



The Chorus in the Later Greek Drama with Reference to the Stage Question

Edward Capps

The American Journal of Archaeology and of the History of the Fine Arts, Vol. 10, No. 3. (Jul. - Sep., 1895), pp. 287-325.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1540-5079%28189507%2F09%2910%3A3%3C287%3ATCITLG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

The American Journal of Archaeology and of the History of the Fine Arts is currently published by Archaeological Institute of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aia.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A M E R I C A N JOURNAL OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

Vol. X.

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1895.

No. 3.

PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL
STUDIES AT ATHENS.

THE CHORUS IN THE LATER GREEK DRAMA WITH
REFERENCE TO THE STAGE QUESTION.

The chorus in the Greek Drama, its position and external functions, has formed the basis of the investigations¹ in the last decade that have contributed in no small degree to the overthrow of the traditional belief in a high stage for actors during the classical period. Those who at first opposed the entire theory of Dr. Dörpfeld now concede, almost without exception, that the theatre of the fifth century placed no restraint upon the free and constant intermingling of actors and chorus.² But the question

¹HÖPKEN, *de theatro attico*, Diss. Bonn, 1884; WILAMOWITZ, in *Hermes*, 21, 607 ff.; WHITE, in *Harvard Studies*, 1891, 159 ff.; CAPPS, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1891, 1 ff.; BODENSTEINER, in *Jahrb. f. class. Phil.*, 19^{tes} Suppl., 1893, 639 ff.; PICKARD, in *Am. Jour. Phil.*, 1893, 68 ff.; WEISSMANN, *Die scenische Aufführung der griech. Dramen*, München, 1893; WECKLEIN, *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad.*, 1893, 1429 ff.

²The suggestion of a low stage for the fifth century first came from HAIGH, *Attic Theatre* (1889), 158, and has since found favor with many, either in its original or in a modified form. See GARDNER, in *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, *Suppl. I.*, (1892); WEIL, in *Jour. des Sav.*, 1893, 603; CHRIST, in *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad.*, 1894, 1 ff.; OEHMICHEN, in *Woch. f. klass. Phil.*, 1894, 761; A. MÜLLER, in *Berl. phil. Woch.*, 1894, 1456; NAVARRE, *Dionysos*, p. 95. For the view of Christ, who at first favored the new theory, see *Class. Rev.*, 1895, 133. Other compromises have been offered by DYER, in *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, 1891, 356 ff., EARLE, *Report of Arch. Inst. of Am.*, 1892-3, 611, and in the Introduction to his edition of the *Alcestis*, and PAULSEN, *Grekiska teatern*, Goteborg, 1894.

has by no means reached its solution. Vitruvius remains, and, until fresh evidence has been gathered from literary sources which shall conclusively refute or explain him, he will probably continue to remain, the stronghold of many who have not felt the overwhelming force of the evidence of the ruins.

The theories formulated by Mr. Gardner and Prof. Christ rest upon the assumption that at about the beginning of the third century, without any assignable reasons, the low stage was replaced by the high Vitruvian stage. This is the time of the first appearance of stone proscenia. From this time on there can be no compromise; the actors stood either upon the proscenium or in the orchestra in front of it, where, according to Dr. Dörpfeld, they always stood.³ If, from 300 B. C. on, the actors stood upon the proscenium, then the chorus must either have entirely disappeared from the drama or have essentially changed its character before the reconstruction of the theatre was possible, *i. e.*, during the fourth century.

Our knowledge of the later Greek drama is extremely meagre. The current histories of Greek literature are full of all manner of vague statements as regards the history and character of the chorus after the fifth century. The prevailing view seems to be that both tragedy and comedy underwent a sudden change shortly after the Peloponnesian war, and that a throng of worthless or distinctly inferior poets succeeded the old masters; as for the chorus, that in tragedy it rapidly waned during the fourth century, soon became a mere appendage and at last disappeared, while in comedy it did not long outlive the Peloponnesian war. It is not surprising, therefore, that, in the discussion of the stage question, it has become the custom of the conservative party to ignore the chorus altogether after the fourth century. But not even the meagreness of our positive knowledge warrants the assertion of Haigh (*A. T.* 261), that "in the course of the fourth century the tragic chorus came to occupy the position of a band in modern times," and of Gardner (*Excav. at Megal.*, p. 157), that "it is only in the plays of the fifth century that there was

³ Mr. Gardner's theory, on the other hand, involves the following changes: V cent., a low stage; IV cent., a stage of *ca.* 4 ft.; III cent., a stage of 10 ft., gradually increasing to 12 ft.; I cent., a stage of 5 ft. (Roman). He considers, however, that the Roman theatre (the drama also?) was an independent growth.

any close connection and intercourse between actors and chorus, orchestra and stage. In the fourth century the chorus disappeared almost entirely from comedy, and in tragedy its functions came to be confined to the duty of merely singing interludes,"⁴ and similar statements in Christ's last article.⁵ Müller's paragraph on the subject (B-A. 341 ff.) and the introductory chapter of Ribbeck's *Geschichte der römischen Tragödie* should have prevented such sweeping assertions. But neither Müller nor Ribbeck, nor, so far as I know, any other scholar, has submitted the subject of the character and functions of the later Greek chorus to a thorough investigation.⁶ It is my purpose in this paper to bring together the evidence as to the later history of the chorus, and to determine, as far as possible, how it differed in character from that of the fifth century.

THE CHORUS IN THE LATER TRAGEDY.

Side by side with the formal exhibitions of tragedy at the great religious festivals, existed another kind of histrionic performance that was dignified by the name of tragedy—the exhibitions of wandering troupes at the country fairs and in the market-places of the cities. They were of an informal, doubtless extemporaneous character, and probably dispensed with choruses as well as with extensive scenic apparatus (*cf.* Plat. *Legg.* 7, 817 c). Leaving these out of account, there is no evidence that Greek tragedy ever gave up its chorus; on the other hand the literature and inscriptions contain many references to the tragic chorus at Athens and elsewhere down to a very late period. It will suffice to mention Lys. 19, 29 and 21, 1; Isaeus, *de Dic. her.* 36, *de Phil. her.* 60; Dem. *Mid.* 58 and 156; Arist. *Pol.* 3, 3, 1276 B, 4, *Prob.* 19, 48, 'Aθ. Πολ. 56, 3; Demochares *apud.* Vit. Aeschinis II; Plut. *Script. Mor.* 68 A, 599 B; Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 7, 1; CIA II,

⁴This seems to rest on Haigh's authority alone. See *Att. Theat.*, 157. Oehmichen (B-W., 197), evidently takes the same position.

⁵See pp. 26 f., 31, and *passim*.

⁶WELCKER, *Die griechische Tragödien*, pp. 899, 1276, 1319 ff., discusses the existence of the tragic chorus. The history, but not the character, of the chorus in tragedy and in comedy after the fifth century is discussed with admirable judgment by Magnin in his *Les Origines du Théâtre Attique*, Paris, 1868, p. 129 ff. But his views now require revision in some important particulars.

1277, 1289, III, 68*b*. For Delos, Arist. 'Αθ. Πολ. 56, 3; *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 7, 122 ff; Iasos, La Bas, *As. Min.*, no. 281; Thespieae, *CIG* 1585; Rhamnus, 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1891, 49 (ca. 300 B. C.); Samos, *CIG* 3091 (170-60 B. C.); Teos, *CIG* 3089; Rhodes, Loewy, *Arch. Epig. Mitth.* 7, 111 (after fourth century).⁷ In addition to these inscriptions, which mention the tragic choregia, are many other references to the tragic *agon*, in which the tragic chorus undoubtedly took its part along with the cyclic choruses. See Welcker, *Die griechische Tragödien*, p. 1295.

As to the character of the later tragic chorus, the opinion prevails that it had lost its former intimate connection with the action, and that its only function was to entertain the audience between the episodes. This opinion is based wholly on the much-discussed passage in Aristotle's *Poetics* (18, 1456 A, 26): *καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἕνα δεῖ ὑπολαβεῖν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν καὶ μόριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου καὶ συναγωνίζεσθαι μὴ ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδῃ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Σοφοκλεῖ· τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τὰ ἀδόμμενα οὐδὲν μᾶλλον τοῦ μύθου ἢ ἄλλης τραγωδίας ἐστίν· διὸ ἐμβόλιμα ἄδουσιν πρώτου ἄρξαντος Ἀγάθωνος τοῦ τοιοῦτου· καίτοι τί διαφέρει ἢ ἐμβόλιμα ἄδειν ἢ εἰ ῥῆσιν ἐξ ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο ἀρμόττοι ἢ ἐπεισόδιον ὄλον;* These words are not ambiguous or obscure. It is surprising that they should have been so consistently misunderstood or partially understood. In the first sentence Aristotle states briefly the whole function of the chorus,⁸ adding by way of illustration *μὴ ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδῃ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Σοφοκλεῖ*. This refers to the *manner* in which these poets gave their choruses a connection with the plot, not to the fact; for the chorus in Euripides takes a larger part in the action and, in this respect, does the work of an actor, to a greater extent than in Sophocles. And yet there is an essential and unmistakable difference in the conceptions of these two poets of the true function of the chorus. This difference is exhibited, not so much in the external conduct of the

⁷ A full collection of inscriptions published before 1888 is given by BRINCK, *Inscriptiones graecae ad choregiam pertinentes*, Halle, 1888. Some of the above are given on the strength of Brinck's restorations.

⁸ So far as this was possible in a single sentence, seeing how varied and complex are the functions of the chorus in the best plays of the best poets. *Prob.* 18, 48: *ἔστι γὰρ ὁ χορὸς κηδεστῆς ἀπρακτος· εὐνοίαν γὰρ μόνον παρέχεται οἷς πάρεστιν*, if genuine, probably reflects the opinion of Aristotle when he was still more under the influence of Sophocles than when he wrote the *Poetics*. ARNOLDT, *Chorische Technik des Euripides*, p. 50.

chorus, but in the very motive of its presence in the play. The choruses of Sophocles, as a rule, have a deeper sympathy with the actors, a more intimate connection with the plot, than those of Euripides, although those of the latter move about more freely and come into closer personal contact with the actors than those of the former.⁹ This is a distinction that has been generally overlooked by interpreters of Aristotle. Or are we to suppose that a critic like Aristotle approved more heartily of the active chorus of the *Helen* than of the inactive chorus of the *Oedipus Rex*? It is true that he commended the chorus that took its part in the action, as is sufficiently indicated by *συναγωνίζεσθαι*. Much depended on the plot chosen by the poet. The chorus in the *Bacchae* necessarily bore a very different character from that of the *Oedipus*, though one could hardly say that it was better motivated. But undoubtedly Aristotle intended that the main stress should be laid upon what we may term the inner character of the chorus, as is shown not only by the comparison of Sophocles and Euripides, but also by what immediately follows in the text.

"The melic parts," he proceeds, "of the successors of Euripides and Sophocles belong no more to the myth than to another tragedy altogether, in fact are mere interludes. Agathon was the first to do this sort of thing. But this is no more justifiable than to transfer whole speeches or episodes from one tragedy to another." The fact that Aristotle proceeds to discuss the pertinency of the melic parts to the subject of the drama is a confirmation of the view advanced above, that in the first sentence he had in mind, though not exclusively, as here, the *manner* in

⁹ MUFF, *Chorische Technik des Soph.*, finds that the Sophoclean chorus takes no part in the action in *Antigone*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Rex*, and *Trachiniae*, while some of the melic parts in the last named drama alone are open to the charge of irrelevancy. Arnoldt, *l.c.*, criticizes the *Hecabe*, *Andromache*, *Troades*, *Helen* and *Iphigenia Aul.* for the intermezzic character of some of their choral odes, but no play for the inactivity of its chorus. MAHAFFY, *Gr. Lit.*, 1, 317, goes so far as to say that the chorus "was not by Euripides, but by Sophocles, degraded to be a mere spectator of the action." But he misses the distinction that I point out above. The weak remark of Schol. Arist. *Ach.* 443: *οἶτος γὰρ (i. e. Eurip.) εἰσάγει τοὺς χοροὺς οὔτε τὰ ἀκόλουθα φθειρομένους τῇ ὑποθέσει κτέ.*, and that of Accius (*apud* Nonius, p. 178): *sed Euripides, qui choros temerius in fabulis*, have had apparently too much effect on modern criticism. An able defense of the choruses of Euripides is found in Decharme, in *Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre*, Paris, 1893.

which an ideal chorus should be made an integral part of the whole. There is not the slightest ground for the inference that the chorus whose odes are purely intermezzi take no part in the action.¹⁰ Aristotle is discussing now a part of the function of the chorus; the whole was sketched in the first sentence. On the contrary, since one of the requisites of the ideal chorus is *συναγωνίζεσθαι*, and since *οἱ λοιποὶ* receive no word of criticism on this score, it is a fair inference that Aristotle had no reason to rebuke the poets of his day for the inactivity of their choruses. It will be shown later that the dramas of the fourth century seem to bear out this inference.

What is precisely Aristotle's criticism of Agathon? It is commonly asserted, on the strength of this passage, that Agathon was the first to substitute entertaining musical interludes for odes on subjects directly suggested by the play; that this was his practice and that of his successors. We have the authority of Aristotle that this was indeed the prominent characteristic of the tragedy of his day. But was it the regular practice of Agathon, or did he merely furnish one marked example of it? The latter is Welcker's view (*Gr. Trag.* p. 1000 ff.), and it seems to me extremely probable. In *ch.* 18 of the *Poetics* Aristotle warns against the danger of dramatizing an epic subject, extended in time and embracing too ramified a myth. Such an attempt, he says, cannot be successful. *σημείον δέ· ὅσοι πέρσιν Ἰλίου ὄλην ἐποίησαν --- ἢ ἐκπίπτουσιν ἢ κακῶς ἀγωνίζονται· ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἀγάθων ἐξέπεσεν ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ.* From this Hermann and others have inferred that Agathon wrote a play embracing the material contained in the *Ἰλίου Πέρσις*. Now he would have been a poet of extraordinary ability who could have dramatized a story so full of incident and so extended in time, and at the same time have kept his chorus up to the Sophoclean standard. A good illustration is the *Troades* of Euripides, a more or less loosely connected series of scenes from the same subject as that of Agathon, but on a smaller scale. Some of the stasima narrowly escape being *ἐμβόλιμα*. Given the

¹⁰ And yet many have committed themselves openly to this *non sequitur*. RIBBECK, *Röm. Trag.*, p. 7, says: "damit (*i. e.*, Agathon, by writing *ἐμβόλιμα*) jede Theilnahme des Chors an der Handlung abschnitt," and CHRIST, *Theat. des Polycl.*, *Sitzungsber. der bay. Akad.*, p. 26: "diese (*ἐμβόλιμα*) setzen ja keinen Wechselverkehr zwischen Chor und Bühne voraus." So also Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 85, n. 2.

broader subject of the *Iliupersis*, it would have been almost impossible to link the episodes together more closely than, for example, the three parts of a trilogy. As for the chorus, it would have been an easy matter to give it a part in the action, but between the episodes it would be left high and dry. It seems to me, therefore, altogether probable that the play in which Agathon set the example of *ἐμβόλιμα* was an "Iliupersis," whether this was its exact title or not. It is not probable that so clever a poet made the experiment again. Elsewhere Aristotle has nothing but praise for him, considering him alone of the younger poets worthy to be placed side by side with Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides.

We have seen that Aristotle gives us implicit information as to the character of the fourth century tragic chorus which furnishes us with a valuable presumption that will assist in our further investigation. We know that the choruses of Euripides show no decline in his later period, so far as concerns their participation in the action.¹¹ It is true that choral odes that may almost be called *ἐμβόλιμα* occur, though rarely. This is true even of Sophocles. Under the influence of Sophocles, Euripides, and Agathon, and partly, doubtless, through lack of higher dramatic ability, the poets of the fourth century came to neglect the vital, traditional connection of the chorus with the drama, which in early times was exhibited mainly in the choral songs. It is incredible, however, that the strong conservative influence¹² exercised by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and especially by Euripides, on the whole later history of the drama, should have failed to maintain the chorus, externally at least, in close connection with the plot. The sons of the three great tragic poets, thoroughly trained in the technique of their fathers, brought tragedy over into the fourth century, not considerably changed in any of its essential features. The tendency in the fifth century was to diminish the part of the chorus. This tendency doubtless continued. But if we had representative plays from the beginning and end of the fourth century, is it

¹¹ OERMICHEN, (*B.-W.*, p. 299), quotes the comic poet Plato *apud* Athen. xiv, 628E, to prove the inactivity of the chorus in the time of Euripides, (which was also, we should remember, the time of Sophocles). But Athenaeus quotes the verses merely to illustrate a point about choral (dithyrambic?) dancing.

¹² See RIBBECK, *Röm. Trag.*, p. 1.

probable that we should find a greater difference between them than between the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus and the *Aulian Iphigenia*? If the chorus were separated from both plot and action, it is hard to see why the Athenians should have spent so much money on its further maintenance.

The contemporaries of Demosthenes, who were thoroughly familiar with the masterpieces of the classical period of the drama, and who had the opportunity every year of comparing the new with the old, seemed to have loved the new no less by reason of the comparison. The *καινὰ τραγῳδίαί* were the chief attraction of the Great Dionysia. Aristotle, also, who insisted so strongly on the maintenance of the high standard of the fifth century, by no means disapproved of the new tragedy. He draws his illustrations from Theodectes, Polyeidus, Dicaeogenes and Astydamus almost as often as from the classical trio, with whom he clearly believes them worthy to be classed.¹³ Chaereon and Carcinus are censured, but so is Euripides, by all odds the most popular poet of the time, almost as often as he is praised. Hence, though the extant fragments are too scanty to warrant an independent judgment, yet we have a good right to suppose that tragedy did not at once decline through the inferiority of the new generation of poets.

A probable indication of the general characteristics of the choruses of the later poets may be obtained from an examination of the plays of Euripides. The most natural expedient of a poet who is conscious of the dramatic weakness of his chorus is to introduce some external connection with the action, or to offer some form of entertainment that will draw attention from the defect. Sophocles seems to have resorted to this device in the *Trachiniae*, whose chorus, though weak in comparison with that of the *Oedipus*, still "*ergötzt das Publicum durch Mannifaltigkeit und Wechsel in Vortrag und Stellung*" (Muff., *l. c.* p. 226). A lesser poet, but perhaps a better though less conscientious playwright, Euripides, uses the first device. Take, for example, the two plays in which are found the clearest examples of *ἐμβόλιμα μέλη*—the *Helen* (third stasimon) and *Andromache* (fourth stasimon). Admitting

¹³ Mahaffy again needs correction when he says (i, 390), that Aristotle "*hardly mentions any of them, and then almost always by way of censure.*"

for the moment that the chorus in these odes fulfils only the functions of a band, is the chorus in general of so little consequence to the action as a band? The *Helen* furnishes one of the few instances that have never been disputed of the passage of the chorus over the "stage" (v. v. 315, 327), and of its attack on actors (724, 846). In the *Andromache* (817 ff.), the chorus is on the point of entering the house when deterred by the entrance of Hermione. In every play whose chorus has been criticized for the irrelevancy of its songs,¹⁴ whether the criticisms have been just or not, are found indications of direct participation in the action. In view of this fact I suspect that the chorus in Agathon's "*Iliupersis*" exhibited the same kind of activity. It was probably composed of soldiers. What more probable than that, when not singing their interludes, they should have filled the scene with "alarums and excursions"? It is doubtful if the audience would have found fault with such a chorus, whatever might be the verdict of the judges and of Aristotle.

The tragedy *Rhesus*, which tradition has assigned to Euripides, is now generally believed to have been written in the fourth century.¹⁵ The grounds on which this belief rests are manifold, and, taken altogether, fairly conclusive. In view of the widespread and growing belief in its later origin, I shall call it into evidence on the question of the chorus of the fourth century—remembering always that this dating is to a certain extent hypothetical.

The chorus of *Rhesus* is formed of Trojan soldiers, the night-watch of Hector's camp. Its presence is remarkably well motivated,

¹⁴ Arnoldt has shown that there is generally a sufficient dramatic reason for the irrelevancy—and Arnoldt is no blind champion of Euripides, as Hartung was. The latter (*Eur. Restitutus* II, p. 369), finds only two odes that are open to this criticism—in *Iph. Taur.* and *Hel.* I omit the former in recognition of Arnoldt's defense (l. c. p. 86), and take the *Andr.* as a clearer case. The third stasimon of the *Helen* has been thought by Fritzsche and O. Müller to have been taken from another tragedy. On the fourth stasimon of *Andr.* see ARNOLDT, l. c. p. 68. Few critics would agree with Bernhardy, who says that the majority of Euripides' choral odes are merely "*Beiwerke und Randzeichnungen*," or would go as far as Wilamowitz, *Herakl.* I, p. 354. See WEILL, *Jour. des Sav.* 1893, p. 600.

¹⁵ Since VALCANAR'S *Diatrise in Euripidis fragmenta* (see §88, page 85, of the Glasgow Euripides). SITTL (*Gr. Lit.* III, p. 331) is an exception. CHRIST (*N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* 1894, 160), has receded from the position taken in his *Litt. Gesch.*, p. 229, that it is a work of Euripides' early period. For the full literature of the subject see ROLFE in vol. IV of the *Harvard Studies*. Wilamowitz, *Herakl.* I, p. 130, suggests 370–80 as the probable time of composition.

and its sympathy with the actors complete. This close relation finds expression not only in appropriate choral songs but also in lively participation in dialogue and action. The chorus is in an unusual degree one of the actors. The realism of the play is enhanced by the departure of the chorus from the scene in order to call the relief watch, thus giving the spies the opportunity to enter the camp. The play is further remarkable for the appearance of two θεοὶ ἀπὸ μηχανῆς. The choral odes are short and metrically simple, but always apposite. The author of this play, therefore, conforms to the Aristotelian ideal of a chorus in both its applications, although he is entirely unhampered by conventions and rules in every other respect. An evident and doubtless conscious imitator, or rather student, of the earlier poets, he had yet native ability enough to give his chorus a distinct character of its own,¹⁶ whatever be the defects in the economy of the piece. In its external characteristics the chorus is exactly what the preceding discussion has led us to expect in a play of the fourth century. On the other hand there are no ἐμβόλιμα—the compact plot prevented that. In other respects I suspect that it is very similar to the chorus in Agathon's "*Iliupersis*"—a play which would have afforded precisely the same opportunities for spectacle and animated action.

The first Roman tragedy was produced sixty years after the end of the fourth century. Roman tragedy, even to a greater extent than comedy, was confessedly not only modelled on that of the Greeks, but often directly copied (Cic. *de fin.* 1, 2). Even if no fragments were extant, we should have the right to assume that, as a rule, no important character of the original was omitted, especially in the earlier translations. Very slight evidence of "contamination" is found.¹⁷ Oemichen¹⁸ is to a certain extent right when he says that most of the Greek originals were

¹⁶ CROISET, *Hist. Litt. Gr.*, III, p. 380, well says "*La façon dont il emploie le chœur en cherchant à suppléer par le spectacle et le mouvement au mérite des chants, dénote un esprit qui cherche.*"

¹⁷ WELCKER, *Gr. Trag.*, p. 1348: "*im Ganzen und Grossen war die römische Tragödie vor der Augustischen Periode eine übersetzte, die einzelnen Stücke auf griechische Originale durchgängig gegründet.*"

¹⁸ He wrongly adds: "*(Eine Zeit) in der die chorische Actione als lästige Fessel empfunden und deshalb beschnitten wurde.*" B-W. p. 285.

taken from the later period of the drama. They were taken from the plays which were at that time to be seen in Greek theatres. A large number of them, however, were the *παλαιὰ τραγῳδία*, especially of Euripides. But whatever was the time of the composition of the Greek originals, we may expect to find in the Roman reproductions a fairly true reflection not only of the general character of the later Greek tragedy, but also the art and manner of the presentation of both the old and the new tragedies in the contemporary Greek theatre, just as is the case with comedy.

Grysar, Jahn, and Ribbeck have established the fact that Roman tragedy never lacked a chorus.¹⁹ The activity of this chorus was not confined to the interludes, though not many years ago scholars maintained the contrary on the strength of Donatus²⁰ as confidently as they now maintain it, on the strength of Aristotle, for the later Greek tragedy. In Horace, *Ep.*, 2, 3, 215: *tibicen traxitque uagus per pulpitum uestem*, is found an indication of the customary freedom of movement of the chorus following the musician. In the scanty fragments Ribbeck and Jahn have found sufficient evidence that the choreutae regularly came into close contact with the actors. They engage in conversation with them in the *Medea* and *Thyestes* of Ennius, the *Antiopa*, *Chryses*, and *Niptra* of Pacuvius, and the *Philocteta* of Accius. Bacchic choruses seem to have been especially popular, occurring in the *Lycurgus* of Naevius, the *Periboea*, *Antiopa*, and *Pentheus* of Pacuvius, and the *Bacchae* of Accius. Such plays as the *Eumenides* and the *Alcumeo* of Ennius probably suggested to Cicero the image which he found so effective: "*quem ad modum in fabulis saepenumero uidetis, eos, qui aliquid impie sceleratque commiserunt, agitari et perterri Furiarum taedis ardentibus.* (*Rosc. Am.* 24, 67; cf. in *Pis.* 20). Further still, in the *Philocteta*, a chorus of sailors accompanies

¹⁹ See GRYSAR, *Canticum u. Chor der röm. Trag.* in *Sitzungsber. d. wien. Akad.* 15 (1855), 365 ff.; JAHN, in *Hermes* 2 (1867), 225 ff., and RIBBECK, *Röm. Trag. and Gesch. d. röm. Dichtung*, and the convenient summary in Schwabe's last revision of TEUFFEL'S *Gesch. der röm. Lit.*, I, 20.

²⁰ Arg. to *Andria*: *est igitur attente animaduertendum ubi et quando scaena uacua sit ab omnibus personis, ut in ea chorus uel tibicen audiri possit; quod quom uideremus, ibi actum esse finitum debemus agnoscere.* *Tibicen* seems to refer to comedy, *chorus* to tragedy. Donatus is not in error. The function of the chorus during the progress of the piece does not concern him.

Ulixes and Diomedes, and a similar chorus appears in the *Iphigenia* of Ennius. In the *Antiopa* (?) of Pacuvius the choreutae threaten an actor (Ribbeck, T. R. F. *fr. inc.* iv), and in his *Niptra* (*fr.* ix) they carry the wounded Ulixes in upon the stage. In the *Antigona* of Accius (*fr.* iv), the chorus of watchmen seize the heroine as she sprinkles dust on her brother's corpse. A second chorus appears in the *Eumenides* and *Alexander* of Ennius and in the *Antiopa* of Pacuvius. Such subordinate choruses were probably always taken from the Greek original, but they seem to have been given far greater prominence. One of the peculiarities that we observed in the *Rhesus* occurs again and again on the Roman stage—the withdrawal of the chorus during the progress of the play. This is found in plays in whose Greek originals the chorus remained in its position, *e. g.*, the *Antigona*, *Iphigenia*, and others. Ribbeck regards it as exceptional for the chorus to remain on the scene from its entrance to the close of the piece. It probably came and went as it was needed, thus adding life and movement and spectacular effect, as well as affording more room on the stage for actors (Jahn, *l. c.* p. 227). The Roman poets in this way evaded the difficult task of keeping the chorus in easy and natural connection with the actors during the dialogues. In short, the chorus on the Roman stage, except for its songs between the acts, was much like the mobs, retinues, and armies on the modern stage, though it had a more intimate part in the action. To compare it with the modern band would be radically misleading.

I have mentioned so far only those plays which can with probability be traced back to fifth century originals. The plot, characters, and chorus generally are retained practically without change, but the treatment of the chorus reminds one rather of Aeschylus than of Sophocles. When Ennius in his *Iphigenia* substitutes a chorus of sailors for the Chalcidian maidens of Euripides, and Pacuvius in his *Antiopa* a chorus of watchmen for the Theban elders of Sophocles, the desire is clearly seen of establishing a closer personal relation between chorus and actors, with a view to imparting more life and activity to the former. Ennius and Pacuvius doubtless had examples to follow, not only in the later Greek imitations of the classical dramas, but also in the practice of the stage-managers in the contemporary Greek theatres, who regu-

larly brought out the old favorites, set and interpreted according to the tastes of the time, very much as Shakespeare is brought out in our own day in the best theatres.

It is difficult to identify Roman copies with originals from the fourth and following centuries, firstly because only scanty fragments of both original and copy remain; secondly because the Roman poets often changed the original title. Some of the plays above mentioned may come from late treatments of subjects used by the earlier poets; for the late Greek tragedy shows little variety in the selection of myths and much imitation in their employment. Undoubtedly some of the Bacchic subjects are of this class, *e. g.*, the *Statistae* or *Tropaeum Liberi* of Accius, the *Nuptiae Bacchi* of Santra, and, according to Leo, the *Periboea* of Pacuvius. Weleker and Ribbeck refer the original of the *Hector Proficiscens* of Naevius to Astydamas, whose *Hector* was a war piece, like the *Rhesus*. The *Penthesilea* of Ennius (?) seems to go back to Chaere-mon, as well as the *Io* of Accius, whose *Hellenes* was probably taken from Apollodorus. The *Armorum Judicium* of Pacuvius was more likely a copy of the *Aias* of Theodectes, which, according to Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1399 B, 1400 A), gave special prominence to the ὄπλων κρίσις, than of the similar piece by Aeschylus. Other plays that cannot be identified, but which almost certainly do not go back to the fifth century, show traces of important choruses. The *Iliona* of Pacuvius used to a certain extent the material of the *Hecabe* of Euripides, but is later; the *Ino* of Livius had a chorus of worshippers of Trivia, and the *Nyctegresia* of Accius was probably a copy of the *Rhesus*. The *Alexander* of Ennius had a chorus of shepherds. The *Myrmidones* of Accius, if it is not after Aeschylus, as Ribbeck thinks, may have been taken from Astydamas, Carcinus, Euaretus, or another fourth century poet. It admits of no doubt that, if we had more extensive data, we should find that a very large number of Latin tragedies were based on post-classical originals.²¹ The chorus in the Roman tragedy, with its leading characteristics which I have tried to trace, was not an inheritance from the old Greek tragedy alone, but from Greek tragedy as a

²¹ LEO, *Seneca*, I, p. 158, n. 15, attributes the following to post-Euripidean poets: the *Dulorestes*, *Iliona*, *Medus*, *Periboea*, and *Atalanta* of Pacuvius, and the *Melanippus*, *Clytemnestra*, and *Hellenes* of Accius.

whole. So firmly had the Greek conception of tragedy taken hold of the Romans that, when they made a national tragedy of their own, as far removed as possible from Greek influence, the chorus was retained as a matter of course. Ribbeck embraces Roman tragedy of all periods, both Greco-Roman and *praetexta*, when he says (*Gesch. röm. Dicht.* I., 194), that it strove “*durch drastische Mittel die Aufmerksamkeit zu fesseln,*” and he considers that the chorus contributed largely to that end.

The Roman chorus appeared, of course, upon the stage. There was no other place for it, and the Roman stage was large enough. The activity of the Roman chorus has been explained by this fact alone, for when brought so near the actors and upon the same level, what was more natural than that it should be given a part in the action? What was the exception in the Greek theatre, says Jahn (*l. c.* p. 227), became the rule in the Roman, that the chorus might not become a mere chorus of dummies. But Jahn, of course, did not know that it was, in fact, the rule in the Greek theatre also for the chorus to commingle with the actors. One who recognizes the general attitude of the Roman poets toward their Greek models, and their almost absolute lack of originality in all that pertains to dramatic art, will be loth to concede that the chorus was rescued by them from imbecility, or even elevated by them from a position comparable to that of a band. In view of the interpretation of Aristotle, which I have offered, and of the evidence of the last plays of the fifth century and of the fourth century *Rhesus*, I cannot but think that the Roman chorus, which seems hitherto to have been overlooked in interpreting the Greek, furnishes strong grounds for believing that the external characteristics of the Greek tragic chorus, and, to a certain extent, its inner relations to the drama, remained unimpaired from the fifth century down to the first. Horace was not only laying down a practical precept, but was also insisting on an actual, historical fact, when he defined the functions of the tragic chorus:

actoris partes chorus officiumque uirile
defendat, neu quid medios intercinat actus,
quod non proposito conducat et haereat apte.

THE LATER SATYRIC CHORUS.

Originally one of the most characteristic forms of the worship of Dionysus, and, with the dithyrambic chorus, the precursor of both tragedy and comedy, the satyr-drama in classical times occupied a position at the festivals and in public interest distinctly inferior to tragedy and comedy. Comedy had so grown in popularity after its admission to the Great Dionysia, and filled so satisfactorily the desire of the Athenian populace for scurrility, irreverence and buffoonery, that we can readily conceive that the satyr-drama continued to wane in proportion as its traditional importance was lost sight of. When it became necessary for Athens to retrench expenses on all sides to tide over the years of distress that followed the Peloponnesian war, we should expect to find that the lusty companion of tragedy was the first to feel the change. There is no record until 340 B. C., however, that such a change was made. An inscription of that year (*CIA*, II, 973, ll. 17, 30), shows that the number of satyric plays given each year was reduced from three to one. Yet during the first half of the fourth century the satyr-drama seems to have continued to flourish. Achaëus the Eretrian, a younger contemporary of Euripides, held a high place in satyric poetry. The philosopher Menedemus ranked him next to Aeschylus *ἐν τοῖς σατύροις* (*Diog. Laert.* 2, 133). The titles of seven of his satyri are known. Still later than Achaëus, Astydamos is represented by two, Chaeremon by three or four,²² Python and Timocles by one each, while four or five fragments that possibly belong to this period are found among the *ἀδέσποτα*.²³ This is a large number considering that titles can be reclaimed for this branch of the drama often only by the shrewdest combinations alone.

Toward the end of the fourth century it seems that the satyr-drama fell more or less into disuse, though we are told of the performance of the *Ἀγήν*, a *σατυρικὸν δράματιον*, of which either Python or Alexander the Great was the author (*Nauck, T. G. F.*² p. 810). A revival took place under the influence of Sositeus of

²² NAUCK, *T. G. F.*² pp. 781 ff.; WELCKER, *Nachtrag*, 288 ff. I am inclined to think that the *Κέρραυπος* also was a satyric drama, not a tragedy. The comic poets Pherecrates and Nicochares made use of the same subject in the *Ἄγριοι* and *Κέρραυπος*.

²³ NAUCK, *T. G. F.*² Nos. 90, 146, 165, 205, and possibly 346.

the Alexandrine Pleias, as is recorded by his contemporary, Dioscorides (*Anth. Pal.* VII, 707). The satyr Scirtus is supposed to be standing at the tomb of the poet, as another had done at that of Sophocles (*ibid.*, no. 37), speaking as follows:

Κῆγῶ Σωσιθέου κομέω νέκυν, ὅσσον ἐν ἄστει
 ἄλλος ἀπ' αὐθαίμων ἡμετέρων Σοφοκλῆν,
 Σκίρτος ὁ πυρῖογένειος · ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ὄνηρ
 ἄξια Φλιασίων, καὶ μὰ χοροῦς, Σατύρων.
 κῆμέ, τὸν ἐν καινοῖς τεθραμμένον ἦθεσιν ἦδη,
 ἦγαγεν εἰς μνήμην, πατρίδ' ἀναρχαίσας.

πατρίς, as Welcker (*Gr. Trag.*, 1254, note) says, is clearly a reference to Athens. The chorus was still the prominent feature as of old. In fact a satyric play without a chorus, either of satyrs or of a suitable substitute for them, (*e. g.* the pupils of Menedemus in Lycophron's piece *Μενέδημος*), is not to be thought of at any period in the history of this branch of dramatic poetry.²⁴ The importance of the satyr-drama after the revival instituted by Sositheus is shown by the fact that they were composed by at least four of the seven Pleiades—Philiscus (Nauck, *T. G. F.* p. 819), and Alexander Aetolus (Schenkl, *Wien. Stud.* 10, 326), besides Sositheus and Lycophron—as well as by Callimachus, Timon and Timesitheus (Welcker, *Nachtrag*, 313), and Amèinias (*CIG* 1584, *ca.* 195 B. C.)—an importance reflected in the art of the third and following centuries.²⁵

The continuance of the satyr-drama outside of Athens even down into Roman times has long been known from inscriptions. See Le Bas, *As. Min.* p. 37, nos. 91, 92; *CIG* 1584, 1585, 2758, IV; *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 2 (1878), 590; 'Εφημ. 'Αρχ. 1884, 121 ff.; *Archiv. d. missions scientif. et littér.*, 2^{me} ser., tom. IV, 522; Rhangabé, *Ant. Hell.* II, 691, l. 20; Keil, *Insc. Boeot.*, p. 61; *cf.* Diog. Laert. 5, 85. Fulgentius tells of the *satyra* in Alexandria after the time of Cicero.²⁶ New records have more recently come to light. An inscription from Rhodes, skilfully put together by Kaibel (*Hermes* 2,

²⁴ "Dass ein Satyrdrama ohne Satyrchor bestehen konnte . . . lässt sich in keinem Fall glaublich machen," Kaibel, *Hermes*, 1895, 73. For the chorus in the *Menedemus* see Ath. 10, 420; ἐν οἷς φησιν ὁ Σιληρὸς πρὸς τοὺς σατύρους, and *cf. ibid.* 427 c.

²⁵ ATH. 196 F, 198 D.; JAHN, *Berichte d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1847, 294, and *Philologus* 27, 17; HEYDEMANN, ninth *Wincklemann Prog.* from Halle, p. 10.

²⁶ WELCKER, *Gr. Trag.*, p. 1270.

269 ff.) tells of the production in the first century before Christ of a complete Sophoclean trilogy followed by the satyr-drama *Telephus*. Finally some inscriptions from Magnesia, recently published by Kern (*Ath. Mitth.*, 1894, 96 ff.), give a satyric piece with the lists of comedies and tragedies for each year. The poets and plays for five years are as follows: Theodorus Θυτή (Θυέστη?); Polemon, name of play omitted; Polemaeus Αζαντι; Harmodius Πρωτεσιλάφ; Theodorus Παλαμήδη. The date is about the first century. Although at this time Athens was no longer the centre of the Hellenic world, yet the fact that the documents above quoted come, not from Alexandria, Pergamon or Antioch, but from small inland towns and from islands, whose festivals had a purely local character, lends no small degree of probability to the supposition that the satyr-drama still flourished at its early home.²⁷

THE CHORUS IN THE MIDDLE COMEDY.

The plays of Plautus and Terence, which go back almost exclusively to the new comedy,²⁸ must be accepted as proof that the comic chorus had disappeared by the second century before Christ. We should perhaps be justified in placing the date still earlier, but for the fact that among the fragments of the new comedy are found remains of choral odes, which Meineke has collected in vol. 1, p. 441 ff. of his *Comic Fragments*. The Soteric inscriptions of

²⁷ The question of the satyr-drama among the Romans does not concern us here. The *Erigona* and *Σύνδειπνοι* of Quintus Cicero were probably satyric plays (Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* 626 ff.), and the *Sisyphus* of Pomponius (Porphyrio on Hor. *Ep.* 2, 3, 221). Horace certainly seems to have living and future writers of *σάτυροι* in mind in *Ep.* 2, 3, 221 (Kiessling. *ad loc.*). The close resemblance, if not relationship, between the Atellane farces and the satyr-drama is well known. The farces of Sulla were said to be *σατυρικοί κωμῶνται* (*Ath.* 6, 261 c). In the face of all this and the evidence cited above, the contention of Maass (*Annali del Inst.*, 1881, 120) that the satyr-drama disappeared after the Pleias, cannot be maintained. Kern's view that the satyr-drama flourished in Rome as a distinct branch of the drama is more probable now than ever before.

²⁸ HÜFFNER, *de Plauti comoed. exemplis Att.*, Diss. Gött. 1894, agrees with Wilamowitz (*Index Lect.* Gött., 1893), in attributing the *Persa* to a fourth century original. Holm, however, will not concede even this (*Berl. phil. Woch.* 1894, 1253). Almost all of the Plautine pieces whose originals can be dated come from the first quarter of the third century. Apart from Aul. Gel. 2, 23, there is no evidence of the use of models from the middle comedy.

the third century give some comic choreutae in each list.²² Roman comedy, like Roman tragedy, followed the contemporary Greek usage even in using models of an earlier period. The chorus in the new comedy, however, as far as it existed at all, was only a shadow of the earlier comic chorus. On the other hand the last extant play of Aristophanes has a chorus that is materially curtailed. What was the history of the chorus during this interval of 100 years? It is the general belief that the marked decline noticed in the second *Plutus*, produced in 388, probably the next year after the *Ecclesiazusae*, whose chorus is still vigorous, was followed abruptly by a practically chorusless comedy. The chorus was the heart and soul of the old comedy. Its abolition involved the entire reconstruction on experimental lines of this branch of the drama. So great a change, if it occurred suddenly, must have been produced by the pressure of external influences. If no such influences can be found, and no authentic record of the sudden change, then we must believe that the history of the middle comedy was a history of gradual development as regards both form and matter. The question therefore limits itself to this—have we sufficient evidence for the prevalent belief that the comic chorus, as we know it from the old comedy, was abolished early in the fourth century?

Our principal sources for the history of the later Attic comedy, apart from the scanty notices in Aristotle, are the treatises of the grammarians which are prefixed to the scholia of Aristophanes. Most of them are wretched compilations, but they go back to earlier authorities, whom we can trust if only we can glean their statements from the mass of rubbish in which they are buried. Many contributions have already been made toward this result. Of these the instructive dissertation of Fielitz, *de Atticorum comoedia bipartita*, Bonn, 1866, must receive especial attention here. His main contention is that before the time of Hadrian the threefold division of Attic comedy was unknown; that the Alexandrine grammarians recognized only two, the old and the new. Thus many contradictions in the ancient notices find an easy explana-

²² Dated by DITTENBERGER after 229 B. C. MÜLLER, *B.-A.* 433, thinks that the chorus simply filled the pauses in the play—an inference that is by no means necessary.

tion. Kaibel (*Hermes*, 24 (1889), 56 ff.) has shown that Fielitz left out of account the certain existence of a tradition which the post-Hadrianic writers took up. Two canons long existed side by side, that of the Alexandrines recognizing the threefold division, and that of the Pergamene school the twofold. Our notices are generally a mixture of the two. Fielitz tried further to prove that, in the twofold division, what was afterward called the middle comedy was classed with the new. So far as I know this claim has received general acceptance. The argument rests essentially on the assumption that the middle comedy resembled the new more than the old. I believe that it can be shown that the contrary is the case, especially as regards the chorus, whose absence from the middle comedy Fielitz takes for granted.

Aristotle had noticed that a change had taken place in comedy. Poetry, he says in the *Poetics* (1451 B, 7 ff.), differs from History in that it confines itself to τὰ καθόλου, whereas the latter deals with τὰ καθ' ἑκάστων· ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς κωμωδίας ἤδη τοῦτο δῆλον γέγονεν· συστήσαντες γὰρ τὸν μῦθον διὰ τῶν εἰκότων, οὕτω τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα ὑποτιθέασιν, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ἰαμβοποιοὶ περὶ τὸν καθ' ἑκάστων ποιούσιν. The ἰαμβοποιοί are especially the old comic poets. In 1449 B, 8, Crates is said to have been the first to give up τὴν ἰαμβικὴν ἰδέαν in comedy. In *Eth. Nic.* 4, 14, 1128 A, 22, he makes the point clearer: ἴδοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμωδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦν γελοῖον ἢ αἰσχρολογία, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπόνοια. From these passages we learn that the comic poets of his day abused people in a general way and not by name, and that they had substituted suggestive allusions for downright obscenity, and that the change begins with Crates, that is, just before Aristophanes. That Aristotle is speaking of the general tendencies that characterized the early and the recent comedy is abundantly shown by the plays of Aristophanes and the fragments of his successors. It is to be noticed that he uses the general terms παλαιά and καινή, whereas the grammarians generally use the more specific ἀρχαία and νέα to distinguish the definite periods. Aristotle has no intention of marking out specific periods in the history of comedy. It was still too early for that. But the broad distinctions that he draws between "the former and the recent comedies" became the starting point for the early

grammarians, who received their impulse and their methods largely from him. Almost every succeeding writer accepted as the principal criterion for the various periods the extent and the quality of the *σκόμματα* employed. In the last passage quoted the division into two periods lies on the surface: (1) the period of open abuse, roughly the fifth century, (2) the period of mitigated license, the fourth century down to the time of writing. Taking strictly into account the reference to Crates, we could make three periods: (1) the period before Crates, (2) that of Aristophanes, (3) from Aristophanes to Aristotle—for we know that *αἰσχρολογία* characterizes Aristophanes much better than *ὑπόνοια*. Aristotle doubtless did not intend, however, that the *καινή* should begin with Crates. He mentions him incidentally, very much as he mentions Agathon in the *Poetics*, as the precursor of the change that afterward prevailed. I cannot agree, therefore, with Wilamowitz (*Herakles* I, p. 134, note) when he says that the comedy afterwards designated as *μέση* (the *καινή* of Aristotle) was originally intended as a division according to content and not according to time (*begrifflich*, not *zeitlich*). The fact that Plato is the regular representative in the ancient accounts of the *μέση*, though he was a contemporary of Aristophanes, upon which Wilamowitz's assertion seems to rest, will be explained later on. Certainly we do not find in him that mildness which Aristotle ascribes to the middle comedy. To go back to Aristotle, one fact deserves especial emphasis. He says not a word about the chorus.

After the development of the new comedy of Philemon and Menander it was possible to make either a broad division of Attic comedy into two periods on the basis of the presence or absence of the chorus and other characteristics equally marked, or to extend Aristotle's twofold division, on the basis of the *σκόμματα* employed, designating his *καινή* as middle, or lastly to make a still more subtle division suggested by the reference to Crates. Naturally considerations of language, metre, myth, etc., would also be taken into account. The first, the twofold division, which Kaibel attributes to the Pergamene school, appears in several ancient accounts; the second, which modern scholars have adopted, seems to have found very little favor in ancient times, whereas the third, which seems the least acceptable of all, is

found in a large majority of the writers *περὶ κωμῳδίας*. It will be necessary to examine these various traditions to ascertain whether or not Fielitz's position is tenable.

The anonymous writer *περὶ κωμῳδίας* v (Dübner and Bergk), whose account is the most straightforward of all, recognizes the three divisions, *τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, τὸ δὲ νέον, τὸ δὲ μέσον*. In the analysis of the differences between them, however, he apparently leaves *τὸ μέσον* out of account. Hence editors have bracketed these words as an interpolation. But Kaibel (*l. c.*, p. 63) believes that the whole account is a careless Byzantine contamination, undeserving of correction, adding that *τὸ μέσον*, if due to an interpolation, would have been put in its proper position between the two others. I agree with Kaibel that the words belong where they are, but for a very different reason, which has been strangely overlooked. The account proceeds: *τῆς δὲ νέας διαφέρει ἡ παλαιὰ κωμῳδία χρόνῳ, διαλέκτῳ, ὕλῃ, μέτρῳ, διασκευῇ. Χρόνῳ μὲν καθὼς ἡ μὲν νέα ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἡ δὲ παλαιὰ ἐπὶ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν εἶχε τὴν ἀκμὴν. ----- διασκευῇ δὲ, ὅτι ἐν μὲν τῇ νέᾳ χοροῦ οὐκ ἔδει, ἐν ἐκείνῃ δὲ δεῖ. 2. καὶ αὐτῇ δὲ ἡ παλαιὰ ἐαυτῆς διαφέρει. καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐν Ἀττικῇ πρῶτον συστησάμενοι τὸ ἐπιτηδεύμα τῆς κωμῳδίας (ἦσαν δὲ οἱ περὶ Σουσαρίωνα) καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα εἰσήγον ἀτάκτως, καὶ μόνος ἦν γέλωσ τὸ κατασκευαζόμενον. 3. ἐπιγεγόμενος δὲ ὁ Κρατῖνος κατέστησε μὲν πρῶτον τὰ ἐν τῇ κωμῳδίᾳ πρόσωπα μεχρὶ τριῶν, στήσας τὴν ἀταξίαν, καὶ τῆ χαριέντι τῆς κωμῳδίας τὸ ὠφέλιμον προσέθηκε, τοὺς κακῶς πράττουσας διαβάλλων ----. 4. ἀλλ' ἔτι μὲν καὶ οὗτος τῆς ἀρχαιότητος μετεῖχε καὶ ἡρέμα πῶς τῆς ἀταξίας. ὁ μέντοι γε Ἀριστοφάνης μεθοδεύσας τεχνικώτερον ---- καὶ οὕτω πᾶσαν κωμῳδίαν ἐμελέτησε. καὶ γὰρ τὸ τούτου δρᾶμα Πλούτος νεωτερίζει κατὰ τὸ πλάσμα. τὴν τε γὰρ ὑπόθεσιν οὐκ ἀληθῆ ἔχει καὶ χορῶν ἐστέρηται, ὅπερ τῆς νεωτέρας ὑπῆρχε κωμῳδίας.* To my mind it is perfectly clear that the author adheres to the three divisions throughout. At first he draws the broad, general distinction between the *παλαιά* and the *νέα*, then the finer distinction between the two kinds of *παλαιά*. *τὸ ἀρχαῖον* is represented by Susarion, and is characterized by crude technique. The next is the period of perfected technique, represented by Aristophanes. Cratinus falls between the two. The whole ancient comedy reached its highest point at the time of the

Peloponnesian war. Aristophanes was not only the best poet of his own period, but of his age as well. Then comes a different *kind*, well distinguished from the preceding, but already foreshadowed in the later plays of Aristophanes—τὸ νέον. The strict use of ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός places it beyond doubt that τὸ μέσον was intended to designate the second period of the first division. The account is perfectly logical, for the lack of a chorus in the new comedy differentiated it distinctly from both the others, whereas the difference in the first two periods was one of species, not of genus. The division may be represented by the scheme I παλαιά, (a) ἀρχαία (b) μέση, II νέα.

From the fact that the acme of the new comedy is placed ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου Fielitz argues that the comedy of the fourth century was classed with the new, because Philemon alone of those whom we assign to the new comedy had yet produced plays "*Alexandro regnante*." But the very fact that Menander, τὸ ἄστρον τῆς νέας κωμωδίας, flourished after Alexander's death shows that the phrase is used, not unsuitably, as a designation of the Alexandrine period. According to this writer the μέση continued until the loss of the chorus.

The same account occurs again, incorporated bodily in the longer notice in Cramer's *Anecdota* I, 3, (Dübner ix a, 68, Bergk VIII, 14). Very similar is the notice of Diomedes (Suet. *ed. Reifferscheid*, p. 9): *Poetae primi comici fuerunt Susarion Mullus Magnes; hi ueteris disciplinae iocularia quaedam minus scite ac venuste pronuntiabant Secunda aetate fuerunt Aristophanes Eupolis et Cratinus, qui uel principum vitia sectati acerbissimas comoedias composuerunt. Tertia aetas fuit Menandri Diphili et Philemonis, qui omnem acerbiter comediae mitigauerunt atque argumenta multipliciter graecis erroribus secuti sunt.* Diomedes does not mention the chorus elsewhere. He implies that Attic comedy always had a chorus. It will be noticed that in addition to the technique (cf. *μηῖος scite* and *ἀτάκτως*) he takes up again the criterion of abusiveness. This is entirely the basis of Anon. ix a, l. 150 ff. (Dübner; VIII, 24 Bergk), who makes three classes *πρώτη, δευτέρα, τρίτη*, (1) *σκώμματα φανερά*, down to Eupolis, (2) *τὰ συμβολικὰ σκώμματα*, Eupolis, Cratinus, Pherecrates, Plato, and Aristophanes, and (3) *σκώμματα εἰς δούλους μόνους καὶ ξένους*, Menander and Philemon. Here, also, the chorus is left out of consideration.

So far no serious objection can be made to the threefold division of comedy, except as to the ignorant misapplication of Aristotle's suggestion about *σκώμματα*, which puts Aristophanes and his contemporaries among the milder poets. But another class of writers, following largely the same principle, fall into still greater error. As an example may be cited Anon. IX a, 1-53 (Dübner; VIII, 1-10 Bergk)—a miserable compilation, full of glaring contradictions and mistakes. The hand of the compiler or of a still later interpolator is detected everywhere.³⁰ The first part is a consistent though not very intelligent account of comedy, with special reference to the element of personal travesty. The definitions and divisions correspond to those just quoted from l. 150 ff. of the same extract. But the compiler adds: *γέγονε δὲ τῆς μὲν πρώτης κωμωδίας ἄριστος τεχνίτης οὗτος τε ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Εὐπολις καὶ Κρατίνος· τῆς δὲ δευτέρας Πλάτων, οὐχ ὁ φιλόσοφος· τῆς δὲ νέας Μένανδρος*. The same divisions and the same poets are found in the short account of Andronicus and in the verses of Jo. Tzetzes *περὶ διαφοράς ποιητῶν*. It would seem that in their sources these writers found lists of poets made out on some principle of division, as well as divisions into period of comic literature, drawn up on other principles, and ignorantly tried to combine them.³¹ But none of these writers was quite so stupid as Euanthius, who gives as the three divisions *vetus, satyra, nova*. These writers also omit to mention the chorus in this connection.

I shall mention next those writers who seem to recognize only two divisions of comedy, old and new.³² Anon. VIII (Dübner)

³⁰ IX a contains almost all the other accounts. The passage under consideration is found also in Anon. IV and IX b (IX Bergk).

³¹ This supposition would account for the fact that Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes, the representatives of unbridled license in writers who recognize the twofold division (*e. g.*, *Hor. Sat.* 1. 4, 1 ff.), are sometimes given as representatives of the *σκώμματα συμβολικά*, more satisfactorily, I think, than the explanation proposed by Hendrickson in *Am. Jour. Phil.*, 1894, p. 30, note. Such lists of poets are found in DÜBNER, III and VIII. Aristotle in *Poetics* 1449 B, 8, seemed to favor such a classification. On p. 15 the same writer suggests that the confusion in Euanthius' account arose from an attempt to harmonize the common threefold division with a twofold in which *satura* was equivalent to *ἀρχαία*. This seems very probable. Of course "*satyra*" refers to the *second* division of the *ἀρχαία*, which would more correctly be called *μέση* or *δευτέρα*.

³² Omitting the passing allusions of various Roman writers, collected by Fielitz, and of Plutarch.

seems to belong to this class, for under the heading τῶν τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας ποιητῶν ὀνόματα καὶ δράματα he mentions Theopompus, Strattis, Pherecrates, Crates, Plato, Teleclides, and Phrynichus, that is, an indiscriminate list of poets of the fifth and fourth centuries. The article *de comoedia et tragoedia*, published by Usener (*Rh. Mus.* 28, 417 ff.) distinguishes between the *prior ac vetus comoedia ridicularis*, whose author was Susarion, and the later comedy, represented by Plautus and Terence among the Romans, the writers of which, *omissa maledicendi libertate, privatorum hominum vitam cum hilaritate imitabantur*. So far no mention of the chorus. Tzetzes, in his verses *περὶ κωμῳδίας* v. 68 ff., mentions only the *παλαιά* and the *νέα*, the former having the chorus, the latter not. The context does not show how far the first division extends. This is true, also, of Horace's *chorus turpiter obticuit*, which will be considered later. The two *Vitae* of Aristophanes state that Aristophanes *πρῶτος καὶ τῆς νέας κωμῳδίας τὸν τρόπον ἐπέδειξεν ἐν τῷ Κωκάλῳ, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβόμενοι Μέανδρος τε καὶ Φιλίμων ἐδραματούργησαν*. If the writer meant that the new comedy began with the later plays of Aristophanes, which is by no means a necessary inference, we shall see later that he was in the wrong. The same holds true, so far as the chorus is concerned, of Platonius who dates the chorusless middle comedy from the same period. Anon. III makes the same threefold division that prevails to-day, but says nothing of the chorus.

Two significant facts as regards these notices should be emphasized. Firstly, the poets who are assigned to the middle comedy, (omitting Anon. III, who mentions Antiphanes and Stephanus) are Eupolis, Cratinus, Pherecrates, *etc.*, Plato always, and generally Aristophanes, but never Antiphanes, Alexis and others who belong to what we know as the middle comedy.³³ On the other hand, there is no confusion between the representatives of the comedy of the fourth and of the third centuries. Now, however faulty these classifications are, if the comedy of the fourth century had been recognized as forming a

³³ I refer, of course, only to those accounts which I have quoted above. Suidas, Pollux, Athenaeus, the scholiasts, *etc.*, often mention the poets of the fourth century as belonging to the middle comedy. But these passages are not taken into consideration here because they give no information on the question at issue.

distinct epoch, the poets of this period would not have failed to receive mention. The question arises, therefore, whether this period was considered as belonging to that of Plato or to that of Menander. Since the criterion of *κωμῳδεῖν αἰνιγματωδῶς* or *καθόλου* undoubtedly was first employed to distinguish the post-Aristophanic comedy from that which preceded it, we can most readily explain the fact that Aristophanes and Plato are often assigned to the second period, and that Menander and Philemon never are (Apul. *Florid.*, 3, 16 is a palpable error), by the supposition that the grammarians from whom these notices sprung had no clear idea of any distinction between the fourth century comedy and that of Aristophanes. We certainly cannot concede the claim made by Fielitz that the new comedy was considered to embrace the middle by the grammarians of the twofold division, because a few times, in Suidas and in passing allusions of late Roman writers, a poet of the new is assigned to the middle. The second significant fact will make my point clearer. Amidst all the confusion that pervades these notices, the lack of a chorus is constantly kept as a distinct characteristic of the new comedy, and in Anon. v, where the old and the middle are combined under the common head *παλαιά*, it is expressly stated that the *παλαιά* (not the *ἀρχαία*) required the chorus. Perhaps some significance should be attached to this fact also, that in many of the notices the chorus is not mentioned at all. Diomedes (Suet. *ed. Reif.*, p. 11) certainly thought that Attic comedy always had a chorus. After various remarks about the chorus in general, he adds: *Latinae igitur comoediae chorum non habent*. Perhaps the chorus had not disappeared even from the new comedy so far as is generally believed.

Fielitz further remarks that the characteristics of middle comedy, as laid down by Anon. III, are really those of new comedy. He therefore proposes to cut out the references to the former as interpolations. But, as Kaibel has shown (*l. c.* p. 63), none of the characteristics assigned to middle comedy belong to it exclusively, whether it be the nature of the myths employed, the language, the metres, or the general spirit. The predominant traits of one period are found in the other two also, more or less modified. The designation of the comedy of the fourth century as the middle

comedy is convenient as marking the transition period, even if it is not in accordance with some of the grammarians. To class this period with the new, as Fielitz demands, would be to ignore one difference that is more marked than any other—the existence of the chorus in the fourth century and its absence in the third. We should be nearer the truth if we should class it with the old.

This brings us to the causes assigned for the abolition of the chorus. They are two in number: (1) the restriction of personal satire (a) by legal measures, (b) by intimidation of the poets, and (2) the withdrawal of choregic support.

It is hard to see how the restriction of the privilege of lampooning important personages, *ὀνομαστί* or *συμβολικῶς*, whether produced by law or by threats of vengeance, should have had anything to do with the abandonment of the chorus. And yet this is the teaching of many ancient authorities, and not a few modern. Horace heads the list with the verses (*Ep.* 2, 3, 281):

*successit uetus his comoedia, non sine multa
laude; sed in uitium libertas excidit et uim
dignam lege regi; lex est accepta chorusque
turpiter obticuit sublato iure nocendi.*

A poet may be excused an occasional *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. But in this case Horace has misled others on a point of history. The *Vita Aristophanis* refers to a *ψήφισμα χορηγικὸν μὴ ὀνομαστικῶς κωμωδεῖν*, which took away τὸ αἴτιον κωμωδίας, τὸ σκόπτειν, resulting in the chorusless *Cocalus* and *Plutus*. But it also mentions the default of the choregi, which is more likely to have caused the curtailment of the chorus in these plays. Euanthius also knew of a law in Athens *ne quisquam in alterum carmen infame proponeret*, but the result was that the poets, not the chorus, “became silent”—which is logical if not true. Perhaps Euanthius here as often confounded things Roman with Greek, having in mind the Roman law (*Cic. Resp.* 4, 10, 12). The scholia to Aristophanes furnish us with a fragmentary history of the legislation against scurrility.³⁴ A law was passed under Morychides

³⁴ For a full collection of such notices, of which the above are the most important, see HAUPT, *de lege quam ad poetas comicos pertinuisse ferunt*, p. 36 ff. Haupt shows that license did not cease until Alexander, and then not wholly. I follow Bergk, *Kl. Sch.* II, 444 ff.; cf. MEINEKE, *C. G. F.* I, 34 ff. Lübke's work on the subject has not been accessible to me.

440/39) and remained in force three years (Schol. *Ach.* 67). Its author may have been the Antimachus whom Aristophanes taunts in *Ach.* 1149 (Schol. *ad loc.*) Pseudo-Xen. *Resp. Ath.* 2, 18 probably refers to public opinion rather than to legislation. A certain Syracosius is said to have introduced a measure against the poets (Schol. *Av.* 1297). Droysen (*Rh. Mus.* 4, 59) conjectures with probability that this was intended only to prevent reference to the unfortunate affair of the Hermae and the mysteries. Anon. *περὶ κωμ.* IX a (Bergk VIII) evidently had this law in mind, but he wrongly assigns its authorship to Alcibiades.

After the fall of the Democracy, says Platonius, *ἐνέπιπτε τοῖς ποιηταῖς φόβος· οὐ γὰρ ἦν τιμὰ προφανῶς σκώπτειν, δίκας ἀπαιτούντων τῶν ὑβριζομένων.* Then he tells how Eupolis was drowned by those against whom he composed the *Baptae*. The Eupolis story occurs again and again, with interesting variations (Mein. I, 119 ff.), but it remained for Kanngiesser³⁵ to elaborate this and similar stories into a touching chapter on the ill-treatment of the old comic poets. Now there is no doubt that the poets were persecuted in the courts by the objects of their satire (Bergk. *l. c.* p. 456), but the only known result in the best authenticated case, the attacks of Cleon on Aristophanes, was not the silencing of the poet, but a fresh attack in the *Knights*.

This is the extent of our positive knowledge of legislation against the liberty of the poets and of the attempts to intimidate them. We may judge of the effects in the plays of Aristophanes. Bergk thought that he detected a comparative mildness of tone in the plays produced about the time of the Four Hundred and of the Thirty. But comedy quickly assumed again its old freedom as soon as circumstances allowed. It is impossible to believe that, either in the fifth century or in the fourth, when a milder spirit prevailed, the existence of the chorus was dependent on the license to abuse.³⁶ The old authorities themselves furnish us with a good excuse for incredulity. It is a curious fact that those

³⁵ *Alt-komische Bühne zu Athen*, p. 124.

³⁶ See *Croiset, Hist. Litt. Grec.* III, p. 583. I think with Leo (*Quaest. Aristoph.*, Bonn, 1873, p. 11 ff.) that the whole story of the restraint of license by law had its origin in an imaginative interpretation by the grammarians of certain passages in the comedies themselves, and that such laws as were actually enacted were for the protection of the higher state officials.

who attribute the disappearance of lampooning to law also record that at first the poets were compelled by law *ὀνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν* as a means of checking lawlessness in high places.³⁷

The second reason assigned for the abolition of the chorus must receive more respectful consideration, inasmuch as it has until now remained undisputed. The anonymous writers *περὶ κωμωδίας* have nothing to say about this point. But Platonius, after the reference to the Eupolis episode, adds: *καὶ ἐπέλιπον οἱ χορηγοί· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι προθυμίαν εἶχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς χορηγοὺς τοὺς τὰς δαπάνας τοῖς χορευταῖς παρέχοντας χειροτουεῖν. 8. τὸν γοῦν Αἰολοσίκωνα Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδαξεν, ὃς οὐκ ἔχει τὰ χορικὰ μέλη. τῶν γὰρ χορηγῶν μὴ χειροτουημένων καὶ τῶν χορευτῶν οὐκ ἐχόντων τὰς τροφὰς ὑπεξηρέθη τῆς κωμωδίας τὰ χορευτῶν μέλη καὶ τῶν ὑποθέσεων ὁ τρόπος μετεβλήθη. 9. σκόπου γὰρ ὄντος τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ κωμωδίᾳ τοῦ σκώπτειν δήμου καὶ δικαστὰς καὶ στρατηγούς, παρὲς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ συνήθως ἀποσκῶψαι διὰ τὸν πολὺν φόβον Αἴολον τὸ δράμα τὸ γραφὲν τοῖς τραγῳδοῖς ὡς κακῶς ἔχον διασύρει. 10. τοιοῦτος οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας τύπος, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ Αἰολοσίκων Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ οἱ Ὀδυσσεῖς Κρατίνου καὶ πλείστα τῶν παλαιῶν δραμάτων οὔτε χορικὰ οὔτε παραβάσεις ἔχοντα. Then in § 14: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἔχοντα παραβάσεις κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἐδιδάχθη καθ' ὃν ὁ δῆμος ἐκράτει, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας λοιπὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου μεθισταμένης καὶ τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας κρατούσης. Then follows §§ 7–8 again, again the admission that other such plays as the *Ὀδυσσεῖς* are to be found in the old comedy, but under the oligarchy, and again the notice of the failure of the choregia. To this should be added § 10 and the interpolated § 11 of the *Vita*, which says that the *Cocalus* and *Plutus* were brought out under similar circumstances. In both these accounts are elements that arouse suspicion, especially the insistence on the fear of the poets and the “choregic law” against scurrility as helping to bring about the change. Platonius was an extremely careless compiler, as is shown by the repetitions.³⁸ He is strangely ignorant of the nature of the early choregia, supposing that the choregi were elected by the*

³⁷ Anon. IV, IX a, IX b, Thom. Mag. (Düb. xv), Cic. *Resp.* 4. 10, 11, THEMISTIUS *Or.* 8, 110 B.

³⁸ FIELTIZ, *l. c.*, p. 28. Leo, *Quaest. Aristoph.*, shows in detail that the whole article is a curious hodgepodge of several parallel accounts.

people, and that the choreutae could be selected without choregi. But this is probably blind inference from the reported failure of choral odes in the plays mentioned. Platonius himself practically admits this by prefacing his citation of the *Aiolosicon* by "at any rate" (*γούν*). The statement that the parabasis was lacking in the middle comedy and sometimes in the old is doubtless correct, but the explanation that it occurred in the latter only under the oligarchy is false. Cratinus died about 420, and the three plays cited of Aristophanes were brought out in the second decade of the next century, as was also the *Ecclesiazusae*, which has no parabasis. We are told that the plays mentioned had *οὔτε χορικά οὔτε παραβάσεις*. The lack of a parabasis seems to have been the only ground for this sweeping statement. The *Ὀδυσσεύς* certainly had a chorus, as we know from the fragments. See Kock, C. G. F., I, 43 and 44, Meineke, fr. v, and Bergk, *Commentt. de reliq. comoed. att.*, p. 160 ff. Kaibel, *Hermes* 30, p. 25, makes it exceedingly probable that it had also a second chorus and a parabasis as well. The *Αἰολοσίκων* had a chorus of women (Kock, *ibid.* I, comment on fr. 10, and Meineke II, fr. x, XI, XII). The *Κωκάλος* probably had at least as important a chorus as the *Πλούτος* (Meineke II, fr. VI). Thus Platonius is refuted by his own examples. The occasional omission of the parabasis in the old comedy is significant as showing that its entire abandonment in the middle comedy was due to purely natural causes. Comedy had outgrown it, along with certain other crudities and exuberances. Perhaps the cost of the choregia was thereby lessened somewhat, though we cannot consider this the real cause of the change. The loss of the parabasis involved no serious change in the structure of comedy, as we see from the *Lysistrata*. The omission of the choral odes was a more serious matter, which could have been caused only by the collapse of the choregia. Now it happens that we have a few ancient notices to this effect.

A scholiast to Arist. *Ran.* 404 gives this important information: *ἐπὶ γούν τοῦ Καλλίου τούτου*³⁹ *φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι σύνδυο ἔδοξε χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια τοῖς τραγωδοῖς καὶ κωμικοῖς*. This is verified by an inscription of the early part of the fourth century (C. I. A. II, 280), which may refer to either tragedy or comedy, by another, dating not long after Euclid's archonship, record-

³⁹ Probably the archon of 406/5, possibly, however, of 412/11.

ing the joint choregia of two residents of Eleusis at both tragic and comic contests (Philios, *Ath. Mitth.*, 1894, p. 20), and by a third from the middle of this century relating to comedy alone (Köhler, *Ath. Mitth.* 7, 348). The next part of the same scholium rests on the commentator's own authority: ὥστε ἴσως ἦν τις καὶ περὶ τὸν Ληναϊκὸν ἀγῶνα συστολή, χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον οὐ πολλῶ τιμὴ καὶ καθάπαξ περιείλε Κινησίας τὰς χορηγίας· ἐξ οὗ Στράτις ἐν τῷ εἰς αὐτὸν δράματι ἔφη σκηνὴ μὲν τοῦ χοροκτόνου Κινησίου. In the first place the scholiast misunderstands the purpose of the new arrangement mentioned by Aristotle. That two choregi were to take the place of one in providing for a chorus indicates a desire not to stint the chorodidascalus (συστολή) but to provide for him as usual, at the same time making the burden upon each individual choregus lighter. The next statement is false, for we know that both tragic and comic choregiae continued long after Callias. Schol. *Ran.* 153, however, also accuses this same Cinesias of an attempt against the choregia: ὁ Κινησίας ἐπραγματεύσατο κατὰ τῶν κωμικῶν ὡς εἶεν ἀχορηγήτοι. On the strength of this and the notices of Platonius and the Vita above quoted, even so careful a scholar as A. Müller (B-A., p. 342) concludes that the comic choregia was abolished after the Peloponnesian War.⁴⁰ It seems to me, however, that the whole tradition as regards Cinesias admits of a probable explanation. Cinesias, the dithyrambic poet, was not only repulsive in appearance, vile in his personal habits, and impious, if we may believe the poet Plato, Aristophanes, Anaxilas, and Lysias, but also a very poor poet. Aristophanes constantly ridicules his verses, and Plato, *Gorg.* 501 E, condemns them. Plutarch *de mus.* 30, 1141 E, after explaining some changes that had taken place in musical accompaniments, quotes from the *Chiron* of Pherecrates a complaint of Poetry about certain poets who had introduced disastrous innovations. The following is the reference to Cinesias (Mein. C. G. F. II, p. 327):

Κινησίας δὲ ὁ κατάρατος Ἀττικὸς,
 ἐξαρμοσίους καμπὰς ποιῶν ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς,
 ἀπολώλεκε μ' οὕτως, ὥστε τῆς ποιήσεως
 τῶν διθυράμβων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν,
 ἀριστέρ' αὐτοῦ φαίνεται τὰ δεξιά.

⁴⁰So BRINCK, *Insc. Graec. ad choregiam pertin.*, Halle, 1888, p. 94.

At the end of the paragraph Plutarch adds: ἄλλοι δὲ κωμφοδοποιοὶ ἔδειξαν τὴν ἀτοπίαν τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν μουσικὴν κατακερματικῶς. Cinesias then, in the opinion of Pherecrates and Plutarch, cut to pieces and killed dithyrambic poetry. Since the chorus was itself the dithyramb, Strattis goes no further than they when he applies to him the epithet χοροκτόνος. This suggested to the ancient commentator, who knew the hatred of Cinesias for his persecutors, the explanation καθάπαξ περιέλε τὰς χορηγίας. This, I believe, is the history of the whole tradition.

But we do not lack positive evidence of considerable importance for the existence of comic chorus after the time of its reported abolition. Besides the references to it in Aristotle *Pol.* 3, 3, 1276 B, 5, *Eth. Nic.* 4, 6, 1123 A, 22, the last paragraph of the extract *περὶ κωμωδίας* recovered from the wreck of the second part of the *Poetics* by Bernays,⁴¹ and Theophrastus, *Charac.* VI, the newly found 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία gives the authoritative notice (§ 56): πρότερον δὲ καὶ κωμωδοῖς καθίστη (ὁ ἄρχων) πέντε, νῦν δὲ τούτους αἱ φυλαὶ φέρουσιν. As late as 325 B. C., therefore, the comic choregia was regularly provided for. The first intimation of the decline of the chorus is given in the fragment of Menander beginning ὥσπερ τῶν χορῶν οὐ πάντες ἄδουσι (Meineke IV, 117). But this may refer to the dithyrambic chorus. The only choregic inscription from Athens after this period which mentions a comic contest, (CIA II, 1289, Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, p. 417—307/6 B. C.) does not give evidence one way or another on the chorus.⁴² But the fact that outside of Athens⁴³ the comic choregia lingered a long time still

⁴¹ *Ergänzung zu Aristotles Poetik, Rh. Mus.* 8, 561 ff., reprinted in *Zwei Abhandlungen über die aristotelischen Theorie des Drama*. See Vahlen's and Christ's editions of the *Poetics*.

⁴² KÖHLER in *Ath. Mitth.* 3, 287 judged from the fact that the poet and actor, not the tribe and didascalus, are mentioned in this inscription, that both tragedies and comedies were given without choruses. BRINK, *Insc. Graec. ad choregiam pertin.*, pp. 90, 99, has shown the falsity of this assumption.

⁴³ AESCH. *Tim.* 157. At Delos both comic and tragic choregiae are recorded down to the end of the III cent.; *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 7, 122 ff. Choruses of citizens were provided at Iasos in the II cent. (Le Bas, *As. Min.* 281; Lüders, *Dion. Künstler* p. 181). Cf. the χορὸς πολιτικός in the late Thespian insc. CIG, 1586. In the inscriptions from Samos and Teos of the II cent. (CIG, 3091; BRINK, p. 211, 212; CIG, 3089) the comic choregia is mentioned. Seven comic choreutae are given for each festival in the Soteric inscription from Delphi from the last part of the III cent. Cf. LÜDERS, p. 187 ff.; WESCHER and FOUCART, *Insc. de Delphes* I, nos. 3-6; DITTENBERGER, p. 404. As to the function of the chorus at these later festivals nothing positive is known.

makes it advisable to adopt a conservative position on the question, and to believe that in Athens the comic chorus was retained for some time, in some form, after the beginning of the third century. This belief finds confirmation in the extant fragments, as we shall see later on.

The existence of the chorus in the middle comedy can therefore be no longer called in question. But it may be said that it was not the same kind of a chorus as that in the old comedy. Here, also, we should not go further than the known facts warrant.

Even in the fifth century the choregi were sometimes inclined to be parsimonious. That this tendency would seriously affect comedy itself, and not simply hamper the didascalus in his training of the chorus, cannot be inferred from Arist. *Ach.* 1155, where the choregus is attacked for not having furnished a dinner after the performance, nor from Eupolis *fab. inc.* VII (Mein. II, 551), where the choregus is called "dirty," and still less from Arist. *Ran.* 404 (see schol.) On the other hand, it is rendered improbable by the fact that the Archon was expressly empowered to prevent any remissness on the part of the choregi (Xen. *Hieron* 9, 4). Still it is quite conceivable that in times of great financial distress the Archon and the poets would have allowed considerable curtailment of expenses. To some such circumstance we may ascribe the cutting down of the choral parts of the four plays mentioned in the ancient notices.

The arrangement made under Callias was certainly an attempt to sustain the chorus in its former prominence in comedy and in tragedy. This arrangement lasted until after 350. This must have reduced the burden of the comic choregi to a comparatively small amount. There is no reason to suppose that citizens became less willing than before to provide the necessary money. The orators abound in references to the liberality of the choregi. It is true that the tribes sometimes neglected to appoint choregi for the cyclic choruses (Dem. *Mid.* 13). But the case was quite different in comedy, for which it was the Archon's duty to appoint the choregi. Early in the fourth century the number of comedies for each festival was increased to five. This was due not only to the lessened expense of the choregia, but also to the

increasing popularity of comedy.⁴⁴ When the still further change was made—the transfer of the appointing power from the Archon to the tribes—is not known. But it must have been between the date of the latest synchoregic inscription (after 350) and the date of composition of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (ca. 325).⁴⁵ From this time on neglect on the part of the tribes or illiberality on the part of the choregi might often result in serious curtailment of the duties of the chorus. There was no longer the control of the Archon, but only the spirit of rivalry between the tribes, to maintain the chorus in its former splendor. Finally Demetrius of Phaleron entirely reorganized the choregia, probably in 307, making the Demos the nominal choregus for all contests, and laying upon the Agonethet a large part, at any rate, of the expense of the festival. This would encourage still more the tendency to cut down the expenses of the chorus, and explains the occasional omission of the dramatic contests which the inscriptions begin to record soon afterwards. The history of the choregia, therefore, would lead us to believe that the comic chorus was generally well sustained until after 350; that before 325 it was possibly neglected, and that after 307 it was probably rapidly reduced in importance until it finally disappeared. No doubt Philemon, and Menander, who was under the influence of Aristotle's teaching, resisted the tendency as long as possible. But the ties of the chorus to comedy were gradually growing weaker. In the course of the century comedy had had time to adapt itself to the changing conditions, so that when at last the chorus was abandoned there was no sudden change in the nature of comedy itself, such as would have resulted from the loss of the chorus a century earlier.

It remains to discuss the character of the chorus of the middle comedy. We are told by Platonius and the Vita that the *Plutus* is a representative of the second period. But the diminution in the importance of its chorus may have been due to peculiar

⁴⁴ HAIGH, *Att. Theat.* p. 31, says that it was due to "the disappearance of the chorus from comedy." But the first known occurrence of the new arrangement was at the performance of the *Plutus*, which itself has a not inconsiderable chorus.

⁴⁵ There is no reason for thinking with Wilamowitz, *Aristotle und Athen* I, 254, note, that the increase to five and the tribal choregia were parts of the same change.

circumstances. Besides, the corrupt state of our manuscripts makes it impossible to determine how much more prominent the chorus was in the play as performed in 388 than it is in the present text. The *χοροῦ* of the MSS. is probably an indication of the loss of the original odes of an intermezzic character (as so many of the odes of Aristophanes), rather than the sign of an intermission.⁴⁶ But apart from this, the part still left to the chorus is exceedingly instructive for our present purpose. The choreutae mingle freely with the actors, both in the prologue and in the exodos, and take a spirited part in the conversation—an excellent illustration of the point on which I insisted in the chapter on tragedy, that a chorus whose songs are mere interludes is likely to be given a lively part in dialogue and action. Böckh, *Staatshaushalt.*, p. 493, says of the *Plutus*: “So blieb der Chor nun als handelnde und redende Person stehen.” For the stage question the “*handelnde Person*” is all-important.

The comic poets of the fourth century, even the best of them, were by no means averse to taking a model from the fifth century and adapting it to the taste of the time. But some of the most successful plays of the old comedy were so interwoven with allusions to current events and to contemporary personalities that many of the brightest hits would have been lost upon an audience a decade or two later. We can readily understand why they were not reproduced in later times. And yet the impression they made upon the generation that heard them, and the fame of their success that lingered still in the next succeeding generations, can be paralleled only by the success and influence of Euripides and Menander. As the popular demand for the masterpieces of tragedy resulted in the admission into the programme of the Dionysia of a *παλαιὰ τραγωδία* alongside of the *καιναί*, so we might

⁴⁶ So RITTER, *de Aristoph. Pluto*, Bonn, 1828, p. 11 ff. He accepts the tradition of the abolition of the choregia, but thinks that the poet or volunteers would have supplied the necessary money. His opinion on the late chorus is sound: *Talem chorum qualem in Pluto uidemus, in multis tum mediae tum nouae comoediae fabulis fuisse iudico.* Ritter is one of the few who have properly distinguished the function of the chorus in the stasima from its part in the action. *Cf. p. 24.*

The Tischendorf fragment of Menander, Kock, *C. G. F.* III, no. 530, also bears the inscription *Χοροῦ*, thus confirming the statement of the *Vita Aristoph.*, § 11, though of course the sign is due to a grammarian, and not to the poet.

reasonably expect to find in the fourth century some echo of the famous comedies of former times. But no *παλαιὰ κωμῳδία* appears in the didascalía of the fourth century, and in the third the play selected is always by a poet of the new comedy. However, on this evidence alone, is not the assertion too sweeping that no play of the old comedy was ever reproduced? Is not the only safe inference that, so far as we know, no fifth century comedies were reproduced as *παλαιαί*? In order to be presentable at all many pieces would have had to be entirely revised. Now it was the custom in Athens for a poet to produce as new, often under a new title, an old play of his own or of another which he had revised, no matter how slightly. In fact, in this way alone was he allowed to bring out an old play, in the fifth century at any rate. It often happened in the fourth century that a poet revised and reproduced under his own name a successful piece of a rival. So Alexis revised the *Ἄντεια* and *Ἀλείπτρα* of Antiphanes and the *Ὅμοία* of Antidotus, Epicrates the *Δύσπρατος* of Antiphanes, while both Alexis and Ophilio plundered Eubulus, etc., etc.⁴⁷ Sometimes the changes were trifling (*cf.* Ath. 3, 127 B: *ἐν ὀλίγοις σφόδρα*). Now such a play as the *Acharnians* would require a complete rewriting, but this is no reason why it should not have furnished the ground-plan of a new piece. The *Peace*, *Clouds*, and *Plutus* were much changed in their second editions, and yet essentially the same. The *Frogs* would have needed little editing to make it as fresh as when first reproduced. These pieces are successfully brought out on the modern stage, with all their obscure allusions. When, therefore, we find among the titles of the middle comedy many that are identical with those of the old comedy, and detect under new names the subjects and treatment of old plays, what supposition is more reasonable than that we have in them the vestiges of the old comedy, exactly as we refer a play of Plautus back to the new comedy? This is hypothesis, but it accounts for the facts better than the other hypothesis, which leaves a surprising phenomenon unexplained.

It seems to me not too daring, therefore, to suggest, for example, that the *Εἰρήνη* of Eubulus, the *Ἴππεύς* of Antiphanes, the *Πλοῦτος* of Nicostratus,⁴⁸ the *Ἀθήνναι* of Alexis and Antiphanes, bore a close

⁴⁷ MEINEKE I, 31 f.; KAIBEL in *Hermes* 24, 44.

⁴⁸ So KOCK, *C. G. F.* II, 226.

relationship to plays of Aristophanes, and that the *Κένταυρος* of Antiphanes was modelled on the *Ἄγριοι* of Pherecrates. Probably a still commoner form of borrowing was the adaptation to a new set of characters of an old conception, of which the *Ἰχθυες* of Archippus furnishes an excellent example. The *Birds* of Aristophanes undoubtedly suggested the plot and its treatment. A chorus of fishes replaces that of birds. Remarkable similarities are pointed out by Kaibel, *Hermes* 24, 49 ff. Though in point of time Archippus belonged rather to the old comedy, yet, as Meineke says (I, 205), the *Ἰχθυες* is entirely in the manner of the middle comedy. In like manner the *Νῆσοι* of Archippus was a free imitation of the *Πόλεις* of Eupolis, to which the *Πόλεις* of Alexandridis also probably owed more than its name alone. If our fragments were more extensive we should undoubtedly find confirmation for these conjectures, and many additions to the list of certain cases.

The middle comedy was much given to parodying the old tragic poets, especially Euripides. If the spirit of Aristophanes descended to his successors, they did not fail to ridicule the choruses, as well as the ethics and philosophy of their victims. That this was in fact the case is shown by the *Orestes* or the *Orestautocleides* of Timocles, a parody probably of the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus. In the one fragment still preserved (Meineke III, 608; Kock II, 462) a chorus of harlots is seen surrounding the new Orestes: *περὶ δὲ τὸν πανάθλιον εὐδουσι γρᾶες, Νάννιον, Πιλαγγών, Λύκα, κτέ.* The trial is held in the *Παράβυστον*, and the court is composed of the Eleven. The *Bacchae* of Antiphanes, probably after Euripides, would have been tame without a Bacchic chorus, and a Bacchic chorus could not easily become a mere “*umbra veteris chori.*” Lastly I may mention the lively chorus in the *Trophonius* of Alexis—a play which seems to have been in the manner of the new comedy. The Boeotians who form the chorus are expected to vindicate themselves against the charge that they are good for nothing but to eat and drink, and finally receive the command: *γυμνοῦθ' αὐτοὺς θάπτρον ἅπαντες, ut ad saltandum habiliores euadent,* as Meineke observes (III, 491). Now since Alexis was active as a poet from ca. 368 to 286, and belonged almost as much to the new comedy as to the middle, this chorus from a

play produced certainly during the last half of the fourth century should have no little weight in favor of my contention.

In view of these considerations the opinion of Bernhardt (*Grundr. d. gr. Litt.* II, 2, p. 676), that, although more than half of the poets of the old comedy lived on far into the period of the middle comedy, yet there was no organic connection between the middle and the old, seems preposterous, and the claim of Fielitz, that the middle comedy really belonged to the new, is in contradiction to both tradition and fact. As to the character of the chorus in this intermediate period, while I grant that it steadily diminished in importance, especially as regards its melic functions, and especially toward the end of the fourth century, yet I trust that I have been able to show that it exhibited external characteristics that might actually be called Aristophanic. The scanty remains do not furnish proof of this in abundance, and yet one may fairly claim at least that the chorus of the middle comedy should be taken into consideration in the discussion of the stage question.

The question of the chorus in reproductions of old tragedies does not require a separate discussion, if, as I believe, it held its place in new tragedies down to a very late period. We know that almost every one of the extant plays of Euripides were brought out at the time of Lucian and Plutarch (Welcker, *Gr. Trag.* 1313 ff., Schultze, *N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* 1887, 117 ff.). And yet they without exception demand that the chorus should be in easy and intimate connection with the actors. In the multitude of references there is only one to warrant the supposition that they were ever given without their choruses, or so changed that the chorus could have been separated from the actors by a Vitruvian stage. This exception is Dio Chrysostom 19, 487 R, who speaks of the omission of *τὰ περὶ τὰ μέλη*. But Welcker has shown (*l. c.* p. 1319) that this passage refers only to the tragic recitations at minor festivals. At such a recitation, however, it was quite as possible that the choral parts should be selected and the dialogue omitted; as when the actor Jason and his choreutae performed a part of the *Bacchae* of Euripides before the Armenian king after the death of Crassus (Plut. *Crassus* 32), and when Satyros of Samos gave at Delphi a *κιθάρισμα* from the same piece

(*Bull. Cor. Hell.*, 1894, 85, where Couve rightly draws this inference from the mention of the lyre). Our present texts afford abundant proof that actors tampered freely with passages which would cause them trouble to perform, but not a shred of evidence that it was found necessary to alter the parts of the chorus. On the other hand, a passage in the *Iphigenia at Aulis*, which is generally recognized as interpolated (*v.v.* 615 ff.), requires the intermingling of the chorus with the actors. Christ (*Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad.* 1894, p. 17) calls for proof that the *Orestes*, for example, was ever reproduced after the fourth century. But this very play furnishes the clearest example of an actor's interpolation (1366-8, schol.) which was surely made a long time after the law of Lycurgus for protecting the text of the dramatists was passed. The Roman tragedy also gives evidence that the chorus in the Greek still remained. This applies, of course, to the production of tragedies in the city theatres at important festivals. The evidence of inscriptions weighs more and more in favor of this view. One cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that in Rhodes in the first century before Christ a complete tetralogy of Sophocles, satyr-drama and all, was reproduced. Nor is there any reason for believing that this was an exceptional occurrence. Finally it should be mentioned that the late writers on music were still familiar with the choral parts of classical tragedy, evidently from the theatre (Wilamowitz, *Herakles* I, 181, note 18).

In conclusion I may summarize my argument as follows: The theory that at the end of the fourth century the actors were elevated from their former position to a stage ten to twelve feet high is untenable, because (1) the chorus in tragedy, though perhaps less correctly handled by the later poets as regards its connection with the plot, was still regularly brought into close contact with the actors down to at least the end of the Roman republic; (2) the satyr-drama with its chorus flourished still in Roman times; (3) the chorus in comedy continued into the third century, meanwhile retaining its connection with the action; (4) the intimate relation of the chorus to the action in the old tragedies of the fifth century was not changed in later reproductions. The continuance for the longest time of the external functions of the

chorus was perfectly natural. The principal cost of the old chorus was in the training for the orchestric and melic parts. The least expensive and the most practically dramatic function was the last to be given up. The erection of the low stage of Nero in the theatre at Athens was the first outward sign of the diminution of the chorus in one of its functions. From that time on it took its position on the stage as in the Roman theatre. Up to that time it had occupied the level of the orchestra with the actors.

EDWARD CAPPS.