest of the Trojans.

The whole picture is one of sacrilege, but this is merely suggested in the deserted groves; in the shrines running with blood we feel it far more strongly, and it culminates in what we are told of Priam's death. This, I believe, accounts for the phrase κρηπίδων βάθροις, one of the two redundant elements in an otherwise terse and concrete passage. It is repetitive emphasis again, and has the effect of underlining the altars.

The diction is likewise climactic. In ἔρημα δ' ἄλση it is as plain and brief as possible, and there is no verb. In θεῶν . . . καταρρεῖ it is fuller, but still concise and economical. In the picture of Priam's death there are two denotatively redundant phrases, κρηπίδων βάθροις and πέπτωκε θανών. Both are repetitively emphatic,[21] and have the effect of italicizing "death at the altar."

The total effect of these lines is an extremely powerful picture of Greek sacrilege in Troy fallen. This sacrilege is one of the principal motifs in the play, and Euripides has presented it with consummate dramatic and poetic skill. What could be more natural than that a pro-Trojan god, describing the aftermath of the fall of Troy, should first deal with the groves, the shrines, and the altars? The dramatic effect is magnificent. In 8ff. we have learned of Troy's fall. The very first thing that we learn about Troy fallen is the sacrilege that has been committed, and it is just this sacrilege that is to bring a dreadful retribution on the Greeks. Verses 15ff. thus prefigure both the climax of the Prologue and the central meaning of the play.

In this initial appearance the motif of sacrilege is quite impersonal; we are not explicitly told that it is Greek sacrilege, although this is obvious enough. The primary concern of the poet is to present the sacrilege as a group of *acts* rather than as the actions of a group of *persons;* the sin really resides in the things done, and not in their doers.

[21] Since the basic meaning of πέπτωκε is "fallen," the word has here the additional value of giving a graphic touch to "death at the altar," by conjuring up the picture of the prostrate corpse of old Priam.

Poseidon now puts more secular matters into his canvas.

18 Πολὺς δὲ χρυσὸς Φρύγιά τε σκυλεύματα
πρὸς ναῦς Ἀχαιῶν πέμπεται·

Here the language is terse and factual again. Every word is denotatively necessary, except Φρύγια, and the significance of that has already been indicated. The fact that the word is here denotatively superfluous evinces Euripides' concern to sound the note Τροία as often as possible. The facts presented in this line-and-a-half are the immediate secular results of the sack of Troy.[22]

Poseidon now turns his attention briefly to the Greeks.

μένουσι δὲ
20 πρύμνηθεν οὖρον, ὡς δεκασπόρῳ χρόνῳ
ἀλόχους τε καὶ τέκν' εἰσίδωσιν ἄσμενοι,
οἳ τήνδ' ἐπεστράτευσαν Ἕλληνες πόλιν.

The Greeks are waiting for favouring winds. One is inevitably reminded of Aulis, and of the adverse winds that held the Greeks there, until they gained release only at the cost of Iphigenia's innocent life; it was sacrilege that had caused the adverse winds, and to reach Troy Agamemnon had to sin yet again. These connotative values of the words μένουσι . . . οὖρον have additional strength because the picture of sacrilege in 15ff. has preceded them. In them we have the faintest suggestion of the doom that awaits the Greeks. The word ἄσμενοι in 21 contrasts with this. Denotatively the word is not remarkable, but when we consider it in the light of the Prologue as a whole, we find that it is the only suggestion of joy on the part of the victorious Greeks. This is surely remarkable enough. Yet more so is the fact that the only thing in which the Greeks are to rejoice is just what most of them will not live to see, the reunion with their wives and children. The word ἄσμενοι is thus pre-contrasted with the woes that the Greeks shall suffer as soon as they set sail for home.

The phrase δεκασπόρῳ χρόνῳ requires careful attention. We shall have evaded our duties as critics if we dismiss it as a merely "poetic" way of saying "in the tenth year." Denotatively it serves to indicate the exact time at which the Greeks should arrive home, i.e., near or after the autumnal equinox of the tenth year. Connotatively it has important additional values. The time of sowing on land is the time of storms at sea, and the phrase δεκασπόρῳ χρόνῳ therefore prefigures the doom that awaits the Greeks.

At first sight 22 appears almost superfluous. Denotatively it contributes only a subject for μένουσι, and this could be dispensed with. The real function of the line is to pre-contrast the two that follow it, where the motif prefigured in μηχαναῖσι Παλλάδος (10) is developed.

[22] The spectator who knew the myths of the νόστοι would find double values in πολὺς . . . πέμπεται. For him the central meaning of the play is prefigured in these words. The spoils are the solid symbols of Victory, but these will never reach Greece.

When we consider 22 in this light we see that it was composed with this contrast in mind. The prosaic ἐπεστράτευσαν now acquires poetic and functional propriety; it is pre-contrasted with νικῶμαι in 23. Troy was *conquered* by the gods; the Greeks merely *made an expedition* against her.

Poseidon now speaks of himself again.

> 23 Ἐγὼ δέ—νικῶμαι γὰρ Ἀργείας θεοῦ
> Ἥρας Ἀθάνας θ', αἳ συνεξεῖλον Φρύγας—
> λείπω τὸ κλεινὸν Ἴλιον βωμούς τ' ἐμούς·

The dramatically important fact, prefigured in μηχαναῖσι Παλλάδος, that it is the gods who have vanquished Troy, here receives full and explicit statement. The diction is generally terse. The only purely ornamental words seem to be Ἀργείας θεοῦ and κλεινόν, but both are organic. The former emphasizes the fact that Hera was on the Greek side; significantly it is placed before her name. The adjective Ἀργείας has additional propriety because of the famous cult of Hera at Argos. The word κλεινός is conventional and colourless enough when applied to Ἴλιος, but since Ἴλιος has the organic values noted above, κλεινός underlines it here. The occurrence of Φρύγας in the same sentence with Ἴλιον is notable in this connexion.

The word συνεξεῖλον is richly connotative. It denotes that Athene and Hera "worked together to take Troy." It connotes that "together they selected Troy out for destruction" and that "together they removed the Trojans." The last-mentioned connotation is an important element in the desolation of Troy fallen; there are no Trojan men any more. This prefigures one of the important features of the *Troades*; throughout the play no Trojan *man* either appears or is spoken of as being alive.

Troy is thus quite stripped of her human defenders, and her gods are likewise deserting her. This important motif is explained, and thereby emphasized, in the next two lines.

> 26 ἐρημία γὰρ πόλιν ὅταν λάβῃ κακή,
> νοσεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν οὐδὲ τιμᾶσθαι θέλει.

Poseidon is perhaps concerned to explain that he is not disloyally deserting Troy, but rather that there is nothing left to stay for. The lines, however, have far wider values. The word ἐρημία denotes the important motif of desolation, but connotatively it suggests sacrilege; it has been prefigured in 15, and acquires some of the values which ἔρημα there derived from its context.

Verse 27 describes the effects of ἐρημία on the gods of the unfortunate city. In the immediate horizon the line means "religion declines, and it is no longer customary to worship the gods." Both νοσεῖ and θέλει are here used in derived senses. Their usual meanings give the line its connotative values, which are significant. "There is sickness in what relates to the gods, and they no longer wish to be honoured." The important motif of sacrilege is subtly and strongly brought in here, together with the suggestion that the real reason why the gods leave a

defeated city is because the victors outrage their worship, desecrate their holy groves and shrines, and murder their favourites.

Poseidon now passes from the divine to the secular again. He has told us what has happened to Troy's men and to Troy's gods; now he describes the fate of Troy's women.

28 Πολλοῖς δὲ κωκυτοῖσιν αἰχμαλωτίδων
βοᾷ Σκάμανδρος δεσπότας κληρουμένων.

These are powerful lines, tersely composed, and even in the denotative horizon their values are considerable. The captive Trojan women, while having masters allotted to them, are wailing loudly by the Scamander. The picture is impressive, and the order of words gives it especial power. The many wails are presented first, then the fact that these are the wails of captive women, then the place, Scamander, and finally the allotment to masters. The connotative values of the words add greatly to their power. The word κωκυτοῖσιν suggests Cocytus, and hence death. The adjective πολλοῖς conveys that these are the wails of a multitude of wailers, and in the connotative horizon almost puts πολλῶν after αἰχμαλωτίδων. In the word αἰχμαλωτίδων we feel the etymological sense of "spear-taken," and are thus reminded that this is the aftermath of War.

The words βοᾷ Σκάμανδρος have particularly rich values. Scamander was a Trojan river, and the name is thus another sounding of the tonic note Τροία. The word βοᾷ might seem hardly necessary after κωκυτοῖσιν, but it is entirely functional. It serves to connect the sound directly with the place where it is being made; in an ideal production this would make both the scene and the sound concretely alive for the spectator. This effect is strengthened by the fact that the river itself is said to be making the sound. Secularly this creates a picture of the river's banks echoing the wails of the women, and we remember that Homer (Φ 10) speaks similarly of Scamander. Scamander, however, was also a god, and for the animistically minded Greek spectator βοᾷ Σκάμανδρος must have simultaneously conveyed that the river-god himself was bewailing the sad fate of Troy.[23]

The words δεσπότας κληρουμένων do not explicitly mention slavery, but they clearly connote it. The connotations of κληρουμένων are especially powerful. The Trojan women are not being sold into slavery, but merely allotted. This is the extreme of impersonality, and the bare use of δεσπότας, with no adjective, greatly contributes to the impression. The picture is one of mere groups on both sides; unindividualized Trojan women are being parcelled out to unindividualized Greek masters. In the next two lines these masters are partially specified.

30 Καὶ τὰς μὲν Ἀρκάς, τὰς δὲ Θεσσαλὸς λεὼς
εἵληχ' Ἀθηναίων τε Θησεῖδαι πρόμοι.

[23] This notion suggests yet another; a river-god might not leave his stream, and Scamander is thus far more wretched than Poseidon, because he faces an endless future in a desolate land, where once he was honoured by a great city; he may therefore be felt as bewailing his own sad fate also.

It will now be evident, I think, that in 28f. the primary emphasis of impersonality is on the Trojan women; hence in δεσπότας κληρουμένων they are the grammatical subject, not the Greeks. Actually it was the Greeks who drew the lots, to determine which Greeks should receive which groups of captives, but Euripides does not put it this way, because he seeks to make the treatment of the Trojan women seem as coldly impersonal as possible. Hence, in this context, the Greek masters had to be given equally little individualization. The connotative *quality* of one word or phrase will serve to intensify a similar connotative quality in another word or phrase that occurs reasonably soon thereafter. In 28f. the Trojan women are quite unindividualized; this quality of impersonality culminates in κληρουμένων, but is intensified by the impersonality of the bare δεσπότας that immediately precedes it.

The Greek masters are but slightly individualized. In 30f. we are presented only with λεώ, and but two of them at that. A third "host" appears in Ἀθηναίων in 31, but it is in the genitive, and the patronymic Θησεῖδαι soon follows, giving us a pair of actual individuals, Acamas and Demophon, but only by implication; they are not individually named. The individualization in these two lines is thus progressive, but never gets very far.

Why does Euripides mention just Arcadia, Thessaly, and Athens, but no other part of Greece? In the *Iliad*, and in the Trojan legend generally, the Arcadians play a very minor rôle. The Thessalians, however, who signify primarily the followers of Neoptolemus, earlier of Achilles, are amongst the most distinguished of the hosts. Euripides' purpose is now clear; he has chosen two extremes, the lowly Arcadians and the preëminent Thessalians, to signify the Greeks as a whole. He thereby also succeeds in giving new values to the picture of the fate of the Trojan women. Sortition is equally fair to high and to low, and even the Arcadians are to get their allotted parcel of αἰχμαλωτίδες.

In the *Iliad* the Athenians are far from glorious, and seem little more important than the Arcadians. Does Euripides mention them here just to point out that yet another insignificant people shared in the allotment? There can be no doubt, I think, that the words Ἀθηναίων . . . πρόμοι have this value in the connotative horizon. The presence of Ἀρκάς in 30 is enough to assure this, and the result is repetitive emphasis of the fact that even the least of the hosts have their Trojan captives. For the Athenian spectator, however, this connotation can have been only a fleeting suggestion. Far more important for him was the fact that his ancestors had taken part in the conquest of Troy, the aftermath of which was now engaging his sympathetic participation. This brought the Greeks as a whole much nearer to him; all that had been said, and was to be said, of them, now applied to the Athenians also. The sacrilege and its punishment were henceforth almost personal concerns.

The word Θησεῖδαι has yet another value. We know that Strongylion's statue of the Horse showed the heads of Menestheus, Acamas, and Demophon, projecting from the head of the Horse. This statue was

referred to in 13f., and those lines prefigure the present one. The mention of the Theseidae here must have again conjured up Strongylion's work. Verse 31 is thus a second prefiguration of the Horse-motif in the first Stasimon. It prefigures a passage in the Parodos also. In 207f. the Chorus, wondering what Greek state will be their new home, express the hope that it will be the "glorious and happy land of Theseus." Immediately thereafter they say that next to Athens they should most wish to go to Thessaly. This too, we see, is prefigured in the lines now under consideration.

Poseidon now returns to the women of Troy.

32 Ὅσαι δ' ἄκληροι Τρῳάδων, ὑπὸ στέγαις
ταῖσδ' εἰσί, τοῖς πρώτοισιν ἐξῃρημέναι
στρατοῦ, σὺν αὐταῖς δ' ἡ Λάκαινα Τυνδαρὶς
Ἑλένη, νομισθεῖσ' αἰχμάλωτος ἐνδίκως.

In the first half of this passage (ὅσαι . . . στρατοῦ), the values are largely denotative. Euripides here informs us of the situation of the rest of the Trojan women, and at the same time explains the significance of the huts which the spectator sees on the stage. The spectator would naturally conclude that the women in these huts were going to constitute the Chorus of the play, and these lines have, amongst other functions, the immediate dramatic one of giving an advance identification of the Chorus.

The word ἄκληροι is to be taken quite literally, in the denotative horizon; these are the Trojan women who have not yet received masters as their κλῆροι. These women are in obvious antithesis to those mentioned in 28f., and hence ὅσαι δ' ἄκληροι means αἱ δ' οὔπω δεσπότας κληρούμεναι. The word ἄκληρος usually means "destitute," and this is its connotative value here, which is pathetically ironic in this antithesis. The tonic note Τροία is again sounded in Τρῳάδων, which is denotatively not strictly necessary.

The word ἐξῃρημέναι (in the connotative position) has multiple values. It echoes the συνεξεῖλον of 24, and hence possesses all its connotations. It suggests that the Trojan women have been "selected out for destruction" and that they are "expatriated." The word ἐξαιρέω also means "select as a special gift," and in this sense is honorific for both the recipient and the gift. This sense literally applies to the Trojan women in the huts, but in their present plight it is pathetically ironic to apply it to them.

The second half of the passage is dramatically very significant. Denotatively it tells us that Helen is in one of the huts, with the Trojan women, considered a captive, and justly so. The natural question of what has happened to the *femme fatale* of the Trojan War is thereby answered. This information has yet another immediately dramatic function: The audience already expects that the Chorus will emerge from the huts; now they are given reason to expect that at some point in the play Helen too will appear. This expectation has to wait a long time for fulfilment, but after 894 Helen finally does appear, and her

subsequent reunion with Menelaus, one of the high points of the play, is prefigured in what Poseidon tells us in 34f.

The Helen-scene is further prefigured in the connotation of the word ἐνδίκως, which is in the connotative position. Here the word denotes "justly," but it might also mean "under trial" or "subject to trial."[24] Since the Helen-scene consists largely in a *trial* of the beauteous Tyndarid, with Menelaus judging and Hecuba prosecuting, it is obviously prefigured in ἐνδίκως.[25]

The wider values of what Poseidon tells us about Helen are considerable. The repetitive emphasis in Λάκαινα Τυνδαρὶς Ἑλένη prepares us for something important, and this emphasis is reinforced by the contrast between the full individualization of Helen and the complete anonymity of the two classes of Trojan women that have been mentioned.[26] The whole Trojan War has supposedly been fought in order to recover the wife of Menelaus, but we hear of no joyous reunion. Helen is just another captive, like any Trojan woman, and Menelaus has not got around to her yet. As the play proceeds we see that he is in no hurry. It is only at 860 that he appears. His opening words are worth quoting here.

860 Ὦ καλλιφεγγὲς ἡλίου σέλας τόδε,
ἐν ᾧ δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμὴν χειρώσομαι

These lines are amongst the greatest in the play, and very important for its central meaning. The key-word is χειρώσομαι. All those that precede it might lead up to some word denoting reunion. Παρὰ προσδοκίαν we hear the terrible χειρώσομαι. "Oh, the fair-shining brightness of the sun today, on which day I my wife shall—conquer." Nothing could more devastatingly convey the emptiness of the Greek victory. The man for whose sake the Trojan War was undertaken and has been carried on for ten long years, in order that he might have his beautiful wife back, now meeting that beautiful wife, can speak only of "conquering" her.[27] Victory has infected everything, has become an end in itself, and even the recovery of Helen is now a χείρωσις!

The thing relevant to our present discussion is that the values of the Helen-scene are prefigured in 34f. What they tell us about Helen implies clearly that ten years of war have deeply affected the Greeks. Their aims have changed, and now that they are victorious they have little interest in the woman for whom they originally made the expedition; she is just another captive. These implications of 34f. powerfully sup-

[24] I know of no passage in which ἔνδικος has the sense of "under trial," but its derivation from δίκη enables it to have such a connotation, I believe.

[25] In the word νομισθεῖσα we feel the presence of νόμος, and it therefore reinforces the connotations of ἐνδίκως.

[26] The word Λάκαινα prefigures 210ff. in the Parodos, where the chorus hopes that it will not be taken to Sparta.

[27] The word χειρώσομαι has been so built up that it cannot fail to connote χείρ, with bitterly ironic suggestions.

plement what 21f. convey concerning the attitude of the Greeks toward their victory. Their only joy is in their future homecoming. Their present victory is joyless and empty. This is one of the three primary motifs of the Prologue.

Poseidon now turns his attention to the prostrate figure of Hecuba. In dealing with the women of Troy he has proceeded from the many to the few; now he comes to the one. The climactic arrangement serves to emphasize the individual, and thus to focus the interest of the spectators on the woman who will be the dominant character of the play. She has already engaged our curiosity by being present on the stage from the opening of the play. Euripides here uses the theatrical device introduced, apparently, by Aeschylus in his *Niobe*, with great effectiveness. Hecuba's lot is somewhat comparable to Niobe's; Euripides evidently so regarded it, and hence presented her to his audience in a similar manner, so far as staging was concerned. The use of the silent and motionless figure in the *Niobe* seems to have been very famous in fifth-century Athens. Euripides was therefore able to count on the audience's being acquainted with that play. In opening the *Troades* with Hecuba prostrate on the earth he could feel sure that many of the spectators would remember the *Niobe*, and hence would conclude that this grief-stricken woman would turn out to be another Niobe, greatly wretched, and the tragic heroine of the play.

Thus Hecuba has been emphasized by theatrical technique even before Poseidon mentions her. He devotes no less than nine verses to her, which emphasize her yet more, especially since these verses culminate the climactic arrangement already commented upon. Euripides is evidently doing everything he can to "spotlight" Hecuba. Consonant with this is the fact that at the conclusion of the Prologue the Chorus does not enter immediately, but only after a 60-line anapaestic *Threnos* by Hecuba.

In 36ff. Poseidon identifies Hecuba

> 36 Τὴν δ' ἀθλίαν τήνδ' εἴ τις εἰσορᾶν θέλει,
> πάρεστιν Ἑκάβη κειμένη πυλῶν πάρος
> δάκρυα χέουσα πολλὰ καὶ πολλῶν ὕπερ·

The key-words are ἀθλίαν and πάρεστιν. These are the outstanding things about Hecuba; she is wretched and she is present, all through the play. Thus at the very beginning of his introduction of the Trojan queen Euripides prefigures her total rôle. The motif of wretchedness is repetitively emphasized in 38, and the fulsome diction of that line effects yet greater emphasis. This too is repetitive; in the use of πολλά and πολλῶν in the same line it is even literally so. The word ἀθλίαν is richly connotative. It denotes "wretched," but its derivation from ἆθλον is connotatively present also; in the present context the word thus suggests that the prizes of the Greeks are at the same time the sorrows of the Trojans; this brightly illuminates the unmorality of war and of its gains. The word ἄθλιος can also be active, and mean "winning the

prize." This sense, too, is connotatively present in ἀθλίαν, and it prefigures the triumph of Hecuba over Helen in the great *Agon* (906–1059).

In the diction of 36f. there is remarkably much that is denotatively unnecessary, e.g., εἴ . . . θέλει and κειμένη . . . πάρος. The purpose of these apparently otiose words is primarily theatrical. Euripides is spotlighting Hecuba. He seeks to focus the attention of the audience on her as completely as possible. The opening phrase, τὴν δ' ἀθλίαν τήνδε, accompanied by an indicatory gesture of Poseidon's hand, directs the eyes of the spectators to the prostrate figure. The words that follow (εἴ . . . θέλει) constitute a kind of marking time, an interval of rest during which the visual picture of the wretched woman is given an opportunity to have its full effect. In such an interval spoken words are apt not to be heard with full comprehension. Their meaning must therefore not be important, for anything significant might be missed. Ideally such words should merely denote what the spectators are doing; in the present instance this is εἰσορᾶν.[28]

The interval of rest is followed by the name of the prostrate figure. This gives it new meaning for the spectators, and another interval of rest accordingly follows, to give the now identified prostrate figure time to "register." Here the words denote what the audience sees, i.e., Hecuba lying before the doors. Thus the apparently otiose elements in 36f. turn out to be theatrically functional, and we now see that the fulsome diction of 38 has this value also, to some extent, along with its repetitive emphasis of the motif of wretchedness, and the connotations of ἀθλίαν.

Poseidon now specifies the reasons for Hecuba's grief, the πολλῶν ὕπερ of 38.

39 ἦ παῖς μὲν ἀμφὶ μνῆμ' Ἀχιλλείου τάφου
λάθρα τέθνηκε τλημόνως Πολυξένη,
φροῦδος δὲ Πρίαμος καὶ τέκν'· ἣν δὲ παρθένον
μεθῆκ' Ἀπόλλων δρομάδα Κασάνδραν ἄναξ,
τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τε παραλιπὼν τό τ' εὐσεβὲς
γαμεῖ βιαίως σκότιον Ἀγαμέμνων λέχος.

The variation of tempo in the diction of these lines is remarkable. The fate of Polyxena is presented fulsomely, that of Priam and the "children" with maximum terseness, and that of Cassandra fulsomely again. We shall see that this is entirely functional.

[28] The clause εἰ . . . θέλει has ironic connotations also. The conditional form of expression suggests that no one really cares to look at Hecuba. This has several implications. The former Trojan queen presents a spectacle too miserable to be borne, and one must therefore avert one's eyes. Those who most should look on her, and therefore pity her, are the Greeks, but it is they who are least inclined to do so. In the subsequent dialogue Hecuba is not noticed by Athene, who is still very much the goddess of the Greeks, even though she has now become their chastising Nemesis; cf. the remarks on verses 65ff., below.

The substance of what Poseidon says merits careful consideration. He actually tells us very little about Hecuba's present woes. The fate of Polyxena is not yet known (λάθρα) to her, and Cassandra's concubinage is in the future. Only the words φροῦδος . . . τέκνα serve to specify the πολλῶν ὕπερ of 38. The mention of Priam recalls the account of his death in 16f., and the συνεξεῖλον of 24 has prefigured the application of φροῦδος to Hecuba's sons. The terseness of the diction does not therefore prevent it from having rich values; it does, however, effectively contrast it with the fulsome phraseology that surrounds it.

In the account of Polyxena's fate the key-word is λάθρα. We are here told a fact, and at the same time we learn that Hecuba is unaware of this fact. Our theatrical experience makes us reasonably certain that at some point in the play Hecuba will be informed of this fact. Thus a Known End is established, which makes multiple our experience of what follows. Generally this takes the form of our knowing that for all her present woes Hecuba has yet another very great one, of which she is not yet aware. Specifically it gives additional values to any mention of Polyxena hereafter. The dramatic importance of a Known End demands that it be communicated fully and clearly, and this is why the diction of 39f. seems superficially like mere τραγικὴ λέξις.

The account of Cassandra's future serves to prefigure the magnificent and terrible scene in which she appears. It has also a more important value. The taking of Cassandra is another instance of Greek sacrilege, and Poseidon explicitly designates it as such. A full treatment is thus doubly demanded.

The diction has interesting connotative values. Denotatively μεθῆκε is aorist of μεθίημι, signifying, with παρθένον, that Apollo let Cassandra remain virgin. It could, however, be imperfect of μεθήκω, and would then mean "came in quest of." The word δρομάδα here denotes "insane," but its basic sense of "running away" is connotatively present, and connects with the connotation of μεθῆκε as imperfect of μεθήκω; Apollo came in quest of the girl who ran away. The two most important parts of the story of Cassandra are thus presented at once; this is poetry of a very high order.

The function of the words ἦν . . . ἄναξ is to make clear in advance why Agamemnon's taking of Cassandra is sacrilegious; her person really belongs to Apollo. The next verse repetitively emphasizes the fact of sacrilege, but it is only in the last line of the passage that we learn that the guilty man is Agamemnon, and what it is that he is going to do. The structure of the sentence is climactic, and by the time his name is mentioned Agamemnon has been thoroughly condemned. In the last line connotative suggestion is again important. The word σκότιον here denotes "illicit," but its derivation from σκότος, which can mean the "darkness of death," gives it an ominous overtone, especially for the Athenian spectator, who was familiar with the doom of Agamemnon, and with Cassandra's connexion with that doom. The word λέχος, which is in the connotative position, seems to be syntactically a sort of cognate accusative after γαμεῖ, and as such must denote "bedfellow."

The word, however, can also mean "bier," and this signification, which ties up so well with the funereal suggestions of *σκότιον*, is clearly present in the connotative horizon.[29]

Poseidon now bids formal farewell to Troy.

> 45 'Αλλ', ὦ ποτ' εὐτυχοῦσα, χαῖρέ μοι, πόλις
> ξεστόν τε πύργωμ'· εἴ σε μὴ διώλεσε
> Παλλὰς Διὸς παῖς, ἦσθ' ἂν ἐν βάθροις ἔτι.

The god's emotions are deep and strong, and their expression is therefore somewhat full. The words *ποτ' εὐτυχοῦσα* are nostalgic in their implied contrast between Troy past and Troy present. They prefigure a motif that occurs frequently in the play itself, and contributes greatly to its pathos. The phrase *ξεστόν τε πύργωμα* supplies a touch of sentimentality proper to a farewell; Poseidon thinks of the parts of Troy that he built with his own hands. It should be observed that the phrase owes its emotional value to the fact that in 4ff. Poseidon has told us that he and Apollo built Troy; even the word *πύργωμα* is reminiscent of the *πύργους* of 5. If Poseidon had not previously given us this information, the phrase *ξεστόν τε πύργωμα* would be somewhat redundant after *πόλις*. The reminiscence of 4ff. has yet another value; it reminds us that the city that has fallen is a god-built city, and that its fall is an epochal event. In 45ff. there is no mention of the Greeks, and this is perhaps significant. The reminiscence of 4ff. recalls what immediately followed those lines; there for the first time the Greeks were presented as the mere implements of divine wrath against Troy. The fact that the mortal agents are passed over in silence in 45ff. is eloquent.

In *εἴ . . . Παλλάς* a familiar motif is expressed. For the third time we are told that it was Athene who conquered Troy. An important fact is thus repetitively emphasized. The verb *διώλεσε* puts it as strongly as the *συνεξεῖλον* of 24, but without connotative suggestion.

At the conclusion of his monologue Poseidon is about to leave, when there appears another divinity, who is none other than Athene herself. Her appearance must be sudden and unexpected. There is no trace of the advance announcement of a new entrance, which even divine characters in Greek tragedy usually make. In an ideal production Athene will suddenly materialize out of nowhere. Her entrance, however, is far from unprepared in Poseidon's monologue. He has mentioned her three times, and the third mention is in the last line of the monologue. Her name has occurred every time we have been told that it was the gods, rather than the Greeks, who conquered Troy, and in two out of three passages she has been the only divinity mentioned. Her entrance

[29] Cf. *Hipp.* 835ff.

has thus been effectively built up, and when she appears it is as Troy's Nemesis *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. The result is a magnificent confrontation of victorious goddess and vanquished god. Before either has addressed a word to the other we feel tension in the atmosphere. The dialogue portion of the Prologue is thus brilliantly introduced, and gets off to a highly dramatic start; it will not disappoint us as it proceeds.

Athene speaks first, very stiffly and pompously, in fulsome diction.

48 *Ἔξεστι τὸν γένει μὲν ἄγχιστον πατρὸς*
μέγαν τε δαίμον' ἐν θεοῖς τε τίμιον,
λύσασαν ἔχθραν τὴν πάρος, προσεννέπειν;

The tone is anthropomorphically realistic, and perfectly fits the situation; evidently the two divinities now confronting each other have not been on speaking terms for years. Athene is breaking the ice, but she is greatly concerned not to lose face in so doing.

Poseidon is completely the gentleman, and family ties mean a lot to him. His reply is cordial and accommodating, but very reserved.

51 *Ἔξεστιν· αἱ γὰρ συγγενεῖς ὁμιλίαι,*
ἄνασσ' Ἀθάνα, φίλτρον οὐ μικρὸν φρενῶν.

The formality of these lines is shown by the title *ἄνασσ' Ἀθάνα*, and by the fulsomeness of the diction. The didacticism is quite appropriate to an older god speaking to his niece.

Athene curtly thanks him, and makes a general statement of why she has approached him.

53 *Ἐπῄνεσ' ὀργὰς ἠπίους· φέρω δὲ σοὶ*
κοινοὺς ἐμαυτῇ τ' ἐς μέσον λόγους, ἄναξ.

She too is still being formal; hence she uses the title *ἄναξ*, but her diction is much more terse than Poseidon's. The tone of her remarks indicates that she is doing something she does not like, and wishes to get finished as soon as possible. She is not yet prepared, however, to lay her cards on the table; she is still sounding Poseidon out.

He evinces a polite and restrained curiosity, and again expresses himself fulsomely.

55 *Μῶν ἐκ θεῶν του κοινὸν ἀγγέλλεις ἔπος,*
ἢ Ζηνὸς ἢ καὶ δαιμόνων τινὸς πάρα;

Athene, with characteristic terseness, dismisses this question with a monosyllabic answer, and then reveals somewhat more of her purpose.

> 57 Οὔκ, ἀλλὰ Τροίας οὕνεκ', ἔνθα βαίνομεν,
> πρὸς σὴν ἀφῖγμαι δύναμιν, ὡς κοινὴν λάβω.

The denotatively unnecessary ἔνθα βαίνομεν emphasizes the tonic Τροίας, and thus reiterates the basic fact that this is Troy.

Poseidon now has the advantage over Athene; she is asking a favour of him. His answer is acidulous.

> 59 Ἦ πού νιν ἔχθραν τὴν πρὶν ἐκβαλοῦσα νῦν
> ἐς οἶκτον ἦλθες πυρὶ κατηθαλωμένης;

The sting of the remark is in its tail, in epigrammatic style; πυρὶ κατηθαλωμένης is a strongly graphic way of saying "now that it is too late." The participle ἐκβαλοῦσα must be concessive; otherwise the phrase in which it stands will be superfluous.

Athene ignores this, and testily calls Poseidon back to the point.

> 61 Ἐκεῖσε πρῶτ' ἄνελθε· κοινώσῃ λόγους
> καὶ συνθελήσεις ἂν ἐγὼ πρᾶξαι θέλω;

Noteworthy is the full phraseology of the question, which gives it an almost forensic tone: "will you, or will you not, etc." Athene must first be sure that Poseidon will coöperate; the key-word is κοινώσῃ, in the emphatic position in its clause; it has been prefigured by κοινούς in 54, κοινόν in 55, and κοινήν in 58.

Poseidon's politeness reappears in his cordial reply.

> 63 Μάλιστ'· ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ τὸ σὸν θέλω μαθεῖν·
> πότερον Ἀχαιῶν οὕνεκ' ἦλθες ἢ Φρυγῶν;

With μάλιστα he hastens to assure her that he fully intends to coöperate. "*But*," he says, with strong emphasis, "I wish to hear about *your* intention, too."

Athene's reply is bitterly sarcastic.

> 65 Τοὺς μὲν πρὶν ἐχθροὺς Τρῶας εὐφρᾶναι θέλω,
> στρατῷ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν πικρόν.

The phrase τοὺς πρὶν ἐχθρούς denotes "my former enemies," but it also connotes "my *late* enemies." This connotation echoes those of συνεξεῖλον in 24 and διώλεσε in 46. The masculine τοὺς ἐχθρούς

denotes all the Trojans, regardless of sex, but connotatively it suggests the Trojan men, who are no more. If they are to rejoice, it will have to be in the Underworld! The word *εὐφρᾶναι* is thus terribly ironic, in the connotative horizon. Athene's real aim is to harm the Greeks; she has neither pity for Troy, nor any real desire to gladden the hearts of the Trojans.

Poseidon understands this fully, and his reply is far from gentle.

> 67 Τί δ' ὧδε πηδᾷς ἄλλοτ' εἰς ἄλλους τρόπους
> μισεῖς τε λίαν καὶ φιλεῖς ὃν ἂν τύχῃς;

These words are a pointed accusation of fickleness and emotional instability. From 70ff. we learn that Poseidon was fully aware of Athene's reasons for harming the Greeks, and regarded her as quite justified in so doing. Hence the present lines are unmistakably personal in their reference, and must be understood as Poseidon's reaction to the sarcasm of what Athene has just said.

Athene either fails to grasp this, or, what is more probable, chooses to ignore it. Her reply is a defense of her attitude.

> 69 Οὐκ οἶσθ' ὑβρισθεῖσάν με καὶ ναοὺς ἐμούς;

Here the important motif of sacrilege is brought in again, and its full significance now begins to become clear. Hence the motif receives explicit and powerful expression, and the dread word *ὕβρις* appears, for the first time in this Prologue.

Poseidon's reply is reservedly sympathetic.

> 70 Οἶδ', ἡνίκ' Αἴας εἶλκε Κασάνδραν βίᾳ.

Poseidon states the fact of Ajax' crime in order to make clear to Athene that he understands the grounds of her wrath; this is quite natural and in character. The effect is not only to give the spectator additional information about Greek sacrilege, but also to make concrete, and hence even more powerful, the strong general statement of Athene in 69. The rape of Cassandra is not explicitly connected with Athene's temple; Euripides assumes that the spectator's familiarity with the myth will establish that connexion.

Athene's next remark supplies still more information.

> 71 Κοὐδέν γ' Ἀχαιῶν ἔπαθεν οὐδ' ἤκουσ' ὕπο.

"Not a single word of rebuke" is the sense of *κοὐδέν γε*, but the omis-

sion of κακόν (or κακῶς) with ἔπαθεν οὐδ' ἤκουσε further suggests that the Greeks paid absolutely no attention to Ajax' crime.

The presentation of Greek sacrilege in the present passage is climactic. First we learn of ὕβρις against Athene and her temples; then this is specified, and we learn the names of the criminal and of his victim. The name Cassandra recalls 41ff., in which we were told that she was a consecrated virgin, and this reminiscence makes the rape appear still more sacrilegious; Ajax has sinned against two divinities at once. Next we learn that the Greeks have thoroughly condoned Ajax' crime, which means that they share his guilt; the ὕβρις is not an individual's merely, but a whole people's. The culmination comes in Poseidon's next remark.

72 Καὶ μὴν ἔπερσάν γ' Ἴλιον τῷ σῷ σθένει.

Not only are the Greeks guilty of ὕβρις; they have sinned against the very goddess who gave them their Victory! It is this above all that will bring on retribution, as Athene makes clear in the first word of her next remark.

73 Τοιγάρ σφε σὺν σοὶ βούλομαι δρᾶσαι κακῶς.

Only one act of sacrilege is mentioned in the present passage, but it is generalized by the connivance of the rest of the Greeks. Neither Poseidon nor Athene refers to any of the other sacrilegious acts that Poseidon previously suggested or described. Nevertheless, the spectator remembers them, and for him the present climactic passage has a wider value, as being, in itself as a whole, the culmination of a larger climactic series.

Poseidon now repeats his assurance of coöperation, and enquires what Athene plans to do. She answers in general terms only.

74 ΠΟ. Ἕτοιμ' ἃ βούλῃ τἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Δράσεις δὲ τί;
ΑΘ. Δύσνοστον αὐτοῖς νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν θέλω.

After the νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν πικρόν of 66, 75 might seem superfluous, a stop-gap to preserve the Stichomythy. The line has, I think, sufficient organic value. Both it and 66 suggest the storm, which, as the climax of the Prologue, requires full prefiguration. They prepare us for the storm by repetitively emphasizing the fact that it is to be on their νόστος, to which they look forward with eager anticipation, that the Greeks will meet their doom. This is clearly manifested in the use of νόστον in 66, followed by the oxymoron

δύσνοστον νόστον in 75. The occurrence of ἐμβαλεῖν in both lines gives additional force to the repetition of νόστον.[30]

Athene's statement is very general, and Poseidon accordingly requests more specific information.

76 Ἐν γῇ μένουσιν ἢ καθ' ἁλμυρὰν ἅλα;

The connotation of "bitter" in ἁλμυράν is far stronger in the present context than it was in 1.

Athene answers Poseidon in a single line, and thus ends the Stichomythy.

77 Ὅταν πρὸς οἴκους ναυστολῶσ' ἀπ' Ἰλίου.

The phrase πρὸς οἴκους recalls 21, and the reminiscence of ἄσμενοι in that line is terribly ironic in the present context.

Athene now gives a full account of her plans and desires.

78 Καὶ Ζεὺς μὲν ὄμβρον καὶ χάλαζαν ἄσπετον
πέμψει γνοφώδη τ' αἰθέρος φυσήματα·
80 ἐμοὶ δὲ δώσειν φησὶ πῦρ κεραύνιον,
βάλλειν Ἀχαιοὺς ναῦς τε πιμπράναι πυρί.
Σὺ δ' αὖ, τὸ σόν, παράσχες Αἴγαιον πόρον
τρικυμίαις βρέμοντα καὶ δίναις ἁλός,
πλῆσον δὲ νεκρῶν κοῖλον Εὐβοίας μυχόν,
85 ὡς ἂν τὸ λοιπὸν τἄμ' ἀνάκτορ' εὐσεβεῖν
εἰδῶσ' Ἀχαιοὶ θεούς τε τοὺς ἄλλους σέβειν.

The opening words strike another note of doom; Zeus himself is against the Greeks now.[31]

The diction of the passage is characterized by a wealth of concrete detail, and hence is highly graphic. This is quite proper, dramatically. Not only does the climax of the Prologue require full expression, but the storm, being ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας, must be made so vivid for the spectators that they will carry a lively memory of it throughout the play. So concerned is Euripides to make the storm unforgettable, that he has Poseidon, after briefly agreeing to grant Athene's request, give a graphically detailed account of the destruction that he will effect.

[30] The repetition has, perhaps, another value also. The verbatim agreement of νόστον ἐμβαλεῖν with 66 tends to recall also the final πικρόν of 66, and this word is present in our minds while we hear the colourless and almost superfluous θέλω of 75.

[31] On this cf. γ 130ff.

87 Ἔσται τάδ'· ἡ χάρις γὰρ οὐ μακρῶν λόγων
δεῖται· ταράξω πέλαγος Αἰγαίας ἁλός.
Ἀκταὶ δὲ Μυκόνου Δήλιοί τε χοιράδες
90 Σκῦρός τε Λῆμνός θ' αἱ Καφήρειοί τ' ἄκραι
πολλῶν θανόντων σώματ' ἔξουσιν νεκρῶν.

The two pictures of the storm effectively complement each other. Athene dwells mainly on the present actuality, the meteorological phenomena and the upheaval of the sea. Only briefly (in 84) does she touch on the numbers of the dead and the dispersion of the corpses, i.e., the aftermath of the storm. Poseidon, on the other hand, is very brief on the subject of the actual storm (*ταράξω κτλ.*, in 88) but fully portrays the aftermath, with much geographical detail. The place names are significant. For Athenians in 415 B.C. they rendered the picture more concrete and graphic (and hence unforgettable) than any other poetic device could have done. They likewise most effectively conveyed the magnitude of the disaster, and hence the terrific force of divine retribution; it is about 200 miles from Myconos to Lemnos, and for the Greeks this distance was vastly more impressive than it is for us.

The language of the two accounts of the storm requires little detailed comment. Denotatively it is powerful word-painting, which achieves its effects by accumulating details. Dramatically it acquires greater than graphic values because of our knowledge that it is the Greeks whom the storm will assail, and that the far-strewn corpses will be Greek corpses. The redundancy of *πιμπράναι πυρί* in 81, after *πῦρ κεραύνιον* in 80, is quite functional. The motif of destruction by fire has two values; it makes the fate of the Greeks seem far more terrible, and it suggests the operation of a primitive justice which will cause the Greeks to suffer what they have wrought (cf. *καπνοῦται* 8 and *κατηθαλωμένης* 60). The motif therefore merits repetitive emphasis.

The word *ἁλός* in 83 and 88, in the connotative position both times, recalls the connotations of *ἁλμυράν* in 76 and 1. This is especially the case in 88, where *ἁλός* is denotatively redundant after *πέλαγος*. The fulsomeness of 91 is remarkable, with *θανόντων σώματα* and *νεκρῶν* in the same line. It is repetitive emphasis again, and quite functional. This is the last line in Poseidon's account of the aftermath of the storm. The dominant motif is "corpses," and this requires full expression. It is in character also. Like every-

thing else that he says in this dialogue, Poseidon's account of the storm is less terse (even though shorter), than Athene's.

Poseidon now bids Athene get herself ready for the storm.

> 92 Ἀλλ' ἕρπ' Ὄλυμπον καὶ κεραυνίους βολάς
> λαβοῦσα πατρὸς ἐκ χερῶν καραδόκει,
> ὅταν στράτευμ' Ἀργεῖον ἐξιῇ κάλως.

The words καραδόκει . . . κάλως put the finishing touch on the picture of the future that we shall carry through the play. Athene will be waiting, waiting for the fateful moment when the Greeks cast off, waiting to pounce on them as they sail homeward.

The word κάλως denotes "ropes," but it is in the connotative position, and suggests καλῶς. The ἐξ- of ἐξιῇ would be sufficient to suggest departure, and hence to tie up with the suggestion of καλῶς in κάλως, to make a combined connotation of "bon voyage." The word ἐξίημι, however, can be intransitive, meaning "empty into"; it is used of rivers pouring into the sea. The phrase ἐξιῇ κάλως is richly connotative, and conjures up a picture of a splendid stream of Greeks pouring into the sea like a river. The ominous overtones of this, coming so soon after the account of the storm and the deaths in its wake, need no special demonstration.

Athene now departs, and Poseidon muses on the whole tragic situation.

> 95 Μῶρος δὲ θνητῶν ὅστις ἐκπορθεῖ πόλεις,
> ναούς τε τύμβους θ', ἱερὰ τῶν κεκμηκότων,
> ἐρημίᾳ δοὺς αὐτὸς ὤλεθ' ὕστερον.

It is noteworthy that both Athene's last speech and Poseidon's end with the motif of sacrilege, and with the indication that the doom of the Greeks is a punishment for their sacrilegious actions. This is repetitive emphasis again, and shows conclusively that the real function of the Prologue is to make this causal sequence clear. In Poseidon's final lines the moral lesson is generalized, and applies to mankind as a whole; they thus express the central meaning of the play.

I hope that the foregoing analysis will have shown that the Prologue of the *Troades* has high merits, both poetically and dramatically. It is organically integrated, in the fullest sense of that term, and is so composed that practically every word in it contributes in some measure, both denotatively and connotatively,

to the purpose of the Prologue as a whole. The principal devices whereby the words become functional are prefiguration and repetitive emphasis. Every important motif is made effective, and is shown to be important, by being suggested before it is stated, and by being stated more than once. The motifs which the poetic technique of the Prologue shows to be most important are the emptiness of the Greek victory, the sacrilege of the Greeks, and its impending retribution.[32]

The most important function of the Prologue is thus to establish the Known End for the *Troades*. It accomplishes this with supreme effectiveness, and makes the Known End quite unforgettable. Because of the Known End our experience of the play itself is multiple, and the pathos in the pageant of the miseries of defeat is not excessive, because we also know of the miseries of victory. The Known End also discloses the central meaning of the play, and with a brief statement of this we may conclude our study of the Prologue of the *Troades*.

For ten long years the Greeks have toiled and fought before Troy, and finally the gods have granted them victory. Then, at the height of their success, the Greeks have been guilty of ὕβρις. Forgetting that their victory is really a gift from the gods, they have acted as though it had been won entirely by their own efforts. Once they have taken Troy they have run amok, unmindful of the gods and of the gratitude that they owe them. Instead of walking warily in the favour of their gods they have cast to the winds the humility proper to mortals, and have arrogantly and wantonly indulged their lustful and sanguinary impulses. Even the shrines and the altars of the gods have been soiled with blood, and the crowning crime has been the rape of the consecrated virgin Cassandra in the temple of the virgin goddess Athene. This was the deed of Ajax alone, but the connivance of the others fatally evinces

[32] There is something almost Aeschylean about this predicted retribution. Right after an opening monologue such as only Euripides wrote, and in the midst of a dialogue such as only Euripides *could* write, lively, realistic, anthropomorphic, a chilly Calvinistic blast assails us, and we might almost suppose ourselves in the first, rather than the last, quarter of the fifth century.

Mr. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* 210f., presses the comparison with Aeschylus too far, I believe. He finds in both the *Agamemnon* and the *Troades* that a large portion of the play is devoted to establishing the guilt of those who are "doomed from the start." This makes the Greeks the tragic hero of the *Troades*, and thereby weakens, or annihilates, the powerful pacifism of the play.

their equally impious attitude. They have thus, all of them, directly or indirectly, sinned against the very goddess who gave them their victory, and they have thereby alienated the staunchest friend they had amongst the immortals. They are like dogs that have bitten the hand that fed them, and their mistress Athene is inflexibly resolved to punish them, with Aeschylean austerity and exuberance.

Victory has corrupted the victors. She has not only been hollow and bitter and disillusioning; she has also actively debased her possessors, bringing out the worst that was in them, making them godless and bestial gluttons, filled only with bitterness and achieving only destruction and sin. The real villain, the Evil Genius, of the *Troades*, is therefore Victory. She is a misfortune in disguise, who poisons those whom she seems to feast and damns those whom she seems to bless.

This picture of Victory is sharply outlined in the Prologue; the play itself fills in the terrible details. At the same time it most movingly presents the sufferings of the vanquished. The combination of the pathos of Defeat with the unmasking of the corruptress Victory is what makes the *Troades* a very great anti-war play. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find anything in literature which so simply and so powerfully exposes the futility and the folly of war, by driving home the lesson that no one really wins; there is only pain and degradation on both sides.

μῶρος δὲ θνητῶν ὅστις ἐκπορθεῖ πόλεις!