CHAPTER ONE

THE THEATER AND ATHENIAN SPATIAL PRACTICE

> We have already said that the city should be open to the land and to the sea, and to the whole country as far as possible.
> —Aristotle, *Politics*

WE CAN DESCRIBE the fifth-century theater of Dionysus at Athens as a spare architectural frame set in a natural landscape,[1] in contrast to the enclosed buildings we usually think of as theaters. This expansive outdoor space gathered a large and diverse audience. Theatergoers arrived by foot from the city, via animal cart from the environs of Attica, and by sea from elsewhere in Greece. They made their way to the precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus, past the god's altar and temple, then through the *eisodoi* (the same side entrances used by the performers), across the hard earth of the orchestra, and finally up the south slope of the Acropolis to the seating area (*cavea*), which included the bare ground of the hillside (figure 1).[2]

From their different vantage points, those in the audience looked down over the paths they had just traveled. They could see the temple and sanctuary of Dionysus, the city walls, and (from east to west) the Hippades, Dipylon, Itonian, Halade, and South gates (figure 2). Within the walls were visible (from various points in the *cavea*) the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus, including the abandoned but imposing temple started by the Pisistratids; the temple of Apollo Pythios, called the Pythion; the temple of Apollo Delphinios and the nearby Palladion (the wooden statue of Athena purportedly captured at Troy), with the adjoining areas where the eponymous homicide courts (the Delphinion and Palladion) met; the sanctuary of Cronos and Rhea; the shrine to Gē; a shrine called the Neleion, dedicated to Kodros, Neleus, and Basilē; the sanctuary of the Nymphs, where brides-to-be dedicated votives before their wedding; possibly a shrine dedicated to Theseus, Hippolytus, and Aphrodite; and many private houses of the southern city, which Thucydides (2.15.3) considered to be the oldest part of non-Acropolis Athens (figure 3).

Those sitting higher up in the theater audience could gaze outside the walls. They could see the Illissos valley and the extension of the city to the south, including the sanctuary and gymnasium of Kynosarges, the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios in Agrai, and the Callirrhoe spring, which provided water for the nuptial baths that a bride and groom took (separately) as part of their

wedding ritual; to the east (figure 4) they caught the slopes of Mount Hymettos, famous for its thyme (an Athenian export), honey, and the marble quarries that provided much of the building material for Athens' impressive public monuments; closer in they could see the Ardettos hill, the sanctuary of Artemis Agrotera (the site of annual sacrifices commemorating the victory over the Persians at Marathon) and the edges of the Lykeion, the exercise ground and place of muster for the Athenian hoplites and cavalry; to the south and west (figure 5), the bay of Phaleron (hidden by the hill of the Nymphs and of the Muses), out in the direction of the city's port, Piraeus; further beyond, the Saronic Gulf and the peak of Prophitis Ilias, the site of the shrine of Zeus Panhellenios, on the island of Aegina where many Athenians had sheltered when the Persians occupied and burned their city in 480.[3] Behind and above them loomed the Acropolis (the particular target of the Persians), packed with various cult sites, most of them dedicated to the goddess Athena. The audience gazed up at the sky, down at the beaten earth of the orchestra, out over the city, its plains, hills, and out toward the sea. The spectators also looked at one another because the slope where they sat and the common light of the sun forced them to survey themselves even as they watched the performances.

Let us compare this account with the description of the Greek theater offered by Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy*: "[It] recalls a lonely valley in the mountains: the architecture of the scene appears like a luminous cloud formation that the Bacchants swarming over the mountains behold from a height—like a splendid frame in which the image of Dionysus is revealed to them."[4] For all its power, Nietzsche's vision of romantic loneliness and Dionysiac apotheosis ignores the theater's civic location. To be sure, it remained part of the natural environment, and performances depended on the cooperation of the elements. But the theater also acknowledged its physical situation within the city, offering public and open space, outward in its impulses and in its potential for shared experience. The space of such a theater implies not only the order of nature and the gods but also the human society of which it is a part.

Tragedy continually draws together the natural world of the earth and the heavens and the built environment of the *polis*, exemplified in the opening lines of the parodos in *Antigone*:

> Hail the sun! Brightest
> of all that ever dawned
> on the seven gates of Thebes,
> great eye of golden day,
> sending light across
> the rippling waters of Dirce.
>
> (*Ant.* 100–105)

Greek tragedies often refer to sunlight or the dawn near their outset, a dramatically effective means of bringing the myth into the present world of its performance.[5] The acknowledgment of natural elements may lessen the differences that some critics postulate between the Athens of the audience and the non-Athenian settings of many tragedies, especially Thebes.[6] In the *Antigone* passage, for example, the audience that watched the Theban Chorus praise the dawn also looked on the sun overhead, the Athenian city gates, and the reflected light off the Ilissos, all analogous to elements in the choral aubade. The morning sun heralds Thebes' victory over Argos, the successful expulsion of disaster from the city; it also brings to light a new disaster, emanating from the corpse of Polyneices. As the Guard reports, Antigone appears over the body "when the bright circle / of the sun stood in the middle of the heavens / warming us with its heat" (*Ant.* 415–17).[7] As the tragedy moves toward its climax, Teiresias warns Creon that he faces his own disaster "before the racing sun completes many laps" (1064–65). The sun signals key moments in the mythic world of the play, even as it visibly registers the passage of time during the performance.

Following Gibson's lead, this chapter considers the theater of Dionysus "ecologically," as a place nested within a series of encompassing spaces. We begin by reconstructing (with unavoidable speculation and simplification) the fifth-century theater per se, focusing on the audience, orchestra, and stage areas. As noted earlier, the theater lay within the *temenos* (sacred precinct) of Dionysus Eleuthereus, and we need to consider the sanctuary's layout, as well as the place of the festival within the Athenian religious and agricultural calendar. The discussion leads to the role played by sacred, or sacralizing, space in Athenian life, defined by permanent elements (primarily altars), processions that link them, and rituals performed there, particularly blood sacrifice. We then consider the ceremonies that took place in the theater before and after the competitions. Here, the orchestra-audience relationship resembled that of other civic spaces crucial to Athenian democracy, such as the Pnyx (where the assembly met), the council chamber (*bouleutērion*), and the law-courts. We then examine other aspects of Athenian spatial practice, including the interdependence of city and country in daily life and the configuration of domestic space, with its interplay between inside and outside. In the process we may understand better how the Greek theatrical environment included the nontheatrical world in its compass, extending the audience's visual field and exploiting the reflexive possibilities inherent in this open public space.

The Theater of Dionysus

The *theatron* in fifth-century Athens was less a building than what we would call landscape architecture. It derived its physical nature and layout from

three basic elements, listed in order of their importance for providing a workable theatrical space:

1. The hillside on the south slope of the Acropolis, called the *cavea*, provided space for the audience, most of whom sat on the ground or on wooden benches, although some stone seating may have appeared late in the century.
2. A flat area of beaten earth supported by a retaining wall lying lower down the slope, called the *orchēstra* (henceforth "orchestra"), was where the performers played.[8]
3. A wooden stage-building, called the *skēnē*, at the back of the orchestra and in front of the terrace wall, allowed for access (*eisodoi*) into the orchestra along its two edges. Its facade had a single door or opening offering entrances and exits—into a house, cave, temple, tent—reflecting the setting of the play. The door may have fronted onto a low wooden stage (perhaps three feet high) extending into the orchestra, linked to it by wooden steps, although this is uncertain.[9] At some later date in the century, a machine called the *ekkuklēma* allowed for the revelation of "interior" scenes, by rolling out a preset tableau through the door that exposed part of the offstage space. Similarly, the *skēnē* supported a roof on which characters could appear, either climbing up by ladder or ramp from behind, or by being hoisted on a cranelike device, the *mēchanē*, or "machine."[10] Scene painting, attached to the *skēnē*, may have played a role in indicating the setting, but scholars have exaggerated its importance.[11]

In this scenario, priority goes to the *cavea*, which accommodates a large audience (estimates range from ten thousand to fifteen thousand), followed by the orchestra, which captures the audience's focus.[12] In his valuable study *The Idea of Space in Greek Architecture*, Martiennsen speaks generally of the "horizontal plane . . . as the first essential in any system of formal arrangement intended to embrace the activities of organized or collective life," negating as it does "the irregularity of existing topographical conditions."[13] The terraced orchestra floor, which provides a level playing area for the performers and a clear focus for the audience, converts the south slope of the Acropolis into a theater. Stabilizing the hillside by arresting its movement downward, the orchestra opens up a space where something other than what normally transpires can happen there.

The final element in defining the theater space, and one that may not have emerged at the outset, is the simple horizontal screen offered by the *skēnē* building.[14] This facade further stabilized the activities onstage, although by virtue of its impermanent nature and modest proportions (compared with its massive Roman successors), the facade did not deny the vista beyond. In contrast to later buildings that would dominate performance, the space of the theater of Dionysus offered definition without control, shape without separation, enclosure without protection, "une liaison du théâtre et du terrain" (figure 6).[15]

Lacking in this account is any standard architectural form or template into which the theater fits. Fostering a very different reconstruction, some archaeologists and theater historians give priority to a circular orchestra, suggesting that Athenian "spatial practice" vis-à-vis the theater demanded this geometrical shape. Just over a century ago the German archaeologist Wilhelm Dörpfeld excavated the theater of Dionysus and found seven smallish stones in the form of an arc. These he connected with another stone some *twenty meters away* to reconstruct an original circular orchestra, a farfetched idea that still holds the popular imagination and a prominent place in the scholarship.[16] Circles have a powerful attraction and make for a reassuring sense of order, handy for schematic drawings and plans reproduced in handbooks on the theater. Sadly, there is no substantial archaeological evidence for a circular orchestra in *any* fifth-century theater, including the theater of Dionysus in Athens, and sound evidence against it.[17] Nonetheless, the myth of an original—and originating—circular orchestra remains.

What might account for the continued purchase of this idea on our notion of the early theater in Athens? First of all, it aligns archaeological reconstruction to the ancient Greek interest in geometry and geometric forms.[18] A circle for the orchestra suggests an abstract template existing prior to the theater cavea and organizing its subsequent development. Much of what we know of nonsurviving ancient architecture comes from the Roman Vitruvius, a committed geometrician, who championed the notion that the theater grew up around the orchestra, and not down from the hillside where the audience sat.[19] Once accepted as the a priori fact, a circular orchestra allows us to see the theater as a visual-spatial image of the cosmos, a symbolic microcosm.[20] For example, ancient thinkers who believed in a flat earth envisioned it as a circular plain surrounded by the river Ocean, like the picture Hephaestus engraves on the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18.[21] Others believed in a spherical earth,[22] and in such a system a circular orchestra might suggest a two-dimensional analogue for a centrifocal earth. As well as offering the attractions of large-scale geometry, the idea of a circle responds to the roundness of the sun and moon, the dome of the heavens, the radial form of trees and plants, and so on.

Shifting to the working world of the Greeks, scholars see in the circular orchestra a reflection of the threshing floor. Tying ancient drama to the agricultural cycle, they draw (often unconsciously) on the "Cambridge School" theory that tragedy sprang from the ritual death and rejuvenation of Dionysus as a year god, born again each spring. The circle now serves as an image of the cycle of seasons, and what the earth can produce through human effort. Sadly, the evidence we have fails to support such a conclusion. Ancient Greek threshing floors were paved in stone, not the beaten earth of the theater orchestra. Threshing seems to have been accomplished by draft animals, when available, who could be tethered to walk in a circular route

(hence the shape of the threshing floor). We should be cautious about invoking peasant progenitors of a circular dance who turned monotonous thresh-walking into a choreographic form that demanded a circular orchestra, the sine qua non (according to the argument) of the ancient theater.[23]

The earliest surviving theaters in the Greek world all appear to have irregularly shaped orchestras, more or less rectilinear in form. The compelling desiderata involved finding a suitable seating area on a hillside that offered the audience a view down on the action, then a flat area of earth (supported by a retaining wall when necessary) that established the orchestra. No circle was drawn in the dirt, around which a seating area was built, a practice that seems to begin with the construction of the great theater in Epidauros, dating from the second half of the fourth century. Unlike this paragon of formal perfection, the early theater in Athens was not governed by geometric preconditions or architectural refinement. The gradual improvements in visual focus and acoustics, the petrification of seats and stage building, the growth in importance of the *skēnē* facade reflect a formalizing of the idea of theater-as-building, which only begins in the late classical period and flourishes in the era of town planning that followed. Connected to the construction of new cities and the expansion of old sanctuaries, all surviving theaters with circular orchestras date from then.

Were we to ignore the best archaeological evidence and reconstruct an original orchestra circle for the Athenian theater of Dionysus, we still would need to explain why no deme theater in Attica followed suit—all (save Thorikos) later than the big theater, and surely modeled on it. As to why a fully fledged orchestra circle should appear for the first time at Epidauros, we can only speculate. Certainly fourth-century interest in the geometry of urban and sanctuary planning influenced the innovation. Moreover, as was the case generally among popular cults, the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidauros competed with rival shrines elsewhere to attract pilgrims. The presence of spectacular productions (fourth-century theater seemed to move in that direction) in a spectacular setting offered an obvious drawing card. The Asclepion at Epidauros already featured a famous circular building associated by Pausanias with Polycleitus, the *tholos* (also known as the *thumele*), considered the finest of its kind in the ancient world. Although *tholoi* had long existed in Greece, earlier in the fourth century the architect Theodoros built an elaborate marble version at Delphi, and Epidauros created its own not long after. The *tholos* became its most famous building, housing a labyrinthine crypt beneath the floor that may have represented the tomb of Asclepius.[24] Perhaps the distinctive *tholos* shape encouraged sanctuary officials to write it large on the landscape, featuring it in the new theater they were to build. Without doubt, the theater at Epidauros was like none before it, surpassing earlier examples in scale, technological innovation, and architectural refinement—and, as the archaeological evidence suggests, in boasting the first orchestra circle.

Similar misconceptions to the idea of an original circular orchestra in Athens operate in the arguments for a permanent altar located at its center. As Richard Schechner puts it (with characteristic assurance), "At the center of the theater stood the altar of Dionysus, open to the heavens; around it, encircling the sacrificial nexus of Athenian drama, danced the chorus."[25] As far as we can tell, *no* altar of Dionysus ever stood in an early orchestra; the altar dedicated to the god, the site of ritual sacrifice during the City Dionysia, stood much further down the slope, in the southern end of the sanctuary, well below the retaining wall and outside the theatrical area. No sacrifices or offerings needing an altar took place in the theater itself. Probably a temporary construction when used as a prop (in plays like Euripides' *Suppliant Women*), the stage altar most likely *was placed* in the central area of the orchestra to take advantage of the dramatic focus and power of that position.[26]

In the spirit of Schechner, David Wiles construes the "governing spatial paradigm" of the theater of Dionysus as "a community gathered in a ritual circle around a surrogate altar."[27] However, we know from the location of altars in Greek sanctuaries that encirclement by the crowd usually was impossible, given the location of the altar close to the cult temple.[28] That is, sacrifice did not take place "in the round"; altars, like temples, "faced" front. The officiating person, priest, or priestess stood behind the altar, while those gathered stood before it, free to arrange themselves as they wished, including an arc to maximize sight lines. In the rare case where members of a large audience could surround an altar, it seems unlikely they did, for much of what took place would be hard to see from behind. In Wiles' attractive but misleading scenario, the presentational nature of the events that constituted a sacrifice have given way to the seductions of a "ritual circle," not a secure basis from which to reconstruct Greek spatial practice.

Rejecting an idealized notion of orchestra as circle, or a central altar that constructs the theater as a place of surrogate sacrifice, we might more profitably compare the theater of Dionysus to other plein-air public enclosures, particularly the agora and the Pnyx. Before doing so, however, let us consider more fully the immediate spatial context of the theater, the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus, and the festivals in which tragic performances played a part. This will lead to a discussion of secular and sacred (or "sacralizing") space, the function of various rituals (including sacrifice), and the place of the gods in Athenian life.

The Sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus

The theater of Dionysus abutted the god's sanctuary, and the festival of the City Dionysia (including performances of tragedy, satyr plays, comedies, and dithyrambs) and the Lenaia (with tragedies and comedies) bound the two

areas together.[29] Generally speaking, a sanctuary (*temenos* 'a place cut off') was a precinct set aside for the ritual worship of a god or hero. It inevitably included an altar for offerings and animal sacrifice, "the ritual core of Greek religion," as Jameson reminds us, and frequently it had a temple to house the cult image of the god.[30] The sanctuary of Dionysus south of the Acropolis fits the pattern, with a large altar (a base roughly 11.5 by 3.3 meters) oriented east-west near the southern edge of the precinct (allowing a large crowd to witness the sacrifice from further up the slope), and an archaic temple to the god, which held his wooden image (*xoanon*) during the festival, located close to the orchestra retaining wall to the north and west of the altar.[31] A low wall (*peribolos*) or a series of boundary stones marked the perimeter of the sanctuary, and it seems that the northern boundary of the temenos of Dionysus was coextensive with the retaining wall of the orchestra and *skēnē* building. This suggests the precinct was two-tiered, with a formal area dedicated to the god below, and an ancillary area for the performances higher up the hill (figure 7).[32]

This spatial division helps explain the uses of the theater separate from the sanctuary and outside the festival proper, of which there were many. For example, more than twelve hundred performers had to rehearse in the space before the festival every year. Each of the ten *phulē*—"tribes" created by the reforms of Cleisthenes—presented two dithyrambs (choral lyric in praise of a god) in both a boys' and a men's competition.[33] We can assume that the fifty members of each chorus had some access to the theater before their moment in the sun, time to practice their entrance and exit, the audibility of their singing, their internal spacing in the orchestra, the volume of the musical accompaniment, and so on. Simply guaranteeing the order of twenty different groups performing on the same day presents a logistical nightmare that would require its own rehearsal before the festival.[34]

In addition to these thousand performers competing for their tribes, the city as a whole arranged for the production of three sets of tragic tetralogies (three tragedies plus a satyr play, all by the same author), each requiring a minimum of three actors and a chorus of twelve, later fifteen, performers, not to mention extras, secondary choruses, and so on, as noted in our discussion of Euripides' *Suppliant Women*. In addition, the *polis* produced five comedies by five different playwrights, each with three to five actors and a chorus of twenty-four.[35] Many of these plays demanded chariot entrances, large processions, arrivals on high via the machine, long entrances down the *eisodoi*, carefully timed appearances on the *ekkuklēma*, and so on. Theatrical common sense tells us that the theater and the sanctuary environs were in *constant use for weeks* before the festival began.[36] If the Lenaia also used the theater of Dionysus for its performances, a similar rehearsal schedule operated earlier in the winter, albeit on a smaller scale.[37]

As well as rehearsals before these festivals, the theater provided the meet-

ing place for the "oversight" assembly at the close of the City Dionysia, and we know that the assembly also met in the theater in the fourth century for its annual review of the ephebes. We have substantial evidence that other theaters in Attica (and elsewhere in Greece) were used for political meetings,[38] undermining the notion that the theater of Dionysus was simply an extension of the sanctuary and "belonged" to the god.

The multifaceted nature of the theater may reflect earlier dramatic performances in the Athenian agora. A place of burial in the Mycenaean period and of both burial and habitation later (through the geometric period), this relatively flat area north of the Acropolis gradually became the civic and religious center of town, its composite nature reflecting the inclusive attitude of the Greeks to these activities. As Martiennsen puts it, "From a practical standpoint, the agora was equivalent to a great open-air hall, available no less for festivals than for the ordinary activities of everyday life."[39] Theatrical performance took place in a part of the agora called the *orchēstra*,[40] an area that has left no archaeological trace but nonetheless has proliferated theories about its form and structure.[41] This open area (figure 8) lay just to the west of the main roadway (*dromos*), which ran from the cemetery and potters' quarter (the Kerameikos, outside the Dipylon Gate) through the agora and up to the Acropolis, the route taken by the great Panathenaic procession. Hammond believes that the "just-off-the-road" location of early agora performances may have provided the impetus for the *eisodoi* 'in-roads' (also called *parodoi* 'side-roads') in the theater of Dionysus, located alongside the *skēnē* building and linking the theater orchestra to the outside world.[42] It also seems likely that the assembly (*ekklēsia*) met in the agora (possibly in the *orchēstra*) until the reforms of Ephialtes in the late 460s, when the meetings took place on the Pnyx, a hill to the south.[43] The early spatial overlap between dramatic performance and political assembly in the agora suggests that tragedy—in the reflexive manner outlined in the introduction—could evoke political space without straining, something it continued to do after the performances moved to the theater of Dionysus.

Another structure in the agora, the altar of the Twelve Gods (figure 8, located west of the *dromos* and north of the *orchēstra*), may have influenced tragedy in its early days. Built by the younger Pisistratus (son of Hippias and grandson of the tyrant Pisistratus) around 521 B.C., the altar united the pantheon of Olympian gods in a concentration of the sacred.[44] Road distances in Attica were measured from this spot, the symbolic center from which the Athenian *polis* radiated outward. Pisistratus' uncle, the tyrant Hipparchus, erected herms on the roads marking the midpoint between the city (measured from the altar) and the deme centers, one side bearing this geographical information and the other a moral tag like "Pass, thinking just thoughts" or "Don't deceive a friend."[45]

As well as marking the city's territorial center, the altar of the Twelve Gods

became the locus for foreign suppliants seeking Athenian aid.[46] In 519, shortly after the altar was dedicated, the Plataeans appeared at the shrine to supplicate Athens to help them against the Thebans,[47] anticipating—in broad terms, and by almost a century—the plot of Euripides' *Suppliant Women*. The fact that supplication plays an important role in tragedy, and that political debate and violence frequently result from a suppliant's request, suggest that activities near the original agora *orchēstra* may have left their mark on the genre and the new theaters in which it came to be performed.[48]

That the first home of tragedy may have stood near the focal point for the territory of Athens is suggestive. Time and again in the plays that survive (written for the theater and not the agora) we observe characters pulled in from far away as if drawn by a magnet. I know of no theatrical genre that more easily accommodates "attraction from a distance" than Greek tragedy. When the magnetic poles reverse (as they frequently do), characters depart under compulsion (flight, exile, a foundational journey), sent off from a place of previous attraction. We explore this pattern in later chapters, but we should note here the strong centralizing function of tragedy, reflecting the site of its earliest performances and continuing in the theater of Dionysus.

The move from the agora seems to have occurred in the late sixth or early fifth century. The area south of the Acropolis may have recommended itself because it held a preexisting sanctuary to Dionysus, although the date of the earliest structure there—the old temple to the god—could be contemporaneous with the move, suggesting that the newly democratic *polis* relocated the City Dionysia as a way of celebrating the city's political transformation.[49] There can be no question of the theater moving to the margins (a feature of early Elizabethan public playhouses in London),[50] but separation from the rule of the Pisistratids and their building program in the agora may have played a role. In practical terms, the new location on the south slope of the Acropolis offered several advantages (figure 9): it could support a far larger audience than the agora *orchēstra*; by its relative isolation from other activities, the space allowed for more dedicated use, helpful in preparation and rehearsal; the protective location below the Acropolis sheltered the audience from the strong north winds of the winter and early spring, when the dramatic festivals took place; and the grand prospect suited a festival that welcomed visitors from all over the Greek world, eventually providing the locus for ceremonies linked to the Athenian Empire.

The City Dionysia: Procession, Sacrifice, and the Secular

The annual festival of the City Dionysia had to fit into the preexisting religious and civic calendars of Athens,[51] as well as into the unofficial schedule

of agricultural activity on which Athenian life depended. "The agricultural year shaped the religious year," Osborne points out,[52] and Athens celebrated the City Dionysia during an idle time in the fields, after the last olives were gathered in February and before the grain harvest in late May. Scheduled over seven days in early spring (mid to late March), when the Aegean was navigable and non-Athenians could attend, the festival preceded the annual election of the ten generals (*stratēgoi*) and the assembly meetings that planned the military campaigns of April and May, after which the demands of the summer harvest (late May to early July) and the fall plowing and planting (September to November) reasserted themselves.[53] The lesser dramatic festivals took place earlier in the winter, also a period of agricultural inactivity. At least 14 demes (local political units in Athens, of which there were 139), as well as Brauron and Salamis, possessed some sort of theater. There they celebrated the rural Dionysia in December,[54] and the city as a whole mounted the Lenaia in January, setting the stage for the great Dionysia two months later.

The conformity to given political, religious, and natural parameters is not unique to dramatic festivals, but it does suggest how integrated these elements were in the Athenian idea of the theater. Where we might construe tragedy as ritual, or insist that drama is political, or claim the theater primarily as an aesthetic phenomenon, or theorize performance as "playing the Other," the Athenians experienced a theatrical continuum that incorporated sacred, secular, civic, artistic, and natural realms. We can identify distinctive elements that contribute to this unified picture, many of which underwent important transformations over the course of the week-long celebration of the City Dionysia.

The festival began with a great procession (*pompē*)—second in size and grandeur to the quadrennial Great Panathenaia—that brought celebrants, sacrificial victims, and other offerings to the god in his sanctuary below the theater. The procession involved the community in its broadest definition, either as audience members lining the route or as direct participants: men, women, slaves, metics, children, Athenian allies, foreigners in town for the performances, rich and poor, old and young.[55] Each Athenian colony dedicated a carved wooden phallos, which was borne in the parade; the *chorēgoi*, picked by the city and by the ten tribes to pay for the dramatic and dithyrambic choruses respectively, marched in ornate dress; the metics, alien residents of Athens, wore dark-red robes and carried trays of offerings; well-born girls, called *kanēphoroi*, bore baskets of gold filled with firstfruits (perhaps grapes); citizens marched with full wineskins, and others carried thin loaves of bread resembling spits; attendants drove along the bulls meant for sacrifice, numbering between 100 to 240 animals.[56]

Although the route of the procession remains unknown, Xenophon informs us that it included a choral dance at the altar of the Twelve Gods, the

only reference to any public ritual there.[57] Perhaps the "city on the move" paused to acknowledge the place of past performances, if indeed the early *orchēstra* was located near this altar dedicated to the Greek pantheon. Gathering its people, past, and values, the city took measure of itself in the procession to the sanctuary of Dionysus, "activating, like an electric current, the landscape's potential symbolism," as Jameson puts it.[58]

According to Hubert and Mauss, a procession that culminates in sacrifice "constitutes a process of sacralization, bringing something from the profane world [domestic animals] and making it over to the world of the gods [sacrificial offerings]."[59] For the humans involved, the procession resembles a temporary *rite de passage* (like the rituals of transition marking childbirth, puberty, marriage, and death), with a liminal period before the sacrifice and the reintegration of the participants in their "normal" world afterward.[60] Other theorists downplay the procession, viewing sacrificial bloodshed as *the* act of self-definition, where humans dramatize their proper place between animals and gods.[61] According to Burkert, Greek sacrifice confronts a basic anxiety over bloodletting and so requires the victim's "willing compliance."[62] Girard emphasizes how sacrificial ritual harnesses violent tendencies and directs them against acceptable targets.[63] Bloch views ritual bloodshed as a losing and gaining of vitality in an endless process of "rebounding violence."[64] More politically minded theorists locate sacrifice within a broader ritual network designed to prop up the sociopolitical status quo.[65] For example, the "commensal occasion" following a sacrifice confirms the power of those organizing the event and distributing the meat.[66] In her study of visual imagery associated with Athenian sacrifice, Pierce challenges the more overwrought of these theories. The images offer "a visual metaphor for ideas of festivity, celebrations, and blessings," making it "impossible that the viewers for whom these images were intended experienced *thysia* as an awesome, fearsome, or guilty act." Sacrifice for fifth-century Greeks involved the "dedication of animals and their acceptance by the gods . . . as an aspect of feast and festival."[67]

In sum, we understand the procession of the City Dionysia as a sacralizing process that gathered and moved the community through the city, while consecrating the sacrificial animals for the god. At the altar in the sanctuary, the bloodletting itself was more celebratory than anxiety-ridden, in anticipation of the coming feast. After slaying the beasts, the priests and attendants wrapped the thigh bones with fat and burned them on the altar, roasted tail pieces auspiciously, and divided the butchered meat among the crowd. Many took their portion home for consumption and private festivities, while others remained in the sanctuary to cook their meat on portable braziers and share in a larger communal feast.[68]

No precise information survives regarding the distribution of meat at the

City Dionysia, but the Panathenaia dedicated specific portions to various officials, with the rest divided among the demes in proportion to the number of deme members in attendance.[69] Following its inclusive procession, the Panathenaia adopted a mode of division that reflected the principles of Athenian democracy, which directly involved only male deme members and not women, children, metics, or slaves. It may be that similar criteria regarding meat distribution operated at the City Dionysia. Of course, at both festivals those who received their portion were free to share it with whomever they chose—most likely their *oikos*, including family, household slaves, and guests.[70]

It seems reasonable that the *pompē*, sacrifice, feasting, and celebration occupied the first day of the festival, with the competitions (for dithyramb, tragedy, and comedy) spread out over the next five days.[71] The contests exemplify the divisions referred to earlier, in this case the difference between a citywide and an intracity rivalry. The ten boys' and ten men's dithyrambs pitted tribe (*phulē*) against tribe. With the *chorēgoi* and performers drawn from each group, success meant a victory for that *phulē* alone.[72] The dramatic performances, on the other hand, were the product of the city in its political totality. City-supported artistic teams drawn from the *polis* at large—*chorēgos*, playwright, actors, chorus, aulos players—competed before a (comparatively) impartial audience, judged by ten representatives drawn by lot from each tribe.[73] In Sourvinou-Inwood's terms, the festival performances manifested both a "whole-*polis* articulation" and an "articulation by *polis* subdivision,"[74] defining the city on both the large and small scale.[75]

However, artistic and cultural factors complicate the view that festival performances were designed solely for the mutual articulation of the *polis* and its tribes. At the City Dionysia, we know that many (perhaps most) of the dithyrambs were composed by non-Athenian poets, and the instrumentalist (*aulētēs* 'aulos player') who accompanied each of the choruses (dithyrambic, tragic, satyric, comic) also tended to be foreign.[76] Because music was central to the Greek idea of poetry and performance of almost any kind (including ritual events, athletic contests, marching to battle, rowing, dancing, feasting), we cannot overestimate the impact of the *aulētai* at the City Dionysia. They played the *diaulos*, a difficult double-beating reed instrument—like a bifurcated oboe with two sets of fingerholes—that originated in Asia Minor or Syria, first appearing in Greece in the seventh century.[77] Plato and Aristotle associate its music with frenzy and orgiastic possession,[78] and this (along with its provenance) may explain why the virtuosi were foreign to Athens.

As well as the dithyrambic poets and *aulētai*, playwrights and actors were frequently non-Athenian. Pratinas, credited with introducing the satyr play and winner on one occasion against Aeschylus, haled from Phlius, and his

son Aristias also won tragic competitions at the City Dionysia. Achaeus of Eretria and Ion of Chios both competed against Sophocles and Euripides (whose *Hippolytus* was among the plays Ion defeated in 428), and were admitted to the Alexandrian canon of great tragedians. We also hear in fifth-century Athens of the tragic poets Aristarchus of Tegea and Spintharus of Heracleia in Bithynia and the comic playwright Acestor of Thrace.[79] Regarding non-Athenian performers, we know of the Aeschylean actor Mynniskos of Chalkis and, in the fourth century, Neoptolemus of Scyros, Aristodemus of Metapontum, and the notorious Polus of Aegina, the first "method actor," if one credits the anecdote that he used an urn with the ashes of his newly deceased son while portraying Sophocles' Electra (in the scene where she mourns her dead brother).[80] At the Lenaia, foreigners also competed as playwrights, and metics could serve as *chorēgoi* and perform as chorus members in the tragic and comic competitions.[81]

At the local level, demes celebrating the rural Dionysia followed the general pattern of the city festival with a procession, sacrifice, local liturgies, and performances of tragedies, comedies, and dithyrambs (any or all, as each deme chose for itself).[82] There is evidence—at Ikarion in the mid-fifth century and at Eleusis in the mid-fourth—that an alien residing in the deme could assume the role of *chorēgos* for these performances. Whitehead thinks that these exceptions prove the rule that no noncitizen or nondemesman was involved in the rural Dionysia.[83] But the dithyrambic poets (when dithyrambs were performed), the playwrights, and presumably the acting companies that played them may have had no deme connection whatsoever. Moreover, if metics could pay for, and act in, performances at the Lenaia, why should a similar involvement be impossible at the local level? Are we to imagine a demarch, eager to make a splash with a tragedy at his rural Dionysia, prohibiting a local metic from participating in the chorus, even though the same man had sung and danced at the Lenaia before thousands? This seems unlikely.

We have no idea how many, or how frequently, metics served in dramatic choruses at the Lenaia and locally, but the fact that they did cautions against any simple bipolar reading of tragedy that sets the mythic, heroic characters against a chorus of "citizens," if by citizens we understand only adult male Athenians. Although the restriction on choral participation *did* apply at the City Dionysia, it did not extend to the other festivals in Athens or to productions outside of Attica, which began as early as Aeschylus (in Sicily) and became increasingly popular in southern Italy in the fourth century.[84] This is not to claim that tragedy had no local purchase; on the contrary, as Poole asserts, "the power of Greek tragedy to outlive the local conditions of its original production depends on the quality of the challenge which it once offered to those local conditions."[85] The connection of the genre and its per-

formance to the *polis*, however, may be less about strict citizen definition than about a more inclusive sense of *polis* membership.

The Cleisthenic reforms of 508/7 formalized the deme system by recognizing the political status of preexisting towns and neighborhoods throughout Attica, a process that may have enrolled some aliens as citizens in the initial deme formation. This would help explain the replacement of the patronymic with the demotic as the official designation of an Athenian citizen, an easy way to avoid embarrassing a "new" citizen whose (foreign-sounding) father's name would drop away.[86] The argument remains controversial, and Whitehead rejects it out of hand.[87] Emphasizing Aristotle's juristic classification of citizens in terms of strict political "rights" and responsibilities, he views Athenian metics less as "quasi-citizens" than as "anti-citizens."[88]

This division fits Whitehead's dualistic scheme perhaps better than it does the actual experience of living in classical Athens, where (for example) conservatives raged against the apparent interchangeability of metic and citizen.[89] Metics served in the Athenian fleet and as hoplites—more than three thousand fought alongside Athenian citizens at Megara in 431, at the outset of the Peloponnesian War. Although they could not own land in their own name, some metics acquired great wealth and power and owned slaves; others, especially from the poorer allied states, took advantage of Athenian openness to improve their economic circumstances and that of their families back home. Metics participated in most religious cults, including such major civic festivals as the Panathenaia and City Dionysia. They attended the theater, used the public gymnasia, and contributed greatly to the intellectual life of the city; Herodotus, Hippodamus, Lysias, Isaeus, Aristotle, and some of the Sophists were foreigners who lived more or less permanently in Athens.[90] As Connor points out, Pericles' citizenship law of 451/0 disenfranchised the future offspring of marriages between Athenians and foreigners, effectively preventing international dynastic families from using their influence to manipulate Athenian foreign policy. Paradoxically, the law encouraged the private interchange between metics and citizens, exemplified by Pericles himself, who set up a stable relationship with the foreign-born Aspasia without fear of political consequences.[91] So, too, metics like Anaxagoras (Pericles' friend) and others spread their intellectual influence without being viewed as a *direct* threat to the political body.[92]

Because deme (like tribal) membership was hereditary, over time the politicogeographic definition of Athenians grew to include a historical as well as a living connection to place. For example, when citizens moved to a new village in Attica, they maintained their old (inherited) deme allegiance.[93] In both its political organization and its festival life, Athens "stirred up" the loyalties of its citizen population. Part of that agitation involved the inclusion of noncitizens in the mix, where the theater played an important part. In its

festival context, production process, and subject matter, Greek tragedy at the City Dionysia, the Lenaia, and the various rural Dionysia challenged the assumption that the male citizen—whether on or off the stage—was all that mattered.

With this possibility in mind, let us look briefly at two other significant factors, the composition of the audience and the function of the preperformance ceremonies. Based on the surviving evidence and testimonia, most scholars agree that the theater audience included anyone who could afford a ticket: men, women, children, metics, slaves, prisoners (released on bail specially for the festival), foreigners, Athenians and non-Athenians, citizens and noncitizens alike. This openness reflects the nature of Dionysiac cult generally, and the particular pan-Athenaic flavor of the City Dionysia.[94] The theoric fund (probably introduced in the fourth century) provided poorer citizens with money to purchase theater tickets; other economic advantages of citizenship included subsidies for grain, and payments for jury duty, attendance at the assembly, and service in public office.[95] In the case of the theater, however, the *polis* subsidy for male Athenians does not mean that nonmales and noncitizens could not, or did not, attend.

The preperformance ceremonies have attracted a good deal of recent interest, and (as noted in the discussion of *Suppliant Women*) they have much to say about the play of space in the tragic performances themselves. The first such ceremony involved the purification of the theater by carrying a bleeding piglet, whose throat had been cut, around the orchestra. This was the common means of purifying Athenian public spaces, most prominently the Pnyx before assembly meetings, but also temples, civic buildings, and even shipyards.[96] Nilsson differentiates the pig-bleeding practice from sacrifice proper, which required that an animal be offered to a specific god (or gods) who received some part of it, not at all what transpired during these purification rites.[97] We hear of the analogous rite applied to personal purification at *Eumenides* 280–83, when Orestes refers to "slaughtered swine" at Apollo's hearth, whose blood—poured over his head and hands—cleansed him of matricide.[98]

At some point after the purification (the exact order of events is beyond recovery), the ten *stratēgoi*—the annually elected board of generals, one from each tribe—entered the orchestra and poured libations to the gods. The fact that these libations were offered by the leading military personnel of the city, and not the priest of Dionysus or the annually appointed archon *eponymous* (who oversaw the festival), indicates the complicated weave into which tragic performances fit. The festival took place shortly before the election of the *stratēgoi*, and the appearance of those "incumbents" in the orchestra who were candidates for reelection might have helped their chances. In the introduction we discussed the reference in *Suppliant Women* (723–28) to *stratēgoi*,

including advice about the kind of general the Athenians should choose. Shortly after that election, the assembly met to decide on the military strategy for the upcoming summer, meaning that the City Dionysia was well timed to raise issues relevant to Athenian foreign policy.[99] Pericles, for example, held power in Athens due to his election to the annual board of generals twenty-two times, including fifteen consecutive terms.[100] Between circa 453 and 429, Pericles appeared before the huge crowds at the City Dionysia twenty-two times, performing the ritual libation reserved for the generals. As a younger man he also availed himself of the theater to catch the public eye and register his political sympathies, serving as *chorēgos* in 472 for the Aeschylean tetralogy that included *Persians*, discussed in chapter 6. By emphasizing Themistocles' role in the victory at Salamis, Aeschylus (and perhaps Pericles) indicated his tacit support for the policies of the beleagured leader, ostracized not long after *Persians* was produced.[101] Through Pericles' role as *chorēgos* and *stratēgos*, we see the ties linking the festival space of the City Dionysia, the theatrical space of the performances proper, and the political space of Athens.

A further manifestation of the theater's spatial reach involves the preperformance ceremony of Athenian orphans whose fathers had fallen in battle, a practice evoked at the end of *Suppliant Women*. Raised at the city's expense, the orphans marked their coming of age by parading in the orchestra dressed in full hoplite armor (a gift of the city) and then taking front-row seats for the performances.[102] We may wonder if the prominence of fatherless orphans in tragedy—Orestes, Neoptolemus, Eteocles and Polyneices, the sons of the Seven against Thebes, Astyanax, Eurysakes, Hyllus, the sons of Heracles, Pentheus, even Xerxes—goes beyond the givens of the myth to tap the affective experience of the Athenian audience, who has seen its own orphans feted before the play. Although the ceremony emphasized the future (the armor given and worn for the defense of the city), the absent father and husband remain in the shadows, as the Chorus in *Agamemnon* suggests:

> And everywhere, for those who sped
> to war from the land of Greece,
> a woman sits lost in grief—
> home after home—
> cut deep to the heart.
> They know the ones they sent,
> but take back—home after home—
> an urn of ashes instead of a man.
>
> (*Ag.* 429–36)

The selection of judges for the competitions also took place in the orchestra, probably after the generals' libation. Although the manner in which the votes

were counted remains uncertain, the festival took elaborate measures to insure that the selection of judges and their verdicts avoided any taint of bribery or tampering. Here, the City Dionysia clearly reflects the democratic practices found elsewhere in the city. Prior to the festival, each of the tribes submitted a list of possible judges, whose names (after approval by the *boulē*, or council) were sealed in jars and kept in the *polis* treasury on the Acropolis. On the day of selection, the jars were brought down to the theater and the archon drew a name from each. The judges picked by this lottery stepped forward and swore an oath of impartiality in front of their fellow audience members, then sat in special seats set aside for them to watch the performances.[103]

The process offers a window on the Athenian political and legal system, because it combines aspects of both: tribal allotment (e.g., the fifty-member *prytaneis*, drawn from the council, which served for a tenth of the year); nomination (e.g., some magistrates); *boulē* approval (e.g., the new archons and newly elected *boulē*, examined by the council before taking office); sortition (e.g., the jurors for the people's courts picked daily from a larger group of eligibles, or the selection of the priestesses of Athena Nike and Bendis from all Athenian wives and their daughters); public oath taking (e.g., council members, magistrates, and jurors); and special privileges (e.g., the free meals for the sitting *prytaneis* or the *prohedria* for the aforementioned judges and orphans).[104]

Following the judges' vote at the close of the competition, the winning *didaskalos* (normally the playwright-director) was crowned with an ivy wreath in the theater,[105] and we can presume a similar honor for the *chorēgos* of the winning production, and for the best actor (after the institution of the prize for tragic protagonists in 449).[106] This public acknowledgment mirrors the preperformance ceremony in which distinguished citizens and foreign benefactors of the state, to whom the assembly had voted golden crowns, were proclaimed by a public herald.[107] The theater offered the space and occasion where the Athenian community (not simply those eligible to attend the assembly), as well foreigners who had come for the festival, could share in the celebration of *polis* honors—whether for past public service or for theatrical productions that had just taken place.

The theater crowd also heard a proclamation naming slaves who had been freed by their masters. Here the audience assumed the role of potential legal witnesses, for Athens lacked any civic record or public roll that listed slaves.[108] As befits an oral culture in which writing played a secondary role in legal and political matters, the manumission proclamation in the theater insured that "everybody knew" of the former slave's new status (freedmen who chose to remain in Athens became metics).[109] Should doubts arise in the future, a freed slave would have the citizens in the audience as witnesses. Hypothetically, a slave whose freedom was announced in the theater of Dionysus could (at some later date) sponsor a dramatic chorus, or perform in a tragedy or

comedy, in the same theater during the Lenaia. The fact that manumission became public just before the tragic performances may have made more poignant sentiments like those uttered by the Paidagogus (a slave in the royal house of Athens) in Euripides' *Ion*:

> One thing alone brings shame to slaves—
> the name; in all else a slave who is a good man
> is no way inferior to those who are free.
>
> (*Ion* 854–56)

A final preperformance ceremony in the orchestra involved the display of the annual tribute (*phoros*) paid by the members of the Delian League.[110] It seems likely that the practice began with the transferal of the league treasury from Delos to Athens in 454 B.C. Most of the allied cities chose to pay tribute rather than contribute directly (via ships and soldiers) to the defense of the league, which Athens came to dominate.[111] Like the libations involving the *stratēgoi* and the parade of war orphans, the display of the *phoroi* brought political and military issues directly into the theater, albeit outside the performances proper. It seems likely that a herald announced the source and amount of each contribution, although the actual tribute probably was divided evenly among its bearers and carried into the orchestra without concern for its place of origin. The ceremony provided the allies with an unwritten "receipt," public acknowledgment at the City Dionysia of their payment. On many occasions the event must have generated celebratory and patriotic feelings; on others—after allied revolts, for example—it called attention to the league's unpopularity abroad.[112] According to Thucydides, allied revolts before and after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War forcefully engaged the *dēmos* of Athens, revealing the harsh realities of imperial rule.[113] Called to mind during the tribute ceremony in the orchestra, the tensions between Athens and its allied subjects found their way into the plays themselves, as many critics have recognized in Euripides' *Trojan Women*.[114]

After the City Dionysia, the assembly met in the theater to evaluate the festival's success. By convening the *ekklēsia* there, male citizens asserted their prerogative in the space that the festival previously had opened to residents of Attica and to foreigners who desired to attend. At this meeting, any citizen (i.e., males over eighteen born of Athenian parents) could stand in the orchestra and address the assembly, much like the actors and choruses over the previous few days.[115] The "spatial rhyme" goes both ways, for the relationship between actor and audience in the theater of Dionysus mirrored that of speaker and assembly in the large concavity of the Pnyx (figure 10). There at least once every month (but usually two, three, and even four times), citizens gathered to determine *polis* policy by simple majority vote. Exploiting the power of the spoken word, speakers appealed to reason, emotion, and morality, not unlike actors playing characters in the theater. In fact, the ac-

claimed Athenian right of *isēgoria*, usually translated "freedom of speech," resembled something closer to "freedom to perform," given the daunting prospect of addressing an assembly whose quorum numbered six thousand.[116] The spatial similarities between the Pnyx and the theater reflect the essential role played by public performance in democratic Athens.

A similar relationship applies to smaller political arenas where democracy flourished—the council or *boulē* (five hundred citizens who set the assembly's agenda), local deme gatherings, and meetings of kinship and neighborhood organizations. In the *boulē*, each deme had representation proportional to its population, and the year-long term of office—renewable only once after a lapse of two years—meant that a significant minority of Athenian citizens belonged to the council at least once in their lives (by contrast, urban dwellers tended to dominate the assembly).[117] Both the old (ca. 500) and new (415–406) council chambers (*bouleutēria*) in the agora seem to have included seating banks around the speaker's platform much like the cavea surrounding the orchestra in the theater of Dionysus (figure 11). Reporting a sacrilegious act in the new chamber as if it were a scene from Euripides, Xenophon describes how antidemocratic elements violently removed suppliants who had taken refuge at the council altar. Here the actions were staged to terrify council members rather than to outrage a theater audience.[118]

We find an even closer analogue to theatrical performance in the Athenian lawcourts, where the jury (ranging from one hundred to two thousand members) reached its verdict by majority vote, after hearing speeches offered by the litigants. Some of these speeches have survived, composed by professional writers to be delivered by the principals, because no lawyers were present at the trial. Here the legal system converted both plaintiff and defendant into performers charged with interpreting their script for the benefit of a jury-audience.[119] Histrionics from the sublime to the ridiculous characterized these forensic displays, which even exploited the presence of weeping women and children, who could attend the court but not testify.[120] The creation and interpretation of a "character" for a lawcourt performance drew on, and may have influenced, the work of the playwright and actor in the theater. To be sure, Athenian litigiousness provided a rich vein for Greek comedy, and it left its mark on tragedy as well, in the ubiquitous legal vocabulary and in such courtroom scenes as Orestes' trial in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and Polymestor's arraignment in Euripides' *Hecuba*.[121]

Inside Out, Outside In: Land, Livelihood, and Living Space in the *Polis*

Although the theater of Dionysus shared essential qualities with other public forums, the plays almost invariably focus on domestic space, usually a palace

or house, sometimes a cave, a tent, or even a cottage. The (apparently natural) division between onstage and offstage has led critics to posit the former as the "male," public area and the latter as the "female," private, interior domain.[122] No one denies the interpretive power of this approach to space, or the evidence from the plays that supports it. Clytemnestra speaks of female quarters in *Choephori*; Creon insists that women should stay inside where they belong in *Antigone*; the Farmer chastizes his wife for talking with strange men outside the cottage, while she in turn claims mastery over its interior, in Euripides' *Electra*. Although these examples (there are others) differentiate male and female realms, tragedy violates this division so consistently as to raise doubts about its functional value. Time and again female characters appear unapologetically in public, protest when they are kept from doing so, and manifest their independence from, and power over, men.[123] Choruses of women arrive from afar and give opinions on matters ranging from public policy to personal morality, from the role of education to the nature of the gods. Among extant tragedies, five of seven choruses of Aeschylus, two of seven of Sophocles, and fourteen of seventeen of Euripides consist of women. Above all, female tragic characters attend to the essential rituals of their families and *philoi*, frequently outside their homes and often at risk to themselves. Birth ritual draws Clytmenestra to the cottage in Euripides' *Electra*; wedding ritual figures prominently in *Medea*, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, and *Trojan Women*; and female characters attend to death ritual in Aeschylus' *Choephori* and *Seven against Thebes*,[124] Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Electra*, and Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Suppliant Women*, *Heracles*, *Trojan Women*, *Helen*, *Orestes*, and *Bacchae*. Female supplication features prominently in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*, and Euripides' *Medea*, *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Suppliant Women*, and *Helen*. Women make ritual offerings and sacrifice outside the home in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, and the Chorus of Euripides' *Electra* visits her on its way to attend the festival of Hera. In pursuing these activities, female characters mirror the lives of their fifth-century counterparts, who participated in and made crucial contributions to the religious life of their *oikoi* and the Athenian *polis* at large.

Cynthia Patterson meets head-on the notion that fifth-century Athenian women lived lives of seclusion, tracing the idea back to its roots in eighteenth-century European Orientalism, later instantiated as "fact" by nineteenth-century social historians like Johan Jakob Bachofen, Denis-Numa Fustel de Coulanges, Henry Maine, Louis Henry Morgan, and Friedrich Engels. Patterson's important study recovers a very different reality; far from living in private seclusion, "the Athenian women was . . . a privileged 'shareholder' in the Athenian polis."[125] To be sure, Athenian women lived in a patriarchal society that offered them little power over their own person and no role in political decision making. Nevertheless, a variety of work (domestic chores,

agricultural labor, "cottage" industry, child care) and religious responsibilities (festivals, cult service, ritual duties, rites of passage, priesthoods) took Athenian women out of their houses and into the public sphere. Although these activities do not fit neatly into the male-oriented idea of "the political," they were public in nature and played an essential role in the life and well-being of the Athenian *polis*.[126]

Recent work on ancient Greek houses also challenges the traditional dualistic notion of separate male and female spaces. The archaeological record indicates no clear division between male and female areas in Greek dwellings of the classical period. In a famous essay, Vernant argues that the Hestia-Hermes dyad organized the annual Greek experience of space. "The hearth [Hestia], established at the centre of the domestic space is, in Greece, fixed, implanted in the earth. It represents, as it were, the *omphalos* of the house; it is the navel by which the human dwelling is rooted into the depths of the earth." Hermes, on the other hand, is all movement and flow, providing transitional contact with foreign elements: "in the house, his place is at the door, protecting the threshold."[127] For all its suggestiveness, Vernant's argument draws next to no support from archaeological remains, fitting a virtual world far better than the one lived in ancient Greece. The overwhelming majority of excavated houses from the classical period show no trace of a permanent hearth; moreover, as Jameson concludes, "no circular hearths, thought to be essential to the ideology of the household, are known for *any* [my emphasis] classical house." Instead, portable braziers (of terracotta or bronze) and small fires on the dirt floor (of charcoal or brushwood) were the rule. As for household herms, they too operated more as an ideal than as an actual physical presence, except in a few wealthy homes whose occupants could afford a stone-carved monument at their doorway.[128]

Athenian houses tended to be small and unprepossessing, usually one floor, with rooms unspecialized as to function. No architectural or structural features emerge to distinguish male from female areas, or those meant for slaves. The sole exception, the so-called *andrōn* 'men's room', served like an old-fashioned front parlor, used for entertainment and hospitality ("the one room to which males outside the family had access"), for transacting business, and for accommodating guests overnight. Not everyone had the resources for such a room, but in the many *oikoi* that did, the *andrōn* was not physically isolated from the living and working areas of the household.[129] When thinking of the domestic realities of classical Athens, we should recall the description of Heracleides in the third century: "The whole city is dry, not well watered, badly laid out on account of its antiquity. Most of the houses are mean, the nice ones few. A stranger would doubt, on seeing it first, if this were really the renowned city of the Athenians."[130]

However, there *was* a core element characteristic of almost all Greek

houses, namely the courtyard, the area where most of the work and ongoing activity of the *oikos* took place.[131] Even those who spent a disproportionate amount of time at home—wealthy women and their retainers, in the main—were still "out of doors" much of the time. Unlike a front yard that provides a transition from the public street to the private interior, the enclosed courtyard incorporates the "outside" on the "inside." Rooms opened directly onto the courtyard and were extensions of its living area; open to the sun, it provided almost all the light in the house, as windows were rare and narrow. Because the rooms generally lacked interconnecting doors, one entered and left them via the courtyard.[132] A single entranceway, opening onto the street, did not call attention to the house; in this respect alone, Greek domestic space resembled the "introversion" of traditional Muslim homes in the Mediterranean, where the appearance toward the outside was unimportant.[133]

Where orthagonal "town planning" held sway (probably introduced to the Greek world in the late eighth century, but associated by modern scholars with the fifth-century Hippodamus of Miletus), "uniform blocks of housing took precedence over every other consideration."[134] In the housing "insula" that Hippodamus developed in Piraeus, the blocks of essentially undifferentiated dwellings with party walls did not interconnect but remained independent units next to, and isolated from, their neighbors, each with its set of rooms off a courtyard.[135] Housing an extended nuclear family, the economically and socially independent *oikos* remained the basic building block of the *polis* throughout the classical period. As such, its health and inviolability offered a measure of the well-being of the city at large,[136] a mutually informing relationship explored relentlessly on the Greek stage.

The economic well-being of most Athenian *oikoi* was tied to the soil.[137] The fact that the citizen population worked the land, coupled with the political organization of Athenian democracy, meant that Athens avoided a pronounced split between urban and rural worlds.[138] Although for much of the fifth and fourth centuries Athens depended on grain imports (primarily from the Black Sea) to supplement local production, an ideology based on agricultural work informed the life of its citizens.[139] In this regard, Athens—as, indeed, most ancient Greek cities—fits Braudel's category of an "open city," that is, "open to the countryside and on terms of equality with it," a relationship manifest in tragedies that deal specifically with the Athenian landscape.[140]

Recent theories on the rise of the Greek *polis* emphasize the manner in which the city (*astu*) and countryside (*agros*) were bound together. In *Cults, Territories, and the Origins of the Greek State*, de Polignac argues that the early *polis* bound its "urban" center to the outlying territory via the establishment of rural religious cults (often at border areas), physically linked by festival processions from the center to the periphery.[141] Although de Polignac exempts Athens from this pattern, other scholars point out that the

extramural sanctuaries at Brauron (Artemis), Eleusis and Halimus (Demeter and Persephone), Phaleron (Athena), Eleutherai (Dionysus), and Sounion (Poseidon) each were connected to a site in the *astu* on or near the Athenian Acropolis.[142] Critics note that his bipolar model neglects important changes in social practice, such as colonization and the growing links between military service and citizenship.[143] Perhaps de Polignac's most important contribution lies in his emphasis on "religious citizenship" (which included women), "without which there could never have been any citizenship of the other, political, kind." For de Polignac, "religious citizenship was a sine qua non condition for the formation of the city, or rather for the very process of the redefinition of social cohesion from which the *polis* resulted."[144] Territory cohered around religious cult linked to specific sanctuaries, in which an inclusive idea of citizenship arose, allowing a more defined "political" identity to emerge later.

Tied to the land by agricultural work, ownership, religion, and political identity, Athenians imagined themselves to be autochthonous, a race aboriginal to the soil of Attica. In Herodotus, the Athenians boast that "we alone among the Greeks have never changed our dwelling," and, according to Thucydides, Attica "has been inhabited by the same people always." The myth surfaces in several tragedies, particularly Euripides' *Ion*, which conjoins the xenophobia of native Athenians with the humorous and fatherly wisdom of the foreign-born Xouthus (husband of the Athenian Creusa), who explains to his erstwhile son, "My boy, the earth doesn't have children."[145]

The past two decades have seen a spate of scholarly interest in the role of autochthony in forging Athenian self-identity.[146] Some critics argue that the myth devalues the role of women as mothers, consistent with the misogyny they find in Athenian society and on the tragic stage. Other interpretations see autochthony as a compensatory measure for the lack of epic heroes—Athenians play an insignificant role in the Homeric poems. By making the earth the mother of the race, Athens avoids the unique "oikist" figure typical of other cities' foundational narratives.[147] Lacking a dominant individual or family, a "gathering together" of the population (*sunoikismos*) offers a myth of origins without an originating agent. As Connor observes, authochthony and *sunoikismos* "united citizens of different regions and backgrounds within Attica, avoiding the necessity of probing into genealogy and claims of aristocratic distinction."[148]

Athenians associated their communal integration with the mythological hero Theseus, the closest the city got to a founding hero and the representative of Athens in tragedy, as discussed in the introduction. Interestingly, Theseus' genealogy (in all its mythic variations) inevitably represents him as an outsider, born of a non-Athenian mother (Aethra, whom we met in *Suppliant Women*), who immigrates as a young man to Athens.[149] Through his

various tragic guises—in *propria persona* in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, and *Heracles*, and via his father (Aegeus) in *Medea* and his son (Demophon) in *Heracleidae*—Theseus reaches out to suppliants and welcomes them to Athens. His own background, coupled with his attitude toward foreigners, provides mythic validation for the incorporation of outsiders into the city, crucial to its cultural and economic prosperity, discussed earlier vis-à-vis the metic population.

The integral relationship between Athenian identity and the *land* of Attica helps account for tragedy's keen interest in exile and expatriation. When the Chorus in *Agamemnon* invokes the fugitive Orestes, for example, the usurping Aegisthus responds: "An exile feeds on empty hopes—I know; I was one" (A. *Ag.* 1668). In their eponymous plays, Oedipus, Philoctetes, Hippolytus, Orestes, Heracles, the sons of Heracles, Euripides' Electra, and Aeschylus' suppliant women all experience a form of exile. The return of the banished Polyneices to Thebes has disastrous consequences in Aeschylus' *Seven*, Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Oedipus at Colonus*, and Euripides' *Phoenician Women* and *Suppliant Women*. Captive slaves have lost or stand to lose their homeland in *Choephori*, *Trachiniae*, *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *Trojan Women*, *Helen*, *Electra*, and *Iphigenia among the Taurians*.

Even in *Ion*, the most autochthonously Athenian of extant tragedies, the last descendant of the earthborn Erechtheids begs not to be removed from his (nonnatal) home in Delphi and forced to live in Athens (589–647). There, the "famous autochthonous Athenians" will resent him for his (apparent) foreign birth (589–92), and their ballots will "shut him off" (603–5), a reference to the practice of ostracism, by which the Athenian *dēmos* "voted out" (for ten years) citizens deemed to pose a threat to the city. The fact that the exiled party was banished from Attica at large and not simply from the "political center" of the *astu* reminds us that an urban-rural continuum characterized the Athenian *polis*.[150] Viewed from an autochthonous perspective, ostracism offered Athenians a grass-roots mechanism to correct the predictable consequences of their own foundation myth—not all subsequent offspring would measure up to the original children of the earth.

Whatever its ideological effects, the myth of autochthony nurtured a central paradox in the city during the fifth century. Three times in the span of fifty years, Athens forsook its unmediated link to the land, abandoning its territory to foreign invaders in order to defend its population. In the 480s, when the Athenians inquired at Delphi about the impending Persian invasion, the oracle proclaimed that only "a rampart of wood would stay unravaged" (Hdt. 7.141). Based on this response, Themistocles convinced the assembly to evacuate the city and place its hopes in its ships. Some eighty thousand Athenians fled to Troezen (on the Peloponnesian coast) and the nearby islands of Salamis and Aegina, while Xerxes' army laid waste to Attica

and burnt the Acropolis, only to be destroyed by the Athenian fleet in the naval battle off Salamis in 480.[151] A year later, the city repeated this strategy before the invasion of Mardonius, who burned the city a second time before his army was defeated at Plataea.[152] After these victories, the Athenians expanded their fleet and also rebuilt their "nonwooden" walls with great urgency, improving the rough circuit around the city that the Persians had destroyed. Between 461 and 456, they extended the fortifications to the port of Piraeus and the southern end of the bay of Phaleron, the "Long Walls" that protected Athens' vital link to the sea (figure 12).[153]

The fortifications encouraged Pericles to adopt a strategy in the Peloponnesian War similar to that of Themistocles fifty years earlier, when the city "opened itself" to the Persians. Trusting in the Long Walls and in the Athenian fleet, Pericles refused to engage the Spartan army when it invaded the Attic countryside in 431. During the enemy's seasonal occupation over the next five years, the threatened population moved behind the city walls, where temporary overcrowding worsened the plague that had broken out in Athens (discussed in chapter 5).[154] The epidemic confirmed what many Athenians felt to be the unnatural dispensation of their fields and *oikoi*. In Thucydides' words, Pericles' defensive posture forced nonurban Athenians to "leave their homes, their sacred places which had been passed on to them continuously from their ancestors . . . transforming their way of life, each person in effect abandoning his own *polis*."[155] When the Spartans gained a permanent base in Attica by capturing Decelea in 413, the impact of territorial dispossession grew worse: "The Athenians were deprived of [using] their whole countryside; more than twenty thousand slaves deserted, most of them skilled workers; all the sheep and beasts of burden were lost."[156] Ignoring these realities, Aeschylus in Aristophanes' *Frogs* looks back to Pericles' policy with nostalgia, as if it held the answer to defeating the Spartans—Athenians should save themselves "by considering the land of their enemies / to be their own, and their own to be their enemies'" (*Ran.* 1463–64).

The paradoxical relationship of Athens to its own territory reflected the city's trust in its fleet and its growing empire, allowing its own "mother" to be occupied by enemy forces, while drawing sustenance, nurture, and tribute from foreign lands.[157] Between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, Athens settled poorer citizens overseas, including a thousand led by Pericles to Chersonese (the setting of Euripides' *Hecuba*, discussed in chapter 4), and others to Naxos, Andros, Carystos on Euboea, and Lemnos (the location of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*).[158] Wealthy Athenians could buy property in allied cities, a right extended only rarely in the other direction, to non-Athenians in Attica. During the Peloponnesian War Athens seized the land of rebellious allies such as Mytilene (427) and Melos (416), which it distributed to its own citizen cleruchs, who either occupied the land or, as absentee landlords, rented it back to local inhabitants.[159]

In spite of its importance for trade and empire, the sea never lost its sense of danger for the Athenians.[160] Death at sea was deemed particularly grievous, for it denied the *oikos* of the deceased the chance to fulfill its ritual obligations to the dead. According to Diodorus, the failure at Arginusae to recover Athenian corpses for burial led to the execution of the six naval commanders (including Pericles' son) in 406, in spite of their having engineered an unexpected victory over the Spartan fleet, when the Peloponnesian War hung in the balance.[161] One of innumerable ironies in Euripides' *Helen* involves a comparable scenario that plays off traditional burial in Greek soil. To escape from Egypt, Helen concocts a false "funeral at sea" for Menelaus, the opposite of what any Athenian would desire. However, the corpses left in her wake (unarmed Egyptians cut down by her previously unrecognized husband) may have reminded the audience of the multitude of Athenians lost in the waters off Syracuse in 413, the year before the play was produced.[162]

Both the vital role of the sea and its dangers surface time and again in tragedy: storm and shipwreck haunt plays dealing with the Trojan War and its aftermath (*Agamemnon*, *Hecuba*, the *Trojan* trilogy of Euripides, the satyr plays *Cyclops* and *Proteus*); battle deaths at sea feature prominently in *Persians*; the Athenian navy lurks behind the Chorus in *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* (discussed in chapter 3); metaphors based on sailing and navigation elucidate personal and political norms from *Seven against Thebes* to *Oedipus at Colonus*.[163] On occasion, the sea even invades the prerogatives of dry land. In *Hippolytus*, for example, the protagonist meets his death in a chariot along the shore, but the Messenger describes the events like a shipwreck. A giant wave, heaven-high, cuts off the sight of land (*Hipp.* 1206–9), and Hippolytus pulls on the reins like a rower pulling hard on his oar (1220–22). However, the horses fail to respond to the "shipmaster's hand" (*nauklērou cheir*, 1224). No matter where he "moves the rudder" (*echōn oiakas euthunoi*, 1227), Hippolytus cannot avoid disaster, and his chariot smashes on the rocks (1230–39).

Whether on sea or land, the realities of Athenian life find their way into the play of tragic space. In the interaction of theatrical, scenic, extrascenic, and distant spaces, we see reflected the continuum of urban and rural worlds; the outside-as-inside core of domestic experience; the workaday mobility of women, metics, and slaves connected to the *oikos*; the conception of public life as one that includes the religious and ritual spheres; the pull of empire out to the distance, with its potential for destruction and relocation; the paradox of autochthony where the homegrown leave and foreigners move in. Within the context of civic festivals, each tragic production was the result of democratic processes that it might then represent onstage. In tragedy's metatheatrical and reflexive moments, the Athenian audience could see itself included in the performance space. Taken together, these various spaces make up the heterotopia that was the theater of Dionysus, a place that could

be "other" by virtue of being grounded, embedded in a landscape, offering its vistas and affordances, representing "spaces that matter" in the city to which it belonged.

With these observations in mind, let us turn to the idea of *nostos* in tragedy, "homecomings" that bring to Athens new—and unexpected—residents.

Figure 1: Theater of Dionysus in Athens (view from above), including the hillside on which the audience sat and the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus below the theater (DAI 75/576).

CHAPTER ONE
THE THEATER AND ATHENIAN SPATIAL PRACTICE

1. Scranton 1965, 33. See also Bernand 1985, 17–21, on "le théâtre ouvert."

2. For festival travel, see Dillon 1997, 29–38. We do not know how the City Dionysia handled "front of house" (audience control, ticket collection, refreshments, etc.); see generally Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 263–78. When Lycurgus in the fourth century expanded the theater and extended the stone seating, the *diazōma* (middle passage) halfway up the slope may have offered another audience entrance. Le Corbusier's statement that "the pack-donkey's way is responsible for the plan of every continental city" (quoted in Kostof 1991, 95) may well describe access to the early theater.

3. See Thuc. 2.15.3–6; Paus. bk. 1; Travlos 1971 and Boersma 1970 (s.v. for individual sites and monuments); Boegehold 1995, 3, 11, 43–44, 48–49, 91, 97–98, 135–46 (Delphinion and Palladion, which Boegehold thinks might have met in Phaleron); Guen-Pollet 1991, 91–95, and Kearns 1989, 107 (Kodrus-Neleus cult and its links to the Ionian cities); Jameson 1998, 185 (the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios, and the shrine to Aphrodite, Theseus, and Hippolytus); Hdt. 6.116, Kyle 1987, 77–92, and Shapiro 1989, 158–63 (Kynosarges); Robertson 1992, 4–16, 21–31, 134–43, and map 1 (sanctuaries south and east of the Acropolis). For the evacuation and sack of Athens, see Hdt. 8.41.1, 8.51–52, Hignett 1963, 198–203, N.G.L. Hammond in *CAH* 4:563–69, and my notes 151–52 herein.

4. Nietzsche 1967, 63.

5. A. *Ag.* 1–24, *PV* 88–95; Eur. *El.* 54, 102, *Ion* 82–88, *Pho.* 1–6, *Alc.* 244–45 (Alcestis' first appearance), *Med.* 56–58 (the Nurse speaks her mistresses troubles "to the earth and sky"), and 148 (the Chorus calls on "Zeus, and earth, and daylight"); S. *Tr.* 94–101, *El.* 16–22 (Tutor) and 86–91, 103–9 (Electra's first appearance). Bernand 1985, 152–57, and Podlecki 1980, 80, discuss other references to the sun in Sophocles, "the god foremost of all the gods" (*OT* 660–61). Invocations to the sun do not imply that the performances began at dawn, unlikely given the logistics of audience travel, admission, seating, and so on. For all we know *Antigone* began in the afternoon; cf. Nussbaum 1986, 70–71, whose comments on the *Antigone* passage are otherwise illuminating.

6. Particularly Zeitlin 1990a, whose views on the alterity of tragic Thebes I discuss in chapters 4, 5, and 6.

7. By then the corpse was decaying (410–12), an implicit reminder of the effects of the sun.

8. Hammond 1972 and 1988 posits a mound of bedrock just off the orchestra, for which there is no archaeological evidence; see Wiles 1997, 64–65, and Rehm 1988, 270 n.34.

9. Proponents include Scully 1999; Hammond 1988, 22–23; Wycherley 1978, 207; Webster 1970b, 7; Hourmouziades 1965, 58–74; Arnott 1962, 15–41. Those unpersuaded of a raised stage (low, wooden, otherwise) include Pickard-Cambridge 1946, 74; Taplin 1977, 441–42; Garvie 1988, xliv. For a single door, see Dale 1969, 103–18; Taplin 1977, 438–40; C. W. Dearden, *The Stage of Aristophanes* (London 1975) 50–74; cf. K. J. Dover, "The Skene in Aristophanes," *PCPhS* 12 (1966) 2–17, arguing that Aristophanes requires two doors.

10. For the *ekkuklēma*, see Pickard-Cambridge 1946, 100–122; for the *mēchanē*, Mastronarde 1990; for both, H.-J. Newiger, "Ekkyklema e mechané nella messa in scena del dramma greco," *Dioniso* 59 (1989) 173–85. Note that there is *no evidence* for an underground passageway (under bedrock?) allowing entrances from below, *pace* Padel 1990, 345–46, and Taplin 1977, 447–48.

11. See my introduction and its notes 104–5. As the wooden *skēnē* served for all performances over the course of the festival, painting and other visual elements must have been easily removed.

12. "In no case is there evidence that the orchestra [in fifth-century theaters] had a form different from that of the space defined by the seats and terrace" (Gebhard 1974, 440).

13. Martienssen 1964, 3–5; also Scranton 1965, 13.

14. For the importance of a horizontal wall in the Greek idea of architectural space, see Martienssen 1964, 6. Following Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1886, Taplin 1977, 452–59, believes that no *skēnē* existed in the theater of Dionysus before Aeschylus' *Oresteia* in 458, a view that now dominates the field. However, by studying the offstage cries in *Agamemnon* and *Choephori*, Hamilton 1987, 595–99, demonstrates that Aeschylus took advantage of earlier usage, indicating that the facade was introduced before the *Oresteia*. We have at most four extant tragedies prior to that date, which should temper generalizations about the absence of an early backdrop. The fact that the meager fragments of Aeschylus don't prove otherwise (Taplin 457) depends on how they are read. Fr. 87, for example, from *Hiereiai* ("Quiet! The beekeeping priestesses are here to open the house of Artemis") suggests a visible temple and the presence of the *skēnē*. So, too, fr. 58 from *Edonai* ("The house is frenzied with the god, the roof revels like a bacchant") might point to a backdrop representing the palace of Lycurgus (like Eur. *Ba.*), which Dionysus has infected. See further chapter 2.

15. Martin 1974, 284.

16. Dörpfeld and Reisch 1896, 26–28, 366–69; Pickard-Cambridge 1946, 5–10, 15–16; Hammond 1972, 405–11; J. M. Walton, *The Greek Sense of Theatre* (London 1984) 45; Arnott 1989, 2–3; Scullion 1990, 58–60; L. du S. Read, "Social Space in Ancient Theatres," *NTQ* 9 (1993) 316–28; Wiles 1997, 44–52.

17. See Moretti 2000, 377–78 and 389–96, and Csapo 2000, introduction, 289; Goette 1995, esp. 7–30; Green 1995, 50 (the dating of the Attic deme theater of Euonymos—with its rectilinear orchestra—to the third quarter of the fourth century "really does seem to settle the fact that the earliest datable theater with a circular orchestra is that at Epidauros"); and Gebhard 1974 (a seminal article). Also see O. Broneer, rev. of *The History of Greek and Roman Theater*, by M. Bieber (Princeton 1939), *AJA* 42 (1938) 596–98; J. T. Allen, *CP* 62 (1947) 259; C. Anti, *Teatri greci arcaici da Minosse a Pericle* (Padua 1947) esp. 55–82 (also 27–51 and 85–149); Izenour 1977, 10–14, and 1992, 4–7; E. Pöhlmann, "Die Proedrie des Dionysos-Theaters im 5. Jahrhundert und das Bühnenspiel der Klassik," *MusHelv* 38 (1981) 129–34, "Bühn und Handlung im *Aias* des Sophokles," *AuA* 32 (1986) 23, and "Vitruvs Schalltheorie und das antike Theater," in *Beiträge zur antiken und neueren Musikgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main 1988) 145–63; Rehm 1988, 276–79; C. Ashby, "The Case for the Rectangular/Trapezoidal Orchestra," *TRI* 13 (1988) 1–20, and 1999, 24–41; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 276–77; and L. Polacco, *Il teatro di Dioniso Eleutereo ad Atene* (Rome 1990) 8 and 101–4, and 1998, 90–97.

18. Polacco 1998 analyzes the impact of geometry and the circle on ancient Greek architecture, insisting that the theater at Epidauros (built in the second half of the fourth century) housed the first circular orchestra. On the date of that theater, see also A. von Gerkan and W. Müller, *Das Theater von Epidauros* (Stuttgart 1961) 77–80 (late fourth or early third); Tomlinson 1983, 85–87 (late fourth); and Lawrence 1996, 206–7 and 227 n.6.

19. Vitruvius 5.7.1, leading O.A.W. Dilke, "The Greek Theatre Cavea," *BSA* 43 (1948) 125–92, to conclude that "in the designing of theatres, the orchestra had to be planned first. . . . A suitable centre is found and the orchestra circle is drawn" (127, 133). Cf. Izenour 1977, 32–43, whose comments on Vitruvius are salutary: For example, "Chapter VII is devoted to design principles Vitruvius recommends for Greek theaters; again, a literal and exact interpretation does not fit any extant buildings" (43).

20. For a recent version of this view, see Wiles 1997, 73–78.

21. H. *Il.* 18.607 (also 8.13), Hes. *Th.* 116–34 and 726–45, Thales and Anaximines (Arist. *Cael.* 2.13.294a29 and 295b10–16), the Epicureans (Lucretius 2.62–232), and the atomists; see Furley 1989, 10, 14–26, and 234–35.

22. Parminides (*DK* B 8.42–49), Plato (*Phd.* 108E–109A), Aristotle (*Cael.* 2.13.295b); see Furley 1989.

23. On the agricultural-year ritual and threshing floors as proto-orchestras, see J. E. Harrison, *Epilogomena to the Study of Greek Religion* and *Themis* (New York 1962; orig. *Themis*, 2nd ed. 1927) 199–211, 331–34, and 341–63 ("Excursus on the Ritual Forms Preserved in Greek Tragedy," by G. Murray); A. D. Ure, "Threshing-Floor or Vineyard," *CQ* 5 (1955) 225–30; Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 126–29; Hammond 1972, 446–47; Gould 1985, 266; Arnott 1989, 2–3; Naerebout 1997, 257 n.606. For a different view, see Rehm 1988, 276–77 and n.58; X. *Oec.* 8.3; J. R. Harlan, *The Living Fields* (Oxford 1995), 228–30; Burford 1993, 140–41. Athenaeus (v. 181 c) refers to the dithyramb as a "circular chorus" and the tragic chorus as "square," a second-century A.D. observation that tells us little about the shape of the space in which fifth-century B.C. performers danced. An American square dance does not require a square floor, only a flat one; the same applies to dithyrambs and tragedies, both of which were performed on the same orchestra floor at the theater of Dionysus.

24. On the *tholos-thumele* at Epidauros (including dates), see F. Seiler, *Die Griechische Tholos: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung, Typologie und Funktion kunstmässiger Rundbauten* (Mainz am Rhein 1986) 72–89, and Tomlinson 1983, 60–67. See also A. Burford, *The Greek Temple-Builders at Epidauros* (Liverpool 1969) 53–54 and 63–68, who notes the sanctuaries' "exploitation of . . . hitherto comparatively little used [architectural] features, the circle and its various parts (in the tholos and the theatre) and the Corinthian order" (53); Lawrence 1996, 135–41; and Polacco 1998, 61–67. For the association of Epidaurous with contests, performances, and games prior to the new theater, see P. *N.* 5.95–97, Pl. *Ion* 530A, and other sources gathered by E. Edelstein and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* (Baltimore 1945) nos. 556–63 (pp. 312–15); also Tomlinson 1983, 85 and 90–91.

25. R. Schechner, *Essay on Performance Theory, 1970–77* (New York 1977) 115. Almost all Greek altars were "open to the heavens," so the phrase is redundant.

26. Rehm 1988, 264–74; Wiles 1997, 70–73; Ashby 1999, 42–61.

27. Wiles 1997, 210.

28. A fact acknowledged by Wiles 1997, 54 n.119. Tomlinson 1976, 17, notes that the (normal) location at the east front of the temple was designed with the god in mind, "giving the cult-image in the temple a view of the sacrifice." That the sacrificer or attendant first circles the altar (Ar. *Pax* 956–58, Eur. *IA* 1569) says nothing about those gathered to watch.

29. For the performance schedule of the two festivals, see Csapo and Slater 1995, 103–21 (City Dionysia), 122–24 and 132–37 (Lenaia); Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 36–37, 40–42, 359–60 (Lenaia), 58–70, 361 (City); and Mikalson 1975, 109–10 (Lenaia), 123–31 and 137 (City).

30. M. H. Jameson, "The Ritual of the Athena Nike Parapet," in Osborne and Hornblower 1994, 307. Only the "oddfellows" of the ancient world, the Orphics and Pythagoreans, rejected animal sacrifice (Humphreys 1986a, 97 n.5). Connor 1991 argues that Socrates' critical attitude toward the practice helped spawn the perception that he posed a threat to the community. On the action-based, rather than "credal," nature of Greek religion, see Jameson 1998 and 1999; Osborne 1994, 144; Versnel 1981a; Dodds 1973, 140–44; and J. K. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London 1972) 33.

31. A second temple dedicated to the god has been dated to the fourth century, outside our period. See Rehm 1988, 267 and n.20 (altar), and 280 n.73 (new temple); Goette 1995, 22; Travlos 1971, 537; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 57–58; Connor 1989, 24–26; Shapiro 1989, 85–86 (cult image).

32. Travlos 1971, 537; Tomlinson 1976, 17–19, 41; Schachter 1992, 49 (theatrical area distinct from Dionysus sanctuary, both in Athens and Thasos); B. Bergquist, "The Archaic Temenos in West Greece," in Schachter 1992, 144–45, 316; Sourvinou-Inwood 1993, 11. The Odeion of Pericles was constructed ca. 444 B.C. next to the east analemma of the theater to house the competitions in music and Homeric recitation at the Panatheneaic festival, dedicated to Athena Polias; it also held the *proagōn* at the City Dionysia, a "teaser" before the festival (Erp Taalman Kip 1990, 38–41 and 123–29). The Odeion quite possibly served as the meeting place for one of the city's main courts, that "of the archon" (Boegehold 1995, 6, 26, 29–30, 93–94, 173–74), further exemplifying the multiple use of buildings within the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus. On the lack of distinction between the religious and secular aspects of Attic festivals generally, see Parker 1996, 76–80.

33. For dithyrambic competitions at the City Dionysia, see Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 74–79. During the annual Athenian festival of the Thargelia, the dithyrambs honored Apollo (Ant. *Or.* 6.11–13, Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 56.3, Parke 1977, 146–49).

34. For rehearsals, see Hourmouziades 1965, 4–5. Pollux 4.88 (Csapo and Slater 1995, 118) notes that a trumpet announced each new performance after the comic actor Hermon missed his entrance one year. Although late, the testimony points to backstage confusion, surely magnified in the boys' dithyrambic competition.

35. Csapo and Slater 1995, 222.

36. We may contrast this open use of the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus with that of Dionysus in the Marshes (*en limnais*), the more ancient sanctuary, which opened only one day a year during the festival of the Anthesteria that honored Dionysus and the new wine. See Thuc. 2.15; [D] 59, "Against Neaira"; and Parke 1977, 110–13.

37. The Lenaia had no dithyrambic competitions, but included three to five comedies by individual playwrights, and two tragedies each by two to three tragedians; see Csapo and Slater 1995, 122–24.

38. Thuc. 8.93–94; McDonald 1943, 42–51; Martin 1951, 251–52; Kolb 1981, 88–99; Hansen 1983, 3–6, 21; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 68–70; and Wiles 1997, 23–36, who differentiates the multipurpose function of deme theaters from that of the theater on the south slope. However, a far more varied function existed for the main theater than (e.g.) for the Pnyx (see note 32).

39. Martienssen 1964, 42, and Camp 1992, 14–15; for a historical survey, see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 1–24. Connor 1988, 173–74, Sourvinou-Inwood 1993, 12, and Jameson 1997, 493, emphasize (correctly, in my opinion) the admixture of sacred and civic activities in the agora, against such schematic views of Athenian urban space in which the agora "mediates" between the Kerameikos and the Acropolis (N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* [Cambridge, Mass. 1986; orig. Paris 1981] 284), or the theater of Dionysus provides "a locus and mediation" between the Acropolis and the agora (D. C. Pozzi, "The *Polis* in Crisis," in Pozzi and Wickersham 1991, 127).

40. Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 37–38; Camp 1992, 46; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 126–29; Wycherley 1957, 162–63 and 220–21; and Haigh 1907, 110–11, including late testimonia regarding wooden bleachers (*ikria*) in the agora, whose collapse may have led to the transfer of performances to a more secure site.

41. Hammond 1972, 390–405, 447; Kolb 1981, 26–61.

42. Hammond 1972, 405. Pollux' often repeated claim (4.126–27) that the theater's stage-right *eisodos* led to the country and harbor, and the stage left to the city, has no bearing on fifth-century staging practices (Burian 1977, 91–92, and Taplin 1977, 450–51). Even when the text of a tragedy contradicts this spatial dualism (as does Eur. *Ba.*), translators cannot resist it; see Esposito 1998, 121–22. Wiles 1997, 133–60, insists absolutely on the binary of "left and right, east and west" in the *eisodoi*.

43. Martin 1951, 290; Kolb 1981, 54–57; Thompson 1982, 136–38; Hansen 1991, 128–29; Hölscher 1991, 370 (gradual differentiation of function—theater, gymnasia, assembly—out from the agora). Hölkeskamp 1992, 97, sees the agora in Homer as a place "set apart for free debate and peaceful settlement of disputes," an early version of an assembly meeting place.

44. Thuc. 6.54.7; Camp 1992, 40–42; Hölscher 1991, 365; Lewis 1988, 289, 296; Boardman 1988, 415–16; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 129–36; Wycherley 1957, 119–22.

45. Pl. *Hipp.* 228b1–229b1; Shapiro 1989, 125–26 and 133; Lewis 1988, 292–93; R. Osborne, "The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai," *PCPhS* 211 (1985), esp. 48–57. The altar also served as the point from which Athenians measured the city's distance from the temple of Zeus at Olympia (Hdt. 2.7.1).

46. For the divine sanction to hear suppliants, see Dover 1974, 247–48. Zelnick-Abramovitz 1998 discusses the civic aspects of supplication at Athens (e.g., foreign suppliants represented at the assembly, as reflected in Eur. *Supp.*; see the introduction, note 133).

47. Hdt. 6.108; Lewis 1988, 296–98; and Gadberry 1992, 447–52. The association of this altar with the "altar of Pity" (*Eleos*) (Wycherley 1957, 67–74 and 119–22, Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 134–36, and Hölscher 1991, 375) has been discredited. See Robertson 1992, 51–54, and Gadberry 1992, 478.

48. Tragedies featuring supplications include A. *Su.*, *Eum.*; S. *Aj.*, *OC*; Eur. *Med.*, *Andr.*, *Hcld.*, *Hec.*, *Supp.*, *HF*, *Ion*, *Hel.*; among fragmentary plays, probably A. *Niobe*; S. *Aechmalotides* and *Second Athamas*; Eur. *Dictys*, *Oeneus*, *Alexander*, and *Alcmeon at Corinth*. See Vickers 1973, 438–94.

49. See Connor 1989.

50. Mullaney 1995, 26–59. However, he underestimates the importance of theaters within London's city walls and distorts ancient Athenian theatrical practice, claiming it was a "geographically and ideologically closed system" (8).

51. The City Dionysia had to avoid conflicts with scheduled political meetings and preexisting festivals; see Burkert 1985, 227, and generally Parker 1996, 43–56. For the internal festival schedule, see note 29.

52. Osborne 1987, 172–74; also Burford 1993, 162–63. Note that ritual celebrations linked to the agricultural cycle did not always line up; the "harvest festival" of the Thesmophoria, for example, did not take place during harvest time (Burford 1993, 257 n.173 and Burkert 1985, 226 and 245).

53. In similar fashion, the Panhellenic games—Olympic, Nemean, Isthmian, and Pythian—took place in the slack period of mid-July to early September, before the fall plowing and sowing.

54. Whitehead 1986, 213–22; Csapo and Slater 1995, 121–22 and 124–32.

55. Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 61–63; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 270–72; Csapo and Slater 1995, 105–6, 112–15; cf. Goldhill 1994, 361–63.

56. Parke 1977, 127–28; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 61–63; S. G. Cole, "Procession and Celebration at the Dionysia," in *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, ed. R. Scodel (Ann Arbor 1993) 25–38; and Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 242 (*kanēphoroi*). Parker 1996, 142 and n.80, notes that the phallos dedication was not extended to the empire at large, unlike the requirement that (from the 440s) all allied cities contributed a cow and a panoply to the Greater Panathenaia, which they escorted in the procession.

57. X. *Hipp.* 3.2. Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 278–88, reconstructs the route, based on her view that the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus reflects the myth that the Athenians originally rejected the god, who then struck the men's sexual organs with incurable disease.

58. Jameson 1997, 486–87.

59. Jameson 1999, 323, summarizing H. Hubert and M. Mauss, "Essai sur la nature et fonction du sacrifice" (1899), in their *Mélanges d'histoire des religions*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1929) 1–130; reprinted in M. Mauss, *Oeuvres* 1 (Paris 1968) 193–307, as "Les fonctions sociales du sacré." English tr. by W. D. Halls, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function* (Chicago 1964).

60. See generally A. van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, tr. M. Vizedom and G. Caffee (London 1960; orig. 1909); R. Hertz, *Death and the Right Hand*, tr. R. Needham and C. Needham (Glencoe, Ill. 1960; orig. 1907); V. Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Ithaca 1977; orig. 1969) 94–97, 106–13, 165–203, and *Celebration: Studies in Festival and Ritual* (Washington, D.C. 1982) 26–28 and 201–18; and Osborne 1985, 171. W. R. Connor, "Tribes, Festivals and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece," *JHS* 107 (1987) 40–50, explores how Athenian festivals and processions articulated changing community values, also noting the "apparent convergence between festivals and political disturbances" (e.g., Kylon's attempted coup during the festival of Zeus, Harmodius and Aristogeiton's plot against the Pisistratids at the Great Panathenaia of 514). As a point of comparison, R. Sinos ("Divine Selection,"

in Dougherty and Kurke 1993, 75–77) notes the heroicization in Athenian vase depictions of wedding ritual, a temporary stepping out from reality before the mundane reasserts itself (Alltag to Fest, and back).

61. M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec* (Paris 1979)—Vernant's essay "Sacrificial and Alimentary Codes in Hesiod's Myth of Prometheus" appears in R. L. Gordon, ed., *Myth, Religion and Society* (Cambridge 1981) 57–79; J.-P. Vernant, "Between the Beasts and the Gods" (1974), in *Myth and Society* (Brighton 1980) esp. 150–67; P. Vidal-Naquet, "Hunting and Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*," in Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1981, 150–74; Vernant 1991, 278–83. For a summary of recent sacrificial theory, see Seaford 1994, 285–93, and Foley 1985, 23–25, 30–36 (structuralist approaches), 46–56 (sacrifice and violence).

62. Burkert 1983, 1–12, 35–48, and 1985, 54–60 (an excellent summary of sacrificial practice); Vernant 1991, 290–302.

63. Girard 1977, 1–67.

64. Bloch 1992, 1–7, 21, 28–36, 64–65, and 78–79.

65. I. Morris, "Poetics of Power," in Dougherty and Kurke 1993, 20–23, and *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge 1987) 33, adapting E. Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1925); see also Jameson 1998, 174–75, 178, 180, and Versnel 1987, 77–78.

66. Wiessner 1996, 6.

67. Pierce 1993, 260. For literary support of her view, see Thuc. 2.38; Ar. *Nu.* 386–87, 408–11, *Eq.* 652–82; [X.] *Ath.Pol.* 2.9–10, 3.2; and Isoc. 7.29 (the *dēmos* adds festivals to the calendar solely for the free meat, a food subsidy for the poor). On the general principle, G. Bowersock (in Molho, Raaflaab, and Emlen 1991, 551) observes that "the experience of symbols and rituals is what really mattered, rather than reading [interpreting] them."

68. See Jameson 1998, 178–89, and 1999, 324–31. Evidence for the existence of a *kōmos* 'revel' may indicate the continuation of the feasting and celebration into the night; see Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 63 and 101–3.

69. Parke 1977, 46–49; Whitehead 1986, 137.

70. "For most Athenian citizens the slave was the *oikētēs*, the lowest member of his household" (Jameson 1977–78, 141; also chapter 4, note 73). The anecdotal evidence for the exclusion of slaves from sharing meat at a sacrifice (Ath. 6.262b–c) is late and unreliable. Some public sacrifices *guaranteed* distribution to metics; at the Athenian Hephaisteia, three oxen were reserved for metics to consume (*IG* I^3 82.23–24); this may reflect Hephaistus' close association with artisans, many of whom were foreign (Jameson 1998, 185, and Garland 1992, 110).

71. For various proposed schedules, see note 29.

72. See Giovannini 1991, 473.

73. On the choregic system, see Wilson 2000, and Csapo and Slater 1995, 139–55. On judges and judging, see note 103.

74. Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 271–72.

75. Over time the procession combined both aspects. All-inclusive in terms of participation, it initially was overseen—as was the entire festival—by the archon eponymous, assisted by ten board members elected by the assembly, who covered the expenses of the procession; later (ca. 340) these *epimelētai* were picked by lot, one from each tribe, and provided with public funds to handle the cost of the procession. See Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 56.4; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 58; Hansen 1991, 242.

76. Wilson 2000, 68–70; Ostwald 1992, 326–38; Lewis 1988, 292–93; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 76, and 1962, 31–58; Haigh 1896, 20–25.

77. West 1992, 30, 81–85, and 101–7; more generally, Mathiesen 1999, 177–222.

78. Pl. *Smp.* 215c, and Arist. *Pol.* 1341a21–27; see also West 1992, 105 n.103, and P. Wilson, "The Aulos in Athens," in Goldhill and Osborne 1999, 58–95.

79. Ostwald 1992, 323–25; Whitehead 1977, 70; Haigh 1896, 40–42, 405–9, 418–20, and 463–72.

80. Haigh 1907, 315–17; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 101–35 and 360; Csapo and Slater 1995, 222–35; Easterling 1997b, 213–17. Plato (*Lg.* 817c) disparages actors as "imported" (*eisagagomenoi*), evidence that foreign performers were even more numerous in Athens in the fourth century.

81. Wilson 2000, 28–31; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 40–41; Haigh 1907, 26–28; D.S. 15.74 (Dionysius of Syracuse won the tragic prize at the Lenaia in 367).

82. Whitehead 1986, 212–22; for the local popularity of Dionysiac cult, evidenced by deme calendars, see Henrichs 1990.

83. Whitehead 1986, 151–52 and 215–16.

84. See C. J. Herington, "Aeschylus in Sicily," *JHS* 87 (1967) 74–85; Easterling 1997b; O. Taplin, "Spreading the Word through Performance," in Goldhill and Osborne 1999, 33–57, stressing the "international" claims of tragedy.

85. Poole 1987, 12.

86. Davies 1977–78, 116 (on Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 20.1, 21.2, 21.4); D. Kagan, "The Enfranchisement of Aliens by Cleisthenes," *Historia* 12 (1963), 41–46 (on Arist. *Pol.* 1275b35–1276a7); and J. B. Edwards, *The Demesman in Attic Life* (Menasha, Wis. 1916) 58–61. Cf. T. F. Winters, "Kleisthenes and Athenian Nomenclature," *JHS* 113 (1993) 163–65.

87. Whitehead 1977, 140–47; also 1986, 69–75 (demotics) and 81–85 (metics).

88. Whitehead 1977, 70; Arist. *Pol.* 1274b32–1278b5. For recent challenges to this "constitutionalist" approach to citizenship, see Boegehold and Scafuro 1994 (esp. the essays by Scafuro, Ober, Manville, and Connor), and my note 125.

89. On excessive freedom of speech and movement for metics, slaves, and women in the Athenian democracy, see Pl. *Resp.* 563a–d, [X.] *Ath.Pol.* 1.10–12, and Arist. *Pol.* 1313b34–1314a12.

90. Thuc. 1.143.1–2, Meiggs 1975, 439–41 (fleet); Thuc. 2.13.7 and 31.1–2, Meiggs 1975, 262–64 (hoplites); Cartledge 1993, 139 (slaves); Meiggs 1975, 271–72, Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977, 267–84, R. Garland, *The Piraeus* (London 1987) 58–68, 142, 191–93, Sinclair 1988, 28–31, Hansen 1991, 116–20, and Ostwald 1992, 307–12 (wealth, economic and trading prospects); Kyle 1987, 88–92, and D. *Erotikos* 23 (gymnasia and athletics); Hansen 1989a, 21 (cults). Although mostly itinerant, some Sophists spent long periods resident in Athens, making them subject to legal proceedings and possibly the metic tax (*metoikon*). See Guthrie 1969, 35–41; Podlecki 1998, 17 (Zeno), 23–25, 32–34 (Anaxagoras), and 93–94 (Protagoras); and MacDowell 1978, 75–79 (alien statuses), 183–86 (*eisaggelia*), and 200–201 (Anaxagoras and Protagoras). Meiggs 1975, 263, summarizes: "Athens . . . probably made better provision for metics than in any other Greek state."

91. Their child, Pericles the younger, became Athenian only when Pericles sought special exemption from his own citizenship law, after his legitimate sons Xanthippos and Paralos died in the plague (as Pericles himself would later).

92. Connor 1971, 97–100; also Humphreys 1974, 93–94, and Whitehead 1977, 150, who notes that Cleisthenes, Themistocles, and Kimon—political powerbrokers in the early democracy—had foreign mothers. Rihll 1999, 9 n.29, posits an interesting link between metic status and "free-thinking." On Anaxagoras' trial for impiety, see Podlecki 1998, 31–34.

93. Hansen 1991, 47–49; Osborne 1994, 155; Jones 1999, 51–58 and 133–50 (on demes as both "natural" and "territorial" communities). Nilsson 1972, 162 n.40, notes the New Testament parallel—Joseph and Mary do not pay taxes where they live (Nazareth), but where Joseph's ancestors come from (Bethlehem). The Cleisthenic reforms (allocating citizens to tribes, trittyes, and demes) may have aimed to limit the rival political influences of inherited wealth and regionalism. See E. M. Wood, "Democracy," 72, and B. S. Strauss, "The Melting Pot, the Mosaic, and the Agora," 259–64, both in Euben, Wallach, and Ober 1994; Ober 1989, 68–75; Sinclair 1988, 3–4; Whitehead 1986, 67–69 and 352–60. For their effect on Attic religious life, see Parker 1996, 102–21.

94. On women and Dionysiac cult, see Henrichs 1984 and 1990, 263–64. On women in the theater, see Csapo and Slater 1995, 286–87, 290–92, 300–301, 304–5; J. Henderson, "Women and the Athenian Dramatic Festivals," *TAPA* 121 (1991) 133–47; A Podlecki, "Could Women Attend the Theatre in Ancient Athens? A Collection of Testimonia," *Anc.W.* 21 (1990) 27–43; Haigh 1907, 323–29; cf. Goldhill 1994. Wilamowitz (on Ar. *Lys.* 1114) thought that women appeared on stage in nonspeaking roles (girl flute players, Theoria in *Pax*, etc.) in Aristophanes' comedies; see Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 153 n.1 and 221. Recall that Athenian female choral performances took place on various ritual occasions in Attica. See C. Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*, tr. D. Collins and J. Orion (Lanham, Md. 1997) 98–101 (Artemis Brauronia), 125–33 (Panathenaia, Plynteria, Oschophoria), 138–39 (possibly at Thesmophoria and Skira). For metic attendance at theater performances, see Sommerstein 1997, 66–67.

95. Sommerstein 1997, 66–67 and 71, Csapo and Slater 1995, 287–89 and 293–97, and Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 266–68 (theoric fund); Hansen 1991, 98–99, and Davies 1977–78, 110–11 (economic advantages of citizenship and citizen pay generally); Boegehold 1995, 20 and n.5, Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 27.3–4 and *Pol.* 1274a5–11 (dicast pay, introduced after the Ephialtic reforms of 462); Hansen 1983, 18–20, and 1989a, 97–98 (assembly pay introduced between 403 and 393). Davies 1977–78 offers an excellent summation of an Athenian citizen's "rights."

96. Parker 1983, 21–22, 30–31; Burkert 1985, 81–82; Hansen 1987, 171 n.575; Istros *FGrH* 334F 16.

97. M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion*, tr. F. J. Fielden (Oxford 1925) 25. As Burkert 1985, 82, puts it, "the purification ritual appears reduced to a magical-instrumental function."

98. Sommerstein 1989 on 282–83. Ignoring its role in spatial purification, Keuls 1993, 355, plumbs the "depth of . . . pig-womb symbolism" in Orestes' action. Initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries, undertaken before the initiates processed from Athens to Eleusis, also required purification with pig's blood (Parke 1977, 62–63; Ar. *Ach.* 764, *Pax* 374–75, *Ran.* 337–38).

99. Rehm 1994b, 16; Goldhill 1990, 107–14, eschews comment on military decision making, focusing on the ideology of military service generally.

100. Plut. *Per.* 16.3, R. Develin, *Athenian Officials, 684–321 BC* (Cambridge 1989) 491, and Ober 1989, 86–93; for the functioning of the Athenian command, see Hammond 1973, 346–94 ("Problems of Command in Fifth-Century Athens").

101. See Podlecki 1966 (8–26, 125–29) and 1970 (4–11); W. G. Forrest, "Themistokles and Argos," *CQ* 1960 (10) 221–41; and P. J. Rhodes, "Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles," *Historia* 19 (1970) 387–400.

102. Isoc. *de Pace* 82; Aeschin. 3.153–54; Csapo and Slater 1995, 117–18.

103. Csapo and Slater 1995, 157–65. On the vote counting, see M. Pope, "Athenian Festival Judges—Seven, Five or However Many," *CQ* 36 (1986) 322–26.

104. Hansen 1991, 178–265, and Rhodes 1986, 113–51, offer useful accounts of these democratic practices; on the sortition of priestesses, also see S. B. Aleshire, "The Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus," in Osborne and Hornblower 1994, esp. 326–27 and 332–34 (also Osborne, introduction, 10), and Garland 1992, 102–3.

105. On the *didaskalos*, see the introduction.

106. The City Dionysia did not award a prize for comic actors until the late fourth century; it did for the Lenaia from ca. 440, with a prize for tragic actors instituted ca. 432. See Csapo and Slater 1995, 226–29.

107. Csapo and Slater 1995, 107–8 and 117–19; Goldhill 1990, 104–5; Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 59, 67, and 82; and Parke 1977, 133–34.

108. Aesch. 3.41–43; Is. 9.8.11–13; H. Raedle, "Freilassung von Sklaven in Theater," *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 19 (1971) 361–64; Parke 1977, 134; Garlan 1988, 73–74. On bearing witness in Athenian courts, see Dem. 35.10–12; C. Carey, "The Witness *exomosia* in the Athenian Courts," *CQ* 45 (1995) 114–19; Thomas 1992, 41–44; MacDowell 1978, 212–17 and 242–47. Tragic characters often ask others to bear witness—in *Agamemnon*, for example, Cassandra calls on the Chorus to "bear witness" and "swear" that her revelations regarding the house of Atreus are true (*Ag.* 1196–97).

109. Garlan 1988, 73–84; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiōn Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 497. As new metics, those freedmen who stayed in Athens registered with the polemarch (Hansen 1991, 117) and possibly with his deme as well.

110. Isocr. 8.82; Meiggs 1975, 234–54 and 433–34; and Goldhill 1990, 101–4. Cf. Podlecki 1998, 99, who thinks the tribute was due at the time of the festival but not displayed in the theater.

111. Thuc. 1.96–101; Meiggs 1975, 58–67.

112. On the Athenian alliance and revolts from it, see Hammond 1973, 325–45; Meiggs 1975, 205–19, 358–63; Rhodes 1992, 47–49; Andrewes 1992, 464–71; and Lewis 1992b, 382–86 and 402–6.

113. The most famous include Potidaea in 433/2 (Thuc. 1.56–66, 2.70), Mytilene in 428/7 (3.2–15, 25–50), Melos in 416 (5.84–116), Chios and much of Ionia in 412 (bk. 8). The revolt in Potidaea had a demonstrable effect on Athenian tribute (Meiggs 1975, 201–2, 252–54, 309–11, 528–29), one that could not escape notice in the annual display at the City Dionysia. Mytilene, Chios, and Melos, however, do not appear on the tribute lists; the first two supplied ships to the league, not money, and the Melian "revolt" involved the island's desire to remain neutral in the war between Athens and Sparta.

114. See Croally 1994, Di Benedetto 1971, Goossens 1962, Murray 1946. Cf. Michelini 1987, 28–30, for a representative dismissal of the "historicist school."

115. On the *ekklēsia* meeting in the theater, see Kolb 1981, 92–96, and McDonald 1943, 44–65. By 338, and perhaps as early as 403/2, a young citizen had to be twenty before attending the assembly, following his two years of ephebic training (Hansen 1991, 88–89 and 129).

116. A literal translation, "equality before the gathering," suggests the idea of "taking the stage" to address the assembly. On the size of assembly meetings, see Hansen 1991, 130–32. Socrates (Pl. *Phdr.* 258B) compares the assembly to a theater, and a political speaker to a dramatic poet; similarly, Dem. 5.7 (Yunis 1996, 187 and 253). Halliwell 1997 discusses how tragedy exposes the instabilities inherent in the Athenian experience of rhetoric.

117. Osborne 1985, 91–92; Giovannini 1991, 460–61; Raaflaub 1991, 569–70.

118. X. *Hell.* 2.3.50–56; McDonald 1943, 172–73 and pl. 3–4; Boersma 1970, 204; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 34.

119. MacDowell 1978, 33–40; also S. Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford 1999) 16–26.

120. Humphreys 1986b, 72–91.

121. On the relationship between Athenian legal and theatrical practice, see Wise 1998, 119–68; R. Garner, *Law and Society in Classical Athens* (London 1987) 95–130 (his interpretation of the tragedies notwithstanding); Humphreys 1986b, 67 (drama and lawcourts developed "under close reciprocal influence"); and Walcott 1976, 26–27 and 37–42. Cf. S. Johnstone, *Disputes and Democracy: The Consequences of Litigation in Ancient Athens* (Austin 1999) 121–22.

122. Shaw 1975; L. Lupas and Z. Petre, *Commentaire aux "Sept contre Thèbes" d' Eschyle* (Bucharest 1981); Segal 1981 and 1986; Loraux 1987, 19–24, and 1998, 24–34; Padel 1990; Zeitlin 1985; esp. 68–79 (= 1996, 243–50) and 1990b (esp. 75–78); Rabinowitz 1993, 73–99.

123. As Humphreys 1993, 62, puts it, "The heroines of fifth-century tragedy are . . . agents in their own right, acting in opposition to men or as substitutes for them." Herington 1985, 84, observes how a male character's condemnation of women as a class (Hippolytus, Jason) and efforts to contain them (Creon, Pentheus) signal impending disaster. Electra (A. *Cho.* 446) protests at being "locked away in my chamber [*muchos*] like a savage dog." See Easterling 1987 for astute comments on women in tragic space.

124. See C. Orwin, "Feminine Justice: The End of *Seven against Thebes*," *CP* 75 (1980) 187–96.

125. Patterson 1998, esp. 5–43 and 125–29 (quotation at 129). See also Nevett 1999, 13–17; D. M. Schaps, "What Was Free about a Free Athenian Woman?" *TAPA* 128 (1998) 161–88; Blundell 1995, 130–49; Hunter 1994, 9–42 (a "generous evaluation of women's sphere in Athens"); Cohen 1989 and 1991, 149–67 (a valuable corrective to assumptions of Athenian women's seclusion and immobility) and 70–98 (on the extended notion of the *oikos* for understanding the public-private relationship in Athens); Foley 1982, 3–5; and A. C. Scafuro, "Introduction," in Boegehold and Scafuro 1994, 4–7 (supporting Patterson's model of *polis* membership as a double-stranded bond of men and women). See also Jones 1999, 123–33 (women and deme membership); Lambert 1993, 36–40, 178–88, 237–40 (women and phratry member-

ship); Foxhall 1989, and V. Hunter, "Women's Authority in Classical Athens," *EMC/CV* 8 (1989) 39–48 (women's control over property). For married Athenian women as *polis* members necessary for citizen offspring (Arist. *Pol.* 1275b 22–23), see Podlecki 1998, 159–61; Patterson 1990, also her "Marriage and Married Women in Athenian Law," in Pomeroy 1991, 48–72, and *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 B.C.* (New York 1981); and W. Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* (Munich 1934) 261–66. Note that marriage of *homometric* siblings was forbidden in Athens, whereas siblings with the same father but different mothers could marry (Rehm 1994a, 54–57 and 178–79 nn.57–62). For women's public religious activity, see H. McClees, "A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1920), documenting priestesses in over forty major cults; also Feaver 1957, 137–57; Dontas 1983, 54–55; Kearns 1989, 61 and 79; Pollitt 1990, 190; Giovannini 1991, 462–64; N. Bookidis, "Ritual Dining at Corinth" (esp. 47–50) and S. G. Cole, "Demeter in the Ancient Greek City and Its Countryside" (esp. 201–4), both in Marinatos and Hägg 1993. For female pilgrimages to sanctuaries all over Greece (with Olympia the major exception), see Dillon 1997, 183–203. On votives and other dedications by women, see D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* (Oxford 1995) 224–28 and 236–38 ("it is clear that the Akropolis was open to women and should be considered one of their spheres. The sharp line between domestic and public is blurred in the sanctuaries, which are public spaces where women actively participated"); Pulleyn 1997, 168–71; and van Straten 1981, 75–77, 98–99. On women's cults, see Larson 1995 (heroine cults, s.v. cults in Athens/Attica), Jameson 1999, 333–35, and my comments in the introduction and in notes 88 and 94 herein. For female figures carved on grave monuments representing their "symbolic and actual capital" within the *oikos*, see R. E. Leader, "In Death Not Divided: Gender, Family, and State on Classical Athenian Grave Stelae," *AJA* 101 (1997) 683–99. On the misunderstood passage from Pericles' funeral oration regarding "women's silence," see Lisa Kallet-Marx, "Thucydides 2.45.2 and the Status of War Widows in Periclean Athens," in Rosen and Farrell 1993, 133–43.

126. Among a plethora of *counterexamples*, ubiquitous in current scholarship, see (e.g.) Case 1985, reprinted in the popular *HBJ Anthology of Drama*, ed. W. B. Worthen (Fort Worth, Tex. 1993) 111–16, where drama students are taught that "Athenian women were confined to the house"; Parker 1987, 188–89, who uses Bachofen's *Das Mutterrecht* (1861) and Zeitlin 1978 to conclude that the *Oresteia* ultimately "denies the mother altogether"; S. des Bouvrie, *Women in Greek Tragedy: An Anthropological Approach, SymbOs* supp. 27 (Oxford and Oslo 1991), and Rabinowitz 1993, who tend to reduce female characters to automized "pencils" drawing ideological boundaries around themselves in order to validate the Athenian male order and "recuperate the female figures for patriarchy" (Rabinowitz 1993, 14, but cf. E. Hall, rev. of des Bouvrie, *CR* 42 [1992] 56–58); Seidensticker 1995, 152 (women "stayed inside") and 167 (Athens "marginalized women further than any other Greek *polis*"); Walker 1995, who claims that Athenian women were "a group completely excluded from the polis" (100, 121), that the proper role of an Athenian woman was "of course, no role whatsoever" (125); etc. Cf. note 125.

127. "Hestia-Hermes: The Religious Expression of Space and Movement in Ancient Greece," in Vernant 1983 (quotations at 187 and 128–29). The idea has proved infectious—see, e.g., Malkin 1987, 115 n.5; Hartog 1988, 122–23; J. Wright, "The

Spatial Configuration of Belief," in Alcock and Osborne 1994, 57–58; Croally 1994, 165–66; Walker 1995, 85.

128. Jameson 1990a, 192–95; also 1990b, 98–99 and 105–6, emphasizing the non-site-specific, improvisatory nature of Greek domestic religion. For the public hearth of Athens, located in the Prytaneion, see Gernet 1981, 328–34, and Miller 1978, 13–16 and 21–35. Regarding herms, it is possible that cheaper wooden models substituted for stone outside poorer *oikoi*.

129. Jameson 1990a, 187–91, and 1990b, 99–100, 103–4, and 106. Nevett 1999, 18–19, discusses the possibility (likely in my opinion) that the *andrōn* also was used for family occasions. Symposia seem to have been an aristocratic or upper-class phenomenon, discussed by O. Murray, "The Greek Symposion in History," in *Tria corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. E. Gabba (Como 1983) 257–72; see my chapter 4, for symposia as occasions for "Dionysiac" performance. The cramped proportions of most house *andrōnes* (seven dining couches against walls fourteen feet long, an off-center door, no windows) undermine the spatial reading proposed by Lissarague (1990, esp. 19–20, 35–36, 44–45), where the mixing bowl (*kratēr*) in the middle (*eis to meson*) "embodies all the values of the mean." Although possibly true for larger civic *andrones*, in a closed-in domestic environment, the experience of "converging sightlines," "visual reciprocity," and egalitarian spatial focus would seem virtual at best. For dimensions, see B. Bergquist, "Sympotic Space," in Murray 1990, esp. 37–39, although she concentrates on larger civic and ritual dining rooms.

130. *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides*, ed. F. Pfister (Vienna 1951) 72; on the haphazard rebuilding of Athens after the Persian sack (as opposed to Miletus on the coast of Asia Minor), see Boersma 1970, 42–45. Herodotus (7.102.1) makes the general point: "Poverty is the messmate of Hellas." Cf. M. Vickers, "Attic *Symposia* after the Persian Wars," in Murray 1990, 105–21, who imagines a very high-life Athens indeed.

131. The house "concentrates itself upon its interior, its court" according to W. Hoepfner, "Bürgerhäuser im klassischen Griechenland," in *Palast und Hütte*, ed. D Papenfuss and V. M. Strocka (Mainz 1982) 43–48 (quotation at 44).

132. Jameson 1990a, 179–82 and 186, and 1990b, 97–98 and 100; Scranton 1965, 34–35. Even in the largest homes, rarely is a room more than one room away from the courtyard.

133. Kostof 1991, 63.

134. Jameson 1990a, 175–78, and 1990b, 95–97; Arist. *Pol.* 7.11; and M. Hansen, in *Demokratie und Architektur: Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Enstehung der Demokratie*, ed. W. Schuller, W. Hoepfner, and E.-L. Schwandner (Munich 1989) 66.

135. See W. Hoepfner and E.-L. Schwandner, *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland* (Munich 1994).

136. Patterson 1998, 1–4, 83–91, and 107–37; Davies 1992, 288–92; Jameson 1990a, 195, and 1990b, 109–10.

137. Thuc. 2.14–16; Jameson 1990a, 172–73, and 1990b, 102; Strauss 1986, 43–45; Osborne 1985, 142; J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica*, *Hesperia* supp. 14 (Princeton 1975) 70–71; and Padgug 1975.

138. Thomas 1981, esp. 43–44; Osborne 1985, 185–89, and 1987, esp. 16–23, 91–92, 89–104, 130, 140–41, 178–80, and 195 ("The Classical city was embedded

in the countryside"); Strauss 1986, 59–63; and Finley 1999, 123–49, who overrates Weber's notion of the ancient city as a "centre of consumption, not of production." Cf. R. Osborne, "Exchange and Society in the Greek City," 119–45, and I. Morris, "The Early Polis as City and State," esp. 34–40, both in Rich and Wallace-Hadrill 1991.

139. On grain imports, see Garnsey 1998, 183–200 (fourth century); Davies 1992, 300–01; Casson 1991, 70 and 87–113; Osborne 1987, 97–104; Jameson 1977–78, 130 (the biggest import was wheat, as local production was primarily barley, intended for animals, slaves, and the poor majority); Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1977, 289–95; Meiggs 1975, 374; and my chapters 3, note 111, and 4, note 42. For civic ideology built on agricultural values, see Solon in Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 12.4; X. *Oec.* (esp. 5.1–17 and 19.17–20.5); Pl. *Lg.* 740; Wood 1988, 93–110; Burford 1993, 32–34; and (on a rather vast scale) V. D. Hanson, *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization* (New York 1995).

140. F. Braudel, *The Structures of Everyday Life* (London 1981) 27; for the close link between *astu* (city) and *agros* (country) in tragedy, see E. Krummen, "Athens and Attica: *Polis* and Countryside in Greek Tragedy," in Sommerstein et al. 1993, 191–217.

141. De Polignac 1995. In "Mediation, Competition, and Sovereignty: The Evolution of Rural Sanctuaries in Geometric Greece" (Alcock and Osborne 1994, 3–18), he prefers "transition" (rather than "birth") for the emergence of the *polis*.

142. Foley 1994, 170–72; Osborne 1985, 72–83, and 1994, 153–60; Schachter 1992, 31–33; Hölscher 1991, 367–68; C. Morgan, "Ethnicity and Early Greek States," *PCPhS* 37 (1991) 131–63 (esp. 142–45), and 1990, 13–14.

143. Malkin 1987, 12 and 263, his review of de Polignac 1995, *JHS* 107 (1987) 227–28, and his "Territorial Domination and the Greek Sanctuary," in Hellström and Alroth 1996, 75–81 (de Polignac ignores colonization as foundational act, mistakes "established borders" for "changing frontiers"); A. M. Snodgrass, "Archaeology and the Study of the Greek City," in Rich and Wallace-Hadrill 1991, 18–20, and F. Millar, rev. of Molho, Raaflaub, and Emlen 1991, in *CR* 43 (1993) 123–24 (de Polignac underplays military service and the much-disputed "hoplite reform"); see also R. T. Ridley, "The Hoplite as Citizen," *AC* 48 (1979) 508–48. Demand 1990, 14–27, posits external military threats as crucial to early urbanization and relocation.

144. De Polignac 1995, 72–74. "There was no real community among the Greeks that was also not a religious community," according to V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State* (London 1960) 16. Burkert 1985, 254–60, discusses ritual in terms of *polis* and community building. De Polignac (128–41) also emphasizes the role of the hero who comes from abroad to bring order to a community, extending the notion of *polis* building to the incorporation of an original "outsider." In Athens, Theseus exemplifies the phenomenon, discussed further in the text.

145. Hdt. 7.161; Thuc. 1.2.5; Eur. *Ion* 542. Autochthony is a common topos in Athenian funeral orations (Thuc. 2.36.1; Lys. 2.17; [D] 60.4; Pl. *Men.* 237).

146. J. E. Ziolkowski, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* (New York 1981); N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986; orig. Paris 1981), and 1993; A. Saxenhouse, "Reflections on Autochthony in Euripides' *Ion*," in Euben 1986, 252–73; duBois 1988, 42–45, 57–64, 169; Kearns 1989, 110–13; F. Zeitlin, "Mysteries of Identity and Designs of the Self in Euripides' *Ion*," in Zeitlin 1996, 285–338; J. B. Connelly, "Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological In-

terpretation of the Parthenon Frieze," *AJA* 100 (1996) 53–80, whose reading of the frieze, even if wrong in details, offers an important corrective to those like Loraux and duBois who see Athenian foundational myths as a fundamental denial of the importance of women and mothers. See also Hall 1997, 51–56 (autochthony as an anti-Ionian myth); Lefkowitz 1996; Saxenhouse 1992, 50–89; and Pucci 1980, 122 ("The Athenians [as descendents of earthborn Erechtheus] therefore are originally born from the earth, directly, without insemination by any male").

147. On the link between oikist cult and the soil, see Malkin 1987, 13 and 266.

148. Connor 1996, 120; also Martin 1992, 19.

149. Connor 1996; also my chapter 6. Mills 1997 fails to engage this aspect of Theseus. On Theseus and *sunoikismos*, see Thuc. 2.15.1–2 and Kearns 1989, 117–19.

150. E. Vanderpool, *Ostracism at Athens* (Cincinnati 1970); Cartledge 1993, 99 (ostracism a "reverse election"); Jameson 1997, 490; and Wise 1998, 200–203. The ostracized person did retain his property in Attica and could draw revenue from it during his ten-year absence (*FGrH* 328F 30, Philochorus).

151. Hdt. 7.139–45, 8.40–96. See A. Momigliano, "Sea Power in Greek Thought," *CR* 58 (1944) 1–7; Hignett 1963, 193–239 and 441–45; Meiggs 1982, 122–27; A. J. Halladay, "The Forethought of Themistocles," *JHA* 107 (1987) 182–87; Hartog 1988, 42–57 and 199–204; Vernant 1991, 311–14; Casson 1991, 81–92; Garland 1992, 73–75.

152. Hdt. 9. 1–6, 13–14, 17–25, 38–40, 61–63; Lazenby 1993, 211–17; Burn 1984, 502–42; Green 1970, 233–34 and 239–71.

153. Thuc. 1.69.1, 1.107, 1.190–93 (and Gomme 1945 on these passages). By 443 Pericles saw to the completion of a middle Long Wall, close to the previous northern wall, providing a more easily defensible corridor between the *astu* and the port. See Boersma 1970, 45–46 (city walls), 57–58 (Long Walls); A. W. Lawrence, *Greek Aims in Fortification* (Oxford 1979) 114–15 and 156; also *CAH* 5:97, 113, and 138 (Lewis), 207–8 (Wycherley).

154. Thuc. 1.140–43, 2.13–17, 2.19–2.23, 2.55–59, 3.1; Lewis 1992b, 380–88; Casson 1991, 92–96; J. Ober, "Thucydides, Pericles, and the Strategy of Defense," in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, ed. J. W. Eadie and J. Ober (Lanham, Md. 1985) 171–88.

155. Thuc. 2.16–17, 2.65; Ar. *Ach.* 26–42. Hanson 1983, 111–27, points out that the Spartan invasions of 431 to 425 accomplished "no widescale nor lasting damage to the agriculture of Attica," but he acknowledges (143, 147–51) the psychic toll on the Athenians. By the war's end in 404, deaths from disease, battle, and civil unrest had reduced the adult male citizen population to about half its number before hostilities broke out, from well over 40,000 in 431 to about 22,000 in 404; see Raaflaub 1991, 571 and 577, and A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Chicago 1967) 26. In a more dire account of the effects of the war on Athens, Strauss 1986, 70–86, reckons an adult male citizen population over 40,000 in 434, dropping to 14,000 to 16,250 by 404.

156. Thuc. 7.27; also 7.18, 7.28. During the first Spartan invasions of Attica (431–425), the Athenians sent their sheep and cattle to Euboea and other coastal islands for safekeeping (Thuc. 2.14.1), retrieving them sometime before the Peace of Nicias in 421; after the occupation of Decelea, they did the same, but Euboea revolted in 412, leading to the effective loss of their herds (Burford 1993, 148–49 and 160).

157. See Rosenbloom 1995 on Athens' confusion between "one's own" (*oikeia*) and "someone else's" (*allotria*), a theme manifest in Aeschylus, and reflecting the rise of the Athenian fleet.

158. Meiggs 1975, 120–23, 159–61, 260, and 424–25, estimating some 8,000 Athenians settled abroad between 475 and 415 (p. 260). See also Rhodes 1992, 59–61, and Lewis 1992a, 127–29. Strauss 1986, 77, reckons that 5,000 to 10,000 Athenian cleruchs and colonists were sent out under Pericles during the Archidamian War, many of whom returned to Attica as the war went against Athens. On the definition of *klērouchos* and *klērouchia*, see Figueira 1991b, 40–78 and 236–49.

159. Thuc. 3.50.2. 5.116.4; Meiggs 1975, 261–62 and 384; Burford 1993, 194.

160. See A. Lesky, *Thalattoi: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Vienna 1947) 56, 171, 200; U. Sinn, "The Influence of Greek Sanctuaries on the Consolidation of Economic Power," in Hellström and Alroth 1996, 67–69; Griffith 1999 on *Ant.* 334–41. We know of no ancient Greek who sailed for pleasure.

161. D.S. 13.97–101 and 15.35.1; see Andrewes 1992, 492–94.

162. Thuc. 7.51–72; for Euripidean twists in *Helen* that undercut the romantic escapism assumed by critics, see Rehm 1994a, 121–27.

163. Nussbaum 1986, 58–60 and 73–74; Thalmann 1978, 32–38; Lebeck 1971, 106–8 and 163–65; E. Blaiklock, "The Nautical Imagery in Euripides' *Medea*," *CP* 50 (1955) 233–37; Goheen 1951, 44–50.

CHAPTER TWO
SPACE FOR RETURNS

1. Kurke 1991, 15–34. See also Crotty 1982, 108–9. Kurke may overemphasize the problem of return in Pindar. Departure, fraught with uncertainty, also features prominently in the epinician odes.

2. Concern for homecoming recurs throughout the poem; see, e.g., *Il.* 2.134–41, 13.231–34, 14.65–81, 16.81–86, 17.238–39. See Anderson 1997, 75–91, on the link between destruction (*persis*) and *nostos*.

3. Rehm 1994a, 12, 18, and 155 n.8, discusses Greek marriage as a homecoming; Malkin 1987, 6 and 90, argues that "colonization signified some sort of return." For the *nostos* following Greek initiation rituals, see Seaford 1994, 259–61; B. Heiden, "Emotion, Acting, and the Athenian *ethos*," in Sommerstein et al. 1993, 156–61 (linking tragic humiliation to that experienced in initiation); Burkert 1985, 260–64 and 276–93; Osborne 1985, 157–79; and P. Vidal-Naquet, "The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian Ephebia," *PCPhS* 194 (1968) 49–64. For the return of Dionysus' cult statue to its "home" during the City Dionysia, see Seaford 1994, 240–51, Rehm 1994b, 15, and Connor 1989.

4. "Classic" American realism treats incessantly of homecoming and its impossibility—Biff in Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, Edmund in O'Neill's *Long Day's Journey into Night*, Vince in Shepard's *Buried Child*, and the Younger family in Hansberry's *Raisin in the Sun*; see (e.g.) Chaudhuri 1995, 91–135. Although we continue to employ the concept, the mobility to which many of us have access threatens to make homecoming in the contemporary world more a psychological metaphor than a reality of physical place. On the enforced mobility of exiles and refugees, see Bernand

THE PLAY OF SPACE

SPATIAL TRANSFORMATION IN GREEK TRAGEDY

Rush Rehm

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON AND OXFORD

PUBLISHED BY PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 41 WILLIAM STREET,
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540
IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 3 MARKET PLACE, WOODSTOCK,
OXFORDSHIRE OX20 1SY

ISBN 0-691-05809-1 (ALK. PAPER)

BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA IS AVAILABLE

THIS BOOK HAS BEEN COMPOSED IN BERKELEY BOOK

PRINTED ON ACID-FREE PAPER. ∞

WWW.PUPPRINCETON.EDU

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2