

Tragedy and City

Deborah Boedeker and Kurt Raaflaub

Tragedy and Civic Education

In the year 405, shortly before the disastrous end of the Peloponnesian War and soon after the deaths of both Sophocles and Euripides, Aristophanes produced his brilliant comedy *Frogs*. Disgusted with the poor quality of the surviving poets, the god Dionysus descends into the underworld to bring Euripides back. He arrives just in time to judge a contest between Aeschylus and Euripides for the chair of tragic poet (757ff.). The two dead poets, having outrageously criticized one another's diction and plots, soon focus on the tragedian's central function. To Aeschylus' question, "For what should a poet be admired?," Euripides responds, "For skill and good advice, and because we make men better in their cities" (1008–10). In the ensuing debate, Euripides is accused of making tragedy democratic: he has given everyone a voice, and has portrayed even the vices and weaknesses of ordinary characters. We will return to this charge, which we think points to one of tragedy's vital political functions. In the comic Aeschylus' view, however, this democratization is reprehensible; the poet's duty is not to describe normal life, let alone its scandalous aspects, but to portray noble ideals and behavior, to instill virtue into the body politic. Unlike Euripides, Aeschylus claims, he has presented models of patriotic and martial conduct in plays like *Seven against Thebes* and *Persians*; his drama was intended to bring out the audience's bravery.

In highlighting the playwright's obligation not just to entertain but also to improve and inspire, Aristophanes caricatures both Euripides and Aeschylus beyond recognition. Yet we should not doubt that his Athenian audience accepted the tragic poet's didactic function – indeed, in *Frogs* even the comic playwright prays to "speak much in fun [*geloia*] and much in earnest [*spoudaia*]" (389–90). Not surprisingly then, as the debate concludes, the emphasis switches even more directly to communal concerns. Dionysus explains: "I came down here for a poet . . . so that the city may survive and keep presenting its choral festivals. So whichever of you is going to give

the city some good advice, that's the one I think I will bring back" (1418–21). In the end, more fully understanding his initial purpose of saving the *theater*, Dionysus decides to bring Aeschylus back to the upper world to bring blessings to his fellow-citizens and save the *city* (1487). Hades bids farewell to the poet: "Save our city with your good counsels, and teach the fools – of which there are many!" (1500–3).

Behind its witty excesses, Aristophanes' comic contest reflects the venerable Greek tradition that the poet is a teacher of the people. Aristophanes' Aeschylus cites the famous poets of old, Orpheus, Musaeus, Hesiod, and Homer, as models of the poet-educator (1030–6). Of these, Homer and Hesiod were credited with creating the Greeks' religious framework (Herodotus 2.53), and already in the sixth century they were criticized for the way they did this (Xenophanes fr. 11 Diels-Kranz). More generally, recent scholarship has recognized the Homeric poet's role as political thinker and educator (Raaflaub 2000: 23–34; Hammer 2002). Beyond these epic "teachers," the fragments of archaic lyric and elegiac poetry include many passages that reflect the polity's ethos and transmit its ideology. The martial elegies of Spartan Tyrtaeus and Callinus of Ephesus, for example, clearly enunciate civic and military ideals; even such works as Alcman's *parthenia*, "maiden songs," induct the young female chorus members into the lore and values of Spartan society. Alcaeus' political and social advice to his comrades in Mytilene is part of a long tradition of advice poetry, with parallels in Hesiod, Archilochus, Theognis, and from Athens itself, in Solon. Later in the sixth century, Xenophanes of Colophon addresses his audience on matters of public interest.

Athens' tragedians were not excluded from the assumption that poets are teachers. As we saw, Aristophanes' parody of advice given by Aeschylus and Euripides indicates that this didactic role would seem "normal" to the comedian's audience (which was also the audience of tragedy).

The orator Demosthenes (19.246–8), attacking a political opponent who was also a tragic actor, makes much of the "fine and useful" speech that "the wise Sophocles" wrote for Creon in his *Antigone* (ll. 175–90), declaring that love for one's country far outweighs other sentiments and bonds. A Hellenistic summary of *Antigone* even states that Sophocles was elected a general in the war against Samos because the Athenians were so impressed by this play.

Aristotle, too, seems to have accepted the role of poet-teacher, believing that tragedy could improve citizens by persuading them to live seriously, virtuously, and thoughtfully (see Salkever 1986), but in this view he differed conspicuously from his teacher Plato. In *Republic*, Plato's Socrates objects to tragedy on two grounds, both of them derived from its being a mimetic genre, in which actors imitate behavior of various kinds. (This criticism applies even to Homeric epic, whose speeches are mimetic, but Plato is concerned most of all with tragic drama.) First, Socrates argues that it would be deleterious for the Guardians of his ideal city to be influenced by tragedy's imitations of inferior kinds of people, or even of superior men behaving in accord with emotions rather than reason and law (394c). Second, the Guardians should be educated only with the truth, not an imitation, but dramatic mimesis is

far removed from reality, being the mere imitation (in performance) of a fiction (602b–d). In *Republic* 3, Socrates argues that tragedy should be restricted to imitations of good and noble actions (401b–c); by Book 10 (607a), he is in favor of banning it altogether. In *Gorgias* (502b–c), Plato's Socrates makes a further charge. Tragic poets, he argues, cannot really educate their large and heterogeneous audience; to compete successfully, like flute-players or orators, they must flatter their hearers rather than teach them. For Plato, then, tragedy is a powerful, influential medium, but rather than being truly educative, it is harmful and meretricious.

The question of the tragedian's role within the city lies at the center of a current, as well as an ancient, controversy. Political interpretations of tragedy have proliferated in recent years (e.g., Meier 1993; Seaford 1994). That the community or specifically the democracy forms the crucial, even indispensable, background for understanding tragedy has almost become an orthodoxy (e.g., Winkler and Zeitlin 1990; Sommerstein et al. 1993; Pelling 1997; see Saïd 1998 for an excellent summary and discussion). Such views, sometimes exaggerated or presented without sufficient support from ancient evidence, have prompted protest and refutation, challenging scholars to step back, reconsider, and seek a more balanced and comprehensive assessment (e.g., Griffin 1998, 1999; Kurke 1998; Rhodes 2003). It is not our purpose to take sides in this debate. Rather, we wish here to illuminate three issues: the civic context of tragic performances in fifth-century Athens; the politics of tragedy in selected plays whose content is clearly political; and the complexity of content, meaning, and function against which such political interpretations need to be assessed. We shall return briefly to the current controversy at the end of this chapter. Despite the primacy given to it in *Frogs* and *Republic*, we are far from claiming that the role of educator of the polis was a tragedian's only or even most important function – though we do think it was important. As will become clear, however, we would not limit the poet's educative role to advocating specific policies or behaviors.

Tragedy in a Civic Context

We discussed briefly the long-standing tradition that saw the poet (whether epic, lyric, or tragic) as an educator or teacher. Yet certainly in fifth-century Athens there was no lack of those who, officially or unofficially, for pay or without, were happy to offer their advice and wisdom: philosophers, sophists, other intellectuals such as historians or physicians (Thomas 2000), and of course the politicians. Moreover, Athens was politicized to an extraordinary degree; every year thousands of citizens participated in multiple assembly meetings or sat on large judicial panels, hundreds were allotted to offices small and large. Of those over forty, probably two-thirds of the citizens, had even been members of the central administrative Council of Five Hundred for at least one year (Hansen 1999: 249). In all these capacities, Athenian men constantly received advice from fellow-citizens and various "experts" (Plato

Gorgias 455b–d; *Protagoras* 319b–d). Why, then, would they consider, or even need, a tragic poet as political advisor?

We can approach an answer by exploring more broadly the political nature of Athenian theater. Unlike most modern Western theatrical performances, ancient Athenian dramas were public events in public space at the heart of civic festivals, imbued with overtly political overtones. Let us survey this aspect of tragedy in more detail (see also chapter 12 in this volume; Pickard-Cambridge 1968; Csapo and Slater 1995).

Dramatic performances were initially limited to the Great (or City) Dionysia, the main festival of Dionysus (on which we will focus here), and later spread to lesser festivals of the same god (Lenaea, perhaps also Anthesteria). In addition, several of the rural districts (demes) of Attica featured dramas at their own Dionysiac festivals. Performances at the Great Dionysia originally took place in a temporary wooden structure erected each year at the orchestra in the Agora, the most important public square in the city (Travlos 1971: 1–3). By the mid-fifth century at the latest, performances were moved to a permanent outdoor site connected with the sanctuary of Dionysus on the south slope of the Acropolis. By the fourth century, this theater accommodated 15,000–20,000 spectators, a substantial percentage of the city's population – indeed, far more than the political assembly place on the Pnyx, which held about 6,000. Even before the Peloponnesian War, when the population of Athens was much greater (and, since the theater fund had not yet been established, tickets were still expensive, costing two obols or half a day's wage: Sommerstein 1997: 66–7), the theater would have held five to seven percent of the whole population of Attica. The audience consisted mostly of male citizens but included also resident aliens (metics), foreign visitors, and probably some women and slaves (Csapo and Slater 1995: 286–7; Goldhill 1995; Sommerstein 1997). Both in quantity and distribution, it was thus in some ways representative of the entire polis. The chorus members were amateur citizens; although usually they played the role not of Athenian citizens but of foreigners, women, slaves, or even divine beings, they nevertheless often functioned as an internal audience for the actions on stage, voicing reactions and sentiments that would be shared by many in the external audience. Polis, theater community, and stage were deeply interconnected.

The Great Dionysia included four or five days of dramatic performances every spring. Three tragic poets produced “tetralogies,” consisting of three tragedies (sometimes thematically connected) followed by a satyr play, which was a kind of burlesque on a mythical subject; five comic poets produced one comedy each. The performances were financed by a special tax levied on the wealthiest citizens, one of several such obligations (“liturgies”). The sponsor (*chorêgos*) paid for the equipment, costumes, and maintenance of chorus, actors, and director (often the poet himself) during rehearsals and performance. One of the highest officials (archons) selected the *chorêgos* who then assembled the chorus, hired or was assigned the actors, and was assigned a poet (probably by lot). No explicit evidence survives about how the poets who were going to perform their plays were selected. Statements made in passing, especially in

comedies, suggest that the poets applied, presumably with the text or a sketch of the play, and the archon in charge made the decision, perhaps together with his two assistants (*paredroi*). Two aspects are extraordinary here. One is the procedure itself: decision by a single office holder, in a democracy that otherwise operated through committees. The other is that this issue apparently was uncontroversial and taken for granted in antiquity. It is perhaps best explained by the fact that it was embedded in tradition and cult – two reasons that helped defy adaptation to democratic practices in other religious respects as well (Csapo and Slater 1995: 139–57; Schuller and Dreher 2000: 523–6, 533–4).

A few days before the festival, the poets introduced their plays at an event in the Odeon next to the theater. In a solemn procession, recalling the introduction of Dionysus from the Boiotian village Eleutherai to Athens in the sixth century, the wooden image of Dionysus was carried out to the grove of the hero Academus (later the site of Plato's Academy) on the way to Eleutherai, and later brought back to his sanctuary in a torchlight parade before the festival began. At the end of the performances, a board of judges, selected by a complicated procedure designed to avoid partisanship and bribery, determined the ranking among poets, actors, and *chorégoi*, who all received prizes (Csapo and Slater 1995: 158–65; Schuller and Dreher 2000: 526–36). An assembly held in the theater reviewed the entire event. In addition to all these official public procedures, the first day of the festival opened with a series of explicitly civic and political ceremonies in the theater. The ten elected generals (not the priests) poured libations for the gods. The war orphans, who had been raised by the city and reached adulthood, were introduced with their own and their fathers' names, equipped with a panoply, and discharged to their families. Meritorious citizens were honored with a crown and public acclamation. And the tribute of the empire was displayed in the orchestra (Goldhill 1990). All these ceremonies reminded the audience not least of their city's imperial might, and all were set in an overtly civic, political, and imperial context (*ibid.*, 39–40; Smarczyk 1990: 155–67).

We might explore a little further the possible range of political components at the Dionysia. How exactly the dramatic performances were distributed over four or five days is much debated: one opinion places all five comedies on the first day, followed by a tragic tetralogy on each of the next three, another has the comedies spread over five days, joined on the first two by dithyrambic contests, on the last three by tragedies (Csapo and Slater 1995: 107). Whatever the exact program, it seems that comedies preceded tragedies. Now, as Aristophanes' extant plays and numerous fragments of his competitors attest impressively, comedies in the fifth century tended to be intensely and directly political. The comic poets routinely poked fun at their fellow citizens both collectively and individually, criticizing and satirizing the demos, the jurors, politicians, generals, poets, sophists, and other eminent personalities. With very few exceptions, freedom of speech was virtually unlimited, and, as the case of Aristophanes' feud with Cleon shows, a sore victim's angry and inappropriate reaction could easily backfire (Henderson 1998).

Comic characters sometimes addressed the audience directly, and the poet, speaking through the chorus in the *parabasis*, might even do so in his own persona, explaining, defending, or advertising himself, or offering his advice to the community. Even if the political immediacy of the *parabasis* in *Frogs* (686ff.) is an exception, justified by the emergency of the final phase of the Peloponnesian War, the comic poet apparently saw it as one of his primary functions to comment on the civic life of the community and the tensions caused by it. Through the experiences and figures it satirized, comedy placed the community itself on stage. Whether ridiculing it relentlessly (as in *Knights* or *Wasps*) or drawing on deeper registers beneath hilarious fantasy (as in *Birds* or *Lysistrata*), comic satire often targeted problems and behaviors that were directly connected with the community's way of life and politics and, since Athens at the time was a democracy, especially with democratic ways of doing things.

Most of this decidedly does not apply to tragedy, but it prompts the question whether the audience, "primed" by the politics of comedy, did not attend tragic performances with certain expectations that carried over from previous days and plays. Other considerations also suggest that the audience would be prepared to find contemporary, communal relevance in tragedies. As mentioned earlier, with rare exceptions tragedy's subject matter was taken from myth, and mythical poetry had always had the potential of dramatizing communal concerns. Moreover, a particular group of these mythical themes – focusing on Athenians' selfless dedication to helping the oppressed and saving their fellow Hellenes from barbarian onslaught or tyrannical injustice (such as their protection of the children of Heracles, or intervention to secure the burial of the seven heroes who had fallen in attacking Thebes) – formed an essential component of Athens' self-presentation and imperial ideology, as pronounced annually in the Funeral Oration (Lysias 2.1–16). Such myths were occasionally put on stage, especially in the "suppliant plays" (e.g., Euripides' *Heracleidae* and *Suppliants*). Further, these same themes, as Herodotus (9.27) and Thucydides (1.73; 5.89; 6.83) emphasize, also served as serious arguments in foreign policy debates and diplomatic exchanges. Finally, at least one of these myths, the defeat of the Amazons, along with other deeds of Athens' "national hero" Theseus (Castricola 1992), was prominently represented in public art, such as the "Painted Stoa" in the Agora, friezes and metopes of sanctuaries (e.g. the Parthenon, temple of Hephaestus, and Nike temple), and in independent sculptures (the base of the statue of Athena Parthenos). Such representations contributed to forming an ideological panorama that decisively shaped the self-perception and identity of the Athenians (Hölscher 1998) and conditioned them to consider emulation of their ancestors' great deeds as a primary civic virtue (Raaflaub 2001). Myth thus was a common object of civic and political interpretation and instruction. It is reasonable to assume that it could play that same role in tragic adaptations of mythical stories and that the theater audience, used to multiple aspects of this function, was prepared to recognize it on the tragic stage as well.

It is time, then, to examine in some detail the civic or political content of a few tragedies.

The Politics of Aeschylus' *Suppliants* and *Eumenides*

Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, usually dated to 463, was performed in a time of great political turmoil. After repelling Persian invasions in 490 and 480–79, the Athenians had continued the war against Persia, set their military organization, based on naval power, on a permanent foundation, organized their own alliance (the "Delian League"), and transformed it into a naval empire. The fleet maintaining this empire was rowed largely by lower-class citizens. In contrast to earlier periods, when they had counted for little, these citizens now assumed a military role that was crucial to their city's safety and power, and that raised the possibility (and probably their demand) that they were entitled to a more significant political role as well. In 462 the Athenians enacted reforms that shifted important political powers from the traditional Areopagus Council to the Council of 500, the assembly, and the law courts, that is, to bodies that represented the demos as a whole. Subsequent reforms further facilitated popular participation in politics, and simultaneously made citizenship more exclusive.

The reforms of 462, fully establishing democracy, coincided with a drastic realignment of foreign policy (from collaboration to open rivalry with Sparta) and with the ousting of the long-popular leader Cimon. They were apparently experienced as the victory of one part of the citizen body over the other, bitterly contested and resented by the defeated, and resulted in acute civil strife. This outcome was, of course, not yet known at the time of the performance of *Suppliants*. Still, we may safely assume that an emotional debate about the planned changes was raging for sometime before 462.

In this situation Aeschylus chose to dramatize a myth that played not in Athens but in Argos (a polis traditionally hostile to Sparta, with which the Athenians at the time were seeking closer relations). The chorus consists of the Danaids, daughters of Danaus, descendants of the Argive princess Io who, for reasons familiar to the audience, had ended up in Egypt. Escaping from an unwelcome marriage, pursued by their bridegrooms (with an army), the Danaids seek refuge in their ancestress's home town. After much worry and debate, the Argive leader brings the issue to the assembly, which decides to offer the women shelter and to defy the Egyptians' demand for their extradition. The Argives defeat the Egyptians in battle and integrate the Danaids into their polis. The play's theme thus focused on the protection of suppliants and as such connected it, despite geographical displacement, with a major component of Athenian ideology (mentioned above). Moreover, in their new polis the Danaids became metics (resident aliens). Unusual emphasis is placed in this play on this civic status – an issue of great significance in Athens around that time (Bakewell 1997). All this is likely to have signaled to members of the audience that other issues in the play, too, could be seen as relevant to their community.

The Danaids, with their Egyptian background, hold views about political power and decision-making that contrast starkly with those of the Argives, a typical Greek

polis. The former expect the King to decide autocratically, as any eastern monarch would, but the Argive king himself is unwilling to decide in such an important matter without consulting his people (365–75). His dilemma is simple but extreme (as is typical of tragedy). He is confronted by the clash of two almost irreconcilable claims: the demand of the suppliants for protection (backed by Zeus, the divine protector of suppliants, who threatens violators with divine wrath and punishment) and the responsible leader's concern for the safety of his community (which forces him, if at all possible, to avoid war with its inevitable risks and losses). This conflict increases in intensity (341–489) and climaxes in the Danaids' suicide threat (which would add religious pollution to the city's plight). To the Argive leader, the resolution of this dilemma is a matter of communal urgency: if the entire community will be affected by a decision, all citizens have to participate in it.

Hence the leader cannot but let the community decide. The poet stresses often that *all* citizens (the *entire* polis) need to be involved (366–67, 398–9, 483–5, 517–18, 942–3), and he draws attention to the importance of persuasion (523, 623–4). This strand of development in the play culminates in the description of the crucial assembly and its unanimous decision in favor of the suppliants (605–24, 942–9). Accordingly, the choral ode thanking Argos (625ff.) combines traditional physical blessings with explicitly political aspects (the avoidance of civil war, and close collaboration and balance between council and people).

All this helps us recognize the gist of the poet's political concern. In a time of rapid and fundamental social and economic change (Boedeker and Raaflaub 1998: Ch.2), when distinctions between citizens and non-citizens became blurred in many spheres, it seemed all the more important to emphasize the citizens' share in political power, government, and responsibility. This need was even more urgent when the polis was faced with extraordinary outside challenges – as Athens was in the decades following the Persian Wars. When the wellbeing of the entire community was at stake, all the citizens who would have to bear the consequences of political decisions needed to participate in those decisions. It is difficult not to think that this argument was intended to help the theater audience understand one of the most effective justifications of the planned democratic reform. The poet, however, did not formulate a direct political recommendation. Rather, by dramatizing in a mythical story some crucial aspects of the current debate, he drew the citizens' attention to these aspects, raised their critical awareness, and made them conscious of their civic responsibility. By interpreting myth from the perspective of his own time, he made it immediately relevant to his community – especially when the mythical king acted like a model democratic leader, the assembly operated like an exemplary democratic assembly, and the protagonists came to grips with dilemmas that were all too familiar to the audience.

We should not conclude too quickly, though, that Aeschylus the poet here played the role of a thinly disguised pro-democratic activist. Five years later, when the reforms' impact on the community and the negative reaction of the losers had become fully visible, he highlighted the other side of the coin. In the last play of the *Oresteia*,

Orestes, killer of his mother and her lover, avenger of his father's murder, tyrannicide and liberator of Argos, and restorer of legitimate rule, is being hounded by the Furies, avenging spirits of murdered relatives. He has acted upon the orders of Apollo, and Apollo cleanses him of his bloodguilt. A new court, founded by Athena herself on the Areopagus hill in Athens, acquits him. But this does not eliminate all threats: old family claims and the traditional demand for revenge (represented by the Furies) have not been satisfied. This problem is resolved by appeasing the Furies, integrating them into the community, and turning them from hostile outcasts to "well-meaning" powers (*Eumenides*). Conflicts that emerged on three levels in the preceding plays of the trilogy (*Agamemnon* and *The Libation Bearers*) are resolved in this final play. On the level of the family, the action moves from killing and counter-killing (vendetta in an unintegrated community) to court action in the integrated polis; on the divine level, the Furies with their ancient rights yield to the new justice of Zeus which is represented by Apollo and Athena; and on the political level, violent coup and counter-coup, threatening to tear the community apart, are replaced by broad-based communal action, compromise, and vote.

Ingeniously, the poet merges all these strands into one major conflict and its resolution. The Furies are represented as primeval deities (as also in Hesiod's divine genealogy: *Theogony* 185), ordained by fate with a specific function (*timê*) that they have fulfilled from time immemorial and which is thus not subject to any time's judgment. By contrast, Apollo, Athena, and the other gods descended from and ruled by Zeus are young gods. The Furies describe them as violent usurpers, tyrants, who destroy old rights and claims and have no understanding and respect for the old gods. Apollo indeed seeks victory in confrontation, but Athena, sponsor of the new court and protectress of Athens, uses a more diplomatic, conciliatory approach. In this confrontation, an old system of justice, based on fixed claims (oaths), in which every case is the same and neither logic nor mitigating circumstances count, clashes with a new system of justice which is differentiated, takes arguments into account, and is based on persuasion and vote.

Athena justifies her decision to install a new court by pointing out that both claims are powerful, constituting a "crisis either way" (similar to the leader's dilemma in *Suppliants*), a confrontation that cannot be resolved by any one person, even one god (particularly since she is one of the new gods). As in *Suppliants*, therefore, the decision must be made by the community, here represented by the judges. Again ingeniously, the poet lets their votes to acquit or condemn Orestes turn out even. This suffices to release Orestes (with Athena's vote clinching the decision), but an even vote knows no loser, and this opens the way for a compromise solution on other levels.

For it is not enough to reach and announce a verdict in court. If the losing side does not accept this verdict, the conflict will continue. The play thus demonstrates how such a crisis can be resolved – here concerning a murder case, but the implications reach much farther. For the Furies initially are not willing to accept anything but victory; they consider defeat a sign of tyranny and anarchy, an irreparable loss of honor and elimination of their age-old rights, and in revenge they threaten the community

stern monarch
an important
le but extreme
t irreconcilable
us, the divine
d punishment)
r (which forces
) . This conflict
e threat (which
eader, the reso-
ommunity will

resses often that
83–5, 517–18,
, 623–4). This
of the crucial
5–24, 942–9).
ditional physical
war, and close

1 a time of rapid
ib 1998: Ch.2),
n many spheres,
political power,
en the polis was
ecades following
at stake, all the
isions needed to
s argument was
fective justifica-
ormulate a direct
ory some crucial
se aspects, raised
esponsibility. By
e it immediately
ted like a model
tic assembly, and
familiar to the

poet here played
later, when the
osers had become
ay of the *Oresteia*,

with destruction. Athena skillfully overcomes this danger by using rational argument against irrational anger, patient persuasion against desperate threats, and generosity toward the losing side against self-asserting stubbornness: the Furies are offered a position of great importance in the heart of Athena's city, they will become the guardians of domestic prosperity and peace, and they will receive special honors forever. This approach works: the Furies are eventually appeased and allow themselves to be integrated into the community and to contribute their efforts for the good of the community. (For a darker reading of this resolution, focusing on what the Furies have lost and how, see chapter 9 in this volume.)

This play also contains unmistakable references to contemporary conditions or events, such as the alliance with Argos promised by Orestes (significant in Athens' recent turn against Sparta) or the appropriation of Troy in Asia Minor by Athena herself (alluding to the crucial importance of that area for Athenian imperial policies). Even more importantly, this drama plays out in Athens, and its focus on the Areopagus, the very institution that was deprived of its ancient powers by the new democracy just four years earlier, makes it clear that the tragedy's tensions and resolutions relate in very tangible ways to Athenian ones. Hence Athena's warning against tyranny, anarchy, and the pollution of law by inconsiderate innovation must be taken seriously. Other pointers are provided by the poet's urgent call for domestic peace, condemnation of civil strife, and appeal to engage in war, if at all, united against foreign enemies. Finally, we should pay attention to Aeschylus' emphasis on vote, persuasion, and conflict resolution by compromise and integration.

All this appears directly significant in the situation of 458, still full of tensions and potential civil strife. What happened in Argos and the house of Atreus did and might happen in Athens: violent coup and counter-coup, dividing the community and prompting more violence. The old powers (the Furies, in some ways analogous to Athens' traditional aristocratic government) have been ousted by new powers (the young gods, perhaps corresponding to the new democracy). Despite their defeat, they do not accept the verdict and threaten the community with further violence. In order to bring out these claims more sharply, the poet grants the defeated side a higher legitimacy, and compares the victorious side with tyranny. In this constellation, to hold power does not suffice to guarantee peace and durable government; victory by vote is not sufficient to overcome partisanship and hatred. What is needed is patient persuasion and compromise, integration (with high honors) of the old system into the new, and collaboration for the common good (Meier 1990: Ch.5; 1993: 102–37).

In sum, then, *Eumenides* complements *Suppliants*. Under the specific conditions prevailing in Athens, broad-based rule by the entire community makes sense. But democracy as partisan rule without respect for older claims and traditions will be self-destructive and cannot last: it needs to rule by persuasion and compromise, and it must find a way to integrate opposing elements. Seen in this light, *Eumenides* is a powerful example of political thought and an impressive testimony of the tragic poet's independent position and sociopolitical responsibility.

The Politics of *Antigone*

In the 450s and early 440s, large-scale military ventures forced the Athenians to close ranks and focus on foreign policy. War with the Persians ended by ca.450, with Sparta in 446. In the late 440s, the large island of Samos revolted from the Delian League and was subdued in a long and costly war, in which Sophocles himself served as a general. On the domestic scene, in the 440s Pericles proposed a grandiose program of construction on the Acropolis (where the sanctuaries, destroyed by the Persians in 480, had been left in ruins as memorials). This proposal and its funding (in part by the allies' tribute) became the focus of a long power struggle between two factions that ended in 443 with the ostracism of Thucydides (son of Melesias, not the historian) and initiated Pericles' 15-year domination of Athenian politics. (Thucydides 2.65.9 describes this as democracy in name but in reality rule by the first man.) Already in the 440s comedy mocked Pericles as "Olympian" and "tyrant." By the time of *Antigone's* performance (probably in the late 440s), the impact of democracy on Athenian society and politics had become fully visible. Presumably the civic ideology summarized in Pericles' Funeral Oration (Thucydides 2.36–46) was in place by that time as well: it emphasizes service to and sacrifice for the community and the primacy of the citizens' political over their social identity (Meier 1990: Ch.6); the citizen's relationship to the polis is compared to that of a lover (*erastês*) to his beloved, subordinating his own interests to the community's well-being.

The subject matter of *Antigone* is part of the Theban cycle of myths. Oedipus' children have grown up. His sons, Eteocles and Polynices, have agreed to take turns in ruling Thebes, but Eteocles has refused to relinquish power. Polynices and six other heroes have led an army against Thebes; the assault has failed, and the two brothers have killed each other in a duel. Creon, heir to the Theban throne, prohibits by decree the burial of Polynices, the traitor and enemy of his fatherland. Antigone, Polynices' sister, defies this order, sprinkles dust on the corpse, and is captured by guards. Since she refuses to yield to the king's decree and threats, Creon condemns her to be buried alive. Haemon, Creon's son and Antigone's fiancé, fails to change his father's mind. Confronted by the seer Tiresias, Creon first threatens even the god's prophet but then, urged by the chorus, understands that the gods themselves oppose his view and disapprove of his treatment of Polynices and Antigone, which, reversing divine order, keeps the dead above and entombs the living in the earth. He hurries to free Antigone and bury Polynices but comes too late: Antigone has hanged herself in her tomb, Haemon kills himself over her body, and the queen, hearing the disastrous news, ends her life as well, leaving Creon standing alone in despair over the ruins of his house.

In this play, Antigone and Creon can be identified with contrasting principles that clash violently because of the protagonists' intransigence. Antigone defends family interests and obligations, divine laws that demand the burial of the dead, the autonomy of the individual and the private sphere, and the women's world (*oikos*,

home, inside, and love), while Creon insists on obedience to the laws of the city and decrees of the ruler, on the primacy of the state and the public sphere over the private, of the common good over individual interests; he represents the men's world (community, outside, strictness and toughness).

Creon's leadership reveals crucial flaws. Although initially evoking principles (the primacy of the common good and of allegiance to the community) that seem right and are accepted by the chorus of Theban Elders, he demonstrates a level of strictness and harshness that does not bode well; nor does his paranoia about conspiracies and opposition based on corruption – a paranoia that will emerge ever more clearly. News about an attempt to bury Polynices' corpse prompts him to suspect bribery and treason. As he meets resistance, first on the part of Antigone, then of Haemon, he insists ever more rigidly on his principles (including absolute control over family members), fears to lose face, considers it unthinkable to yield to a woman or a younger man, and eventually proclaims his absolute right to make decisions by himself. Power and rule, he declares, are his property, he possesses the city. His understanding of leadership is thus unmasked as tyranny in the harshest sense – not just a self-proclaimed monarch, but an unjust and peremptory one as well. In the course of his confrontation with Tiresias, whom he groundlessly accuses of being bribed as well, he even refuses to yield to the gods and Zeus himself. Creon's personal catastrophe can thus be seen as divine punishment for tyrannical arrogance and *hubris*.

Various people interact with Creon in characteristically different ways. Antigone, fiercely independent (described in her last scene as autonomous, living according to her own laws), bases her defiance on principles; she is the first to accuse Creon openly of tyranny. Confrontational and uncompromising, she consciously risks meeting a violent end. Ismene, Antigone's sister, dares not to stand up against law and authority. The Elders in the chorus, initially deferential and supportive, grow increasingly more doubtful but avoid open resistance. Haemon is at first polite, loyal, and deferential to his father and ruler; when his attempts at persuasion fail, however, he opposes Creon vigorously. Discovering Antigone dead in her underground chamber, he turns violently against Creon and when this attack fails, Haemon kills himself instead, joining Antigone in death. The average citizens, we hear from Creon's opponents, are oppressed by fear but agree with Antigone and hate Creon; they form a silent opposition.

As often, the choral odes offer important insights. Zeus' power is the only stable element in the world; he hates and punishes human self-aggrandizement. Mythical examples illustrate the fate of such overbearing personalities. Wisdom is what we learn from such examples and experiences. The famous "Ode to Man" (332–83) is crucial: humans have mastered the earth and the animals, taught themselves all the skills, speech and quick thought and laws to rule cities, even the healing of illness; but death they have not mastered.

Humankind – clever, with ingenuity
in skill unimagined–

moves ahead, sometimes to ill,
 at other times to good ends. Who interweaves
 the laws of the land and the gods' sworn justice
 is elevated in his city [*bupsipolis*]-
 but he is cityless [*apolis*]
 who associates with baseness
 because of daring.

(365-1, trans. Robert Fagles, slightly modified)

All these highly political issues encourage us to find in this play also, among many other perspectives, a pointedly political emphasis. The conflict between Antigone and Creon has often been understood as a contest pitting superior divine, unwritten laws against inferior human laws decreed by polis or tyrant; in this view, Antigone, though dying, would be the moral winner. Many scholars, however, see the conflict as raging between two important prerogatives taken equally to extremes. In this view, both protagonists insist intransigently on their position and on confrontation, and suffer irreversible harm. The solution, conspicuously not achieved in this tragedy, must lie in a compromise. As suggested by the Ode to Man, peace, stability, and the city's prosperity can be achieved only by respecting, reconciling, weaving together the two sets of values. (In the Funeral Oration, Pericles too emphasizes this principle: Thucydides 2.37.3.) What may have prompted the poet's focus on this problem is democracy itself: democracy's process of decision-making allowed for only one winner and one solution; in extreme cases, the loser was ostracized, removed from the polis, and the winner took all, dominating the polis. Laws and decrees passed by the demos allowed no appeal. Against the backdrop of the conflict between Pericles and Thucydides, and of decisions about policies connected with this conflict, we understand why such issues would have troubled many citizens.

Another question is why Sophocles characterizes Creon as a tyrant. This makes it difficult to empathize with him but brings out starkly the conflict between the primacy of the polis and that of the family – a conflict heightened by the fact that Creon's main opponent is a woman and one of his own family. Especially in democracy, the question of the state's interference in areas that traditionally were the family's prerogative must have become a major issue and caused manifold tensions. (The conflict over Polynices' burial reminds us of the Athenian burial of the war dead in a public cemetery, a custom introduced soon after the Persian Wars, in which the state clearly arrogated a family function: Thucydides 2.34.) Creon's decree is called a pronouncement (*kêrugma*); he himself speaks of a law (*nomos*). In fifth-century democracy, decrees on specific issues and the enactment of new laws were not clearly distinguished; some of these "laws" must have appeared to many as arbitrary decisions, dictated by ininterest groups rather than serving the common good. Questions raised by this experience, then, were likely to concern relations between majority decisions, based on specific constellations, and traditional social norms, and the limits of public authority and legislation.

Furthermore, given the potentially enormous influence of a popular leader in a democracy, it was necessary to ask how such a leader could be prevented from becoming so self-possessed that no sane advice could reach him, so obsessed with power that he considered it his right and possession. This explains the emphasis the poet places on the importance of flexibility, listening, and learning – crucial steps for the success of the democratic process. Finally, Antigone is no revolutionary. She opposes not Creon's rule but one particular decree. She thinks as an independent individual and has the courage to differ. This attitude – made more conspicuous and problematic because attributed to a woman – is crucial in a democracy, but it can be destructive if confrontation and independence become an end in themselves. From this perspective, too, the variety of reactions to Creon's decree and behavior are surely intended to stimulate the audience's thinking.

Antigone is typical of Athenian tragedy in being a complex creation, weaving together multiple strands of characters, actions, ideas, and conflicts. Various versions of the political interpretation presented here have been proposed by many scholars, and other perspectives have been argued as well (see Saïd 1998). In general, we believe, this tragedy, like most, did not take sides in political conflicts, and it is therefore better to avoid one-on-one identifications. Polemics against individuals and specific policies were comedy's domain. Although many Athenians probably thought of Pericles when they watched Creon, this is not to say that Sophocles intended to identify the two. Nor does it seem likely that the play was meant to confirm the Athenians in their devotion to democracy by assuring them that the conflict dramatized here could happen only in a tyranny, not at home. On the contrary, the play questions, probes, exposes weaknesses and potential dangers; it places on stage important tensions that accompanied, though they were not limited to, the rise of democracy. After all, not only a powerful individual, but the demos, too, was capable of tyrannically abusing the power of decrees, causing clashes between public and private, state and family, that resulted in conflict and alienation and that needed to be overcome by mutual respect and understanding.

Tragedy and the Polis

Admittedly and intentionally, the plays we selected here for closer analysis are among the most explicitly political in the preserved corpus. But political or civic issues play crucial roles in many other tragedies as well. Aeschylus' *Persians*, to which we return below, and *Seven against Thebes* (467) are obvious examples. Political interpretations of Sophocles' *Ajax*, *Oedipus the King*, *Philoctetes*, and *Oedipus at Colonus* are common, if more controversial. They impose themselves for Euripides' Trojan War plays (*Hecuba*, *Trojan Women*, *Andromache*, *Helen*) and *Phoenician Women*, all performed during the Peloponnesian War (Gregory 1991; Croally 1994). Political themes are also prominent, though less predominant, in *Medea*, *Ion*, *Orestes*, and other plays.

Scholars have often tried to identify some of the tragic heroes with specific Athenian politicians: Sophocles' Creon or Oedipus with Pericles, Polynices in *Phoenician Women* with Alcibiades. While it is likely that such correlations may have occurred to audience members, especially since comedy frequently and overtly engaged in them (Philocleon and Bdelycleon, "Lovecleon" and "Hatecleon" in Aristophanes' *Wasps* could not possibly be misunderstood), we do not think that sustained direct correspondence with current events or prominent individuals is typical of tragedy. With rare exceptions, tragedians formed their plots from traditional, broadly familiar mythical tales rather than using historical themes or inventing their own stories. Of course the poets did not hesitate to adapt the plots freely and sometimes radically to serve their purposes – and some of those purposes relate to political discourse. Euripides' Jocasta in *Phoenician Women*, for example, survives the revelation of her incestuous marriage with Oedipus so that she can mediate between her sons in a great debate about power and equity; in *Suppliants*, the same poet has Adrastus describe the "Seven against Thebes," traditionally exemplars of hubris, as ideals of civic virtue. Moreover, tragedians freely interpreted persons, institutions, and events "anachronistically" from a contemporaneous perspective – thus, for example, transforming mythical kings such as Theseus into democratic leaders. Yet the stories and their protagonists remained set apart in the heroic age, the realm of myth.

Like the geographic separation afforded by using myths set in alien places such as Thebes (see Zeitlin 1990), Argos, or Troy, mythic distancing offered the poets great advantages. They could present tragic events as taking place far from the here-and-now, while retaining the freedom to dramatize problems and concerns that were in some ways relevant. The distancing could even allow some viewers to discern important issues (including but not limited to political matters) that were obscured by prevailing ideologies, or that tended to be overlooked in the heat of current controversies.

Keeping in mind this temporal and geographical distance, as well as our conviction that tragedy avoided sustained correspondence with specific political figures and situations, we return to our suggestion that the Athenian audience may have been conditioned to look for contemporary relevance in tragic performances. For their part, the poets occasionally provide clues that they intended a dramatic situation to be politically relevant, by using buzzwords, phrases, or concepts that would bring to mind contemporaneous events or concerns. In this effort they would have been aided by the fact (commented upon by Aristophanes' Praxagora in *Ecclesiazusae* 241–4 and by Thucydides' Cleon in the Mytilenian Debate, 2.38) that their (ideal) audience regularly attended both theater performances and political debates, and thus was skilled in the nuances of political discourse. Obvious examples of a tragic reference intended to be relevant would be the promise of a treaty with Argos, or the foundation of the Areopagus Court, both in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (discussed above).

Such clues encouraged the public to make the intended connections, but even so, we maintain, the plays generally were not created to support or oppose a specific person, policy, or decision. Whatever he may have thought personally about such

pular leader in a prevented from so obsessed with the emphasis the – crucial steps for evolutionary. She s an independent e conspicuous and acy, but it can be themselves. From behavior are surely

creation, weaving . Various versions by many scholars,). In general, we onflicts, and it is st individuals and probably thought roles intended to nt to confirm the he conflict drama- contrary, the play t places on stage ted to, the rise of s, too, was capable tween public and d that needed to be

closer analysis are t political or civic hylus' *Persians*, to examples. Political es, and *Oedipus at elves for Euripides' hoenician Women*, all ly 1994). Political n. *Orestes*, and other

issues, in our judgment Aeschylus' purpose in *Eumenides* was not primarily to recommend the treaty with Argos or the restoration of the Areopagus Council's powers. Rather, tragedies illuminated broader attitudes and problems, including critical aspects of Athenian polity. It might be useful to illustrate this assertion with a further example. Aeschylus' *Persians*, performed in 472, only eight years after the event, is a highly political play. Focusing on the magnificent description of the Battle of Salamis, we can read it as patriotic, celebrating the Greek triumph over the Persians. The setting in Susa and the Persian protagonists (including Xerxes himself) clearly provide a Persian perspective, and we can understand the drama's emphasis on divine punishment for human *hubris* and aggrandizement. Yet we should not overlook two striking innovations. Darius who, according to history, almost perished in an ill-conceived and badly executed campaign to conquer the Scythians (Herodotus 4.1–144) is idealized as a king who never jeopardized the safety of his people by aiming at large-scale foreign conquests. Darius' moderation contrasts pointedly with his son Xerxes' *hubris* in having ignored and willfully disrespected a divinely ordained separation between the Asian lands (the Persians' domain) and Europe and the sea (the Greeks' prerogative). In bridging the Hellespont and aiming at conquering Europe, Xerxes trespassed into forbidden realms. Many spectators may have been perfectly happy to revel in patriotic pride and the arrogant king's demise. More critical viewers, however, might have thought of their city's ongoing efforts to establish its control over vast areas along the Anatolian coast that had been "the king's land," and wondered about how the gods might react to trespasses in the other direction.

At the beginning of this chapter, we mentioned the current controversy about the predominant scholarly tendency to consider political meanings pervasive throughout the corpus of extant tragedies. Without denying the political nature of a small number of plays, critics have rightly pointed out that such interpretations often seem arbitrary, fanciful, and ill-founded. Different political interpretations of the same play frequently contradict each other. The role of the community and especially of democracy in shaping tragic concerns has been exaggerated; standard civic, ethical, and religious concerns, shared among democratic and oligarchic poleis, are much more prevalent. Focus on political aspects may ignore or obscure other aspects that are much more widely shared among the extant plays, that indeed were noticed by ancient observers, and that have secured the continuing attractiveness of many plays. "Tragedy is, rather, to be seen as providing a uniquely vivid and piercingly pleasurable enactment of human suffering, magnified in scale and dignity by the fact that the agents were the famous people of myth, and winged with every refinement of poetry and music" (Griffin 1998: 60).

Much of this criticism seems justified. The pendulum has swung too far in one direction. Yet, as so often, the truth may lie in the middle. At the high point of tragedy, nine plays were produced every year for the Dionysia alone (more than a thousand plays overall in the fifth century), each intended to be performed only once for the sponsoring community (before it might be taken "on the road" and later

reperformed in other poleis and at kings' courts). For most of that time, Athens, after all, was a democracy – and ruler over an empire. It is easy to underestimate the profound impact, on this community as a whole and on the intellectuals of the time, of the two major transformative experiences of the time: democracy and imperialism. Tragedy shares with other genres of literature (not least historiography) an abiding interest in and concern about these phenomena. The greatest challenge we face is how to develop reliable and verifiable interpretive methodologies that help us avoid guesswork, unfounded assumptions, even mere fantasy, and enable us to base our interpretations on sound foundations. Future discussions should focus more explicitly on this problem. One approach seems most promising: to pay close attention to the clues the poets themselves provide, not least in word choice and terminology; this requires close reading and attention to details (see, e.g., Knox 1979: chs. 9, 11, 21).

All this raises a further (and final) question. Even by a cautious assessment, we hope to have shown, many tragedies were markedly political. Often, it seems, the poets did not hesitate to raise unsettling questions about various aspects of their community's policies and official ideologies. If so, did they have any impact on the citizens' attitudes and decisions? Did what these citizens experienced in the theater influence their vote in the Pnyx? In one area, that of Athens' attitudes toward war, the answer seems to be negative, and reasons can be adduced to explain this (Raaflaub 2001). Yet the evidence available to us is far too limited and unspecific to permit a more general assessment.

One conclusion can be drawn with confidence, however, about tragedy's relation to the polis that produced it. In Aristophanes' *Frogs*, as we have seen, Aeschylus criticizes Euripides for allowing *everyone* to talk in his plays – men of all classes, women, slaves, foreigners. Plato's Socrates warned that tragedy's imitation of all kinds of human behavior would provide the Guardians of his ideal state with too many models, not all of them meritorious. In just that noisy dialogism, in its disagreements, verbal contests, dismayed reactions, doubts, and second thoughts, Athenian tragedy largely reflects the discursive civic context in which it flourished. The dramas provided provocative models both negative and positive for ways that opposing positions could share the public stage and lead to unexpected but, in retrospect, not unintelligible results. In this sense at least, the tragic poet served as a teacher of his audience: not so much by providing specific advice, but by illuminating aspects of the process in a political culture where dialogue really did have immediate and immense consequences.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Bakewell, Geoffrey W. (1997). "Metoiikia in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus." *Classical Antiquity* 16: 209–28.
- Boedeker, Deborah and Raaflaub, Kurt A. (eds.) (1998). *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Castriota, David. (1992). *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Croally, N. T. (1994). *Euripidean Polemic: The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Csapo, Eric, and Slater, William J. (1995). *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goldhill, Simon. (1990). "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, ed. John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 97–129.
- Goldhill, Simon. (1995). "Representing Democracy: Women and the Great Dionysia." In *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Essays Presented to David Lewis*, ed. Robin Osborne and Simon Hornblower. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 347–69.
- Gregory, Justina. (1991). *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Griffin, Jasper. (1998). "The Social Function of Attic Tragedy." *Classical Quarterly* 48: 39–61.
- Griffin, Jasper. (1999). "Sophocles and the Democratic City." In *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, ed. Jasper Griffin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 73–94.
- Hammer, Dean. (2002). *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hansen, Mogens H. (1999). *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structures, Principles, and Ideology*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. (1998). "Attic Old Comedy, Frank Speech, and Democracy." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, ed. Deborah Boedeker and Kurt A. Raaflaub. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 255–73, 405–10.
- Hölscher, Tonio. (1998). "Images and Political Identity: The Case of Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, ed. Deborah Boedeker and Kurt A. Raaflaub. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 153–83, 384–7.
- Knox, B. M. W. (1979). *Word and Action. Essays on the Ancient Theater*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kurke, Leslie. (1998). "The Cultural Impact of (on) Democracy: Decentering Tragedy." In *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges*, ed. Ian Morris and Kurt Raaflaub. Archaeological Institute of America: Colloquia and Conference Papers 2. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 155–69.
- Meier, Christian. (1990). *The Greek Discovery of Politics*. Tr. David McLintock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Meier, Christian. (1993). *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*. Tr. Andrew Webber. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Morris, Ian, and Raaflaub, Kurt, eds. (1998). *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges*. Archaeological Institute of America: Colloquia and Conference Papers 2. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Pelling, Christopher, ed. (1997). *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. [1968] (1988). *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, revised by John Gould and David Lewis. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. (2000). "Poets, Lawgivers, and the Beginnings of Political Reflection in Archaic Greece." In *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. Christopher Rowe and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 23–59.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. (2001). "Father of All – Destroyer of All: War in Late Fifth-Century Athenian Discourse and Ideology." In *War and Democracy: A Comparative Study of the Korean War and the Peloponnesian War*, ed. Barry S. Strauss and David McCann. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 307–56.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2003). "Nothing to Do with Democracy: Athenian Drama and the Polis." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123: 104–19.
- Saïd, Suzanne. (1998). "Tragedy and Politics." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, ed. Deborah Boedeker and Kurt A. Raaflaub. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 175–95, 410–15.

- Salkever, Stephen. (1986). "Tragedy and the Education of the *Demos*: Aristotle's Response to Plato." In *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, ed. Peter Euben. Berkeley: University of California Press, 274–303.
- Schuller, Wolfgang, and Martin Dreher. (2000). "Auswahl und Bewertung von dramatischen Aufführungen in der athenischen Demokratie." In *Polis & Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Pernille Flensted-Jensen, Thomas Heine-Nielsen, and Lene Rubinstein. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 523–39.
- Seaford, Richard. (1994). *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smarczyk, Bernhard. (1990). *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund* [Investigations into the religion, politics, and political propaganda of Athens in the Delian-Attic sea-federation]. Munich: Tuduv-Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Sommerstein, Alan H. (1997). "The Theatre Audience, the *Demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus." In *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed. Christopher Pelling. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 63–79.
- Sommerstein, Alan H., Halliwell, Stephen, Henderson, Jeffrey, and Zimmermann, Bernhard, eds. (1993). *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*. Bari: Levante Editori.
- Thomas, Rosalind. (2000). *Herodotus in Context. Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Travlos, John. (1971). *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. New York: Praeger.
- Winkler, John J. and Zeitlin, Froma I., eds. (1990). *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zeitlin, Froma I. (1990). "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, ed. John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 130–67.

y periods and movements
istory. Extensive volumes
on canonical and post-
elds of study and provid-
urrent and new directions,

A COMPANION TO
TRAGEDY

EDITED BY REBECCA BUSHNELL

Edited by Duncan Wu
Edited by Herbert F. Tucker
Edited by David Scott Kastan
Edited by David Punter
Edited by Dymphna Callaghan
Edited by Peter Brown
Edited by David Womersley
Edited by Michael Hattaway

Edited by Thomas N. Corns
Edited by Neil Roberts
Edited by Phillip Pulsiano
and Elaine Trebarne
Edited by Susan J. Owen
Edited by Anita Pacheco
Edited by Arthur F. Kinney
Edited by Richard Cronin, Alison
Capman, and Antony H. Harrison
Edited by Patrick Brantlinger
and William B. Thesing
Edited by Richard Dutton
and Jean E. Howard
Edited by Charles L. Crow
Edited by Walter Jost
and Wendy Olmsted
Edited by Richard Gray
and Owen Robinson
Edited by Shirley Samuels
Edited by Robert Paul Lamb
and G. R. Thompson
Edited by Susan Schreibman,
Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth
Edited by Corinne Saunders
Edited by Brian W. Shaffer
Edited by David Krasner
Edited by Paula R. Backscheider
and Catherine Ingrassia
Edited by Rory McTurk
Edited by Rebecca Bushnell

 **Blackwell**
Publishing