

Christopher Collard

Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy

Revised and enlarged edition of P. T. Stevens's
Colloquial Expressions in Euripides

HERMES

Klassische Philologie

EINZELSCHRIFT 113

Franz Steiner Verlag



Christopher Collard
Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy

Einzelchriften

Herausgeber:

PROF. DR. JAN-WILHELM BECK, Universität Regensburg, Institut
für Klassische Philologie, Universitätsstr. 31, 93053 Regensburg
(verantwortlich für Latinistik)

PROF. DR. KARL-JOACHIM HÖLKESKAMP, Universität zu Köln,
Historisches Institut – Alte Geschichte, 50923 Köln
(verantwortlich für Alte Geschichte)

PROF. DR. MARTIN HOSE, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München,
Fakultät für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften, Griechische und Lateinische
Philologie, Schellingstr. 3 (VG), 80799 München
(verantwortlich für Gräzistik)

Band 113

Christopher Collard

Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy

Revised and enlarged edition of P.T. Stevens's
Colloquial Expressions in Euripides



Franz Steiner Verlag

Umschlagbild: Statue des Hermes / röm. Kopie, Vatikan
akg-images / Tristan Lafranchis

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
<<http://dnb.d-nb.de>> abrufbar.

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist unzulässig und strafbar.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2018

Druck: Offsetdruck Bokor, Bad Tölz

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-515-12055-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-515-12056-2 (E-Book)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	9
INTRODUCTION I	
Stevens's Introduction to CEE (1976, 1–9) (unchanged)	15
INTRODUCTION II	
(revised from Collard, Supplement 2005, 351–60)	23
A.1 Stevens's definitions of the colloquial and methodology of presenting expressions in CEE maintained in this revised edition. ..	23
A.2 and 3 The identification of colloquialisms until CEE	24
B Stevens's progressive refinement of his definitions.	24
C.1 Other scholars' definitions and discussions subsequent to CEE.	25
C.2 Some particular aspects: satyric drama; vulgarisms; diminutives; direct speech 'within' speech; particles; proverbs and the like; colloquialisms in Latin.	30
D.1 and .2 State of the discussion; range of comparative evidence adduced by scholars.	34
D.3 The tragedians' use of colloquialisms: (1) 'clustering' in context; (2) a means of characterization?	35
D.4 Summary appraisal of Sections D.1–3 above; consequences for this revised edition	37
E Broad differences between the three tragedians.	39

COLLOQUIAL EXPRESSIONS

PART I	40
A. Exaggeration: emphasis	40
B. Pleonastic or lengthened forms of expression	56
C. Understatement: irony	61
D. Brevity: ellipse	66
E. Interjections and expressions used to attract attention or maintain contact	78
F. Particles	98
G. Metaphorical expressions	109
H. Miscellaneous	113
I. Colloquial forms and syntax	126

PART II

Expressions which seem not to match Stevens's criteria convincingly	133
A. Exaggeration; emphasis	133
C. Understatement; irony	140
D. Brevity; ellipse	142
E. Interjections and expressions used to attract mention or maintain contact	146
F. Particles	149
G. Metaphorical expressions	152
H. Miscellaneous	155
I. Colloquial forms and syntax	170

APPENDIX TO PART II

Expressions which seem not to meet Stevens's criteria, including some for which compelling comparative evidence is very thin or lacking	176
A. Exaggeration: emphasis	176
B. Pleonastic or lengthened forms of expression	176
C. Understatement; irony	176
E. Interjections and expressions used to attract attention or maintain contact	177
G. Metaphorical Expressions	177
H. Miscellaneous	177
I. Syntax	180

ADDITIONAL NOTES AND CHAPTERS

1. TWO NOTES, ON VOCABULARY AND METAPHOR SOMETIMES ATTRIBUTED TO COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE (expanded from Collard 2005, 374–5, 379–80)	182
2. DISTRIBUTION AND DRAMATIC SIGNIFICANCE OF COLLOQUIAL EXPRESSIONS (expanded from Stevens's Note, CEE 64–5)	185
3. STYLISTIC AND DRAMATIC SIGNIFICANCE OF COLLOQUIAL EXPRESSIONS: SPOKEN DIALOGUE ONLY (expanded from Stevens's Note, CEE 66–8)	194
A. Clusters of expressions – and infrequencies, even absences, of expressions – in Euripides and Sophocles	195
B. Characterization by means of colloquial expressions?	206
B.1 Mortals: ordinary or subservient persons	208
B.2 Gods	212

BIBLIOGRAPHY	214
followed by	
A Note on A. López Eire's <i>La lengua coloquial de la comedia</i>	
<i>aristofanica</i> (Universidad de Murcia 1996).....	217
An Orientation, for both Greek and Latin drama.....	218
 AFTERWORD	 220
 INDEXES.....	 221
1 (a) Greek words and expressions classified as colloquial in Part I	
and possibly colloquial in Part II	221
(b) Linguistic phenomena or usages, and syntax, similarly	
classified and located, and phenomena discussed elsewhere	224
2 Other Greek words and expressions; Latin words and expressions..	226
3 General: aspects and issues; (selected) scholars' names.....	228
4 <i>Indices locorum</i>	
(a) Locations in Tragedy of expressions and usages	
in Parts I and II.....	231
(b) Other places in Tragedy (selected).....	252
(c) Other references (selected).....	255

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This revised and enlarged edition of Stevens's *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 38, Wiesbaden 1976) aspires to something more than its simple combination with my 'Colloquial Language in Tragedy: A Supplement to the Work of P. T. Stevens' (*CQ* 55 (2005) 350–86).

It is important to the subject and its study, and a just recognition of Stevens's pioneering and convincing methodology, to reprint the Introduction to his 1976 monograph; for he had there refined his methods and definitions of the colloquial subsequently to his initial articles 'Colloquial Expressions in Euripides' (*CQ* 31 (1937) 182–91) and 'Colloquial Expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles' (*CQ* 39 (1945) 95–105). For consistency and convenience I use again here the abbreviated references to all three works which I employed in my *Supplement* of 2005: 1937 and 1945 for Stevens's two articles, CEE for his monograph of 1976.

It is also right that I repeat Stevens's acknowledgments in CEE, originally published as p. 1 n. 3a: 'I am grateful for the help and encouragement of a number of scholars, including the late J. D. Denniston, Professor H. Lloyd-Jones, and especially Professor K. J. Dover, who read the typescript and sent valuable comments.' These are names of great significance: see that of Dover in the Bibliography of this volume, listing his publications subsequent to CEE.

As to the Introduction to my 2005 *Supplement*, I repeat as much of it as seemed helpful, abridging or summarising some of the matter, or expanding it in the light of recent publications, or relocating some matter to this Foreword. My work in 2005 had benefited greatly from my access to unpublished material, which I need to describe again here.

First, I included many notes upon colloquial and everyday language left at his death by Eduard Fraenkel (1888–1970). They are in the archive of Corpus Christi College Oxford, where Mr Peter Brown of Trinity College had suggested to me that such notes might survive; and I repeat my gratitude to the President and Fellows of Corpus for permission to transcribe or cite from them. In the Fraenkel Papers Box 12 there are two small notebooks which are devoted to the language of Sophocles, particularly the colloquial and the everyday, and to colloquial idioms of Iono-Attic dialect as precursors of the *koinê*. 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 particularly: see the bibliography by N. Horsfall, *JRS* 66 (1976) 200–5 and the survey by L. E. Rossi in Fraenkel 1977, xviii–xvi.

Second, I drew extensively upon the unpublished Oxford DPhil 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. I remain extremely grateful to Dr Waś for allowing me to cite, if mostly by summary page-references, his detailed, judicious and still important work; I summarise it at Introduction II C.1 p. 26 below.

In reproducing Stevens's lists of expressions I have checked, corrected (and very occasionally deleted) and updated all references to primary texts, especially for dramatic fragments: both Snell-Radt-Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* and Kassel-Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* began publication after 1976. For the complete plays I have everywhere checked references against the new Oxford Classical Texts by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson for Sophocles, by Diggle for Euripides, and by Wilson for Aristophanes; for Aeschylus, Page's *OCT* edition remains, but I have depended largely upon the subsequent Teubner edition of West and the Loeb edition of Sommerstein; for Menander I continue Stevens's use of Sandbach's *OCT*. I reproduce these editors' indications of inauthenticity, usually by repeating their square brackets [...]. For Stevens's references to secondary literature I have checked and corrected almost all items, having to pass up those few which were unavailable in Oxford or difficult for me to consult for single references except at unreasonable cost to my time and energy; accordingly there may be an error or two among CEE nn. 5 Gautier, 17 Devries, 30 and 63 Lammermann, 52 Rudberg, Kühning, 71 Kuenzi, 100 Spitzer, 146 Stahl. I have done the same checking for my 2005 *Supplement*, again as thoroughly as I could; my apologies for any escapees apprehended.

I have been able to add further material, especially for Sophocles on the basis of Fraenkel's MSS and of my own reading of the plays; I comment on this unexpected expansion in the course of the book. References to dramatic texts, the primary evidence, have in general increased, but also to discussions in secondary literature. The former are divided as in my 2005 *Supplement* into two parts according to their match or otherwise with Stevens's criteria; note in particular that where I have added expressions to Stevens's own list, particularly in Part I below, I signal them with an asterisk. I have retained Stevens's headings of each category of phenomena, A, B, C and so on; but Stevens seldom himself refers by means of such headings and his numbering of individual expressions; and I do not recall seeing them used by others citing CEE (including myself in 2005), only page-numbers. I have nevertheless not been as confident as in 2005 in suggesting further expressions (see Introd. II Section D.4 p. 37); I have demoted a number from both CEE itself and 2005 from Part I to Part II (and to its Appendix).

I must emphatically repeat my *caveat* from 2005, 351 I.A.1 end: 'I do not, of course, anywhere pretend to completeness'; that is neither sensible nor possible in a work of this kind. It is certain that I have missed some examples, particularly among particles and pronouns, and likely that I have missed some work published before 2014, let alone afterwards. Furthermore, I hope that this revision may itself be open to supplement from further significant recoveries of dramatic texts upon papyrus.

Some guidance on my presentation of material.

Use of the first person singular. Only in Stevens's reprinted Introduction and its Notes 1–30, and in his Notes on Distribution and Significance at CEE 64–8 which I have reproduced, does the first person refer to him. In the rest of the book I substitute his name or anonymize him, and the first person points to myself.

Footnotes. After Stevens's n. 20, I have begun intercalating footnotes of my own where convenient or necessary; all subsequent notes are numbered in sequence from 21, both those original to Stevens and my new ones, but I reproduce Stevens's number in brackets, e. g. ³² (= CEE n. 30). I have however sometimes added matter to Stevens's notes, and it will usually be obvious where.

Abbreviations of poets' names and play-names. A. stands for Aeschylus, S. for Sophocles, E. for Euripides; minor tragedians are unabbreviated. For both Tragedy and Comedy the names of complete plays are abbreviated in conventional style; the *Supplices* of Aeschylus and Euripides, and the *Electra* of Sophocles and Euripides, are always given their poet's abbreviated name. Fragmentary plays are normally given their full title in the main text, together with their fragment-numbers in *TrGF*; in the Indexes they appear as sub-headings followed by their fragment-numbers.

Listing of expressions. In Parts I and II (pp. 40–175) I repeat the format described by Stevens in his Introduction to CEE pp. 8–9 (= p. 21–2) and used by him throughout. For Tragedy I have kept the first place which he gave Euripides when he listed examples of expressions, followed by Aeschylus and separately the *Prometheus Vincitus*, then Sophocles, the *Rhesus*, the *Tragici Minores* and finally the *Adespota*. In the Appendix to Part II (176–81) I follow no fixed format, but depend on the nature of the material. Some expressions appear both in the main listing and in discussion elsewhere.

In Parts I and II my listing for Tragedy of individual expressions or usages is generally as complete as I can make it, except for a very few, usually particles, which are so frequent that full exemplification would yield no benefit. Where a Greek 'question-mark' (:) would normally precede an English semi-colon (;) within an entry, I put only the Greek mark, and follow it with a comma if the sentence continues; I use no punctuation after the Greek mark if a new sentence follows it.

I introduce two symbols prefixed to expressions and usages listed in Parts I and II (but not those in the Appendix to Part II). These are an asterisk, indicating an addition to Stevens's material (already mentioned above), and a question-mark indicating my doubt that an expression is securely located in that Part; such question-marks in Part I suggest possible demotion to Part II, and those in Part II demotion to the Appendix. A question-mark sometimes also prefixes a poet or play, indicating an insecure attribution, or an unconfidently classified formal context (see next paragraph).

Formal context. In what I hope is a useful improvement upon Stevens's method, and one which scholars have sometimes desiderated, in Parts I and II I insert after each Tragic text-reference for an expression its formal context; and I sometimes briefly describe that context. These contexts are indicated as follows:

st(ichomythia), single or double; I indicate separate speakers not with their abbreviated names (as Stevens did), but with two short dashes (--) for each, and just occasionally letters (A, B, C) where there are three speakers in the example cited.

di(alogue), an irregular conversation in which an individual spoken utterance seldom exceeds three or four lines. In many cases, especially in Sophocles, it is hard to distinguish a loose stichomythic structure from the uneven and often brisk form of a more 'natural' exchange;

rh(esis), which is usually at least five to six lines long, and feels a little 'separate' in its context; rheseis longer than about ten lines almost always feel, and often very clearly are, detached; many are part of a protracted discussion or argument, some are monologues, others are messenger-speeches;

anap(aests), intoned as 'recitative', not lyric or 'melic' anapaests;

lyr(ic), continuous, strophic, astrophic or monodic;

lyr(ic) **di**(alogue), a term necessarily wide in scope: dialogue between two or more chorus-members, or between chorus (or its leader, *coryphaeus*) and individual play-character; but also dialogue between a lyric voice, whether choral or individual, and a speaking voice, or sometimes the reverse (such dialogue is usually termed 'epirrhetic').

This innovation, the indication of formal context, brings two advantages, I hope: first, a look at Index 4 (a) (an *Index locorum* recording occurrences in Tragedy of expressions and usages listed in Parts I and II) will reveal clear or apparent concentrations or 'clusterings' within a play (a topic I deal with in Chapters 2 and 3: see below); these will be within an episode or scene or even an anapaestic or lyric passage; second, it will show where expressions and usages clearly identified as colloquial in Part I intermingle with those uncertainly identified in Part II, so that greater confidence in colloquial status may perhaps be suggested for the latter.

Citing of scholars' names. At the end (usually) of the entry for each expression I often cite explicit judgements of colloquial status by scholars, or its denial. Where no such judgements are attached, acceptance by the scholars named is not necessarily to be inferred, only a discussion indicated.

Additional Notes and Chapters. Within Chapters 2 and 3 I explain how I have greatly expanded Stevens's two brief Notes on Distribution and Significance (CEE 64–5 and 66–8), with matter and discussion of my own which is often more subjective than his. I hope that users will apply their own judgement to these chapters in the same way as I invite them, as Stevens did, to assess for themselves the claim to colloquial status of the many expressions I have added in my Part II. I repeat this hope in my Introduction A.1 and D.4 and yet again in my Afterword.

Indexes. These are set out and numbered on the Contents page:

- 1 (a). Greek words and expressions classified as colloquial in Part I and as possibly colloquial in Part II. References are to Sections A to I within them, followed by a page-number. Question-marks prefixing 'Part I' suggest possible demotion to Part II, and those prefixing 'Part II' demotion to its Appendix: e.g. Ἀπολλων in surprise I.H 114; ἀρχαῖος derogatory ?II.G 153.

- 1 (b). Linguistic phenomena or usages, and syntax, classified and located as in Index 1 (a), and phenomena discussed elsewhere: Greek words and expressions in the Appendix to Part II which I judge not to be colloquial, and those in the section Two Notes on Vocabulary and Metaphor; also other words and expressions in any part of the book.
2. Other Greek words and expressions; Latin words and expressions.
3. General matters and issues, and (selected) scholars' names.
4. *Indices locorum*
 - (a) Locations in Tragedy of expressions and usages in Parts I and II. These have the form: poet's name, play-name and/or fragment number (from *TrGF*), line-number, formal context, Greek expression or usage, location by Part or Appendix (see under Index 1 (a) and (b) above), page-number; sometimes a further page-number where the expression or usage is discussed or mentioned elsewhere. E.g. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1042 ρη εἰ δ' οὐν ?II.D 144; 43 Critias, *Pirithous* F 7.12 πῶς δοκεῖς; I.E 90.
 - (b) Other places in Tragedy (selected).
 - (c) Other references (selected).

Now that this book is finished, I cite with some feeling:

Wie schwierig und undankbar es ist, ein fremdes Werk so zu bearbeiten, wie es einerseits die Pietät für den Verfasser, andererseits die eigene wissenschaftliche Überzeugung verlangt, weiss ein jeder, der einmal in ähnlicher Lage gewesen ist.

B. Gerth, *Vorwort*, R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre I*, Hannover 1898².

and:

Inevitably, in carrying out a revision of this kind one is faced with two temptations: to add material of one's own, and to modify interpretations of the author's with which one disagrees. The second temptation was naturally not very strong in the case of this book, and where it arose I resisted it ... The first temptation has not been entirely resisted.

K. J. Dover, *Preface*, J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954².

Both these quotations should be read against my personal esteem for Stevens and respect for his work and judgement which I record in n. 34 on p. 24, and which in fact grew as I progressed in this revision and despite my great expansion of his last two Notes (CEE 64–8).

And some acknowledgements.

My gratitude goes first and chiefly to Franz Steiner Verlag and the editors of *Hermes Einzelschriften*, especially Prof. Martin Hose, for accepting my proposal of this new edition, and to their Classics editor Katharina Stüdemann and production editor Andrea Hoffmann for goodwill and efficiency. I am grateful too that as copyright-holder of Stevens's CEE Franz Steiner Verlag willingly gave permission to revise this standard work.

I gladly acknowledge permission from Cambridge University Press, on behalf of the copyright-holder The Classical Association, to reprint or adapt matter drawn

from my paper ‘Colloquial Expressions in Tragedy: a *Supplement* to the Work of P.T. Stevens’, published in *CQ* 55 (2005) 350–86. That paper had its distant origin in my review of Stevens in *CR* 28 (1978) 224–6, a few parts of which I had repeated in 2005 with the permission of Oxford University Press.

Warm thanks go to Prof. Richard Kannicht for raising the whole idea of this book long ago, in a friendly response to my 2005 *Supplement*, and now to Dr. Almut Fries for valuable suggestions and help during my preparation.

The Queen’s College, Oxford
January 2018

Christopher Collard

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 φάσανον 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 μολεῖν⁵, it cannot have sounded unfamiliar. It is given to an Athenian in Ar. *Eq.* 21 ff., in order to lead up to the compound αὐτομολεῖν, 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 Ἀργεῶν 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 πράσσεις; 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), βούλῃσις (*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 χρόνεται, 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 γενναῖος εἰ "You're very good" (thanking for the loan of a razor) is probably a colloquial exaggeration, but the same phrase γενναία γὰρ εἰ 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 χωρίον '(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 *χαίρειν λέγω* see below Part I Section C p. 65). Cf. also *παχὺς* 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 *ἀφικνουμαι ὡς τὸν καὶ τὸν*: see W.L. De Vries, *Ethopoia, 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 γείτονος 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 γρὺ*, 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 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 ἄταρ 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 δήπου 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 δὴ; 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 ὁρθῶς 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

slightly as having a distinctively conversational flavour' (4 = p. 17 above). 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.³⁶ Stevens's discussion and categories in CEE acknowledged a debt to Thesleff 1967, 63–80; and for imagery they compared well with the views of Taillardat 13–14, in his remarkable study of Aristophanes, which Stevens apparently did not use³⁷. For Taillardat, such images are those frequent in Comedy and occasional in prose writers – and found in some poets, especially Euripides; and Stevens's rather meagre list of metaphors (CEE 49–51) can be expanded from Taillardat³⁸. 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 Two Notes on Vocabulary and Metaphor on p. 182.

C.1 Other scholars' definitions and discussions subsequent to CEE.

I record here some general definitions and discussions, often illustrative, of the 'colloquial' subsequent to that of Stevens, in order of time (I both reduce and supplement, or transfer, parts of Section I.C.1 of 2005, 353–5).

First, two reviewers of CEE. Van Looy 1977 noted the sometimes precarious nature of definitions which 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'; he was one of the first classicists, as far as I have found, to observe that 'colloquial' is too unsatisfactory a term or category to employ in modern linguistic theory (see

36 (= *Supplement* 2005, 352 n. 4) Bers 1997, 136–47, at 137 nevertheless sets 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 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 (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.' I have noted many judgements by Bers in their place.

Two brief notes upon prose authors admitted as criteria by Stevens: (1) R. Heni, *Die Gespräche bei Herodot.* Heilbronn 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; (2) Thesleff 1967, 65–6 analysed *Laches* 194c–6a as a sample of Plato's colloquial style 'having a light and easy tone with many shifts of emphasis and tendency to brevity and slackness of exposition, and marked use of idioms'; for *Republic* and *Phaedrus* see De Vries. On prose authors generally see Dover 1987, 16–30.

37 Taillardat was favourably reviewed by Dover 1987, 283–7.

38 The same desideration was made in Rubino's 1982 review of CEE, citing Fraenkel 1977, 25–37.