Sn〔   〕8. *Aischylos und das Handeln im*
〕   〕pzig: Dieterich.
Sor〔   A.H. 1996a. *Aeschylean Tragedy.*
B   〕e Editori; 2nd rev. edn. London:
D   2010.

Further Reading

Bacon, H.H. 1961. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cartledge, P. 1993. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, T. (ed.). 2002. *Greeks and Barbarians.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

EFI PAPADODIMA

Forgetfulness *see* MEMORY AND FORGETFULNESS

Forgiveness *see* COMPASSION

Formal Debates English "formal debate" inadequately represents tragedy's *agōn logōn*, "contest of words"; this phrase headlines such scenes at EURIPIDES' *SUPPLIANTS* 427 and elsewhere (with synonyms at, e.g., Soph. *Aj.* 1163; Eur. *HF* 1255). Modern scholars often retain the name "(tragic) *agōn*" because the word connotes a competition balanced in form and often truly antagonistic that is native to Greek culture and poetry (see also STICHOMYTHIA); the *agōn* of Old Comedy had an older genesis and differed in form and ethos. The tragic scene's literary precursor, even origin, is generally identified in Homeric arguments, especially that of AGAMEMNON and ACHILLES in *Iliad* 1, which is left unresolved and drives the whole poem until book 19 (see also GREEK EPIC AND TRAGEDY). The scene's development after about 450 BCE is ascribed in varying degrees to influence from institutionalized and often combative debate in deliberative bodies, from SOPHISTIC argumentation, from rhetorical techniques, and from law-court ambience and practice, all chiefly in tragedy's home, ATHENS (Lloyd 1992: 13–15, 19–36; Scodel 1999–2000:

129–31, 139–40; Dubischar 2006: 25, n. 37; Barker 2009: 272–5; see also RHETORIC AND RHETORICAL DEVICES). Emblematic is: "One could make a contest of two arguments from any matter if one had skill in speaking" (Kannicht *TrGF* vol. 5.1 *Antiope* F 189).

Many debates show such variety in structure, however, and range between dispassion and enmity, that defining the "pure" *agōn* is difficult. In shape it is a symmetrically structured verbal duel, making either a complete or part episode; its calculated progression is distinguishable from more naturally styled confrontations. Two opposing speeches of roughly equal length are its core; the first sets out a case and may also anticipate the opponent's; the second rebuts and tries to overcome the first. They embody the contest's meaning for the whole play; their advent is often explicitly heralded (above) and their significance pointed also by a sententious couplet spoken after each by the CHORUS-leader (Hose 1990: 216–29). They are often introduced and usually followed by short-form dialogue; a closing stichomythia through its own symmetry emphasizes a stalemate or irreconcilable gulf to which the long speeches have led (e.g., Soph. *Ant.* 726–65) – indeed, isolated, divisive, hostile stichomythic exchanges predate the developed *agōn* (e.g., Aesch. *Ag.* 931–45). There is a tendency in EURIPIDES for the offended or hostile party to speak first (like a law-court plaintiff, e.g., Eur. *Phoen.* 465–8) and for the seeming "winner" or more sympathetic interest to speak second (disputed exceptions are Eur. *El.* 998–1146 and *Tro.* 860–1059; Lloyd 1992: 15–17, who nevertheless insists that "winner" is a misleading notion and that "the agon in Euripides rarely achieves anything"). Sometimes a third voice participates and makes a final "judgment" between the interests, especially in SUPPLICATION scenes, e.g., Eur. *Heracl.* 111–287 (the supplication *agōn*, always dramatic and often a theatrical high-point, has an important surviving ancestor in the complex scene Aesch. *Supp.* 234–523: Gödde 2000: esp. 75–142).

Scholars nevertheless dispute instances and numbers among the surviving plays (Dubischar 2006: 18–23), agreeing only that there is no true example in AESCHYLUS (the trial scene in *Eum.* 566–777 comes nearest), and that in SOPHOCLES and Euripides only WOMEN OF TRACHIS and IPHIGENIA AMONG THE TAURIANS lack one (even the satyric CYCLOPS has a shadowy one, 285–355). There is evidence enough that many now FRAGMENTARY PLAYS of the two later poets contained an actual or approximate *agōn* (Duchemin 1945: 62–72, 81–104), e.g., Sophocles' *Gathering of the Achaeans* and *Polyxena*; and there were dramatically important such scenes in, e.g., Euripides' *Alexandros* and *Palamedes* (trial scenes), *Antiope* (conflict of lifestyles), *Philoctetes* (a diplomatic incident), and *Telephus* (an issue of sanctuary).

Late nineteenth-century scholars tagged the *agōn* as a self-contained set piece, its stage effects tangential to a play's chief meaning; they analyzed mostly its structural and rhetorical techniques, criticizing Euripides heavily. Mid-twentieth-century and subsequent critics have introduced a truer appraisal. Dubischar 2001: 24–42 summarizes their findings, and himself (385–415) rehabilitates Euripides with regard to formality, dramatic logic, and the nature and contribution of rhetoric; Mastronarde 2010: 222–45 considers CHARACTERIZATION; Scodel 1999–2000: 131–43 and Barker 2009: 267–80 emphasize theatrical "performance" (see also PERFORMATIVE APPROACH TO GREEK TRAGEDY). Sophocles has seldom been assessed in the round (but see Long 1968: 155–60; Webster 1969: 148–56; and Lloyd 1992: 11–13 on his style of debate).

There is general agreement that Euripides from the start maintained strict regularity of form (see also EURIPIDES: CHARACTERISTICS OF DRAMATIC COMPOSITION), while Sophocles created more natural drama by avoiding equivalence between long speeches and favoring looser dialogue (see also SOPHOCLES: CHARACTERISTICS OF DRAMATIC COMPOSITION). Real importance, even centrality, of the *agōn*

is now argued for both poets. Sophocles' few strongly formalized debates are (a) generated primarily by previous actions (*Aj.* 1223–315; *Ant.* 441–525; *El.* 516–633); (b) generated by supplications (*OC* 720–814, 886–959, and in consequence 1249–398); (c) primarily deliberative and prospective (*Aj.* 430–595; *Ant.* 631–780; *El.* 938–1057). There are also numerous *agōn*-like confrontations throughout his oeuvre which lack formal structure, e.g., the crucial exchanges *OT* 300–462 (OEDIPUS and TEIRESIAS) and *Phil.* 49–134 (ODYSSEUS and NEOPTOLEMUS).

For Euripides, Dubischar (2001, 2006) has identified some broad dramatic types: (a) two-person scenes of angry reckoning for previous actions, e.g., *Alc.* 614–740; *El.* 998–1146; two-person scenes with reckoning still in prospect, e.g., *IA* 303–414; "trials" with a third person as "judge," e.g., *Hec.* 1109–292; (b) advisory or deliberative scenes, either censuring, e.g., *Supp.* 286–364, or attempting consolation, e.g., *HF* 1214–426; *Ion* 569–675; (c) many scenes embodying or concerning supplication, with two or three participants (suppliant, enemy, and [potential] rescuer), e.g., *Andr.* 147–273; *Hec.* 726–849; *Supp.* 381–597 (this scene uniquely with two pairs of long speeches); *Or.* 356–455, 632–728.

Such dramaturgical analysis has eased general appreciation of the *agōn*, and its significance in individual plays. Cause and location in the plot; context, progression, and outcome; outward form and inner dynamic; incidental illumination of participants' attitude and behavior – the most successful *agōn* contributes something under every head. Those formal debates "purest" in form create a special challenge: how do their structural regularities (with only occasional variations) convey, enhance, or impair their conviction on the stage? In consequence the multiple actual and approximate debates of SOPHOCLES' AJAX (actual: 430–595, 1223–315; approximate: 1042–162, 1316–75) and the actual ones of EURIPIDES' HECUBA (216–443, 726–849, 1109–292) have attracted the greatest

attention (e.g., *Ajax*: Heath 1987c: 165–208 and Barker 2009: 281–324; *Hecuba*: Barker 2009: 325–65) – and *Tro.* 860–1059 as a trial scene for its relation to forensic ambience and rhetoric (e.g., Croally 1994: 134–62 and Meridor 2000: 16–29). Others particularly studied are Soph. *El.* 516–633 and Eur. *Alc.* 614–740; *Med.* 446–626; *Hipp.* 902–1101; *Andr.* 147–383, 547–746; *El.* 998–1146; *Phoen.* 446–527.

References

Barker, E.T.E. 2009. *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croally, N.T. 1994. *Euripidean Polemic*: The Trojan Women *and the Function of Tragedy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubischar, M. 2001. *Die Agonszenen bei Euripides: Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Dramen.* Stuttgart: Metzler.

Dubischar, M. 2006. "Der Kommunikationsmodus der Debatte im griechischen Drama." *Rhetorik* 25: 14–29.

Duchemin, J. 1945. *L'ΑΓΩΝ dans la tragédie grecque.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Gödde, S. 2000. *Das Drama der Hikesie: Ritual und Rhetorik in Aischylos'* Hiketiden. Münster: Aschendorffer.

Heath, M. 1987c. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hose, M. 1990. *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides.* 2 vols. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.

Lloyd, M. 1992. *The* Agon *in Euripides.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Long, A.A. 1968. *Language and Thought in Sophocles: A Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique.* London: The Athlone Press.

Mastronarde, D.J. 2010. *The Art of Euripides: Dramatic Technique and Social Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meridor, R. 2000. "Creative Rhetoric in Euripides' *Troades*: Some Notes on Hecuba's Speech." *CQ* 50: 16–29.

Scodel, R. 1999–2000. "Verbal Performance in Euripidean Rhetoric," in M.J. Cropp, K.H. Lee, and D. Sansone (eds.), *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century. Illinois Classical Studies* 24–5. Champaign, IL: Stipes: 129–44.

Webster, T.B.L. 1969. *An Introduction to Sophocles*, 2nd edn. London: Methuen.

Further Reading

Collard, C. 2003. "Formal Debates in Euripides' Drama," in J. Mossman (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Euripides.* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 64–80; first published in *G&R* 22 (1975): 58–71; supplemented in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot (eds.), *Greek Tragedy*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993: 153–66.

CHRISTOPHER COLLARD

Fortune   *see* FATE AND CHANCE

Fourth-century Tragedy   *see* ANCIENT GREEK THEATERS; FRAGMENTARY AND LOST PLAYS §8; GREEK TRAGEDY IN THE FOURTH CENTURY; ORIGINS AND HISTORY OF GREEK TRAGEDY; RECEPTION AND USE OF TRAGEDY IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

Fragmentary and Lost Plays

Introduction   This survey of the fragmentary remains begins by describing their extent and study before assessing them in the approximate chronological order of their poets; it will best be read together with the entry ORIGINS AND HISTORY OF GREEK TRAGEDY, which traces the cultural contexts in which successive tragedians worked.

Scheme

1 and 2	Extent and study
3	Before AESCHYLUS
4	Aeschylus
5	SOPHOCLES
6	EURIPIDES
7	Contemporaries of Sophocles and Euripides
8	Fourth-century tragedy
9	Hellenistic and later tragedy
10	Fragments assignable to neither author nor play (*adespota*)
11	Appendix: Fragments of satyric drama (to be read in conjunction with SATYR PLAY)

The fundamental resource for all tragic remnants is the five-volume edition in Greek and Latin by Snell, Kannicht, and Radt,