CHAPTER FOURTEEN

NOTES ON THE PARODOS-SCENE IN EURIPIDES’ HERACLIDAE, 73–1171

In response to Iolaus’ cry for help, the chorus in Hcld. enter at a run (βοηδροµούντες, cf. 121), and the Parodos takes a form appropriate to that. Instead of choral song-and-dance, what follows, after an exceptionally brief non-strophic ‘entry’-passage, is an amoibaion first between the Chorus-leader and Iolaus, then between the Chorus-leader and Herald, musical only as featuring some ‘half-chanted’ sequences in the Chorus-leader’s utterances.

73–7. The ‘entry’:

ΧΟΡΟΣ
ἐὰ ἐκ τὸς ἑ βοη βωμοῦ πέλας
ἐστηκε; ποιαν συμφοράν δείξει τάχα;
ἳδετε τὸν γέροντ’ ἀμαλλὸν ἐπὶ πέδοι
χύμενον’ ὦ τάλας,

πρὸς τοῦ ποτ’ ἐν γῇ πτώμω δύστηνον πίννεις;

73–4 and 77, as iambic trimeters with Attic vocalization, are presumably spoken by the Chorus-leader. 73–4 might be interpreted as

ἐὰ ἐκ’ τὸς ἑ βοη βωμοῦ πέλας
ἐστηκε; – ποιαν συμφοράν δείξει τάχα;

and thereafter there might be speaker-changes before ἰδετε and before and/or after ὕ τάλας; but nothing in the pattern of the verses favours such fragmentation. Dochmiacs can combine with spoken iambics in the same sentence;2 and the continuity at 76–7 is like Hipp. 818–19...

1 CQ 41 (1991), 525–9. I am grateful to Dr J. Diggle for encouragement and helpful comments; also to the CQ referee who drew attention to some errors and inadequacies in the first draft submitted.

2 Cf. especially Hipp. 817–51; also Med. 1286–9, Hec. 1030–4, Or. 1353–60.

3 δ is a common length, which need not be divided (arbitrarily) as 2δ | δ or δ | 2δ or δ | δ | δ. For the expressive effect of the shift from dochmiacs to speech, cf. Barrett on Hipp. 817–51; note that in all these mixed passages (last n.) resolution is eschewed.
Diggle, after Murray, marks a lacuna of one iambic trimeter between 76 and 77, though nothing in the sense suggests that anything is missing at this point; nor, alternatively, between the question in 77 and the answer to it in 78–9, as Seidler had opined. The lacuna is postulated solely in accordance with Seidler’s determination of ‘strophe’ and ‘antistrophe’ as beginning at 75 and 95 respectively. In following Murray, Diggle surprisingly accepts the anomaly of 95–8 as being divided between Χορός and Iolaus, whereas 75–7 has no corresponding speaker-change. This runs counter to the rule of ‘symmetry of speakers’, in general recognized by Diggle, and most unlikely to have been breached in the first strophic pair.4

There is no reason, a priori, to expect the beginning of a strophe at 75. Why not rather (if the scene is strophic, which it need not be) at 73, given that the corresponding passages include trimeters as well as dochmiacs? And is it not odd prima facie to begin an antistrophe at 95, in the middle of the exchanges between Iolaus and the Chorus-Leader, rather than at 99 (see below), where the Herald steps in and replaces Iolaus in the dialogue?

78–117. The dialogue between Iolaus and the Chorus-Leader (78–98) has the pattern \( a - b^1 - a - c - a - b^2 - a - c - a \) (\( a = \) two trimeters); that between the Herald and the Chorus-Leader (99–119) begins \( a - b^1 - a - c - a \) … (continuing with trimeters only). Prima facie, if we are looking for strophe and antistrophe, this is the place at which to begin our search.

The shorter Χο. utterances (c) are straightforward ετίχοι (printable uno versu) of three dochmiacs, like 75–6 above, but now self-contained:

86–7  ὄνομα τι ζε, γέρον, Μυκηναῖος ὁ-νόμαζεν λεώς;
95–6  τί χρέος; ἢ λόγων πόλεος, ἕνεπε μοι, μελόμενοι τυχεῖν;
107–8  ὄθεν ἤκέλαιον μεθείναι πόλει ξένων προστροπάν (see below).

It may be observed that 107–8 has syllabic correspondence with 86–7, and 95–6 with 75–6. That might be fortuitous, but see further below.

The other Χο. utterances (\( b^1, b^2 \)) are iambic-dochmiac, with a shift

---

4 A few exceptions to the rule have been claimed; see Collard, Supplices ii. 392–5, and my comm. Or., p. 105. But it remains a rule.