

ONCE AGAIN ON PL. *SYMP.* 172A*

Una vez más sobre Pl. *Symp.* 172a

CARMEN HERNÁNDEZ GARCÍA

Universidad de Sevilla, España

chernandez@us.es

ORCID: 0000-0002-8605-7408

Abstract: This paper aims to discuss yet once more the extensively commented opening of Plato's *Symposium*. Some scholars have readily acknowledged that the second summon οὔτος Ἀπολλόδωρος was intended to be comically rude. Inspecting the examples of vocative οὔτος in Greek drama, I shall argue that there is syntactical and pragmatic evidence that outweighs interpreting the demonstrative pronoun οὔτος as the core point for the alleged joke encapsulated in the text, thus settling the matter in favouring the idea that the banter need be in the first summon ὦ Φαληρεύς.

Keywords: Plato; address; vocative; Conversation Analysis; repair.

Resumen: Este trabajo pretende discutir una vez más la ampliamente comentada apertura del Simposio de Platón. Algunos estudiosos han reconocido sin reparos que la segunda invocación οὔτος Ἀπολλόδωρος pretendía ser cómicamente grosera. Inspeccionando los ejemplos de οὔτος vocativo en el drama griego, argumentaré que hay evidencias sintácticas y pragmáticas que superan la interpretación del pronombre demostrativo οὔτος como el punto central para la supuesta broma encapsulada en el texto, resolviendo así el asunto a favor de la idea de que la broma necesita estar en la primera invocación ὦ Φαληρεύς.

Palabras clave: Platón; interpelación; vocativo; Análisis de la Conversación; reparación.

* I am most thankful to Emilia Ruiz Yamuza and Luigi Battezzato for their invaluable help. This work was funded by the Spanish Government through the project GIGA-AGORA (PID2022-138136NB-I00): "Gramática de la Interacción en Griego Antiguo (I): Elementos Parentéticos en la Conversación".

1. Introduction

The opening of this platonic dialogue has received the greatest deal of attention on the grounds that it allegedly contains a pun by Apollodorus' acquaintance. It is thus expressed on the Greek text:

(1) καὶ γὰρ ἐτύγχανον πρῶν εἰς ἄστὺ οἰκοθὲν ἀνιών Φαληρόθεν· τῶν οὖν γνωρίμων τις ὀπίσθεν κατιδὼν με πόρρωθεν ἐκάλεσε, καὶ παίζων ἅμα τῇ κλήσει· ὃ Φαληρεὺς, ἔφη, οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; *For just the other day I happened to be going into Athens from my home in Phalerum when an acquaintance of mine caught sight of me from behind and called after me, jokily: 'Phalerian! You there, Apollodorus! Wait for me, will you?'*¹

What has prompted the majority of the scholars' writing is the participle clause καὶ παίζων ἅμα τῇ κλήσει, loosely translated above by "jokily" and more literally perhaps "and joking about the address". The issue has been quite divisive so far. Some have ventured that the joke is encapsulated in οὗτος and consequently offered some audacious explanations. Bury (1932, *ad loc.*), for instance, thought the joke may have been that Apollodorus' acquaintance was pretending not to know him and he even endorsed Rettig (1875-1876) and Badham's (1866) decision to emend away the name Ἀπολλόδωρος, considering it "the best and simplest solution". He also tossed in the idea that the banter would be in the demotic:

Glaucon, at a distance behind, feigns ignorance of the identity of "the Phalerian," and shouts after Apollodorus "Ho there! you Phalerian, halt," in a "stop thief!" tone. It is plausible to suppose also that a certain contempt is conveyed in the description Φαληρεὺς ("Wapping-ite"): porttowns are often places of unsavoury repute: cp. Phaedrus 243 C ἐν ναύταις που τεθραμμένον: Juv. Sat. VIII. 174 "permixtum nautis et furibus ac fugitivis." (Bury, 1932, *ad loc.*)

Dover (1984) does not risk the interpretation that much, but also puts his finger on the presence of οὗτος:

The humour may lie in startling Apollodorus by shouting with feigned urgency 'Hi! The man from Phalerum! *You!*' οὗτος is not always rude, but it is forceful; cf. Ar. *Birds* 1164: οὗτος τί ποιεῖς; 'Hey, what's up with *you?*' (*ad loc.*, his emphases).

* I am most thankful to Emilia Ruiz Yamuza and Luigi Battezzato for their invaluable help. This work was funded by the Spanish Government through the project *GIGA-AGORA* (PID2022-138136NB-I00): "Gramática de la Interacción en Griego Antiguo (I): Elementos Parentéticos en la Conversación".

¹ I reproduce here Burnet's edition of the text (1901 [1967]). Translation by Howatson (2008).

Others have argued that the jokily call lies in the demotic Φαληρεύς, but the explanations and approaches have been manifold. Hug found the apparent shift in register amusing: the demotic would have been usual in legal practice and formal proceedings. He imaginatively proposed that the funny thing about the summon would be the hendecasyllabic rhythm and the poetic combination ὦ οὔτος (Hug, 1909, *ad loc.*). Hommel (1834, *ad loc.*) suggested to write ὁ Ἀπολλόδωρος, with the vulgate, and probed into the meaning of the name, “gift from Apollo”. Bury considered this far-fetched and of little wit.

Until very recently, more elaborate explanations focusing on Φαληρεύς have been put forward. Allen (2020, pp. 344-345) maintained that the form of address Φαληρεύς – to be read Φαλ<λ>ηρεύς – had to be interpreted as a mock-demotic inspired by Aristophanes’ playful creations, such as Ἀχερδούσιος (*Ecl.* 361-362), stemming from ἀχράς ‘pear’, and coming to mean “the *Pearousian*”². Hence, Φαλ<λ>ηρεύς would essentially mean ‘Phalerian’, but it would have an indubitable phallic ring to it. His insight is that the whole form of address, οὔτος included, echoes several passages of Aristophanes comedies. Such remarks are partially coincident with Sansone (2017) and Stokes (1993) and frontally oppose Cotter (1992, p. 2014). Sider (2002, p. 261) hypothesizes that only a recognizable feature of Apollodorus’ would have given way to such a summon from afar. His perspective is that what is being bantered is his baldness and therefore the demotic Φαληρεύς would be echoing φαλακρός ‘bald’. He even claims that the combination of high (the demotic) and low register (the aristophanic phrase οὔτος, οὐ περιμενεῖς;) makes way for “the tragic and comic (and satyric) dialogue that follows”. He does not thereby rule out the possibility of the phallic pun. Cotter (1992, pp. 131, 133) is the only one to immediately reject the putative humour about οὔτος. He, in turn, outlines the proposal that the joke lay in what could be taken as the feminine equivalent of Φαληρεύς, φαληρίς ‘bald coot’. By doing so, he has the phallic reference collide with the baldness banter and a light-hearted accusation of homosexuality. In a later paper, Cotter (2014) argued that a process pertaining to folk etymology and vase iconography had produced a link between “coot” and “phallus” even resulting in “phallus bird”. In his refute, Allen (2016) highlighted that the Hesychian gloss upon which Cotter had developed his theory was surely corrupt and, in reality, it should be more satisfactorily described as a dialectal gloss. Sansone (2017, p. 481) points towards the evocation of a phallic ritual associated with Dionysus, but also

² He does not mention the demotic Σαλαμίνιος (*Ec.* 38) applied to the husband of Praxagora’s neighbour “as a sexual joke, based on the use of rowing as a metaphor for sexual activity”, (Kanavou, 2010, p. 178). This would further ground Allen’s rationale.

allows for the puzzling rudeness of urbane Glaucon in his summon, combining the demotic and the low-register οὔτος.

All jokes aside, a revision of the assumptions on the use of the demonstrative as a form of treatment (henceforth: FT) is, indubitably, in order. The syntactic and pragmatic analysis of the demonstrative οὔτος as a FT in the Classical Greek drama can shed some new light on the matter and help support the pertinent arguments put forth by other scholars. In other words, linguistic analysis provides data to support that the use of the demotic is, in fact, the intended pun, and not οὔτος. This FT has by no means any funniness to it, neither in its apparent rudeness nor in showing that the hearer's identity is unknown. In this paper I shall argue that the platonic text ought to be interpreted as a first failed attempt to establish contact with the hearer: ὦ Φαληρεὺς, followed by self-initiated repair: οὔτος, Ἀπολλόδωρος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; Repair as a concept was first coined by conversation analysts Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson as an umbrella-term for all the mechanisms operated by the speaker to deal with turn-taking errors and violations (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974, p. 701).

2. Vocative οὔτος in Ancient Greek conversation

Allen's take on the matter— in a nutshell, that the funniness to the call is about the demotic Φαλ<λ>ηρεὺς, but the whole FT is reminiscent of the aristophanic style— is further supported by multiple examples of οὔτος as a FT found in Aristophanes' comedies: no less than 57, according to both Dickey (1996, pp. 176-177) and Allen (2020, p. 345), and no less than 63 if I am not mistaken³.

The opening of the *Symposium* has been deemed the only example within Classical Greek prose where οὔτος is used as a FT, as pointed out by Dickey (1996, p. 157), and strikingly so, given that it precedes a noun⁴. She has οὔτος modify

³ More precisely, in: *Ach.* 564, *Ach.* 578, *Ach.* 587, *Eq.* 240, *Eq.* 1354, *Nub.* 723, *Nub.* 732, *Vesp.* 144, *Vesp.* 395, *Vesp.* 751, *Pax.* 253, *Pax.* 268, *Pax.* 682, *Pax.* 879, *Av.* 49, *Av.* 225, *Av.* 274, *Av.* 354, *Av.* 1044, *Av.* 1055, *Av.* 1164, *Av.* 1567, *Av.* 1631, *Lys.* 878, *Lys.* 880, *Thesm.* 689, *Thesm.* 930, *Thesm.* 1083, *Ra.* 198, *Ra.* 312, *Ra.* 479, *Ecl.* 372, *Ecl.* 753, *Ecl.* 976, *Pl.* 439, *Pl.* 926, *Pl.* 1100, *Vesp.* 854, *Av.* 933, *Av.* 1199, *Lys.* 728, *Thesm.* 224, *Thesm.* 610, *Ec.* 1049, *Vesp.* 1, *Vesp.* 1364, *Ecl.* 520, *Nub.* 1502, *Av.* 274, *Av.* 658, *Ra.* 171, *Eq.* 821, *Nub.* 220, *Av.* 1243, *Ra.* 851, *Eq.* 89, *Vesp.* 829, *Vesp.* 1412, *Av.* 57, *Av.* 1048, *Lys.* 437, *Ra.* 522, *Ecl.* 703. Same numbers in Jacobson (2015) 194 and Hernández García (2022, pp. 177-178). In Menander there are three examples, in *Sam.* 312, 657 and *Mis.* 217. There is a single example—at least to my knowledge— of this FT in the feminine plural, in *Ar. Lys.* 126: Αὐταί, τί μοιμῶτε κάνανεύετε; I have not included it in the percentages, focused only on the singular.

⁴ However, in *Pl. Prot.* 310b.5 there is another example: Καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν φωνὴν γνοῦς αὐτοῦ, “Ἱπποκράτης,” ἔφην, “οὔτος μὴ τι νεώτερον ἀγγέλλεις;”, this time the vocative preceding οὔτος. For a discussion on the analyses concerning this instance, cf. Díaz de Cerio Díez & Serrano Cantarín (2004, *ad loc.*) Perhaps *Pl. Symp.* 213b.9 “Σωκράτης οὔτος;” should also be considered an example of this FT.

Ἀπολλόδωρος in a rather unusual fashion. The only parallel she provided for this structure is found in Sophocles' *Oedipus Colonneus*⁵:

(2) *O.C.* 1627 (God-Oedipus): ὦ οὔτος οὔτος, Οἰδίπους, τί μέλλομεν χωρεῖν; πάλαι δὴ τὰπὸ σοῦ βραδύνεται. *Oedipus, Oedipus, why do you delay our going? Too long you have been lingering*⁶.

This verse triggered Jacobson's reading of Ar. *Vesp.* 1364 as para-tragical (2015, p. 201). In his view, the repetition of the demonstrative had to be taken as a cue to bring back the sophoclean verse to the spectator's (or reader's) mind. Furthermore, he maintained that ὦ οὔτος was restrictively more formal than its more used counterpart οὔτος:

(3) *Vesp.* 1364-1365 (Bdelycleon-Philocleon)⁷: ὦ οὔτος οὔτος, τυφεδανὲ καὶ χοιρόθλιψ, ποθεῖν ἐρᾶν τ' ἔοικας ὡραίας σοροῦ. οὔτοι καταπροῖξει μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τοῦτο δρῶν. *You there! Yes you psychotic pussy-squeezer! You seem to be fondly infatuated with a fresh—coffin! You won't get away with this behavior, by Apollo you wont.*

Indeed, the very origin of οὔτος as a FT is far from unproblematic. Svennung defended that the deictic pronoun οὔτος resulted in a FT from an apposition to the implicit second person pronoun and Dickey (1996, p. 158) just reproduced Svennung's ideas (1958, pp. 208-212), neither favouring nor rejecting his reasoning with her data. Svennung had turned to the Homeric poems to offer examples, such as (4), in which οὔτος agrees with a verb conjugated in the second person singular:

(4) Hom. *Il.* 10. 82-84 (Nestor-Agamemnon): τίς δ' οὔτος κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχεται οἶος / νύκτα δι' ὀρφναίην, ὅτε θ' εὐδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι, – ἢ τίς οὐρήων διζήμενος, ἢ τίς ἐταίρων; *Who are you who are coming alone by the ships through the camp in the murky night, when other mortals are sleeping? Do you seek of your mules, or one of your comrades?*

⁵ I followed Page's (1972) text for Aeschylus, Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) edition for Sophocles' plays and Diggle's (1984) edition of Euripides. For Aristophanes, I followed the text by Wilson (2007), but I have also consulted McDowell's edition of *Wasps* (1971), Dover's (1968 [1970]) edition of *Clouds*, Ussher's (1973) text of *Ecclesiastusae*. The translations correspond to the LOEB editions, unless otherwise noted.

⁶ Jebb (1889 [2010]) decides not to echo οὔτος in his English, but certainly accounts for it on his commentary. Οἰδίπους is in the vocative form, which for this declension was originally identical to the nominative. In *OT* 405 there is an alternative, analogical vocative Οἰδίπου, (Moorhouse 1982, p. 31).

⁷ There is no consensus when it comes to the attribution of these verses. Bile & Olson (2015, *ad loc.*) ascribe them to Bdelycleon and bring about some convincing arguments against who prefer to assign them to Philocleon, the father.

2.1. οὔτος data

οὔτος is mostly found in comedy, but there is a pertinent number of instances in the tragedies, too. Examples add up to a total of 16⁸ in the three tragedians. Hence, Classical Greek drama as a whole provides 78 instances of οὔτος. As a FT it behaves as a thetical, meaning that it is, among other things, fairly mobile⁹. As a result, it can hold any position an asyndetic thetical would within the utterance: left periphery, insert position or right periphery. In the overwhelming majority of the cases, the FT occupies the left periphery. As a matter of fact, instances of this FT located in positions other than the left periphery of the utterance are only found in comedy —never in tragedy— and represent a modest 15,19 %¹⁰.

The structure of the summon also varies: οὔτος may be found by itself or followed by the second person personal pronoun σύ ‘you’ or by a vocative expression or even in a self-repaired structure¹¹. The vocatives (nouns or adjectives) may or may not be preceded by the personal pronoun σύ. The distribution of these types of structure is not even throughout: whilst for Euripides and Aristophanes isolated οὔτος is by far the most frequent (62,5% and 74,6 % respectively), the trend is reverted in Sophocles’ works (14,28%). A good 42,86% of the examples by Sophocles correspond to the structure of repaired οὔτος. This is only explained by the three examples of *Ajax*, play in which the eponymous character happens to be so deranged or either so carried away by his own actions that Athena’s summons go unnoticed. Examples (5) and (6) are not far apart in the play, but it is only after verse 90 that Ajax comes out to the *skēnē*:

(5) *Aj.* 71-73 (Athena-Ajax): Οὔτος, σὲ τὸν τὰς αἰχμαλωτίδας χέρας / δεσμοῖς
ἀπευθύνοντα προσμολεῖν καλῶ. / Αἶαντα φωνῶ· στείχε δωμάτων πάρος. *You there,*

⁸ There is only one example documented within the works of Aeschylus in *Supp.* 911-912: οὔτος, τί ποιεῖς; ἐκ ποίου φρονήματος / ἀνδρῶν Πελασγῶν τήνδ’ ἀτιμάζεις χθόνα; *You there! What are you doing? What kind of arrogance has incited you to do such dishonor to this realm of Pelasgian men?* (Translation by Smyth 1926). For Sophocles I have counted 7 instances in *Tr.* 402, *OT* 532, *OT* 1121, *OC* 1627., *Aj.* 71-73, *Aj.* 89 and *Aj.* 1047. As for Euripides, I have traced 8 examples in *Cycl.* 552, *Alc.* 773, *Med.* 922, *Hel.* 1186, *Hec.* 1127, *Hec.* 1280, *Hel.* 1627 and *Or.* 1567.

⁹ Theticals are information units that contrast with the rest of the utterance in that they display the following properties: a) they are syntactically independent, b) they are prosodically set off from the utterance, c) their meaning is “non-restrictive”, d) they tend to be positionally mobile and e) their internal structure is built on principles of the sentence grammar but can be elliptic. Formulae of social exchange, vocatives and interjections, amongst others, fall under the category of formulaic theticals, (Kaltenböck, Heine & Kuteva 2011, 857).

¹⁰ Only 12 examples, out of which 3 correspond to the insert position: *Eq.* 821, *Nub.* 220 and *Av.* 1243 and 8 correspond to the right periphery: *Eq.* 89, *Vesp.* 89, *Vesp.* 1412, *Av.* 57, *Av.* 1048, *Lys.* 437, *Ra.* 522 and *Ecd.* 703.

¹¹ The criterion for tagging them as one or the other was simple. If the FT was followed only by a vocative, I classified it as οὔτος+ vocative. If the FT was followed by a reformulative expression (whether a vocative was involved or not) I tagged it as repaired οὔτος. Cf. (5).

who are bending back with ropes the arms of your prisoners, I call you to come here! I speak to Ajax! Come out in front of the hut.

(6) *Aj.* 89-90 (Athena-Ajax): ὦ οὔτος, Αἴας, δευτέρον σε προσκαλῶ. / τί βαιὸν οὕτως ἐντρέπει τῆς συμμάχου; *You there, Ajax, I call you a second time! Why have you so little regard for your ally?*¹².

The following example is slightly odder, because it consists of the first utterance by Menelaus when he first enters in *skēnē*. As previously observed, this FT is generally expected when the addressee just entered but not when the speaker has (Hernández García, 2022, p. 180):

(7) *Aj.* 1047-1048 (Menelaus-Tecucer): οὔτος, σὲ φωνῶ τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν χεροῖν/ μὴ συγκομίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν ὅπως ἔχει. *You there, I order you not to lift this body; leave it as it is!*

Examples of this specific self-repair function, albeit scarce, are found within all three authors encompassed in the study, as shown in (8)-(10):

(8) *E. Or.* 1567 (Orestes-Menelaus): οὔτος σύ, κλήιθρων τῶνδε μὴ ψαύσης χερί. Μενέλαον εἶπον, ὅς πεπύργωσαι θράσει. *You there! Keep your hands off those doors! I mean you, Menelaus, so towering in your pride.*

(9) *Ar. Av.* 274-276 (Euelpides-Pisthetaerus): {ΕΥ.} Οὔτος, ὦ – σέ τοι. / {ΠΙ.} Τί βωστρεῖς; / {ΕΥ.} Ἔτερος ὄρνις οὐτοσί¹³. *Eu: Ho there, psst-yes, you! Pei: What do you want? Eu: Here's another bird!*

(10) *Ar. Av.* 658 (Leader of the Chorus-Tereus)¹⁴: {ΧΟ.} Οὔτος, σὲ καλῶ, σὲ λέγω. {ΤΕΡ.} Τί καλεῖς; *Chorus leader: (to Tereus) Yoo hoo! Yes you. A word, please. Tereus: What is it?*

Additionally, several restrictions on the structure and position of the FT have been detected. Stand-alone οὔτος is bound to appear in any position, though it is much more usual utterance initial. οὔτος σύ on the other hand is limited to the left periphery. Both kinds tend to initiate a new sequence or pre-sequence of an adjacency pair¹⁵. Therefore, they may be classified as first-pair parts (FPPs) in

¹² Similar emphatic word order in *Aj.* 339-343, also a reformulation of a failed address, as assessed by Catrambone (2022, pp. 901-902).

¹³ One may well note this example to ascertain that only οὔτος can function as an FT. The demonstrative οὐτοσί, with the reinforced index – ί, has specialised in the *Der-Deixis*.

¹⁴ Dunbar's (1998) and Coulon & van Daele's (1928 [1967]) editions assign the response to Epops, not Tereus.

¹⁵ Adjacency pair, term coined by Schegloff & Sacks (1973) is defined as the minimal unit of a sequence and consists of two turns uttered by two different interlocutors, placed in adjacency in a quite fixed order in which

Conversation Analysis. Contextually, some have sought to explain if there is an actual preference for either alternative (Hernández García 2022, 183-184). This FT as a whole tends to appear in multi-party conversations, but οὗτος (or its feminine counterpart αὕτη) has been found to also function in dyads. οὗτος, on the other hand, seems to have specialised in multi-party conversations only, where the speaker wants to unequivocally pick out the addressee. In tragedy, it usually conveys great dramatic intensity, cf. (8). In the comedy, however it does not seem to transmit a more perceptible brusqueness (Hernández García, 2022, p. 187, *contra* Collard, 2018, p. 86).

Many remarks on this FT revolve around these assumed impolite connotations. These intuitions derive from the unfounded suspicion that οὗτος is a conventionalized way to approach an unknown fellow. This seems to be the position held by the aforementioned editors and commentators of the *Symp.*, Bury (1932) and Dover (1980). However, the evidence for this pragmatic function is rather scant in the corpus. Only six examples from Aristophanes' comedies perform it: *Vesp.* 144, *Av.* 1199, *Pl.* 1100, *Eccl.* 703, *Eccl.* 753-755 and *Eccl.* 976:

(11) *Vesp.* 144 (Bdelycleon-Philocleon): ἀναξ Πόσειδον, τί ποτ' ἄρ' ἡ κάπνη ψοφεῖ;
/ οὗτος, τίς εἶ σύ; *God almighty, what's all that racket in the chimney? You in there!*
*Who are you?*¹⁶.

Moreover, the fact that the demonstrative is sometimes immediately followed by a proper name does not seem to fit in well with the above. For this matter, we may refer back to examples (5)-(7). Dickey (1996, pp. 57, 155) challenged this notion by clarifying that, in the Classical period, ἀνθρωπε 'man, human' was the conventional address for a stranger. οὗτος took over ἀνθρωπε's domain only in the Post-classical period. She added that it might only be perceived as impolite in the sense that it is "extremely informal". She translated it by "hey!", to which Lloyd (2005) objected and added that: "(...) It obviously does threaten the addressee's negative face, as attention-getting expressions inevitably do. This can be impolite but is not necessarily so" (p. 227). However, no addressee ever takes the offence. What's more: their reactions are always cooperative.

one can identify types of pair, such as summon-answer, greeting-greeting, invitation-acceptance/declination, etc. (Stivers, 2013, pp. 191-193).

¹⁶ This example requires some explanation. Bdelycleon and Philocleon are actually father and son. This verse has been interpreted in various ways. MacDowell (1971, *ad loc.*) pointed out that the person addressed is not visible inside a chimney, hence the question about the identity. Biles and Olson (2015, *ad loc.*) remark this is not a "real question", but more so a protest or maybe Bdelycleon is playing the straight-man. Even if it were all feigned, the question would still make sense pragmatically.

Another crowd-pleasing misconception is the one relating to the speaker's apparent urgency to capture the attention of an addressee who "has his gaze elsewhere" (Jacobson, 2015, p. 197). Let us look at example (12):

(12) E. *Med.* 922 (Jason-Medea): αὐτή, τί χλωροῖς δακρύοις τέγγεις κόρας, / στρέψασα λευκὴν ἔμπαλιν παρηίδα, / οὐκ ἀσμένῃ τόνδ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ δέχῃ λόγον; Medea turns away weeping. *You there, why do you dampen your eyes with pale tears and turn your white cheek away, and why are you not pleased to hear these words from me?*

Both Page (1938 [2001], p. 141) and Mastronarde (2002, 320) observe that Medea is not showing sufficient attention. This may be true for the tragedy, but upon reading Aristophanes we are met with examples in which both interlocutors are engaged in a collaborative task, namely, calling Socrates from afar, as shown by (13):

(13) Ar. *Nub.* 220 (Strepsiades-Student A): ἴθ' οὗτος ἀναβόησον αὐτόν μοι μέγα.
Come on, you, call up to him for me, loudly!

Kendon's pioneer investigation suggested that speakers tend to look away in longer deliverances and only gaze back at the addressee when approaching the end of the intervention. This claim has not yet been rightly supported by the data (Clayman, 2013), but gaze is indisputably instrumental in conversation (Kendon, 1967). Perhaps in (9) it is not only Medea who is looking away from Jason, but he himself has been so self-absorbed by his own words that fails to remark her crying until the very end of his long speech (vv. 908-924). Hence, the observations on gaze may work both ways¹⁷.

2.2. The syntax of vocative οὗτος

Now let us turn to the syntactic matter. It is true that noun phrases may well consist of a demonstrative οὗτος and a noun head. Accordingly, it would be just natural to interpret that (2) is a case of modifier + noun. However, a handful of objections may be raised. Firstly, the fact that οὗτος is almost every time used as a stand-alone FT would imply that by itself it suffices as a summon. Hence, in most cases we would be dealing with an odd headless noun phrase.

Secondly, because of word-order reasons. In Greek prose, the demonstrative may hold two alternative positions in the noun phrase: ὁ μίαντος οὗτος or either οὗτος ὁ μίαντος. As Biraud (2014) and Biraud, Denizot & Faure (2021, p. 186) put it, the demonstrative οὗτος is always periphrastic with respect to the noun phrase, that

¹⁷ For a more in-depth assessment of gaze, cf. Rossano, 2013, especially pp. 317-320.

is the head and, virtually, the article. In other words, the demonstrative is never interjected between the article and the noun. In poetry, however, the article may not be used. Consequently, the sequence *μιαρός οὔτος* (*Vesp.* 900, *Thesm.* 649), as opposed to *οὔτος μιαρός*, is proner to be analysed as predicative, exclamative in poetry (Willi, 2003, pp. 254-255)¹⁸. Having said that, it must be stressed that vocative *οὔτος* always precedes the nominal address, if any. Restrictively, only the fixed sequences *οὔτος ὁ μιαρός* or *οὔτος μιαρός* might be had as potential FTs. Bakker (2009, pp. 77-78, especially n. 54, 55) observed that demonstratives hold the pre-nominal position in the noun phrase only when they are purely contrastive or otherwise the most salient element of the noun phrase¹⁹. Neither of these seem to be the case for our object of study.

In light of the above, it would make more sense to analyse the sequence as a stand-alone vocative pronoun *οὔτος*, shortly followed by a free or non-restrictive appositive vocative expression. The appositive structure has been extensively studied in the last few decades and linguists have come to distinguish close (restrictive) and loose (free or non-restrictive) appositions. Some even disregard close appositions as part of the appositive spectrum, considering them an entirely separate structure²⁰. The differences between the two range from the intonational pattern to the definiteness of the anchor, among other features. Free appositions lead on after semantically saturated expressions, being more loosely related to the element they determine or qualify than close appositions²¹. This looseness would manifest in a pause in spoken language, the so-called comma intonation, a concept discussed by Heringa (2012, pp. 2-3), which should be expressed by a comma on the text (Spevak, 2014, 264). From a pragmatic perspective, this kind of appositions serve the purpose of referent-construction, as already remarked by Ruiz Yamuza (2018, pp. 14-15):

¹⁸ Needless to say, the presence of the preceding interjection *ὦ* would resolve the matter straight away. However, the pattern of use of the interjection is quite problematic. Cf. n. 24.

¹⁹ She thus defied Rijksbaron's (1991) description of *οὔτος* (*ὅς*) *ὁ* + noun pattern, whereby he explained the position of the demonstrative by the scope of its referring function. She stated that the widespread demonstrative noun phrase would seem to contradict the conventional idea that the presence of the demonstrative would highly rely on the accessibility of the referent. She would attribute this phenomenon to the referential nature of the text, prevalent over the 'real' anaphoric distance.

²⁰ Coreference has been deemed a key feature in identifying both close and free appositions, (Longrée, 1990, 8; Lavency, 1986, p. 377; Spevak, 2014, p. 263). More thorough approaches pinpoint the bothersome fact that neither coreference nor any other trait (linearized antisyntax or different illocutionary force) is shared by all the members of the appositive network, cf. Acuña Fariña (2006, p. 27).

²¹ The anchor, albeit pragmatically saturated, may be indefinite. Compare restrictive apposition (a) *Mary invited a linguist Johnson to her party to non-restrictive (b) Mary invited a linguist, Johnson, to her party (Burton-Roberts, 1975, *apud* Heringa, 2012, p. 4; Lavency, 1997, p. 120).

- (14) *Nub.* 1502 οὗτος, τί ποιεῖς ἐτέρον, οὐπὶ τοῦ τέγους; You there, you on the roof, what do you think you're doing? *“¡Tú!, ¿qué estás haciendo, en verdad? ¡el del tejado!”* (Her translation).

As shown by many an example, οὗτος can be saturated and pragmatically successful in summons. The summon may fail and the speaker may rephrase it in a self-repair move, cf. (5)-(10). However, this is not always accurate. These free appositions —though interjected by a pause— need not be analysed as self-repair every time. Acuña-Fariña (2006), in his aim to disentangle the network of the many appositive constructions at hand, distinguished proper correction from right dislocations in that the former performs the function of erasing the anchor (Unit1), while the latter specializes in repair and entails an obligatory second pause. He nuanced that: “Typical R[ight]D[islocation]s involve U[nit]1s which are pronominal, while U[nit]1s of P[rototypical]A[pposition]s very seldom are” (p.26). Likewise, the next two examples excerpted from the corpus do not really rephrase the FT οὗτος, more so, they consist of right dislocations which do not mean to erase the anchor. In short, οὗτος + noun is an appositive structure which does not always have to perform a repair, correcting function. This kind of examples run against Dickey's (1996, p. 157) statement on *O.C.* 1627 being *Symp.* 172a's only *comparandum*:

- (15) *E. Hel.* 1627 (Servant-Theoclymenus): οὗτος, ὦ, ποῖ σὸν πόδ' αἶρεις, δέσποτ', ἐς ποῖον φόνον; Theoclymenus starts to go inside. Enter from the skene a second servant, who bars his way. *Serv.* You there, master, where are you going? What murder are you going to commit?
- (16) *Ar. Vesp.* 1 (Sosias-Xanthias): Οὗτος, τί πάσχεις, ὦ κακόδαιμον Ξανθία; *Hey Xanthias, you damned jinx, what's the matter with you?*

Both appositions resemble (14) in the sense that they show a certain degree of discontinuity. In (15), the right periphery is held by two concretions of two preceding referents: δέσποτ' refers to οὗτος, while ἐς ποῖον φόνον completes ποῖ. As right dislocated constituents typically do, examples (14) and (16) specify an element that has already been uttered, whose reference is saturated, going from more generic —οὗτος— to more concrete —οὐπὶ τοῦ τέγους, δέσποτα, Ξανθία—, through a process of identification (Spevak, 2014, p. 327; Heringa, 2012, p. 26)²².

²² This is perfectly cogent if we take into account the process by which οὗτος developed into an FT. In his work about deixis in the Homeric poems, Bakker (1999, p. 2) had already documented how οὗτος originally belonged to the second person deictic space (*Du-Deixis*), thus being more profusely employed in the discursive sections of the poems than in the narrative ones. Through a process of anaphora, it came to surpass that value and operate in the *Der-Deixis* domain in the Classical period, (Ruijgh, 2005, p. 155).

Let us briefly refer back to (2). Jacobson (2015, p. 184) acknowledged that reduplicated οὔτος ought not to be taken as a substantially different structure, but more so, as an adamant way of summoning Oedipus. This resonates with what the messenger himself says before reproducing the speech of the deity: Καλεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν πολλὰ πολλαχῇ θεός· *For the god called him with many callings and manifold* (OC 1625). The FT is doubled because Oedipus does not seem to notice the deity's calling: Ὁ δ' ὡς ἐπήσθετ' ἐκ θεοῦ καλούμενος, / αὐδᾷ μολεῖν οἱ γῆς ἄνακτα Θησέα *But when he perceived that he was called of the god, he craved that the king Theseus should draw near* (OC 1629-1630)²³. Jacobson's notes on the doubled FT are correct: the effect is not more peremptory. However, the same does not hold for the apparent formality about ὃ οὔτος (2015, p. 201). The interjection ὃ before vocatives has generated a scholarly debate which has destroyed forests, without the slightest prospect of harmony²⁴. As I will argue more in depth in the next section, ὃ should be had as a mere contact-establishment device.

All things considered, Jacobson's perspective on (3) may be defied. His translation "Sir, excuse me, you stupid pussy stroker, you seem to desire and lust for a lovely coffin" (Jacobson, 2015, p. 201) means to portray the alleged humorous contrast between what he regards as a formal FT ὃ οὔτος and the two downright insulting vocatives that come thereafter τυφεδανὲ καὶ χοιρόθλιψ. As shown, there is no certified difference in formality between ὃ οὔτος and οὔτος. Therefore, Jacobson's translation is not in tune with the text. This remarks on οὔτος humorousness are reminiscent of the hypotheses developed by Bury (1932) and Dover (1980) when trying to disentangle the joke at *Symp.* 172a. But, hélas, the banter lies elsewhere.

To wrap up this section, I want to highlight several aspects about vocative οὔτος. First of all, and although οὔτος may operate as a contact-establishment device, this is not its most frequent function. It is initiative (FPP) nearly every time and, most of all, it serves the speaker's need to change subject by introducing a new conversational sequence (Collard, 2018, p. 86; Hernández García, 2022, p. 190). Albeit infrequent, repaired οὔτος is well documented in drama. OC 1627 and *Symp.* 172a are not the only examples in which the FT is followed by a vocative expression, though perhaps the most renowned. When followed by a vocative, it ought to be analysed as an appositive structure.

²³ Translations by Jebb (1885 [2010]). He remarks that οὔτος implies that "the person addressed is not duly hearing the speaker; here it helps to express impatience". I differ in this matter. I have argued it is not impatience but insistence: Oedipus fails to notice the summon many times.

²⁴ Cf. Dickey (1996, pp. 199-206) for references on the matter. Brioso Sánchez (1971) is also worth perusing.

3. What about Plato?

When vocative οὔτος is followed by a nominal expression, this is a free apposition, not a noun phrase. Consequently, one major emendation must be made on the Greek text in the first place: οὔτος must be followed by a comma thus resulting in: οὔτος, Ἀπολλόδωρος, οὐ περιμενεῖς; Every example taken from the corpus except for this one has been printed with a comma, so it seems only right to make this proposal²⁵.

Secondly, something has to be said about Ἀπολλόδωρος. It is unusual to have οὔτος followed by a case other than vocative. However, the phenomenon of *nominativus pro vocativo* is not rare. As we know, this very passage has not been without controversy and some editors even wanted to emend away the noun, cf. §1. Nonetheless, a noun in the nominative case in this position would not be as problematic as to trigger a diverging syntactic explanation. The editorial tradition of the text might have thought of οὔτος Ἀπολλόδωρος as a noun phrase and therefore made it agree in case. Be that as it may, nominatives in apposition to functional vocatives are not unheard of in Ancient Greek, as noted by Gildersleeve (1900, §13)²⁶.

In view of the data, we can state a number of things about the platonic text. The way the narration is delivered is significant in order to dissect the acquaintance's reported speech. The parenthetical speech verb ἔφη is interjected between the two different summonses in a not so very casual spot. Moreover, both vocatives, Φαλ<λ>ηρεύς and Ἀπολλόδωρος are introduced by other "presentative" elements, so to speak: ὦ and οὔτος. As examined in the previous section, there is not a unanimous opinion on the interjection that sometimes prefaces the vocative. Anyway, even if the use pattern is not satisfactorily described, the interjection ὦ may be taken simply as a (optional) contact-establishment linguistic device. All of this means that the wording of the text indisputably sets the two summonses apart, leading to think that the second one is reformulative, that is, a self-repair move, the type of what Schegloff (2013) named *replacing*: "(...) a speaker's substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a T[urn]C[onstructional]U[nit]-in-progress another, different element, while retaining the sense that 'this is the same utterance' (...)" (p. 43).

Replacing, the most common operation in same-Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) repair in many languages, has been more accurately described as 'alternative formulation' of the trouble-source term (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 236). A TCU is

²⁵ S. OT 1121, OC 1627; E. Hel. 1627; Ar. Vesp. 1, Vesp. 1364, Eccl. 520 and Ra. 851.

²⁶ This statement comes together with what I have argued throughout. Perhaps the reading of the manuscript Ἀπολλόδωρος could be replaced by the corresponding vocative Ἀπολλόδωρε, used profusely throughout the dialogue (172a.6, 173d.4 and 173e.4), but this would be twisted, and of utmost triviality anyhow.

“a coherent and self-contained utterance, recognizable in context as ‘possibly complete’” (Clayman, 2013, p. 151). This implies that the first call, ὦ Φαλ<λ>ηρεύς fails to capture the addressee’s attention and thus the speaker reformulates it in an alternative manner: οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος. The inserted material tends to “modify the original reference formulation so as to *specify* it more closely by identifying a unique referent” (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 237, *her italics*). Fowler’s nuanced translation did not fail to capture this: “Hullo, Phalerian! I say, Apollodorus, wait a moment”, deliberately glossing the second address with the expression “I say”, a so-called repair preface by conversation analysts or an apposition marker, as named by syntacticians (Fowler, 1925, *ad loc.*; Lerner & Kitzinger, 2010, 2015, 2019; Blakemore, 1996, p. 325). The fact that ὦ Φαλ<λ>ηρεύς is the trouble-source in the matter is indicative of the precise spot where the alleged pun resides. This is not a case of repaired οὗτος (the demonstrative is not the problematic chunk of the utterance), but an instance of οὗτος +vocative. These details would suffice to discard Bury’s (1932) and Dover’s (1980) suggestions on the humour about οὗτος.

οὗτος, in turn, is used here, as in many *loci* studied in the corpus, e.g. (2), (11), (14), as a summon to gain the hearer’s attention. Apollodorus’ acquaintance calls him from the back, as he narrates himself, so his gaze is *indeed* elsewhere. This ties in perfectly with the observation made by Mastronarde (2002, p. 320) and Page (1938 [2001], p. 141) concerning *Med.* 922, *vid. supra* (12). It is not until the speaker addresses Apollodorus by οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος, that is, the conventionalised way to approach someone —certainly not an unknown— plus his name, that Apollodorus takes the hint: Καὶ γὰρ ἐπιστὰς περιέμεινα: *So I stopped and waited*. Bury (1932, p. 2) quotes *Ar. Pl.* 440, *Thesm.* 689, *Eq.* 240 and *Eq.* 1354 to support his arguing on οὐ περιμενεῖς being a future form rather than a present to express lively impatience.

In sum, Apollodorus turns back only when he hears his name, uttered in the same turn slot as vocative οὗτος. This is same-TCU repair. He had overheard the first summon (otherwise he would not have been able to reproduce it in the narration) but did not relate or respond to it. The phallic joke contained in the first summon was unfortunate, because Apollodorus did not really get it, and that made the first attempt at interacting infelicitous.

4. Conclusion

The linguistic examination of οὗτος as an FT in Classical Greek drama presents positive proof that there is no plausible comicalness about it. Consequently, this should be taken as definitive refute of those scholar proposals condemning the rudeness of οὗτος or considering that it feigns ignorance of the addressee’s identity in

the *Symposium* or elsewhere. Syntactically, the structure of vocative οὔτος is stark: if followed by a noun in the vocative case, this is always a non-restrictive apposition. Pragmatically, the apposition serves the purpose of referent construction, but the FT οὔτος is saturated and, most of the times, successful by itself. As a result, I propose it be printed with a comma between the pronoun and the noun, as every other passage infallibly is.

Accordingly, in *Symp.* 172a, the first jokily summon ὦ Φαλ<λ>ηρέυς goes unnoticed and Apollodorus' acquaintance is forced to reformulate it in a self-repair move: οὔτος, Ἀπολλόδωρος, a well-documented way to accost a fellow in Classical Greek, especially when their gaze is elsewhere, as it inevitably is when somebody calls from the back. The reason why the summon is not effective at first is because it is intricate: the phallic joke lies in the demotic and Apollodorus is not sharp enough to grasp it.

Finally, I offer my own translation below:

Oy, Phall-erian", he said, "hey, Apollodorus! Won't you wait?

References

- Acuña-Fariña, J. C. (2006). A constructional network in appositive space. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(1), 1-37. DOI: 10.1515/COG.2006.001.
- Allen, A. (2016). An Attic Coot For Hesychius. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 159, 437-438.
- Allen, A. (2020). ὦ Φαληρέυς. Plato, *Symp.* 172a. *Philologus*, 164(2), 342-247. DOI: 10.1515/phil-2020-0111.
- Badham, C. (1866). *Platonis Convivium*. London: Williams et Norgate.
- Bakker, E. J. (1999). Homeric ΟΥΤΟΣ And The Poetics of Deixis. *Classical Philology*, 94, 1-19.
- Bakker, S. (2009). *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek. A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Biles, Z. P., & Olson, S. D. (2015). *Aristophanes. Wasps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biraud, M. (2014). ὁ αὐτὸς οὔτος – N. une structure de SN propre à la classe des spécifiants du nom en régime rhétorique. *Glotta*, 90, 71-86.
- Biraud, M., Denizot, C. & Faure, R. (2021). *L'exclamation en grec ancien*. Leuven-Paris: Peeters.
- Blakemore, D. (1996). Are apposition markers discourse markers?. *Journal of Linguistics*, 32(2), 325-347.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. (1971). El vocativo y la interjección ὦ. *Habis*, 2, 35-48.
- Burnet, J. (1901). *Platonis Opera, Vol. 2. Tetralogiae III-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bury, R. G. (1932). *The Symposium of Plato. Edited with Introduction, Critical Notes and Commentary*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.
- Catrambone, M. (2022). Ajax behind the *skēnē*. Staging, Address and Word Order at Sophocles, *Ajax* 339-343. *Mnemosyne*, 75, 898-929. DOI. 10.1163/1568525X-BJA10071.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013). Turn-Constructional Units and the Transition-Relevance Place. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (ed.). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 150-166). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Collard, C. (2018). *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Cotter, J. (1992). The Joke on Apollodorus' Demotic (Pl. *Symp.* 172a). *Classical Philology*, 87(2), 131-134.
- Cotter, J. (2014). Φαληρίς. Coot, Plant, Phallus. *Glotta*, 90, 105-113.
- Coulon, V., & van Daele, M. (1928 [1967]). *Aristophane* (Vol.3). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Denyer, N. (2008). *Plato. Protagoras*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Díaz de Cerio Díez, M., & Serrano Cantarín, R. (2004). *Platón. Protágoras*. Madrid: Alma Mater.
- Dickey, E. (1996). *Greek Forms of Address. From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diggle, J. (1984). *Euripidis Fabulae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dover, K. (1980 [2009]). *Plato. Symposium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunbar, N. (1997). *Aristophanes. Birds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, H. N. (1925). *Plato in Twelve Volumes* (Vol. 9). London: William Heineman Ltd.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (1900). *Syntax of Classical Greek. From Homer to Demosthenes* (Vol. 1). New York-Cincinnati-Chicago: American Book Company.
- Heringa, H. (2012). *Appositional Constructions*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Hernández García, C. (2022). οὔτος οὐ! «¡Oye, tú!». Deixis y apelación en griego antiguo. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 52(2), 169-194. DOI. 10.31810/rsel.52.2.6.
- Hommel, A. (1834). *Platonis Convivium*. Lipsiae: Sumptibus Friderici Fleischeri.
- Howatson, M. C. & Sheffield, F. C. C. (2008). *Plato. The Symposium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hug, A. (1909). *Platons Symposion*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Jacobson, D. J. (2015). Vocative ΟΥΤΟΣ In Greek Drama. *Classical Philology*, 110, 193-214.
- Jebb, R. C. (1885 [2010]). *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With Critical Notes, Commentary and Translation in English Prose. Volume 2. The Oedipus Coloneus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenböök, G., Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2011). On Thetical Grammar. *Studies in Language*, 35(4), 852-897. DOI. 10.1075/sl.35.4.03kal.
- Kanavou, N. (2010). *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names. A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica*, 26, 22-63.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (ed.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 229-256). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lavency, M. (1986). Pour définir une fonction d'apposé en latin classique. *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 20, 375-383.
- Lavency, M (1997). *VSVS. Grammaire latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Lerner, G. H & Kitzinger, C. (2010). *Repair prefacing. Preparing the way for same-turn self-repair*. Paper presented to the International Conference for Conversation Analysis. Mannheim: Germany.
- Lerner, G. H & Kitzinger, C. (2015). Or-prefacing in the organization of self-initiated repair. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(1), 58-78. DOI. 10.1080/08351813.2015.993844.
- Lerner, G. H & Kitzinger, C. (2019). Well-Prefacing in the Organization of Self-Initiated Repair. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(1), 1-19. DOI. 10.1080/08351813.2019.1572376.
- Lloyd, M. A. (2005). Sophocles in the Light of Face-Threat Politeness Theory. In I. J. F. de Jong & A. Rijksbaron (ed.) (2005), *Sophocles and the Greek Language* (pp. 225-240). Leiden: Brill.

- Lloyd-Jones, H., & Wilson, N. G. (1990). *Sophoclis fabulae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Longrée, D. (1990). À propos du concept d' 'apposition'. Les constructions *rex Ancus* et *urbs Roma*. *Information grammaticale*, 45, 8-13.
- Mastrorarde, D. P. (2002). *Euripides. Medea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1982). *The Syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill.
- Murray, G. (1955 [1960]). *Aeschyli tragoediae*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Page, D. L. (1972). *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Page, D. L. (1938 [2001]). *Euripides. Medea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rettig, G. F. (1875-1876). *Plato. Symposium*. Warminster.
- Rijksbaron, A. (1991). Sur quelques différences entre οὗτος ὁ + substantif, οὗτος δὲ ὁ + substantif, ὁ δὲ + substantif + οὗτος chez Hérodote. *Lalies*, 12, 119-130.
- Rossano, F. (2013). Gaze in Conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (ed.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 308-329). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ruijgh, C.J. † (2005). The Use of the Demonstratives ὃδε, οὗτος and (ἐ)κεῖνος in Sophocles. In I. J. F. de Jong & A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language* (pp. 151-162). Leiden: Brill.
- Ruiz Yamuza, E. (2018). La periferia derecha y los tipos de texto en griego antiguo. *Minerva. Revista de Filología Clásica*, 31, 13-34.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sansone, D. (2017). Getting the Joke at Plato *Symposium* 172a. *CPh*, 112, 479-82.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist*, 6, 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond & J. Sidnell (ed.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding* (pp. 41-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289-327. DOI. 10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289.
- Sider, D. (2002). Two Jokes in Plato's *Symposium*. *Noctes Atticae. 34 Articles on Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Its Nachleben* (pp. 260-264). University of Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Smyth, H. B. (1926). *Aeschylus with an English Translation* (Vol. 2). Harvard University Press.
- Spevak, O. (2014). *The Noun Phrase in Classical Latin Prose*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence Organization. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (ed.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 191-209). Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stokes, M. C. (1993). *Symposium* 172a-c. A Platonic Phallacy?. *LCM*, 18, 128.
- Ussher, R. G. (1973). *Aristophanes. Ecclesiazusae*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Willi, A. (2003). *The Languages of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, N. G. (2007). *Aristophanis Fabulae* (Tomus I-II). Oxford: Oxford University Press

