



**HAL**  
open science

## The Mask of Troy. When tragic fiction gives way to reality (Euripides, TW 1322-1324)

Pascale Brillet-Dubois

► **To cite this version:**

Pascale Brillet-Dubois. The Mask of Troy. When tragic fiction gives way to reality (Euripides, TW 1322-1324). “ Greek theatre and metatheatre. Definitions, Problems, Limits ”, Nov 2018, Bâle, Switzerland. halshs-03381844

**HAL Id: halshs-03381844**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03381844v1>**

Submitted on 18 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The Mask of Troy  
(Euripides, *TW* 1322-1324)

When it comes to Euripides's *Trojan Women*, metatheatres tends to be confused with metapoetry. The play's structure, which at first sight seems straightforward, to the point that it has been deemed too linear or undramatic, does not attract much attention, whereas allusions to the Muse and to new hymns in the first stasimon, as well as other self-reflexive songs and dances, are at the core of an important discussion about the specificity of tragic lament.<sup>1</sup> I will therefore seek to contribute to this volume's debate on metatheatres by focusing on aspects of dramaturgy and performance that do not imply only language or reference to poetry but potentially also spectacular and complex effects combining different medias and appealing to all senses.<sup>2</sup> I hope to demonstrate that this play's metatheatricality makes it much more theatrical in fact than has been so far established.

*The Trojan Women* was performed in 415 BC at the Great Dionysia, a few months after the sack of Melos and after several months of debates about the expedition to Sicily. In my reading, which is based on a renewed analysis of its poetics and staging, this play is not only a universal and poignant representation of war's impact on a community,<sup>3</sup> but also a highly topical work referring to contemporary events in front of an audience composed of the Athenians, their allies and very probably, seated in the front rows, the Egestan ambassadors who have arrived in Athens at the end of the winter.<sup>4</sup> By competing in the *agôn* of the Dionysia, Euripides offers this most elaborate tragedy to Dionysos in order, I believe, to obtain the god's protection for his city prone to impiety and *hubris* in its leadership of the Delian league. He also appeals to his fellow citizens for purification of the crimes committed in Melos and for caution in the hazardous conquest of Sicily.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Tr.* 511-512. See Torrance (2013), 218-245, and before her Segal (1993), Loraux (1999).

<sup>2</sup> This paper is a small part of the dramaturgical commentary I am devoting to Euripides' *Trojan Women*, to be published in the *Commentario* collection of the Belles Lettres.

<sup>3</sup> See for example Poole (1976), di Benedetto (1992), Loraux (1999), Dué (2006).

<sup>4</sup> *Thuc.* 6,8. A lot has been written on Euripides and Athenian history. Though I often disagree with the systematic historicist approach of Delebecque (1951) and Goossens (1962), I find that their postulate – Euripides stages myths and characters that are related to contemporary events – has been discarded rather than refuted (see for example Zuntz (1972) which has been influential in the debate). I do not agree with the argument that the poet did not have the time to compose his tragedy between the sack of Melos (autumn of 416) and the Dionysia (early spring of 415) nor to take into the account the idea of an expedition to Sicily, for 1) Euripides was used to composing at least four plays a year, 2) Thucydides reports that debates about sailing to Sicily had started before winter.

To this end, he makes a complex use of the Trojan fiction, inviting the Athenians to a double identification. On the one hand, as the descendants of the Theseids who participated in the Trojan war, and as sackers of cities, they can easily relate to the Greek victors to whom Ilion's captives are allotted. On the other hand, Euripides assimilates the Athenians to the Trojan women by different means, so that Troy becomes an *exemplum* of the catastrophe that might await them, notwithstanding their present greatness, should they be defeated in the Peloponnesian war.<sup>5</sup> The relationship of the Trojan myth to Athens' recent history is thus comparable to the one created by the actors' masks, which cover Athenian heads with the faces of sometimes Trojan, sometimes Greek characters. My hypothesis is that in this play more than in others, Euripides does not allow the audience to give themselves up to the distraction of the performance nor to forget the reality beneath the mask and maintains a degree of self-awareness. I will try to demonstrate this by commenting on a few elements of the prologue and the *exodos*, which are the moments when Euripides puts his mask of words on the Athenian theatre and finally takes it off to confront his fellow citizens to the spectacle of their own reality. I will thus be focusing, as O. Taplin put it during the conference, on transitions between the diffused performance and the core-performance.

Poseidon is the first speaking character to appear on stage. A woman lies there whom he will soon designate as Hecuba for the benefit of “whoever wishes to look” (εἴ τις εἰσορᾶν θέλει, l. 36) – thus establishing a relation of connivance with the other onlookers in the *theatron*. As for him, he is probably easy to recognize thanks to his costume and attributes, thanks also to the fact that he appears on the roof of the *skene*, so his name is not delayed (ἦκω λιπῶν Αἰγαῖον ἄλμυρὸν βάθος / πόντου Ποσειδῶν : “I am Poseidon, and I have come here from the briny depths of the Aegean”, l. 1-2).<sup>6</sup> He then sets to disguise the space, if I may say so. The location of the drama, designated by a deictic, will be the Trojan land (τήνδε Τρωικὴν χθόνα, v. 4). We can not be sure that the actor gestured to underline his words, but the simple fact of his standing up on the roof to pronounce them includes at least the lower part of the *theatron* in the range of the deictic. Then he mentions “these roofs” (ὑπὸ στέγαις / ταῖσδε, v. 32-33), which turns the *skene* into one of the tents in the Greek camp where the Trojan captives are held. However, the plural and the emphasis laid on the deictic by the enjambment may imply reference to a larger space including the other rooftop visible to the audience, that of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Croally (1994), Brillet-Dubois (2010).

<sup>6</sup> I have made free use of D. Kovacs's translation in this paper.

recently built Odeon, which happens to be modelled on the tent of Xerxes.<sup>7</sup> Pericles conceived it as a monument to the defeat of the king of Persia and had it erected at the bottom of the acropolis that he had sacked. This hypothesis seems all the more likely that not all the Trojan women mentioned by Poseidon l. 32-35 will enter the stage through the door of the *skene* : the chariot carrying Andromache, her son and her spouse's spoils will arrive from the tent of Neoptolemus using one of the *eisodoi*.<sup>8</sup> If I am right, then it is the complex of buildings facing the audience that is defined as the stage set. Euripides would be thus subtly calling attention to Xerxes, the fallen sacker of Athens, as Poseidon proceeds to denounce the crimes of the Greeks and foretell their punishment.

Enunciation enhances these processes of identification as the god, l. 45, addresses in the second person the *polis* and its walls and bids them farewell. Now *polis*, to an Athenian ear, can designate both a political group of citizens and, much more specifically, Athens' acropolis. The character facing not only this acropolis and its walls but also the crowd of the Athenians might thus seem to be addressing Athens, and from there, it is not only the *orchestra*, the *skene* and the Odeon which constitute the setting of the play, but the whole theatre and the hill behind it.

The way Euripides uses the mythical tradition complements these enunciative phenomena. In accordance with homeric *epos*, the god reminds the audience that he and Apollo have built Troy's walls (l. 4-6). In the *Iliad*, though, this episode was the starting point of Poseidon's unquenchable hatred towards the Trojans.<sup>9</sup> Here, on the contrary, the god makes the most surprising statement: since he has completed this labor, he has felt nothing but benevolence towards them (εὖνοι(α), l. 7, is delayed and emphasized by the enjambment). This innovation, which might be ironically and metapoetically signalled by the use of the word *kanon* just before the playwright bends the tradition, has never been actually interpreted, even though Euripides's mythical twist is as paradoxical as if in a World War II fiction Hitler appeared to say he had always been a great friend of the Poles! In fact, it turns Poseidon into the defeated opponent of Hera and Athena, as he admits l. 24-25, which greatly affects the interpretation of the spectacle. For when Athena appears next to her uncle in the second part of the divine

---

<sup>7</sup> Plut. *Per.* 13, 9.

<sup>8</sup> The examination of entrances and exits in the play allows us to consider that Euripides chose the Western *eisodos* – which in real Athens led to the Piraeus – as the way to reach the off-stage Greek ships. Andromache, who crosses the *orchestra* before leaving Troy to embark, would therefore be coming from the Eastern *eisodos* and the vicinity of the Odeon.

<sup>9</sup> *Il.* 21,458-460.

prologue, she forms with him a pair of former enemies who have fought over a city and now switch alliances to punish its victors.

Both visually and thematically, this tableau resembles the imagery of the conflict over Attica. I believe we can even go further and see here a visual allusion to one specific image, that of the recently finished pediment of the Parthenon. In order to explain my reasoning, I need to go back a few lines. When Poseidon explains how Troy was taken and mentions the wooden horse, he adds two strange lines which refer to the present of the audience (ὄθεν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὑστέρων κεκλήσεται / δούρειος ἵππος, κρυπτὸν ἀμπισχῶν δόρυ: “whence among later men, it will be called the *doureios* horse, for it held in its flanks a hidden spear (*doru*)”, l. 13-14).<sup>10</sup> The *doureios hippos* is known, thanks to Aristophanes, Pausanias and archeology, to be a colossal statue of the Trojan horse erected on the platform of the Acropolis some time just before 415.<sup>11</sup> It represented the Athenian heroes hidden inside the wooden device, but visible at little windows. Ἀνδρῶν ὑστέρων, then, refers to no other than the Athenians, whom Euripides invites to mentally relocate on the Acropolis for a brief moment while the present intrudes into the mythical past. This short but brutal journey prepares the audience to identify the scene formed by Poseidon and Athena, standing above the door of the *skene* where a pediment would be if the facade had one : it is a replica of the Parthenon's West pediment, the one that faces whoever enters the Acropolis and walks past the *doureios hippos* towards the great building.

As we can see, the prologue's communication situation, its mythical and visual effects concur so that the Athenian audience is associated to an ambiguous, both glorious and excessive victory over Troy, as well as to the great fallen city. The whole play explores this reversal of victory and defeat, this exchange of roles between conquerors and conquered.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, the poet incorporates to his tragic fiction a set of references to recent realities, events, objects, buildings, which makes the process of dramatic illusion more complex and keeps at least some of the spectators aware of the time and place of the performance, just as the specificities of an actor's voice or figure might prevent the audience from forgetting his presence under the mask.

---

<sup>10</sup> These lines have been suppressed by most editors since Burges, according to the scholiast's judgement that the etymological figure is a weak one and to the postulate that tragedy, unlike comedy, never breaches dramatic illusion. *Contra* Parmentier (1923).

<sup>11</sup> Ar. *Birds*, 1128 and schol. ad. v.; Paus. 1,23,8; Raubitschek (1949), n° 176, p. 208-209.

<sup>12</sup> Croally (1994).

There are many other poetic and visual ways in which Euripides suggests in the course of the tragedy that his Trojan drama is also or actually an Athenian and Melian one, but they exceed the limits of this paper, so I will skip straight to the second part of the *exodos*, which in the circular construction of the play echoes the prologue in many ways. Once Astyanax has been mourned and taken away for burial, only Hecuba and the women of the chorus remain to be led away. Talthybios the herald warns them that they must leave to the Greek ships when the trumpet rings (l. 1266-1267) and that the queen must follow Odysseus' men (l. 1269-1271). But before that, he orders his soldiers to set Troy's acropolis on fire for the last time (l. 1260-1264).

It is not easy to determine where those fires are located in the theatre – in the event that they are to be seen and not merely imagined. The chorus calls attention to them and Hecuba tries to precipitate herself in the flames to die with her city. So either they are lit in the back of the audience, at the top of the *theatron*, and the assimilation between Athens' and Troy's sacred hills is made even more obvious than before, or we must assume that the stage set changes and that the function of the *skene* switches to represent Troy instead of the Greek tents.<sup>13</sup> However bold and original, this option is not to be excluded. The change would occur line 1256 between two sets of choral anapests and the fires would be lit either inside or on the roof of the building. The reversal from Agamemnon's tent to the Trojan acropolis would be consistent with the reflexive relation between victory and defeat that is constantly suggested in the rest of the play. As for Hecuba's attempt to enter the building lit by flames, it would be a neat reminder of Cassandra's exit in the first episode, for the torches she waved had Talthybios worry that the Trojan slaves might try to commit suicide (l. 298-303). With this choice of staging, the audience facing Troy would have to adopt Poseidon's perspective in the prologue. This is, as will soon become clear, the reason why I have a slight preference for this hypothesis.

Be it as it may, the combination of the fire and of the dispersal of the women indicates the end of Troy (l. 1277-1280), and more specifically the disappearance of its name (τὸ κλεινὸν ὄνομα' ἀφαιρήσῃ τάχα: “you will soon be deprived of your illustrious name!”, l. 1278). As Hecuba sees it, once the captives are scattered and the city burned to the ground, there will be no Trojan community left, and no recognizable location that might still bear the name of Troy. Yet the use of ἀφαιρέω, “to take off or away”, allows the spectators to hear also something

---

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion, see Lee (1976), Biehl (1989) *ad. v.*

else: these two actions prepare the moment when the stage will lose its fictitious and temporary name and the mask of Troy will be taken off.

At this point starts the final *kommos*, which is a poignant song of farewell. Hecuba, who has been prevented by the Greek soldiers from committing suicide, implores Zeus, asking whether he sees Troy's sufferings. Then she kneels down to call upon the Earth and the dead, and the women of the chorus join her. Finally, she addresses the temples of the gods and the city, echoing Poseidon in the prologue (l. 45-47), before being set in motion by a noise.

The song presents certain metrical and enunciative peculiarities that have been considered anomalous and corrected by all modern editors, starting with Seidler and Kirchhoff in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. The composition is a complex one indeed. At first sight, the song comprises first a non strophic section<sup>14</sup> yet divided in two as is underlined by the duplication of ὄττοτοτοτοτοῖ (1287~1294), then a pair of strophes which, if one considers the text of the manuscripts, do not strictly abide by the rules of the *responsio*. There are a few metrical flaws, some of which are likely to be errors, but the most remarkable thing is that cues are not distributed evenly between the strophe and the antistrophe. As Enrico Medda justly points out, in this type of matter, manuscripts are not to be blindly trusted as the habit of indicating changes of speakers is a late one, yet he also stresses the fact that editors' decisions are guided by the idea they have of what is going on on stage.<sup>15</sup> In this case, according to a normative conception of the *responsio* and of the place of the chorus in the *exodos*, Seidler and Kirchhoff, followed by all subsequent editors, assumed against the unanimous tradition that the manuscripts omitted character names in places, even though they do signal them elsewhere. They redistributed the cues in order to obtain the same pattern in both strophes and to have the chorus say the last lines of the tragedy, which is the general habit at least in the remaining plays as we know them.<sup>16</sup> But apart from the fact that the final *kommos* does not go by what we have come to define as the conventions of the genre, there is nothing inconsistent in the text as it is transmitted by the manuscripts.<sup>17</sup> So the actual question here is that of the poet's liberty to create significant effects by disturbing the *responsio* and the audience's expectations. What if modern editors were more inclined in the present case than medieval copyists to normalizing rather than interpreting the unordinary? What if the *lectio difficilior* was preferable?

---

<sup>14</sup> Biehl (1989) largely rewrites the text to create a strophic structure.

<sup>15</sup> Medda (2013), 287.

<sup>16</sup> Among the plays whose final lines present no textual nor cue-related issues, only *Prom. B.* and *Ag.* have characters other than the chorus speak last.

<sup>17</sup> See the appendix showing the text of P.

As a matter of fact, Seidler's and Kirchhoff's corrections conflict with another principle of composition of the song: the ring composition of lines 1285 to 1332. A close look at the text of manuscript P, considered by many editors as our best source, reveals that the cues, regardless of their length, are distributed in a symmetrical fashion. Talthybios's initial injunctions are repeated in the imperative form in the last lines, the difference being that Hecuba regains some dignity by commanding her own limbs to carry her, whereas the herald ordered the guards to escort her. Then each of the queen's and the chorus's cues is echoed in reverse order after l. 1310. Themes and wordings are also repeated : a question to an audience (1290~1325), the disappearance of Troy (οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔστι Τροία: 1292~1323-24), blazing Ilion turning into an invisible name (Λέλαμπεν Ἴλιος: 1295~Ἵνομα δὲ γὰρ ἀφανὲς εἶσιν: 1322), smoke flying up in the air (1298~1320), fire and spear (1300-1301~1318), a call to the dead children mirrored by a call to the dead husband (1302-1304~1312-1316), a double injunction from Hecuba to her companions (κλύετε, μάθετε: 1303~Ἀγόμεθα, φερόμεθα: 1310). At the heart of the structure are lines 1305-1309 in which the women of the chorus say that they are kneeling down to imitate their old queen and invoking the Earth. The disturbing thing is that this ring composition does not coincide with the strophic system, nor even with the limits of the song, as it comprises lines 1284-86 spoken by Talthybios. The *kommos*, in effect, is slightly off-center. My interpretation of this anomaly is that it allows and enhances an extraordinary metatheatrical effect.

Let us now focus on the chorus's last words as they appear in P. Lines 1318-1324 end with the sentence οὐδέ τ' ἔστιν / ἅ τάλαινα Τροία which echoes, as we have just seen, l. 1292 in the ring composition. Preceded by ὄνομα δὲ γὰρ ἀφανὲς εἶσιν· ἄλλα δ' / ἄλλο φροῦδον (“The name of our land will be invisible; it's all gone,/ scattered!”), it has a conclusive and final character. The shift from the future tense to the present stresses the completion of the name's gradual disappearance that started l. 1278.<sup>18</sup> Ashes and smoke have hidden Ilion and prevented its identification.<sup>19</sup> It is now an invisible, secret name. And as it is, l. 1324 is the last time Troy's name is pronounced in the play. The manuscripts have the reading οὐδέ τ(ε) ἔστιν, “and wretched Troy doesn't even exist”, which was later corrected into οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔστιν “and wretched Troy does not exist anymore”. To be true, there is no way, at the moment of performance, to draw a distinction between the two phrases. The audience might perceive a sentence concluding the tragedy of Troy's annihilation, a peak of tragic *pathos*, as well as a

<sup>18</sup> On closure words and completion, see in this volume Taplin, p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> See Wohl (2018).



metatheatrical statement about the non-existence of the mythical city enhancing the awareness that the tragedy was fictitious. Thus, as V. Wohl notices, language conveys the same kind of mixture of materiality and immateriality, absence and presence as smoke and ashes, which are and are not Troy<sup>20</sup> and the audience stands at this point in an intermediary zone between fiction and reality.

The play could end on this ambiguous line, if it were not for the strophic structure which implies that the tragedy is not over yet. Hecuba's questions follow (ἐμάθετ', ἐκλύετε; "Do you understand? Do you hear?", l. 1325), which correspond in the ring composition to her address to Zeus (Κρόνιε (...) /τάδ' οἶα πάσχομεν δέδορκας; "Son of Cronos, (...) do you see the things we suffer?", l. 1288-1290). At first, a reader may have the impression that the queen is asking about the chorus's last words, but she goes on by giving the two verbs an object, and it becomes clear that the performance implied the hearing of a thunderous noise: περγάμων κτύπων, "These are the sounds of Pergamon", κτύπων being emphasized, if we accept the manuscripts' text, by a syncope, or maybe preceded by γε as Seidler suggested. Then the word ἔνοσις narrows down the nature and meaning of this noise without however resolving its ambiguity: we do not know whether Hecuba is referring to the crash of the crumbling fortress, or to an earthquake shaking the city and expressing Poseidon's anger – for he is traditionally called ἐνοσίχθων –, or to the shaking produced by the captives' feet as they leave – for κτύπος can be said of the trampling of feet<sup>21</sup> and ὠθέω, from which ἔνοσις derives, means "to push someone forward". What we do know is what the noise corresponds to in the ring composition, for when Hecuba asked Zeus, the divine onlooker: δέδορκας; "Do you see?" – in itself a metatheatrical effect –, the Trojan women replied bitterly: Δέδορκεν. "He sees alright.", and went on lamenting the fact that Troy was nevertheless being destroyed. It would therefore be logical to find just before the mirroring questions "Do you understand, do you hear?" something that might at the same time confirm the presence of a divine audience, and express the city's final annihilation.

From the material point of view, I see three elements that might produce the sound. The most obvious one is the *bronteion*, this metallic instrument which makes a thunderous noise and according to Pollux is sometimes used to indicate a divine intervention.<sup>22</sup> Pessimistic spectators attuned to the despair expressed by the Trojan women can consider that they are hearing nothing but the fall of the mortal city and presume that the gods are indifferent. Or,

---

<sup>20</sup> Wohl (2018), 25-33.

<sup>21</sup> *Od.* 16,6. See also the κτυπέω, AR.

<sup>22</sup> Poll. 4,127.

remembering the prologue, they can attribute the noise to Poseidon, conclude that Hecuba's prayers are about to be answered (if not by Zeus, then by another son of Cronos), and hope that the Greeks are about to be punished for their crimes. But Bacchylides also calls κτύπος the sound of the trumpet.<sup>23</sup> Now Talthybios has announced that the *salpinx* would ring to signal departure (l. 1267) and it makes great sense that it should resonate now, forbidding the chorus to say another word and forcing them to exit, maybe with trampling feet. That the manuscripts then attribute the last lines to the herald and not, as expected, to the women can be a neat manifestation of their change of condition from freedom to slavery (l. 1330) and of the abnormal power that the Greeks exert over the stage, just as Clytemnestra silences the chorus's voice at the very end of *Agamemnon* in a symbolic act of illegitimate *kratos*.

It is not at all unlikely that both the *salpinx* and the *bronteion* should be used at this point, each instrument having its signification within the fiction; their combination would associate mortal and potentially divine actions. Yet I believe we should also take into consideration a third possibility. Assuming that the *kommos* is off-center, that its beginning is non strophic and the *responsio* in the strophic part irregular, it might cause some of the spectators, when they hear the conclusive line of the chorus, to think that the tragedy is over, especially if it is followed by a musical suspension of some sort and if the women start leaving the stage at the sound of the trumpet. Just as it happens today in classical or jazz concerts that people applaud before a piece is over, between the movements of a symphony, or when the band slows down almost to a stop, I believe it is possible that Euripides gives the audience the time and opportunity to mistakenly stomp their feet or clap as if the tragedy had ended. The *ktupos* heard by Hecuba would thus come also from the *theatron* and merge with the mortal and divine characters' actions.

Now if we contemplate this hypothesis and the possible overlap between core-performance and diffused performance – to use O. Taplin's words –<sup>24</sup> the queen's questions take on a new ring. They are not only spoken to the chorus, who is leaving, nor to Talthybios or the gods, but also to the spectators who are drawn into the action and whose position now equals that of the internal audience. “Do you understand”, she is asking the Athenians, “that Troy does not exist and that it is your story we are telling? Do you hear that you have a part to play in the barely disguised drama we are performing for you?”. The name of Troy has vanished, but once the chorus has revealed its emptiness, it gives way to the noun Pergamon (l. 1325), which is both a proper name for the Trojan acropolis and a common term designating any

---

<sup>23</sup> *Paian* F1,75 Irigoin.

<sup>24</sup> See in this volume, p. XXX.

fortress, then to πόλις (l. 1326) which, as we have seen, can designate any city but in Athens names specifically the sacred hill now shaken by the noise coming from the *theatron*. Troy thus gradually becomes Athens, until ἡ τάλαινα Τροία (l. 1324) is replaced in Talthybios's words with ἰὼ τάλαινα πόλις (l. 1331).

This revelation of the reality hidden by the fiction is enhanced by a reminder of l. 8-9 and l. 13-14 about the enemies' weapons and the *doureios hippos*. For, just as the horse was called *doureios* because it held a hidden spear, *doru*, the temples and the Trojan city hold another spear (v. 1318, ἔχετε... δορός τε λόγχαν). I think Euripides here reveals the cryptic and allusive nature of his tragedy, suggesting that Athenians were hiding in his stage set as they are in the Acropolis statue. He thus brings his audience back to the present of the performance and out of the fiction.

By associating the noisy stomping or clapping of a part of the audience to the sound of the *bronteion* and of the trumpet, the poet gives his spectators and fellow-citizens a choice: will they endorse the part of the crumbling city, or persist in acting as the Greeks, enslaving women, killing innocents and provoking the wrath of their city's divine patrons? Will they look down on the victims of their power as an indifferent Zeus or will they adopt Poseidon's perspective, his benevolence towards the vanquished and severity towards the impious victors? The answer does not belong within the play, but neither do the disastrous return of the Greeks nor the vengeance of the Trojan women foretold by the gods in the prologue and by Cassandra in the first episode.<sup>25</sup> Euripides does not predict what will come out of his unsettling show. Yet, with Hecuba's questions repeating her injunctions of l. 1303, he suggests that his contemporaries imitate the women of the myth as the chorus imitated the old queen when she asked them to “hear and understand [their] mother's voice” (κλύετε, μάθετε ματρὸς αὐδάν).<sup>26</sup> Maybe they too should kneel down to implore Gaia and the other gods of the Acropolis, if not in mourning, then as a prayer for forgiveness and purification of their crimes.

In this most elaborate composition and staging, what is at stake is a duality experience very similar to that of Pentheus in the *Bacchae*: it is when they see double that the spectators “see what [they] must see”<sup>27</sup>, or rather when they see both the masks and the faces united in the same reality, a Trojan drama that is also their own. I suggest that Euripides inscribes this reflexivity in the *exodos* by introducing one more structural twist. According to P, just before

---

<sup>25</sup> *Tr.* 75-94, 425-461.

<sup>26</sup> For this self-reflexiveness of choral performance, see in this volume Bierl, p. XXX, and its bibliography.

<sup>27</sup> *Bacch.* 924.

the *kommos* as Hecuba tries to die in the fire with her homeland (σὺν τῆδε πατρίδι... πυρουμένη, l. 1283), the chorus says to her: “You are possessed, poor woman, with your own misfortunes!” (Ἐνθουσιᾶς, δύστηνε, τοῖς σαυτῆς κακοῖς, l. 1284). V has an interesting variant attributed to Talthybios: “You are possessed, poor woman, with the same misfortunes!” (Ἐνθουσιᾶς, δύστηνε, τοῖς αὐτοῖς κακοῖς). The sentence is more difficult and seems to link Hecuba's miseries to that of the land and city she has always been embodying but is not allowed to perish with.<sup>28</sup> Editors choose to keep P's text while giving the line to Talthybios, who would thus be thwarting Hecuba's insane gesture while expressing his sympathy to her (δύστηνε) and making sure to secure his masters' property, both things that he does again in the final lines of the play. This is enough, I believe, to contemplate that the line might be the first element of the ring composition of the *kommos*. It should then have an equivalent after what is for us the last line of the play. But the tragedy, in a way, is one sentence short. In its place, there is nothing on stage but silence and emptiness, at the moment when the spectators are meant to acknowledge that during the performance, they have always seen the Athenian theatre, Athenian actors and chorus members, even maybe the smoke of Athenian sacrifices coming from the altar of Dionysos behind the *skene* and that they themselves have been part of the drama. At the end of a ritual that is supposed to have summoned the god's presence among them, speaking is now up to them. It is the jury's turn to reveal by their vote whether the lesson that Euripides has been staging has been understood and heard; it is the Athenians' turn to show whether they are positively inspired by the Dionysiac spectacle of “their own misfortunes”, or possessed with suicidal frenzy.

Pascale Brillet-Dubois

Université Lumière-Lyon 2 / Laboratoire HiSoMA

pascale.brillet@mom.fr

Appendix: *TW*, 1284-1332 The *kommos* according to ms P

Χο . ἐνθουσιᾶς, δύστηνε, τοῖς σαυτῆς κακοῖς.  
 Τα. ἀλλ' ἄγετε, μὴ φείδεσθ'· Ὀδυσσέως δὲ χρῆ (1285)  
 ἐς χεῖρα δοῦναι τήνδε καὶ πέμπειν γέρας.  
 Εκ. ὄττοτοτοτοῖ.  
 Κρόνιε, πρύτανι Φρύγιε, γενέτα  
 πάτερ ἀνάξια τῆς Δαρδανίου

<sup>28</sup> It can also be understood by comparizon with the Cassandra scene, for the prophetess was described several times as being in a state of bachic trance: *Tr.* 170, 172, 307, 341, 349, 408.

- γονᾶς, τάδ' οἷα πάσχομεν δέδορκας; (1290)  
 Χο. δέδορκεν· ἅ δὲ μεγάλῳπολις  
 ἄπολις ὄλωλεν οὐδέ τ' ἔστι Τροία.  
 Εκ. ὄττοτοτοτοῖ.  
 λέλαμπεν Ἥλιος, Περ- (1295)  
 γάμων τε πυρὶ καταίθεται τέραμνα  
 καὶ πόλις ἄκρα τε τειχέων.  
 Χο. πτέρυγι δὲ καπνὸς ὥς τις οὐ-  
 ρία πεσοῦσα δορὶ καταφθίνει γᾶ.  
 μαλερὰ μέλαθρα πυρὶ κατάδρομα (1300)  
 δαΐφ τε λόγχαι.  
 Εκ. ἰὼ γᾶ τρώφιμε τῶν ἐμῶν τέκνων. Str.  
 Χο. ἔ ἔ.  
 Εκ. ὦ τέκνα, κλύετε, μάθετε ματρὸς αὐδάν.  
 Χο. ἰαλέμφ τοὺς θανόντας ἀπύεις  
 γεραιά τ' ἐς πέδον τιθεῖσα μέλεα (1305)  
 καὶ χερσὶ γαῖαν κρύπτουσα δισσαῖς.  
 διάδοχόν σοι γόνυ τίθημι γαίᾳ  
 τοὺς ἐμοὺς καλοῦσα νέρθεν  
 ἀθλίους ἀκοίτας.  
 Εκ. ἀγόμεθα φερόμεθ' Χο. ἄλγος ἄλγος βοᾶς. (1310)  
 Εκ. δούλειον ὑπὸ μέλαθρον. Χο. ἐκ πάτρας γ' ἐμᾶς.  
 Εκ. ἰὼ,  
 Πρίαμε Πρίαμε,  
 σὺ μὲν ὀλόμενος ἄταφος ἄφιλος  
 ἄτας ἐμᾶς ἄιστος εἶ.  
 μέλας γὰρ ὅσσε κατακάλυ- (1315)  
 ψει θάνατος ὅσιος ἀνοσίοις σφαγαῖς.  
 ἰὼ θεῶν μέλαθρα καὶ πόλις φίλα Ant.  
 Χο. ἔ ἔ.  
 τὰν φόνιον ἔχετε φλόγα δορός τε λόγχαν.  
 τάχ' ἐς φίλαν γᾶν πεσεῖσθ' ἀνώνυμοι.  
 κόνις δ' ἴσα καπνῶ πτέρυγι πρὸς αἰθέρα (1320)  
 ἄιστον οἴκων ἐμῶν με θήσει.  
 ὄνομα δὲ γᾶς ἀφανὲς εἴσιν· ἄλλα δ'  
 ἄλλο φροῦδον, οὐδέ τ' ἔστιν  
 ἅ τάλαινα Τροία.  
 Εκ. ἐμάθετ', ἐκλύετε; περγάμων... κτύπων. (1325)  
 ἔνοσις ἅπασαν ἔνοσις ἐπικλύσει πόλιν.  
 ἰὼ  
 τρομερὰ τρομερὰ μέλεα, φέρετ' ἐ-  
 μὸν ἵχνος·  
 Τα. ἴτ' ἐπὶ τάλαιναν

δούλειον ἀμέραν βίου. (1330)  
ἰὼ τάλαινα πόλις. ὄμως  
δὲ πρόφερε πόδα σὸν ἐπὶ πλάτας Ἀχαιῶν.

Var. V: 1284 Τα. ἐνθουσιᾶς, δύστηνε, τοῖς αὐτοῖς κακοῖς.  
1289 πάτερ ἄξια τᾶσδε Δαρδανου

## Bibliography

- Barlow (1986): Shirley Barlow, *Euripides. Trojan Women*, Warminster.
- Di Benedetto (1992): Vincenzo Di Benedetto, *Euripide : Teatro et società*, Torino.
- Biehl (1989): Werner Biehl, *Euripides. Troades*, Heidelberg.
- Brillet-Dubois (2010): Pascale Brillet-Dubois, “Astyanax et les orphelins de guerre athéniens. Critique de la cité dans les *Troyennes* d'Euripide”, *REG* 2010-1, 29-49.
- Croally (1994): Neil T. Croally, *Euripidean Polemic. The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy*, Cambridge.
- Delebecque (1951): Edouard Delebecque, *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse*, Paris.
- Dué (2006): Casey Dué, *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy*, Austin.
- Goossens (1962): Roger Goossens, *Euripide et Athènes*, Brussels.
- Kovacs (1999): David Kovacs, ed. *Euripides. Trojan Women, Iphigeneia among the Taurians, Ion*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lee (1976): Kevin Hargreaves Lee, ed., *Euripides. Troades*, Basingstoke.
- Loraux (1999): Nicole Loraux, *La voix endeuillée: Essai sur la tragédie grecque*, Paris.
- Medda (2013): Enrico Medda, “Drammaturgia e critica del testo (I). Testo e scena in Aesch. *Ag.* 1649-54”, in: Enrico Medda, *La saggezza dell'illusione. Studi sul teatro greco*, Pisa, 287-306.
- Parmentier (1923): Léon Parmentier, “Notes sur les *Troyennes* d'Euripide”, *REG* 36, 46-61.
- Parmentier (1925): Léon Parmentier, *Euripide. Les Troyennes, Iphigénie en Tauride, Electre*, Paris, Belles Lettres.
- Poole (1976): Adrian Poole, “Total Disaster: Euripides's *The Trojan Women*”, *Arion* 3-3, 257-287.
- Raubitschek (1949): Antony Erich Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Segal (1993): Charles Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, Gender and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus and Hecuba*, Durham, London.

Torrance (2013): Isabelle Torrance, *Metapoetry in Euripides*, Oxford.

Wohl (2018): Victoria Wohl, “Stone into Smoke. Metaphor and Materiality in Euripides’ *Troades*”, in: Mario Telò, Melissa Mueller, *The Materialities of Greek Tragedy: Objects and Affect in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides*, London, 17-34.

Zuntz (1972): Günther Zuntz, “Contemporary Politics in Euripides”, in: Günther Zuntz, *Opuscula selecta*, Manchester, 54-61.