

INTRODUCTION I

Stevens's Introduction to CEE (1976, 1–9)
(unchanged)

The language of Attic Tragedy in speeches and dialogue, taken as a whole, is evidently a *Kunstsprache*, but we might expect that current conversational idioms would have some influence; indeed it is now generally recognised that colloquial expressions do in fact occur in the extant plays, especially in Euripides, and most commentators on his plays describe certain words as phrases as obvious colloquialisms or as probable or possible colloquialisms. As far as I know two articles and a chapter of a book have been devoted to this topic: in 1901 C. Amati published a collection of colloquial expressions in Euripides¹, providing in most instances some examples for Old Comedy as the criterion of colloquial character; in 1936 J. Smereka included in a study of some aspects of the language of Euripides a chapter on colloquialism², giving many alleged examples but marred by lack of discrimination and absence of any indication of the criteria adopted; in 1937 I published some additions to Amati's list, with a more detailed discussion of the evidence for colloquial usage³. In the present monograph I offer a more comprehensive collection of examples, including those previously published (except that I have omitted some of Amati's examples which I now think unjustified), together with a fuller discussion of the criteria for inclusion and an attempt to estimate the stylistic and dramatic significance of colloquial language in Euripides.

Before considering the evidence for colloquial usage in the last decades of fifth century Athens it will perhaps be advisable to make clear what I mean by colloquial, with reference to other levels of speech from which this element in Euripides is to be distinguished. A possible classification [[p. 2 of CEE]] of language is into four levels: poetic, prosaic, neutral and colloquial. In our own language there is generally no difficulty about differentiating between these levels, though in modern English distinctively poetic diction has almost ceased to exist. In ancient Greek, poetic language in diction, form and syntax is an important and easily recognisable feature; between the other three levels discrimination is liable to be more difficult in a foreign and especially a dead language: we lack the native speaker's intuitive perception of such nuances, and the facts of usage and distribution may be misleading, particularly in Greek where so small a proportion of ancient Greek literature is now extant.

- 1 (= CEE) 'Contributo alle ricerche sull' uso della lingua familiare in Euripide', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 9 (1901) 125–248.
- 2 (= CEE) *Studia Euripidea* (Leopoli 1936) I.100–9, 250–3.
- 3 (= CEE) 'Colloquial Expressions in Euripides', *CQ* 31 (1937) 182–191, reprinted in *Euripides* (Wege der Forschung LXXXIX), hrsg. E.R. Schwinge (Darmstadt 1969) 104–123.

If we have in mind a different line of division, between the emotional and intellectual aspects of language, then there is something in common between poetry, impassioned oratory and colloquial speech⁴, since they all at times use language emotionally and all make free use of certain general types of expression, such as pleonasm, metaphor and hyperbole. The result of such common characteristics is that a colloquialism would often be less incongruous in poetry than a distinctively prosaic word or phrase, and that it may be more difficult to establish the colloquial character of a given phrase.

In Euripides, as in all Attic Tragedy, there is clearly a poetic colouring, derived partly from words which in form and meaning would be recognised as characteristic of epic and lyric poetry and alien from ordinary speech, for example compounds such as *καλλιπύργωτος* and *ἀσπιδηφόρος*. Such words, however, are not common in Euripidean dialogue, and poetic diction here consists mainly of words for which there was a normal Attic equivalent, such as *φάσγανον* for *ξίφος*, *δῶμα* for *οἰκία*, *εὐφρόνη* for *νύξ*. Some of these ‘poetic words’ were apparently in everyday use in non-Attic dialects, for example the Doric *μολεῖν* for *ἐλθεῖν* and Ionic *εὐφρόνη* for *νύξ*, and though an Athenian would not himself use *μολεῖν*⁵, it cannot have sounded unfamiliar. It is given to an Athenian in *Ar. Eq.* 21 ff., in order to lead up to the compound *ἀυτομολεῖν*, which was normal Attic, and in Tragedy *ἐλθεῖν* [[p. 3]] and *μολεῖν* often appear in close juxtaposition⁶. Thus no special incongruity need have been felt at the juxtaposition of *μολεῖν* and the colloquial *εὐ ἐποίησας* in *E. Med.* 472⁷.

The poetic colouring of Tragic dialogue appears not only in diction but in forms of words, syntax, idiom, word order and so on. Thus in *E. Med.* 1073–4 *εὐδαιμονοῖτον, ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖ· τὰ δ’ ἐνθάδε | πατήρ ἀφείλετ(ο)*, where the poignant simplicity is achieved partly by the use of neutral diction, there is still a slight touch of remoteness in the absence of the article with *πατήρ*. As regards form of words the differences from normal Attic are not very great. The Attic provincialisms *ττ* and *ρρ* were naturally avoided, but the forms with *σσ* and *ρσ* were in use in historical prose

4 (= CEE) Cf. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica II* (Lund 1956) 365: ‘Sie sind (die Poesie und die Umgangssprache), kurz ausgedrückt, im Gegensatz zur kühlen dahinschreitenden Normalprosa, die beiden wärmeren Stilarten.’

5 (= CEE) The few examples (apart from its use by non-Athenians) in Old Comedy (Cratinus F 118; *Ar.* F 717.1; Strattis F 42) are probably paratragic or otherwise exceptional. It first appears in prose in *Xen. An.* 7.1.33, where it is given to a Boeotian. For a discussion with reference to literary and epigraphical evidence see L. Gautier, *La Langue de Xénophon* (Geneva 1911) 29–30.

6 (= CEE) E. g. *IT* 515 *καὶ μὴν ποθεινός γ’ ἦλθεσ ἐξ Ἄργουσι μολών; Alc.* 539–40; *Her.* 531–2; *Ion* 332; *Or.* 738. *μολών* is particularly common at the end of a line and in the passages cited and many others metrical convenience may have determined the choice, but in many it has not, e. g. *Med.* 776, where *μολόντι* is first word.

7 (= CEE) See below Part I.H p. 119.

and must have been familiar on the lips of foreigners⁸. Thus in τί πρόσσεις; the non-Attic form would not necessarily deny the colloquial character of the phrase⁹.

Prosaic words in English, i. e. words that would produce a slight effect of incongruity in a poetic context or in ordinary conversation, are generally technical or semi-technical terms of science, medicine, law and the rest, specially coined for a specific purpose and generally derived from Latin or Greek, such as “thermodynamics”, “bilateral”, “metabolism”. Fifth century Athens probably saw the beginnings of technical vocabularies, and occasionally a foreign source might be used, e. g. a Doric word might be taken over as a military term. Generally however special senses were assigned to ordinary Attic words or new words formed from existing Greek stems; parodies in Aristophanes¹⁰ imply a tendency in certain circles to coin nouns in -σις and adjectives in -ικός. In Euripides there are some words that may well carry with them something of the atmosphere of a medical or rhetorical [[p. 4]] treatise or of philosophical argument, e. g. διάγνωσις (*Hipp.* 696, 926), ἐλκώδης (*Hipp.* 1359), βούλησις (*And.* 702; three times in all), λελογισμένως (*IA* 1021; the verb λογίζομαι fourteen times). These and many other words are certainly confined to Euripides and prose writers as far as our evidence goes, but in view of the immense quantity of fifth century Tragic dialogue no longer extant we do not know how far this is due to chance. A word is presumably more likely to be distinctively prosaic if there is a normal poetic equivalent, and it cannot, for instance, be accidental that the simple verb κτείνω is normal in poetry and in all three tragedians, and that the prose form ἀποκτείνω is found once in Aeschylus, never in Sophocles, and about forty-five times in Euripides.

Neutral language consists of the sort of words and expressions that have no special connotation and are equally at home in any context. The general impression, shared by ancient and modern critics, of greater simplicity of diction in Euripides as compared with Aeschylus and even Sophocles is probably due mainly to the higher proportion of neutral language in his plays.

Lastly by colloquial I mean not merely words and expressions that are likely to occur in ordinary conversation, since this consists largely of neutral language, but the kind of language that in a poetic or prosaic context would stand out however slightly as having a distinctively conversational flavour. In Greek some words, at any rate in certain senses, are in themselves colloquial, but more often it is a matter of idiom and usage. Very often a slight change in meaning or in the form of a phrase will remove its colloquial character, or even a change of context. For exam-

8 (= CEE) It would not be surprising if the influx of strangers to Athens, as visitors or settlers, affected the speech of native Athenians, though in the well-known passage in Ps. Xen. *Ath. Pol.* II 8 ἔπειτα φωνὴν πᾶσαν ἀκούοντες τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς· καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἰδίᾳ μᾶλλον καὶ φωνὴ καὶ διαίτη καὶ σχήματι χωρῶνται, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ κεκραμένη ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων the author's personal bias has led him to exaggerate. In Attic vase inscriptions we find e. g. both Κασσάνδρα and the atticised Καττάνδρα; see Kretschmer 1894, 76–8, and A. Thumb, *Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Strassburg 1901, 56.

9 (= CEE) See below Part I.E p. 94.

10 (= CEE) Ar. *Eq.* 1378–81; *Nub.* 317–18. On -σις nouns see E. W. Handley, *Eranos* 51, 1953, 129–42; Long 1968, 29–35 and Index; Parker on *IT* 1019 βούλευσις.

ple Amati cites as colloquial the use of φαίνεσθαι to denote someone's arrival in E. *Her.* 705, *Ba.* 646 and *Ph.* [1747], and Wilamowitz (on E. *Her.* 705) notes "aus der Umgangssprache", citing as evidence Pl. *Prot.* 309a πόθεν, ὃ Σώκρατες, φαίνῃ; "Where have you appeared from, Socrates?" Here the verb probably is colloquial, but only because it is a dignified word deliberately used in a trivial context. In *Her.* 705, however, ἔξω κέλευε τῶνδε φαίνεσθαι δόμων "Bid them appear ...", the Greek is not more colloquial than the English "appear" in that context. Again in Ar. *Thes.* 220 γενναίος εἶ "You're very good" (thanking for the loan of a razor) is probably a colloquial exaggeration, but the same phrase γενναία γὰρ εἶ in *IA* 1411 has its full meaning and is not colloquial¹¹.

For the last thirty years of the fifth century the best evidence for colloquial usage is provided by the comic dramatists. The language of Attic Vase Inscriptions is naturally limited in range, and though it tells us something of the characteristics of popular speech, on the whole it is below the level [[p. 5]] of colloquialism found in Tragedy. The language of Old Comedy also includes much that was clearly regarded as beneath the dignity of Tragedy, not only ordinary terms for sex organs, various bodily functions and like and slang equivalents (most of which are also excluded from New Comedy) but also diminutives. These are very common in Aristophanes and perhaps also characteristic of colloquial speech, but are hardly ever found in Tragedy¹². At the other extreme the language of many Aristophanic lyrics is not relevant for our purpose, and examples of paratragic usage must of course be excluded. The latter can generally be identified without difficulty, though occasionally when a particular expression is found in Aristophanes and Euripides but not elsewhere in Tragedy there may be doubt whether it is colloquial or Aristophanes is deliberately introducing a characteristic Euripidean turn of phrase; here the evidence of prose dialogue may serve as a check¹³.

For the same period Herodotus can also be used as evidence, especially in passages of dialogue but also perhaps in narrative, where the occurrence of colloquial words is attested by 'Longinus'¹⁴. No doubt the diction of Herodotus is mainly neutral, and indeed to Athenian ears might well have a slight poetic tinge owing to the use of Ionic words, such as εὐφρόνη, which in Athens belonged to the language

11 (= CEE) Our own language shows how easily one could go wrong; e. g. both 'lo' and 'behold' are poetic/archaic, yet the expression 'lo and behold' may be heard in any casual conversation. On φαίνομαι 'appear' see also Part II.H p. 169.

12 (= CEE) (first sentence alone from CEE) An exception is χλανίδιον, E. *Or.* 42; *Supp.* 110; 71 Chaeremon *Oeneus* F 14.9; Adesp. Trag. F 7.1. It may have ceased to be felt as a diminutive, like perhaps χροσίον '(little) place, spot' at 43 Critias F 19.39, a 'Sisyphus' play which may or may not be satyric. Zangrando 1997, 197 judges that diminutives tend to be pejorative, and her n. 33 there states that Tragedy avoids them as 'vulgarisms' (Introd. II p. 31 below). For their occurrence in satyric see e. g. *Cyc.* 266 Κυκλώπιον, 316 ἀνθρώπισκε; Lämmle 65–6.

13 (= CEE) See Part I.E p. 91 below on σὸν ἔργον.

14 (= CEE) Περὶ Ὑψους 31.2, where κατεκρεουργήθη (7.181.2) is cited as a word that grazes the very edge of vulgarity but is saved by its expressiveness. In 43.1 several words in Herodotus are censured as being below the dignity of the subject.

of poetry; but I take it that the colloquial character of an expression is if anything confirmed by occurrence in Herodotus, especially in dialogue¹⁵.

In the early fourth century we have the evidence of the conversational parts of the prose dialogues of Plato and Xenophon. The many styles of Plato include the conversational style, which presumably reflects the colloquial idiom of contemporary Athenian society¹⁶. At about the same period and in the fourth century the Attic Orators are also relevant, with certain distinctions. On the whole their vocabulary and idiom are mainly neutral [[p. 6]] or prosaic. There is, however, as we might expect, some difference in this respect between public and private speeches. In Lysias the everyday nature of some of the incidents dealt with and the deliberate simplicity of style to suit clients for whom the speeches were written provide a context in which it is not surprising to find words and expressions which are, to judge by Old Comedy, colloquial¹⁷. Similarly in some private speeches of Demosthenes a colloquial touch would help to maintain the illusion that the words are those of a plain man¹⁸. In the public speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines the style in narrative and argument is generally rather more formal, but even in these speeches, especially in the frequent rhetorical questions, imaginary retorts and scraps of imaginary dialogue, the orators avail themselves of the vigour and expressiveness of obviously colloquial idiom¹⁹, including some words and forms that are confined to Demosthenes and Comedy and are apparently too strongly colloquial for Tragedy²⁰.

Towards the end of the century further evidence for colloquialism is provided by New Comedy, in which the diction and idiom are likely to be modelled on the speech of everyday life. At about the same time the *Characters* of Theophrastus can also be used, especially where the author quotes remarks supposed to be typical of the type he is describing. These writers are admittedly a century later than Euripides, but their evidence should, I think, be regarded as valid, at any rate in confirmation of earlier evidence. In the third century and later we have good evidence for the colloquial speech of that period in the Ptolemaic papyri and New Testament Greek, and there is further material in the *Mimes* of Herodas and the more conversational

15 (= CEE) Wilamowitz (on *Her.* 575) suggests that Ionian notions of propriety differed from Attic, so that an Ionic writer might naturally use words or expressions that in Attic would be felt as somewhat coarse or colloquial. His example is *κλαίειν λέγω* (4.127.4) which is not found in Tragedy (for the more polite colloquialism *χάριεν λέγω* see below Part I Section C p. 65). Cf. also *παχύς* almost 'bloated aristocrat', which is used in serious narrative in Hdt. (e.g. 5.30.1, 77.2) but in Attic only in Aristophanes (*Eq.* 1139; *Pax* 639; *Vesp.* 287).

16 (= CEE) For a good account see Thesleff 1967, esp. 63–80.

17 (= CEE) E.g. the diminutives *οιζίδιον* (1.9) and *δωμάτιον* (1.17), and *ἀφικνούμαι ὡς τὸν καὶ τὸν*: see W.L. De Vries, *Ethopoïia, A Rhetorical Study of the Types of Character in the Orations of Lysias*, Baltimore 1892, though he somewhat exaggerates the extent to which language is used for characterization.

18 (= CEE) The opening sentence of Dem. 55 is a good example: *Οὐκ ἦν ἄρ(α) ... χαλεπώτερον οὐδὲν ἢ γειτονος πονηροῦ ... τυχεῖν, ὅπερ ἐμοὶ νυνὶ συμβέβηκεν.*

19 (= CEE) Denniston lxxiv observes, 'The vividness of Demosthenes' style leads him to employ a number of lively conversational idioms which are not found in the other orators.'

20 (= CEE) E.g. *οὐδὲ γρῦ*, confined to Demosthenes and Old Comedy.

idylls of Theocritus, especially the fifteenth. All this is not too far removed in time or place to have some confirmatory value²¹.

Lastly, I have occasionally cited parallels from colloquial Latin, for which the evidence is much fuller²², and from modern Greek and other modern languages. Colloquial speech, at any rate in in most European languages, has certain general characteristics, such as various kinds of ellipse and the substitution for plain statement of exaggeration or deliberate [[p. 7]] understatement²³; and the parallels I have cited are included partly as a matter of interest, partly because they may offer slight confirmation of colloquial character.

For a given expression in Euripides to be reckoned as colloquial its occurrence elsewhere in suitable contexts is of course not enough; it must also in the main be confined to such contexts. Thus we should expect to find no examples in Epic and Choral Lyric poetry or in the prose of Antiphon, Thucydides and Isocrates. On the other hand no hard and fast rule can be made, since there are hardly any writers of whom we could be sure that they would never admit a colloquial expression. It has been suggested by modern critics that certain words in Homer may be colloquial²⁴, though we have no means of confirming this and Denniston suspects “that the particles Homer employs were, in the main, those of everyday speech”²⁵ and that, for instance, “τιῆ found only in Homer, Hesiod and Attic Comedy was colloquial from first to last, though it seems to have gone out of use before the days of Plato and Xenophon”. Thus I take it that the colloquial character of ἀτάρ in the fifth century is at any rate not disproved by its use in Homer²⁶. In the personal elegiac, iambic and lyric poetry of the seventh and sixth centuries the subject matter and style are such that an occasional colloquialism is not surprising²⁷, and generally speaking I have not regarded these writers as negative evidence. Even in the more stately choral lyric of Pindar we have in *P.* 4.87 the colloquial οὐ τί που, but here Pindar purports to give us the actual words of a bystander. Among prose writers, Antiphon’s style tends to be somewhat stiff and formal, but in *Or.* 5.43 we have the colloquial οὐ γὰρ δῆπου οὕτω κακοδαίμων ἐγὼ ὥστε ... “I wasn’t such a confounded fool

21 For the ‘limpid’ simplicity of Theophrastus’ style, and its occasional colloquialism, in the evocation of character, see J. Diggle, *Theophrastus. Characters*, Cambridge 2004, 20–5 (a little more fully in his earlier ‘The *Characters* of Theophrastus’, *Praktika* 77 (2002) 56–68). For the ‘colloquial’ elements in Theocritus’ poetic style see K.J. Dover, *Theocritus. Select Poems*, London 1971, xxxix, li; the latter place picks out their frequency in *Idylls* X (see Dover’s p. 167), XIV (p. 189), XV (pp. 197–8), and hardly less in *Idyll* V; these details are repeated in Dover 1987, 21, cf. 23.

22 (= CEE n. 21) See esp. Hofmann-Ricottilli 1985²; J. Marouzeau, *Traité de Stylistique Appliquée au Latin*, Paris 1962, 153–89; Bagordo 2001; Dickey and Chahoud 2010.

23 (= CEE n. 22) For the persistence of certain types of colloquial idiom, over long periods, see D. Tabachovitz, ‘Phénomènes linguistiques du vieux grec dans le grec de la basse époque’, *MH* 3, 1946, 144–79.

24 (= CEE n. 23) See Stanford on *Od.* 14.467, 508, and cf. T. Arnold, *Lectures on Translating Homer*, London 1896, 88. In Hesiod, *WD* 26 γαστέρες appears to be colloquial: see Part I.G p. 109.

25 (= CEE n. 24) Denniston lxxv.

26 (= CEE n. 25) See also on δαί Part I.F p. 103 below.

27 (= CEE n. 26) E. g. Theognis 768 οὐδὲν ἄρ’ ἦν, 1045 ναὶ μὰ Δία.

as to ...” and in 5.41 the parenthetic πῶς γάρ; In Thucydides, apart from τὰ ὅπλα ταυτί in the exceptional passage of lively dialogue in 3.113.4, we find in 3.75.4 the apparently colloquial οὐδὲν ὑγιές; it is relevant that this and some other possible colloquialisms in Thucydides are in passages of virtual reported speech, but in plain narrative ὀλίγου “almost”, probably colloquial in fifth century Attic, occurs in 4.124.1 and 8.35.3. [[p. 8]]

Aeschylus and Sophocles are somewhat anomalous. I have for convenience included examples from fragments of satyric dramas along with those from tragedies, though the former are certainly not negative evidence, and may sometimes be regarded as confirmation. I have regarded examples from the tragedies as negative evidence to the extent that frequent occurrence in Aeschylus and Sophocles tells against the colloquial character of a given expression and suggests that it belongs rather to what may be called the “dialogue style”²⁸. On the other hand colloquial expressions are certainly admitted by both these dramatists²⁹, including, for instance, the clearly colloquial εὖ γε (*S. Phil.* 327), which is not found in Euripides³⁰. If therefore the general picture strongly suggests the colloquial character of an expression I have not automatically rejected it on the ground that it occurs in Aeschylus and Sophocles, especially in the *Prometheus*³¹ and *Philoctetes*. This procedure may seem rather arbitrary, but it illustrates the fact that 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.

A few words are necessary on the form in which the following material is arranged. Examples of colloquial words and expressions are grouped in the following categories:

- A. Exaggeration: emphasis.
- B. Pleonastic or lengthened forms of expression.
- C. Understatement: irony³².
- D. Brevity: ellipse.
- E. Interjections and expressions used to attract attention or maintain contact.

28 (= CEE n. 27) Stanford 1942, 48–50 has an interesting account of colloquialisms, among which he includes examples of ‘staccato phrasing’, such as *Eum.* 431 πῶς δῆ; δίδαξον. τῶν σοφῶν γὰρ οὐ πένει, and *PV* 259, cf. n. 29 below; also *S. OC* 1099 ποῦ ποῦ; τί φῆς; πῶς εἶπας; I (Stevens) should regard such effects as belonging to the essential nature of dramatic dialogue rather than being distinctively colloquial. We should also expect that some uses of particles would belong to question and answer as such, whatever their tone. Only those are included that are almost confined to Euripides and colloquial sources.

29 (= CEE n. 28) For a collection, which does not claim to be complete, see *CQ* 39, 1945, 95–105.

30 (= CEE n. 29) On εὖ γε see under ὀρθῶς γε Part I Section A below p. 44. Aeschylus is perhaps the only tragic dramatist who certainly uses the Aristophanic μάλλά (*Cho.* 918) – but see now Part I.D below p. 70.

31 I differ from Stevens in holding that the *Prometheus* is not authentic to Aeschylus, but like him I place it together with examples from Aeschylus.

32 (= CEE n. 30) A and C are of course both ways of giving emphasis, as contrasted with plain exact statement. C is perhaps specially characteristic of Greek: see Lammermann 1935.

- F. Particles.
- G. Metaphorical expressions.
- H. Miscellaneous.
- I. Colloquial forms and syntax.

It will be evident that the division is not on a uniform principle; some might be called psychological categories, others are grammatical. It is also clear that these categories are not mutually exclusive; e. g. an example of colloquial exaggeration may also be metaphorical. However this grouping, though in some respects anomalous in conception and arbitrary in execution, makes it possible to illustrate some general tendencies of colloquial speech. [[p. 9]] Within each group the order is alphabetical, generally according to the first word, and any particular word or phrase can easily be located from the Index (*on the indexes in this revised edition see the Foreword, p. 12*).

References and quotations are normally in the following order:

- 1) Evidence for colloquialism: Comedy, Old, Middle and New; Herodotus, Plato, Xenophon, Orators; later writers, papyri, Hellenistic Greek; colloquial Latin and other languages.
- 2) Euripides.
- 3) Aeschylus and Sophocles.
- 4) Negative evidence or opinions, of which there will normally be none.

Examples from Attic Tragedy are intended to be complete, and unless otherwise indicated are in iambic trimeters or trochaic tetrameters. In Euripides there are a few examples of colloquialism in recitative anapaests, as might be expected, and I have not regarded the rare occurrences in lyric dialogue (as contrasted with the more formal stasima) as outweighing good positive evidence. Examples for colloquial sources are not necessarily complete, especially when a word or phrase is very common in Aristophanes or Plato; where evidence for colloquialism is scanty I have endeavoured to give as much as possible. When an English equivalent is offered for a Greek expression it does not, of course, purport to be a suitable translation in every passage cited.

INTRODUCTION II

(revised from Collard, *Supplement* 2005, 351–60)

A.1 Stevens’s definitions of the colloquial and methodology of presenting expressions in CEE maintained in this revised edition.

Stevens’s CEE 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 he advanced and then modified definitions of the ‘colloquial’ in Greek earlier than the *koinê*³³; they 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 2005 *Supplement* was both a tribute to Stevens³⁴ and an attempt to supplement his monograph as usefully as possible. In that hope I confined myself to updating his general discussion (CEE Introduction, 1–9, which had largely subsumed 1937, 182–3 and 1945, 95–8; reproduced as Introduction Part I above), mostly with bibliography but with some matter of my own. I followed his methodology throughout and retained his categorization and arrangement of phenomena (see A.2 and A.3 below). In particular, my hospitable attitude there towards probable or possible colloquialisms, which I maintain in this revised edition and extend even to very unlikely examples, also reflected 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 = p. 21 above)³⁵. He there, and myself in 2005 and again here, leave others to approve, question or disagree with our judgement if they will – as one or two already have, particularly commentators on the plays: good.

As in 2005 I cannot, of course, anywhere pretend to completeness: that would be folly (cf. Foreword p. 10).

- 33 For the *koinê* as closer to Classical Attic than to the spoken vernacular see L. Kim, ‘The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic’, in E. J. Bakker, *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Cambridge MA 2014, 468–82, at 470–1; cf. Horrocks 2010, esp. 83–4, 88–9.
- 34 (first paragraph = *Supplement* 2005, 351 n. 3) I briefly enjoyed Stevens’s acquaintance in the early 1970’s; he gave me help *in rebus Euripideis sapiens tironi peritus*. I contributed the entry for Stevens to R. B. Todd (ed.), *The Dictionary of British Classicists*, Bristol 2004, 924–5. I have always wondered that Stevens’s modesty caused him to mention his 1945 article only at the end of his CEE Introduction, at p. 8 n. 28 (= p. 21 n. 29 above) – and to omit both it and his earlier 1937 article from his ‘Select Bibliography’, p. 69.
- 35 Alongside Stevens’s own caution note this comment by M. S. Silk in M. S. S. (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic*, Oxford 1996, 499 n.6: (of elevated stylization in Tragedy) ‘it is symptomatic that P. T. Stevens in CEE should have thrown up so little that is demonstrably unelevated – and one tends to suspect that comparably systematic researches into the other tragedians would throw up as little and as much.’

A.2 and 3 The identification of colloquialisms until CEE.

A.2 The expressions listed by Stevens in his paper of 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 (= p. 15 above) Stevens largely dismissed Smereka's material from 'everyday' language as '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 about 120 expressions from Euripides; it included examples 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.

A.3 In fact Stevens in CEE omitted no fewer than 104 expressions from Amati's total of 144, and retained only 31 of Smereka's 175 locutions and words; he had however included in both the 1937 paper and CEE many expressions identified by neither Amati nor Smereka. In CEE he nevertheless omitted five or so expressions from 1937 and about ten from 1945, some of which I thought worth reconsidering for Tragedy both in 2005 and now here; in addition I have listed in Part II below (pp. 133–75) many words and expressions described variously as colloquial or everyday, and with varying confidence, by reviewers of CEE (see Collard 1978, Rubino 1982, Tarkow 1977, Thesleff 1978 and Van Looy 1977 in the Bibliography) and by subsequent scholars.

It was unfortunate that Fraenkel's scattered but important treatments of colloquial language during the 1960's either were not used by Stevens or remained unknown to him: see in the Bibliography Fraenkel's publications of 1962, 1963 and 1969 for the former, and for the latter under 1977, 1994 and MSS the working-notes and records of his seminars in Italy during 1965–9 (Foreword p. 9 above). Stevens would without question have owed as much to Fraenkel in expanding his material as I did in 2005 and do again in this revision.

B Stevens's progressive refinement of his definitions.

Stevens repeatedly debated the nature of colloquialism. His earlier definition, 'such words and phrases as might naturally be found in everyday conversation, but are avoided in distinctively poetic writing and informal or dignified prose' (1937, 182), was refined in CEE. There 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; note especially his words 'the kind of language that in a poetic or prosaic context would stand out however