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Abstract: In Greek tragedy and comedy, a character arriving on stage may be announced by using the particle combination ἀλλὰ γάρ or καὶ μήν. Entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ is said by Denniston (1954) to be either “complex” (whereby ἀλλὰ goes with the main clause and γάρ with a dependent clause) or “simple” (both particles going with the main clause). Taking this as a starting point, all the instances of entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ are surveyed in the light of the PUSH and POP theory as expounded by Slings (1997). Similarities and differences between ἀλλὰ γάρ and entry-marking καὶ μήν are also pointed out, and brief conclusions are drawn thereof.
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Resumo: Na tragédia e comédia gregas, o ingresso de um personagem em cena pode ser anunciado com o uso da combinação de partículas ἀλλὰ γάρ ou καὶ μήν. Denniston (1954) afirma que ἀλλὰ γάρ pode ser classificado tanto como “complexo” (quando ἀλλὰ está ligado à oração principal e γάρ à oração subordinada) ou “simples” (ambas as partículas ligadas à oração principal). Tomando isso como ponto de partida, todos os exemplos de ἀλλὰ γάρ como anúncio de ingresso em cena são analisados à luz da teoria PUSH e POP exposta por Slings (1997). Semelhanças e diferenças entre ἀλλὰ γάρ e καὶ μήν também são apontadas, de onde se tiram breves conclusões.
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1. Ἀλλὰ γάρ as a “complex” combination

The entrance of a character upon the stage may be marked by the use of particles, the most common ones being καὶ μήν and ἀλλὰ γάρ. Denniston (1954: 98, 103-4) identifies two main constructions regarding ἀλλὰ γάρ...
γάρ, a “complex” one and a “simple” one. In the “complex” use ἀλλά and γάρ fulfill their functions independently, ἀλλά going with the main clause and γάρ with a dependent clause, while in the “simple” use both go with the main clause, whereby the collocation usually means “but, as matter of fact” (Denniston 1954: 101).

As regards the “complex” use, the passages where ἀλλά γάρ (or ἀλλά … γάρ for that matter) signal an entrance on stage may be readily analyzed in terms of the PUSH and POP theory as expounded by Slings (1997). Let us take for instance Euripides Hippolytus 51. Upon seeing Hippolytus approaching, Aphrodite cuts short her speech and retires in order to shun an undesired encounter. The goddess marks his arrival by saying:

(1) _pop_ ἀλλ’ _push_ εἰσορω γάρ τόνδε παίδα Θησέως οίκειοντα, θήρας μόχθον ἐκλειπότα, Ἰππόλυτον, _pop_ ἔξω τῶνδε βήσομαι τόπων.

‘But now I see Hippolytus coming, finished with the toil of the hunt, and so I shall leave this place.’2 (E. Hipp. 51-3)

By means of _pop_ ἀλλ’ Aphrodite dismisses the prospect of giving further details of events to come, announcing in its stead (and in the same breath) a course of action she will take: _pop_ ἀλλ’ … _pop_ ἔξω τῶνδε βήσομαι τόπων ‘but … I shall leave this place’. The PUSH following the first ἀλλά POP, marked by the inserted γάρ-clause, furnishes the reason why she will do so.3 The same pattern recurs a few times, the bridging γάρ-clause (= PUSH) always giving grounds for the explicit action to be carried out by the speaker at the POP level. The three following examples are akin in their envisaged action, namely, to fall silent, with the reason to do so duly given in the PUSH construction between the two-layered POP level triggered

---


3 Cf. Barrett 1964: 167. Entry-marking ἀλλ’ εἰσορω γάρ... occurs once in Aeschylus and seven times in Euripides (four times with an explicit action at POP level, three times without it), what has lead Taplin (1997: 269; 148 n.2) to consider it virtually a Euripidean formula (cf. Griffith 1983: 254; West 1987: 109). Taking into account also the probably spurious passages (see below), entry-marking ἀλλά γάρ occurs ten times in Euripides, twice in Aeschylus, once in Sophocles and four times in Aristophanes.
by sentence initial ἀλλά. Helen breaks off upon catching sight of Theoclymenus, whose entrance on stage she signals thus:

(2) \[\text{aba} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{ἀλλ'}, \quad \text{PUSH} \quad \text{ἐκπερᾶι γὰρ δωμάτων ὁ τοὺς ἐμοὺς γάμους ἑτοίμους ἐν χεροῖν ἔχειν δοκῶν,} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{σιγητέον μοι·} \]

'But since he is coming out, the man who thinks he has me safely in his possession, I must say nothing.' (E. Hel. 1385-7)

The entry of Agamemnon in Euripides Hecuba 726 is announced as follows by the chorus leader:

(3) \[\text{aba} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{ἀλλ'}, \quad \text{PUSH} \quad \text{εἰσορῶ γὰρ τοῦδε δεσπότου δέμας Ἀγαμέμνονος,} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{τοὐνθένδε σιγῶμεν, φίλαι.} \]

'But since I see Agamemnon, your master, approaching, let us now hold our peace.' (E. Hec. 724-5)

It is again the chorus leader who makes known the appearance of the Phrygian in Euripides Orestes 1369 – this time not upon seeing the new character, but upon hearing noises from inside the skene.4

(4) \[\text{aba} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{ἀλλα} \quad \text{PUSH} \quad \text{κτυπεῖ γὰρ κλῆιθρα βασιλείων δόμων,} \quad \text{POP} \quad \text{σιγήσατ'·} \quad \text{ἔξω γάρ τις ἐκβαίνει Φρυγών,} \quad \text{οὐ πενύομεσθα τὰν δόμοις ὅπως ἔχει.} \]

'But the bars of the palace gate are clanging. Hush, here comes one of the Phrygians, from whom we shall learn how matters stand indoors.' (E. Or. 1366-8)

The envisaged action within the POP level may comprise either a verbal adjective in -τέος (σιγητέον [ex. 2]), an exhortative subjunctive (σιγήσατ’ [ex. 3]), an imperative (σιγήσατ’ [ex. 4]), or a first person future (βήσομαι [ex. 1]). For the sake of thoroughness, let me quote one more example from the last three complements to \[\text{POP} \quad \text{ἀλλα} \quad \text{PUSH} \]

- first person future, second person plural imperative, and verbal adjective in -τέος respectively. In all these examples, it must be borne in mind that the γάρ-clauses provide the reasons for the course of action to be undertaken: the same particle cluster accounts for a sudden shift of focus calling for action (\[\text{POP} \quad \text{ἀλλα} \quad \text{PUSH γάρ} \]

and furnishes the cause thereof (\[\text{PUSH} \quad \text{γάρ} \]

character on stage.

---

4 The passage may have been inserted by a later actor, to whom the pattern was familiar. It does not figure in Denniston’s list of entry-marking ἀλλα γάρ.

Following a sorrow-laden choral song, the chorus leader signals the entry of Creon in Euripides’ *Phoenician Women* 1308 by vowing to put a stop to her weeping.\(^5\)

\begin{quote}
(5) \textit{ἀλλὰ} γὰρ Κρέοντα λεύσσω τόνδε δεῦρο συννεφή πρὸς δόμους στείχοντα, \textit{παύσω} τοὺς παρεστῶτας γόους.

‘But I see Creon coming to the palace with clouded brow: \textit{I shall cease} from my present lamentations.’ (E. Ph. 1308-9)\(^6\)
\end{quote}

Agave, showing clear signs of madness, arrives on stage announced by the chorus leader, who thereupon instructs her fellow revelers:

\begin{quote}
(6) \textit{ἀλλ’ εἰσορῶ γὰρ ἐς δόμους ὁρμωμένην Πενθέως Ἀγαυὴν μητέρ’ ἐν διαστρόφοις ὀσσοῖς, \textit{δέχεσθ’} ἐς κῶμον εὐίου θεοῦ.

‘But look! I see Pentheus’ mother Agave coming toward the house, her eyes rolling in madness! \textit{Receive her} into the reveling band of the blissful god!’ (E. Ba. 1165-7)\(^7\)
\end{quote}

When dawn rises on the first episode of Euripides’ *Electra* (102-6), Orestes addresses Pylades and suggests stepping aside from the path and asking (105 ἱστορήσομεν) some farmer or slave woman whether his sister Electra lived in those parts. Upon seeing an approaching servant, he apparently changes his mind\(^8\) and now wants to spy on her, who is none other than Electra herself and whose entry is thus announced:

\begin{quote}
(7) \textit{ἀλλ’ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τήνδε πρόσπολόν τινα πηγαῖον ἄχθος ἐν κεκαρμένωι κάραι φέρουσαν, \textit{ἑζώμεσθα κἀκπυθώμεθα} δούλης γυναικός, ἢν τι δεξώμεσθ’ ἐπος ἐφ’ οἷσι, Πυλάδη, τήνδ’ ἀφίμεθα χθόνα.

‘Look! I see a slave woman here carrying her burden of water on her close-cropped head. \textit{Let us crouch down}, Pylades, \textit{and listen to her} on the chance that we might catch some word to further the purpose that brought us to this land.’ (E. El. 107-11)
\end{quote}

\(^5\) This passage may be spurious as well, but see footnote 25.

\(^6\) \textit{ἀλλὰ} as opposed to disjoined \textit{ἀλλὰ} … γὰρ is admittedly rarer in its “complex” use, but as the present examples shows they are perfectly similar and need not be distinguished (cf. already Wilamowitz 1895: 37; Mastronarde 1994: 515).

\(^7\) The passage is absent from Denniston’s list.

\(^8\) Cf. Denniston 1939: 64.
Evidently not every instance of “complex” ἀλλὰ γάρ in tragedy (or in Euripides for that matter, for the seven examples above stem from him) announces the entry of a character, yet many occurrences of this cluster in other contexts display the same complements to ἀλλὰ POP, namely the subjunctive, the imperative, the future and the verbal adjective in -τέος. The pattern, as shown in the next four examples, one for each complement, is absolutely the same – bar the verb of seeing (εἰσορῶ, λεύσσω) and the deictic pronouns that are predictably widespread when it comes to an entry mark.

(8) [SUBJUNCTIVE]

\[\text{POP} \, \text{ἀλλά} \, \text{POP} \, \text{δέξομέθ'} \, \text{οἴκων καταλύσεις.}\]

‘Well, since your present guest and the absent son of Agamemnon, for whose sake we have come, are his worthy guests, let us accept the lodging this house affords.’ (E. El 391-3)

(9) [IMPERATIVE]

\[\text{POP} \, \text{ἀλλά}' \, \text{POP} \, \text{δεξώμεθ'} \, \text{οἴκων καταλύσεις.}\]

‘but since a hard compulsion forces me to do this, you must bear with me!’ (S. El. 256-7)

9 Cf. Ar. Nu. 798 ἀλλά' οὐκ ἐδέξει γὰρ μανθάνειν, τι εἰσόρω πάθω; ‘but he refuses to go to school, so what can I do?’ (N.G. Wilson prints a period after μανθάνειν; Denniston 1954: 99 prefers a comma, to my mind correctly); V. 318-9 ἀλλά', οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί εἰμι' ἀδείν—τι ποιήσω; ‘But since I can't sing, what am I to do?’. In E. El. 1245-6 σιγῶ may of course be either indicative or subjunctive: ἀλλά', ἄναξ γάρ ἐστι' ἐμός; ‘But no, since he is my lord, I hold my peace (or may I hold my peace)’; compare with example (3).

10 A similar example, although with a different word order (the ἀλλὰ and γάρ clauses do not appear intertwined, they follow one another), is Ar. Pax 668-9 ἀλλά, σιγῶ ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἣν τότε' ἐν τοῖς σκύτεσιν ‘but do pardon us: at that time our brains were in our shoe leather’. Other instances of imperative use (I confine myself to tragedy and comedy): S. Ant. 148-51 ἀλλὰ γάρ ἄραμα καταλύσεις ἢ μὲν δὴ πολέμων τῶν νῦν θέσατε (v.l. θεάται) λησμόσειν 'But since Victory whose name is glorious has come …, after the recent wars let us be forgetful' (as in example [5], ἀλλὰ and γάρ occur side by side, with no difference whatsoever to the disjoined ἀλλὰ … γάρ instances); E. Alc. 422-4 ἀλλά', ἑκοροάν γὰρ τοῦτο τιθέω μενοῦ, πάρεστε καὶ μένοντες ἀντιχήσατε παῖνα τῶι κάτωθεν ἀσπονδόν θεῶι ‘But since I shall conduct the funeral, attend me here, and while you wait sing a hymn to the god below, a hymn unaccompanied by libations'; E. Med. 1344-6 ἀλλά', ὁ γὰρ ἐν σε μυρίοις ὄνειδισιν δάκομι· τοινῦτ’ ἐμπέφυκέ σοι θράσος; ‘But since ten thousand insults of mine would not fail to sting you – such is your native impudence – be gone, doer of disgraceful deeds and murderer of your children’; S. OC 624-5 ἀλλά', ὁ γὰρ αὐδᾶν ἢδον τάκινητ’ ἐπη', ἀμαρτοστοὺς καὶ τέκνων μιαφόνε ‘But since our boys and our children…'
In all these examples, including the entry-marking ones we have seen so far, the shift of focus is accompanied by either a resolution or a command.
to put something into effect; the reason underlying this call to action – falling in silence included – is furnished simultaneously, whereby ἀλλὰ and γάρ clauses intermingle. Not every example, though, of the “complex” use of our ἀλλὰ γάρ cluster is so clear-cut, and Denniston himself (1954: 99) includes among them two passages that demand further discussion. In the first one, Euripides Trojan Women 706, ἀλλὰ γάρ may well have been taken as an entry mark, for Hecuba interrupts her speech when she sees “a servant of the Achaeans” approaching (actually Talthybius) and says:

(12) ἀλλ’ ἐκ λόγου γάρ ἄλλος ἐκβαίνει λόγος,

τίν’ αὖ δέδορκα τόνδ’ Ἀχαικὸν λάτριν

στείχοντα καινῶν ἄγγελον βουλευμάτων;

‘But now a new subject arises after the old: what servant of the Achaeans is this I see coming to announce new edicts?’ (E. Tr. 706-8)

The question is how to interpret ἀλλὰ γάρ in PUSH and POP terms. It cannot be that the γάρ clause (ἐκ λόγου … ἄλλος ἐκβαίνει λόγος) furnishes the reason why the ἀλλὰ clause is uttered (τίν’ αὖ δέδορκα τόνδ’ Ἀχαικὸν λάτριν στείχοντα καινῶν ἄγγελον βουλευμάτων). Quite on the contrary, it seems that the reason for claiming that “a new subject arises after the old” is precisely the fact that Hecuba makes out the servant coming. Here it seems that the cluster only operates at the POP level, the ἀλλὰ … γάρ POP dismissing the encouragement Hecuba has been giving in the previous lines to Andromache and breaking off her speech when she catches the glimpse of an Achaean (Talthybius first entrance on stage was announced by entry-marking καὶ μήν [230], on which more later). Apparently the example should have been understood as a “simple” construction, either as a breaking off device ([2.i] in Denniston’s classification, p.102) or even – but less likely – as an entry marking ([4.i], p.103). The next example seems also difficult to reconcile with the “complex” interpretation of the cluster (here we are not dealing with an entry mark). Polynices addresses Jocasta thus:

(13) ἀλλ’ ἐκ γὰρ ἄλγους ἄλγος αὖ, σὲ δέρκομαι

κάρα ἐνιχθεὶς καὶ πέπλους μελαχίμως

ἔχοσαν·

‘But – here one grief crowns another – I see you with shorn head and garments of black!’ (E. Ph. 371-3)
The reason for Polynices seeing Jocasta in such a state is not because one grief piles upon another. Rather, it is precisely because he has in front of his eyes the wretched figure of his mother that he is prompted to assert his distress. He dismisses the account of his personal plights given in the previous lines, cutting it short to address her. Here, again, ἀλλὰ ... γάρ POP seems to fulfill this breaking-off function. Both last examples show the use of ἀλλὰ ... γάρ with almost idiomatic expressions, making up what seem to be self-contained phrases (ἀλλ’ ἐκ λόγου γάρ ἄλλος ἐκβαίνει λόγος and ἀλλ’ ἐκ γάρ ἄλγους ἄλγος αὖ) followed by independent clauses.¹³

Yet the picture may be more complicated. Let me quote one last example of the ἀλλὰ ... γάρ combination unrelated to entries of characters on stage. In Euripides Iphigenia at Aulis 506-12 Agamemnon thanks Menelaus for his conciliating speech but then breaks off, stressing the necessity of killing his own offspring:

(14) ἀλλ’ ἥκομεν γὰρ εἰς ἀναγκαίας τύχας,
θυγατρὸς αἷματηρὸν ἐκπρᾶξαι φόνον.
'But we have reached the point where we are forced to commit the bloody murder of my daughter.' (E. IA 511-12)

Two analyzes present themselves. Either ἀλλὰ ... γάρ, as in the last two examples, is regarded as a single unity at the POP level (POP ἀλλ’ ἥκομεν γάρ ... φόνον) or each particle fulfills its relevant function in a “complex” structure (POP ἀλλ’ PUSH ἥκομεν γάρ ... φόνον). In the second alternative, the return to the ἀλλὰ POP level after the intervening γάρ PUSH should be considered as suppressed, entailing a sort of ellipsis or aposiopesis. Indeed, the whole line 512 stays in apposition to ἀναγκαίας τύχας; strictly speaking, one might take γάρ as a PUSH particle and translate: “POP But since we have reached the point where necessity rules – necessity, that

---

¹³ For a similar use of such expressions, cf. E. Tr. 1118-22: ἵω ἵω, καίν ἐκ καινόν μεταβάλλουσαι χόνι τυντυχίᾳ. λεύσπετε Τρώοις τῶνδ’ ἀστιάνακτ’ ἄλγοις μέλεαι νεκρόν... 'Ah, ah! Our land’s fortunes undergo one woeful change after another! Look, unhappy wives of the Trojans, at dead Astyanax!'. Here there is no particle involved, but the lines signal the entrance on stage of the body of Astyanax, and one may compare λεύσπετε (Tr. 1119) with δέδορκα (Tr. 707) and δέρκομαι (Ph. 371). Cf. also E. Or. 1503-5 καὶ μὴν ἀμείβει καινόν ἐκ καινόν τόδε: ἐξαφνύριν γὰρ εἴσορῷ πρὸ δοιμάτων βαίνοντ’ ὁρέστῃν ἐπιστημένοις ποδί. ‘But see, one strange thing succeeds another: I see Orestes, armed with a sword, coming out in front of the house with agitation in his step.’ I shall briefly discuss the relationship of entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μὴν in section 3 below.
is, to commit the bloody murder of my daughter, \( \text{pop} \emptyset \)…” What is omitted is the inevitable conclusion: “then let me do it” (πρακτέον, ἕκπραξόμεθα \( \text{vel sim} . \)). This will become clearer in passages where the verb εἰσορῶ is involved, and here I go back to the entry-marking cases.

### 2. Ἀλλὰ γάρ as a “simple” combination

Aeschylus’ Prometheus interrupts his conversation with the chorus upon seeing the god Hermes approaching.

(15) Ἀλλὰ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε τὸν Διὸς τρόχιν,
    τὸν τοῦ τυράννου τοῦ νέου διάκονον,
    πάντως τι καινὸν ἀγγελῶν ἐλήλυθεν.

‘But I see Zeus’s message-boy is here, the servant of the new autocrat; he will certainly have something fresh to announce.’ (A. Pr. 941-3)

Denniston (1954: 104) hesitates over how to classify this instance of ἀλλὰ γάρ, whether “simple” or “complex”. Three hypotheses may be put forward:

(i) \( \text{pop} \text{ push} \) ἀλλὰ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε τὸν Διὸς τρόχιν, τὸν τοῦ τυράννου τοῦ νέου διάκονον, \( \text{pop} \) πάντως τι καινὸν ἀγγελῶν ἐλήλυθεν.

(ii) \( \text{pop} \text{ push} \) ἀλλὰ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε τὸν Διὸς τρόχιν, τὸν τοῦ τυράννου τοῦ νέου διάκονον, πάντως τι καινὸν ἀγγελῶν ἐλήλυθεν.

Hypothesis (i) may be ruled out, since it is not because Prometheus spots Hermes (\( \text{push} \) εἰσορῶ γὰρ) that the god approaches with a message (\( \text{pop} \) ἀγγελῶν ἐλήλυθεν); hypothesis (ii) envisages the cluster as a “simple” one (\( \text{pop} \text{ push} \) ἀλλὰ εἰσορῶ γὰρ…); hypothesis (iii) accepts in turn a “complex” structure with zero or implied complement (\( \text{pop} \emptyset = σιγητέον μοι, σιγῶμεν \text{ vel sim} . \)).

Both (ii) and (iii) are in principle acceptable, yet to my mind (iii) is to be preferred if we take into consideration that in examples (1), (3), (5), (6), and (7) above it is not the verb of seeing that accounts for the sudden shift of focus, which is conveyed rather by the complement to \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλὰ. In other

---

words, when a γάρ clause is present the verb of seeing only furnishes the reason for the sudden call to action (implied or not).\textsuperscript{14}

Another entry-marking passage in which the cluster may be viewed either as simple or complex is Euripides \textit{Heracles} 442. The chorus leader announces the entry of several characters as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
(16) ἀλλ' ἐσορῶ γὰρ τούσδε φθιμένων ἐνδυτ' ἐχοντας, τοὺς τοῦ μεγάλου δή ποτε παιδας τὸ πρὶν Ἡρακλέους, ἄλοχον τε φιλην τύπο σειραίους ποιον έλκουσαν τέκνα καὶ γεραιόν πατέρ’ Ἡρακλέους, δυστήνος εγώ, δακρύων ὡς οὐ δύναμαι κατέχειν γραίας ὄσσων ἐτι πηγάς.

'But look, I see the children here with the finery of the dead upon them, children of Heracles once mighty, I see his dear wife moving the children forward, as they cling to her legs that draw them like a trace horse, and the old father of Heracles. Ah unhappy me, I cannot check the tears flowing from my eyes!' (E. \textit{HF} 442-50)
\end{verbatim}

The zero or implied complement (\textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{pop}}} ἀλλ' \textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{push}} ἐσορῶ γὰρ ... πατέρ' Ἡρακλέους, \textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{pop}}} \textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{O}}...) might be justified, on the one hand, by the sprawling description of the entering characters, at the end of which the ἀλλὰ complement would sound unnatural; and, on the other, by the very exclamation of vv. 448-50: the elderly coryphaeus bursts into tears against his will, and one might suppose that the call to action following \textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{pop}}} ἀλλὰ would have hypothetically referred to it, e.g. “let me hold my tears in front of them”.

A case where joy, not grievance, is involved is the following entry marking announced by Orestes:

\begin{verbatim}
(17) ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε φίλτατον βροτῶν Πιλαδὴν δρόμωι στείχοντα Φωκέων ἄπο,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{\footnotesize \textit{E. Supp.}} 794-7 is a somewhat different case; the chorus leader signals the entry of Adrastus and Theseus in the following way: ἀλλά τάδ’ ἢδη σώματι λέοσσω τῶν οἰχομένων παιδῶν μελέα πῶς ὡς ἐν ὀλοίμην σὶν τοῖσδε τέκνοις κοινόν ἐς Άιδην καταβᾶσα: 'But now I behold the bodies of our perished sons! O how I wish I could die with these children, treading with them the downward path to Hades!’ Here there is no ἀλλὰ γάρ cluster and no call to action is at issue: πῶς ὡς ἐν ὀλοίμην, to which ἀλλὰ could be related, is merely a wish.
Pylades’ entry comes as a great surprise to Orestes; his hopes were gone since Menelaus had left the stage, breaking Orestes’ suppliant grasp in 716. Now, putting in the shade his previous fears, he is thrilled at the sight of his friend, and the comparison in 727-8 might be said to have precluded, or at least left implicit, a call to action (e.g. “let me welcome him!”) resuming the \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλά after the intervening γάρ clause (“since I see him…”): \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλ’ εἰσορῷ γὰρ τόνδε φίλαττον βροτῶν Πυλάδην δρόμωι στείχοντα Φωκέων ἄπο, ἢδειαν ὅψιν. \( \text{pop} \) πιστὸς ἐν κακοῖς ἀνήρ…

In Euripides’ \( \text{Heracles} \) a sense of foreboding from the chorus leader might be expected when he announces the entry of, Lycus, the usurper of the throne of Thebes:

(18) ἀλλ’ εἰσορῷ γὰρ τόνδε δωμάτων πέλας

Λύκον περῶντα, τήροθα κοίρανον χθόνος.

But I see the country’s ruler, Lycus, approaching this house.’ (E. \( \text{HF} \) 138-9)

Here, too, as in example (15) above, the assumption of an ellipsis or aposiopesis is not out place: \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλ’ εἰσορῷ γὰρ τόνδε δωμάτων πέλας

Λύκον περῶντα, τήροθα κοίρανον χθόνος. \( \text{pop} \) … \( \text{pop} \) \( \text{Ø} \) … (\( \text{pop} \) \( \text{Ø} \) = σιγητέον μοι, σιγῶμεν vel sim.). The cluster ἀλλὰ γάρ POP would be ill-suited to signal the entry of a character when a verb of seeing is at issue, for the idea of replacing conveyed by ἀλλά (a shift in the action is called for to replace a former one) has little to do with the act of seeing itself. In other words, the act of seeing is in an embedded sequence marked by the PUSH particle

15 In the lines preceding Pylades’ entry Orestes exclaims (722-4): οἴμοι, προδέδομαι, κοὐκέτ’ εἰσίν ἔλπιδες ὅπηι τραπόμενος θάνατον Αργείων φύγω· οὗτος (= Menelaus) γὰρ ἦν μοι καταφυγὴ σωτηρίας. ’Oh, I have been abandoned! I have no hope, no place I can turn to escape an Argive death! He was my life-saving refuge’.

16 Cf. Bond 1981: 101 (who apparently overlooks in his reckoning of entry-marking \( \text{ἀλλὰ γὰρ} \) two Euripidean passages: \( \text{Ba} \). 1165 and \( \text{Or} \). 1366; the list provided by Mastronarde 1994: 515 is rather incomplete). Bond himself posits an ellipsis already suggested by Willamowitz (1895: 37). Other scholars have also drawn attention to this type of ellipsis without investigating it any further, e.g. Jebb (1900) on S. \( \text{Ant} \). 148 (cf. Jebb [1899] on S. \( \text{OC} \) 988); Griffith (1983: 254 and 1999: 154); Allan (2008: 312).

γάρ and has a different frame of reference from the embedding sequence marked by the POP particle ἀλλά.\textsuperscript{18}

Other instances of entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ that do not display a complement to \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλά nor a verb of seeing (or hearing) at the γάρ level can be interchangeably analyzed as examples of either “complex” or “simple” construction (\( = \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ \( \text{PUSH} \) γάρ or \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ γάρ respectively). Sophocles Antigone 155 is a case in point; Creon’s entry is thus announced by the chorus:

(19) ἀλλ’ ὁδε γὰρ δὴ βασιλεὺς χώρας, τὸ Κρέων ὁ Μενοικέως τὸ νεοχμὸς νεαρά χωρεῖ τίνα μὴν ἐρέσσων, ὅτι συγκλητον τῆν γερόντων προὔθετο λέσχην, κοινῷ κηρύγματι πέμψας; 'But here comes the new king of the land, … Creon, under the new conditions given by the gods; what plan is he turning over, that he has proposed this assembly of elders for discussion, summoning them by general proclamation?'
(S. Ant. 155-61)

These lines come at the end of the choral song, and it would not be stretching a point to suggest that a complement to \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλά has been left implicit (e.g. “but let us put a halt to this song, since here comes Creon …”).\textsuperscript{19} Something similar would hold true for Aeschylus Seven Against Thebes 861, although the passage is most probably spurious, for Antigone and Ismene may have been added to the cast at a later date, when a reshaped ending was created to the play (the mss. usually ascribe to the sisters the responsive phrases beginning in 961).

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. examples (12) and (13) where the \( \text{δέδορκα} \) and \( \text{δέρκομαι} \) clauses go logically with the explanation provided by the previous γάρ: in (12) it is because Hecuba sees (\( \text{δέδορκα} \)) a servant of the Achaeans that she asserts that a new subject arises after the old (\( \text{PUSH} \) \( \text{ἐκ} \) λόγου γάρ \( \text{ἄλλος} \) \( \text{ἐκβαίνει} \) \( \text{λόγος} \)); in (13) it is because Polynices sees (\( \text{δέρκομαι} \)) Jocasta that he asserts that one grief crowns another (\( \text{PUSH} \) \( \text{ἐκ} \) γάρ \( \text{ἄλγους} \) \( \text{ἄλγος} \) \( \text{αὖ} \)). If one is ready to accept this, then ἀλλὰ γάρ in example (12) could be regarded as an entry-marking instance with the following schema: \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ \( \text{PUSH} \) \( \text{ἐκ} \) λόγου γάρ \( \text{ἄλλος} \) \( \text{ἐκβαίνει} \) \( \text{λόγος} \) \( \text{POP} \ldots \) (\( \text{POP} \ldots \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \ldots \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{PO} \) (i.e. ἀλλὰ γάρ POP) cannot be ruled out and in my view should be preferred.

\textsuperscript{19} Wakker (1997: 228) perfectly catches the meaning in her translation of lines 155-6: “but enough about this for [ἀλλὰ ... γάρ] here comes – please note [δὴ] – the king of the land, Creon”.

José Marcos Macedo

The lines are suspect not least for disregarding the use of the entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ cluster as a breaking-off device, which is common to every other instance in our corpus: the chorus only breaks off a hundred lines or so afterwards. In Aristophanes we find four times our cluster to signal the entrance of a character on stage, and in all of them an implicit “[but] enough of this, [for]…” or “[but] it doesn’t matter, [for]” may be assumed. That is to say that an outline such as ἀλλὰ … γάρ … may be taken for granted.

In (21) Dicaeopolis signals the entry of the Prytaneis after his introductory jeremiad on the woes of Athens. In (22) the same Dicaeopolis dismisses his sorrow over the loss of a savory dish (174 οἴμοι τάλας, μυττωτὸν ὅσον ἀπώλεσα ‘Damn it all, what a good salad I’ve lost’) by announcing the entrance of Amphiteus. In (23) Peisetaerus shrugs off the messenger’s account of walls so quickly built, which he considers a fish story, upon seeing the approach of a second messenger. In (24) the Athenian Delegate breaks off his speech and, baffled as he is, signals the entry of the slaves who were chased off a few lines before (1224).

20 Denniston (1954: 103) refers also to Ar. Ec. 951, but wrongly so, for this is not really an entry mark. Epigenes, the young man whose entrance is allegedly signaled, is already on stage: his appearance was made known by the First Old Woman at 934 (ὁδὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔστιν ‘In fact, here he comes now!’).
All in all it seems that every instance of entry-marking ἀλλὰ (...) γάρ may be viewed as “complex”, whereby the γάρ-clause explains the main clause introduced by ἀλλὰ, which in turn may be elliptical or not. Many instances of ἀλλὰ γάρ not marking an entrance-announcement in tragedy and comedy follow this “complex” pattern, either with non-elliptical POP ἀλλὰ (as seen in examples (8) to (11)) or with ellipsis (e.g. example (14)).

“Simple” ἀλλὰ (...) γάρ, I suggest, is only found where an entry is not involved, even though it may have a breaking-off function, as in Euripides Ion 144 where, as far as I can see, there is little possibility of taking γάρ as a PUSH particle even if one is ready to accept an ellipsis. Rather, the combination as a whole – as a “replacing” set formula – must be viewed as POP, for here γάρ hardly retains its explanatory force:

(25) \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλ’ ἐκπαύσω γὰρ μόχθους
dαφνας ὀλκοις,
χρυσεων δ’ ἐκ τευχέαν ῥίψω
gαίας παγάν (…)
But I shall cease my labor of sweeping with these laurel branches, and from a vessel of gold I shall cast the water the earth produces (…).’ (E. Ion 144-7)

As for chronology, it is quite natural to suppose that an elliptical \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλὰ ...

\( \text{push} \) γάρ ...

\( \text{pop} \) Ω pattern will have been the starting point for reanalyzing the collocation as \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλὰ ...

γάρ tout court.

3. Ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μήν

Breaking-off is therefore one of the features that distinguish entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ. Yet this might also be a characteristic of some instances of entry-marking καὶ μήν, and is it not always easy to say why one cluster is used instead of the other. Let us take Euripides Orestes 348 where the chorus leader, right after the strophic choral song, signals the entrance of king Menelaus as follows:

(26) καὶ μήν βασιλεὺς ὃδε δὴ στείχει
Μενέλαος ἀναξ, πολὺς ἄβροσύνη.

Cf. Jebb (1899) on S. OC 899. He apparently envisages either an elliptical or a non-elliptical usage for the combination ἀλλὰ ... γάρ, but not a “simple” one (= \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλὰ γάρ... as against the “complex” \( \text{pop} \) ἀλλὰ \( \text{push} \) γάρ \( \text{pop} \) Ω...). The same view is left implicit in Willamowitz’s commentary (1895: 37).
δῆλος ὁρᾶσθαι τοῦ Τανταλίδων
ἐξ αἵματος ὤν.
στρατὸν ὄρμησας ὡς γῆν Λύσιαν,
χαῖρ'.
'But look, here comes king Menelaus, resplendent in luxury: his looks mark
him plainly from the blood of the sons of Tantalus. Leader of the thousand-ship
fleet to Asia, hail!' (E. Or. 348-53)

It is also the chorus leader who, again after a strophic choral song, an-
nounces the arrival of Lycus, himself a king – but this time ἀλλὰ γάρ is em-
ployed (see example (18)): ἀλλ’ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόδε δωμάτων Λύκον
περῶντα, τῆσδε κοίραν χθόνος. 'But I see the country’s ruler, Lycus,
approaching this house' (E. HF 138-9). What is the pragmatic difference
between both?

First it must be said that both ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μήν are used by either
chorus leader or character to mark an arrival. But one may note that, at least
in Euripides, when καὶ μήν is used to announce the arrival of a character it
is basically uttered by the chorus leader, and seldom by a character, whereas
the split is not so clear-cut in Sophocles and Aeschylus (in Aristophanes it is
in fact the characters who preferentially utter entry-marking καὶ μήν).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euripides</th>
<th>Sophocles</th>
<th>Aeschylus</th>
<th>Aristophanes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chorus leader (or chorus)¹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character²</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Who utters entry-marking καὶ μήν? (notas 1²² e 2²⁴)

The figures for entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ in Euripides do not show such
an imbalance, and only characters utter them in Aristophanes.

²² A similar question seems to have puzzled Kamerbeek (1978: 60), who, commenting on S. Ant.
155, prefers not to delve into the problem: "Here the difference with καὶ μήν is slight". Cf. also
Webster (1933: 119-20): his account on what he calls "the καὶ μήν and the ἀλλὰ γάρ class" is
nevertheless rather chaotic.

²³ E. Alc. 507, 611, 1006; Heracl. 118; Hipp. 899, 1151, 1342; Andr. 494, 545, 879, 1166; Hec. 216,
665; Supp. 980, 1031; El. 339; Tr. 230, 1207; IT 236; Ph. 443; Or. 348, 456, 1012; IA 1619; [Rh.]
85; S. El. 1422 (chorus); Ant. 525, 1180, 1257; OC 549; A. Th. 372 (?semi-chorus); Ar. Lys.
1072, 1082.

²⁴ E. Ion 1257 (Creusa); [Rh.] 627 (Athena); S. Aj. 1168 (Teucer); El. 78 (old slave); OC 1249
(Antigone); Ar. Ach. 908 (Dicaeopolis); Eq. 691 (sausage seller); Pl. 332 (Chremylus), 1038
(old woman). Denniston (1954: 586) is somewhat misleading when he says that καὶ μήν is
"often" used as the first words of a character.

There is no exception to the rule that entry-marking καὶ μήν is uttered as the first words of character or chorus leader (or chorus). In its turn entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ is markedly used not as first words (13x), except when employed after a strophic choral song and uttered by the chorus leader (4x, all of them in Euripides).

As we have seen, examples (26: καὶ μήν) and (18: ἀλλὰ γάρ) are very much similar in this regard, appearing as they do after a strophic choral song and being uttered by the chorus leader. In fact, as noted by Hamilton (1978: 72), entrances that immediately follow choral odes are not announced.27 It is perhaps not without interest to note that, in the fewer instances when they are indeed announced, they tend to be accompanied – especially in Euripides – by one of our particle combinations. As regards the tragedians,28 there are 87 unannounced entries of characters after (or else at the end of) strophic choral songs,29 as against 30 announced ones. Of these, 15 employ καὶ μήν and ἀλλὰ γάρ. If we discount three instances where a break-off is not involved – what may well have precluded the use of either of our particle collocations30 – we end up with 15 out of 27 unannounced entries of characters, which represents a frequency of 71.43%. Of these, 15 employ καὶ μήν and ἀλλὰ γάρ. If we discount three instances where a break-off is not involved – what may well have precluded the use of either of our particle collocations30 – we end up with 15 out of 27 announced entries of characters, which represents a frequency of 71.43%.

Table 2 – Who utters entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ? (notas 325 e 426)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euripides</th>
<th>Sophocles</th>
<th>Aeschylus</th>
<th>Aristophanes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chorus leader (or chorus)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 E. Hec. 724; HF 138, 442; Ph. 1308 (probably spurious; for Mastronarde 1994: 512-4 lines 1308-53 are genuine); Or. 1366 (probably spurious); Ba. 1165; S. Ant. 155 (chorus); A. Th. 861 (probably spurious).
26 E. Hipp. 51; El. 107; Hel. 1385; Or. 725; A. Pr. 941; Ar. Ach. 40, 175; Av. 1168; Lys. 1239
28 Data based mainly on Hamilton 1978: 73-80.
29 Aeschylus: 16x; Sophocles: 19x; Euripides: 52x.
30 In E. Alc. 232-3 Chorus A announces the arrival of Alcestis and Admetus, thereupon Chorus B and the chorus leader speak another ten lines, and only then Alcestis and Admetus begin to sing. Thus the announcement does not involve a break off, and both ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μήν would be ill-suited in this context. E. IA 590-7 are probably spurious and may belong to a second chorus, in which case they are followed by another nine lines (598-606) uttered by the chorus of women from Euboea, and only then Clytaemesta begins her speech. Again, the announcement does not involve a break off, hence our particles are not employed. The semi-chorus in Aeschylus Seven Against Thebes 369-71 heralds the arrival of the scout without the use of any particle; thereupon (372-4) the other semi-chorus announces that Eteocles is coming (372 καὶ μήν ὅδ...). It appears that the use of καὶ μήν is warranted in the second announcement, but not in the first, because only after the second announcement the chorus breaks off.
nounced entrances following choral songs (55%) using either καὶ μήν or ἀλλὰ γάρ (in Euripides the percentage is 69%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euripides</th>
<th>Sophocles</th>
<th>Aeschylus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ μήν</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλὰ γάρ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Announced entrances after (or at the end of) strophic choral songs (notas 532 e 633)

As for the announced entries after strophic choral songs without the use of ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μήν, apart from the three instances mentioned above where a break-off does not occur, there are three further instances where either ἀλλὰ or μήν is employed: S. Ant. 626 (μήν); E. Hipp. 170 (ἀλλὰ); E. IT 456 (ἀλλὰ). Most of the remaining cases display different constructions, of which Sophocles is particularly fond: S. Ant. 376-8, 801-5; Tr. 962-4; OT 1110-12; OC 1096-8; E. Tro. 1118-21; A. Ag. 489-94. In all these passages the entry announcement is couched in an explanation of sorts following upon a sentence. The use of καὶ μήν is hence precluded, whereas the adversative character of ἀλλὰ γάρ would be out of place.

31 The previous assertions correct and build upon Wilamowitz’s claim (1895: 38) – rightly challenged by Bond (1981: 101) – that ἀλλὰ γάρ is customary “bei der überleitung vom gesange zum dialoge”.

32 E. Alc. 1006; Hipp. 1151; Andr. 494; Supp. 980; Tr. 230; Or. 348, 1012; S. Aj. 1168; OC 1249; A. Th. 372.

33 E. HF 138, 442; Ph. 1308 (probably spurious); Or. 1366 (probably spurious); S. Ant. 155.

34 The break-off function is common to the three examples, and καὶ μήν or ἀλλὰ γάρ might have been used as well, particularly in the last case, where ἀλλὰ … γάρ would suit the context very well (*pop ἀλλὰ ... push γάρ ... pop στίγματε ...). The most interesting example is of course E. Or. 1549-50, combining as it does ἀλλὰ and μήν: ἀλλὰ μήν καὶ τόνδε λεόνσιον Μενέλεων δόμων πόλεως ὀβώσων, ἡμιθημένον ποιν τὴν τύχην ἢ νῦν πάρα Ἀθρ. But here I see Menelaus approaching the house with hurried step: he must have heard about what has happened. In this example one might argue that ἀλλὰ goes with lines 1551-2: (ἀλλὰ...) οὐκέτ’ ἢ φθάνοντες κλήθρα συμπεραίνοντες μοχλός, ὦ κατὰ στέγας Ἀτρέων. ‘But…’ [y]ou in the house, Atreus’ descendants, it’s high time you finished bolting the doors with bars!’

35 In A. Ag. 489-94 the announcement of arrival (κήρυκ’ … τόνδ’ ὑμῶν) follows, by way of explanation, the sentence in which the arrival itself is hinted at (τάχ’ εἰσόμεσθα…). Hence the adversative incision, so to say, that prevails in contexts where entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ and καὶ μήν are used is absent (and καὶ μήν at 493 would be anyway impossible for it would not figure as the first words spoken by the character (= Clytaemestra), the only place where it is found among the extant tragedies and comedies (cf. Denniston 1954: 586 and Meridor 1979). See E. Med. 1116-20, where καὶ δῆ is used: the context is similar, but Medea is certain of her success and only waits for confirmation (cf. Erp Taalman Kip 2009: 114), while Aeschylus’ Clytaemestra is not, hence the use of καὶ δῆ in Agamemnon 493 would be unwarranted. Something...
Still, though not uninteresting in themselves, these figures cannot account for the reason why καὶ μήν is used in example (26) and ἀλλὰ γάρ in example (18). A possible explanation may be sought along pragmatic lines and has to do with text cohesion. In (26) the chorus had just mentioned appraisingly in their song the house of Tantalus (Or. 345-7 τίνα γὰρ ἔτι πάρος οἶκον ἄλλον ἐτερον ἦ τὸν ἀπὸ θεογόνων γάμων, τὸν ἀπὸ Ταντάλου σέβεσθαι με χρή; ‘But what other house shall I rather honor than this, the house of Tantalus, descended from marriage with the gods?’), and Menelaus’ entry announced by the chorus leader suits them very well: 350-1 δήλος ὁρᾶσθαι τοῦ Τανταλίδων ἐξ αἵματος ὤν ‘his looks mark him plainly from the blood of the sons of Tantalus’. The topic of the house of Tantalus is carried on from the immediately preceding choral song to the announced entry of the Tantalid (καὶ μήν...), and the praise heaped on him is all the more justified in light of it. Nothing similar can be said of example (18): the approach of Lycus (ἀλλ’ … γὰρ) signals an abrupt shift of focus – in fact, some anxiety is to be expected from the chorus’s leader upon seeing him, a true antagonist.

Entry-marking καὶ μήν, I suggest, tends to be used where a topic is carried on (or else resumed) when announcing an arrival on stage, even though the shift of focus is inherent in its employment. Entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ, on the other hand, tends to signal a harsher shift of focus without explicit topic continuity. Perhaps this is best illustrated when comparing E. Hec. 724-5 (= example (3): ἀλλ’ εἰσορῶ γὰρ τοῦδε δεσπότου δέμας Ἀγαμέμνονος, τοῦνθένδε σιγῶμεν, φίλαι ‘But since I see Agamemnon, your master, approaching, let us now hold our peace’) with the following:

similar also could be said of the following: S. Ant. 376-8 (the announcement explains why the chorus is at a loss); S. Ant. 801-5 (for the tears that cannot be held in check when announcing new arrivals upon stage, cf. E. HF 442-50 [ex.16: ἀλλὰ ... γάρ], esp. 449-50); S. Tr. 962-4; and OC 1096-8. In E. Tr. 1118-21 the announcement explains why the chorus leader asserts that one woeful change follows another (cf. E. Tr. 706-8 [ex.12]: ἀλλ’ ἐκ λόγου γὰρ ἄλλοις εἴκοσι λόγος..., and in S. OT 1110-12 the main clause τὸν βοτῆρν ἐτάν δοκό ἀλλ’ ἐκ λόγου γὰρ ἀλλοις εἴκοσι λόγος...) the conditional clause in which the conditions for its truth are specified, thus precluding any adversative incision typical of our particles. The case of E. Tr. 568-9 is a unique one: ‘Ἑκάβη, λεύσσεις τήνδ’ Ανδρομάχην ἐπὶ οὐρανοῦ ἐκζητήσας. ‘Hecuba, do you see Andromache here carried on an enemy wagon?’ In our corpus, never is a verb of seeing (λεύσσω, ὁρῶ, ἔκθεο, δέδορκα, δέρκομαι, βλέπω) used in the second person singular with the particles ἀλλὰ γάρ or καὶ μήν to announce a new arrival. Only the first person singular is attested (11x καὶ μήν, 9x ἀλλὰ γάρ); the second person λεύσσεις seems to have blocked any possibility of employing either of the clusters.

(27) καὶ μήν περώσα τυγχάνει δόμων ὕπο ἥδ’ (= Hecuba), ἐς δὲ καρφὸν σοίσι φαίνεται λόγοις.
‘But here she comes out of the tent, appearing at the right moment to hear your report.’ (E. Hec. 665-6)

Hecuba is the main topic since line 658. Her arrival is most suitable, and this is duly underlined by the chorus leader: she comes “at the right moment” (ἐς δὲ καρφὸν). Characters arriving at the right moment are indeed not infrequently announced with the use of καὶ μήν, suggesting that the topic is being either resumed or carried on. In Euripides Hippolytus 899, Hippolytus is the main topic since line 885 and his arrival simply moves the topic forward, notwithstanding the break-off function inherent to καὶ μήν. Again the right time (ἐς καρφὸν) is mentioned.

(28) καὶ μήν ὅδ’ αὐτὸς παῖς σὸς ἐς καιρὸν πάρ Ἱππόλυτος…
‘Look! Your son Hippolytus is here himself, a timely arrival!’ (E. Hipp. 899-900)

An example of a topic being resumed is Sophocles Ajax 1168:

(29) καὶ μήν ἐς αὐτὸν καρφὸν οἶδε πλησίοι πάρειν ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε παῖς τε καὶ γυνὴ, τάφον περιστελοῦντε δυστήνου νεκροῦ.
‘Yes, at this very moment here are this man’s son and wife, come to adorn the tomb of the hapless corpse.’ (S. Aj. 1168-70)

Teucer had sent Tecmessa to fetch the child at 985-9; now they make their entrance ἐς καρφὸν, announced by entry-marking καὶ μήν. Alternatively, entrances signaled by ἀλλὰ γάρ are never said to happen at the right time.39

36 The maidservant asks the chorus where Hecuba is at 658 (γυναῖκες, Ἑκάβη ποῦ ποθ’ ἡ παναθλία ‘women, where is Hecuba the utterly wretched…?’) and explains why she does so at 663 (‘Ἐκάβη φέρω τόδ’ ἅλγος ἢ it is to Hecuba that I bring this sorrow’).
38 Compare also A. Th. 372-3 καὶ μήν ἄνας ὅδ’ αὐτὸς Οἰδίπου τόκος (= Eteocles) ἐς ἀρτικόλλον, ἄγγελον λόγον μαθεῖν ‘And here is the king himself, the son of Oedipus, just at the precise time to learn what the messenger has to say’. At 369-71 a voice from the chorus (or the second half-chorus) had announced the entry of the scout, without particles; now Eteocles’ entry is signaled alongside the remark that he has come “in the nick of time” to hear what the scout is about to say.
39 Rather, an element of surprise may be felt: the entrance of Amphiteus coming back so soon from Sparta (Ar. Ach. 175 = example 22) must surely have caused a mild astonishment to Dicaeopolis, for he had sent him on a diplomatic mission to the city at 130-2, barely forty-five
In Euripides *Heracl.* 118, Demophon is the main topic since 111:

(30) καὶ μὴν ὁδ’ αὐτὸς (= Demophon) ἔρχεται σπουδὴν ἔχων
Ἀκάμας τ’ ἀδελφός, τῶνδ’ ἐπήκοοι λόγων.
’Look! Here he comes himself in haste, and his brother Acamas with him, to hear these words.’ (*E. Heracl.* 118-9)

Here lies one of the main differences between καὶ μὴν and καὶ δή: the character whose arrival is signaled by καὶ μὴν may well have been the topic of the discussion that immediately precedes it, yet the arrival is not prepared for (when it is, καὶ δή is used). But the crucial point is that entry-marking καὶ μὴν tend to enhance topic continuity, lending particular cohesion to an arrival on stage. A character arriving of his or her own accord, for instance, may be explicitly integrated into the plot in the following examples:

(31) καὶ μὴν ὁρῶ καὶ Βλεψίδημον τουτονὶ
προσιόντα· δῆλος δ’ ἐστίν ὅτι τοῦ πράγματος
ἀκήκοέν τι τῇ βαδίσει καὶ τῷ τάχει.
’And here comes Blepsidemus too; the way he’s striding and hurrying along, he’s obviously heard something about what’s going on.’ (*Ar. Pl.* 332-4)

(32) καὶ μὴν ὁρῶ τάλαιναν Εὐρυδίκην ὁμοῦ
δάμαρτα τὴν Κρέοντος· ἐκ δὲ δωμάτων
ἤτοι κλυοῦσα παιδὸς ἢ τύχῃ περά.
’Now I see the unhappy Eurydice close by, Creon’s wife; she is coming from the house, perhaps because she has heard about her son.’ (*S. Ant.* 1180-2)

A character may also arrive on stage after being summoned, and here καὶ μὴν may signal that a topic is being resumed.

---

lines before! In *Ar. Ach.* 40 (= example 21) the Prytaneis were previously referred to, but the use of ἀλλὰ γάρ may well be sarcastic: “Look, what a surprise, here they come... at noon!” (they were expected long before that).


41 Cf. *Ar. Pl.* 1038-9 καὶ μὴν τὸ μειράκιον τοδὶ προσέρχεται, οὗπερ πάλαι κατηγοῦσα τυγχάνω (...). ’But look, here comes the young man now, the very one I’ve been castigating.’ Example (30) is of course a suitable one as well.

42 Cf. *E. IA* 1619-20 καὶ μὴν Ἀγαμέμνονον ἄναξ στείχει, τοῦσδ’ αὐτός ἔχων σοι φράζειν μύθους ὁξύπου, ἠισθημένον που τὴν τύχη νῦν πάρα. ’But here I see Menelaus approaching the house with hurried step: he must have heard about what has happened.’

---

καὶ μὴν ἄναξ ὅδ’ ἡμῖν Αἰγέως γόνος
Θησεύς κατ’ ὀμφήν σὴν ἀποσταλεὶς πάρα.
‘See, here is our king, the son of Aegeus, Theseus, who was summoned according to your words.’ (S. OC 549-50)43

In Euripides’ Hippiolytus, Theseus commands the messenger to bring his son at 1265 (κομίζετ’ αὐτόν); at 1342 Hippolytus’ entrance is announced by the chorus leader thus: καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας ὅδε στείχει (...) ‘Look, here comes the unhappy man (...)’44 In Sophocles Antigone, Creon summons Ismene at 491 (καὶ νιν καλεῖτ’) and the chorus leader’s anapests announce her arrival at 525: καὶ μὴν πρὸ πυλῶν ἡδ’ Ἰσμήνη (...) ‘See, here before the gates is Ismene (...)’.

Finally, a character’s arrival may be hinted at by the plot. The actual arrival may be signaled by καὶ μὴν, whereby the previously mentioned topic is taken up. In Euripides Alcestis 477, Heracles asks the chorus whether Admetus is at home;45 some lines later (507-8) Admetus is announced as follows: καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας τήσδε κοίρανος χθονὸς | Ἀδμητος ἔξω δωμάτων πορεύεται ‘But here, Admetus, the king of this land, is himself coming out of doors’. Euripides Andromache 1166-7 (καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας τήσδε κοίρανος χθονὸς | Ἀδμητος ἔξω δωμάτων πορεύεται) ‘See, here is our lord, his body carried home from the land of Delphi’) may be viewed either as a case of a topic being carried on or resumed, for at 1158-60 the messenger had told Peleus that Neoptolemus’ body was being brought back to be mourned (cf. Erp Taalman Kip 2009: 116). In Sophocles Oedipus at Colonus 1249, Antigone announces the entry of Polynices (καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας τήσδε κοίρανος χθονὸς | Ἀδμητος ἔξω δωμάτων πορεύεται) , who was the topic of the previous conversation between Oedipus, Theseus and Antigone (1150-1210) before the choral song.46 The topic continuity is made explicit by Antigone: Oedipus asks her who that stranger might be (1252a) and she retorts (1252b-53): ὁνὶπερ καὶ πάλαι κατείχομεν | γνώμη, πάρεστι δεῦρο Πολυνείκης ὅδε ‘The man who for some time has occupied our thoughts, Polynices has come here!’

43 Theseus was summoned by Oedipus himself at 455-6; cf. Erp Taalman Kip 2009: 113.
44 Cf. Erp Taalman Kip 2009: 116; 117 (on Eur. Ion 1257-8). In Euripides Andromache 545-6 (καὶ μὴν δέδορκα τόνδε Πηλέα πέλας, σπουδῆι τιθέντα δεῦρο γηραιὸν πόδα ‘But look, I see Peleus nearby, hastening his aged steps hither’), Peleus enters accompanied by the maidservant sent by Andromache some 450 lines before (cf. vv. 79-90)!
45 Ἀδμητον ἐν δόμοισιν ἄρα κατασκεύαζε;

4. Conclusions

To sum up, it may be said that entry-marking ἀλλὰ (... γάρ:

1. signals a strong or marked shift of focus;
2. may be accompanied by an explicit call for action \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ … \( \text{PUSH} \) γάρ … \( \text{POP} \) [SUBJUNCTIVE] [IMPERATIVE] [FUTURE] [-τεός]);
3. when a call to action is absent \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ […] \( \text{PUSH} \) γάρ … \( \text{POP} \) \( \text{POP} \), it may be presumed, which is tantamount to say that there are only “complex” instances of the cluster, as against “simple” ones \( \text{POP} \) ἀλλὰ […] γάρ… \) not related to entry announcements;
4. has a stronger break-off function when compared to entry-marking καὶ μήν, for more often than not it does not figure as first words of either character or chorus leader;
5. may be uttered likewise by either character or chorus leader (or even by the whole chorus).

In comparison, entry-marking καὶ μήν:

1. signals a light or unmarked shift of focus;
2. may be used to carry on a given topic, or else to resume a topic that has been dropped;
3. is normally uttered by the chorus leader in tragedy;
4. tends to appear – and the same may be said to a lesser extent of entry-marking ἀλλὰ γάρ – when an arrival is announced after strophic choral songs.
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