

COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE IN TRAGEDY: A SUPPLEMENT TO THE WORK OF P. T. STEVENS

INTRODUCTION

This paper has its distant origin in my review of P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 38 (Wiesbaden, 1976), published in *CR* 28 (1978), 224–6; I repeat a few parts of it here by permission of Oxford University Press. Over the years I had collected further qualificatory or supplementary matter, but I gathered much more, and wrote the paper, in 2004. Even so, I may have missed important or useful work on tragedy, especially some waiting for notice in *APh* after vol. 73 (2002).

In a bibliography at the end I list works cited more than once; they are abbreviated to the author's name, where necessary a date, and page or section number. As to Stevens's own publications, I cite his 1976 monograph as 'CEE' and his two earlier articles (both published in this journal) just by the years of their appearance, 1937 (Euripides) and 1945 (Aeschylus and Sophocles). Commentators on plays get their usual terse recognition, 'Author on play(-name and) line-number'. Base-texts for the dramatists are the current OCT editions: Aeschylus (Page), Sophocles (Lloyd-Jones and Wilson), Euripides (Diggle), Aristophanes (Hall and Geldart), Menander (Sandbach), Plautus (Lindsay), Terence (Kauer and Lindsay). Dramatic fragments are cited from Snell–Kannicht–Radt *TrGF* and Kassel–Austin *PCG*.

The paper benefits greatly from my access to unpublished material. First, I include many notes upon colloquial and everyday language left at his death by Eduard Fraenkel (1888–1970). I owe my knowledge of them to Mr Peter Brown of Trinity College, Oxford, who suggested that such matter may survive in the archive of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where indeed it does; I thank the President and Fellows of the college for permission to transcribe or cite from it.¹ In the Fraenkel Papers Box 12 there are five small notebooks, two of which are devoted to the language of Sophocles, particularly the colloquial and everyday, and to colloquial idioms of Iono-Attic dialect as precursors of the *koinē*. The notebooks are not dated, but some of the material in them was to be used—or had been used—for Fraenkel's Italian seminars on Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* during the middle to late 1960s (published posthumously: see the bibliography at Fraenkel 1977 and 1994; for the new material see at Fraenkel MSS). In the last years of his life Fraenkel returned energetically to his lifelong interest in registers of dramatic language, and studied Sophocles generally: see the bibliography by N. Horsfall, *JRS* 66 (1976), 200–5 and the survey by L. E. Rossi in Fraenkel 1977, viii–xvi.²

¹ Peter Brown has my thanks also for helping me to improve the general discussion with which the paper begins, Part I below; so too Angus Bowie and Doreen Innes. I gratefully acknowledge some advice over arrangement by the editor Miriam Griffin, and particularly thank her for accepting a paper of unusual form.

² Rossi's *premissa* contains lively reminiscences of Fraenkel in Italy; on pp. xxix–xxx he lists published commemorations of Fraenkel. Russo's *prefazione* in Fraenkel 1994 also has factual and biographical matter relating to the Italian seminars, with some photographs.

Second, I have drawn extensively upon the unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis of John Waś, 'Aspects of Realism in Greek Tragedy', which was written with guidance from Mr T. C. W. Stinton and was approved in 1983. In the long first chapter, Waś reconsiders Stevens's criteria of colloquialism (pp. 1–25; cf. my Part I.C.1 below); he subjects almost all expressions listed by Stevens in 1937, 1945, and *CEE*, together with some proposed by earlier scholars, to re-examination against their occurrence whether in stichomythia (pp. 26–67) or other dialogue and, rarely, lyric (pp. 67–257), and everywhere in their dramatic context; and he offers some general conclusions upon the tragic poets' deployment of such language (pp. 257–66). I am extremely grateful to Dr Waś for allowing me to cite, if mostly by summary page references, his detailed, judicious, and still important work.

The paper has six parts:

- (I) definitions and generalities;
- (II) supplementary examples from all tragedy of expressions already listed chiefly for Euripides by Stevens in *CEE*, in nine categories in each of which expressions are arranged alphabetically;
- (III) further expressions which appear to match Stevens's criteria of the 'colloquial', organized alphabetically in the same nine categories, but for all of tragedy, not Euripides alone;
- (IV) still further expressions often judged by scholars as 'colloquial' which seem not to match Stevens's criteria, similarly organized, and also for all of tragedy;
- (V) a brief comment upon vocabulary, chiefly metaphorical, attributed with varying confidence to colloquial language;
- (VI) a composite index of expressions and phenomena treated in Parts I–V of this paper and in all three of Stevens's publications, 1937, 1945, and *CEE*.

I. DEFINITIONS AND GENERALITIES

I.A.1. Stevens's monograph of 1976 was the first well-considered and comprehensive study of its kind for Euripides and, in virtue of its comparative material, for tragedy as a whole. It justly remains a standard work of reference, for there and in his earlier 1937 and 1945 papers Stevens advanced and then modified definitions of the 'colloquial' in Greek earlier than the *koinē*, which still command general assent; and he followed them closely when he listed expressions. He also made important observations about the way in which tragedians deployed such language. My paper is both a tribute to Stevens³ and an attempt to supplement his monograph as usefully as possible. In this hope I have confined myself to updating his general discussion (*CEE* 1–9, which largely subsumed 1937, 182–3, and 1945, 95–8), mostly with bibliography but with some matter of my own; I have throughout followed his methodology, given its wide endorsement by others, and have therefore retained his categorization and arrangement of phenomena (see I.A.2 below). Lastly, my hospitable attitude in Parts III and IV towards probable or possible colloquialisms also reflects Stevens's own practice: 'no precise specification is possible and each instance must be considered on its merits. For this reason it seemed necessary to present the evidence in sufficient detail to enable scholars to judge for themselves' (*CEE* 8). I do not, of course, anywhere pretend to completeness.

³ I briefly enjoyed Stevens's acquaintance in the early 1970s; he gave me help *in rebus Euripideis sapiens tironi peritus*. I have contributed the entry for Stevens to R. B. Todd (ed.), *The Dictionary of British Classicists* (Bristol, 2004), 924–5.

I.A.2. The expressions listed by Stevens in 1937 were mainly of additions to Amati's long list of 1901, based on comparison between tragic and comic diction. The 1937 paper became a *locus classicus* for grateful commentators and was reprinted in 1969. In 1936 Smereka's study of Euripidean language had begun to appear (its completion was a casualty of World War II, it seems), just too late for Stevens to use; but subsequently at *CEE* 1 Stevens largely dismissed Smereka's material from 'everyday' language as 'giving many alleged examples but marred by lack of discrimination and absence of any indication of the criteria adopted'. Stevens's further paper of 1945 was devoted to Aeschylus and Sophocles but included some additional Euripidean material illustrating the other two tragedians. In 1976 *CEE* itself offered nearly 120 expressions under nine heads: (A) Exaggeration, (B) Pleonasm, (C) Understatement, (D) Brevity, (E) Interjections, (F) Particles, (G) Metaphors, (H) Miscellaneous, and (I) Forms and Syntax; it included examples of these expressions occurring also in Aeschylus and Sophocles, many drawn from the 1937 and 1945 papers, but did not repeat those that Stevens had identified as confined to those two tragedians.

I.A.3. When I reviewed *CEE* in 1978, I had been unable to see Amati's and Smereka's lists. When I was at last able to compare them with Stevens's three publications, I found that in *CEE* Stevens had omitted no fewer than 104 expressions from Amati's total of 144, and retained only 31 of Smereka's 175 locutions and words (Smereka listed 108 Euripidean locutions from 'everyday life' on pp. 100–9, the majority noted from stichomythia but including very few particles, and on pp. 250–3 67 words from 'everyday language'; but for the latter list he ignored *Cyclops*). Stevens had, however, included in both the 1937 paper and *CEE* many expressions identified by neither Amati nor Smereka. In *CEE* he nevertheless omitted some five or so expressions from 1937 and about ten from 1945, many of which I have thought worth reconsidering here for tragedy, mostly in Part III below; reviewers and others had canvassed some of them. As well as drawing for Part II on my own review of *CEE* and on the reviews by Rubino, Tarkow, Thesleff 1978, and Van Looy (see the bibliography), I have listed in Parts III, IV, and V many words and expressions described variously as colloquial or everyday, and with varying confidence, by subsequent scholars.

I.B. Stevens repeatedly debated the nature of colloquialism. His earlier definition, 'such words and phrases as might naturally be used in everyday conversation, but are avoided in distinctively poetic writing and in formal or dignified prose' (1937, 182), was refined in *CEE*. Here he described levels of language as poetic, prosaic, neutral, and colloquial, but distinguished between emotional and intellectual aspects; and because Greek colloquialisms share something in their emotion with poetry and impassioned oratory, he argued that they may be less obvious in poetry than in plain prose. He ended by describing levels of imagery (*CEE* 1–4); note especially 'the kind of language that in a poetic or prosaic context would stand out however slightly as having a distinctively conversational flavour' (4). So his evidence for colloquial pedigree widened from comedy, Platonic dialogue, mime, and Ptolemaic papyri to include some Herodotean and Xenophontic dialogue and the private speeches of the orators, where ethopoeia sometimes dictates imitation of a plain man's speaking style.⁴ Stevens's discussion and categories in *CEE* acknowledged a

⁴ Bers 1997, 137, nevertheless set out a strong reservation about the use of colloquialisms in direct speech in the orators, especially in the private speeches: 'Before examining the Oratio Recta passages of Attic oratory, we need a tighter definition of "colloquial" language. For

debt to Thesleff 1967, 63–80; and they compared well with the views of Taillardat 13–14, in his remarkable study of Aristophanic imagery, which Stevens apparently did not use. For Taillardat, colloquial images are those frequent in comedy and occasional in prose writers—and in some poets, especially Euripides—so that it is likely his collection might expand Stevens’s rather meagre list of metaphors, e.g. 388 §682 *κίβδηλεύω Bacch.* 475 (see Roux ad loc.), *κίβδηλος El.* 550, *Hipp.* 616, *Med.* 516; the same desideration was made in Rubino’s review of *CEE* (1982, citing Fraenkel 1977, 25–37). Stevens was nevertheless rightly cautious in excluding very many individual words which Amati had identified as colloquial ‘metaphors’; I return to this difficult issue in Part V of this paper.

I.C.1. I record here general definitions and discussions of the ‘colloquial’ subsequent to Stevens’s, in order of time. First, two reviewers of *CEE*. Van Looy 617 noted the sometimes precarious nature of definitions because they must often depend on identical or similar expressions in authors who are thought to reproduce their current language in a literary or artistic form. Thesleff 1978 commended Stevens’s caution and endorsed his definitions as ‘not too vague a category to characterize a certain aspect of the style of Euripides’. Thesleff was one of the first classicists, as far as I have found, to observe that ‘colloquial’ is too unsatisfactory a term or category to be employed in modern linguistic theory (see also Bagordo below in this section, and Landfester in I.D.1).

Then there is H. D. Jocelyn’s discussion of *communia verba* in ‘Vergilius cacozelus (Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 44)’, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2 (1979), 109–18.

Waś (1982), 3, begins by suggesting that ‘the most useful formal indication [of colloquial language] will be some deviation from strict “correctness” of expression. This vague criterion . . . only partially covers colloquialism, and . . . can be better understood if I label as “incorrect” those expressions which cannot adequately be rendered by a completely literal, word-for-word translation.’ He continues: ‘the usual reference to parallel occurrences in certain other authors and genres (e.g. Stevens, pp. 5f. . . .) yields inconclusive results. Scholars . . . have not made the distinction between “natural” and “colloquial” very clear, but it is important in assessing the naturalness of tragic language’ (p. 4). After reviewing ‘ancient comment on style, particularly that which mentions Tragedy and its relation to natural language’ (pp. 4–5), principally Aristotle at *Rh.* 1404a28ff., 1404b5ff., *Poet.* 11458a18ff., 1458b31ff., *Rh.* 1395a2ff (pp. 5–12), Waś judges the (limited) ‘utterance’ on vase-paintings as ‘one fairly safe indication’ (pp. 12–15, at 12). He notes some forms of divine address in inscriptions which turn up in tragedy, judging that tragedy simply reflects

our purposes here, the term will cover lexical or syntactical features that are largely or exclusively found in Old Comedy in those parts that are contextually appropriate to everyday speech and are not paratragic or blatantly non-Attic. This applies a far narrower criterion than that applied by Stevens [at *CEE* 1–9], particularly in that I have very little confidence in our ability to discern authentically Attic and conversational elements in Plato and Xenophon.’

Two brief notes upon prose authors admitted as criteria by Stevens: (i) R. Deni, *Die Gespräche bei Herodot* (Heilbron, 1977), 154–61, finds that common indicators of the colloquial such as interruptions, anacolutha, diminutives, paucity of, or weak, particles, words of perplexity, interjections, oaths, and so on, and simple syntax overall are not characteristic of Herodotean ‘speech’; and that some other colloquial expressions seem concentrated in the ‘novelistic’ parts of the author; (ii) Thesleff 1967, 65–6, analysed *Laches* 194C–6C as a sample of Plato’s colloquial style ‘having a light and easy tone with many shifts of emphasis and a tendency to brevity and slackness of exposition, and a marked use of idioms’; for *Republic* and *Phaedrus* see De Vries. On prose authors generally see Dover 1987, 16–30.

ordinary usage (pp. 15–20, at 17). Then he turns to literary sources, concluding that ‘Aristophanes, Herodotus, Plato, Xenophon, the orators, and New Comedy provide the material’ for literary comparison, but that ‘all are theoretically open to the objection expressed by Dover in his Gaisford Lecture⁵ that most presumed instances might be “literary representations of the colloquial”. . . . On grounds of probability, however, coincidence of usage between several of these groups [of authors and genres] must be considered the best evidence we can have’ (pp. 25–6). Finally, Waś notes that the precise context in which supposed colloquialisms occur has rarely been discussed (pp. 20–6, at 25–6). In sum, Waś advances some principal criteria of the colloquial in tragedy: departure from ‘strict’ language; clear attestation in comedy; the appearance of putative phenomena in tragic contexts of excitement, passion, and extreme emotion will tend to confirmation (cf. also his pp. 64–6); their appearance in stichomythia or very close to stichomythic exchange will be strongly suggestive, like the clustering of such expressions anywhere in a play; but Waś emphasizes throughout that for many individual expressions it may be impossible to distinguish between a natural and a colloquial register from one context to another.

Bers 1984, 187–90, amid his discussion of *differentiae* between dialects, offers the following considerations:

[Such] *differentiae* are not used to distinguish the general speech habits or temporary emotional states of speakers . . . not one of them has a strong association with a particular class, age, or gender of speaker . . . the principal determinant in the purely linguistic practice of an author is the genre of the work as a whole, not the smaller units within the work, whether formal or thematic. Uniformity of linguistic usage stands in marked contrast to the extreme rhetorical variations from character to character.

(p. 188; cf. Bers 1984, 5–8 which include remarks on Stevens)

Dover 1987, 16–30, is a review of evidence appropriate for determining the ‘colloquial’—literary, artistic (vase-paintings with ‘speech-bubbles’), and documentary—and the mutual illumination of these three stylistic markers, e.g. sentence structure; pp. 23–4 are on comic and tragic dialogue. Note Dover’s bracing question in the same volume, p. 194: ‘before labelling a word “colloquial”, “technical”, “poetic”, etc., on the purely positive evidence [students of comic vocabulary should have] asked and answered the vital question: “How else could the poet have said it?”’

West (1990), 3, contents himself with citing Stevens and Dover for definitions of ‘colloquialism’ but adds ‘Perhaps I can get away with saying that a colloquialism is an expression that some people would sometimes avoid as lacking in dignity’; and on p. 5 he states: ‘The antithesis of naïve style . . . is writing in which complex utterances are confidently articulated in a manner that is fully controlled, avoiding grammatical derailment and unnecessary duplication’ (on pp. 6–8 he exemplifies these two markers of the naïve style from Aeschylus).

López Eire (1994) (see also below in I.C.3) offers a notable caution against equating comic language automatically with the colloquial. I cite the English résumé (p. 486):

[F]rom [Aristophanes’ comedies as] literary works, [it is] impossible to reconstruct properly the colloquial Attic of the fifth century B.C., starting from their data. Notwithstanding this, we can obtain some glances at it if we compare its most striking features with similar ones found in the well-known colloquial level of languages spoken today. In the colloquial level of every language, compared with non-colloquial ones, there is an important increase in the use of

⁵ Delivered in 1977, revised and published as ‘The colloquial stratum in Attic prose’ in Dover 1987, 16–30, where see pp. 16–17.

non-referential linguistic functions as, for instance, the expressive, the conative and the phatic function. And this fact always enhances the importance of context, situation, intonation and gesture.

Bers 1997, 146, in discussing Lysias 1 (*Eratosthenes*), states:

Provided the realm of colloquial Attic Greek is thought to be co-extensive with low-temperature conversation, the distinction between literary and routine uses of language usually serves well enough. Serious confusion often arises when the occasion is emotionally charged, for we are then confronted with language that may resemble the artificial, premeditated, even specifically literary.

Dover 1997, 64–5, offers approving remarks on Stevens's classifications.

Adams and Mayer (1999), 3, note the often overlapping terms employed by their contributors, 'common parlance', 'ordinary discourse', 'everyday language', 'ordinary language', 'speech, spoken language', 'colloquialism' (and similar terms), 'vulgar (Latin)'. On pp. 5–10 they discuss colloquialism and orality, and I quote two passages at length:

[T]he difference between the deliberate use in colloquial speech, or indeed high literature for that matter, of an item belonging mainly to the lower, non-literary registers ... and the failure under conditions of stress or in a heated spoken exchange to complete an utterance according to accepted norms of correct grammar. A usage of the first type may be called a 'colloquialism', but features of unsuccessful oral performance are not deliberate. (p. 6)

Poets [Latin] in most genres were more tolerant than orators or historians of usages across a wide stylistic spectrum, from the archaic to the colloquial. A colloquialism ... might of course have the function of giving an appropriate tone to a genre or a particular context, but equally some colloquialisms which cannot be accounted for in this way may simply have been raised to acceptability because they were potentially useful (e.g. metrically), or because some other factor gave them respectability in the poets' eyes. (p. 9)

Bagordo (2001), 21–5, discusses the concept of 'Umgangssprache' and the problems of identifying it accurately in literary works of 'elevated' style, especially poetry; cf. p. 169 of his earlier review in *Drama* 8 (1999), 169–82, of R. Müller, *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialog-linguistische Studien zu Terenz* (Heidelberg, 1997).

Dover 2002, 96, discusses some evaluative terms in Aristophanes.

Willi 2002, 24–5, discusses Aristophanes and Menander.

I.C.2. *Some particular aspects*

'*Vulgarisms*'. Sommerstein (2002) is not so much defining the colloquial as illustrating robust or vulgar vocabulary and expressions usually taken to be a stratum of the colloquial; he deals with a number of words of comic pedigree in the *Oresteia* (tabulated on 167–8). He describes a 'comic feature of language ... as a feature that is common in comedy (and/or in other low-register forms of verse, such as iambic) but very rare or unknown in tragedy'; cf. Henderson, 8, writing on the uncertain status in tragedy of vigorous wording sometimes used for deliberate obscenity in comedy.

Direct speech 'within' speech in tragedy. In his study of this phenomenon, Bers 1997, 71, finds very few sure examples of colloquialism: none in Aeschylus, perhaps two in Sophocles (*Aj.* 228 τί χρῆμα (δρῆς); *OC* 1627 οὗτος, τί μέλλομεν;); and nine expressions in Euripides (*HF* 1290 οὐ ... ἀποφθάρῃσεται;; *Hec.* 563 ἰδοῦ; *HF* 965 τί πάσχεις;; cf. *Med.* 879 τί πάσχω;; *HF* 966 οὐ τί που; *HF*

975 τί δρᾶς; cf. *Melanippe Desmotis* F 495.16 τί δρᾶτε; *El.* 831 τί χρῆμα; *Med.* 1209 γέρων τύμβος; *Or.* 936 οὐ φθάνοιτ' ἄν . . .; cf. 941 οὐ φθάνοι . . .). Also on p. 71 he cites the familiar comments on Euripides 'by his contemporaries and near contemporaries as opening the doors of tragedy more widely to everyday speech (*Ar. Ran.* 939–42 and *Aristot. Rhet.* 1404b24–5)',⁶ but on p. 226 he comments on the surprising fact that 'Oratio Recta is not especially rich in the marks of *Umgangssprache*, even in Euripides . . . tragedy increasingly portrayed language as part of the off-stage world'. Waś 265 gave the same examples for direct speech as Bers, except for *Soph. OC* 1627 and *Eur. Hec.* 563, but adds *Soph. Aj.* 1154 ὄνθρωπε, *Eur. Heracl.* 805 τί . . . οὐκ . . .; *IT* 321 ὅπως θανούμεθα, 369 ἦν ἄρα; *Ion* 32 αὐτῶ σὺν ἄγγει, 1131 ἔστωσαν; *Hel.* 1561 and 1597 οὐχ' εἶα, 1562 νεανίας ὄμοιοι; *Or.* 665 ἀδύνατον; *Bacch.* 719 θέλετε θηρασώμεθα . . .; 1106–7 φέρε . . . λάβεσθε; *IA* 817 δρᾶ (δ') εἴ τι δρᾶσεις.

Particles, and their inconsistent appearance in differing literary genres, are a special problem: see Denniston throughout his pp. lxiv–lxxxii; for the differences between tragedy and Aristophanes, see Willi 2003, 260–1. Users of this paper will accordingly find little new material for particles in the sections 'F' of Parts II, III, and IV below.

Proverbs and the like. Any dramatic person, tragic or comic (and Platonic), is entitled to employ everyday maxims or aphorisms, so that there is general agreement that proverbs should not be categorized as colloquial (see especially Bagordo 23–5; caution earlier by e.g. Waś 20–5, noting that it is difficult to distinguish such expressions in tragedy from 'what people were actually accustomed to say in the fifth century').

Colloquialisms in Latin. Stevens himself, like many commentators on Greek tragedy and comedy, and Fraenkel in his Notebooks, occasionally adduced analogous expressions from Roman comedy. Conversely, Hofmann and, for example, Bagordo often illustrate Latin expressions from Greek, because some of them appear to be derived through 'translation' or imitation. In this paper I have contented myself with directing readers chiefly to Bagordo's extensive collections for Latin analogies for the Greek expressions I treat.

I.C.3. Substantial recent bibliographical starting-points for Greek colloquialisms, often with useful discussion, are: Landfester 31–4; Zangrando 1997, 189 nn. 2 and 5; Zangrando there, and Willi 2002, 281–2 and 2003, 288–9, list the work of A. López Eire (see especially his 1994, 130 n. 1 for some quite widely ranging bibliography); Bagordo 150–5. Even commentators on Greek comedy have given consistently full attention to colloquialisms only in recent years: see e.g. the indexes in D. Olson, *Aristophanes: Peace* (Oxford, 1998) and *Aristophanes: Acharnians* (Oxford, 2002); C. Prato, *Aristofane: Le donne alle Tesmoforie* (Milan, 2001).

An aside: except for Bagordo's study of Terence (which nevertheless includes much comparative matter from Plautus), less attention has been paid to colloquialism in Latin dramatic poetry, even in comedy, because of Hofmann's long-lived study: see J. Kramer, 'Die lateinische Umgangssprache', in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997), 156–62 (Hofmann 'bleibt unersetzt', 162; similarly, Landfester 133 n. 8); but there was also H. Happ, 'Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus', *Glotta* 45 (1967), 60–104, including methodological discussion for all languages at pp. 60–79. The discussion for Latin by Adams and Mayer already mentioned has hardly anything relating to drama. For Senecan tragedy there is a useful brief appreciation by M. Billerbeck, *Senecas Tragödien* (Leiden, 1988), 135 §25; for commentators' individual notes, see especially her *Hercules Furens*, on lines 372–3, 1169–70, 1308–10; then, for

⁶ These two passages had been cited by Stevens 1937, 182 n. 1, but not in *CEE*.

example, Tarrant on *Agamemnon* 129 and 971 and *Thyestes* (pp. 25–6 and index); Ferri on *Octavia* (p. 341 and index); Fitch on *Hercules Furens* 1120 and 1140; Töchterle on *Oedipus* 270ff., 671, 787. H. D. Jocelyn ventured a few generalizations for Ennian tragedy in *ANRW* I.2 (1972), 1003–4.

1.D.1. Much repeated effort has been spent in defining and characterizing colloquialisms by idiom, syntax, literary niveau, nuance, context, and even imagery. Some of the more recent opinions cited above, however, show more caution than did Stevens himself in distinguishing the colloquial from the everyday or ordinary—despite his use of the term ‘neutral’. Zangrando 1997, 189–90 records her impression of a certain growing diffidence over the years in attempts to validate such distinctions (cf. also her 1998, 81 and 87); in the same year Bers 1997, 137, judged Stevens’s criteria too broad for direct speech (cited in I.B above). The variation in terminology used by even a single scholar can be striking; the descriptions ‘colloquial’ and ‘everyday’ are almost indistinguishable in English scholars’ work (see on Adams and Mayer, above), and ‘kolloquial’, ‘Alltags-’, ‘Umgangs-’, even ‘Vulgär-’, in German; the words ‘familiar’, ‘neutral’, ‘ordinary’, or ‘plain’ sometimes appear, in attempts to identify a stratum of language common to all speakers, educated or not, aristocratic, aspirant ‘middle-class’, popular, or classless. Landfester 32–3, in a section headed ‘Umgangssprache/Alltagssprache’ but in which the second term does not in fact reappear, insists on the insuperable problems of identifying the colloquial, especially two: its likely incomplete representation in the surviving written texts, and the impossibility of confident internal linguistic analysis. Yet Landfester lists nine indicators of the colloquial, which compare interestingly with Stevens’s categories in *CEE*: (1) expressive modes like interjections, exclamations, curses, exaggerations (cf. Stevens’s categories A and E); (2) free syntax, especially anacoluthon (Stevens’s I); (3) ellipses (Stevens’s D); (4) forms of address inviting closeness or complicity; (5) resort to the plainest words like ‘do’ or ‘be’ (Stevens’s H); (6) parataxis, not hypotaxis (Stevens’s I); (7) redundancy for emphasis (Stevens’s B); (8) varieties of crasis (Stevens’s I); (9) strongly idiomatic expressions (Stevens’s H).

1.D.2. The material called in comparative evidence is often scanty, and apart from Aristophanes and Herodotus necessarily almost always later than fifth-century tragedy. In particular, Menander’s Greek, and its reflection in Roman comedy, is often taken to signal the beginning of a literary demotic; students of the colloquial have inevitably paid much attention to it. Yet Menander may be unsafe ground on which to distinguish from quite formal speech, the neutral, and the colloquial, the everyday, in dramatists, both tragic and comic, and in prose writers who are some three generations earlier in date. Thesleff in his 1978 review of *CEE* wonders whether Menander and later authors provide a safe standard, but notes that Stevens does not accept them as sole witnesses.⁷ Fraenkel’s unpublished collection of ‘Iono-Attic’ colloquial idioms, for prose heavily dependent upon Herodotus (MSS Soph. III.13–41), which found their way into the developing *koinē* (of which he took Menander as only one measure) was quite large. In his posthumously published notes on Sophocles’ *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* he had seldom described any Iono-Atticism straightforwardly as colloquial, and left most either with a question mark or no description at all (e.g. 1977, 11, on Soph. *Aj.* 293, 32 on *Aj.* 1089); but he had headed his unpublished collection quite plainly ‘Iono-Attic colloquialisms’, and later had a small subcategory of ‘coarse’ expressions, also from Iono-Attic.

⁷ On this matter see Willi 2002, 21–3.

Fraenkel's collection illustrates the difficulty of evaluating this quasi-literary 'dialect', which has long been remarked.⁸ Furthermore, for Fraenkel one regular criterion in listing Iono-Attic expressions which anticipated the *koinē* was their occurrence in contexts (not invariably dramatic) of excitement, anger, and failing self-control; like others, he seems to have believed that in such moments persons may instinctively utter, or blurt out, the simplest and most forceful language.⁹ Consistent is his comment at 1977, 69, that 'Sophocles only abandons educated language for emotion'; cf. also 61 on *Phil.* 645f. Fraenkel's appreciation recalls the discussion by Adams and Mayer cited above; and it matches Stevens's own remark about 'emotion' (*CEE* 4) that the context of a given colloquialism is virtually as important as the expression itself. In his review of *CEE* Tarkow picked up this remark: 'it is only when we have the context . . . that we can move with some confidence to the more risky business of determining its dramatic value, to say nothing of its significance for the development of colloquial Greek' (Tarkow 197); see also e.g. Waś 28, 248, and on 'anger' especially 260–2 (Creon in *Antigone*, Oedipus in *OT*, Peleus in *Andromache*), López Eire 1994, 486, and Bers 1997, 146, all three cited in I.B. above.

I.D.3. Inherent and natural in all scholarly discussions of the colloquial is an individual subjectivity. Consistently acceptable distinction between obvious or probable colloquialism and everyday, plain, or sometimes homely language remains unlikely. Amid these certain uncertainties, what may be most useful is illumination of a poet's intent when he deliberately colours a passage, a whole speech, or part of a scene—or one of his stage persons—with clear colloquialisms or everyday expressions, that is, with ones which are distinctive amid the general tone. Commentaries should if possible contain fewer bald notes on isolated examples. Rather, notes should attempt evaluation, like those of Pearson on *Hel.* 446 (as long ago as 1903; but Pearson was already familiar with Jebb's attention to this need in Sophocles) or Di Benedetto on *Or.* 1523. There should be attention to wider contexts, such as in Stevens's comments on a small range of passages at *CEE* 66–8 (especially *Ion* 517–62, *Alc.* 773–802, *Med.* 667–708) and those by Fraenkel on *Soph. Aj.* 1142–58 (1977, 35–6, a particularly fine analysis of the tense exchange between Menelaus and Teucer) and on *Phil.* 1004–19 (MSS *Soph.* III.13—there is, however, nothing of substance in his notes on this passage published in 1977, 71–2). Other such notes are my own on *Eur. Supp.* 566–80, Craik's on *Phoen.* 181–98 (p. 181, on lines 193–201), and Stockert's on *IA* 303–316 (p. 278). Such attention to the clustering of putative colloquialisms is a major strength of Waś's study; on pp. 258–60 he notes the tendency of such language to creep into speech addressed to persons of low status by their superiors, and sometimes to mortals by gods; Dionysus in *Bacchae* is a special case of the latter, and since he is in human disguise, his colloquialisms have 'a considerable irony' (p. 260). Stevens had started on the question whether the tragedians individualized stage persons through language at 1945, 95–6, with perceptive comments on Aeschylus' and Sophocles' apparent use of colloquialisms to differentiate minor, everyday figures—transient stage

⁸ First, it seems, by Wilamowitz (on *HF* 575); noted by Schmid 2.148, 194 n. 1, and 290 (Aeschylus), 485 n. 8 and 488 n. 1 (Sophocles), 3.790 and 794 n. 4 (Euripides); repeated by Stevens at 1937, 183 n. 4 (cf. *CEE* 5 n. 15), and in the studies of A. López Eire (above). The phenomenon is discussed also by Bers 1984, 7–9 (with bibliography).

⁹ He uses the term 'Erregung' frequently, e.g. MSS *Soph.* II.29 on Neoptolemus at *Soph. Phil.* 1299, II.31 and 39 on Lichas at *Trach.* 410–13, III.13 on Philoctetes at *Phil.* 1010, III.35 on Teucer at *Aj.* 978; also e.g. 'Wut' II.22 on Oedipus at *OT* 429–31, II.36 on Creon at *Ant.* 758 (cf. his 1969 paper), 'Hohn' III.67 on Theseus at *Eur. Hipp.* 952.

persons—from major, heroic ones (see especially his p. 97): there are the watchman at Aesch. *Ag.* 1–39 and the herald at 503–80, the nurse at *Cho.* 734–82, the sentry in Soph. *Ant.* 220–331, 384–440, the messenger and herdsman at *OT* 924–1185, and the messenger at *Trach.* 180–435. In fact, Amati himself had also sometimes identified the speakers of his own Euripidean expressions, if they were ‘unheroic’ persons such as messengers or servants.¹⁰ Brief dramatic moments involving robustly everyday expressions have also drawn much attention, particularly the ‘knocking on the gate’ at Aesch. *Cho.* 653–7,¹¹ or moments where excitement, stress, doubt, and the like generate repeated questions¹² or turbulent syntax.¹³ It is interesting here that Fraenkel believed purely linguistic means not to be a prime means of characterization (MSS Soph. III.1–2, cf. 1977, 35–6)—but see I.E.1 below, on Soph. *Aj.* 1128–42 once again.

I.E.1. On the same p. 97 of his 1945 paper Stevens had valuable words too on Euripides’ generally much plainer style as part of his ‘scaling down of heroic splendour to something nearer to the ordinary life of men’, and observed that in his earlier plays Sophocles seems to have followed Aeschylus’ manner with minor characters, while in his late *Philoctetes* ‘there is some approximation to the manner of Euripides in the more widespread use of colloquial expressions’.¹⁴ Here it is worth transcribing what may be an independent observation of Fraenkel’s, and not derived from Stevens (whose 1937 and 1945 papers he often cited): at 1977, 36, after observing that Sophocles employed a ‘vulgar’ style to characterize Menelaus at *Aj.* 1128–42, with a precedent in Aeschylus’ manner with Aegisthus at *Ag.* 1628ff., he says: ‘Generalmente la lingua della tragedia è più uniforme che la lingua commune. In Euripide non si trova caratterizzazione per mezzo della lingua, ma in Eschilo e Sofocle c’è. Il pubblico ateniese era familiare con ciò e sprezzava chi parlava così. Il primo a iniziare, qui, è Menelao.’¹⁵ Nevertheless, Thesleff 1978

¹⁰ The language of these persons has been frequently discussed by commentators or general critics. For characters of low status see Waś 262–3; for messengers see his 145–6 (Eur. *Hipp.* 1245–6, 1250–4) and 263–4, where he shows that despite messengers having chiefly a narrative role, their quotation of direct speech sometimes contains colloquialisms, which also indeed appear in their plain narrative itself, e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1235 ὄσπερ εἶχε, Eur. *Or.* 895–6 ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχή/πηνδῶσι. For Aeschylus see now also e.g. West 4–12, especially 3–5, and Zangrando 1997, 200; for Sophocles Zangrando 1997, 200–1, and for the sentry in *Antigone* especially A. Petrovic, ‘Die Sprache des Wächters in der *Antigone* des Sophokles am Beispiel seines ersten Auftritts’, *MH* 60 (2003), 193–209. E. Csapo, ‘The limits of realism’, in P. Easterling and E. Hall (edd.), *Greek and Roman Actors* (Cambridge, 2002), 127–47 at 141–2 gives a good general summary of thinking about these persons and the topic of characterization (if any) through language.

¹¹ See P. Brown, ‘Knocking at the door in fifth-century Greek tragedy’, in S. Gödde and T. Heinze (edd.), *Skenika: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Horst-Dieter Blume* (Darmstadt, 2000), 1–16, at 4.

¹² E.g. Davies on *Trach.* 421; Lloyd on *Andr.* 547–9; Willink on *Or.* 732–3.

¹³ E.g. West 5–9; Zangrando 1997, 205.

¹⁴ Stevens’s observation on Euripides repeated that at 1937, 184 n. 3, and was reflected at *CEE* 4 and 8; cf. Waś 265 ‘it is sometimes hard to find a cogent justification for the use of colloquialisms in later Euripides, who perhaps sometimes aimed at a more natural conversational style, rather than confining colloquial language to points of high emotion.’

¹⁵ The distinctive ‘familiar tone’ of *Philoctetes* seems to have been noted first by Jebb in the introduction to his edition (p. xliii). F. R. Earp, *The Style of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1944), 114–17 has some good remarks on the progressive changes in Sophocles’ style in spoken dialogue (apart from the variations depending chiefly on the needs of an individual play: p. 115), from the more complex and figurative to the more simple; note his p. 115 n. 1: ‘The *Philoctetes* and *OC* show more perfect ease, and apparent spontaneity.’ *Philoctetes* prompts Waś 266 to the question ‘Is Sophocles *always* careful to justify colloquialisms by the emotion of the context, or does he

and Waś 26 n. 46 expressed a regret similar to mine (Collard 225) that Stevens did not feel able to expand his remarks on the distribution and stylistic and dramatic significance of colloquialisms beyond the discussion of a dozen or so passages of Euripides; Van Looy 617 added some statistical observations upon Euripides' use of colloquialisms to supplement those given by Stevens at *CEE* 64–5.

I.E.2. I hope that the additional material in this paper may encourage others to pursue what seem to be some principal questions: to define the colloquial more closely if possible, within not only tragedy but all drama and other genres of Greek literature, and into the Hellenistic period; and to relate the phenomena to dramatic context and character, and to the individual style and purpose of the tragedians themselves.¹⁶

II. SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMPLES AND NOTES TO *CEE*

The following examples and references for tragedy as a whole can be added to the expressions which were listed chiefly for Euripides and illustrated from other authors in *CEE*, in nine categories; I have added some further references to satyric drama for phenomena shared with tragedy (cf. *CEE* 8).¹⁷ All examples from Herodotus come from 'speech' unless stated otherwise.

II.A. Exaggeration; emphasis

(*CEE* p. 10) ἀγγώνη; see Wilkins on *Heracl.* 246, Taillardat 212 §381 (who adduces Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.403 ἦδη με πνυγείς); Zangrando 1997, 198, compares also Ar. *Nub.* 988 ὥστε μ' ἀπάγγελθε, Epict. 2.17.34 οὐκ ἀπάγγει . . .; cf. Bagordo 129.

(pp. 10–11) ἄνω . . . κάτω (with τάρασσω, συγγέω) is thought by Van Looy 618 not quite to conform with Stevens's own definitions.

sometimes employ them more casually?' *Prometheus Vincit* too has many individualities; its 'syntax and expression often appear curiously flat, even colloquial': so M. Griffith in his edition (Cambridge, 1983), introduction 34 n. 107, cf. his index on p. 316 (which has a slightly different list of phenomena).

¹⁶ The journal's referee wished to press these latter issues in particular, calling for attention to the differences of register within tragic speech, such as in stichomythia or rhesis of varying temper; to correspondingly different styles of vocabulary and expression; to recurring patterns of dramatic situation—all this in order to identify if possible the colloquial in tragedy's 'constructed dialogue' in relation to real-life situations and talk, and to explain why and how it may be both distinctive and effective in tragedy. In some of these questions, and indeed in some general conclusions or preliminary results tucked away in discussion of individual expressions, the referee has been anticipated by Waś (see both above and the citations in Parts II–V below). Analogous to such reading, perhaps, but general in aim rather than specific to any single register of language, is the important study by F. Budelmann, *The Language of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 2000), especially its first two chapters 'Sentences: a shared world' and 'Character: a shared perspective'.

¹⁷ A few such shared phenomena are included among 'colloquial usages, exclamations and expressions' listed for Euripides' *Cyclops* by R. G. Ussher in his edition (Rome, 1978), 206; cf. R. Seaford's edition (Oxford, 1984), 47, where n. 145 has examples from other satyric drama. For colloquialisms in Aeschylus' satyr-plays see M. Di Marco, 'Il drama satiresco di Eschilo', *Dioniso* 61.2 (1991), 39–61, at 58–9; for an earlier treatment of Sophocles than Stevens's work, see G. Guarini, 'La lingua degli "Ichneutai" di Sofocles', *Aegyptus* 6 (1925), 313–29, at 318–28, an extended parallel exemplification of language in various registers, including the colloquial, from both *Ichneutae* and *Cyclops*. Stevens's *CEE* contains no express discussion of the colloquial in satyric.

(p. 11) ἀποκτείνω: Waś 29 thinks of this as just a distinctively prosaic word, but perhaps used in tragedy as if it were colloquial.

(p. 12) βρέχεσθαι: see also Taillardat 96 n. 4.

γέρων τύμβος: see also Bond on *HF* 112–14; described as ‘banal’ by Taillardat 53 §57, cf. 14 §6.

(pp. 12–13) ἔρρειν, ἀπέρρειν: add ἀπερρε adesp. *108, ἐρρέτω adesp. 556; see also Bond on *HF* 260, 1290; Taillardat 114 §225.

(p. 13) εὐδαιμονοίης was thought by Stevens himself to be less a colloquialism than just a Euripidean idiolect parodied by Aristophanes, and Thesleff 1978 shared the doubt; it is also the view of Quincey 134 and Waś 121–2.

(p. 14) ἦκιστα: add Soph. F **730c.3. See under μάλιστα (p. 16), below.

(p. 15) κακῶς (ἀπ)ολούμενος: add Soph. F 764.1 (satyric); Eur. F 915.1.

(pp. 15–16) κλαίειν: add Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.370, cf. κλαίοντες *ibid.* 168.

(p. 16) μάλιστα: add adesp. 665.4. Waś 45, 139–40 asks whether the tendency of this word and its antonym ἦκιστα to occur chiefly in question-and-answer stichomythia may be due to its useful brevity.

(p. 17) μάλλον μᾶλλον: cf. Bagordo 131, citing Dover on *Nub.* 1288; cf. Arnott on Alexis F 29.2.

(pp. 17–18) φθείρεσθαι: cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 252 οὐκ ἐς φθόρον σιγῶσ’ ἀνασχῆσει τάδε; (1945, 103); some reserve by Hutchinson in his note, however; Soph. *OT* 430, 1146 (Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.20); cf. also Taillardat 14 §6, 116 §229; Dover 2002, 86; Zangrando 1997, 198 under (p. 10) ἀγχόνη above; ἀπολείς: cf. also Bagordo 121.

II.B. Pleonastic or lengthened forms of expression

(p.20) Neuter of the definite article with dependent genitive: add Eur. *Andr.* 713 εἰ τὸ κείνης δυστυχεῖ παιδων πέρι ‘if she is unlucky in the matter of (bearing) children’, where τὸ κείνης is equivalent to simple κείνη (see Stevens’s note). Waś 210–14 notes that the majority of instances in both prose and tragedy occur in religious or abstract expressions, and that there are few places where a colloquial tone seems likely (*Andr.* 713, *Ion* 742); he is therefore sceptical of its status.

(pp. 20–2) χρῆμα: (4) τί χρῆμα; ‘What?’: add Eur. *HF* 714, Critias 43 F 1.1; the idiom is discussed by D. I. Jakob, ‘Euripides, *Ion* 255’, *EEThes* 14 (1975), 375–86. (5) τί χρῆμα; ‘Why?’: delete Eur. *Supp.* 92 (correctly in Stevens’s (4)). Waś 233–7 analyses all Stevens’s five categories, and is sceptical of colloquial status for (1) ‘pleonastic’, which he finds associated with axioms or proverbs, and (3) of ‘situations’, where he finds the evidence insufficiently positive.

II.C. Understatement; irony

(p. 23) ἀληθές;: also Bagordo 101; discussing Eur. F 885, Soph. *Ant.* 758 and *OT* 350, Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.36 attributes to the expression a tone much hotter than Stevens’s ‘ironical’.

(pp. 23–4) οἶομαι: add Critias 43 F 19.41. In a long discussion Waś 150–5 thinks that the expression in Aeschylus and Sophocles is almost certainly colloquial, but that at some places in Euripides (e.g. *Alc.* 565, *Med.* 311, *Bacch.* 321) no distinction can be made between colloquial use and ordinary discourse.

(p. 25) τις, τι; (a): perhaps also τις of unmistakable reference: Soph. *Aj.* 1138 τοῦτ’ εἰς ἀνίαν τοῦπος ἔρχεται τινι ‘These words mean pain for somebody!’, followed soon by 1150 τις ἐμφερῆς ἐμοί, i.e. ‘myself’ (Fraenkel 1994, 59; for the whole linguistic

context see his 1977, 35–6); Eur. *And.* 577 χαλᾶν κελεύω δεσμὰ πρὶν κλαίειν τινά, i.e. Menelaus; *HF* 748 εἰ πράσσει τις ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, i.e. the doomed Lycus. Fraenkel gives no example outside tragedy, but Hutchinson on *Sept.* 402 provides one, Ar. *Ran.* 552 κακὸν ἦκει τινί; cf. Dover 1987, 132 n.; (b) λέγειν τι: add Eur. *Phrixus* 'B' F 820b.3, cf. Bagordo 124; λέγειν οὐδέν: add (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.49) Hdt. 7.17.1 λέγοντα οὐδέν.

(pp. 25–6) μηδὲν ὑγίεις: add Critias 43 F 17.5; Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.13 notes also Hdt. 1.8.3 τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ ὑγίεια; Willi 2003, 190 studies οὐ(δὲν) ὑγίεις in comedy.

(p. 26) χαίρειν κελεύω etc.: the material in *CEE* is anticipated in Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.53–7, with reference to 1945, 100; add Eur. *Oed.* F 554a.2 τὸν νόμον χαίρειν ἔων; cf. Eur. *Supp.* 248 χαίρων ἴθι with my note, cited in A. Laks, 'Remarques sur χαίρων ἴθι et les formules apparentées', *Glotta* 60 (1982), 214–20.

(p.27) ἐν plus genitive 'in x's house': because this usage was so widespread at the end of the fifth century, Waś 36 suggests that it had lost clear colloquial status.

II.D. Brevity; ellipse

(p. 27) αὐτὸ τοῦτο: add Agathon 39 F 9.1.

(p.29) ὡς τί δή; add perhaps (Waś 62) Eur. *Hyps.* F 753a ὡς [δ]ῆ τι[.

ἄπως (μή) plus future indicative: 'obviously a colloquialism' (Willi 2003, 265); see also Bers 1997, 141, and 165 for oratory; Bagordo 146 n. 576.

(pp. 30–1) τί δ' ἦν ...; (b): add Eur. *El.* 978 (see Diggle 1994, 109 n. 62), adesp. 60; cf. also ἀλλ' εἰ ...; Eur. *HF* 1202 ἀλλ' εἰ συναλγῶν γ' ἦλθον; 'But if I've come to share his pain?' (see J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* 88–9 [Oxford, 1955]); Aesch. *Supp.* 511 with ellipse of verb.

τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο: cf. Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.102 ταῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνα; see also Dover 1987, 235; Willink on *Or.* 804. Dover on Pl. *Symp.* 210E draws attention to Arist. *Poet.* 1448b16–17 συλλογίζεσθαι τί ἕκαστον, οἶον ὅτι οὗτος ἐκεῖνος and is cited by Bagordo 139. Waś 58 dissents from Stevens's view that the occasional addition of ἔστι 'does not appreciably modify the basic expression', but on 215–17 seems happier to judge it equally colloquial. Related but not certainly colloquial is καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοιαῦτα Soph. *El.* 696, where Jebb compares Pl. *Tht.* 173b οὔτοι ... τοιοῦτοι; cf. Eur. *And.* 910 τοιαῦτα ταῦτα (Stevens neither there nor in *CEE* claims colloquialism); τοιαῦτα alone *Hec.* 776, *El.* 645.

II.E. Interjections and expressions used to attract attention or maintain contact

(p. 33) ἔα: add Soph. F. **222b7.6; *Ichn.* F 314.100, 205. For general discussion of ἔα in dramatic contexts see Battezzato 81–3.

(pp. 33–4) εἶα add Soph. F **222b7.4; ἄγ' εἶα: add Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.436, Eur. F **953f21 (*POxy.* 4639 fr. 1 col. ii.1; see A. Kerkhecker in ed. pr. for the aspiration εἶα in papyri); ἀλλ' εἶα add Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.174; on the interjection generally see Fraenkel 1962, 108; Diggle on *Phaethon* 221; on Latin (*h*)eia see Hofmann 25.

(p. 34) εἶέν (b) n. 86: Stevens might have quoted Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 849 Dindorf εἶέν ... ἐπίρρημα τοῦ μὲν προτέρου λόγου ληκτικόν, ἑτέρου δὲ ἀρκτικόν. Beginning a speech: add Eur. *Phaethon* 313; mid-speech: add Soph. F 555b10; place uncertain Eur. *Tel.* F 727a9.4, adesp. 625a22.

(pp. 34–5) ἔχ' ἤσυχος: Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.24 notes the sole Herodotean example, 8.65.5.

(p. 35) ἦν: add adesp. 618.13; cf. Latin *en*, rare in ‘Volkssprache’ (Hofmann 35), e.g. Petron. 115.10, and not appearing in comedy; on the whole complex Greek ἦν, ἦν, ἦν, ἦν and Latin *en*, *em*, (*e*)*hem* see G. Luck, ‘Elemente der Umgangssprache bei Menander und Terenz’, *RhM* 108 (1965), 269–77.

ἰδοῦ: add Soph. F 707a1; (doubled) *Ichn.* F 314.107, adesp. 655.5. The dramatic contexts in which ἰδοῦ appears are discussed by Battezzato 164 n. 86; wider discussion by Dover 1987, 20–1.

(p. 36) οἶσθ’ οὖν ὁ δρᾶσον;: discussed also by Zangrando 1997, 204; Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.29 describes Stevens’s last example, Soph. *OT* 543 οἶσθ’ ὡς πόησον; as milder than the other expressions employing both οὖν and the relative pronoun ὅ: ‘seems colloquial’, Waś 48, who endorses Eur. *IT* 1202 but not *Supp.* 932 (‘since the indicative βούλομαι destroys the basic pattern’). Add perhaps Eur. *Med.* 600 οἶσθ’ ὡς μετεύξαι (Elmsley, Diggle in OCT; but Page and Mastronarde retain MS μετεύξει, future indicative, as would Waś 157); Waś suggests also Soph. *OC* 75 οἶσθ’ . . . ὡς νῦν μὴ σφαλῆς; ‘if μὴ plus aorist subjunctive is correctly regarded as the negative of this construction’.

ὄρᾶς;: comic examples are assembled by Arnott on Alexis F 9.8. Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.25 associates with this curt expression the same verb followed by a dependent clause: Eur. *Med.* 404 ὄρᾶς ἃ πάσχεις; Soph. *OT* 687 ὄρᾶς ἔν’ ἦκεις; *OC* 937; Ar. *Nub.* 662 (ἃ ‘recte Dover’), *Vesp.* 1392, *Plut.* 932.

οὔτος; see also Zangrando 1997, 206, who adds Ar. *Nub.* 723; Dickey 154–8.

(p. 38) ποῖος; in agreement with repeated word: in this and τί with repeated word (*CEE* 40) used similarly, see also Diggle 1981, 50–1, cf. on τὸ τί; in III.E below. Described as ‘höhnisch abweisend’ by Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.34–6 when discussing Soph. *Trach.* 427, the last of Stevens’s examples; he compares the similar πῶς . . .; for which see also III.E below.

(p. 39) πῶς δοκεῖς;: Stevens’s ‘*Pir.* 38’ = Critias 43 F 7.12; see also Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1497 (p. 708) and 1962, 17 n. 2; Dover 1987, 230; cf. III.E below on πῶς γὰρ οὐ;.

(pp. 39–40) σὸν ἔργον (*a*) with an infinitive: see also Fraenkel 1962, 108 for Aristophanes. Fraenkel’s later discussion in MSS Soph. III.59–61 is quite different from that of Stevens, for he is concerned, first, to add examples with ἐμόν Ar. *Thesm.* 1172, ἡμέτερον *Hdt.* 5.1.3, ἡμῶν Eur. *Heracl.* 666, and ὑμῶν Ar. *Pax* 1305, and, second, to analyse the presence or absence of copula, finding that its absence with ἐμόν or σὸν ἔργον is peculiar to colloquial language and that this is how Euripides uses it. The examples of ἔργον with a possessive collected by L. E. Rossi in Fraenkel 1977, 44–5, include some which feature the article or demonstrative in a full clause-structure (Soph. *Trach.* 319, Xen. *Mem.* 3.3.3, *Oec.* 11.6, Dem. 61.56), but σὸν ἔργον occurs at Xen. *Symp.* 4.46. Stevens here (*CEE* 40) dissented from Sandbach (on Men. *Dys.* 630), who thought of the expression σὸν ἔργον as probably paratragic; Sandbach was later supported by Mastronarde on *Pho.* 444; Waś 195–7 thinks the usage too variable to make colloquialism certain. West 4 associates with the expression that which omits ἔργον, as in Aesch. *Sept.* 232 σὸν δ’ αὖ τὸ σιγᾶν; and for the article with the infinitive after σόν cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 132, *IT* 1203, *Supp.* 98, without it *HF* 314 σὸν δὲ . . . σκοπεῖν, *Ion* 1020 σὸν λέγειν, *τολμᾶν δ’ ἐμόν*, *And.* 988. (*CEE* 40 line 6: correct to Aesch. *Eum.* 734.). Also p. 40, line 9, add perhaps Soph. *Aj.* 116 χωρῶ πρὸς ἔργον; at Eur. *Antiope* F 223.52 ⟨πρὸς ἔργω⟩ . . . χέρες is conjectured.

(p. 40) τί . . .; with repeated word: cf. Bagordo 144–5; cf. πῶς . . .; in III.E below.

(p. 41) τί πράττεεις;: Stevens noted Eur. *Or.* 732, but Bers 1984, 6, thought that the serious tenor of the conversation disqualifies the expression in this place as colloquial.

τί τὸ δεινὸν ἐργάσῃ; Eur. *Bacch.* 492: support for Stevens and Dodds by Bers 1984, 5; Waś 56 compares *Telephus* F 700 τί ποτέ μ' ἐργάσῃ; (= Ar. *Eq.* 1240), where colloquialism is in context.

(p. 42) φέρε with Imperative is doubted by Thesleff 1978.

ὦ τᾶν: add Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.104; see also Wilkins on *Heracl.* 321 and Dickey 158–60.

(p. 45) τί δαὶ . . .; add Aesch. F **157a1.

II.F. Particles

(p. 46) δὲ δὴ . . .; add Neophon 15 F 2.7.

(p. 47) κάπειτα in mid-speech: add Eur. *Erec.* F 370.61; see also Dover 1987, 28–9 and 234; Diggle 1994, 498.

II.G. Metaphorical expressions

(p. 49) μιᾷ ὀδῶ: colloquial status 'fairly certain' on the evidence given by Stevens and Kannicht on *Hel.* 765, according to Waś 141–2.

(pp. 49–50) On adjectives in *-ικός* as new formations apparently mocked at Ar. *Nub.* 483–4, *Vesp.* 1208–9, etc., see Zangrando 1997, 194–5; for their 'sophistic' associations see Willi 2003, 139–45, esp. 140; for *νεανικός* see also Arnott on Alexis F 193.2. Colloquial status for this last word is supported by Waś 144–8, noting its untypical use by the low-status messenger in Eur. *Hipp.* 1204, and comparing the use of adjectival *νεανίας* at Eur. *Alc.* 679 and *HF* 1095.

(p. 50) οὐδαμοῦ: add Men. *Asp.* 298; see also Diggle 1994, 237 n. 33. Waś 163–9 debates inconclusively whether Stevens's first sense 'nowhere' is less colloquial than his second 'out of the running'.

ῥάϊων εἶναι: 'markedly "low-key" . . . [in Euripides and Demosthenes] achiev[ing] a colloquial effect without becoming entirely bathetic' (Waś 191–3, at 192–3).

τρίβων: cf. also Taillardat 229 n. 3.

II.H. Miscellaneous

(p. 52) αὐτός with noun in dative is doubted as colloquial by Thesleff 1978; Waś 88–94 analyses inconclusively the possible distinction between the colloquial use in 'destructive' contexts ('lost, *x* and all'), tragic as well as Thucydidean, and the use in many others where it appears 'natural'.

(p. 53) αὐτὸ δείξει: cf. Pearson on Soph. F 388.

δρᾶ (δ') (Fix: ⟨γ⟩ MS P²) εἴ τι δράσεις: Waś 104–5 accepts Stevens's case, noting support by D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), 172–3.

(p. 54) ἐς τὸδ' ἡμέρας: Waś 117–20 thinks the case for colloquialism 'unsatisfactory' and accepts Stevens's 'may be colloquial' reluctantly.

καλῶς (εἶ) λέγειν or ποιεῖν: on this idiom expressing thanks, real or ironic, see Quincey 141–4 and cf. Bagordo 114–15; Lat. *bene facis* Ter. *Eun.* 186, *Ad.* 601, 604, etc.; Waś 131–3 inclines to placing it in 'neutral' language. Cf. ὀρθῶς ἐλεξας 'You're right!' ('probably colloquial', Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.30): Soph. *Phil.* 341; Ar. *Ran.* 672 λέγεις; Men. *Epit.* 972, etc.; Pl. *Resp.* 331D; cf. Lat. *recte dicis* Plaut. *Merc.* 1003, Ter. *And.* 363, etc. (Fraenkel cites Dziatzko-Kauer on *Ad.* 609); not in Bagordo, however. Cf. *καλῶς* ἐλεξας 1937, 188.

(p. 56) *ῥσον οὐπω*: Waś 160–2 notes the similar *ῥσον οὐκ ἤδη* ‘almost at once’ Eur. *Hec.* 141, comparing the thoughts ‘narrated’ at e.g. Thuc. 8.96.3 and a report at Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.16 in the sense ‘already almost’.

οὐτῶ ‘offhand, without more ado’: add Eur. *IA* 899 (see Stockert).

(pp. 57–8) *τί γὰρ πάθω*; see also Mastronarde on *Pho.* 895; cf. *τί γάρ*; in the same sense Eur. *Or.* 482, *Supp.* 51 (but my note there is questioned by Waś 201).

(p. 58) *ὡς ἔχω* (correct Stevens’s Hdt. 4.114.5 to 1.114.5): Waś 239–42 adds Soph. *Ant.* 1108 and *ῥπως ἔχω* *Phil.* 819, with further examples from comedy and later prose such as Lucian, especially Ar. *Plut.* 1089, and adduces *ὡσπερ ἔχω* from e.g. Thuc. 3.30.1 (speech): cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1235 *ὡσπερ εἶχε*.

II.1. Colloquial forms and syntax

(p. 59) *ἐγῶδα*: cf. Zangrando 1997, 193.

(p. 60) *ἄν* with iterative imperfect: Waś 28 suggests that the cluster of examples in Soph. *Phil.* 291–5 may be designed to heighten pathos, but not through colloquialism.

(pp. 60–1) *θέλεις* and subjunctive: add Ezekiel, *Exagoge* 128.24; cf. Bagordo 146.

(p. 61) articular infinitive in exclamations: Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.28 thought that Stevens’s illustrative matter for Euripides in 1937, 187 was unconvincing; but Bers 1984, 185 judged that the few prose examples support Stevens’s claim. Waś 247–9 judged the case to have been made for the infinitive both with and without the article.

(pp. 61–2) Genitive of exclamation: see also Mastronarde on Eur. *Med.* 1051.

(p. 62) Imperfect of sudden realization: Waś 243–7 adds Eur. *Alc.* 636, but would delete *IT* 351 and regards *Hel.* 616, *Ion* 184 (lyric), and *IA* 1330 as ‘casual’.

(p. 63) Second-person singular imperative of compounds of *βαίνω*: *ἔμβα*: add adesp. *520; *ἐπίβα* Eur. *Ion* 167. Waś 252–3 is inclined to favour a colloquial tone for other *α*-stem imperatives of uncompounded *βαίνω*: *βάτω* Soph. *Aj.* 1414; *βᾶτε* Aesch. *Supp.* 191, Soph. F 844.1; *βᾶτε* Soph. *OC* 1547.

III. FURTHER EXPRESSIONS FROM ALL TRAGEDY WHICH APPEAR TO MATCH STEVENS’S CRITERIA

Completeness in any collection depending ultimately on subjective impression must always be in doubt (see I.D.3 above); but here are further expressions occurring in all tragedy whose colloquial character has been argued and which appear to me to fit Stevens’s criteria (some are restored after Stevens dropped them from 1937 and 1945). They are arranged as before, according to Stevens’s nine categories in *CEE*.

III.A Exaggeration; emphasis

γε with *ὀρθῶς*: Eur. *Hipp.* 94 (Smereka 105), compared with *εἶ γε* Soph. *Phil.* 327 (1945, 101); see Jebb here, and the endorsement by Fraenkel 1977, 52; for Latin *euge* see Hofmann 27, e.g. *eugae optume* Plaut. *Amph.* 802.

δεινόν coupled with *οὐκ ἀνασχετόν* ‘dreadful and intolerable’: (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.31–2) Soph. *OC* 1651–2 *ὡς δεινοῦ τινος/φόβου φάνετος οὐδ’ ἀνασχετοῦ βλέπειν* ‘as if some dreadful terror had appeared, intolerable to the sight’; Ar. *Eq.* 1305 *δεινὸν εἶναι τοῦτο οὐκ ἀνασχετόν*; Xenarchus F 4.1 Kassel–Austin; cf. Hdt. 7.163.1 (not speech).

ἤδη climactic: perhaps ‘a conversational idiom’ according to Stevens on *Andr.* 1066 τὸδ’ ἤδη δεινόν ‘this is terrible indeed’, comparing Ar. *Ach.* 315, *Vesp.* 426, *Ecc.* 645 all with δεινόν.

θάσσον ἢ λέγοι τις ‘quicker than one could say’ Eur. *Hipp.* 1186 (see Halleran); see also Bers 1984, 131; cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 824 θάσσον νοήματος; Men. F 296.15–16 Kassel–Austin παιδισκάριον θεραπευτικὸν δὴ καὶ λόγου ἴτάχιον; but both κρείσσον ἢ ‘greater than ...’ Eur. *IT* 837, *Supp.* 844 and μείζον’ ἢ F 1083.10 may well be purely tragic.

μὴ φροντίσης ‘Don’t worry!’, Soph. *Phil.* 1404, an ‘everyday’ expression in a scene of excitement (tetrameters), its tone reinforced in 1405 by the idiom τί γάρ, ἐάν ...; (II.D above). So Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.38, noting that μὴ φροντίσης is unique in Sophocles but common in Aristophanes, e.g. *Eq.* 1356; he cited Alexis F 124.3 μῆδὲν φροντίσης, adducing also Plaut. *Pseud.* 232 *nil curassis* and Hdt. 6.129.4 οὐ φροντίς Ἰπποκλείδη.

ναίχι ‘Right!’: Soph. *OT* 684, a vulgarism spoken (by the chorus) in extreme excitement: so Fraenkel 1977, 52, who notes that in Aristophanes it occurs only as ναίικι from the Archer in *Thesm.* 1183, 1184, 1196, 1218, ‘who knows no Greek’; unique in tragedy; also Men. *Epit.* 873, *Sam.* 296, etc.; Callim. *Epigr.* 28.5 and 52.3. Cf. Willi 2002, 117, and 2003, 19: ‘may be an expressive colloquialism’.

οὐ θάσσον + second-person singular future indicative ‘To Hell with you, at once!’: Soph. *OT* 430–1 οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον; οὐχὶ θάσσον αὐ πάλιν/ἄμφορος ... ἄπει, where Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.20–2 insists on the reading αὐ of *POxy.* 22, now adopted by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson instead of οὐχὶ θάσσον; οὐ κτλ.: ‘ebenso unhöflich wie οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον;’ (cf. II.A above, at *CEE* p. 17); cf. Cratinus F 129 Kassel–Austin οὐκ ἀπερρήσεις σὺ θάττον;., cited under ἔρρειν at *CEE* 12. For the idiom Fraenkel cites futures in comedy at Ar. *Nub.* 1253–4 οὐκὼν ἀνύσας τι θάττον ἀπολιταργεῖς/ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας;., *Av.* 1324, *Pax* 1126, Men. *Pk.* 526, *Sam.* 678–9, 719–20, etc.; Bagordo 99 notes θάσσον alone with Imperatives at Soph. *OC* 824, Eur. *Med.* 100, *Andr.* 551.

Overlapping the previous expression is οὐ with the future indicative (ἀπ)εἶ and sometimes a participle, a harsh dismissal, ‘Go ... and be done with you!’: Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.37–9 cites Soph. *Phil.* 975 οὐκ εἶ μεθεῖς τὰ τόξα ταῦτ’ ἐμοὶ πάλιν;., *Ant.* 244 οὐκοῦν ἐρεῖς ποτ’, εἶτ’ ἀπαλλαχθεῖς ἄπει;., cf. *OT* 430–1 above; Eur. *Hipp.* 1065 οὐκ εἶ πατρώας ἐκτὸς ὡς τάχιστα γῆς;.; Ar. *Ach.* 484, *Lys.* 848, *Vesp.* 1378, F 601; cf. χαίρων ἴθι in II.C above.

οὐκὼν μ’ ἐάσεις ...; ‘Won’t you let me be?’ Soph. *OT* 676. ‘Alltagswendung ungeduldiger Abwehr’, Fraenkel 1969, comparing Anacreon 412 *PMG* Page (where Fraenkel would read οὐδ’ αὐ μ’ ἐάσεις;), Ar. *Eq.* 336, 338 οὐκ αὐ μ’ ἐάσεις; and noting Soph. *El.* 630–1 οὐκὼν ἐάσεις .../θῦσαί με ...;

πάνυ intensifying a word: Eur. *Cyc.* 646 ἐπωδὴν Ὀρφείως ἀγαθὴν πάνυ ‘an absolutely splendid spell of Orpheus’, the only instance in Euripides; found in satyric drama also at Aesch. *Dictyulci* F 47a.825, Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.105, ?345; in tragedy Aesch. *Pers.* 926 (941 conj. West), *Ag.* 1456, *Cho.* 861; Soph. *OC* 144; Theodectas 72 F 6.2 (where it is spoken by a rustic); in comedy Ar. *Ach.* 2; Men. *Dys.* 4, 104, 567, etc.: see Thesleff 1978 and especially Dover 1987, 53–7.

III.C. Understatement; irony

οὐ τι χαίρων ‘with no joy at all!’: Soph. *Phil.* 1299 ἀλλ’ οὐ τι χαίρων, ἦν τὸδ’ ὀρθωθῆ βέλος ‘But to your cost, if this shaft flies straight!’ Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.29 and III.12 notes that Jebb here cites Soph. *OT* 363, Eur. *Or.* 1593, Hdt. 3.36.3, Ar. *Ach.*

563, *Ran.* 843 for this ‘regular formula in threats’; cf. also Eur. *Med.* 395–8. Fraenkel adds Hdt. 3.29.2 (plural), and sees the expression’s possible origin in Hom. *Il.* 20.362–3 οὐδέ τι ν’ οἴω/Τρώων χαιρήσειν; ‘sicher der alten ionischen Umgangssprache gehört’.

οὐκ ἄχθομαι ‘I’m very pleased’: (1945, 99) Soph. *Phil.* 671 οὐκ ἄχθομαι σ’ ἰδών. Waś 174–6 adds Axionicus F 6.15 Kassel–Austin from Comedy and wonders about Eur. *Heracl.* 1015–16 θανεῖν μὲν οὐ | χρήμιζω, λιπὸν δ’ ἂν οὐδὲν ἀχθοίμην βίον.

σχολῆ ‘hardly’, ironic: (1945, 99–100), Soph. *OT* 434 σχολῆ σ’ ἂν οἴκους τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐστείλάμην ‘I should hardly have sent for you to my house’, *Ant.* 390; desiderated by Tarkow 1977; support also by Waś 198–9 (who removes Stevens’s example Eur. *Danae* F 319, where the word means ‘in a leisurely manner’).

III.D. Brevity; ellipse

ἄλις ‘Enough!’: Eur. *Hel.* 1581 ἄλις μοι ‘It’s (far) enough for me!’, *Phil.* F 791 ἄλις, ὦ βιότα ‘Life, enough!’; Soph. *Aj.* 1402, *OT* 1515; Ar. F 520.1 Kassel–Austin, and perhaps *Ran.* 1364; with genitive Eur. *Hec.* 278 τῶν τεθνηκότων ἄλις ‘There are enough dead!’ (see Gregory’s note), *Alc.* 334, *Hel.* 143, *Supp.* 1148 etc.; Aesch. *Eum.* 675; Soph. *OC* 1016; Xen. *Anab.* 5.7.2 ὅταν δὲ τούτων ἄλις ἐχρητε, *Cyr.* 6.3.17 ὅτι τούτων μὲν τοίνυν εἶη ἄλις, 8.7.25 καὶ τούτων μὲν ἴσως ἤδη ἄλις; see also Smereka 100, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1656 and 1659; sceptical of colloquial status, Waś 27. The various idioms involving ἄλις were early analysed and illustrated in Schol. Eur. *Hec.* 278 Dindorf.

ἀλλ’ ὅμως elliptical ‘... but (do it; it’ll happen) nevertheless’: Eur. *Bacch.* 1027 (see Roux’s note), *El.* 753, *Hec.* 843, *HF* 1365, *Hipp.* 358, *IA* 904, *Or.* 1023; Ar. *Ach.* 402, 956; Men. *Epit.* 230, *Sic.* 147; see also Smereka 100 (distinguish the pleonastic uses with words following, e.g. Eur. *Or.* 740, *IA* 1358).

μή with ellipse of an imperative: μή ἀλλά (μᾶλλά) Aesch. *Cho.* 918 ‘Don’t (say this,) but ...’ (1945, 100, cf. *CEE* 8 n. 29), confirmed by Waś 45, who adds Pl. *Meno* 75B; μή δῆτα ‘Don’t!’ Eur. *Med.* 336 (‘somewhat colloquial’, Mastronarde), *Hel.* 939, *Pho.* 735; Soph. *Phil.* 762, 1367; five times in Aristophanes; cf. Denniston 276 (2); μή μοι σύ ‘Don’t you, please!’ Eur. *Med.* 964, cf. μή σύ γε *Hec.* 408, *IA* 1459, *Ion* 439, 1335, *Pho.* 532; μή ταῦτα ‘No more of this!’ *Ion* 1331.

Compare the ellipse of a main verb in indignant questions and commands, 1945, 101, to which add Ar. *Vesp.* 1179 μή μοί γε μύθους.

ὡς ‘(Be sure) that ...’: Eur. *And.* 255 ὡς τοῦτ’ ἄραρε ‘Your death (254) is a fixed decision!’: ‘may be colloquial’, Stevens in his note, comparing 587, 923, *Hec.* 346 *Med.* 322 etc.; not in Aeschylus, rare in Sophocles, common in comedy; suggested as colloquial also by Tarkow 1977. Discussion for Aristophanes by López Eire 1994, 138 n. 18.

III.E. Interjections and expressions used to attract attention or maintain contact

ἄπαγε and participle, ‘Away with ...!’: (Amati 140) Eur. *Pho.* 1733 ἄπαγε τὰ πάρος εὐτυχήματ’ αὐδῶν ‘Away with your talk of former success!’ (‘adapted from colloquial usage’, Mastronarde; the line may be inauthentic); Ar. *Nub.* 32, *Ran.* 853; Men. *Dys.* 432, 920, etc. Cf. Lat. *apage a me istum agrum* Plaut. *Trin.* 537; Hofmann 39; Barsby on Ter. *Eun.* 756.

δεῦρο δὴ and imperative ‘Here, . . . !’: Eur. *IA* 1377 δεῦρο δὴ σκέψαι ‘Here, consider this!’, 630; Ar. *Eccl.* 952, δεῦρο τοίνυν *Av.* 646; δεῦρο *nude dictum* Eur. *Heracl.* 48, *Hyps.* F 752f.29 (lyric); cf. Ar. *Eq.* 148, *Av.* 259, etc.

κίνδυνος ‘It’s risky!’: Eur. *And.* 86 (this example is hidden below ἄμεινον at *CEE* 27). Stevens in his commentary makes no remark upon it and may have ceased to believe the ellipse colloquial, as apparently also that in ὅμοιον (next entry). I have found no other example, even in comedy. Other one-word expressions: ὅμοιον ‘It’s all the same!’ Eur. *Supp.* 1069 (see my note; this expression too is hidden below ἄμεινον at *CEE* 27), Aesch. *Ag.* 1404; ὅμοια *Hec.* 398, *Hdt.* 8.80.2, etc., cf. (Fraenkel 1994, 62) *Soph. Aj.* 1366 ἢ πάνθ’ ὅμοια and Aesch. *Ag.* 1239 καὶ τῶνδ’ ὅμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω; apparently not in Aristophanes or Menander, however. οὐδέν ‘No, not at all’ or ‘Never mind!’ in answers: Eur. *Ion* 256, 404 (οὐδέν γε), *IT* 781, *Med.* 64, 925 (this example also is placed below ἄμεινον at *CEE* 27), etc.; Ar. *Nub.* 694, *Av.* 1360; cf. *LSJ* III.1, Bers 1997, 143. *Was* 87–8 regards the ellipse in these expressions as ‘a signal feature of colloquialism’, and adds ἀδύνατον ‘Impossible!’ Eur. *Or.* 665 (note αὐτὸ τοῦτο immediately following) and δῆλον ‘It’s clear!’ *Soph. Aj.* 906 (Jebb’s punctuation; differently in OCT).

οὐκ ἠγόρευον; ‘Wasn’t I saying?’: *Soph. OC* 838 οὐκ ἠγόρευον ταῦτ’ ἐγώ; (‘strong indignation’, Dover 1987, 235); Ar. *Ach.* 41, *Plut.* 102, F 311.1 Kassel–Austin, cf. *Av.* 1019 οὐκ ἔλεγον ἐγὼ πάλαι; Men. *Mis.* 217; cf. Bagordo 143–4.

ποιός; preceded by the article (1937, 185): singular *Soph. El.* 671; Eur. *IT* 1319, *IA* 517, *Pho.* 1704; plural *Pho.* 707; *Soph. Trach.* 78, cf. *OC* 893; comedy; prose; cf. *τό τί;* below, this section.

πῶς with repeated word, like *τί* (*CEE* 40–1): Fraenkel MSS *Soph. II.* 31–4: *Soph. Trach.* 411 . . . μὴ δίκαιος ὦν. 412 – πῶς μὴ δίκαιος; *OC* 832; Ar. *Av.* 595, *Lys.* 496; Men. *Dys.* 829.

πῶς γὰρ οὐ; neither at *CEE* 38 under *πόθεν*; nor at 39 under *πῶς δοκεῖς*; did Stevens include the similarly parenthetic *πῶς γὰρ οὐ;*, ‘of course!’ (1945, 102): Eur. *Bacch.* 612 (on the punctuation of *HF* 280 see Wilamowitz, Diggle); Aesch. *Cho.* 754; *Soph. El.* 865, 1307 (see also Jebb on *Aj.* 279, bare *πῶς γὰρ οὐ*, εἰ . . .); F **269a.32, *730e.5 (both the last perhaps satyric); *Rhes.* 759; cf. Bagordo 136–7. In 1945 Stevens did not include *πῶς δ’ οὐ(χί)*; Aesch. *Pers.* 1014, *Supp.* 918, etc. (*τί δ’ οὐχί*; *Ag.* 273, *Cho.* 123); *Soph. OT* 567, 1015, etc.; Eur. *Hipp.* 275; Ar. *Pax* 1027; not in Menander; Bagordo 137 n. 539 endorsed Stevens’s omission.

τί δέ; (a) ‘Well, and what of that?’ (1937, 184, citing Denniston 175 iv.b, but omitted from *CEE*): Eur. *Hec.* 1256, *Or.* 672, 1326, *Bacch.* 654; and (b) as a formula of transition Eur. *IT* 563, *Or.* 672, 1326 and perhaps *Pho.* 1078 (see Mastronarde’s note); *Soph. Phil.* 421; Ar. *Plut.* 173; Plato, orators (for which see Bers 1997, 138).

τὸ τί; ‘The what?’ (in comedy: 1937, 186): conjectured at *Soph. OC* 1739 by Bergk, cf. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1997, 137.

Repetition of interrogative word before reply: characteristic of comedy, but Stevens 1937, 185, entertained Eur. *Alc.* 1119 *ἔχεις*; — *ἔχω* (noted also by Tarkow 1977; 1119–20 del. Diggle, OCT), *Ion* 958–9 καὶ πῶς . . . ; — *πῶς*; (accepted by Diggle 1981, 51, with other possible places).

III.F. Particles

ἀτάρ . . . γε, in which the second particle emphasizes the new idea: Eur. *Tro.* 344 ἀτάρ λυγρὰν γε πῆνδ’ ἀναϊθύσεις φλόγα ‘but this is a ghastly flame you kindle here’: for

colloquial tone see Lee there, Denniston 51 and 119, and Griffith on *PV* 1011; Ar. *Ach.* 448 and four other occurrences; prose. Waś 79–83 considers that only Eur. *Med.* 80, 84, *Hipp.* 1250, 1398, and *Tro.* 416 seem truly colloquial in context, while *PV* 1011, Eur. *Hipp.* 728, *Tro.* 344, and *IT* 719 are problematic.

μέν γε, where γε emphasizes μέν: ‘probably entirely absent from serious poetry . . . rather rare in comedy’, Denniston 159–60, who therefore doubted the genuineness of Eur. *Oedipus* F *545a.4 (= fr. 909.4 Nauck) πρώτα μέν γε τοῦθ’ ὑπάρχει ‘Now her first principle is this’; read by one papyrus at *Med.* 1094 (the MSS have μέν τε); Ar. *Ach.* 154, *Ran.* 80; Herodotus, Plato.

III.G. Metaphorical expressions

γαστήρ ‘mere belly’: Eur. *Alex.* F 49 κακὸν δούλων γένος/γαστήρ ἅπαντα: see CEE 7 n. 23, citing West on Hes. *WD* 26.

ἐκκομάζω ‘go off riotously’: Eur. *Andr.* 603–5 Ἑλένην . . . ἦτις ἐκ δόμων/τὸν σὸν λιποῦσα Φίλιον ἐξεκώμασεν/νεανίου μετ’ ἀνδρός ‘Helen, for leaving your Family-Zeus and going off riotously from your house with a young man’, where Stevens in his note cites the compounds in ἐπι- at Ar. *Ach.* 982 and περι- *Vesp.* 1025 for comic-colloquial pedigree. On Eur. *Andr.* 603 see also Φίλιος in IV.H below.

κυκάω ‘mix, stir together’, metaphorically ‘confuse, confound’: adesp. *110a κυκῶσιν ἀνθρώπων κέαρ ‘they confound men’s hearts’, cf. adesp. 664.23 καρδί[as] κυκαμένης; Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.123 δεινὸς κυκησμός; coupled with ταρασσῶ *PV* 993 κυκάτω πάντα καὶ ταρασέτω ‘let (fire) confound and upset all’, as in Ar. *Ach.* 688, *Eq.* 251, 692, *Pax* 320; cf. Taillardat 348 §597 and index.

μιαρός ‘abominable, repulsive’ with article, approximating to English ‘blighter, bastard’ (or worse): Eur. *Cyc.* 676–7 ὁ ξένος . . ./ὁ μιαρός, ὅς μοι δὸς τὸ πῶμα κατέκλυσεν ‘the stranger . . . the bastard, who gave me the drink and drowned me’; satyric also *Sisyphus* F 673.2 (see N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos* [Stuttgart, 1998], 206); Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.197 (voc.); comic Ar. *Ach.* 282, 285, etc., Men. *Georg.* 30; in tragedy cf. the adjectival use Eur. *Auge* F 266.3 κοῦ μιαρά [μυσαρά Nauck] σοι ταῦτ’ ἐστίν ‘and this is not repulsive to you’, Soph. *Ant.* 746 ὦ μιαρὸν ἦθος; *Trach.* 987 of Heracles’ agony; traced for both verse and prose by Dover 2002, 95–6, cf. Dickey 166.

III.H. Miscellaneous

ἄνθρωπε ‘fellow!’: Soph. *Aj.* 791, 1154 (ἄνθρωπε), Hdt. 8.125.2 (all three in 1945, 104), to which add Eur. *Antiope* F 223.29 and Ar. *Nub.* 1495, *Pax* 164, etc.; (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.45–8; 1977, 27) Men. *Col.* 50, *Epit.* 446, *Pk.* 481 etc.; Bers 1997, 139 and 206 n. 144 adds Pl. *Grg.* 518C, cf. Hdt. 7.39.1 ὦ κακὲ ἄνθρωπε; see now also Zangrando 1998, 88–90, and Dickey 150–4.

Ἄπολλον, an invocation expressive of alarm, colloquial according to Lloyd on *Andr.* 900 ὦ Φοῖβ’ ἀκέστορ; also Eur. *El.* 221, *IT* 1174, *Hel.* 1204, *HF* 538 (see Bond); Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.48 Φοῖβ’ Ἄπολλον; Ar. *Vesp.* 161; Men. *Dys.* 415, etc.

ἄρ’ οὐχ ὕβρις τάδε;: Soph. *OC* 883 ‘Insolence!’ (Jebb); Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1997, 128, say that ‘it would seem that it belonged to colloquial speech’, citing Ar. *Nub.* 1299 ταῦτ’ οὐχ ὕβρις δῆτ’ ἐστίν; *Lys.* 659, *Ran.* 21, *Plut.* 886.

δός μοι σεαυτόν ‘Put yourself in my hands!’: 1945, 104 had Soph. *Phil.* 84, *Trach.* 117, ‘possibly a colloquialism’, on which Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.27 comments

‘sicher’, comparing Ter. *Ad.* 838 *da te hodie mihi*, *Heaut.* 688; cf. also Bagordo 134. Waś 103–4 assigns the expression rather to ‘ordinary, natural Greek’.

ἔχων ‘keeping on, continually’: Soph. *Ichn.* F 314.133 τί ποτε βακχεύεις ἔχων; ‘why ever do you keep on raging about?’; Ar. *Av.* 341 (‘seems to be colloquial’, Dunbar), *Ran.* 202, 512, 524; Pl. *Grg.* 490E. LSJ B.IV.2 cite only comedy and prose. Perhaps colloquial according also to Moorhouse 254, cf. Dover 1987, 21, and 1997, 65.

λέγω σοι plus infinitive, ‘I tell you to . . .’, threatening: ‘from the Iono-Attic *koinē*’, Fraenkel 1977, 32 (cf. MSS Soph. III.11), on Soph. *Aj.* 1089 καὶ σοὶ προφωνῶ τόνδε μὴ θάπτειν; *OC* 840 χαλᾶν λέγω σοι, cf. 856; Aesch. *Ag.* 1421; at Soph. *OT* 449 preceding a statement; Hdt. 8.68a.1 plus imperative, 8.140a.3 before a statement; common in Aristophanes, Bagordo 126–7. Also Soph. *Aj.* 1140 ἔν σοι φράσω before a defiant assertion: ‘è molto crudo’, Fraenkel 1977, 35.

οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα ‘(it’s) no matter, of no concern’ (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.33–4): Eur. *Med.* 451 κάμοι μὲν οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα (‘Jason is very coarse here’, Fraenkel); Ar. *Pax* 244, *Thesm.* 244, *Ran.* 1215; Hdt. 5.84.2 (7.12.1: not speech); Pl. *Hp. Mi.* 291A, *Grg.* 447B οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα alone (‘colloquial’, Dodds); Dem. 18.283 (not ‘speech’), 21.195.

οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην οὐδενὸς λόγου βροτόν: Soph. *Aj.* 477–8 ‘I wouldn’t pay tuppence for the man’, Fraenkel 1977, 14, citing his note on *Ag.* 275 for comparable idioms with οὐκ ἂν λάβοιμι, to which add especially Ar. *Pax* 1223 οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην οὐδ’ ἂν ἰσχάδος μᾶς; cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 316 *non ego tuam empsim uitam uitiosa nuce*, *Cas.* 347 *non ego istuc uerbum* [i.e. *deos*] *empsim titibilicio*.

πᾶς (τις) with second- or third-person imperative (Fraenkel 1962, 120–1): Eur. *Hec.* 532–3 σίγα πᾶς ἔστω λεώς, / σίγα σιώπα; *Rhes.* 730 σίγα πᾶς ὑφίξει, cf. 690 ἔρπε πᾶς; [Eur.] *IA* 1598; Ar. *Thesm.* 372 ἄκουε πᾶς, *Ach.* 204, *Av.* 1186, 1196. Fraenkel cites esp. KG 1.86 ‘in volkstümlicher Gesprächsweise’.

συλλαμβάνω with reflexive pronoun ‘get oneself together’, i.e. ‘hurry up’ (1945, 104): Soph. *Phil.* 577 σεαυτὸν συλλαβών; ‘a phrase of colloquial tone’ Jebb, citing the verb without reflexive (‘pack off with’) at *OT* 971, *OC* 1383 (on this line see *CEE* 13 n. 37), cf. Ar. *Av.* 1469, *Plut.* 1079, F 156.12 Kassel–Austin; Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1997, 107, compare Ar. *Nub.* 701 σεαυτὸν . . . πυκνώσας ‘get yourself tightly together’. Waś 197–8 doubts that Sophocles intended ‘a specifically colloquial tone’.

ᾠρα (‘στὶν) ἤδη with infinitive ‘it’s already high time to . . .’: Soph. *Aj.* 245–6 ᾠρα ‘στὶν ἤδη (ἄρμοι Lloyd-Jones in OCT) . . . ποδοῖν κλοπᾶν ἀρέσθαι ‘it’s already high time for a man to take to stealthy feet’: see Fraenkel 1962, 29, who cites Ar. *Ach.* 393, Pl. *Prt.* 361E and Philyllius F 3.2 (where Kassel–Austin refer to Headlam on Herodas 6.97 for full exemplification); on Soph. *Phil.* 1395 see Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, 211; cf. also Eur. *Heracl.* 288 ᾠρα προνοεῖν, *Pho.* 1584, and bare ᾠρα in parenthesis at *El.* 112 = 127.

III.I. Colloquial forms and syntax:

Nouns in -μα in abusive personal descriptions: Stevens 1945, 103, discussed e.g. ἄλημα ‘wily rascal’ Soph. *Aj.* 381 and 389, λάλημα ‘prater’ *Ant.* 320, and κρότλημα ‘nasty piece of work’ F 913, *Rhes.* 499; cf. Griffith on *PV* 320; on this whole subject see A. A. Long, *Language and Thought in Sophocles* (London, 1968), 114–20; occurrences in Aristophanes are listed by A. López Eire, *La lengua coloquial de comedia aristofánica* (Murcia, 1996), 23–4; probably ‘vernacular’ in origin, Willi 2003, 138 n. 47. Waś 68–71 extends Stevens’s argument by citing κρόταλον

Eur. *Cyc.* 104 and Soph. F 913 (with Pearson's note); cf. also *πάσα βλάβη* in IV.G below.

ἄν plus optative referring to present time: Eur. *Hel.* 91 *τλήμων ἄν εἴης* 'You poor man!', cf. 824, 834 (Kannicht on 467 cites 1937, 186, and gives numerous examples from comedy); Waś 73–5 thinks the contexts are so variable that it may be better 'to label it *natural* language' (p. 75).

IV. EXPRESSIONS WHICH SEEM NOT TO MATCH STEVENS'S CRITERIA

I am doubtful whether the following expressions meet Stevens's criteria, but they have all been suggested as colloquial, or at least as 'everyday', by someone somewhere (including myself); Stevens himself in *CEE* had dropped a few of them from 1937 and 1945. About some I am very doubtful indeed, minding Dover's 'How else could the poet have said it?' (1987, 194); but I have included them in accord with Stevens's own principle stated at *CEE* 8 (see I.A.1 above). leaving others to disagree with my judgement if they will.

IV.A. Exaggeration; emphasis

ἐπαίνῳ 'Thank you!' (Amati 142, cited by Stevens, 1937, 188 n. 1, but not retained at *CEE* 54–5; see also Smereka 251) Eur. *HF* 1235; Ar. *Ran.* 508; in his definitive discussion of (ἐπ)αινῶ in expressions of thanks and polite refusal, Quincey 144–58 at 156 confidently locates ἐπαίνῳ in 'ordinary conversation'.

ἔσται (τάδε) 'It (This) shall be so': Aesch. *Cho.* 514 (ἔσται alone); Soph. *Phil.* 893; cf. perhaps also (Bagordo 110) *Phil.* 1254 ἔστω τὸ μέλλον; Eur. *Alc.* 328, *Hel.* 744, 1294, *Ion* 413, 425, etc.; (ταῦτα) Pl. *Ph.* 118, *Leg.* 688E, 752A, etc.; see my note on *Supp.* 1182 for bibliography, cf. also Diggle 1994, 409, on *IA* 149. Fraenkel 1962, 77–89 (cf. also 1977, 63), argues that Euripides sometimes prefers to this originally solemn formula of agreement the more everyday expression δράσω τάδε, analogous to ταῦτα ποιήσω or οὕτω ποιήσω, common in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 506, *Ran.* 1515) and Plato (e.g. *Chrm.* 166E, *Resp.* 432, etc.); δράσω τάδε (Fraenkel 1962, 81) e.g. at Eur. *Med.* 184, 267, *Hipp.* 1088, *HF* 606, and also Soph. *OC* 1773, F **221.6; in comedy Ar. *Nub.* 437, *Pax* 428 (δράσομεν), etc.

εἶ νῦν τόδ' ἴσθι and variations 'Now be sure of this: ...', ominous or threatening (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.19–22 and 1977, 37): Aesch. *Pers.* 435 εἶ νῦν τόδ' ἴσθι, μηδέπω μεσοῦν κακόν; Soph. *Trach.* 1107 ἀλλ' εἶ γέ τοι τόδ' ἴστε, *Ant.* 305 εἶ τοῦτ' ἐπίστας', ὄρκιος δέ σοι λέγω; Eur. *Andr.* 368 εἶ δ' ἴσθι; cf. Hdt. 7.14, 7.39.1, 8.144.3; Soph. *Ant.* 1064, *El.* 616, *OT* 658; Ar. *Nub.* 1254, *Plut.* 216; Men. *Dys.* 962, *Epit.* 375. Also σάφ' ἴσθι, often parenthetic, with the same force, Aesch. *Ag.* 1616, *Cho.* 574; Soph. *Phil.* 977, *Ichn.* F 314.335; Eur. *Hipp.* 656; but in Euripides and comedy σάφ' ἴσθι often gives just an assurance. Similarly εἶ ... σαφῶς with parts of οἶδα: Aesch. *Pers.* 784 εἶ ... σαφῶς ... ἴστε is presumed colloquial by Broadhead in his note, citing Ar. *Pax* 1302 εἶ ... οἶδα ... σαφῶς and comparing Aesch. *Cho.* 197 εἶ σάφ' ἦναι, Men. F 755.3 εἶ ἴσθ' ἀκριβῶς.

ἴδοιμι 'if only I might see ...', a wish to see someone suffer (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.32): Aesch. *Cho.* 267–8 οὐς ἴδοιμι ἐγώ ποτε/θανόντας; Soph. *Aj.* 384 ἴδοιμι δὴ νῦν, καίπερ ᾧδ' ἀτώμενος ..., *Trach.* 1037 τὰν ᾧδ' ἴδοιμι πεσοῦσαν; Eur. *Hec.* 440–2 ἀπωλόμην ... ὡς ... Ἑλένην ἴδοιμι (text uncertain). Earliest is Hom. *Il.* 6.284 εἰ κείνόν γε ἴδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἄιδος εἴσω; cf. also Ar. *Ach.* 1156, Men. *Dys.* 659. Note, however, the reverse, a wish to see someone happy, e.g. Eur. *Med.* 920.

μακράν ‘at length’, ‘from everyday language’, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 916, cf. 1296 and his note on 1386; *Soph. Aj.* 1040 (Fraenkel 1977, 32); *Eur. Med.* 1351, perhaps *Hyps.* F 757.832. At *Eur. IA* 420 it means ‘for a long way’ (see Stockert, who translates Fraenkel’s ‘everyday’ as ‘colloquial’). The feminine gender to denote indefinite abstractions is not rare: see Wilamowitz on *HF* 681 (cited by Fraenkel himself).

μυρίῳ with comparative (Amati 138; Smereka 105): *Eur. And.* 701 μυρίῳ σοφώτεροι ‘infinitely more clever’ (Stevens in his note does not mention Amati); elsewhere only in Plato (occurrences listed by D. Tarrant, ‘Colloquialisms, semi-proverbs, and word-play in Plato’, *CQ* 40 [1946], 109, e.g. *Leg.* 802C).

οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ, πλὴν (1945, 98–9): ‘merely’ *Aesch. Pers.* 209 οὐδὲν ἄλλο γ’ ἢ (see West 4); *Eur. Andr.* 746, *Hec.* 596, (without πλὴν and parenthetical) *IT* 827, (appositional) 1169, cf. *Aeolus* F 25.2, F 800.1, etc.; *Ar. Vesp.* 1507, *Av.* 19, *Eccl.* 382, etc., cf. Bagordo 130–1; Fraenkel 1977, 72, adds *Soph. Phil.* 1010 οὐδὲν ἦδει πλὴν.

πολλάκις τε κούχ ἅπαξ ‘Many times and not just once’: *Soph. OT* 1275: so Fraenkel MSS *Soph.* III.23, citing *Hdt.* 7.46.3, *Pl. Leg.* 711a, 743E (οὐχ ἅπαξ alone), etc. Apparently not in Aeschylus, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Menander—but the tragic equivalent is probably οὐχ ἅπαξ μόνον, clearly not colloquial at *Soph. OT* 690, *Eur. Andr.* 81, *PV* 209.

τί δεῖ λέγειν; ‘What need to say it?’: *Eur. Andr.* 920; *Aesch. Ag.* 598 (where Fraenkel says that *Eur. Pho.* 761 τί δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν is an ‘Attic formula’).

ὑπερφεύ ‘excessively’: *Eur. Pho.* 550 τιμᾶις ὑπερφεύ καὶ μέγ’ ἡγήσαι τόδε ‘You esteem this excessively and deem it important’ (with Mastronarde’s note), *HF* 1321; *Aesch. Ag.* 377 (see Fraenkel’s note); *Pers.* 820; Cratinus F 393 Kassel–Austin.

IV.C. Understatement; irony

(τάχ’) εἴσεται ‘He’ll soon find out!’: *Aesch. Cho.* 305; *Eur. Antiope* F 223.43 (*Andr.* 1005–6 seems not to qualify); also second-person εἴση *Hel.* 811, γνώση *Heracl.* 65, *Supp.* 580; *Aesch. Ag.* 1649 (with Fraenkel’s note). No clear examples of the expression *tout court* in Aristophanes; at *Men. Pk.* 335 bare εἴσει means just ‘You’ll find out (where you’re going)’.

ἦδη νῦν or νῦν with imperative, grimly sarcastic (Fraenkel MSS *Soph.* III.66–7): *Eur. Hipp.* 952–3 ἦδη νῦν αὐχει καὶ δι’ ἀψύχου βορᾶς/σίτοις καπήλευε ‘Now you can pride yourself and go peddling with food in your vegetable diet!’; *Hdt.* 6.50.3 (Κριός) . . . ἦδη νῦν καταχαλακοῦ, ὦ κριέ, τὰ κέρα ‘Very well then, Horne, you must have your horns sheathed in bronze!’; from Homer ultimately, e.g. *Il.* 16.844 ἦδη νῦν, Ἐκτορ, μεγάλ’ εὐχέο, 1.456, *Od.* 10.472, etc. Merely impatient or uneasy, ‘Now be done and . . .’, *Soph. OT* 1521 ἅπαγέ νῦν μ’ ἐντεῦθεν ἦδη, *Phil.* 1177; *Eur. IT* 55.

τις mildly contemptuous (Fraenkel 1977, 59): *Aesch. Sept.* 491 ὁ σηματουργὸς δ’ οὐ τις εὐτελής ἄρ’ ἦν ‘no cheap fellow’; *Soph. Phil.* 519 ὄρα σὺ μὴ νῦν μὲν τις εὐχερῆς πάρης ‘Take care you aren’t too easy-going . . .’; *PV* 696 πρῶι γε στενάξεις καὶ φόβου πλεὰ τις εἶ ‘. . . a panic-stricken sort’. Fraenkel gives no example outside tragedy, however.

IV.D. Brevity; ellipse

αὐ elliptical ‘you’re at it again!’: *Eur. Andr.* 240 οὐκ αὐ σιωπῇ Κυπρίδος ἀλγήσεις πέρι; ‘You’re at it again! Keep quiet, won’t you, about love?’, where Stevens

compares Pl. *Euthyd.* 296A οὐκ αὖ . . . παύση . . . ; but does not himself suggest colloquialism; cf. also perhaps Hom. *Il.* 1.540; apparently not in Aristophanes or Menander.

εἰ δ' οὖν approximating to εἰ δὲ μή 'but if not, . . .': suggested as colloquial by Jebb on Soph. *Ant.* 722; Eur. *Hipp.* 507–8 εἴ τοι δοκεῖ σοι, χρῆν μὲν οὖ σ' ἀμαρτάνειν, / εἰ δ' οὖν, πιθοῦ μοι; Pl. *Ap.* 34D; cf. Schmid 3.794 n. 4; Denniston 466 does not suggest colloquial pedigree.

ἐν plus genitive of reflexive pronoun '(be) one's real self': Soph. *Phil.* 950 ἀλλὰ νῦν ἔτ' ἐν σαυτοῦ γενοῦ 'but now be your old self again!', for which Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, 202, cite MacDowell on Ar. *Vesp.* 642 κἄστιν οὐκ ἐν αὐτοῦ, to whose examples add Men. *Asp.* 307, *Sam.* 578, etc. Bagordo 119–20 notes also Hdt. 1.119.6 ἐντός τε ἑωυτοῦ γίνεται (not 'speech') and Antiphon 5.45 ἔνδον ὦν αὐτοῦ, but suggests that Aesch. *Cho.* 233 ἔνδον γενοῦ and Eur. *Heracl.* 709 σῶν φρενῶν οὐκ ἔνδον ὦν indicate a less certain colloquial pedigree for the usage.

οὐχ ὅσον approximating to 'although': Eur. *Hel.* 481–2 εὐνοὺς γάρ εἰμ' Ἑλλησιν, οὐχ ὅσον πικροῦς/λόγους ἔδωκα (Kannicht compares οὐχ ὅπως 'to say nothing of', from Stevens 1945, 100; Soph. *El.* 796, prose; on Soph. F 149.6 see Pearson; colloquial status is doubted by Waś 180).

οὔτι ταῦτημι (ταῦτα) 'there's no way in which this will happen': Eur. *Med.* 365, where Page compares *Hipp.* 41, Soph. *Ant.* 722, 936; *PV* 511; τῆδε Soph. *Aj.* 950; apparently not in Aristophanes or Menander.

σέ without λέγω, calling attention: Eur. *Hel.* 546 σέ τὴν ἡμιλλημένην . . . μείνον (see Kannicht's note); Soph. *Ant.* 441; cf. Ar. *Av.* 274 οὔτος ὦ σέ τοι.

τί δ' ἄλλο; '—what else?': Eur. *Or.* 188 (lyric), where Willink compares *Melanippe* F 509; Ar. *Eq.* 615, *Nub.* 1088, 1287, and often.

IV.E. Interjections and expressions used to attract mention or maintain contact

ἄκουε δὴ νῦν 'Listen, now: . . .': Eur. *Supp.* 857, *Hec.* 833, etc.; 'formula Euripidea', Austin on Men. *Sam.* 305; probably paratragic at Ar. *Eq.* 1014, *Av.* 1513. δὴ νῦν sharpening an imperative is common enough in literature: Denniston 218.

ἤδη 'Now, . . .' in a popular-narrative style, parabolic: 'in the *αἶνος*', Fraenkel 1977, 35–6, on Soph. *Aj.* 1142 ἤδη ποτ' εἶδον ἄνδρ' ἐγὼ γλώσση θρασύν . . . , for which he compares Aesch. *Eum.* 50–1 εἶδόν ποτ' ἤδη Φινέως γεγραμμένας/δείπνον φέρουσας; Hdt. 4.77.1, Pl. *Grg.* 493A.

ιοὺ ιοὺ a cry of joy, a cry to others (to be distinguished from the cry of extreme distress, famously at Soph. *OT* 1071, cf. e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 776): Eur. *Cyc.* 464; Aesch. *Ag.* 25, *Cho.* 881, *Eum.* 143; Soph. *Inachus* F **269b.2, *Ichn.* F 314.443; Ar. *Eq.* 1096, etc.

τεκμήριον δέ 'And here's an indication, here's proof' (Amati 132): Eur. F 898.5, cf. *Danae* F 323.2 ἐν δέ μοι τεκμήριον; LSJ II.2 give only prose examples.

τί δρᾶις; astonished, expostulatory: Eur. *HF* 975 (see Bond), 906, *Alc.* 391, 551, etc.; Ar. *Pax* 164, *Av.* 1567, *Plut.* 439; see also Smereka 108.

τί οὖν; (with hiatus) 'What then?', an urgent or excited question: Aesch. *Pers.* 787 (Broadhead wonders about colloquialism), *Sept.* 208; (with δὴ added) Soph. *Aj.* 873; not in Euripides? Broadhead adds examples of τί οὖν with attached syntax (such as Aesch. *Sept.* 704, *Supp.* 306). Denniston 415–29 has no special discussion of οὖν with interrogatives.

IV.F. *Particles*

γάρ with repeated word: Soph. *Phil.* 755–6 δεινόν γε τοῦπίσαγμα . . . — δεινὸν γάρ κτλ., where Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, 198, cite Denniston 88 for comedy; cf. τί; with repeated word (*CEE* 40).

γέ τοι ‘a lively “at any rate”’, Denniston 550.4 (iv): Soph. *Aj.* 534, *Trach.* 234, 1212, *Phil.* 823; Eur. *Pho.* 730, *IA* 1168 conj. Fix; with δὴ *Cyc.* 224; γέ τοι δὴ Soph. *OT* 1171 (cf. Denniston 551); comedy, Plato, etc.

καὶ . . . μέντοι ‘progressive’ and perhaps colloquial (Denniston lxxv, cf. 414): Eur. *Heracl.* 398 καὶ τὰμὰ μέντοι πάντ’ ἄραρ’ ἤδη καλῶς, ‘Besides, everything on our side is well in order!’, Soph. *El.* 963; *PV* 949; Ar. *Ach.* 1025, *Eq.* 540 etc.; common in prose.

ναί ‘yes’, i.e. ‘please’ (so Barrett on *Hipp.* 605): this and Eur. *Pho.* 1665 are the only two places in tragedy where it stands *intra metrum* in this use (satyric, Soph. F 210.41; cf. ναὶ μὰ Δία *Ichn.* F 314.118); for ναί *extra metrum* see Stevens on *Andr.* 242, who does not claim it as colloquial; but Thesleff 1978 suggests it; ‘presumably colloquial’, Bers 1997, 139.

IV.G. *Metaphorical expressions*

ἀρχαῖος ‘simple-minded, stupid’ (Amati 134; Smereka 250): Eur. F 1088 ἀρχαῖον εἴρηκας; cf. παλαιός in the same sense Soph. *OT* 290, cited in Kannicht’s note on *Hel.* 1056 παλαιότης (Kannicht makes no claim for colloquialism); Taillardat 261 §462 gives Pherecrates F 228 Kassel–Austin as the earliest example, and cites also Ar. *Nub.* 915, 1469 (of persons), 821, 1357 (of abstractions); also e.g. Pl. *Hp.* *Mi.* 371D, *Euthyd.* 295C (both of persons).

ἐμπολάω ‘have one’s business go along, fare’: Soph. *Aj.* 978 ἄρ’ ἠμπολόηκας ὥσπερ ἢ φάτις κρατεῖ; ‘Have you fared as rumour holds?’, ‘a harsh colloquial expression’, Fraenkel MSS III.35; on this passage L. E. Rossi in Fraenkel 1977, 69, notes *Hipp. Morb.* 4.7.580.1 Littré πολλῶ κάλλιον ἐμπολήσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος ‘the person will fare much better’ and, wrongly, the literal διεμπολόω at Soph. *Phil.* 578; but Rossi then cites Soph. *Phil.* 978 οἴμοι πέπραμαι κάπολῶλα ‘I’ve been tricked, “done”!’, comparing the more usual 923 ἀπόλῶλα τλήμων, προδέδομαι. Fraenkel himself could find no example of πέπραμαι in comedy, nor of ἐμπολάω, but did not doubt their ‘everyday’ origin.

εἰς τὸν εὐτυχητὸν τοῖχον χωρεῖν ‘go to the safe side of the ship’: Eur. F 89 (Amati 148, but listed under proverbs). Was 23 thinks this corroborated as colloquial by the tone of Ar. *Ran.* 536, its source; he cites in support Eur. *Or.* 895–6 ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχητὸν/πηδῶσι, on which Willink fairly comments that the ellipse of τοῖχον needs explanation and that the meaning may well be ‘hurry to the safe man’.

μέγας ἀγών ‘great struggle’, i.e. over a great issue: not rare in Euripides, *Hipp.* 496–7 νῦν δ’ ἀγὼν μέγας, / σῶσαι βίον σὸν ‘now there is a great struggle, to save your life’, *Hec.* 229, *Hel.* 843, 1090, *Pho.* 860, *Bacch.* 975; *Rhes.* 195; μέγιστος ἀγὼν at *Med.* 235, *IA* 1003; almost certainly an idiolect of the poet rather than a colloquialism; perhaps paratragic at Ar. *Nub.* 956, *Pax* 276, *Ran.* 883; cf. also Men. *Sam.* 95 οὐ . . . μέτριος ἀγὼν. Metaphorical ἀγὼν in comedy is fully discussed by Taillardat 335 §579.

(ἡ) πᾶσα βλάβη ‘that utter plague’: Soph. *Phil.* 622 of Odysseus: so Fraenkel 1977, 61, noting the same expression at Soph. *El.* 301 (Aegisthus) and suggesting *Phil.* 927 πᾶν δέιμα (addressed to Odysseus) as the only true parallel; for Fraenkel thinks

Ar. *Ach.* 909 ἄπαν κακόν a little different. Waś 68 compares Soph. *Ant.* 533 δὴ ἅτα (Creon's image for Antigone and Ismene).

περισσός pejorative, 'above oneself, proud' (Amati 135), of persons or their actions: Eur. *Hipp.* 445 ὄν ... περισσὸν καὶ φρονοῦντα ... μέγα, *Bacch.* 429, *Philoctetes* F 788.2, F 924.2; Soph. *Ant.* 68. LSJ A.II.4 give one or two prose examples.

φάτνη 'manger', of a place where humans eat, their 'table': Eur. *Sthen.* F 670.1 ἐπάκτιοι φάτναι '(fishermen's) tables on the shore', cf. satyric *Eurystheus* F 378.1 νῦν δ' ἦν τις ... πλουσίαν ἔχῃ φάτνην 'now if anyone keeps a rich table'; Eubulus F inc.126 Kassel–Austin πολλοί, φυγόντες δεσπότης, ἐλεύθεροι/ῶντες πάλιν ζητοῦσι τὴν αὐτὴν φάτνην; cf. perhaps also Ar. *Nub.* 13. LSJ I.2 attest the usage in proverbs, so that the metaphor may be neutral rather than colloquial.

(For metaphorical expressions see also Part V below.)

IV.H. Miscellaneous

ἀπέπτυσσα 'Spit in your face!': Eur. *Hec.* 1276 (see my note), *Hipp.* 614, *Hel.* 664; Fraenkel MSS Soph. I.5 does not cite these passages, however, when discussing Soph. *Ant.* 1232 πτύσας προσώπῳ.

εἰ (σοι) δοκεῖ 'If you will, all right then, etc.': Bagordo 116–18 on Latin *si (tibi) uidetur* cites Barrett on *Hipp.* 507 εἴ τοι δοκεῖ σοι, χρῆν μὲν οὐ σ' ἀμαρτάνειν 'Very well then, you shouldn't be going wrong', but reduces Barrett's examples to just Aesch. *Dictyulci* F 47a.782 (satyric) and Pherecrates F 163.3 Kassel–Austin; but cf. Ar. *Av.* 665, *Thesm.* 216. Bagordo (above) compared εἰ δοκεῖ with εἰ θέλεις Soph. *OT* 343, *El.* 585, Herodas 7.92, 8.6, and ἦν βούλη Ar. *Lys.* 194, εἰ βούλει Timocles F 6.8 Kassel–Austin.

εἴπω τι ...; 'Shall I say ...?' in excited exchange (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.44): Soph. *OT* 364 εἴπω τι δῆτα κἄλλα ...; Ar. *Ran.* 1 εἴπω τι τῶν εἰωθότων ...; Fraenkel notes that the expression often has other tones, e.g. at Eur. *Supp.* 293 εἴπω τι, τέκνον, σοί τε καὶ πόλει καλόν;

ἐν σοί ... ἐστί plus infinitive 'It is in your hands, your power to ...' (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.15): Soph. *Phil.* 963–4 ἐν σοὶ καὶ τὸ πλεῖν .../ἦδη στί; Hdt. 6.109.3 ἐν σοὶ νῦν, Καλλίμαχε, ἐστὶ ἢ καταδουλώσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ...; 8.60a; without ἐστί Eur. *Hel.* 996, 1425, *Pho.* 1250, cf. *IA* 1273 ὅσον ἐν σοί, τέκνον, κἀμὸν ... ἐστί.

(ἔως ἂν, ἦν) ζῆ or the like, 'so long as "x" lasts' (Fraenkel 1962, 49): Aesch. *Ag.* 1434–6 οὐ μοι φόβου μέλαθρον ἐλπίς ἐμπατεῖ, / ἔως ἂν αἴθη πῦρ ἐφ' ἐστίας ἐμῆς / Ἀγισθος; Ar. *Eq.* 395 οὐ δέδοιχ' ὑμᾶς, ἔως ἂν ζῆ τὸ βουλευτήριον; cf. *Lys.* 696 οὐ γὰρ ὑμῶν φροντίσαιμι ἂν, ἦν ἐμοὶ ζῆ Λαμπιτώ.

καλῶς semi-elliptical: Eur. *El.* 76 πᾶνδον εὐρίσκειν καλῶς 'find all well at home', where Denniston in his note compares *Med.* 732 ἔχοιμ' ἂν πάντα πρὸς σέθεν καλῶς.

κατὰ νοῦν 'as (you are) minded, to suit your wish' (Fraenkel MSS. Soph. III.69): Soph. *OC* 1768 εἰ τὰδ' ἔχει κατὰ νοῦν κείνῳ; Hdt. 7.104.5 γένοιτο μέντοι κατὰ νόον τοι, cf. 4.97.4 etc.; Ar. *Eq.* 549 κατὰ νοῦν πράξας, *Pax* 762, 940; Men. *Sam.* 212, F 845.7 Kassel–Austin; Pl. *Euthyphr.* 3e.

κομφός frequently veering from 'clever, sophisticated' to 'over-smart', sneering or ironical (LSJ I.2): Eur. *Supp.* 426, *Tro.* 651, *Antiope* F 188.5, and perhaps other places; such a tone is possible at Ar. *Vesp.* 1317 and *Ran.* 967. Euripides alone of the tragedians uses the adjective (note Ar. *Eq.* 16 κομφευρικῶς); the verb κομφεύω occurs at *IA* 333 (see Stockert's note) but also at Soph. *Ant.* 324 with the same tone. De Vries 87–92 suggests that its many appearances with this nuance in

the *Republic* and *Phaedrus* (e.g. *Resp.* 405D, 408B, 505B) may mark its colloquial status: perhaps.

λύει = λυσιτελεῖ ‘it profits (someone)’: Eur. *Alc.* 627, *Hipp.* 441, *Med.* 566, 1112, 1362, *Sthen.* F 661.28; not in Aeschylus; perhaps Soph. *El.* 1005. Colloquial status argued by Schmid 3.794 n. 4 from its appearance in papyri.

μαῖα without definite article but as subject of a third-person verb, spoken by a child: Eur. *Alc.* 393 μαῖα δὲ κάτω βέβακεν ‘Mummy’s dead!’, where Dale thinks of ‘nursery language’. Waś 159 n. 277 thinks that at Eur. *Hipp.* 311 its vocative may be a colloquial touch from a woman addressing a confidante, and that its Homeric use (e.g. *Od.* 2.372, 17.499) does not disqualify it.

μόνον with imperative or optative (Thesleff 1978): Soph. *OC* 837 προσμείναι μόνον ‘just wait for him’; *Trach.* 1109; Aesch. *Supp.* 1012, *Cho.* 244; Eur. *Alc.* 1109, *IT* 1075, Ar. *Lys.* 365, *Ran.* 7, etc.; cf. also Arnott on Alexis F 178.16—but LSJ B.II.1 show how very widespread this usage was.

νοῦν ἔχειν with abstract subject ‘make sense’ (Thesleff 1978): Soph. *Ant.* 67–8 τὸ γὰρ/περισσὰ πράσσειν οὐκ ἔχει νοῦν οὐδένα; Ar. *Ran.* 696 μόνα γὰρ αὐτὰ νοῦν ἔχοντ’ ἐδράσατε, 1439. Differently at Eur. *Bacch.* 252 τὸ γῆρας ὑμῶν εἰσορών νοῦν οὐκ ἔχον.

ὃ μὴ γένοιτο (or . . . τύχοι) ‘which I wish may not happen’ may come from plain rather than colloquial speech, although found in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 535, *Lys.* 147; Eur. *Heracl.* 714, *Pho.* 242 (see Mastronarde), *Meleager* F 525.1; for a fuller list see Diggle 1981, 104 (on *Ion* 731). Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.63 noted most of these, and included also Hdt. 5.111.4, Men. *Mis.* 264, *Sam.* 728, with analogies in Hom. *Od.* 7.316 μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιτο, Aesch. *Ag.* 1249 μὴ γένοιτό πως.

οἶκον οἰκεῖν ‘manage one’s own affairs’: Eur. *Andr.* 581–2 ἢ τὸν ἀμὸν οἶκον οἰκήσειν μολῶν/δεῦρ(ο); ‘Have you come here to manage my own affairs?’, for which Stevens in his note compares *IA* 331, *Andromeda* F 144 (parodied at Ar. *Ran.* 105). ‘The parody at Ar. *Ran.* 105 is not proof of its colloquial status, only its bizarreness’, Waś 22.

οὐδὲν μέλει plus dative ‘it’s no concern to’ (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.24): *PV* 938 ἐμοὶ δ’ ἔλασσον Ζητὸς ἢ μηδὲν μέλει; Eur. *Cyc.* 331; Hdt. 8.72 (not ‘speech’); Ar. *Ran.* 224, 655, *Ecc.* 641; Men. *Asp.* 257, etc.; also Eur. *Hec.* 1274, *HF* 595, *Bell.* F 287.2, cf. *Heracl.* 443.

οὐ(δὲν) . . . πλέον ‘no(thing) . . . more, . . . further’ (Amati 136): Soph. *Ant.* 268 οὔτ’ οὐδὲν ἦν ἐρευνῶσιν πλέον ‘when (we) got no further with our search’; perhaps also Aesch. *Ag.* 1299; Ar. *Eccl.* 1094 οὐδὲν ἔσται σοι πλέον ‘you’ll get no advantage’; Men. *Con.* 16–17.

οὔπω ‘not at all’, in a ‘tone of friendly irony’: Mastronarde on *Pho.* 850 οὔπω λελήσμεθα ‘We haven’t forgotten at all!’, citing Jebb on *OT* 105; cf. also Owen on *Ion* 546. LSJ note the use with present and future verbs from Homer onward, e.g. present Soph. *OT* 594, future Eur. *HF* 685 οὔπω καταπαύσομεν Μούσας ‘we’ll not cease from music at all’; elliptical Ar. *Ach.* 461 οὔπω μὰ Δία; also μήπω Eur. *Hec.* 1278 with optative, Soph. *El.* 403. Stevens 1945, 99, doubts whether this usage is colloquial.

πάντα (ἀκήκοας) λόγον at the end of a speech: Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.74 on Soph. *Aj.* 480 (cf. 1977, 14, ‘una piccola formula stereotipata’), citing *Phil.* 389, 1240, Aesch. *Ag.* 582; cf. (W. B. Stanford, *Aeschylus in his Style* [Oxford, 1942], 49) *Eum.* 710 εἴρηται λόγος; Eur. *Or.* 1203, *Hec.* 1284 εἴρηται γάρ. Different, but also cited by Fraenkel, are e.g. Cratinus F 151.2 Kassel–Austin πάντα λόγον τάχα πεύση, Hdt. 1.21.1 προπεπυσμένος πάντα λόγον (not direct speech, however; cf. 9.13.2, 9.94.3).

πρὸ τοῦ ‘before then, before now’: Eur. *Andr.* 734, where Stevens points to the occurrences at Aesch. *Ag.* 1202, *Eum.* 462 as against colloquial status, and Waś 52 agrees; also Eur. *Andr.* 928, *Med.* 696; Hdt. 5.83.1; Pl. *Symp.* 173a.

τὰ πρῶτα ‘the head, the topmost’, a leading person (Fraenkel MSS Soph. III.72): Eur. *Med.* 916–17 τῆσδε γῆς Κορινθίας/τὰ πρῶτ’ ἔσσεσθαι; Hdt. 6.100.3 ἐὼν τῶν Ἐρετριέων τὰ πρῶτα (not speech; cf. 9.78.1); Ar. *Ran.* 421 κἄστω τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐκεῖ μοχθηρίας; Men. F 751.3 τὰ πρῶτα πάσης τῆς ἀναιδείας ἔχει.

ὑποβλέπω ‘look askance at, suspiciously at’: Eur. *HF* 1287 (Amati 145, influenced by Wilamowitz’s attribution of the word to everyday speech; so too Smereka 253); comedy and prose.

φαίνομαι absolute ‘appear, show up’: Eur. *Heracl.* 663–4 τίς νιν εἶργε συμφορὰ/σὺν σοὶ φανέντα δεῦρ’ ἐμὴν τέρψαι φρένα; ‘Who stopped him from showing up here with you and delighting my heart?’, where Wilkins follows Wilamowitz in thinking the usage colloquial (cf. Amati 145 and Smereka 253; but against Bond on *HF* 705); but there seems nothing particularly informal, let alone markedly colloquial, in such occurrences as e.g. Eur. *El.* 578 ὦ χρόνω φανείς, Electra’s joy at Orestes’ appearance after so long a time, *Bacch.* 646, *Pho.* 1747; Soph. *Aj.* 878, *El.* 1274, and *OC* 77, despite e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 783 οἱ φαινόμενοι παραχρῆμ’ ὅταν πράττη τις εὖ ‘those who show up at once when someone is doing well’ and Pl. *Prt.* 309A (the dialogue’s opening words) πόθεν . . . φαίνῃ; ‘where have you appeared from?’ The latter at least ‘probably is colloquial’, Stevens at *CEE* 4, in a very balanced discussion which, however, does not include Eur. *Heracl.* 663–4.

Φίλιος as noun, i.e. ‘Zeus’: Eur. *Andr.* 603 τὸν σὸν λιποῦσα Φίλιον ἐξεκώμασεν ‘She left your Family-Zeus [i.e. her properly sanctioned place as your wife] and went off riotously’, where Stevens writes ‘Comedy and Plato . . . except for this passage . . . perhaps colloquial’—a possibility increased by the use of ἐκκωμάζω, for which see III.G above.

IV.1. Colloquial forms and syntax

FORMS

ἔοικα: ἔοιγμεν Soph. *Aj.* 1239, *Ichn.* F 314.101; Eur. *Heracl.* 427, 681, *Cyc.* 99; εἴξασι Eur. *Hel.* 497, *IA* 848 (Amati 126): ‘lokal-Attisches’ Schwyzer 1.769, 773 (but not necessarily therefore ‘colloquial’; similar doubt by Waś 254–7, who notes also the form ἴτων uniquely attested at Aesch. *Eum.* 32); cf. Schwyzer’s note (1.802) on -τωσαν third-person plural imperative Eur. *IT* 1480, *Ion* 1131. Schwyzer 1.110–11 discusses Attic elements in tragedy.

τολμήσατε S.*Phil.* 984: contracted forms in -(η)οεῖς are suspect in tragedy (Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, 203–4, with bibliography); Fraenkel 1977, 70 questioned the form here and Lloyd-Jones and Wilson reluctantly accepted it.

SYNTAX

ἄν with the future infinitive: Eur. *Hel.* 448 πικρῶς ἄν οἶμαι γ’ ἀγγελεῖν τοὺς σοὺς λόγους ‘I think I should report your words to my bitter cost’. Diggle in OCT obelizes, but Kannicht in his note cites A. C. Moorhouse, ‘ἄν with the future’, *CQ* 40 (1946), 1–10 = *Syntax of Sophocles*, 216–17; both accept Soph. *Ant.* 390 σχολῆ ποθ’ ἤξειν δεῦρ’ ἄν ἐξήυχουν ἐγώ, ‘I could have vowed that I should not soon be here again’ in Jebb’s translation; Jebb rightly, I think, feels that word-order compels taking ἄν with ἐξήυχουν; and he doubtfully cites Eur. *El.* 484 according to MS L (rejected by both Murray and Diggle after him in their OCT editions). Schwyzer 2.352 is very cautious about the phenomenon in Attic prose, and cites no example from verse.

βουλήσομαι and infinitive, ‘I shall wish to . . .’: Eur. *Med.* 726 (where Mastronarde entertains colloquial status; Diggle in OCT deletes both 725 and 726), cf. 259, *IT* 1039, *Sthen.* F 661.27 (*Heracl.* 200 *θελήσουσι*); Soph. *Aj.* 681, *OT* 1077, *OC* 1289, etc.; Pind. *Ol.* 7.20; Hdt. 1.109.4 *θελήσει* third-person; Ar. *Plut.* 290, 319, *Ach.* 318 (ἐ)θελήσω. Neither KG 1.172–3 (despite noting German ‘provinziell’ ‘Ich werde dich bitten’) nor Schwyzer 2.294 refers to colloquialism. The usage of these and analogous futures is fully illustrated by S. L. Radt, *Noch einmal zu . . . Kleine Schriften*, ed. A. Harder, R. Regtuit, P. Stork, and G. Wakker, *Mnemos.* suppl. 235 (Leiden, etc., 2002), 310–13.

δεῖ (σε) and ὅπως with future indicative: Soph. *Aj.* 556–7 *δεῖ σ’ ὅπως πατρός/δείξεις . . . οἶος ἔξ οἴου ἑράφης* ‘You must show the kind you are, and from what kind of father you had your upbringing’; *Phil.* 54–5 *τὴν Φιλοκλήτου σε δεῖ/ψυχὴν ὅπως . . . ἐκκλέψεις λέγων*, where Jebb cites Cratinus F 115.1 Kassel–Austin and notes that in all three places an older or superior person is instructing a younger. Moorhouse 308 thinks the usage perhaps colloquial, citing Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* §360.

εἰς τοῦτο, τοσόνδε . . . ὥστε: Eur. *Med.* 56–7 *ἐς τοῦτ’ ἐκβεβηκ’ ἀλγῆδονος/ὥσθ’ ἔμερός μ’ ὑπῆλθε* ‘I reached such a point of anxiety that desire overcame me . . .’, The many examples from Euripides and oratory given by Mastronarde on *Pho.* 963 suggest that it is not a colloquialism (despite Schmid 3.794 n. 4); not in Aeschylus or Sophocles.

οὐ μή with future indicative or aorist subjunctive in prohibitions: very common in tragedy, e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 38, Soph. *El.* 42–3, Eur. *Andr.* 757 (ind.), *Hec.* 1039 (subj.); Ar. *Vesp.* 397, *Nub.* 367; prose; cf. KG 2.221–2. Moorhouse 336 notes the tendency of popular language to find stronger forms of negative expression. This idiom is discussed by A. Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations on Euripides’ Bacchae* (Amsterdam, 1991), 167–74, with suggestions for recasting the standard grammars’ treatment of the idiom with the future indicative; cf. López Eire 135 (unaware of Rijksbaron).

παῦε intransitive, ‘stop!’: Soph. *Phil.* 1275: Fraenkel MSS Soph. I.5 thought of this as ‘everyday’ (but did not mention ‘colloquialism’ at 1977, 74); cf. Eur. *Ion* 522; Ar. *Ach.* 864, *Eq.* 821, cf. *παῦ παῦε Eq.* 919, *Ran.* 299, etc.; Men. *Dys.* 214 with participle *θρηνῶν, Sam.* 311 *παῦ*; Pl. *Phdr.* 228E is the only example in prose, according to Bers 1984, 110 (‘clearly the Active must have flourished in casual speech’).

τὰ Πενθέως ‘Pentheus’ house’: conjectured by Dodds at Eur. *Bacch.* 606, who says the usage ‘seems to be colloquial’, citing Ar. *Vesp.* 1432 *τὰ Πιττάλου* (MacDowell’s note gives other examples), Dem. 43.62 (a law), 54.7, Theocr. 2.76 etc.; cf. *ἐν Αἰδοῦ* and the like, *CEE* 27.

ὦ with imperatives ‘in popular language’: Eur. *HF* 523, *ὦ χαῖρε μέλαθρον*, cf. 781 *Ἰσμήν’ ὦ στεφανηφόρει*; Aesch. *Ag.* 22 (‘seems to belong to the language of ordinary life’, Fraenkel there, citing Ar. *Ran.* 269 *ὦ παῦε παῦε, Lys.* 1269 etc.; cf. also Fraenkel 1962, 111–12). For ὦ and e.g. *πρὸς θεῶν* and imperative see Soph. *Aj.* 371, *OT* 646, 1037, Ar. *Eccl.* 970, etc., cited by Moorhouse 32, as well as Fraenkel on *Ag.* 22.

‘Proleptic’ accusative (Zangrando 1997, 204–5): e.g. Soph. *El.* 1101 *Αἰγισθον ἐνθ’ ἔκκηκεν ἱστορῶ πάλαι*, Eur. *IT* 475–6 *τὰς τύχας τίς οἶδ’ ὄτω/τῶαἰδ’ ἔσονται*; (Zangrando also cites Ar. *Av.* 1269–70). This usage is treated by KG 2.578–9, who show that it is common to both verse and prose.

‘Hanging’ nominative: Eur. *Andr.* 287 (where Stevens does not mention colloquialism), *IT* 695, 947, *Ion* 927, etc.; Aesch. *Ag.* 1009, *Cho.* 520 (West 6 cites ten to twelve examples from Aeschylus as ‘naïve style’); for Soph. *OT* 159, often cited,

see Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, 83. I have found no example from comedy in grammars.

'Frequentative' or 'regular' perfect: Eur. *Pho.* 955–6 ἦν μὲν πικρὰ σημήνας τύχη./ ἔχθρὸς καθέστηκε 'if ever he indicates hostility, he's an enemy', where Mastronarde cites for its colloquial register MacDowell on *Vesp.* 494, 561, 616, etc. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* §49 gives no example; KG 1.148–9 and Schwyzler 2.264 are not very helpful.

Redundant anaphoric pronouns: Eur. *Bacch.* 201–2 πατρίους παραδοχάς, ἄς θ' ὀμίλικας χρόνω/κεκτῆμεθ', οὐδεὶς αὐτὰ καταβαλεῖ λόγος: 'common in the style of Herodotus and Plato', Dodds there, comparing redundant *νιν* at Soph. *OT* 248, *Trach.* 287 (where Easterling adds Hom. *Od.* 16.78–9). For anaphoric *αὐτόν* see KG 1.660. Fraenkel 1962, 89–91, collects examples of enclitic pronouns repeated within a sentence (without claiming colloquialism), e.g. Soph. *OC* 1278–9 ὡς μή μ' ἄτιμον, τοῦ θεοῦ γε προστάτην./ οὕτως ἀφή με μηδὲν ἀντειπῶν ἔπος, Eur. *Andr.* 733–4 ἔστι γάρ τις οὐ πρόσω/Σπάρτης πόλις τις; Ar. *Av.* 465, 544–5; Men. *Dys.* 805–6, etc.

Optative without ἄν in direct questions: (Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.4) Aesch. *Cho.* 595–6 ἀλλ' ὑπέρολμον ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι . . . ; (lyric), Soph. *Ant.* 604–5 δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασίαν κατάσχοι; (lyric): on these two places see Bers 1984, 129. The optative is usually supplied with ἄν or emended to the subjunctive in Fraenkel's other examples, Soph. *Phil.* 895, *OC* 170, Ar. *Plut.* 374, 438 (and in others listed by Jebb in his appendix on *OC* 170), so that the register of this usage is very doubtful. Bers 1984, 135, at the end of a very long discussion, has similar doubts, naming the omission generally as 'rare in all colloquial dialects and literary genres but excluded only from the most rigid and fastidious sorts of writing'. Fraenkel dismissed the discussion by KG 1.230–1 as unreliable.

Note. in Part IV I have not included the following expressions doubtfully considered 'Iono-Attic colloquialisms' by Fraenkel: ἀνέχομαι plus nominative participle MSS Soph. III.73 (very common across a range of literature); κακὸς γνώμην ἔφην Soph. *Phil.* 910, cf. Fraenkel 1977, 64; κόσμον (ἢ σιγή) φέρει Soph. *Aj.* 293, cf. Hdt. 8.60.1, 142.2, Soph. III.36 and 1977, 11; μὴ περιδεῖν and participle, especially aorist, MSS Soph. III.29 (very widespread). And I merely mention the ellipse of first- and second-person singular of εἰμί with e.g. ἔτοιμος proposed as colloquial by L. Campbell, *Sophocles* 1 (Oxford, 1879²), 72, and Jebb on *Aj.* 813.

V: A NOTE ON VOCABULARY AND METAPHOR SOMETIMES ATTRIBUTED TO COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE

V.A. Some words are rare, or have unusual meanings, in tragedy and are therefore identified as probable immigrants from comedy or prose and suspected of colloquial or everyday pedigree. Two plain words may stand as prominent examples: βαδίζω 'go' Eur. *Pho.* 544, where Mastronarde cites Soph. *El.* 1502, Chaeremon 71 F 20, adesp. 177.1, and ponders the pedigree (cf. also Eur. *Med.* 1182 βαδιστής): very frequent in Aristophanes, e.g. *Ach.* 848, 1165, *Ran.* 36, 716 (86 times, according to Willi 2002, 117 n. 10); and ληρέω 'chatter' Soph. *Trach.* 435 (where Davies notes the colloquial touches in the scene; as had Fraenkel MSS Soph. II.39); frequent in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Av.* 341, 572.

V.B. Then there are words or metaphors of such direct vigour that their origin is referred to common speech, although their use seems well within tragedy's own inventive range. Representative examples are: καταξάινω (Smereka 251), literally

‘rend, shred, card, crush’, metaphorically ‘wear away, wear down’ with suffering, Aesch. *Ag.* 197; Soph. *Aj.* 728; Eur. *Tro.* 509, 760, *Med.* 1030, *Hipp.* 274; not so used in comedy, it appears, however, for Ar. *Ach.* 320 is probably paratragic (so Taillardat 343 §587). *κόπις* ‘wrangler’ Eur. *Hec.* 132 ὁ ποικιλόφρων κόπις ἡδυλόγος δημοχαριστῆς Λαερτιάδης ‘that shifty-minded wrangler, smooth-talking people-flatterer, son of Laertes’, on which the schol. cites Heraclitus 22 B 81 DK for the word, which recurs in Lycophron 763, 1464, but is not attested in comedy. *παλαιστής* in two metaphors: first, in Soph. *Phil.* 431 σοφὸς παλαιστής κείνος, the tricky Odysseus, cf. *πάλαισμα* Ar. *Ran.* 689, etc., Aeschin. 3.205 in Taillardat 226 §401 n. 2, and, second, ‘wrestler’, used of the male in a rape at Aesch. *Ag.* 1206 ἀλλ’ ἦν παλαιστής κάρτ’ ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν ‘but he very much wrestled with me as he breathed his favours’ (Cassandra speaking of Apollo; note the noun *πάλαισμα* conjectured at Aesch. *Supp.* 296 by Butler, allusive if not directly referring to Zeus’ union with Io); the verb *παλαίω* occurs of a man wrestling a woman to the ground at Ar. *Pax* 896 (see Henderson 169) and of a woman herself at Longus 3.19.2 *συμπαλαίουσά σοι ταύτην τὴν παλήν*; *Πάλαιστρα* was the title of a comedy of Alcaeus (F 22–5 Kassel–Austin) and the name returns e.g. for the decidedly sexy maid in Lucian 39, who engages in *παλαίσματα* at 39.8; further material in M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart, 1990), 140. Clearly this metaphor was common parlance. *σποδέω*, literally ‘make into ashes’, metaphorically ‘beat down, crush’, Eur. *Andr.* 1129 *παντόθεν σποδούμενος* ‘battered from all sides’ (with stones), where Stevens in his note says that this usage is certainly colloquial in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 622 (cf. Taillardat 362 §633), but may not be in tragedy: Aesch. *Ag.* 670 of a storm-battered fleet, *Sept.* 809 (*κατα-*) of men cut down in war; also Eur. *Hipp.* 1238 of Hippolytus in the chariot disaster. Finally, here are just some of Amati’s examples of verbs, mostly metaphorical (140–6), rejected by Stevens: *διαγράφω* ‘strike the name through, off the list’ Eur. *El.* 1073; (*ἐξ*)*αντλέω* ‘endure to the dregs’ *Med.* 79 (‘a Euripidean mannerism’, Mastronarde), *Supp.* 837, *Cresphontes* F 454.3, etc.; *κατακλύζω* ‘swamp’ *Tro.* 995, [Aesch.] *Sept.* 1078; *καταπαλαίω* ‘wrestle down, overcome’ of one argument bettering another *IA* 1013; *παροχρετέω* ‘sidetrack’ *Bacch.* 479 (rejected also by Waś 51); *συννέφω* of eyes ‘clouded by sorrow’ Eur. *El.* 1078; even *δάκνω* of deeply ‘biting’ emotion, common enough in tragedy and used metaphorically in twenty of the twenty-one occurrences of the verb in Euripides (but entertained as a colloquialism by both Waś 41–3 and Zangrando 1997, 199; her 1998, 103–6 offer a general discussion of ‘colloquial’ metaphor, with bibliography).

VI. INDEX

Words, expressions, and other phenomena, and selected passages, treated in Parts I–V above and in Stevens 1937, 1945, and *CEE*

References to Part I are by section-letter and -number (e.g. I.A.2); references to Parts II–V are by part and letter (e.g. II.C, V.B), to the categories in which expressions are arranged alphabetically. References to Stevens’s works are by page-numbers.

ἄγ’ εἶα II.E
 ἀγχόνη II.A; 1937, 190; *CEE* 10
 ἀγών (μέγας) IV.G
 ἀδύνατον III.E
 ἄκουε δὴ νῦν IV.E
 ἀληθές; II.C; 1945, 99; *CEE* 23

ἄλις III.D
 ἀλλά see μὴ ἀλλά
 ἀλλ’ εἰ . . . ; II.D under τί δ’ ἦν
 ἀλλ’ εἶα II.E
 ἀλλ’ ὁμως III.D
 ἄλλο see οὐδὲν ἄλλο, τί δ’ ἄλλο

- ἄλλως 1945, 100; *CEE* 52
 ἄμεινον *CEE* 27
 ἄν omitted with optative in direct questions
 IV.I
 ἄν with future indicative IV.I
 ἄν with imperfect, iterative II.I; 1937, 186;
 1945, 103; *CEE* 60
 ἄν with optative of present time III.I; 1937,
 186
 (οὐκ) ἀνασχετόν see δεινόν
 ἀνέχομαι and nominative participle IV.I Note
 ἀνθρωπε III.H; 1945, 104
 (ἐξ)αντλέω V.B
 ἄνω . . . κάτω II.A; *CEE* 10
 ἄπαγε III.E
 ἀπεξύγην πόδας 1945, 104
 ἀπέπτυσσα IV.H
 ἄπερρε II.A; *CEE* 12
 ἀποκτείνω II.A; *CEE* 11
 ἀπολείς με *CEE* 11
 Ἄπολλον III.H
 ἀποφθείρεσθαι see φθείρεσθαι
 ἄρα *CEE* 44
 ἄρ' ἦν *CEE* 62
 ἄρά γε *CEE* 44
 ἄρ' οὐχ ὕβρις τάδε III.H
 ἀρχαίος 'simple-minded' IV.G
 ἄτάρ . . . (γε) III.F; 1945, 101; *CEE* 7, 44
 ἀτελεύτητος 1945, 104
 αὐ IV.D
 αὐτός and noun in dative II.H; *CEE* 52
 αὐτό δείξει, σιμμανεῖ II.H; *CEE* 53
 αὐτό τοῦτο II.D; *CEE* 27
 (οὐκ) ἄχθομαι III.C; 1945, 99; cf. Bagordo
 115
 βαδίζω V.A
 βαίνω, imperative in βα- II.I
 βλάβη see πάσα βλάβη
 βούλει (cf. θέλεις) plus subjunctive in para-
 taxis II.I; 1945, 103; *CEE* 60
 βουλήσομαι IV.I
 βρέχεσθαι II.A; *CEE* 12
 γάρ with repeated word IV.F
 γάρ τοι *CEE* 48
 γαστήρ III.G; *CEE* 7 n. 23
 γε emphatic III.A; 1945, 101
 γένοιτο see ὁ μὴ γένοιτο
 γέ τοι IV.F
 γέρων τύμβος II.A; *CEE* 12
 γνώσει, -η IV.C
 γ' οὖν, γοῦν *CEE* 45
 διαί *CEE* 45
 δάκνω V.B
 δέ δή II.F; *CEE* 46
 δεῖ (σε) and ὅπως with future indicative IV.I
 δεινόν with . . . οὐκ ἀνασχετόν III.A; see also τί
 τὸ δεινόν; and ἦδη III.A
 δεῦρο δή and imperative, δεῦρο *nude* III.E
 δηλαδὴ 1945, 101; *CEE* 46
 δηλον III.E
 δή νυν see ἄκοιτα
- δῆπον 1945, 101
 διαγράφω V.B
 (εἰ) δοκεῖ IV.H
 δός μοι σεαυτόν III.H; 1945, 104
 δρᾶ δ' εἴ τι δράσεις II.H
 δράσω τάδε IV.A under ἔσται τάδε
 δύστηνος *CEE* 15
 ἕα II.E; *CEE* 33
 ἕαυ see οὐκουν μ' ἕασεις;
 ἐγώδρα II.I; *CEE* 59
 εἶα II.E
 εἰ (σοι) δοκεῖ IV.H
 εἰ δ' οὖν elliptical IV.D
 εἰέν II.E; 1937, 189; 1945, 102; *CEE* 34
 εἰμί, first- and second-person omitted IV.I
 Note
 εἶπω τι; IV.H
 εἰς plus genitive *CEE* 27
 εἰς καλόν 1937, 189; *CEE* 28
 εἰς τοῦτο . . . ὥστε IV.I
 εἴσει, -η, εἴσεται see τάχ' εἴσεται
 ἐκεῖνο see τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο
 ἐκκωμάζω III.G
 ἐμόν plus infinitive II.E under ἔργον
 ἐμπολάω IV.G
 ἐν plus genitive 'in x's house' II.C; *CEE* 27
 ἐν, ἐνδον plus genitive of reflexive pronoun
 IV.D
 ἐν καλῷ 1937, 189; *CEE* 28
 ἐν σοί ἐστι plus infinitive IV.H
 εὐοιμεν, εἴλασι IV.I
 ἐπανώ IV.A; 1937, 188
 ἔπειτα see κάπειτα
 ἔργον in idiom σὸν ἔργον etc. II.E
 ἔρρειν, ἔρρε, ἄπερρε II.A; *CEE* 12
 ἔσται (τάδε) IV.A
 εὖ . . . σαφῶς IV.A
 εὖ γε III.A; 1945, 101; *CEE* 8
 εὖ ποιεῖς plus participle 1937, 188
 εὖ λέγειν, ποιεῖν see καλῶς λέγειν
 εὖ νῦν τόδ' ἴσθι IV.A
 εὐδαιμονοίης II.A; *CEE* 13
 (εἰς τὸν) εὐτυχῆ (τοίχων χωρεῖν) IV.G
 ἔχ' ἤσυχος II.E; *CEE* 34
 ἔχων 'continually' III.H
 ζῶω (ἕως ἀν ζῆ) IV.H; (μὴ) ζῶην *CEE* 17
 ἦδη climactic III.A; in 'popular narrative'
 IV.E
 ἦδη νῦν plus imperative IV.C
 ἦκιστα II.A; 1937, 188; 1945, 98; *CEE* 14
 (ἔς τὸδ') ἡμέρας II.H; *CEE* 54
 ἦν (interjection) II.E; 1937, 189; *CEE* 35
 ἦν ἄρα *CEE* 62
 ἦ πῶς; 1945, 104
 (οὐ) θάσσω see οὐ θάσσω
 θάσσω ἢ λέγοι τις III.A
 θαυμασιῶς ὡς etc. 1945, 98
 θέλεις plus subjunctive in parataxis see βούλει
 (ἐ)θελήσω IV.I
 ἴδομαι in ill wishes for foe IV.A
 ἰδοῦ II.E; *CEE* 35

- ικός, adjectives in II.G
 ἴνα τί; CEE 29
 ἰοῦ ἰοῦ joyful IV.E
 ἴσθι see εὖ νῦν τόδ' ἴσθι
 καὶ ... δὴ CEE 36
 καὶ ... μέντοι IV.F
 καὶ πρὸς CEE 57
 κάπειτα, κῆρα II.F; CEE 47
 κακοδαίμων CEE 14
 κακὸς γνώμην (ἔφην) IV.I Note
 κακῶς (ἀπ)ολούμενος II.A; CEE 15
 καλὸς see ἐν, εἰς
 καλῶς ironical 1937, 188; 1945, 99; CEE 55;
 cf. Bagordo 102
 καλῶς semi-elliptical IV.H
 καλῶς ἔχει, λέγεις, ἔλεξας II.H under
 καλῶς ... ποιεῖν; 1937, 188; CEE 54; cf.
 Bagordo 114–15
 καλῶς (εὖ) λέγειν, ποιεῖν II.H; 1937, 188; CEE
 54
 κατὰ νοῦν IV.H
 κατακλύζω V.B
 καταξαίνω V.B
 καταπαλαίω V.B
 κατάρατος CEE 15
 κιβδηλεύω, -ος I.B
 κίνδυνος III.E
 κλαίειν, κλαίων II.A; 1945, 100; CEE 15
 κομψός IV.H
 κόπις V.B
 κόσμον φέρει IV.I Note
 κρείττον ἢ λέγοι τις III.A
 κρόταλον III.I
 κυκάω III.G
 (οὐκ ἂν) λάβοιμι III.H
 λάλημα III.I
 λέγειν τι, οὐδὲν II.C; 1937, 189; 1945, 100;
 CEE 25
 (καλῶς) λέγειν see καλῶς
 λέγω omitted with σέ see σέ
 λέγω σοι plus infinitive III.H
 (οὐκ) ἔλεγον III.E
 ληρέω V.A
 λυεῖ = λυσιτελεῖ IV.H
 -μα nouns in, abusive III.I; 1945, 103
 μαῖα IV.H
 μανοίμην γὰρ ἂν CEE 16
 μακράν IV.A
 μάλιστα II.A; 1937, 187; 1945, 98; CEE 16
 μάλλον μάλλον II.A; CEE 17
 μέγας ἀγών IV.G
 μέν in questions CEE 47
 μέν γε III.F
 μή with ellipse of imperative III.D
 (μή ἀλλά) μάλλα III.D; 1945, 100; CEE 8 n.29
 μηδὲν ὑγιές see ὑγιές
 μή ζῶην CEE 17
 μήπω see οὕτω
 μὴ φροντίσης III.A
 μιᾷ ὁδῷ II.G; CEE 49
 (ὁ) μαρὸς III.G
 μολεῖν CEE 2–3
 μόνον plus imperative IV.H
 μυρίῳ intensifying IV.A
 ναί 'please' *intra metrum* IV.F
 ναίχι III.A
 νεανικός, νεανίας (as adjective) II.G; CEE 49
 νεκρός CEE 12
 νοῦς, νοῦν ἔχειν with abstract subject IV.H; see
 also κατὰ νοῦν
 οἶδ' ὅτι elliptical 1945, 102; CEE 29
 οἶδας, οἶδατε CEE 59
 οἶκον οἰκεῖν IV.H
 οἴ(ο)μαι (μέν) II.C; 1945, 99; CEE 23
 οἴμοι annoyed 1945, 98; CEE 17
 οἴσθ' (οἶν) ὁ δρᾶσον; II.E; 1945, 102; CEE 36
 δλούμενος (and ἀπολ.) II.A
 ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τύχοι IV.H
 ὁμοιον, ὁμοια III.E
 ὅπως plus future indicative II.D; 1945, 100;
 CEE 29
 ὄρας; (and with dependent clause) II.E;
 CEE 36
 ὀρθῶς γε see εὖ γε
 ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας II.H under καλῶς ποιεῖν etc.
 ὅσον οὐκ ἤδη, ὅσον οὕτω II.H; CEE 56
 οὐ ... (ἀπ)εῖ plus future indicative III.A
 οὐ γὰρ ἀλλά CEE 47
 οὐ μὴ τί που; 1945, 102
 οὐδαμοῦ II.G; CEE 50
 οὐδὲν in answers III.E
 οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ, πλὴν IV.A; 1945, 98
 οὐδὲν λέγειν CEE 25
 οὐδὲν μέλει IV.H
 οὐ(δὲν) πλέον IV.H; 1945, 104
 οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα III.H; CEE 55
 οὐδὲν, μηδὲν ὑγιές see ὑγιές
 οὐκ(ἂν) πριαίμην III.H
 οὐκ ἠγόρευον, ἔλεγον; III.E
 οὐ θάσσον plus future indicative III.A
 οὐκουν μ' ἔασεις ... ; III.A
 οὐ μὴ and future indicative or aorist subjunc-
 tive IV.I
 οὕτω, μήπω 'not at all' IV.H; 1945, 99
 οὕ(τι) που CEE 7, 29
 οὕτι ταύτη IV.D
 οὕ τι χαίρων III.C
 οὕτως vocative II.E; 1945, 102; CEE 37
 οὕτω pleonastic CEE 19
 οὕτω(ς) 'offhand' II.H; 1945, 104; 'without
 more ado' CEE 56
 οὐχ ὅπως IV.D; 1945, 100
 οὐχ ὅσον IV.D
 ὄχλον παρέχειν CEE 56
 παλαιός 'simple-minded' IV.G
 παλαιστής, παλαίω V.B
 πάντα λογον IV.H
 πάνυ III.A
 παροχετεύω V.B
 πάς (τις) and second-person imperative III.H
 πάσα βλάβη IV.G
 παυ(?)ε IV.I

- πέπραμαι IV.G under ἐμπολάω
 περί plus accusative 1937, 187
 (μὴ) περιυδεῖν plus participle IV.I Note
 περισσός IV.G
 πόθεν; 1937, 183; CEE 38
 ποιεῖν see καλῶς
 ποιήσω τάδε IV.A
 ποῖος . . . ; with repeated word II.E; 1945, 102;
 CEE 38
 ποῖος, ὁ π.;; τὰ π.; III.E; 1937, 185
 πολλάκις καὶ οὐχ ἅπαξ IV.A
 πολλοῦ δεῖ CEE 19
 πονεῖν CEE 17
 πόσον δοκεῖς; II.E; 1945, 103; CEE 39
 πράγμα see οὐδὲν πράγμα
 (οὐκ ἂν) πριαίμην III.H
 πρὸς see καὶ πρὸς
 πρὸ τοῦ IV.H
 τὰ πρῶτα 'top person' IV.H
 πῶς; with repeated word III.E
 πῶς γὰρ οὐ; III.E; 1945, 102
 πῶς δοκεῖς; II.E; CEE 39
 πῶς δ' οὐχί; III.E
 πῶς ἔχεις; CEE 57
 ῥάων εἶναι II.G; CEE 50
 σαφ' ἴσθι IV.A
 σέ without λέγω in address IV.D
 σὸν ἔργον, σὸν plus infinitive II.E; 1937, 189;
 CEE 39
 σποδέω V.B
 συλλαμβάνω with reflexive III.H; 1945, 104;
 CEE 13 n.37
 συννέφω V.B
 σχολή III.C; 1945, 99
 τά and genitive 'x's house' IV.I
 τάρασσω see κυκῶς
 ταῦτα sc. δράσω CEE 30
 ταῦτα (τοιαῦτα) see τοῦτ' ἐκείνο
 (τάχ') εἴσει, εἴσεται IV.C
 τεκμήριον δέ IV.E
 τί with repeated word II.E; 1937, 184; CEE 40
 τί γάρ; elliptical 1937, 184
 τί γάρ, ἐάν . . . ; 1945, 101 (cf. τί δ' εἶ;)
 τί γάρ (πάθω); II.H; 1937, 185; CEE 57
 τί δαί . . . ; II.E
 τί δ' ἄλλο; IV.D
 τί δέ; elliptical III.E; 1937, 184
 τί δ' εἶ, ἦν . . . ; II.D; 1937, 184; 1945, 103;
 CEE 30
 τί δεῖ λέγειν; IV.A
 τί δὴ γὰρ οὐ; CEE 47
 τί δ' οὐ(χί); III.E under πῶς γὰρ οὐ;
 τί δρᾶς; IV.E
 τί οὐ . . . ; and aorist indicative 1937, 184;
 1945, 103
 τί οὖν (. . .); IV.E
 τί πάσχω, πάσχεις; 1937, 185; CEE 41
 τί πράττεις; II.E; CEE 41
 τις, τι = 'important' II.C; CEE 25
 τις mildly contemptuous IV.C
 τις of clear reference II.C
 τί τὸ δευρόν; II.E; CEE 41
 τί τοῦτο; CEE 31
 τί χρήμα; II.B; CEE 21, cf. 33
 τό plus genitive periphrastic II.B; CEE 20
 τοι CEE 48
 τοιαῦτα (ταῦτα) see τοῦτ' ἐκείνο
 τολμήσατε IV.I
 τὸ τί; III.E
 τοῦτ' ἐκείνο II.D; CEE 31
 τρίβων II.G; CEE 50
 -των, -τωναν imperative forms IV.I
 ὕβρις see ἄρ' οὐχ ὕβρις τάδε;
 ὑγιές οὐδέν, μηδέν; 1945, 99; CEE 7, 25
 ὑπερφεύ IV.A
 ὑποβλέπω IV.H
 φαίνομαι 'appear, show up' IV.H; CEE 4
 φάτνη IV.G
 φέρε and imperative or subjunctive II.E
 (κόσμον) φέρει see κόσμον
 φέρων of impulsive action 1945, 105
 (οὐκ ἂν) φθάνοις CEE 24
 φθείρεσθαι II.A; 1945, 103; CEE 17
 Φίλιος IV.H
 (ἐν σοι) φράσω III.H
 (μὴ) φροντίσης III.A
 χαίρειν κελεύω, λέγω, ἔαω; χαίρων dismissive
 II.C; 1945, 100; CEE 26
 χαίρων see οὐ τι χαίρων
 χρῆμα various II.B; 1937, 190; 1945, 105;
 CEE 20
 ᾧ with imperative IV.I
 ᾧρα (ἔστι) (ἦδη) III.H
 ὡς 'be sure that', elliptical III.D
 ὡς . . . γε 'for' 1945, 101; CEE 48
 ὡς ἔχω II.H; CEE 58
 ὡς τί δὴ II.D; CEE 29
 ᾧ τᾶν II.E; 1945, 103
 abstract nouns III.I; 1945, 103
 Accusative 'proleptic' IV.I
 adjectives in -υκός II.G; in -(η)οείς IV.I
 Amati, C. I.A.3
 article, definite: see ποῖος, infinitive
 Aristophanes, *Ranae* 939–42 I.C.2
 Aristotle, *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* I.C.1 (Waś),
 C.2
 Attic dialect, idioms I.D.2; 1945, 96; CEE 3
 n.8; cf. Iono-Attic
 Bers, V.I. C.1
 bibliography I.C.3; final bibliography
 characterization: superior persons I.D.3;
 humble or low status I.D.3 and n. 10, E.1;
 1945, 95–9; CEE 65–8; gods I.D.3
 chorus use colloquialisms CEE 62 n. 148, cf. 9
 'clustering' of colloquialisms I.D.3
 Comedy and the colloquial I.B and n.4, C.2,
 D.2; 1937, 182–3; CEE 4–5, (New C.) 6
 commentaries I.D.3
 comparatives: see θάσσον, μάλλον
 context, dramatic I.C.1, D.2, E.2 n. 15
 definitions I.B, C.1, D.1, 2 n.6, 3, E.2; 1937,
 182–3; 1945, 95–6; CEE 1–9

- dialects *CEE* 2–6
 diminutives, niveau of I.B n. 4; 1937, 182;
CEE 5,6; cf. Zangrando 1997, 197
 Direct Speech I.B. n.4; I.C.2
 Doric *CEE* 2, 3
 Dover, K. J. I.C.1
 ellipse of main verb in independent questions
 III.D; 1945, 101
 emotions I.D.2
 enclitic: see pronoun
 Fraenkel, E. Introd.; I.D.2, E.1; II, III, IV
passim
 genitive after εἰς, ἐν see Greek index; after τῷ
 in periphrasis IV.B; after τῆς, ‘x’s house’
 IV.I
 genitive of exclamation II.I; 1937, 187; *CEE*
 61
 Herodotus I.B n.4; I.D.2; 1937, 183; *CEE* 5
 Homer 1937, 182; *CEE* 7
 images I.B; V.B
 imperative forms II.I; IV.I
 imperfect of sudden realization II.I; *CEE* 62
 infinitive of exclamation, with article II.I;
 1937, 187; *CEE* 61
 inscriptions I.B (Waś)
 Iono-Attic and the colloquial I.D.2; IV.I;
 1937, 182 n. 2, 183 n.4 (= *CEE* 5 n. 15),
 186; *CEE* 3, 5, 59–60
 koinē I.A.1, D.2
 Landfester, M. I.D.1
 Latin comedy I.C.2, 3; *CEE* 6–7, cf. final
 bibliography, esp. Bagordo
 López Eire, A. I.C.1
 Menander I.D.2
 messengers I.D.3 and n. 10; *CEE* 65
 metaphors, status of I.B, V; see also II.G,
 III.G, IV.G
 New Comedy *CEE* 6
 nominative, ‘hanging’ IV.I
 optative in direct questions without ἄν IV.I
 orators I.B and n.4; 1937, 183; *CEE* 5–7
 particles, in general I.C.2; 1945, 101
 perfect, ‘frequentative’ IV.I
 Pindar *CEE* 7
 Plato I.B n. 4; 1937, 183; *CEE* 5
 pronoun, anaphoric, redundant IV.I
 pronoun, enclitic repeated in clause IV.I
 proverbs I.C.2
 repetition of interrogative III.E; 1937, 185;
 1945, 104
 rthesis I.E.2 n. 15
 satyric drama II n.17; 1937, 182; *CEE* 8
 Seneca I.C.3
 Smereka, J. I.A.3
 staccato phrasing *CEE* 8 n. 27
 Stevens, P.T. I.A.1–3, B
 stichomythia Introd. (Waś); I.A.3, B, E.2 and
 n. 16; 1937, 182 n. 2
 Taillardat, J. I.B
 Thucydides 1937, 183
 vase-inscriptions I.C.1; *CEE* 3, 4
 vulgarity I.C.2; *CEE* 5
 Waś, J. Introd.; I.C.1, *passim*
 West, M. L. I.C.1
 Aeschylus I.C.2; 1937, 182–3; 1945, 95–8;
CEE 8; *Cho.* 563 1945, 96; 653–706 I.D.3;
 1945, 96–7; 674 ff. 1945, 96; *Supp.* 836 ff.
 1945, 96; [A.] *PV*, language of I.E.1 n. 15;
 1937, 185 n. 1; 1945, 97
 Euripides I.E.1; 1945, 95–7; *CEE* 7, 64–8;
Alc. 773–802 I.D.3; *CEE* 66; 831–2 *CEE*
 66; *Andr.* 547ff. *CEE* 67; *Bacch.* 785 *CEE*
 67; 802 *CEE* 68; *El.* 326 *CEE* 67; *Hec.*
 613–14 *CEE* 67; *HF* 963ff. *CEE* 66;
 1101ff. *CEE* 66; *Hipp.* 113 *CEE* 67; 1362
CEE 14, 67; *Ion* 517–62 I.D.3; *CEE* 66–7;
Med. 472 *CEE* 3; 667–708 I.D.3; *CEE* 67;
 1049–51 *CEE* 67; 1073–4 *CEE* 3; *Or.*
 211ff. *CEE* 67; [E.] *Rhesus* *CEE* 65.
 Sophocles I.D.2, 3, E.1, 2 n. 16; 1937, 183;
 1945, 95, 97–8; *CEE* 8; *Aj.* 978 IV.G under
 ἐμπολάω, 1142–58 I.D.3; *OC*, language of,
 I.E.1 n. 15; *OT* 430–1 III.A under οὐ
 θᾶσσον; *Phil.*, language of, I.E.1 n. 15;
 1937, 184 n. 3; *Phil.* 978 IV.G under
 πέπραμαι; *Trach.* 427 II.E under ποῖος;

Oxford

CHRISTOPHER COLLARD
chris.collard@classics.oxford.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (omits standard works of reference such as Denniston’s *Particles*, LSJ, and grammars)
 Adams and Mayer = J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, ‘Introduction’, in eid. (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, PBA 93 (1999), 1–20.
 Amati = C. Amati, ‘Contributo alle ricerche sull’uso della lingua familiare in Euripide’, *SIFC* 9 (1901), 125–48.
 Bagordo = A. Bagordo, *Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Terenz, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der umgangssprachlichen Elemente* (Göttingen, 2001).
 Battezzato = L. Battezzato, *Il monologo nel teatro di Euripide* (Pisa, 1995).

- Bers 1984 = V. Bers, *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* (New Haven and London, 1984).
- Bers 1997 = V. Bers, *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* (Lanham, 1997).
- Collard = C. Collard, *CR* 28 (1978), 224–6 (review of Stevens *CEE*).
- De Vries = G. De Vries, ‘Colloquialisms in *Republic* and *Phaedrus*’, in K. Döring and W. Kullmann (edd.), *Studia Platonica. Festschrift für H. Gundert zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 30.4.1974* (Amsterdam, 1974), 87–92.
- Dickey = E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford, 2000).
- Diggle 1981 = J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981).
- Diggle 1994 = J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994).
- Dover 1987 = K. J. Dover, *Greek and the Greeks* (Oxford, 1987), especially 16–30 ‘The colloquial stratum in classical Attic prose’, reprinted from *Classical Contributions. Studies in Honor of Malcolm Francis McGregor* (Locust Valley, NY, 1981), 15–25.
- Dover 1997 = K. J. Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1997).
- Dover 2002 = K. J. Dover, ‘Some evaluative terms in Aristophanes’, in Willi 2002, 85–97.
- Fraenkel 1962 = *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Roma, 1962).
- Fraenkel 1969 = ‘ὄνδ’ ἀν’ μ’ ἑάσεις’, *MH* 26 (1969), 158.
- Fraenkel 1977 = *Due seminari romani di Eduard Fraenkel: Aiace e Filottete di Sofocle*, a cura di alcuni partecipanti, Premessa di L. E. Rossi (Rome, 1977); pp. 41–76 are an unchanged reprint of *Appunti del Seminario ... da Eduard Fraenkel sul Filottete di Sofocle* (Rome, 1969), a limited private edition by the members of the Seminar.
- Fraenkel 1994 = *Corsi seminariali di Eduard Fraenkel, Bari 1965–69*, a cura di R. Roncali; Prefazione di C. F. Russo (Rome, 1994). The chapter ‘Sofocle’, pp. 37–62, deals only with *Ajax*; pp. 37–60 supplement Fraenkel 1977, 3–39, on lines 1–1308; pp. 60–2 add notes on lines 1342–1420.
- Fraenkel MSS = E. Fraenkel, unpublished notebooks in the Archive of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; cited as ‘MSS Soph(ocles, Notebooks) I, II and III’.
- Henderson = J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New York and Oxford, 1991²).
- Hofmann = J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1951³).
- Landfester = M. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen*.
- Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990 = H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea: Studies on the text of Sophocles* (Oxford, 1990).
- Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1997 = H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophocles: Second Thoughts*, Hypomnemata 100 (Göttingen, 1997).
- López Eire = A. López Eire, ‘Situación, entonación, mímica y contacto en la comedia aristo-fánica’, *Humanitas* 46 (1994), 129–49 (English résumé, 486).
- Moorhouse = A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1982).
- Quincey = J. H. Quincey, ‘Greek expressions of thanks’, *JHS* 86 (1966), 133–58.
- Rubino = M. Rubino, *Maia* 34 (1982), 84 (review of Stevens *CEE*).
- Schmid = W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1.2 (Munich, 1934), 1.3 (1940).
- Smereka = J. Smereka, *Studia Euripidea* (2 vols Lwow, 1936–7), 1.100–9, 250–3 (only vols 1 and 2.1 published).
- Sommerstein = A. H. Sommerstein, ‘Comic elements in tragic language: the case of Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*’, in Willi 2002, 151–68.
- Stevens 1937 = P. T. Stevens, ‘Colloquial expressions in Euripides’, *CQ* 31 (1937), 182–91; repr. in E. R. Schwinge (ed.), *Euripides*, Wege der Forschung 89 (Darmstadt, 1969), 104–23.
- Stevens 1945 = P. T. Stevens, ‘Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles’, *CQ* 39 (1945), 95–105.
- Stevens *CEE* = P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 38 (Wiesbaden, 1976).
- Taillardat = J. Taillardat, *Les Images d’Aristophane* (Lyons, 1965).
- Tarkow = T. A. Tarkow, *CW* 71 (1977), 196–7 (review of Stevens *CEE*).
- Thesleff 1967 = H. Thesleff, *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (Helsinki, 1967).
- Thesleff 1978 = H. Thesleff, *JHS* 98 (1978), 173 (review of Stevens *CEE*).
- Van Looy = H. Van Looy, *AC* 46 (1977), 617–18 (review of Stevens *CEE*).
- Waś = J. Waś, ‘Aspects of realism in Greek tragedy’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Oxford, 1983, held in the Bodleian Library).
- West = M. L. West, ‘Colloquial and naïve style in Aeschylus’, in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens’: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford, 1990), 3–12.

- Willi 2002 = A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford, 2002), including his own papers 'The language of Greek comedy', 1–32, and 'Languages on stage: Aristophanic language, cultural history and Athenian identity', 111–50.
- Willi 2003 = A. Willi, *The Languages of Aristophanes* (Oxford, 2003).
- Zangrando 1997 = V. Zangrando, 'A proposito della dimensione colloquiale nella letteratura greca', *SIFC* 15 (1997), 188–207.
- Zangrando 1998 = V. Zangrando, 'L'espressione colloquiale nelle "Diatrìbe" di Epitteto: contatti con lo stile della predicazione diatribica', *QUCC* 59 (1998), 81–108.
- Note.** I have not seen R. N. A. Hankey, 'The colloquial stratum in the language of Attic drama' (unpublished thesis, St Andrews, ?1971), recorded in *BICS* 18 (1971), 182.