EXTRAMETRICAL *NAI* AND *EIEN* IN GREEK TRAGEDY

INTERPRETING EXTRAMETRICAL INTERJECTIONS

It is common in Greek tragedy to find extrametrical words or phrases within or preceding sections of iambic trimeters. Most of these extrametrical items are expressive interjections—words that express the speaker's emotional state—but there is also a small number of extrametrical occurrences of two interjections, ναί and εἶέν, that Lars Nordgren classifies as phatic, since they express "the speaker's mental attitude towards the ongoing discourse."[1] It can be readily understood why an extrametrical position is appropriate for expressive interjections: at a point of great emotion a speaker breaks off from their speech to utter a cry, groan, and so on. But phatic interjections are normally closely integrated with the surrounding language,[2] and so they merit careful attention when placed separately from the rest of the discourse in extrametrical position.

The separation of extrametrical items from the following utterance would be emphasized if, as seems likely, they were followed by a noticeable pause in delivery.[3] The evidence suggests that a pause at the end of a full trimeter was common. In many trimeters verse end coincides with a break in sense,[4] and certain prosodic features also suggest a pause at verse end: interlinear hiatus is common, as is *brevis in longo* in the final syllable

1. Nordgren 2015, 37. His classification, based on Ameka 1992, 113–14, is tripartite: expressive (for interjections expressive of emotion), conative (for words that express a wish or command), and phatic. Biraud (2010, 187) uses different categories, but also distinguishes ναί and εἶέν from expressive interjections. In total there are 131 extrametrical interjections within stichic metres in tragedy, 121 of them expressive, and ten phatic. The overall proportion of expressive interjections that are extrametrical is 22%, only slightly higher than that of phatic interjections (17%), but individual expressive interjections tend to be placed *extra metrum* either often (e.g., ἔα [66% of occurrences], ἄ [44%], φεῦ [41%]) or rarely (e.g., οἴμοι [4%], ὤμοι [7%]). In trimeters ναί appears twenty-three times (five extrametrical) and εἶέν thirty-six times (five extrametrical). All these figures are calculated from the lexicon at Nordgren 2015, 210–45, counting reduplicated interjections as a single occurrence and ignoring occurrences marked as lyric. Nordgren's lexicon for the most part excludes fragmentary plays, but a separate check of the fragments found no extrametrical instances of ναί or εἶέν.

2. Nordgren 2015, 71.

3. This assumption is made by many who comment on the passages I will examine: Hermann 1833, 81; Burnett 1970, 45; Easterling 1982, 126; Kraus 1986, 96; Kyriakou 2006, 251; Marshall 2014, 211; Nordgren 2015, 45.

4. Building on the work of Stinton 1977, Battezzato (2008) investigates the proportion of trimeters (excluding those followed by a change of speaker) that have enjambment of varying strengths, ranging from no enjambment (type A), where the end of a trimeter coincides with the end of a period or main phrase, to strong enjambment (type E), such as when the verse end separates an article and its noun. He finds (Tavola 4, p. 134) that type E accounts for only 5.5% of lines in Euripides, 10% in the Aeschylus sample, and 13% in the Sophocles sample.

of a trimeter, while interlinear elision is rare.[5] In some lines there appears to be some limited prosodic synapheia, but these are exceptions in a form that generally allows no synapheia.[6] This all indicates that the trimeter line was a relatively independent unit of delivery, and in this context it is probable that extrametrical words were independent too. There must also have been pauses within the trimeter, and one could argue that interjections are followed by a pause even when *intra metrum*, making their delivery when placed *extra metrum* nothing unusual. The nature of interjections, particularly expressive ones, makes this an attractive suggestion, and in his influential study of interjections the linguist Felix Ameka claims that they are always preceded and followed by a pause.[7] But this claim has been shown to be incorrect, at least for English-language film.[8] The two interjections in this study, ναί and εἶέν, both usually appear as the first word when included in a trimeter, and substantial pauses so early in the line would be unusual. It is likely, then, that *intra metrum* ναί and εἶέν would not have been followed by pauses of the same length as their occurrences *extra metrum*.[9]

If this account of the delivery of extrametrical words is accepted, then it is a reasonable assumption that the tragedian had in mind some particular effect when positioning phatic interjections *extra metrum*.[10] Some scholars have made brief attempts at explaining individual instances of extrametrical ναί and εἶέν, but there are several passages where, as far as I am aware, the position of the interjection has never been discussed. In this paper I will examine all extant instances to consider the potential significance of the pause that is implied by extrametrical ναί and εἶέν. It is this pause that is the focus of this paper. I might, for ease of expression, refer to, for example, "extrametrical ναί" or "εἶέν *intra metrum*" as a shorthand for "the pause after extrametrical ναί" or "εἶέν *intra metrum* with no substantial pause," but I am not arguing that ναί and εἶέν themselves have a different meaning when placed *extra metrum*.

Judging the significance of dramatic pauses is a subjective exercise even when witnessing the performance; for Greek tragedy, where many details of performance are unknown, the difficulties are even greater. One potential solution is to turn to the insights of modern linguistics,[11] especially since several scholars have fruitfully applied pragmatics to the

5. Elision between trimeters is found just eight times in tragedy, all in Sophocles (see West 1982, 84). Battezzato (2008, 136) finds that in lines with strong enjambment (type D or E), the rate of interlinear hiatus is 7.52% for Euripides, 5.21% for the Sophocles sample, and 13.58% for the Aeschylus sample. While this rate is lower than when there is weak or no enjambment (roughly 20% for all tragedians, see Tavola 1, p. 133), it is relatively high compared to the great rarity of hiatus within trimeters (see Mastronarde 2002, 99). This pattern is repeated for *brevis in longo*: in a sample of six Euripidean tragedies, Battezzato (2008, 138) finds a short syllable in the final position in 20% of trimeters with weak or no enjambment (type A, B, or C), and in 12% of lines with strong enjambment (type D or E). These figures suggest that some prosodic synapheia accompanies enjambment, but that it is still rather limited.

6. Battezzato 2008, 129–32.

7. Ameka 1992, 108.

8. In an analysis of a TV adaptation of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, O'Connell and Kowal (2010, 297) found that a large proportion of interjections were not followed by pauses. They state that of 399 interjections in total, 283 followed a pause, and 104 followed and preceded a pause. Thus at least 179 interjections (45%) were not followed by a pause, and the figure could be as high as 295 (74%).

9. Nordgren 2015, 45.

10. It is not credible that extrametrical words result from the tragedian being unable to compose in full trimeters; see Marshall 2014, 211.

11. Burton (1980, 8–9) says of the value of conversation analysis for discussions of style: "if we are ever going to progress beyond mere intuition and assumption . . . then we must surely use this type of linguistics." Such an approach is not methodologically unimpeachable, as it involves applying to drama techniques and insights developed mainly in the study of natural language. There is a good discussion of this problem in van Emde Boas 2017, 2–5, where it is argued that even in a highly stylized form of drama such as Greek tragedy,

study of tragic dialogue.[12] However, much attention on pauses in pragmatics focuses on their role in turn-taking,[13] while in our passages the pauses are all intra-turn and probably do not occur at places where the audience would expect a change of speaker.[14] Intra-turn pauses have been studied from the point of view of cognitive linguistics rather than pragmatics. Many studies emphasize the cognitive processes taking place during these pauses and that they allow the speaker to think what to say or how to say it; such pauses are sometimes called "planning pauses."[15] The literary critic Vimala Herman draws on this vein of research to stress the importance of planning pauses in drama:

> Thinking and speaking are generally seen as separate activities and mutually exclusive . . . Pauses can signify the gaps between the two activities and dramatize the toil of speech to express the movement of thought. Pauses may also signal uncertainty, lack of confidence, or may be used by a speaker to create suspense, or highlight something about to be said.[16]

However, aside from her initial emphasis on the perception that pauses are used for thinking, this account owes more to Herman's experience as a dramatic critic than to linguistics research. It seems that in the analysis of intra-turn pauses it is difficult to escape the intuitive and the subjective, and while there is still value in attempting the analysis, this limitation should be recognized.

EXTRAMETRICAL ναί IN TRAGEDY

As Nordgren observes, "the most pronounced characteristic of ναί is its use as an affirmation of a preceding utterance."[17] It appears *extra metrum* five times in extant tragedy: Soph. *Trach*. 425; Eur. *Andr*. 242, 586; *IT* 742; *Hel*. 99.[18] Most of these occurrences

---

the fundamental rules of language apply: "naturally occurring conversation is, as it were, the template on which dramatic discourse is grafted." While a degree of caution and an awareness of these methodological difficulties is required, it is likely that linguistics could give useful insights into tragic pauses.

12. Van Emde Boas (2017) provides an extensive study of a single play (Eur. *El*.) along these lines and gives a useful introduction to the methods. Schuren (2014) studies the pragmatic aspects of Euripidean stichomythia. Lloyd (2006; 2009) and Catrambone (2016) apply politeness theory to the study of tragic dialogue.

13. E.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Levinson 1983, 326–29.

14. Linguists call these transition-relevance places (TRPs); see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974, 703. Because εἶεν indicates that one's thought is turning to another topic, a TRP cannot immediately follow it. A turn could consist only of ναί; there are examples of this in comedy (Ar. *Plut*. 82; Men. *Sam*. 409; *Dis Exapaton* 106; *Kolax, CGFP* 164 F 54), and compare ναίχι in lyrics at Soph. *OT* 684. But within stichic meters in tragedy one-word turns are rare: I count seventeen, and of these only four occur where *antilabe* has not already been established (i.e., in positions comparable to our instances of ναί). One-word turns are exceptional, therefore, and the audience would not be primed to see a TRP after ναί.

15. See, e.g., Goldman-Eisler 1968; Butterworth 1975; Stenström 2011, 542. Levinson (1983, 326) uses the term "planning pause."

16. See Herman 1995, 95, drawing on Chafe 1985, who investigates the hesitations of subjects asked to describe the action of a short film, and Walker 1985, a study of lawyers' perceptions of witnesses' hesitations. Both studies emphasize the role of pauses within speech planning, a recurring theme in the literature (see n. 15).

17. Nordgren 2015, 177.

18. I refer to the extrametrical item by the number of the line following it. Excepting proposed emendations, all Greek is quoted from the relevant Oxford Classical Text: Page 1972 for Aeschylus, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1992 for Sophocles, and Diggle 1981–94 for Euripides; all translations are my own. I ignore two instances of extrametrical ναί conjectured by Gilbert Murray. At Aesch. *Supp*. 468 the start of the line is unmetrical: † καὶ μὴν πολλαχῇ γε †. Murray (1938) resolved these problems by emending καὶ to ναί and placing it *extra metrum*: ναί· / ἦ πολλαχῇ γε, building on Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1914, 353), who reads simply ἦ πολλαχῇ γε. Murray's is a neat solution, but far from certain, and it has not been adopted by recent editors, who prefer either

have been omitted by at least one modern editor, and so while each instance needs to be assessed individually, some general comment on their authenticity is called for. In every instance ναί is redundant, at least for the basic locutionary force of the text, and given how often it appears as a scholiastic gloss it could have been interpolated by a scribe mistaking the gloss for an extrametrical interjection.[19] But ease of interpolation is not in itself an argument for deletion. As with the rest of the tragic texts, the case for deletion needs to be made on the grounds of linguistic or dramatic problems with the text as it stands. As will become clear in my discussions of the individual passages, the linguistic arguments against the interjection are not compelling. Furthermore, the plausible explanations that can, I think, be provided for the dramatic function of these interjections add weight to the case for retaining them.

In Sophocles' *Trachiniae* the Messenger accuses Lichas of deceiving Deianeira over the status of Iole. Lichas has told Deianeira that Iole was merely one of many captive women, but he had earlier told the townspeople that she was Eurytus' daughter and Heracles' concubine (Soph. *Trach*. 423–26):

Αγ. . . . ἐν μέσῃ Τραχινίων
ἀγορᾷ πολύς σου ταῦτά γ' εἰσήκουσ' ὄχλος.
Λι. ναί·
κλυεῖν γ' ἔφασκον. ταὐτὸ δ' οὐχὶ γίγνεται
δόκησιν εἰπεῖν κἀξακριβῶσαι λόγον.[20]

Messenger: . . . in the middle of the Trachinian market place a large crowd heard you say this.
Lichas: Yes. I said I had heard it. But giving an opinion and giving a precise report are not the same thing.

R. C. Jebb suggests that extrametrical ναί here "might indicate a moment of embarrassment on the part of the Herald, who now sees he is detected."[21] But the continuation of Lichas' response does not suggest that he is embarrassed, or even that he accepts he has been detected. Instead, he continues his deception, but in a more nuanced way: he now says that he was only reporting what he had heard, not stating known facts. Unlike his earlier deceptions, Lichas has not been able to plan this particular nuance in advance,

to accept the corruption (thus Page 1972), or to adopt the lacuna posited by Sulzberger (1945, 139) (so West 1998, 151). At Eur. *Cyc*. 147 Murray (1902) moves ναί from the start of a trimeter to *extra metrum*, adding γάρ to the trimeter to fill the resulting gap. To my knowledge no editors have followed Murray, and even *intra metrum* ναί is questionable: Seaford (1984, 129–30) summarizes the problems with it. An alternative, suggested by Blumenthal (1936, 455) and Grégoire (1948), is to read νᾷ, which gives excellent sense and with iota adscript would not be an emendation; see also Cerri 1976.

19. I owe this point to an anonymous reviewer.

20. The ναί here, as Jebb (1892, 68) implies, has good manuscript authority, but it is deleted by Dindorf (1859, 610) and Dawe (1996). Diggle (1981, 56 n. 1) queries the use of γε and says: "it may be best that ναί is deleted." A common function of γε is to limit the word that it follows—Goldstein (2019) calls this the "scalar exclusive" use (see also Denniston 1954, 140; van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 692)—and this is probably what it does here: "I said only that I had heard it." The combination of ναί and γε is justified here, then, and there are similar passages: Diggle himself cites Ar. *Plut*. 904. Jebb (1892, 68) says that γε "makes ναί unnecessary, but proves nothing against it."

21. Jebb 1892, 68. See also Easterling 1982, 126, who says simply that it "probably suggests a momentary hesitation on Lichas' part." Kraus (1986, 96) also proposes a hesitation, and explains Lichas' attitude at 425 thus: "als ob es nicht von Bedeutung wäre, was er da zugibt." But surely Lichas does care what he concedes, given that he concedes so little.

but has had to contrive it on the spot. Therefore, a plausible interpretation of the pause here is that Sophocles intends the audience to perceive it as Lichas' planning pause.[22]

Another likely example of a planning pause occurs in Euripides' *Helen*. In this passage Teucer has assumed that Helen is not in fact herself, but a lookalike, and Helen, given his clear antipathy toward her (71–77), proceeds with the conversation under that pretence (Eur. *Hel*. 98–99):

Τε. τὸν Πηλέως τιν' οἶσθ' Ἀχιλλέα γόνον;
Ελ. ναί·
μνηστήρ ποθ' Ἑλένης ἦλθεν, ὡς ἀκούομεν.[23]

Teucer: Do you know of the child of Peleus, Achilles?
Helen. Yes. He came once as Helen's suitor, so I hear.

When asked if she knows Achilles, Helen states explicitly that she knows he was Helen's suitor only because she heard so (ὡς ἀκούομεν, 99). This suggests that Helen is taking care to maintain her pretense,[24] and thus that the pause after ναί was for her to compose a suitably phrased response.[25] A planning pause is appropriate here, where Helen, like Lichas in *Trachiniae*, is forced to come up with a deception on the spot. In most cases of deception in Greek tragedy, the details of the false story have been worked out in advance; it is unusual for a character to invent lies in front of the audience.[26] It is unlikely to be by chance that in both passages ναί is *extra metrum*; instead it indicates that the pause following extrametrical ναί could suggest that a character is thinking.

The two passages from Euripides' *Andromache* are similar to each other: each occurs in one of the play's *agones* and involves a speaker admitting the truth of their opponent's point, before adding a qualification that invalidates the point in this particular instance (Eur. *Andr*. 240–42, 584–86):

Αν. οὐκ αὖ σιωπῇ Κύπριδος ἀλγήσεις πέρι;
Ερ. τί δ'; οὐ γυναιξὶ ταῦτα πρῶτα πανταχοῦ;
Αν. ναί,
καλῶς γε χρωμέναισιν· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ καλά.

Andromache: Will you not suffer your love troubles in silence?
Hermione: Why? Are these not the first concern for women everywhere?
Andromache: Yes. For those women who behave well; otherwise, it is not fine.

Πη. οὑμὸς δέ γ' αὐτὴν ἔλαβε παῖς παιδὸς γέρας.
Με. οὔκουν ἐκείνου τἀμὰ τἀκείνου τ'ἐμά;
Πη. ναί,
δρᾶν εὖ, κακῶς δ' οὔ, μηδ' ἀποκτείνειν βίᾳ

Peleus: My grandson took her as his prize.

22. Planning pauses are not extended silences; they need only be long enough to hint to the audience that the speaker is thinking.

23. The first editor I have found to print ναί here is Murray (1909), but it is now widely accepted. I have not found any explanation in earlier editions for its absence.

24. Kannicht 1969, 2: 45.

25. Marshall 2014, 211: "the audience may perceive Helen thinking." Perhaps we are to imagine that Helen was beginning a response along the lines of "Yes, he was one of my suitors," but managed to correct herself after the first word: "Yes—he was one of Helen's suitors, so I hear."

26. I have not conducted a comprehensive search, but I have found no parallels to the two passages discussed above. The evasions of the Nurse at Eur. *Hipp*. 517 and the Herdsman at Soph. *OT* 1129–71 are rather different.

Menelaus: And are my things not his, and his things not mine?
Peleus: Yes. To treat well, not to harm, and not to kill violently.

The authenticity of these two instances of extrametrical ναί has been doubted more than others'.[27] But both interjections have generally good manuscript authority, and P. T. Stevens and James Diggle agree that there is no reason to delete them.[28] The purpose of the extrametrical positioning in both passages is rhetorical: the pause after ναί makes it appear for a moment as if the speaker has conceded an important point, which makes the subsequent rebuttal more effective. The similar phrasing is one of several parallels between the two *agones*, as William Allan has observed.[29] Extrametrical ναί, and the accompanying pause, would make the delivery of these lines, and thus the parallel, more noticeable.

In Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* the relevant passage occurs before the recognition between Iphigenia and Orestes has been effected, after they have decided to try to send Pylades back to Greece (Eur. *IT* 741–42):

Ορ. ἦ καὶ τύραννος ταῦτα συγχωρήσεται;
Ιφ. ναί·
πείσω σφε, καὐτὴ ναὸς ἐσβήσω σκάφος.

Orestes: And will the King agree to these things?
Iphigenia: Yes. I will persuade him, and I will put your friend on the ship myself.

Both Gottfried Hermann and Maurice Platnauer suggest that ναί *extra metrum* reveals a momentary doubt on Iphigenia's part.[30] This interpretation has the benefit of taking account of the extrametrical position of ναί. However, although Iphigenia's apparently confident continuation does not rule out a moment of doubt, it does not support it, and this interpretation must remain speculative.[31]

EXTRAMETRICAL εἶέν IN TRAGEDY

There are five instances of extrametrical εἶέν in tragedy: Eur. *Med*. 386, *Tro*. 945, *IT* 467, *Ion* 275, and *IA* 1185.[32] In replies εἶέν can indicate acceptance of a statement or request, but more commonly it marks a transition to a new topic, with a backward glance at what has passed.[33] There is an *intra metrum* example of the latter usage in Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, when Iphigenia, after learning that two Greeks have been

27. See the notes of Dindorf 1839, 357 and 366, and their deletion from the editions of Murray 1902 and Kovacs 1995.
28. At 242 ναί is found in all manuscripts except P; at 586 it is in all manuscripts. See Stevens 1971, 123; Diggle 1981, 56 n. 1. Kovacs (1996, 45–47) posits a lacuna after line 241, but even if accepted, this would not tell against the authenticity of ναί.
29. Allan 2000, 66–67, 104.
30. Hermann 1833, 81; Platnauer 1938, 122.
31. Kyriakou (2006, 251) gives a measured summary. Parker (2016, 210–11) argues that ναί signifies ready assent, however it is not ναί itself that would suggest doubt, but the pause.
32. In Aristophanes extrametrical εἶέν appears twice: *Eq*. 1078, 1238. There is no obvious significance for a pause in these places, but the different conventions and delivery of comedy (see Revermann 2006, 40) may mean these are not appropriate parallels.
33. Collard 2018, 80.

captured, expresses eagerness that they are brought to her for sacrifice: εἶέν· σὺ μὲν κόμιζε τοὺς ξένους μολών, / τὰ δ' ἐνθάδ' ἡμεῖς ὅσια φροντιούμεθα ("Right then. You go and get the strangers; I will take care of the sacred things here," 342–43). In the following lines, she gives her excuse for this eagerness, explaining how she used to pity her victims, but that after a dream signifying Orestes' death (in her interpretation), she has become savage (344–50). A little later, εἶέν is used in a similar context, but here it is extrametrical, and the pause that follows it seems to express reluctance toward the rites (Eur. *IT* 466–67):

Ιφ. εἶέν·
τὰ τῆς θεοῦ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς καλῶς ἔχῃ
φροντιστέον μοι.

Iphigenia: Right then. It must be my first concern that the rites of the goddess go well.

The context of the two passages is very similar. In the earlier one it is reported that two Greeks have been captured, the chorus says they will need to be sacrificed, and Iphigenia asks for them to be brought to her and confirms that she will take care of the rites. In the later passage the two Greeks are brought onstage, the chorus says the sacrifice should be prepared, and Iphigenia confirms that she will take care of the rites. However, whereas in the passage with εἶέν *intra metrum* Iphigenia goes on to explain that she no longer pities the victims, in the passage with εἶέν *extra metrum* Iphigenia goes on to express sympathy for the victims' families (472–75), and we already know that she has reverted to her earlier disaffection with the rites she has to oversee (380–91). This contrast supports the interpretation that the pause after extrametrical εἶέν at 466 is suggestive of Iphigenia's reluctance.

Another speech-initial extrametrical εἶέν occurs during Ion's first dialogue with Creusa in Euripides' *Ion* (265–76):

Ιων πρὸς θεῶν, ἀληθῶς, ὡς μεμύθευται βροτοῖς
Κρ. τί χρῆμ' ἐρωτᾷς, ὦ ξέν', ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων;
Ιων ἐκ γῆς πατρός σου πρόγονος ἔβλαστεν πατήρ;
Κρ. Ἐριχθόνιός γε· τὸ δὲ γένος μ' οὐκ ὠφελεῖ.
Ιων ἦ καί σφ' Ἀθάνα γῆθεν ἐξανείλετο;
Κρ. ἐς παρθένους γε χεῖρας, οὐ τεκοῦσά νιν.
Ιων δίδωσι δ', ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ νομίζεται
Κρ. Κέκροπός γε σφ̓ζειν παισὶν οὐχ ὁρώμενον.
Ιων ἤκουσα λῦσαι παρθένους τεῦχος θεᾶς.
Κρ. τοιγὰρ θανοῦσαι σκόπελον ἥμαξαν πέτρας.
Ιων εἶέν·
τί δαὶ τόδ'; ἆρ' ἀληθὲς ἢ μάτην λόγος;
Κρ. τί χρῆμ' ἐρωτᾷς; καὶ γὰρ οὐ κάμνω σχολῇ.

Ion By the gods, is it true, as the story goes among men . . .
Creusa What are you asking, stranger, and eager to learn?
Ion Was your ancestor born from the earth?
Creusa Yes, Erechthonius. But my family does me no good.
Ion And Athena took him from the earth?
Creusa He went into the maiden's hands, but she did not give birth to him.
Ion And did she give him, as is often in the pictures . . .
Creusa To the daughters of Cecrops to keep without seeing him.

Ion	I heard that the girls opened the goddess' casket.
Creusa	Therefore they died and made bloody the cliffs of the headland.
Ion	Right then. What about this matter? Is it true, or just an empty rumor?
Creusa	What is it you're asking about? For I am not pressed for time.

Occasionally εἶέν can be more of an expressive interjection than a phatic one,[34] and Anne Pippin Burnett seems to interpret this instance in that way, describing it as a gasp.[35] In some respects this is an attractive reading: Ion is reacting to Creusa's report of violent deaths, so an expressive interjection would be appropriate here. But εἶέν here also appears to be fulfilling the phatic function of marking the transition to a new topic. On balance, it seems better to assume the phatic use where it is possible, since this is one of the interjection's core functions, while the expressive use is rarer.[36] However, one problem with a phatic reading of εἶέν here is that it could make Ion seem rather abrupt, which is at odds with his presentation throughout the passage. K. H. Lee comments: "Ion's interest as he turns abruptly from one scene of blood to another is pointed by his briskly colloquial tone."[37] Giving proper weight to the extrametrical positioning of εἶέν suggests an alternative interpretation that aligns well with the rest of the passage: Ion is being reticent, rather than abrupt.

Although clearly curious, there are several indications even before the extrametrical εἶέν that Ion is reluctant to probe Creusa for more information. In just ten lines Creusa must ask Ion what his question is once (266), and twice she saves him having to formulate a question by supplying further information before he does so (272, 274). Such patterns are not uncommon in stichomythia, but they can still help to characterize the speakers.[38] Ion's reluctance to press for information is also suggested by the qualificatory phrases at 265: ὡς μεμύθευται βροτοῖς ("as the story goes among men") and 271: ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ νομίζεται ("as is often in the pictures"). These phrases delay the moment when he must pose the question (in the latter instance he avoids having to pose it at all, as Creusa takes up the story), and they are also a way of phrasing the question less baldly.

Immediately after the extrametrical εἶέν there is another instance of Ion's failure to pose a question clearly (275): τί δαὶ τόδ'; ἆρ' ἀληθὲς ἢ μάτην λόγος; ("What about this matter? Is it true, or just an empty rumor?"). That we should see Ion as reticent here is confirmed by Creusa's response, since she sees the need to reassure him that his questions are welcome (276): τί χρῆμ' ἐρωτᾷς; καὶ γὰρ οὐ κάμνω σχολῇ ("What is it you're asking about? For I'm not pressed for time"). As John Gibert comments, "Ion in effect

34. Nordgren 2015, 202, citing Aesch. *Eum*. 244.

35. Burnett 1970, 45. Badham (1867, 77) also seems to see the interjection as expressive, which causes him to advocate emending the text so that εἶέν replaces λόγος *intra metrum*: "independent [i.e., extrametrical] exclamations are not suited to unimpassioned dialogue." Badham's attention to the extrametrical positioning of interjections is in sympathy with my approach, but as the examples above have shown, phatic interjections can be extrametrical even in unimpassioned passages.

36. Nordgren (2015, 21) classifies εἶέν as phatic (here called "category 3"). See also Collard 2018, 80 on the primacy of the transitional sense.

37. Lee 1997, 190; see also Irvine 1995, 165: "Ion is exuding frank and lively curiosity." Colloquialisms are used here—see Collard 2018, 80–81 (on εἶέν) and 101–3 (on δαί)—and this could betray his excitement (Gunther 2018, 211) or suggest an informal relationship between Ion and Creusa (Gunther 2018, 207). But I hope to show that we should not read Ion's questioning of Creusa as brisk or frank.

38. See Finglass 2018, 353 on how "Sophocles exploits the conventions of stichomythia" to characterize Creon at *OT* 571. Mastronarde (1979, 55) observes for Eur. *Tro*. 713–19 the same kind of effect that I am claiming: "[Talthybius] hesitates to finish the horrible revelation and so lets the syntax hang."

asks Creusa's permission to keep asking questions, and she grants it."[39] Given this context, it seems likely that the extrametrical positioning of εἶέν, and the pause or hesitation it suggests, is another indicator of Ion's reticence.

Medea uses extrametrical εἶέν during her monologue where she considers how she should kill her enemies (Eur. *Med*. 384–86):

Με. κράτιστα τὴν εὐθεῖαν, ᾗ πεφύκαμεν
σοφοὶ μάλιστα, φαρμάκοις αὐτοὺς ἑλεῖν.
εἶέν·
καὶ δὴ τεθνᾶσι· τίς με δέξεται πόλις;

Medea: Best is the direct way, in which I am especially skilled: to get them with poison. Right then. And they are dead; what city will receive me?

Denys Page comments, "After εἶέν Medea pauses. She sees the whole course of her future plan in her mind's eye, and starts out of her reverie at the moment of triumph when she sees her victims dead."[40] We do not need to delve this far into Medea's psychology to find a plausible explanation for the pause. I have discussed above how intra-turn pauses in drama are often used to suggest that a character is thinking, and that is what Medea is doing here. Specifically, this pause occurs as Medea turns from planning what sort of revenge she will take to planning how she will escape. In this position it marks the point where Medea's anger is overtaken by her reason, something which is made clear by the way that, unable to find a way to escape, she decides to postpone her revenge until one has been found. In such a position, the pause following extrametrical εἶέν has two main effects. Within the scene it causes a literal slowing down of the speech that reflects the way the action of the play will be slowed as Medea decides against taking revenge straightaway. It also emphasizes the role that rationality plays in Medea's revenge, and how that combines with her passion to make her such a dangerous enemy.[41]

For the remaining two passages it is more difficult to attribute significance to a pause after extrametrical εἶέν. In the *agon* of Euripides' *Trojan Women* Helen criticizes Menelaus for leaving her alone with Paris (943–45):

Ελ. ὅν, ὦ κάκιστε, σοῖσιν ἐν δόμοις λιπὼν
Σπάρτης ἀπῆρας νηὶ Κρησίαν χθόνα.
εἶέν.
οὐ σ', ἀλλ' ἐμαυτὴν τοὐπὶ τῷδ' ἐρήσομαι·

Helen: Leaving him in your house, you most evil of men, you left Sparta by ship for Crete. Well then. In what follows, I will question not you, but myself.

Possibly Helen has become excessively angry with Menelaus, as the address ὦ κάκιστε (943) suggests.[42] If so, the pause after εἶέν could be explained as an attempt to compose herself and continue her speech along less antagonistic lines (945).

In Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* Clytemnestra addresses Agamemnon after she has discovered his plan to sacrifice Iphigenia (1183–85):

39. Gibert 2019, 172. From this point onwards Ion is able to form clear and complete questions (e.g., 277, 279, 281, 283).
40. Page 1938, 101. See also Martina 2018, 156.
41. For this aspect of Medea's character, see Mastronarde 2002, 392–93; Foley 1989, 64.
42. Dickey 1996, 167.

Κλ. μὴ δῆτα πρὸς θεῶν μήτ' ἀναγκάσῃς ἐμὲ
κακὴν γενέσθαι περὶ σὲ μήτ' αὐτὸς γένῃ.
εἶέν·
θύσεις † δὲ παῖδ' ἔνθα † τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς;

Clytemnestra: By the gods, do not compel me to be evil to you, nor be evil yourself.
Well then. You will kill † your child, then † what prayers will you say?

I can find no satisfactory explanation for a pause after this εἶέν. However, perhaps there should be no extrametrical interjection here. The text of 1185 is corrupt, and although it need not affect extrametrical εἶέν, it is possible that εἶέν was moved *extra metrum* as part of the corruption, as August Nauck's emendation suggests: εἶέν σὺ θύσεις παῖδα· τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς; ("Well then, you will kill your child; what prayers will you say?").[43]

CONCLUSION

My aim in this paper has been to show that we need to pay attention to the extrametrical position of ναί and εἶέν whenever we encounter them in tragedy. This point does not seem to have been widely accepted before, since to my knowledge in only half of the ten extant instances has the extrametrical position been addressed by scholars. I made the case for this in my introduction, arguing that it is likely that extrametrical items were followed by a noticeable pause, that it is unusual for phatic interjections such as ναί and εἶέν to be separated from the discourse as they are when *extra metrum*, and that the tragedians' skill at composing trimeters is such that their extrametrical position would be used only by design and to produce a particular effect. Turning to the application of this theory to individual passages, the failure to find a satisfying explanation for the extrametrical position in some places should be acknowledged, but is perhaps not surprising, nor fatal to the approach in general, given that the interpretation of pauses can depend on specifics of performance that are irretrievable. For most instances a convincing interpretation of the pause can be found, and I hope this paper will prompt further study of this topic.[44]

JAMES T. CLARK
Southampton, UK

43. Nauck (1866, v. Kovacs 2003, 144) explains the textual corruption thus: "It seems better to suppose that both δὲ and ἔνθα are a clumsy attempt to fill out a line rendered too short by the mechanical omission of a syllable and the failure to see that εἶέν is *intra metrum*." See Collard and Morwood 2017, 537–38 for a survey of emendations; they think it best to retain extrametrical εἶέν and emend 1185 to θύσεις δὲ <δὴ> παῖδ'; εἶτα τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς; ("Well then. You will sacrifice your daughter? Then what prayers will you say?").

44. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers, from whose comments I have much benefited.

LITERATURE CITED

Allan, William. 2000. *The "Andromache" and Euripidean Tragedy*. Oxford.

Ameka, Felix. 1992. Interjections: The Universal yet Neglected Part of Speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 101–18.

Badham, Charles, ed. 1867. *Euripidis "Ion": With Notes for Beginners*[2]. London.

Battezzato, Luigi. 2008. *Linguistica e retorica della tragedia Greca*. Rome.

Biraud, Michèle. 2010. *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique: Étude sémantique et pragmatique*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
Blumenthal, Albrecht von. 1936. Beobachtungen zu griechischen Texten. *Hermes* 71: 452–58.
Burnett, Anne Pippin. 1970. *Euripides: "Ion," a Translation with Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
Burton, Deirde. 1980. *Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation*. London.
Butterworth, Brian. 1975. Hesitation and Semantic Planning in Speech. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 4: 75–87.
Catrambone, Marco. 2016. Off-Record Politeness in Sophocles: The Patterned Dialogues of Female Characters. *Journal of Politeness Research* 12: 173–95.
Cerri, Giovanni. 1976. Nota testuale a Eur. *Cycl*. 147. *RivFil* 104: 139–43.
Chafe, Wallace L. 1985. Some Reasons for Hesitating. In *Perspectives on Silence*, ed. Deborah Tannen and Muriel Saville-Troike, 77–89. Norwood, NJ.
Collard, Christopher. 2018. *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy: Revised and Enlarged Edition of P. T. Stevens's "Colloquial Expressions in Euripides."* Stuttgart.
Collard, Christopher, and James Morwood, eds. 2017. *Euripides: "Iphigenia at Aulis."* Liverpool.
Dawe, R. D., ed. 1996. *Sophocles: "Trachiniae."* Stuttgart.
Denniston, J. D. 1954. *The Greek Particles*[2]. Oxford.
Dickey, Eleanor. 1996. *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford.
Diggle, James. 1981. *Studies on the Text of Euripides: "Supplices," "Electra," "Heracles," "Troades," "Iphigenia in Tauris," "Ion."* Oxford.
———, ed. 1981–94. *Euripidis fabulae*. Oxford.
Dindorf, Wilhelm, ed. 1839. *Euripidis tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*. Vol. 3. Oxford.
———, ed. 1859. *Sophoclis tragoediae*[3]. Leipzig.
Easterling, P. E., ed. 1982. *Sophocles: "Trachiniae."* Cambridge.
Finglass, P. J. 2018. *Sophocles: "Oedipus the King."* Cambridge.
Foley, Helene P. 1989. Medea's Divided Self. *ClAnt* 8: 61–85.
Gibert, John, ed. 2019. *Euripides: "Ion."* Cambridge.
Goldman-Eisler, Frieda. 1968. *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in Spontaneous Speech*. London.
Goldstein, David M. 2019. Discourse Particles in LSJ: A Fresh Look at γε. In *Liddell and Scott: The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek*, ed. Christopher Stray, Michael Clarke, and Joshua T. Katz, 268–87. Oxford.
Grégoire, Henri. 1948. Le vers 147 du *Cyclope*. *AntCl* 17: 285–86.
Gunther, Martin, ed. 2018. *Euripides' "Ion": Edition and Commentary*. Berlin.
Herman, Vimala. 1995. *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London.
Hermann, Gottfried, ed. 1833. *Euripidis "Iphigenia Taurica."* Leipzig.
Irvine, James. 1995. *Euripides' "Ion": Commentary, ll. 1–568*. PhD diss., University of Oxford. https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:aa555354-e8a0-442d-9539-182ae135ec9e.
Jebb, R. C., ed. 1892. *Sophocles: "Trachiniae."* Cambridge.
Kannicht, Richard. 1969. *Euripides: "Helena."* Heidelberg.
Kovacs, David, ed. 1995. *Euripides: "Children of Heracles," "Hippolytus," "Andromache," "Hecuba."* Cambridge, MA.
———. 1996. *Euripidea altera*. Leiden.
———. 2003. *Euripidea tertia*. Leiden.
Kraus, Walther. 1986. Bemerkungen zum Text und Sinn in den *Trachinierinnen*. *WS* 99: 87–108.
Kyriakou, Poulheria. 2006. *A Commentary on Euripides' "Iphigenia in Tauris."* Berlin.
Lee, K. H., ed. 1997. *Euripides: "Ion."* Warminster.
Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge.
Lloyd, Michael. 2006. Sophocles in the Light of Face-Threat Politeness Theory. In *Sophocles and the Greek Language: Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics*, ed. Irene J. F. de Jong and Albert Rijksbaron, 225–39. Leiden.

———. 2009. The Language of the Gods: Politeness in the Prologue of the *Troades*. In *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*, ed. J. R. C. Cousland and James R. Hume, 183–92. Leiden.
Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, and N. G. Wilson, eds. 1992. *Sophoclis fabulae*. Rev. ed. Oxford.
Marshall, C. W. 2014. *The Structure and Performance of Euripides' "Helen."* Cambridge.
Martina, Antonio, ed. 2018. *Euripide: "Medea."* Pisa.
Mastronarde, Donald J. 1979. *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. Berkeley, CA.
———, ed. 2002. *Euripides: "Medea."* Cambridge.
Murray, Gilbert, ed. 1902. *Euripidis fabulae*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
———, ed. 1909. *Euripidis fabulae*. Vol. 3. Oxford.
———, ed. 1938. *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*. Oxford.
Nauck, August. 1866. *Euripidis tragoediae*^{2}. Vol. 2. Leipzig.
Nordgren, Lars, 2015. *Greek Interjections: Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics*. Berlin.
O'Connell, Daniel C., and Sabine Kowal. 2010. Interjections in the Performance of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 39: 285–304.
Page, Denys L., ed. 1938. *Euripides: "Medea."* Oxford.
———, ed. 1972. *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoedias*. Oxford.
Parker, L. P. E., ed. 2016. *Euripides: "Iphigenia in Tauris."* Oxford.
Platnauer, Maurice, ed. 1938. *Euripides: "Iphigenia in Tauris."* Oxford.
Revermann, Martin. 2006. *Comic Business*. Oxford.
Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* 50.4: 696–735.
Schuren, Liesbeth. 2014. *Shared Storytelling in Euripidean Stichomythia*. Leiden.
Seaford, Richard. 1984. *Euripides: "Cyclops."* Oxford.
Stenström, Anna-Brita. 2011. Pauses and Hesitations. In *Pragmatics of Society*, ed. Gisle Anderson and Karin Aijmer, 537–67. Berlin.
Stevens, P. T., ed. 1971. *Euripides: "Andromache."* Oxford.
Stinton, T. C. W. 1977. Interlinear Hiatus in Trimeters. *CQ* 27: 67–72.
Sulzberger, M-R. 1945. Notes sur Eschyle. *RBPhil* 24: 139–44.
Van Emde Boas, Evert. 2017. *Language and Character in Euripides' "Electra."* Oxford.
Van Emde Boas, Evert, et al. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.
Walker, A. G. 1985. The Two Faces of Silence: The Effect of Witness Hesitancy on Lawyers' Impressions. In *Perspectives on Silence*, ed. Deborah Tannen and Muriel Saville-Troike, 55–75. Norwood, NJ.
West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
———, ed. 1998. *Aeschyli tragoediae*. Corrected ed. Stuttgart.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, ed. 1914. *Aeschyli tragoediae*. Berlin.