

III. Organization

IIIA. Classical Athens

IIIAi. Festivals

IIIAia. The Great Dionysia

Greek drama was performed as part of a religious festival. The importance of the religious context must not be underestimated, but one must also beware of overestimating it. In contrast to the various paradramatic rites and pageants found in other traditional societies, Greek drama is distinguished by its secularity. Drama developed out of ritual at a time when most of Greek society underwent a transition from a dominant rural aristocratic society to a dominant urban democratic social formation, and traditional pieties began to be replaced with a civic ideology suited to the new social structure. The so-called Age of the Tyrants in Greece (7th–6th c. B.C.) was a period in which ambitious men took advantage of the new accumulation of wealth through trade and commerce to oppose the old land-based aristocracy and seize political power. In further developing their urban power-base, the “tyrants” found it convenient to eclipse many traditional rural festivals, which were largely under the control of local aristocrats (through priesthoods, maintenance or ownership of shrines, and funding of sacrifices), by relocating important cult objects to the urban centers and by introducing large urban festivals. Several tyrants took a particular interest in the worship of Dionysus. Not only did the Dionysiac cult, largely centered on wine and revelry, have an enormous popular appeal, but Dionysus, like death, was a great leveler: the forms of his worship overrode class distinctions, while his worshipers were ideally projected in myth as an undifferentiated harmonious collective. Though these festivals were still, strictly speaking, religious in nature, they gave a new secular form and slant to the traditional myths and rituals. The purpose of the new festivals was to foster and

display the power of the unified state, centered politically upon the city and ultimately upon the tyrant himself, and to promote a common cultural identity and a system of values consistent with the new political reality. The new historical conditions that gave rise to the "tyrants" eventually led to their expulsion and replacement by more democratic constitutions in Athens (510–503 B.C.) and elsewhere.

The "Great Dionysia," also called "City Dionysia," was one of the new urban festivals created by Pisistratus, who was tyrant of Athens on and off from 561 and securely from 546–527 B.C. Pisistratus superimposed his festival upon an old local festival and for the purpose appears to have brought an important cult idol of Dionysus down from the town of Eleutherai on the border with Thebes (and added a suitable myth to give the newly transformed cult the sanctity of hoary antiquity, 9). The urban festival had two sacrificial processions for the god (the "Introduction" and the "Procession"), each slightly different in character, and the doubling is perhaps a vestige of the operation that grafted the new civic and secular festival upon the old religious cult.

The original pre-Pisistratid cult no doubt resembled the many local festivals to Dionysus that survived in Attica until late antiquity and came to be known collectively as the "Rural Dionysia" to distinguish them from the urban festival (III A1b). It appears that these festivals originally consisted of a phallic procession to a cult center followed by sacrifice. The ancient sources attest to the use of the *phallos* pole and the singing of obscene songs in the rural Dionysiac procession (24, 26). A mid-6th c. Attic black-figure cup depicts a phallic procession (II 4A–B). *Semos* of Delos (II 9) describes a dramatized phallic parade from the third c. B.C. (?), which involved a ritual song, described as a "virgin dedication," a *phallos* pole, and also improvised abuse by the chorus of members of the audience. *Semos* mentions two different kinds of choruses of *phallos*-bearers, both costumed, one called *ithyphalloi* (i.e., "erect *phallos*"), who are masked, and another called *phallophoroi* (i.e., "*phallos*-bearers"), who are not. It is interesting to note that the cup in Florence shows one group of *phallos*-pole bearers with ithyphallic costume. Comparative material shows a close connection between phallic processions, ritual abuse, and obscenity and the use of masks in Greek cult, particularly Dionysiac cult. Whatever the original practice of the rural Dionysia, which may well have differed in detail from one township to the next, the procession of the later festival does appear to have employed masked participants (24, 25).

The Rural Dionysia took place in December or early January, but the City Dionysia took place in the month of Elaphebolion, roughly late March, when good weather and the beginning of the sailing season permitted national and international participation. The competitors were selected well before the start of the festival by the archon eponymous (in the classical period) or by the Agonothete (in the Hellenistic), who was in charge of the festival (17); it is perhaps a sign of the Pisistratid reorganization that the new festival was not given to the "king archon," who assumed most of the religious functions of the earlier Athenian monarchy, while the archon eponymous was the principal political office in the Athenian state. The criteria for selection remain somewhat obscure. It appears that a poet could be excluded if he made a poor showing at the previous festival (42), but factors other than quality control clearly came into play (1), and in the Hellenistic period we hear of direct political censorship (3). On the 8th Elaphebolion at the latest (4) was an event called the *Proagon* ("Before the Contest"), which took place (after ca. 440 B.C.) in a building called the Odeon ("Music Hall") adjacent the theater. At the *Proagon* the poets who were to compete in the dramatic contests mounted a platform accompanied by their actors and chorus, all garlanded but without masks or costumes, and they spoke "about their compositions" (5–8).

On or before the 9th Elaphebolion, the religious ceremonies began with a procession called the "Introduction" (*Eisagoge*), which was said to commemorate the original introduction of the god Dionysus from Eleutherai in Boeotia to Attica (9). The icon of Dionysus Eleuthereus was a wooden shaft with a mask attached (II 7), one of the most common ways of representing Dionysus in Greece. During the Introduction the icon is dressed, garlanded with ivy, and carried in procession from his temple on the south slope of the acropolis to the Academy (10, 14), a grove outside the city, on the road to Eleutherai, where hymns were sung (12). The icon may have remained at the Academy for one or several days. On the 8th or 9th Elaphebolion, after sacrifices were made, they brought Dionysus back to his theater (in the urban sanctuary) with a torchlight parade (11).

This cultic activity appears not to have been considered part of the official public celebration, which began only the next day. On Elaphebolion 10 the law forbade the holding of the Assembly and the commencement of any legal proceedings (15, cf. 4). Even the prisons were opened and prisoners released on bail to attend the festival (16). The first rite of the official festival was the "Procession" (*Pompe*). We do not know

the precise route of the parade, but it is a reasonable guess that it began at the city's principal gate, the Dipylon, where the road from the Academy entered the city, in a building called the "Pompeion," in which the objects used in various sacred processions were housed (the building, or one near it, later became the Council Chamber of the "Artists of Dionysus," cf. IV 48). The procession included the various strata of Athenian society carrying provisions for the sacrifice and feast, each symbolically appropriate to their rank. It was led by a virgin of "good" (i.e., aristocratic) family, who carried a golden basket containing the "first fruits" of the sacrifice (19, 26). The particular order is unknown, but somewhere behind her followed male citizens carrying wineskins and huge loaves of bread on spits (20, 21). The resident aliens ("metics") carried basins probably filled with honeycombs and cakes, and their daughters carried water jugs (21); the carrying of utensils was evidently regarded as subservient since colloquial Attic used "basin bearers" as a derogatory term for metics. The *choregoi* (III Aiii) appeared in lavish costume (22). Young men of military age (ephebes) escorted the bull "worthy of the god," which was to serve as the principal sacrifice (11). Hundreds of other sacrifices followed (18). At the end of the procession appeared groups of men singing hymns and carrying large *phalloi* (9, 23, 24, 26, II 9). It is not certain whether the icon of Dionysus was present: Athenian pots show the icon carried in a wheeled ship, but it is uncertain whether the rite belongs to the Great Dionysia or another Dionysiac festival. The procession stopped for hymns and dances at the shrines en route (27) and proceeded to the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus for the sacrificial feast.

Contests for choral songs called dithyrambs (I 125; IVC) were probably held on the same afternoon and would likely have continued well into the night. Each of the city's ten tribes produced a chorus of fifty boys and a chorus of fifty men for the competition (28, 29). The *choregos* of the winning chorus of each competition received a crown and a tripod (31, 32), and the poet probably received a bull to sacrifice to Dionysus. Both were then taken home in a victory procession, or *komos* (II).

Up to this point the Athenian Dionysia was more splendid but not qualitatively different in form from archaic Dionysiac festivals in rural Attica and elsewhere in Greece, with the exception perhaps of the tribal competition for dithyrambs. Though dithyrambs were a common element of Dionysus worship throughout Greece, 45 suggests that the dithyrambs were not organized into a competition until the earliest years of the Athenian democracy. If the contest came after Cleisthenes' democratic reforms (ca. 503 B.C.), then the tribal organization of the competition

may have been introduced to help consolidate Cleisthenes' massive reorganization of the Athenian tribes from regional and economic to purely administrative units. It was the last three or four days of the festival (Elaphebolion 11–14), given over to dramatic competitions, which were originally unique to the Athenian festival. This innovation probably goes right back to Pisistratus, since the traditional date for the first tragic competition in Athens is ca. 534 B.C. (45). Comic competitions were not introduced to the Dionysia until 486 B.C. (46).

Considerable controversy surrounds the order of the dramatic competitions and the number of days devoted to them. The dominant view, until recently, was that before and after the Peloponnesian War (431–404 B.C.) five comedies were presented on Elaphebolion 11, followed by three days that were each given to the production (by a single poet and *choregos*) of three tragedies and a satyrplay. Another possibility is that five days were given to competitions in this order: day one—boys' dithyramb plus comedy; day two—men's dithyramb plus comedy; days three through five—tragic tetralogy plus comedy. Numbers 41, 43, and 44 name five comic competitors in 434 B.C., 388 B.C., 312 B.C., and 311 B.C. (cf. 82; I 19). Because the hypotheses to Aristophanes' *Clouds* (Dionysia 423 B.C.), *Peace* (Dionysia 421 B.C.), and *Birds* (Dionysia 414 B.C.) all name only the first-, second-, and third-prize winners, it appears that only three comedies were produced during the war, and it is assumed that this was because of economic cutbacks. It was therefore assumed on the basis of 39 that during the war, each group of three tragedies plus satyrplay were performed in the morning and one of the three comedies were performed on the afternoon of each day of Elaphebolion 11–13. The publication of 42 in 1968 occasioned a challenge to the notion that the number of comedies was reduced from five to three during the war. It may be, however, that the fourth comedy mentioned was produced in the years of the nominal peace between Athens and Sparta in 420–416 B.C., in which case the older view needs only a partial modification.

The competition opened with a number of ceremonies: a ritual purification of the theater (33), followed by a libation (wine offering to the gods) by the ten generals, the most important elected officials in the Athenian state (34). It is of some interest to see that the libations were poured not by the priest of Dionysus or any other sacred office but by civic heads of state. Four rituals followed that were purely civic in character. Along with other proclamations (36A), the public herald presented and announced the names of distinguished citizens and benefactors of the state, who had been awarded golden crowns by the Assembly for

their services to Athens (36B; a ceremony, Demosthenes explains, designed not only to encourage benefaction but to display the magnanimity of the state to its benefactors, 37). As the sailing season began at the time of the Dionysia, the (subject) allies were required to send their tribute to Athens at the time of the festival, and this was brought down from the Treasury and displayed to the audience (35). This display of power was discontinued after Athens lost its empire in 404 B.C. (35). At the time of the empire, the orphaned sons of the war dead who had reached the age of majority were presented with suits of armor and invited to sit in the front-row seats (35, 36). Judges were selected (34, IIIAiiib). The order of appearance of the contestants was decided by lot, probably before the festival (38). A herald announced each performance (40). On the last day, after the judges had turned in their verdicts, the winners were proclaimed and the prizes awarded: a crown of ivy leaves for the victorious tragic and comic poets (38). The victorious poets and *choregoi* were then led home in a victory procession (*komos*). Plato's *Symposium* gives a detailed portrait of the private celebration that followed Agathon's tragic victory in 416 B.C.

Sources

Archon's selection

1. Cratinus, *The Cowherd*, PCG F 17. Produced ca. 453–423 B.C.
<The archon> did not give a chorus to Sophocles but gave one to the son of Kleomachos (Gnesippos), whom I would not think worthy of producing a chorus for me even at the Adonia.
2. Plato, *Laws* 817a–d. Written ca. 347 B.C.
If some tragic poets were to come to us and ask something like "O strangers, shall we visit your city and countryside or not, and should we bring our poetry or what are your thoughts on the matter?" what answer would we give to the marvelous fellows? Here is what I think: "O best of strangers, we ourselves are poets, to the best of our ability, of the most beautiful and best tragedy possible. So all our government is an imitation of the most beautiful and best life—and this is what we call really the truest form of tragedy. So now you are poets and we are also poets of the same genre, your rivals and competitors in the most beautiful drama, which only true law can bring about, or so is our hope. Do not suppose that we will so easily allow you to set up your stage in the

marketplace and bring onto it actors with beautiful voices, who can speak louder than ourselves, and permit you to harangue the children and women and the whole mob, addressing the same concerns as we do, but for the most part saying just the opposite. We and our whole city would be completely mad if we allowed you to do what I've just said, without the authorities first judging whether what you wrote is fit to be said in public or not. So now, you children of dainty Muses, first demonstrate your songs to the archons alongside our own, and if they appear to say the same or better than ours, we will give you a chorus, and if not, my friends, we could never do so."

3. POxy 1253. Written 2nd c. The papyrus contains plot summaries and some production information of plays of Menander. The Athenian general Lachares had been a supporter of Cassander, the Macedonian regent who served as the main prop of the oligarchic faction in Athens. In 300 B.C. he employed his mercenary troops to make himself tyrant of Athens. He was not finally ousted until 295/4 B.C.

The *Imbrians*, of which the first line goes "God its been a long time since I [last saw?] you, Demeas, my friend." <Menander> wrote the play in the archonship of Nikokles (302/1 B.C.) [...] on the seventy-[first? third? sixth? ninth? day] and submitted it for production at the Dionysia. It was not produced because of Lachares the tyrant. Later Kallippos of Athens acted it.

Proagon

4. Aeschines, *Against Ktesiphon* 66–67. Delivered 330 B.C. Inscriptional evidence contradicts Aeschines and shows that the Assembly often met up to and on the 9th Elaphebolion. The fact that Aeschines was able to get away with this statement perhaps attests to the confusion created by the disjunction between the religious and the civic holidays.
<Demosthenes introduced> a decree that the executive officers (*prytaneis*) hold an Assembly on the 8th Elaphebolion, when we sacrifice to Asclepius and hold the *Proagon*, on a holiday, a thing that no one can remember ever having been done before.
5. Scholion to Aeschines, *Against Ktesiphon* 67.
A few days before the Great Dionysia in the so-called Odeon there took place a contest (*agon*) of the tragedians and an exhibition of the plays with which they intended to compete (*agonizesthai*) in the theater. Therefore it is called *proagon* in accord with the original

meaning of the word (i.e., “precontest”). The actors entered unclothed, without masks.

6. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1109.

Those in the Odeon: a place in which they used to announce the compositions before the announcement in the theater.

7. Plato, *Symposium* 194. Written ca. 384 B.C. Fictional date: 416 B.C. Note that 70B places this event at the Lenaea, but there is some room for doubt: we have no knowledge of a *Proagon* at the Lenaea, moreover Plato (70A) refers to a large international audience that would sooner suit the Dionysia.

“I would be very forgetful, Agathon,” said Socrates, “after I saw you mount the platform with your actors and face such a large audience with courage and poise to talk about your composition, revealing not the least sign of stagefright, if now I were to think you would be flustered before so small a group as we are.”

8. *Life of Euripides*. Written 1st c. B.C. or later. The event dates to 406 B.C.

They say that when Sophocles heard that <Euripides> died, he appeared in a black *himation*, and introduced his chorus and actors without garlands in the *Proagon*, and that the people shed tears.

The “Introduction” (Eisagoge)

9. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 243. One would infer from the following legend that the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus was the oldest in Athens, but Thucydides (2.15.5; cf. Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 3.14) tells us that this is not so; the cult of Dionysus in the Marshes appears in Thucydides’ account to have been an integral part of the Anthesteria as worshiped by the Ionians and therefore must predate the Ionian migration (before ca. 900 B.C.), while Pegasos is associated in legend with King Amphiktyon (dated ca. 800 B.C.). The story type is typical of those attached to Dionysus in the Archaic period and it is likely that the story in its present form was made up for the purpose of providing the Pisistratid festival with an ancient foundation myth. Comparison with other stories of this type indicate that the “disease” mentioned below is a permanent erection, hence the ithyphallic parades commemorating the event.

A *phallos* is a long piece of timber fitted with leather genitalia at the top. The *phallos* came to be part of the worship of Dionysus by some secret rite. About the *phallos* itself the following is said.

Pegasos took the image of Dionysus from Eleutherai—Eleutherai is a city of Boeotia—and brought it to Attica. The Athenians, however, did not receive the god with reverence, but they did not get away with this resolve unpunished, because, since the god was angry, a disease attacked the men’s genitals and the calamity was incurable. When they found themselves succumbing to the disease, which was beyond all human magic and science, envoys were hastily dispatched to the divine oracles. When they returned they reported that the sole cure was for them to hold the god in all reverence. Therefore, in obedience to these pronouncements, the Athenians privately and publicly constructed *phalloi*, and with these they paid homage to the god, making them a memorial to their suffering.

10. Pausanias 1.29.2. Written ca. 150.

Outside of the city, in the townships and along the roads, are sanctuaries and the graves of heroes and men. Nearest is the Academy, an estate once owned by a private individual, but in my day a gymnasium. As you descend into the Academy you find a precinct of Artemis . . . Then there is a small temple to which they carry the icon of Dionysus Eleuthereus every year on fixed days.

11. IG II² 1006.12–13. Date: 121 B.C. An inscription honoring the epebes (young men beginning military service) and describing their activities. The use of the word *eschara* shows that the altar of Dionysus is that in the Academy; note that the “Introduction” is distinguished from the “Dionysia,” the latter term being used to designate the “Procession.”

After sacrificing, they also brought (literally, “introduced”; the Greek uses a cognate of *eisagoge*) Dionysus from the altar (*eschara*) to the theater by torchlight; and at the Dionysia they led in procession a bull worthy of the god, which they also sacrificed in the precinct during the Procession.

12. Alciphron, *Letters* 4.18.16. A fictional letter by “Menander” written 2nd or 3rd c. The use of the word *eschara* again shows that the altar of Dionysus is that in the Academy.

May I always be able to garland my head with Attic ivy and sing hymns every year at the altar (*eschara*) of Dionysus.

13. Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 549. Written in the second or third decade of the 3rd c. Herodes was an important Athenian politician and sophist who lived ca. 101–77.

Whenever the Dionysia came around and the icon of Dionysus went down to the Academy, <Herodes Atticus> would supply wine to citizens and foreigners alike while they lay on couches of ivy.

The Festival

14. Oracles of Delphi and Dodona in Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 51–54. Written 348–346 B.C.; the date of the oracles is unknown. Bacchos and Bromios are cult titles of Dionysus.

Of course you know that you do all these dances and hymns for the god not only according to the customs that govern the Dionysia, but also by oracular decree: in all the oracles, those of Delphi and Dodona alike, you will find that the city is commanded to perform dance with song according to ancestral custom and to fill the streets with the smoke of sacrifices and to wear garlands. Read me these oracles. (The court clerk reads the oracle of Apollo at Delphi:) “I say to the children of Erechtheus who inhabit the town of Pandion (i.e., Athens) and regulate festivals by ancestral custom, to be mindful of Bacchos, and to give thanks to Bromios all together in the wide streets, and to make smoke rise from the altars and to tie your head with garlands...” (Oracle of Zeus at Dodona:) “The prophet of Zeus in Dodona commands that you make public sacrifices and mix craters of wine and perform dance with song, that you sacrifice an ox to Apollo the Warder of Evil, and that free men and slaves put on garlands and keep holiday for one day. To Zeus the Protector of House and Property sacrifice a white ox.”

15. Law of Euegoros in Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 10. The speech was written 346 B.C.; the date of the law is unknown.

Euegoros moved: whenever there is the procession for Dionysus in Piraeus and comedy and tragedy, whenever there is the procession at the Lenaion and tragedy and comedy, whenever there is at the City Dionysia the procession and the boys’ <dithyramb> and the komos and comedy and tragedy, and whenever there is the procession and contest at the Thargelia, may it not be permitted to take security or to arrest another, not even those past due in their payments during these days. If anyone violates any of these regulations, let him be liable to prosecution by the injured party and let charges be brought against him in the Assembly held in the precinct of Dionysus as a wrongdoer, just as has been decreed in respect to other wrongdoers.

16A. Demosthenes, *Against Androtion* 68. Date: 355 B.C.

He asks if the prison was built for nothing. I would say so, since your father escaped from it after dancing in the procession of the Dionysia wearing his chains.

16B. Scholion to Demosthenes, *Against Androtion* 68.

It was customary in Athens to release prisoners from jail for the duration of the Dionysia and the Panathenaea upon bail.

The Procession (Pompe)

17. Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 56.4. Written ca. 330 B.C. <The Archon Eponymous> is in charge... of the procession of the Great Dionysia along with his Overseers, who, ten in number, used to be elected by the people and used to pay the cost of the procession from their own pockets, but now the people appoint them by lot, one from each tribe, and give them ten thousand drachmas for the expense.

18. *IG II²* 1496.80f. and 111f. These accounts of the Treasurers of Athena and the Overseers record money received from the sale of hides of animals sacrificed at public festivals. The first of our entries dates to 333 B.C., the second to 332 B.C. It has been calculated, based on an estimated 3–4.5 drachmas per hide, that 240 animals were sacrificed during the Dionysia of 333 B.C. Another estimate of 7.6 drachmas per hide gives only 106 animals. The hides sold may not reflect the actual numbers sacrificed.

<Received> from the City Dionysia from the Cattle-Purchasers: 808 drachmas, 4 obols

... <Received> from the City Dionysia from the generals: 306 drachmas.

19. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 241.

At the festival of the Dionysia at Athens, maidens of aristocratic families carried the basket. The baskets were made of gold. In them they placed the “first fruits.”

20A. Pollux 6.75. Written ca. 170.

Obeliai are loaves of bread that the so-called *obeliaphoroi* carried to the sanctuary of Dionysus. They are of one, two, or three *medimnoi* (= 12, 24, or 36 imperial gallons) in bulk and held together by spits (*obeloi*), whence the name.

20B. Athenaeus 3.111b. Written ca. 200.

The bread is called *obelias* either because it is sold for an obol or cooked on spits... Those who carry them around on their shoulders at processions are called *obeliaphoroi*.

21A. *Suda*, s.v. *askophorein*. Written ca. 1000. Metics are foreign residents of Athens.

In the processions of Dionysus some things are done by the citizens; other things the metics were ordered to do. Metics wore purple gowns and carried basins, whence they were called "basin-bearers." Citizens wore whatever they liked and carried wineskins on their shoulders, whence they were called "wineskin-bearers."

21B. *Suda* s.v. *skaphephoroi*. Demetrius of Phaleron lived from ca. 350 until after 283 B.C.

Demetrius in the third book of *On Legislation* says that the law enjoined metics to carry basins in processions and their daughters to carry water jugs and parasols.

22. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 22. Date: 346 B.C.

Demosthenes, for whom I testify, paid me to prepare a golden crown and make a golden *himation* so that he could walk in them in the procession of Dionysus.

23. *IG I³* 46.11–13. Date: 446/5 B.C. The inscription gives instructions to the Athenian colonists of Brea in Thrace.

To bring an ox and a suit of armor to the Great Panathenaea and a *phallos* to the Dionysia.

24. Plutarch, *On the Love of Wealth* 527d. Written ca. 110. Plutarch implies the absence of masks in the early Dionysia, though, if so, this is unlikely to be more than a guess motivated by his desire to draw a strong contrast between the extravagance of processions in his day and the simplicity of the past.

Our traditional festival of the Dionysia was in former times a homely and merry procession. First came a jug of wine and a vine branch, then one celebrant dragged a he-goat along, another followed with a basket of dried figs, and last came the *phallos*. But nowadays this is disregarded and gone, what with vessels of gold carried past, rich apparel, carriages riding by, and masks.

25. Demosthenes, *On the False Embassy* 287. See II 5.

26. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 240–65. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. The hero of the play, Dikaiopolis, has arranged a separate peace with Sparta, and so can go back to the country and celebrate the rural Dionysia. The procession here described is the prototype for the civic festival.

DIKAIOPOLIS: Keep holy silence; holy silence! The basket bearer, go forward a little! Let Xanthias (the slave) stand the *phallos* upright! Put down the basket, daughter, so that we may begin the sacrifice! DAUGHTER: Mother, hand me the ladle, so that I can pour soup over the cake here. DIKAIOPOLIS: Well, that's fine. Oh Lord Dionysus, look graciously on me, as I make this procession

and sacrifice; may I with my household celebrate in all good fortune the Dionysia in the country, free of campaigning, and may the thirty-year treaty (which he has privately concluded with the Spartans) bring me good luck. Come daughter, see that you carry the basket nicely with a savory-eating look in your eye... Forward, (to daughter) and in the mob take good care that no one unnoticed nibbles off your gold things! Xanthias, it's the job of you two to hold the *phallos* upright behind the basket carrier. I shall follow and sing the phallic song. You, wife, look at me from the roof! Advance! (He sings) Phales, comrade of Bacchos, companion-reveler, night wanderer, adulterer, boylover.

27. Xenophon, *Hipparchikos* 3.2. Written ca. 388–355 B.C.

I think that the processions would be most pleasing to the gods and spectators alike if, starting from the Herms (in the Athenian marketplace), one rode around to all the shrines and cult statues in a circle honoring the gods. Indeed the choruses at the Dionysia pay their respects to the other gods and the twelve with their dancing.

Dithyrambic Contest

28. Scholion to Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* 10. It was once argued on the basis of considerations of timing and the ambiguity of this scholion that each tribe provided only one dithyrambic chorus, men's or boys', but 29 and 30 are clear evidence against this.

By custom the Athenians put on choruses of fifty boys or fifty men for each tribe, so that there were ten choruses, since there were also ten tribes. The dithyramps are called "circular choruses" and the "circular chorus"... in circular choruses the piper stood in the middle.

29. *IG II²* 2318.320–24. *Fasti* for the year 333/2 B.C. Cf. *IG II²* 3061, where the same tribe also wins both events.

In the archonship] of Ni[kokrates
<the tribe> Kekrop[is <won the dithyramb> for boys
Diophantos of Halai was *choregos*
<the tribe> Kekropis[<won the dithyramb> for men
Onetor [was *choregos*

30. *Hesperia* 37 (1968) no. 51, fr. a–b, col. 2, 1–24. An inscription listing dedications of silver vessels (*phialai*). Date: 331/0 B.C. The inscription seems to indicate the existence of a law requiring all liturgists to

dedicate a vessel on the termination of their liturgy (III Aiiia). Eight names are listed in traditional tribal order (as shown by the deme names) under the heading for boys' dithyramb. This leaves no doubt that there were normally ten men's and ten boys' dithyrambs. We must assume that the winner was exempt, since he dedicated a tripod, and that a *choregos* could not be found for one of the tribes for the Dionysia of 330 B.C. (cf. 84). Another fragment of the inscription contains dedications of silver vessels by tragic *choregoi*.

[These dedicated vessels for litur]gies in the archonship of A[r]istophanes]

for b[oys'] dithyrambs

Sosistr[atos - - -]

of the deme Euonym[on, weight: 50 drachmas]

Thymokles [- - - -]

of the deme Prasia[i, weight: 50 drachmas]

Aischylos [son of Hippiskos]

of the deme Paionida[i, weight: 50 drachmas]

Polyarato[s son of Periander]

of the deme Cholargos, w[eight: 50 drachmas]

Theophilos son of Tr[- - -]

of the deme Athmonon, we[ight: 50 drachmas]

Philokrates son of Ph[- - -]

[of the deme O]jinoe, weig[ht: 50 drachmas]

[Ka]llikrates son of Ar[istokrates]

[of the deme Aph]idna, we[ight: 50 drachmas]

[Le]ptines son of Olym[p- - -]

[of the deme Alo]peke, wei[ght: 50 drachmas]

[for men's]

[...]as son of Ariston[- -]

[of the deme ?], weigh[t: 50 drachmas]

[Lysik]les son of Lysiade[s]

[of the deme Leukon]oion, weig[ht: 50 drachmas]

[- - - -]es [.]tin[- -]

31. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 63. Date: 346 B.C.

Although they say Iphikrates was a most hated enemy of Diokles of Pitthos, and in addition to this it happened that Teisias the brother of Iphikrates was a rival *choregos* of Diokles. . . . they had to endure seeing him win and being crowned.

32. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 5–6. Demosthenes was *choregos* of the tribe Pandionis for the dithyramb at the Great Dionysia of 346 B.C. Since this man corrupted the judges and because of this the tribe was wrongfully deprived of its tripod, and I myself was subjected to blows and was outraged as no other *choregos* I know of.

Ceremonies Preceding the Dramatic Competitions

33. *Suda*, s.v. *katharsion*. Written ca. 1000.

The Athenians were accustomed to purify the Assembly and the theaters and practically all gatherings of the people by sacrificing very small piglets, which they called "purificatory." This the so called *peristiarchoi* do, whose name comes either from lustration (*peristichein*) or from the hearth (*hestia*).

34. Plutarch, *Cimon* 8.7. See 112.

35A. Isocrates, *On the Peace* 82. Written in 356 B.C. Isocrates speaks of the Athenians of 454–404 B.C.

They so precisely found the means by which men can best inspire enmity that they voted to divide the incoming public revenues into talents and bring them into the orchestra during the Dionysia when the theater was full. This they did and they brought the orphans of the men who died in the war, making a display at once both to the allies of the extent of their wealth that these mercenaries had carried off, and to the other Greeks of the great number of orphans and the suffering caused by this lust for wealth.

35B. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 504.

It was decreed that the <subject> cities should bring the tributes to Athens at the Dionysia, as Eupolis says in *Cities* (422 B.C.).

36A. Aeschines, *Against Ktesiphon* 41–43. Delivered 330 B.C. Aeschines explains why a law was passed regulating proclamations in the theater. He seems to indicate that the proclamation of crowns (to honor distinguished citizens and foreigners) was restricted to meetings of the legislative assembly, but, if so, there were certainly exceptions to this rule, which in any case, could only have been short-lived, since inscriptions dating throughout the 4th c. B.C. require the proclamation of crowns in the Theater of Dionysus.

At the time of the tragic performances in the city, people would make proclamations without the approval of the Assembly: that so-and-so was being crowned by his tribe and others by the townships; others called upon the Greeks to witness that they were freeing

their slaves; most presumptuous were the proclamations engineered by people who acquired ambassador status (*proxenia*) in foreign cities, that the people of Rhodes or Chios or whatever other city was crowning them, if such was the case, on account of their virtue and rectitude.

36B. Aeschines, *Against Ktesiphon* 153–54.

Suppose for a little while that you are not in the court but in the theater. Imagine that you see the herald approaching and that the proclamation of <Ktesiphon's> decree <that Demosthenes should be crowned> is about to take place. Now consider whether you think the relatives of those who died (sc., at the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C.) would shed more tears for the tragedies and heroic sufferings that will come on after this, or for the insensitivity of the city. What Greek, what man who has had the benefit of a free man's education, would not be pained, if for nothing else, then at the thought that once on a day like today before the performance of the tragedies, at a time when the city was governed by better men, the public herald, bringing alongside the orphans, young sons dressed in armor of those men who died in the war, came forward and made the most noble and most inspiring proclamation, that the people brought up these young men whose fathers died as brave men in the war, and that now the people presented them with a suit of armor and left them with good wishes to follow their own fortunes and now also invited them to take front-row seats (*prohedria*)? In those days this is what the herald announced, but not now. Instead he brings alongside the man who made the children orphans and what will he say, what words will he utter? If he follows the instructions of this decree—but the shameful truth will not be silent! It will seem to contradict the herald's voice that the people crown this man, if this is a man, for his virtue, this coward for his bravery, this wimp and deserter. I beg you, Athenians, do not erect in the orchestra of Dionysus a victory monument built from your own spoils, do not convict the people of Athens of madness in front of all Greece.

37. Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 120. Delivered 330 B.C.

But by the gods are you so stupid and insensitive, Aeschines, that you are unable to perceive that the crown gives the same joy to the person crowned wherever it is proclaimed, but that the proclamation is made in the theater for the benefit of those who confer it? This

is because all the audience is encouraged to do service to the city, and they applaud the gratitude of the giver more than the receiver. This is why the city made this law.

The Dramatic Contests

38. Aristides, *On Rhetoric* 2. Written 2nd c.

For tragedians and kithara players and other musicians being best and performing first is not the same thing, otherwise it would suffice just to take lots, but the best contestant is crowned and proclaimed as the first, even if he happened to perform last.

39. Aristophanes, *Birds* 786–89. Produced Dionysia, 414 B.C. The word here translated as “brunch” is misleading, since our terms “breakfast,” “lunch,” and “supper” imply mealtimes, whereas the Greek equivalents have more to do with levels of formality, the evening meal being the only formal shared meal, and the one or two earlier meals being more like snacks. The *ariston* was normally taken at a pause after the morning's work, and if one can speak of normal times, they differed greatly from country to city and from workday to holiday. The passage is taken from the *parabasis*, where the chorus addresses the audience in the double persona of birds and choreuts.

If any of you spectators had wings, then, when he was feeling hunger pangs during the tragic choruses, he could fly off home to have brunch and then return with a full stomach to us (the comic choruses).

40. Pollux 4.88. Written ca. 170 and referring to an event in the last quarter of the 5th c. B.C.

Hermon was a comic actor. As he was scheduled by lot to perform after several others, he was absent from the theater exercising his voice. Because all the other performers were booted out of the theater, the herald called upon Hermon, but the latter did not come forward and incurred a fine. From that time on they introduced the performers by trumpet.

41. IGUR 216 (= IG XIV 1097). A fragment of the Roman *Fasti*. The inscription shows that five comedies were produced at the City Dionysia before the Peloponnesian War, 431–404 B.C. The hypotheses to plays of Aristophanes produced during the war mention only three prizes. Yet 42 seems to indicate that, if the number of comedies was reduced, it did not remain so for the duration of the war.

]In the archonship of Antiochides (434 B.C.) with the *Cy[clops]*
]s with a comedy fourth prize in the c[ity

...

with the *Frogs* fifth prize in the archonship of Antiochides[

42. *POxy* 2737, fr. 1, col. ii, 1–17. See 71.

43. Fourth Hypothesis to Aristophanes, *Plutus*. It is not said whether the *Plutus* was produced at the Dionysia or the Lenaea, but it appears that five comedies were the norm in either festival after the Peloponnesian War (see 77).

It was performed in the archonship of Antipatros (388 B.C.) in competition with Nikochares with the *Lakonians*, Aristomenes with the *Admetos*, Nicophon with the *Adonis*, and Alcaeus with the *Pasiphae*.

44. *IG* II² 2323a. See IV 14.

45. The “Parian Marble,” *FGrH* 239.54–55, 58, and 61. The Parian Marble is a chronology of major political and literary events compiled and inscribed in 264/3 B.C. The first event, probably fictitious, can be dated by its position on the stone to between 580–560 B.C., the second to ca. 534 B.C., the third to the archon year of 509/8 B.C. The “chorus of men” appears to be men’s dithyramb. The date 508 B.C. would associate the introduction of the contest with the democratic reforms (508/7 B.C.) after the fall of the Pisistratids, though the Cleisthenic constitution was probably not instituted until ca. 503 B.C. Note that the *Fasti* begin about this time (I 100).

From the time when in Ath[en]s a com[ic cho]r[us] was est[ab]lished, the people of Ikarion being the fi[rst] to pro[du]ce it, Sousarion inventing it, and the first prize was established as a basket of dried figs and 40 liters of wine... [two hundred years and ... years have elapsed and the archon was...]

From the time when Thespi[s] the poet first [act]ed, who produced a [dr]a[ma] in the c[ity], and the goat was established as the [prize], 250 [plus ??] years have elapsed, the archon in Ath[en]s being... [naios, the Elder.

From the time when the choruses of men first competed, when Hypo[di]kos the Chalcidian won, 236 years have passed, the archon in Athens being Lysagoras.

46. *Suda*, s.v. *Chionides*. Written ca. 1000. The word translated as “the originator” (*protagonisten*) may conceivably mean “the principal actor,” in which case the introduction of comedy to the Dionysia would have been before 486 B.C.

Chionides: Athenian, writer of Old Comedy, whom they also say was the originator of Old Comedy and produced eight years before the Persian Wars (i.e., eight years before 480 B.C. by the usual inclusive reckoning gives 486 B.C.).

III Aib. The Lenaea, Rural Dionysia, and Anthesteria

In Attica and Athens, each of the four winter months included a Dionysian festival. Our sources give the impression that all the rural festivals of Dionysus took place in the month of Posideion, roughly our December (47, 48, 49G, 49H). They did not all take place on the same days in Posideion, however, since Plato’s theater addicts go from one to another without “missing a single one” (I 21). Plato’s claim may be exaggerated, but possibly some attempt was made to coordinate festival calendars (such as we find in Hellenistic times; see IIIB). The middle of the following month, Gamelion, our late January, was given to the celebration of the Lenaea at Athens. One month later the Anthesteria was celebrated from the 11th to the 13th Anthesterion, and precisely one month after that Athens was celebrating the Great Dionysia. By the late classical period all of these festivals included dramatic contests.

The ancients most readily associated phallic processions with the rural Dionysia (24, 26), though it is unlikely that they ever surpassed the phallic procession of the Great Dionysia in magnitude and splendor. The processions had a relatively greater importance to the rural festivals and there was, perhaps, a feeling, that in the country the procession was more in its rustic element. The phallic procession was probably the only common denominator; at a guess most demes had little more to offer. The later tradition has many murky references to contests involving dancing on greased wineskins; the reader will be grateful to have to seek these elsewhere. Direct evidence for drama comes from only thirteen demes (49–60); others doubtless existed. The thirteen include the largest demes, Piraeus (49), Akharnai (54), Eleusis (52), and Salamis (55), as well as the deme of Kollytos, located inside the walls of Athens itself (53). Ikarion (50) is prominent as an important cult center for Dionysus because of its legendary connections with the first introduction of wine in Attica. The central government in Athens took a direct interest in the management of the Dionysia at Piraeus (49A, B, D–F, H), which far

surpassed that of other demes: it included both the parades familiar from the Athenian Dionysia, an "Introduction," and a "Procession" (49B–E), ending in sacrifices nearly half as voluminous as those of the Great Dionysia (compare 49D and 18), followed by both tragedy and comedy (49B), to which dithyrambs were added by the late 4th c. B.C. (49H), and, in the late 2nd c. B.C. at least, apparently lasting four days (49E). The full slate of dithyramb, tragedy, and comedy are otherwise known only from Eleusis (52A–C) and possibly Akharnai (54); both tragedy and comedy were performed at Thorikos (50^{bis} C, D), Kollytos (53), and possibly Ikarion (50A–C, F, G); dithyramb and (much later) tragedy are attested at Salamis (55), tragedy only in Paiania (57), comedy only in Aixone (51A), Rhamnous (56), and Anagyros (59). There is little evidence for the actual number of performances within each genre: the evidence consistently shows that the performances were part of a competition, we can safely assume a minimum of two performances in each genre, and the Ikarian decree shows a total of only two tragedies (50A). Beyond this we hear only of three dithyrambs competing in Piraeus in the later 4th c. B.C.

The choregic monuments show that *synchoregia* was very common at the rural festivals (i.e., the sharing of production costs by two or more *choregoi*, see III 108). Of the twenty-two choregic offices attested (50–59), there are ten instances of *synchoregia*, two of which are shared by three *choregoi* (50C, E), with several demes showing great flexibility in the practice (esp. 50). Otherwise the rules for the *choregia* appear to have been the same as in Athens, except in perhaps one other respect. It is not entirely clear whether foreign residents (metics) were called upon to serve as *choregoi*, an office from which they were debarred at the Great Dionysia (72). The decree from Ikarion (50A) distinguishes demesmen and residents, though this may mean resident citizens of Attica who are not citizens of the deme. 52B is a certain instance of a metic *choregos*, but this case may well have been exceptional. Note that the demotic *choregia* outlived the abolition of the institution in Athens ca. 317 B.C. (29). Literary sources sometimes treat the deme festivals as third-rate entertainments (53A, B; I 20), but both literary and epigraphical sources show the presence of first-rate competitors (49G; 50^{bis} C, E; 52A, 53C, 54A, 55A).

Of the Lenaeian festival we know little. There was a parade, supervised by the archon, named "king archon," who took over many of the religious duties of the prehistoric monarchy (61); unlike the Great Dionysia, the Lenaeian festival was a very old institution; it was common to the Ionians,

who migrated from Attica around 1,000 B.C. Our comprehension of the character of the festival would be greatly enhanced if it could be proved that the so-called Lenaeian vases actually referred to the Lenaea and not the Anthesteria (see II 7). What little information we do have points to the release from inhibition characteristic of Dionysiac festivals; at any rate the procession seems to have involved ritual abuse, unless the scholia and late lexicographers are confusing Lenaea and Anthesteria (62). Indeed, the confusion of Lenaea and Anthesteria is not limited to late antiquity. On the evidence of 67, many modern scholars have argued that the Lenaion, where the Lenaea was celebrated, and the sanctuary "in the marshes," where the Anthesteria was celebrated, were one and the same. Apart from the improbability of having two names for a single sanctuary, each invariably associated with a different festival, we are explicitly told in the speech *Against Neaira* that the temple in the "Dionysion in the marshes" was open only for a single day in the year, the evening of the Festival of the Cups, and it seems inconceivable that the Lenaea would be held at a sanctuary where the temple remained locked. All the surviving testimony, albeit late and perhaps unreliable, assigns the Lenaeian contests to a location in the Athenian marketplace for the period before the construction of the Theater of Dionysus, and to the Theater of Dionysus afterward (63–66). At any rate, the Lenaeian performances must have moved to the Theater of Dionysus by ca. 440 B.C., when the state established a formal contest for *choregoi* and poets (68). Plato writes of an audience of thirty thousand at the Lenaea of 416 B.C. (70); the Theater of Dionysus was the only venue in Athens that could accommodate a crowd even a half or a quarter of that size. Unlike the Great Dionysia, the Lenaea is generally characterized as a purely Attic affair, as we would expect at a midwinter festival (69, 71), though Plato exceptionally, perhaps rhetorically, stresses the international character of the audience, calling it "Greek" not "Athenian" (70). The relatively less cosmopolitan character of the Lenaea seems to be reflected in the relaxation of restrictions on noncitizen *choregoi* and choreuts (72, 73—since the propaganda of pure Attic content seems directed at an international audience) and in its lower status as a competition (71). The *Didaskaliai* show that tragic poets competed with only two tragedies (74, 75). Less clear is the number of tragic competitors: the *Didaskaliai* show two tragic poets in 418 B.C. and three in 363 B.C. and it is impossible to know which represents the norm. The hypotheses to Aristophanes' Lenaeian plays, like those for the Dionysian plays, name only three comedies (76, cf. 44). The only other evidence for the comic competition, the *Didaskaliai*, shows five

comedies produced in 284 B.C. (77). There is no better evidence than this for the usual handbook dogma that five comedies were regularly produced at the Lenaea except during the Peloponnesian War (the years covered by the hypotheses in 76). The *Didaskaliai* (75) and the Law of Euegoros (49B) mention no satyrplay or dithyramps and it is generally inferred that they were not included at least in the classical period: there is inscriptional evidence for dithyramb at the Lenaea in the 3rd c. B.C. For drama at the Anthesteria the evidence is slim (78–81). It is less likely that dramatic competitions took place there earlier than the late 4th c. B.C., died out, and then were revived by Lycurgus, as 78 implies; if the sources are at all reliable, the dramatic competitions were probably a Lycurgan (ca. 330 B.C.) or later innovation.

Sources

Rural Dionysia

47. Theophrastus, *Characters* 3.5, “The Chatterbox.” Probably Written ca. 319 B.C. The chatterbox is characterized by his excessive fondness for relating trivia, truisms, and clichés. The scholiast to Plato’s *Republic* 475d, the scholiast to Aeschines’ *Against Timarchus* 43, and a grammarian in Bekker’s *Anecdota Graeca* all flatly state that the Rural Dionysia are in Posideion.

The chatterbox is the sort of man who (says) . . . That the mysteries are in Boedromion, the Apatouria in Pyanopsion, and the Rural Dionysia in Posideion.

48. IG II² 1183.36f. This inscription contains regulations governing the handling of public money in the deme of Myrrhinous. Date: after 340 B.C. As at Athens (49B), the special meeting of the Assembly probably follows immediately after the festival.

. . . on the nineteenth of the month of Posideion they are to conduct business concerning the Dionysia.

49A. Dionysia in Piraeus. Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 54.8. Written ca. 330 B.C.

They also choose the archon for Salamis by lot and the mayor for Piraeus, who look after the Dionysia in either place and appoint the *choregoi*. In Salamis the name of the archon is also recorded (on public documents, cf. 55B).

49B. Law of Euegoros. See 15.

49C. IG II² 380. Decree of Piraeus. Date: 320/19 B.C.

Let the market inspectors (*agoranomoi*) see to it that the broad streets on which pass the processions for Zeus Soter and Dionysus be leveled and prepared as well as possible.

49D. IG II² 1496.70. This series of inscribed stelae gives the accounts of the treasurers of Athena at Athens for 334/3 to 331/0 B.C. The accounts list money received from the sale of the hides of sacrificed animals and follow the order of expenditures. Cf. 18.

(Posideion, 334/3 B.C.) From the Dionysia in Piraeus from the cattle purchasers: 311 drachmas.

49E. SEG 15.104.25f. One of a large number of decrees from the late 2nd c. B.C. onward honoring the ephebes in part for their service in the “introduction” and “procession” of Dionysus both in Athens and in Piraeus (cf. 11). Date: 127/6 B.C.

<the ephebes> also sacrificed to Dionysus for the people of Piraeus and they introduced the god (*eisagoge*) and had an orderly sojourn in Piraeus for four days.

49F. IG II² 456. A decree by the Assembly in Athens awarding a long list of honors to the people of Kolophon for remaining faithful to Athens, their “mother city.” Date: 307/6 B.C. For the *architekton*, see IVBi.

. . . and that the theater manager (*architekton*) give the <ambassadors of Kolophon> a seat at the Dionysia in Piraeus.

49G. Aelian, *Varia Historia* 2.13. Written late 2nd or early 3rd c. The event is supposed to have taken place in the late 5th c. B.C.

Socrates frequently attended the theaters, especially when Euripides the tragic poet was competing with new tragedies. And when Euripides was competing at the Piraeus, he even went down there.

49H. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Ten Orators* 842a. The author lists various pieces of legislation introduced by Lycurgus, a prominent Athenian politician, ca. 338–326 B.C.

. . . and to hold a contest of no less than three dithyrambic choruses in the Piraeus in the month of Posideion and to give the winners one thousand drachmas, those judged second eight hundred, and those judged third six hundred.

50A. Dionysia in Ikarion. IG I³ 254. Decree of Ikarion. Date: 440 to ca. 415 B.C. Though the decree envisions a pair of *choregoi*, each competing with one (?) tragedy, the other inscriptions from Ikarion show great flexibility in dividing a single *choregia* between one, two, or three *choregoi*.

This stele [is sacred to Dionysus]. The people of Ikarion have decreed; Menest[ratos proposed. The people of Ikarion will choose two] from the demesmen and from the residents of Ikarion who have not yet served as *choregoi*, whichever two should [...], exchange of pr[operty (*antidosis*) should take place before] the mayor within twenty days [...if there is no] exchange the may[or... the] two *choregoi* should reveal (or give an inventory?) thrice (or in front of three witnesses) [...and these two] are to enroll tr]agic chorusmen from the [...] and the *choregoi* are to swear that they have not [...] within ten days if there is no denial by oath [... they are to put their hands upon?] the (cult) statue [before] the mayor and the [mayor to administer to] them the oath [...to those] managing a chorus for the first time not to [...] fifteen [...] whenever the year [...] send away if not [...] or pay a fine of fi[ve...] to the tragic chorusmen the cho[...fif]teen men each... (there follow twenty-six very fragmentary lines).

50B. *IG II² 3094*. Inscribed block found in Ikarion. Date: beginning of 4th c. B.C. Aristophanes had a son, also a comic poet, named Nikostratos, but there is also a dithyrambic poet of that name.

[A]rchippos son of Archede[ktos], victorious, set this up for Dionysus. Nikostratos was *didaskalos*.

50C. *IG II² 3095*. Inscribed marble statue base found in Ikarion dedicated by a father and two sons. Date: before the middle of the 4th c. B.C.

Ergasos, son of Phanomachos; Phanomachos, son of Ergasos; Diognetos, son of Ergasos; victorious when they served as *choregoi* in tragedy, set this up.

50D. *IG II² 1178*. Honorary decree. Date: before the middle of the 4th c. B.C.

Kallippos proposed. The people of Ikarion voted to honor Nikon the mayor and crown him with a crown of ivy and have the herald proclaim that the people of Ikarion are crowning Nikon and that the deme of Ikarion crowns its mayor, because he conducted the festival and the contest for Dionysus well and justly, and to honor the *choregoi* Epikrates and Praxias and crown them with a crown of ivy and make a proclamation as for the mayor.

50E. *IG II² 3098*. Inscription on a small shrine found at Ikarion. Date: middle of the 4th c. B.C.

Hagnias, Xanthippos, Xanthides, victorious, set this up.

50F. *IG II² 3099*. Inscribed marble slab. Date: mid-4th c. B.C.

Mnesilochos, son of Mnesiphilos, won as *choregos* in tragedy.

50G. *SEG 22.117*. An honorary decree. Date: ca. 330 B.C.

[The people of Ikarion decreed: since - - - aios, son of Sos]igenes of Ikarion sacrificed the victims to all the gods [as is the local custom and looked after everything else] well and zealously, etc... [to praise - - -]aios and crown him with a golden crown worth 10 drachmas for his virtue and justice toward the demesmen... and to proclaim the crown at the tragic performances at the Dionysia.

50^{bis}A. Dionysia in Thorikos. *Thorikos VIII*, no. 75. Decree of the deme of Thorikos. Date: end of 5th c. to beginning of 4th c. B.C. The reference to three *choregiai* is intriguing. Since there is no evidence for dithyramb in Thorikos, it may indicate that there were three tragedies or three comedies, and that only one genre is being discussed here.

G]ods! Lysippides was ma[yor? and] put it to the vot[e]. It was decreed by the people of Thori[kos]. Teleas m[ade the motion to assign the?] three choregia[i] to those who make the lar]gest offers - [- - - not] less than thr[

50^{bis}B. *Thorikos IX*, no. 85. Dedicatory verse inscription found at Thorikos. Date: ca. 400–350 B.C.

T]his Py[- - -
he was *choregos* [- - -
having pray[ed] - - -
You in return?[- - -
a fine[- - -

50^{bis}C. *Thorikos VIII*, no. 76. Dedicatory inscription on a statue base found in the theater at Thorikos. Date: 375–325 B.C. If the restoration is correct, the inscription may refer to Theodoros, one of the most celebrated actors of the 4th c. B.C. (92; I 8A; IV 20, 21, 32). Note that in this inscription, and in the two that follow, comedy is listed before tragedy, presumably following the order of events at the local Dionysia.

D]emocharides for comedy, [Sp]eusiades was actor; [De]mochares for tragedy, [The?]odoros was actor; [...]ades for comedy, [...] was actor. [Having served as *choregoi*, they made this dedication.

50^{bis}D. *Thorikos IX*, no. 83. Decree of the deme of Thorikos. Date: 4th c. B.C.

- - -]was *choregos*[- - -
- - -]of the *choregia* Tho[r]ikos? - - -
and the] time and for the com[edies] - - -
and for the tr]agedies and that the regis[trars

write up] an official record [- - -
 - - -] Ameipsias Mnes[i- - -
 these men were *cho]regoi*- - -
 - - -]of Lidos Mnesi[- - -
 - - -]os son of Dorokle[s- - -

50^{bis}E. *Thorikos* IX, no. 84. A marble stele found in the theater of Thorikos. Date: 4th c. B.C. The list would seem to record the winners of an actors' competition. The name Pindaros may be that of the actor criticized by Aristotle (IV 60). If so, then the list seems to give the victorious comic actor, followed by the victorious tragic actor.

When so-and-so was mayor]: Pindaros, son of Proteas. When Epeusthenes was mayor: Diphilos, son of Astyphilos; Diotimos, son of Hermod[...]. When Mikinos was mayor: Polykrates, son of Polykrates; Polystratos, son of Polykrates.

51A. *Dionysia in Aixone*. Mette, *Urkunden* 136. This decree by the Attic deme of Aixone is dated to the archonship of Theophrastos, but two archons of this name are known, in 340/39 B.C. and 313/2 B.C., and the date is disputed. Another honorary decree proposed by Glaukides and dated to Theophrastos' archonship is known: here also two demesmen receive crowns to be announced during the *Dionysia* at the time of the comedies (*IG* II² 1202). In demes where honorary decrees call for proclamations "at the comic contest," it seems a reasonable assumption that no tragedy was performed. See also I 104.

G]laukides, son of Sosi[pp]os, moved that, since the *choregoi* Aut[ea]s, son of Autokles, and Philoxenides, son of Philip, performed their task as *choregoi* well and zealously, the demesmen decide: to crown them each with a golden crown worth one hundred drachmas in the theater at the time of the comedies that take place after the archonship of Theophrastos, so that future *choregoi* will perform their tasks with zeal; that the mayor Hegesileon and the treasurers give them ten drachmas for a sacrifice; that the treasurers also have this decree written on a stone stele and set up in the theater so that the demesmen of Aixone always produce the best possible *Dionysia*.

51B. *IG* II² 1198. An honorary decree. Date 326/5 B.C. The wording is nearly identical to *IG* II² 1200, another decree honoring two *choregoi* in 317/6 B.C.

Phil]oktemon, son of Chremes, proposed: since the *choregoi* appointed under the archonship of Chremes, Demokrates, son of Euphiletos, and Hegesias, son of Lysistratos, performed their *cho-*

regia for the people of Aixone well and zealously, we should honor them and crown them... etc.

52A. *Dionysia in Eleusis*. *IG* II² 3090. A statue base found at Eleusis. Date: last decade of 5th c. B.C. The inscription generally used to be interpreted as referring to two victories by Eleusinians at the City *Dionysia*, but Capps studied the spacing on the fragments of the *Fasti* (I 100) and found room for only one *synchoregia* in 406/5 B.C. (108, 109). It is now generally interpreted as referring to the Eleusinian *Dionysia*. The use of the term *didaskalos* should indicate that Sophocles and Aristophanes directed their own works at Eleusis.

G]nathis, son of Timokedes, Anaxandrides, son of Timagoros, were victorious as *choregoi* for comedy. Aristophanes was *didaskalos*. <They had> another victory in tragedy; Sophocles was *didaskalos*.

52B. *IG* II² 1186. An honorary decree of the Attic deme of Eleusis. Date: mid-4th c. B.C.

K]al[i]machos, son of Kallikrates, spoke. Whereas Damasias of Thebes, son of Dionysios, has settled in Eleusis and always led an exemplary life, well disposed to all inhabitants of the deme, both he himself and his students, and since, during the Eleusinians' celebration of the *Dionysia*, he showed commitment and zeal, toward the gods, the people of Athens, and those of Eleusis, that the *Dionysia* be the best possible and, equipping two choruses at his own expense, one for boys and one for men, he voluntarily offered them to Demeter and Kore and Dionysus: may it please the people of Eleusis to praise Damasias the Theban, son of Dionysios, for his virtue and piety toward the goddesses and crown him with a golden crown worth ten drachmas. May the mayor who takes office after Gnathis announce at the tragedies during the *Dionysia* at Eleusis that the deme of Eleusis crowns Damasias.

52C. *IG* II² 3100. Inscribed base found in Eleusis. Date: mid-4th c. B.C.

Athenodoros, son of Go[- - -] was victorious] as *choregos* in comedy.

52D. *IG* II² 3107. Inscribed base found in Eleusis. Date: 4th c. B.C.

As *chore]gos* in - - -] Hieron, son of - - -, v]ictorious, set this up.

53A. *Dionysia in Kollytos*. Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 180. Delivered in 330 B.C. Demosthenes ridicules Aeschines not only for being a tritagonist but also for playing the circuit of the Rural *Dionysia*—see also IV 165—but note that the deme of Kollytos where Aeschines is said to have fallen disgracefully and thus gained the appellation "clod-hopping Oenomaus" (242) is hardly rustic. Kollytos is located within the city walls of Athens, not more than five minutes' walk from the Athenian

acropolis, and its Dionysia was very likely conducted in the Theater of Dionysus. The date of Aeschines' performance must be ca. 370–360 B.C.

What role would you have me assign to you and what to myself on that day? Would you have me be "Battalos," as you call me when you abuse and ridicule me, and yourself, not any old hero, but one of those from the stage, Kresphontes or Kreon or Oenomaus whom you once made hash of in Kollytos.

53B. Demochares, *FGrH* 75 F 6a, in *Life of Aeschines* 7. Demochares (ca. 360–275 B.C.) is also cited by several other later sources. Hesychius adds that the *Oenomaus* in question was by Sophocles. For Sannion cf. 107.

Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes, if he is to be trusted when he speaks about Aeschines, says that Aeschines was the tritagonist of the tragedian Ischandros and that when he was acting the part of Oenomaus chasing Pelops he fell disgracefully and was helped to his feet by Sannion the chorus director—this is why Demosthenes calls him Oenomaus, mocking him before an audience well aware of the fact—and he wandered the countryside with Sokrates and Simylos the ham actors. From this he is called a "clod-hopper."

53C. Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* 157. Delivered 346 B.C. The speech is a prosecution, for political motives, against an associate of Demosthenes on the grounds that he had prostituted his body and was therefore to be deprived by law of his citizen rights. Aeschines contrasts Timarchus with citizens of good character so that the judges "can assign him his proper rank." The comic actor Parmenon was a Lenaeon victor around midcentury.

Again <choosing examples> from among the young men and those who are even now still boys, take first the nephew of Iphikrates and son of Teisias of Rhamnous, the namesake of the present defendant. Though he is good-looking, so far is he from disgraceful conduct that the other day during the comic performances at the Rural Dionysia at Kollytos, when Parmenon the actor delivered an anapaestic line to the chorus, in which it was said that there are some big Timarchian catamites, no one understood this to refer to the youth, but everyone thought of you.

54A. Dionysia in Akharnai. *IG II²* 3092. Dedicatory inscription. Date: beginning of 4th c. B.C. Several fragments of the tragedian Dikaiogenes are extant and he is said also to have written dithyrambs; nothing is known of Ariphron or Polychares.

Mnesistratos, son of Misgon; Diopieithes, son of Diodoros, were *choregoi*. [Di]kaiogenes was *didaskalos*. Mnesimachos, son of Mnesistratos; Theotimos, son of Diotimos, were *choregoi*. Ariphron was *didaskalos*. Polychares, son of Komon, was *didaskalos*.

54B. *IG II²* 3106. Dedicatory inscription. Date: 4th c. B.C. No comic poet of the name Speuseades is known.

- - - ?son of Dem]os[t]ratos victorious in the [round] chorus (i.e., dithyramb) and in comedy set this up. Chares of Thebes played the pipes. Speuseades was *didaskalos*.

55A. Dionysia in Salamis. *IG II²* 3093. Dedicatory inscription on base found on Salamis. Date: beginning of 4th c. B.C. Telephanes was one of the most famous pipers of his age (cf. 106).

Diodoros, son of Exekestides, victorious with a boys' chorus. Paideas was the *didaskalos*. Telephanes of Megara was the piper. Philomelos was archon.

55B. *IG II²* 1227. An honorary decree. Date: 131/0 B.C. A proclamation at the (new) tragic contest at the Dionysia in Salamis also appears in *IG II²* 1008 (118/7 B.C.), 1011 (106/5 B.C.), and *SEG* 15.104 (127/6 B.C.).

Theogenes...proposed...to honor the annual gymnasiarch who held office during the archonship of Ergokles, Theodotos, son of Eustrophos, of Piraeus, and, as is customary, to crown him with a golden crown for his zeal toward the deme of Salamis and to proclaim this crown at the tragedies of the Dionysia in Salamis, when it next occurs.

56A. Dionysia in Rhamnous. *IG II²* 3108. Dedicatory inscription on base of an *exedra* found in Rhamnous. Date: 4th c. B.C.?

- - -] of Rhamnous [set this up being victorious as *choregos*] in comedy.

56B. *IG II²* 3109. Dedicatory inscription on statue base inside the small temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous. Date: beginning of 3rd c. B.C.

Megakles, son of Megakles, of Rhamnous, set this up for Themis when he was crowned by his demesmen for his justice during the priestessship of Kallisto and when he was victorious serving as gymnasiarch for men and boys and when he was *choregos* in comedy.

57. Dionysia in Paiania. *IG II²* 3097. Dedicatory inscription found in Paiania. Date: mid-4th c. B.C. This Demosthenes may be a relative of the famous orator, who was also from Paiania.

De]mosthenes, son of D[em]ainet]os, of Paiania was victorious as *ch[orego]s* in [t]ragedy.

58. Dionysia in Aigilia. IG II² 3096. Dedicatory inscription found near ancient Aigilia. Date: before the mid-4th c. B.C.

Timo]sthenes, son of Meixonides; Meixonides, son of Timosthenes; Kleostratos, son of Timosthenes; victorious as *choregoi* set up this statue and altar to Dionysus.

59. Dionysia in Anagyros. IG II² 3101. Dedicatory verse inscription found near ancient Anagyros. Date: second half of 4th c. B.C. Cf. IV 307.

When with the sweetly laughing chorus I won the Dionysia, I set up this gift to the god both as a monument to my victory and an adornment to my deme, an honor to my ivy-crowned father, even before whom I won the ivy-bearing contest.

60. Dionysia at Myrrhinous. IG II² 1182. An honorary decree. Date: mid-4th c. B.C. On *prohedria* see IVBi.

And they are to have *pr]ohedr[ia* in] all the [specta]cles that the people of Myrrhinous produce.

Lenaea

61. Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 57.1. Written ca. 330 B.C.

The king archon looks after . . . the Lenaeon Dionysia. This is [both the procession and the contest.] The king archon and the supervisors together organize the procession. The king archon arranges the contest.

62A. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Knights* 547. The expression “from the wagon” appears frequently in ancient literature meaning unbridled abuse.

The Lenaea is a festival in Athens, in which to this day poets compete composing some songs to be laughed at. That is why Demosthenes says (*On the Crown* 122) “from the wagon,” because the singers sitting on wagons recite and sing the verses.

62B. Photius, *Lex.* s.v. *ta ek ton hamaxon*. Written 9th c.

“The things from the wagons”; because at Athens in the Festival of the Cups (i.e. day two of the Anthesteria) the revelers on the wagons mock and insult everyone they meet. Later they did the same thing at the Lenaea also.

62C. Harpocration, s.v. *pompeias kai pompeuein*. Written 2nd c.?

“Processions and to have a procession”: instead of “abuse” and “to abuse” . . . the metaphor is from people abusing each other on the wagons in the processions of Dionysus. Menander, in the *Perinthia*

(= fr. 4 K.): “there are some ‘processions’ on the wagons, highly abusive.”

63. Hesychius, s.v. *epi Lenaio agon*. Probably written 5th c.

The Lenaion is in the city and has a large enclosure and inside it a temple of Dionysus Lenaios. In it the contests of the Athenians took place before the theater was built.

64A. Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 129. Delivered in 330 B.C.

I am not at a loss for things to say about you (Aeschines) and your family, but for choosing a place to begin . . . or I could mention the fact that your mother earned the means of nourishing you, her lovely manikin and super-tritagonist, by selling her body afternoons in the shed by the shrine of the hero of the probe (a nickname for the statue of the surgeon Aristomachus).

64B. Patmos scholiast to Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 129.

Shed: a building with big doors in the marketplace . . . The sanctuary of <the hero of the probe> is near the Lenaion.

65. Photius, *Lex.* s.v. *ikria* (bleachers). Written 9th c. Pollux 7.125 also connects the “bleachers” with the marketplace.

Those in the marketplace from which they used to watch the Dionysian contests before the theater in the sanctuary of Dionysus was built.

66. Photius, *Lex.* s.v. *orchestra*. Written 9th c. Cf. Plato’s *Apology* 26d, which mentions books for sale in a place called the orchestra. Orchestra means “dancing circle,” and the name of the spot in the marketplace is most easily explained as a carryover from the time when it was really used as such.

<A spot> was first called <“orchestra”> in the marketplace, then also the lower semicircle of the theater, where also the choruses sang and danced.

67. Hesychius, s.v. *Limnai* (Marshes). Probably written 5th c. “Laia” is obviously corrupt and is often corrected to “Lenaia.” But even if the emendation is correct, and this is far from certain—“Limnaia” is a possibility—the statement is extremely doubtful.

A place dedicated to Dionysus in Athens, where the Laia is put on.

68. IG II² 2325. “Victor Lists” of comic poets at the Lenaea, col. i. Most of the beginning of the list of Lenaeon comic victors survives and this enables us to arrive at an approximate date for the beginning of the comic contest at the Lenaea and also presumably for the beginning of the official regulation of drama at this festival. The list gives comic poets/directors in the order of their first victory at the Lenaea. Each

name is followed by the total number of victories won at the Lenaea over the individual's entire career. The key to dating the beginning of the Lenaeian contest is the absence of the name of Aristophanes, whom we know (from the hypotheses and scholia) to have won a Lenaeian victory with *Acharnians* in 425 B.C. Since neither the name of Aristophanes nor his director (*didaskalos*) Callistratus appears on the surviving part of the column, all of the poets on the column won their victories previous to 425 B.C. This makes the earliest conceivable date for Xenophilos' victory 434 B.C. Moreover, we hear from late sources that Eupolis began his career no earlier than 429 or 427 B.C. It is clear therefore that Aristophanes' victory of 425 B.C. must have appeared just below or very close to the break. Some considerations, however, urge a date before 434 B.C. for Xenophilos' first victory. The activity of Teleclides seems not to have extended beyond ca. 430 B.C. The inclusion of Teleclides' other four victories would push the earliest date back to 438 B.C. Similar considerations urge the inclusion of the second victories of Cratinus and Hermippus taking us to at least 440 B.C.

Lenae]a[n Victories of Comi]c [Poets

X]enophilos 1
 Teleclides 5
 Aristomenes 2
 Cratinus 3
 Pherecrates 2
 Hermippus 4
 Phrynichus 2
 Myrtilos 1
 Eu]polis 3

- 69A. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 501–8. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C.
 What I will say is terrible, but just. Cleon will not now slander me saying that I have maligned the city in the presence of foreigners: this contest is the Lenaea and we are alone. The foreigners are not yet present because neither the tribute nor the allies have come from the cities. But now we are winnowed clean—I call the metics the bran of the citizens.
- 69B. Scholiast to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 504.
 The <subject> cities were ordered to bring the tribute to Athens at

the time of the Dionysia, as Eupolis says in *Cities* (*Poleis*, produced at the Dionysia, 422 B.C.)

70A. Plato, *Symposium* 175e. Written ca. 384 B.C. The fictional setting is a private party celebrating Agathon's first victory for tragedy in 416 B.C. This passage is included here on the basis of the testimony in 70B, but the ascription to the Lenaea is problematic. See 7.

(Socrates to Agathon) Your wisdom is brilliant and will grow; indeed, though you are young, it shone forth brilliantly and became famous two days ago before more than thirty thousand Greeks.

70B. Athenaeus 217a–b. Written ca. 200.

But Plato's *Symposium* is complete nonsense, because when Agathon had his victory, Plato was fourteen years old. The former was crowned at the Lenaea in the archonship of Euphemos (417/6 B.C.), but Plato was born in the archonship of Apollodoros (430/29 B.C.)

71. *POxy* 2737, fr. 1, col ii, 1–17. The papyrus, written before the end of the 2nd c., contains a fragment of a commentary, probably on Aristophanes' *Anagyros*. The comic poet Plato's *Theater Police* is to be dated some time between 427–413 B.C. The commentator seems to be explaining the line "those granting choruses should have considered the contest at the Lenaea," probably from the epirrhema of the *parabasis*. The text is very fragmentary and uncertain up to "Eratosthenes."

I have sai]d the thea[trical productions] were [of two types]: the Lenae[an appear not to have been equ]ally reputable, perhaps also because of the fact that in s[pring the all]lies had already c[ome from abroa]d to see [the performances and do b]usin[ess. With "t]o the city" the Dionysia is indicated. Eratosthenes also says of Plato (the comic poet) that as long as he had his plays produced by others, he did well; but when he first produced a play on his own, *Theater Police* (*Rabdouchoi*), and placed fourth, he was pushed back again to the Lenaea.

72. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Plutus* 954.

It was not permitted for a foreigner to dance in the city choruses...but it was in the Lenaea, since even resident foreigners (metics) acted as *choregoi*.

73. *Hesperia* 40 (1971) no. 4. An inscription on a herm base found in the step of the stoa of the king archon in the Athenian marketplace. Date: end of 5th or beginning of 4th c. B.C. Since Sosikrates' profession is given and not his father's name, we can infer that he is a metic.

Onesippos, son of Aitios, of the deme of Kephisia, the king archon, erected this monument. These *choregoi* were victorious during One-

sippos' tenure of office as king archon. For comedy Sosikrates, the bronze-merchant, was *choregos*; Nikochares was *didaskalos*. For tragedy Stratonikos, son of Straton, was *choregos*; Megakleides was *didaskalos*.

74. IG II² 2319, col. ii. The *Didaskaliai*, a list of tragedies at the Lenaea for the years 420–417 B.C. See I 101.

Eir[... (= a tragedy)

The actor was [X

The actor [X won first prize

In the archonship of A[styphilos (420/19 B.C.) poet X with

Aga[memnon etc.

The actor was [X

Herak[leides was second with]

These[us etc.

The actor was [X

The actor [X won first prize

In the archonship of Arch[ias (419/8 B.C.) poet X (Sophocles?) with]

Tyro, T[roilus?

The actor was Lysikrat[es

Callistratus [was second with]

Amphilochus, Ixio[n

The actor was Kallippi[des

The actor Kallippid[es] won

In the archonship of A[ntiph[o]n (418/7 B.C.) S[...]

75. *Hesperia* 40 (1971) 302f. A new fragment of the *Didaskaliai* listing Lenaeian tragedies from the years 364/3 B.C.

The actor was] Hephai[stion

Ni]komachos [was third with

Amymone, T[...]

The actor was [X

The actor Hephastio[n won

In the archonship of Timokrate[s (364/3 B.C.) poet X with

Oinopion, Heka[...]

The actor was Arexis

Theodorides was second with

Medea, Phaetho[n

The actor was Androsthe[nes

Kleainetos was t[hird with

Hypsipyle, Ph[...]

The actor was Hippar[chos

The actor Arex[is won

In the archonship of Charik[leides (363/2 B.C.) poet X

76A. First Hypothesis to Aristophanes, *Acharnians*.

It was produced in the archonship of Euthynos (426/5 B.C.) at the

Lenaea by Callistratus (he was *didaskalos*) and he was first. Cratinus

was second with *Storm-Tossed*. It does not survive. Eupolis was

third with *Firsts of the Months*.

76B. Second Hypothesis to Aristophanes, *Knights*.

The drama was produced in the archonship of Stratokles (425/4

B.C.) publicly at the Lenaea by Aristophanes himself. He won with

first prize, Cratinus was second with *Satyrs*, Aristomenes third with

Wood-Carriers.

76C. First Hypothesis to Aristophanes, *Wasps*.

The drama was produced by Philonides (i.e., he was *didaskalos*)

in the archonship of Ameinias (423/2 B.C.) in the 89th Olympiad.

It was second at the Lenaea. And Philonides won first prize with

Proagon, Leucon was third with *Ambassadors*.

76D. First Hypothesis to Aristophanes, *Frogs*. Date: 405 B.C.

The drama was produced by Philonides (i.e., he was *didaskalos*) at

the Lenaea in the archonship of the Kallias who comes after An-

tigenes (406/5 B.C.). It was first. Phrynichus was second with *Muses*.

Plato was third with *Cleophon*.

77. IG II² 2319, col. i. *Didaskaliai* listing comedies at the Lenaea in 285/4 B.C.

... fourth with ...]stis

The actor was Aristoma]chos

...]es was fifth with *The Rescued Girl*

The actor was Ant]iphanes

The actor Her]onymos won

In the archonship of Di]otimos, Simylos with

Ephe]sian Woman; the actor was Aristomachos

Diodorus was second with *The Corpse*

The actor was Aristomachos

Diodorus was third with *The Lunatic*

The actor was Kephisios

Phoe]nik[id]es was fourth with *The Poet*

The actor was Antiphan?]es

Anthesteria

78. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Ten Orators* 841. The author's source appears to be Philochorus' *Atthis* (79), which was written ca. 261 B.C. Like 71, this passage suggests that success at other festivals could qualify a poet for the Great Dionysia, presumably of the following year. The Anthesteria was a three-day festival whose days are called "Opening of the Wine Jars," "Festival of Cups," and "Festival of Pots."

<Lycurgus> also introduced legislation (ca. 338–326 B.C.), one on comic performances establishing a competition in the theater at the Festival of the Pots (i.e., day three of the Anthesteria), and had the winner enrolled as a competitor for the City Dionysia, a thing not formerly permitted, and thus restored a contest that had fallen into neglect.

79. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 218.

The Pots: a festival in Athens . . . The so-called contests of the Festival of the Pots are held there, as Philochorus says in the sixth book of the *Atthis*.

80. Diogenes Laertius 3.56. Probably written first half of 3rd c. Thrasyllos was an astrologer and friend of Tiberius, active till 36. There is inscriptional evidence for the performance of "new tragedy" at the Panathenaea in the 1st c. and dramatic contests in the 2nd c. B.C.

Thrasyllos says that <Plato> even published his dialogues after the manner of tragic tetralogies, just as <the tragedians> contested with four dramas at the Dionysia, Lenaea, Panathenaea, and Festival of the Pots.

81. Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 4.21. Written ca. 200 and referring to the second half of the 1st c. Apollonius was a mystic philosopher. The author appears to be describing pantomime. Cf. V 37.

<Apollonius> is said to have rebuked the Athenians with respect to the Dionysia, which they perform in the month of Anthesterion. He thought that they were attending the theater to hear monodies and lyrics, *parabaseis* and measures, but when he heard that they danced to the music of a pipe suggesting lithe twistings, and that they acted like Hours, Nymphs, and Bacchantes to the epics and theology of Orpheus, he reproached them and said, "Stop dancing away the memory of the brave men of Salamis."

III Aii. Regulation

III Aii a. The Choregic System

The main burden of organizing the dramatic festivals at Athens fell upon citizens—and in some cases probably metics (72)—whom the archon appointed to be *choregoi*. The *choregos*' principal responsibility was to foot the bill for equipping and training a tragic, comic, or dithyrambic chorus, but the office (called *choregia*) also involved a great deal of organization: the secondary selection from the archon's list of a poet and piper, the primary selection of members of the chorus (a very irksome duty to judge from 94), and the hiring of a chorus director (94, 106, 107), if the chorus was not taught by the poet himself (IV D). The financial burden far outweighed the organizational. The *choregos* was required to provide a training ground (94) for the chorus, to house and feed the chorus and actors (IV 19; 92, 95, 96 attest to high expectations in this regard), and to pay for the costumes and accessories used in the performance (91, 106), including extra actors (98). In the event that the *choregos* won first prize in the contest, there was the additional cost of a dedication to Dionysos (88, 102, and cf. 30).

The *choregia* formed one of a variety of public services, such as paying the upkeep of a warship for the period of a year (trierarchy), or paying for the training of a team of athletes for an athletic contest (gymnasiarchy), which were collectively called "liturgies" (*leitourgiai*). These may be described as special taxes imposed by the Athenian democracy upon the rich. Property qualification for the performance of the more expensive liturgies lay somewhere between three and four talents (18,000 and 24,000 drachmas). The lower limit is more than a skilled laborer could hope to earn in an entire lifetime (1 drachma is the daily wage of a common soldier or a master craftsman in the late 5th c. B.C.). Appointment to the most expensive liturgy, the trierarchy, was generally confined to an elite class of about 300 to 400 citizens, roughly one percent of the (adult male) citizen population (numbering from around 43,000 in 431 B.C. to about 21,000 in 313 B.C.). The attitude of the liturgical class to the *choregia* was generally ambivalent: as far as possible it was a thing to be avoided, but once assigned, the *choregia*, more than any other liturgy, could become something of a potlatch, a display of public zeal and

conspicuous consumption pushed to the very brink of financial ruin (88, 91, 92).

Certain exemptions existed to protect wealthy citizens from overextending their resources by performing more than one liturgy at a time or by performing several liturgies in close succession (82). The evidence is clearest for the 4th c. B.C.: those who acted as trierarchs were not required to perform other liturgies (85); apart from the trierarchy (85), no one was required to perform (precisely) the same liturgy twice (i.e., not “*choregos* for the men’s dithyramb at the Dionysia” twice—see 82); again, apart from the trierarchy (85), an exemption of one or two years (82, 85) intervened between the performance of liturgies; finally, certain benefactors of the city might be voted the honor of *ateleia*, or freedom from taxation, which meant an exemption from the requirement to perform liturgies other than the trierarchy (85). In addition, a law forbade those under forty years of age to act as *choregos* for the boys’ dithyramb (82). It is questionable whether some of these exemptions existed in the 5th c. B.C.: the speaker of 88 and the Thrasyllus mentioned in 85B both performed the trierarchy and other liturgies simultaneously, and neither interrupted his service for the exemption period, possibly out of pure zeal, but more probably because the exemption did not yet exist despite Demosthenes’ rhetorical appeal to “longstanding laws”; moreover, the speaker of 88 was in his early twenties and Alcibiades in his early thirties (105) when they acted as *choregoi* for boys’ dithyrambs, and it seems that the minimum age law mentioned by Aristotle (82) and other 4th-c. authors was not yet in effect.

The state exercised a strict compulsion upon those selected to perform liturgies. As a last resort, an unwilling candidate could instigate a procedure called *antidosis* (literally, “exchange of property”) by presenting the archon with the name of a candidate he thought better qualified to perform the liturgy. It was then open to the new candidate to take up the performance of the liturgy, or to exchange property with the original appointee, who would then perform the liturgy with the financial resources acquired in the exchange (82, 86, 87, cf. 50A). Although the procedure was fully regulated by law, the risks were considerable and probably served as a deterrent to any but the most desperate (87).

The evidence for the cost of the various liturgies gives us a sense of the enormous importance of the dramatic festivals to Athenian society. The speaker of 88 claimed to have served as *choregos* at the Dionysia three times and to have spent 3,000 drachmas for tragedy, 1,600 for a comedy, and 5,000 for the men’s dithyramb. The only comparable figure

is also from a speech of Lysias, referring to two tragic *choregiai* performed some fifteen to twenty years later, which are said together to have cost 5,000 drachmas (89); the slight difference between this sum and that of 88 may be due to less zeal or more careful management, but since the festivals at which the latter tragic *choregiai* were performed are not named, it is possible that one or both were at the Lenaea, which was less expensive since it involved only two tragedies as opposed to three plus a satyrplay at the Dionysia (cf. 74, 75). Similarly, comic *choregiai* were cheaper since they involved only one performance, despite the larger size of the chorus, but it is interesting to see that they were much more cost-intensive than individual tragedies. Demosthenes also attests to the greater cost of the dithyramb (90), due not only to the greater size of the chorus but also probably to the fiercer competition that seems to have attended its tribal rivalry. It is impressive to note that the cost of this dithyramb, at most one half-hour’s public entertainment, was just slightly less than the cost of running a warship for an entire year (5,143 drachmas). If the rival competitors of the speaker of 88 spent as much as he did, then three days’ entertainment cost Athens 113,800 drachmas in choregic contributions, to which may be added an estimated state expenditure of 36,000 drachmas. The resulting figures show that Athens, at war, and fighting for its very survival, spent on a single dramatic festival an amount equivalent to the total annual expenditure on one-tenth of its navy. Plutarch’s claim (92, cf. 93)—that the Athenians spent “more on the production of *Bacchaes* and *Phoenician Women* and *Oedipuses* and the misfortunes of *Medeas* or *Electras* than they did on maintaining their empire and fighting for their liberty against the Persians”—though exaggerated, is not wildly so.

The victorious dithyrambic *choregos* won a tripod, which was normally dedicated in or near the precinct of Dionysus on expensive monuments that added no small sum to the cost of the *choregia* (88, 102; I 137). The successful tragic *choregos* is said to have won a goat to sacrifice to Dionysus, and the successful comic *choregos* is said to have been given a basket of figs and a skin full of wine. As opposed to dithyrambic *choregiai*, there are relatively few stone inscriptions relating to dramatic victories. This is probably due to the fact that dramatic *choregoi* rarely made dedications of this sort. The literary testimonia refer rather to the dedication of masks and costumes (88) or to the dedication of *pinakes* (= plaque, tablet, or painting—see 99, 100), which, as the evidence seems to show, were paintings of scenes relating to the drama or its production. Many of the pots, figurines, reliefs, mosaics, and wall paintings with

theatrical or theatrically influenced mythological scenes probably derive from these dedications (IC). Theophrastus' illiberal man stands out because he merely dedicates a text recording his name on a slab of wood, not an artifact of intrinsic value relating to the context of the victory (101).

It is not the stinginess of the illiberal man per se that makes him ridiculous to his contemporaries but his failure to use his money for the "attainment of respect or distinction" (101). Although the institution of the *choregia* probably goes back to the time of the democratic reorganization of the Dionysia around 502/1 B.C. (see I 100), it is likely that it merely formalized a customary sponsorship of village sacrifice and festival worship undertaken by local potentates for the sake of prestige and good will. The shift from voluntary largesse to obligatory service did not eliminate the potential benefits of the system for the donors. They were, in Isocrates' words, "a burden, but one which conferred a certain honor on those who undertook them" (*Panathenaikos* 145), so that they were frequently assumed by volunteers (84), and even those who acted under compulsion were likely to spend more than the legal minimum (88, 103). *Choregiai* and other liturgies were used in canvassing popularity for political ends (102). The memory of public largesse was openly viewed as a form of litigation insurance if one fell foul of the law, as wealthy Athenians frequently did (103, and, conversely, 104). We owe a great deal of our evidence about the liturgical system to the common practice of winning over the sympathy of the popular juries by recounting past public services (e.g., 84, 88, 89, 90). In addition to these motives, the performance of conspicuous liturgies like the *choregia* provided an outlet for the fiercely competitive *ethos* of the Greek aristocracy, which frequently led to more than financial excess (105–7). For most, however, the cost of the *choregia* far outweighed such potential benefits, and the elite seem to have agitated continually for some alleviation of the burden. Their growing success can be seen, for example, in the apparent growth in the number of exemptions available in the 4th c. B.C. In 359 B.C. the burden of the trierarchy was considerably lightened by the assignment of trierarchies to corporations of sixty men (called *symmoriai*; 85B, 109), though the number of co-contributors was reduced in 340 B.C. The *choregia*, probably because it required much more personal initiative, seems to have been more resistant to this kind of cost distribution scheme. The contradictory evidence for the shared responsibility for the *choregia* (*synchoregia*) has made this a celebrated problem of contemporary scholarship. A scholion on Aristophanes quotes Aristotle to the effect that by

decree, the drama at the Dionysia in 410 or 406 B.C. was jointly sponsored (108). This is the only secure evidence that exists for the *synchoregia* at the urban festivals in Athens (cf. IIIAib). A statement of Demosthenes seems to imply that he knew nothing of the practice (109). The *choregia* was abolished under the oligarchic constitution set up by Demetrius of Phaleron, a Peripatetic philosopher, installed as governor of Athens by Cassander (IV 131–33), and the *choregoi* were replaced by an annually elected official called the *agonothetes*, who organized dramatic and other festivals and seems to have contributed large sums from his own private purse (110). The Aristotelians, at least, were conscious of potential benefits that the coupling of an elected office with choregic functions had for the consolidation of an oligarchic constitution (111). In any case, the abolition of the *choregia* so soon after the restriction of the franchise attests to its unpopularity among the wealthier class, while any opportunity the *choregia* may have provided for winning prestige and popular favor survived in the *agonothesia* in augmented form. The *agonothesia* survived the various constitutional modifications that attended the social and political conflicts of the following centuries.

Sources

Selection of Choregoi

82. Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians* 56.3. Written ca. 330 B.C. The transfer of the responsibility for appointing comic *choregoi* from the archon to the tribal organizations must already have taken place by 348/7 B.C. since tribal appointments of *choregoi* are mentioned in that year in a speech by Demosthenes (*Against Boiotos Concerning the Name* 7).

As soon as he takes up office the eponymous archon first proclaims that everyone shall hold and retain till the end of his term of office all the property he owned at the beginning of his term of office. Next he appoints for tragedy three *choregoi* who are the richest of all Athenians. In former times he also appointed five *choregoi* for comedy, but now the tribes appoint them. Then he receives the *choregoi* put forward by the tribes for the men's and boys' dithyramb and the comedies at the Dionysia and for the men's and boys' dithyramb at the Thargelia—at the Dionysia the *choregoi* are appointed one to each tribe, but at the Thargelia one to a pair of tribes; in other words each tribe of a pair takes its turn. The archon

looks after the exchanges of property (*antidosis*) and introduces the exemptions in cases where the candidate claims to have performed this liturgy in the past, to be exempt because the period of exemption following another liturgy he performed has not yet elapsed, or not to be of age, since the law requires *choregoi* for boys' choruses to be over forty years of age.

83. Second Hypothesis to Demosthenes' *Against Meidias*. The author of this hypothesis is very ignorant about some things and naive about others, but he alone preserves the following piece of information that may have been taken from a reliable source. In any case, 93 indicates that *choregoi* were chosen long in advance of the festival.

In the first month after the end of the festival the names of the *choregoi* for the next festival were put forward.

84. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 13–14. Written 348–346 B.C. Demosthenes' *choregia* was at the Dionysia, 348 B.C.

When two years ago no *choregos* had been appointed for the tribe Pandionis and the assembly was held at which the law requires the archon to allot pipers for the choruses, as there was a great row with the archon accusing the overseers of the tribe and the overseers the archon, I came forward and voluntarily offered myself as *choregos*, and when the lots were drawn and I got first pick of the pipers, you, men of Athens, all welcomed most favorably both my announcement and the outcome of the draw, and made such clatter and applause as to praise and congratulate me.

85A. Demosthenes, *Against Leptines* 8 and 18–19. Delivered in 355/4 B.C., this speech expresses Demosthenes' opposition to a proposed law that would rescind and permanently do away with grants of freedom from the responsibility of performing annual liturgies (*ateleia*), which till then had been awarded to notable public benefactors. Those supporting the legislation claimed that so many of these grants had been made that there were not enough rich men to be found to assume the liturgies and that they now devolved upon "poor men."

(8) Still one has to keep in mind that according to the existing laws that have long been in force . . . each person performs liturgies at one-year intervals, so that half the time he is exempt from contributions. . . . (18–19) Of those taxes levied for the pursuit of the war and for the safety of the city and of the trierarchies, by longstanding laws, rightly and justly, no one is exempt. . . . Let us consider whom <Leptines> (sponsor of the law against exemptions) will add as *choregoi* to those liturgies and, if we don't listen to

him, how many it will leave out. Now the richest citizens, as they are trierarchs, are always exempt from the *choregia*. Those who have insufficient property, enjoying the exemption imposed by necessity, also lie outside the purview of this tax. Therefore no one of either of these groups will be made *choregos* for us through this law.

85B. Isaeus, *Estate of Apollodoros* 38. Written ca. 354 B.C. The law of Periandros, 357/6 B.C., created the system of *symmoriai*, by which corporations of sixty contributors jointly defrayed the cost of a trierarchy. Thrasyllos, the father of Apollodoros, who is the subject of this passage, died serving in Sicily in 415–413 B.C.

We beg you <jurors> to come to our assistance both for Apollodoros' sake and for the sake of his father, for you will find that they were not useless citizens, but as solicitous as possible about your affairs. His father both performed all the other liturgies and acted continuously as trierarch, not as a member of a *symmoria*, as they do at present, but at his own expense, not even as the second member of a pair of trierarchs (i.e., *syntrierarchy*), but all alone, and not even interrupting for two years after each year of service, but serving continuously, and not even acting perfunctorily, but providing the very best service possible.

86A. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* 1.197.3, s.v. *Antidosis*.

Antidosis: someone giving his property to someone wealthier to make him pay the cost of an imposed liturgy, as they are expensive, or, if the latter does not wish to perform the liturgy, the latter giving his property in exchange, and the former receiving it and performing the liturgy.

86B. *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, in *Lexica Graeca Minora* p. 69, s.v. *antidosis*.

Antidosis: whenever someone summoned to perform a liturgy claims that another is wealthier than he and summons the other to perform the liturgy or to discharge the responsibility by giving his own property and receiving that of the other person.

87. Demosthenes, *Against Phainippos* 1–4. Date uncertain: ca. 355–325 B.C. The speaker was appointed to a liturgy and challenged Phainippos to an exchange of property. Phainippos, however, did not carry out the exchange in the proper manner, so the question of which party was to perform the liturgy was submitted to a jury, a form of trial called *diadikasia*.

Gentlemen of the jury, I wish first you all well, and then Solon, the man who established the law concerning exchanges of property

(*antidosis*). For if Solon had not clearly set out what parties agreeing to an exchange of property had to do first, second, and so on in order, I don't know what limit Phainippos' impudence might have reached, since even now when the law prescribes the entire procedure, he nevertheless treated its codified justice with contempt, and instead of giving me the inventory of his property in three days as he swore to do in accordance with the law, or since he didn't wish to do this, instead of giving me the list on the 25th of Boedromion, a date he himself set after requesting an extension and on which he agreed to give the inventory, he did neither of these things, but dismissing both us and the law, he gave me the list more than a month later, just two or three days before coming to trial, and made himself scarce in the entire interval. Instead of leaving the sealings with which I sealed the buildings, he went to his farm, opened the buildings, and carried off the barley and other things, as if the law had given him permission to do as he pleased and not as is just. I, gentlemen of the jury, would happily have seen myself prospering with my former wealth and remaining a member of the three hundred. Since, however, I shared the general misfortune with those who operate the silver mines, but also privately lost my wealth through the imposition of enormous fines, and, to cap it all, must now deposit three talents (18,000 drachmas) with the city, a talent per share—I unfortunately had shares in the confiscated mine—I am compelled to try to find someone to set in my position who is not only richer than I am at present but also richer than I was previously and also someone who has never performed a liturgy for you or paid the special tax on wealth to the state. I beg you all, gentlemen of the jury, if I show that this Phainippos has transgressed the justice of the laws and is richer than myself, to come to my assistance and have this fellow enrolled among the three hundred in my place. It is for this reason that the laws allow for exchanges of property (*antidosis*) once a year, since the joy of continuous prosperity is wont to remain with few citizens.

Costs and Responsibilities

88. Lysias, *Defense Against a Charge of Bribery* 1–5. Delivered 403/2 B.C. or soon after. This is the beginning of the defense of an unnamed defendant charged with accepting bribes. The defendant's liturgical career

is unique in its intensity and expenditures, amounting to 63,300 drachmas over a ten-year period.

Men of the jury, enough has been said about my accusers; I think it right that you learn the rest so that you will know what sort of man you are judging. I was enrolled as a citizen (i.e., reached the age of majority, eighteen) in the archonship of Theopompos (411/10 B.C.) and was appointed *choregos* (at the City Dionysia) for tragedy. I spent 30 mnas (3,000 drachmas) and two months later I won first prize as *choregos* of a men's dithyramb at the Thargelia at a cost of 2,000 drachmas. In the archonship of Glaukippos (410/9 B.C.) I spent 800 drachmas on the *pyrrhiche* at the Panathenaea. Once again *choregos* for the men's dithyramb in the same year, I won first prize at the Dionysia and spent 5,000 drachmas, monument for the tripod included. Also in the archonship of Diokles (409/8 B.C.), I spent 300 drachmas on a circular chorus (i.e., dithyramb) at the lesser Panathenaea. Meanwhile I was a trierarch (i.e., responsible for the upkeep of a warship) for seven years and spent six talents (36,000 drachmas). Even though I incurred such expenses and risked my life daily on your behalf and endured absence from home, I nevertheless contributed to the special property tax, 30 mnas (3,000 drachmas) on one occasion and 4,000 drachmas on another. When I returned from service in the archonship of Alexias (405/4 B.C.) I immediately became gymnasiarch for the Prometheia and won first prize at a cost of 12 mnas (1,200 drachmas). Later I was made *choregos* for a boys' chorus and I spent more than 15 mnas (1,500 drachmas). In the archonship of Euclides (403/2 B.C.) I won first prize in comedy as *choregos* for Cephisodorus (an Old Comic poet whose victory at the Dionysia of 402 B.C. is independently attested by the "Victor Lists") and spent 16 mnas (1,600 drachmas), including the dedication of the masks, and at the lesser Panathenaea I was *choregos* for the youths' *pyrrhiche* and spent 7 mnas (700 drachmas). I won first prize competing in the boat race at Sunium at a cost of 15 mnas (1,500 drachmas). This is not to mention leading the sacred embassy and the Arrephoria and other such things, on which I spent more than 20 mnas (3,000 drachmas). And of those things I've listed, if I had wished to perform these liturgies only to the standard required by the letter of the law, I would not have spent a quarter of what I did.

89. Lysias, *For the Property of Aristophanes* 42. Written in 388 or 387 B.C. The *choregiai* mentioned were performed sometime from 394

to 389 B.C. Earlier in the speech (29), we learn that “on his own behalf and on behalf of his father” refers to two separate *choregiai* for tragedy and that the trierarchy was for three consecutive years.

Now Aristophanes had land and a house worth more than 5 talents (30,000 drachmas). He performed the *choregia* on his own behalf and on behalf of his father at a cost of 5,000 drachmas, as trierarch he spent 80 mnas (8,000 drachmas).

90. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 156. Written 348–346 B.C. Demosthenes’ *choregia* was at the Dionysia, 348 B.C.

This man (Aeschines) once served as *choregos* for tragedy, I for a men’s dithyramb, and surely no one is ignorant of the fact that the latter expense is much greater than the former.

91. Antiphanes, *Soldier*, PCG F 201. A poet of Middle Comedy, Antiphanes was active from about 385 to about 335 B.C.

Whoever thinks, being human born, that any possession is safe in life, couldn’t be more wrong. Either some tax snatches away everything, or incurring a lawsuit he is wiped out, or he goes into debt after becoming a general, or he is chosen *choregos* and furnishing golden robes for the chorus he himself wears rags, or he hangs himself while trierarch.

92. Plutarch, *On the Glory of Athens* 348d–349b. Written ca. 115.

Do you wish us to introduce the men themselves carrying the tokens and insignia of their occupation, giving their own entrance to each? From this side let the poets come forward chanting and singing to the music of flutes and lyres (= Aristophanes, *Frogs* 353ff.), “Keep holy silence and stand out of the way of our choruses whoever is untutored in this form of discourse or is impure in mind or never sang nor danced the mysteries of the noble Muses or was never initiated in the Bacchic rites of the bull-eating tongue of Cratinus,” and carrying props and masks and altars and stage machines and *periaktoi* and victory tripods. And let the tragic actors enter with them, the Nikostratoses and Kallippideses and Mynniskoses and Theodoroses and Poloses, like the beauticians and stool bearers of the rich woman Tragedy, or rather following along like the painters, gilders, and dyers of statues. Now bring forth the unruly mob of props and masks and purple robes and stage machines and chorus directors and supernumeraries. Looking at all this, a Spartan once said, quite appositely, that the Athenians were making a big mistake in lavishing so much on their love for play, in effect pouring the expense of large fleets and the provisions of armies into the theater.

If the cost of the production of each drama were reckoned, the Athenian people would appear to have spent more on the production of *Bacchaes* and *Phoenician Women* and *Oedipuses* and the misfortunes of *Medeas* and *Electras* than they did on maintaining their empire and fighting for their liberty against the Persians. Generals frequently gave the order to bring uncooked grain and led the men off to battle. And, by Zeus, the trierarchs provided the men rowing the ships with barley flavored with onion and cheese and marched them aboard ship. But the *choregoi* set before the members of the chorus eels and lettuce and prime ribs and brain and continued feasting them for a long time while they lived in the lap of luxury and had their voices trained. In return, what was there left over but for the *choregoi* who lost to be abused and ridiculed, and for those who won, a tripod, not a monument to a victory, as Demetrius said, but a libation to a squandered livelihood and a cenotaph to a lost home. Such are the ends of poetry and from it comes nothing more glorious.

93. Demosthenes, *Philippic* 1.35–36. Delivered early 351 B.C.

Yet why then, men of Athens, do you suppose that the festivals of the Panathenaea or the Dionysia always take place at the regular time whether experts or ordinary citizens are chosen to oversee the preparations, though such great amounts of money are spent on these festivals as would never be spent on any military expedition, and though they involve so much trouble and preparation that I don’t know if there is anything at all comparable; instead, all of our military expeditions arrive late, for example, the forces sent to Methone, Pegasai, and Potidaea? It is because the former are entirely regulated by law, and everyone of you knows long in advance who is to be *choregos* or gymnasiarch of his tribe, when, with what, and from what source one has what to do, and nothing has been left unforeseen or unprescribed?

94. Antiphon, *On the Chorea* 11–13. Delivered sometime between 422 and 411 B.C. The speech is a defense by a *choregos* for the boys’ dithyramb on a charge of murder, since one of the boys in training at his house died taking a drug intended to improve his voice. The *choregos*’ responsibility for two tribes is probably an arrangement specific to the Thargelia.

When I was appointed *choregos* for the Thargelia and was given by the lottery Pantakles as chorus director and the tribe Kekropis in addition to my own (i.e., Erechtheis), I performed my duties as

well and as fairly as I could. I first built in the most convenient part of my house a schoolroom, which I also used for training when I was *choregos* for the Dionysia. Then I chose the best chorus I could, without penalizing anyone or levying distraint by force, or incurring anyone's hostility, but taking care to arrive at the most mutually agreeable and convenient terms: I set about making requests and solicitations, and they sent their sons voluntarily and gladly. When the boys arrived, I had at first no leisure to attend and oversee the instruction. I had a dispute with Aristion and Philinos, in which it was important to me to make a fair and accurate presentation to the Council and the rest of the Athenians, since I had initiated impeachment proceedings. While I applied myself to this affair, I charged Phanostratos to look to the chorus' needs. He is a demesman of my accusers here, but my relative by marriage, since I gave him my daughter, and I considered him fit to take the best possible care of the chorus. In addition, there were two others: Ameinias of the tribe Erechtheis, whom the tribesmen themselves voted to put in charge of assembling and overseeing the tribe on every occasion, thinking him the best man for the job, and another fellow of the tribe Kekropis, who always used to assemble that tribe. There was, moreover, a fourth, Philippos, whom I put in charge of purchasing and paying for whatever the chorus director or either of the other three needed to ensure that the boys receive the best service from their *choregos* and that no one want for anything because of my preoccupation.

95. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1150–55. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. The passage is from a quasi-parabolic choral ode; it appears that the first-person singular refers to the choreuts, though it could conceivably refer to the poet himself, or both. The scholiast here jumps to the conclusion that the chorus' hostility to Antimachos is due to some decree injurious to the chorus, though the actual words of the chorus make it clear that he merely cheated his chorus (or Aristophanes) of the expected banquet (at the cast party?) while *choregos*.

Antimachos, the son of Sputter, the lyric poet! In a word, may Zeus destroy him utterly, since he let me go, poor wretch, without a dinner, when he was *choregos* at the Lenaea.

96. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Clouds* 338f. In the play, Strepsiades has just quoted some fragments of a dithyramb and said, "then in return for these <bits of song> I wolfed down great big delicious fillets of *kestra*

(an unidentified delicatessen fish) and the meat of thrushes (also a delicacy)." The scholion comments:

The whole passage alludes both to those being feasted at the houses of *choregoi* and those who always have their meals at the *prytaneion*.

97. Eupolis, *PCG F 329*. From an unnamed comedy produced 429–ca. 412 B.C.

Did you ever see a stingier *choregos* than this?

98. Plutarch, *Phocion* 19.2–3. Written ca. 115. Phocion was active from 350 to 318 B.C.

Once when the Athenians were watching a new tragedy (i.e., not a revival), the tragic actor who was supposed to come on stage as a queen had asked the *choregos* for a large number of richly adorned attendants, but as he did not provide them, he got angry and kept the audience waiting by refusing to come on stage. The *choregos*, Melanthios, pushed him out into the theater and shouted, "Do you not see Phocion's wife, who always goes about in public attended by a single servant? But you're putting on airs and corrupting women." The shouts were overheard and the audience received them with a great deal of boisterous applause.

Victory Dedications

99. Plutarch, *Themistocles* 5. Written ca. 115. Themistocles' victory was at the Dionysia of 476 B.C.

In his ambition <Themistocles> surpassed everyone... He won a victory as *choregos* for tragedy, though at that time already the contest was pursued with serious rivalry, and he dedicated a tablet (*pinax*) in commemoration of his victory with the following inscription: "Themistocles of the deme Phrearrioi was *choregos*; Phrynichus was poet; Adeimantos was archon."

100. Aristotle, *Politics* 1341a34–36. Written ca. 330 B.C. Aristotle is arguing against the use of pipes in musical education, one reason being that it distracts from more important pursuits, "hence our ancestors were right to reject the practice of pipe playing for youths and free men," but he concedes that in earlier times, in the leisure society that emerged after the Persian Wars, the practice was encouraged. Ecphantides is an Old Comic poet, whose first victory is 457/4 B.C. It seems fairly clear that Aristotle is referring to something visible on the tablet, perhaps

Thrasippos himself playing the pipes, and that this *pinax* is a votive painting of a scene probably related in some way to the performance.

And at Athens pipe playing took such hold that most free men took up the practice: this is clear from the tablet (*pinax*) that Thrasippos dedicated when he served as *choregos* for Ecphantides.

101. Theophrastus, *Characters* 22.1–2. Written ca. 319 B.C.

Illiberality is a kind of absence of inclination toward the attainment of any respect or distinction that involves the expenditure of money. The illiberal man is the sort who, after winning a victory in tragedy at the Dionysia, will dedicate a slat of wood with his name inscribed upon it.

Public Recognition for Service

102. Plutarch, *Nicias* 3. Written ca. 115. Nicias lived ca. 470–413 B.C.

Now Pericles governed the state by virtue of his genuine excellence of character and the power of his eloquence and did not need to cultivate his image or to curry favor with the mob. Nicias lacked these qualities but had an abundance of wealth, which he used to advance his political popularity. And since he doubted his ability to match the slick vulgarity with which Cleon catered to the Athenians, he won over the populace by taking on the expense of furnishing choruses (*choregiai*), training and maintaining teams for athletic competitions (*gymnasiarchiai*), and undertaking other costly enterprises of this sort while surpassing all predecessors and contemporaries in elegance and munificence. Among his dedications there survive even till the present day both the statue of Athena on the Acropolis, which has lost its gold, and the temple surmounted by choregic tripods in the sanctuary of Dionysus; he was often victorious as *choregos* and was never defeated.

103. Lysias, *Defense on a Charge of Subverting the Democracy* 12–13. Delivered ca. 399 B.C. The unnamed defendant is accused of having had oligarchical sympathies.

I held the trierarchy five times and fought at sea four times and made many financial contributions during the war, and for the rest I took on liturgies with no less enthusiasm than any other citizen. And yet I spent more than was required by the state in order to be thought better of by you and so as to be better able to defend myself in case any misfortune befell me.

104. Isaeus, *On the Estate of Dikaiogenes* 36. Delivered ca. 389 B.C.

You have no reason, gentlemen, to pity Dikaiogenes because he is poor and in financial difficulty, nor to benefit him as one who has done some service to the city, for neither of these is the case, as I will demonstrate, gentlemen. I will show that he is at once both rich and the meanest of men to the city, to his relations, and to his friends. Although this man received by your judgment an inheritance that brought an annual income of 80 mnas (8,000 drachmas), and although he has enjoyed it for ten years, he claims that he has no money and yet is unable to say what he spent it on, gentlemen. It is a matter worthy of your consideration. For this man, when he acted as *choregos* for his tribe at the Dionysia, came fourth, and came last in tragedy and in the *pyrrhiche*. Being forced to do only these liturgies, this is how well he managed from such a large income.

Competitiveness

105. Pseudo-Andocides, *Against Alcibiades* 20–21. This speech, set in 415 B.C., is generally considered to be a late forgery. The events in this passage probably took place in 417/6 B.C. and are also mentioned by Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 147 and Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 16.5. Alcibiades drove off one of Taureas' choreuts during a performance, but the "him" driven off in the text seems to refer to Taureas, who was metaphorically driven off insofar as his chorus' performance was aborted.

Consider Taureas, who was Alcibiades' rival *choregos* in the boys' dithyramb. As the law permits anyone who wishes to remove any foreigner participating in a chorus and does not permit anyone to obstruct the removal, <Alcibiades> drove him off with blows in front of you and the rest of the Greeks in the audience, including all of the archons. As the spectators sided with Taureas and loathed Alcibiades, to the extent that they praised the former's chorus and did not wish to hear the latter's, Alcibiades took no further action. But the judges gave Alcibiades the victory, placing greater weight upon the man than on their oaths, since some were afraid of him and the others were anxious to please him.

106. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 14–18. Written 348–346 B.C. Demosthenes' *choregia* was at the Dionysia, 348 B.C. Demosthenes brings a charge of impiety against Meidias, who assaulted him, beat him, and

ripped his garments in the orchestra of the Theater of Dionysus during the performance of the men's dithyramb.

And <Meidias> stalked me throughout the entire term of my liturgy, obstructing me continually in matters both great and small. As to the hindrance he provided in opposing the exemption of my choreuts from military service or putting himself forward and urging that he be made overseer of the Dionysia, and all the other things of this sort, I will pass over them without mention. . . . But I will say that which will arouse the indignation of every one of you alike. . . . The sacred garments—I consider sacred everything that is prepared for the festival until it is used—and the golden crowns that I had commissioned as ornaments for the chorus he planned to destroy by breaking into the house of the goldsmith at night. And he did destroy them, though not all of them, because he was unable (Demosthenes says the goldsmith appeared and stopped him). And yet no one claims ever to have heard of anyone attempting or performing such a crime in this city. This, however, did not satisfy him. No, but he even tried to bribe my chorus director and had Telephanes, the finest of pipers, not been with me at the time and driven the man off when he noticed what was afoot, and, had he not felt it necessary to organize and direct the chorus himself, we would not have been part of the contest, Athenians, but the chorus would have entered the theater untrained and we would have suffered the ultimate disgrace. But Meidias' insolence did not even stop there. He had such an abundance of it that he bribed the invested archon, led the *choregoi* in a conspiracy against me, stood by shouting and threatening while the judges took their oath, fenced off the *paraskenia*, nailed them shut, public property, though he was a private citizen, and continued to make indescribable troubles and problems.

107. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 58–61. Written 348–346 B.C. Demosthenes' *choregia* was at the Dionysia, 348 B.C. Meidias' assault on Demosthenes is contrasted with the customary respect shown for the sacred and civic solemnity of the performance; the "misfortunes" suffered by the men who are the subjects of the following anecdotes are the loss of citizen rights because of their convictions for serious offenses.

As you probably know, there is a certain Sannion who directs tragic choruses. This man was convicted of avoiding military service and suffered calamity. After his misfortune an ambitious tragic *choregos*

hired him, Theozotides, I think. So at first his rival *choregoi* were indignant and claimed they would stop him. Yet when the theater was full and they saw the crowd gathered for the contest they recoiled, allowed him to go on—no one touched him—but such pious reserve could be seen by any in each of them that he has been directing choruses ever since and not even his personal enemies try to stop him, let alone *choregoi*. There is another Aristeides of the tribe Oineis, who also suffered the same sort of misfortune. He is an old man now and perhaps less of a choreut, but he was once the leader of his tribal chorus. As you know, if anyone removes the chorus leader, the rest of the chorus falls apart. But though there have been many ambitious *choregoi*, none of them ever saw their way to this trick: no one dared to remove him or obstruct the performance. This is because of the requirement that one has to do this by laying hands on the man—it not being permitted simply to summon him to the archon—just as if you wanted to remove a foreigner, and everyone balks at the outrage of being seen laying hands on someone. Is it not then shocking, men of the jury, and mean spirited, when of the *choregoi*, who consider their victories to depend upon it, who have frequently spent their entire fortunes on the liturgies, no one ever dares to lay hands even on those whom the law permits, but they are so cautiously and so piously and so moderately disposed that they, who have spent money and are eager to win, nevertheless refrain and respect your wishes and the solemnity of the festival, while Meidias, working on his own behalf, who spent nothing, but because he has given offense to someone and become his enemy, abuses and beats him who is spending money, is acting as *choregos*, and is in possession of his full citizen rights, and does so without consideration for the sanctity of the festival, for the law, for public opinion, or for the god?

Synchoregia

108. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs* 405. The scholiast quotes Aristotle, possibly from the lost *Dionysian Victories*. The Cinesias mentioned is the famous dithyrambic poet and exponent of the "New Music" (IVC) and this alone suffices to explain the epithet "chorus-killer." Since the fragment from Strattis comes without context, it is impossible to decide if the scholion is based on more than a possibly false inference from the fragment of Strattis; the scholia are full of such false inferences, cf. 95

and Scholion to *Frogs* 153: "Cinesias . . . took measures against the poets so that they would be without choruses."

He seems to indicate that the poets were already suffering from a reduction in choregic support. At any rate Aristotle says "in the archonship of this Kallias (410 or 406 B.C.) it was decreed that *choregoi* would jointly defray the costs of the tragedies and comedies at the Dionysia." So perhaps there was a similar arrangement governing the Lenaea (*Frogs* was produced at the Lenaea, 405 B.C.). Not much later Cinesias did away with the *choregia* altogether. This is why Strattis says in a comedy named after him (produced not long after the *Frogs*): "stage of the chorus-killer Cinesias."

109. Demosthenes, *Against Leptines* 23. Delivered 355/4 B.C. Demosthenes' statements strongly suggest that *synchoregiai* were far from normal practice.

But if indeed the numbers of those able to perform *choregiai* did fall short, by Zeus, would it be better to have the cost of the *choregiai* defrayed by joint contributions, as we do the trierarchies, or to take back what we have given to our benefactors? I would say the former.

The Agonothetes

110. IG II² 3073. "The Monument of Xenokles" is an inscribed monument found in the Theater of Dionysus at Athens and provides the first inscriptional record of the *agonothesia*. Date: 306 B.C. Since two choregic inscriptions survive from 319 B.C., the end of the choregic system must be dated to the period 318–307 B.C. The order of the listings, tragedy first, then comedy, indicates that the inscription refers to the Lenaea (contrast the order of the *Fasti*, I 100).

The people assumed the costs of production in the archonship of Anaxikrates.

The *agonothetes* was Xenokles, the son of Xeinis, of the deme Sphettos.

In the tragic competition the victorious poet was Phanostratos, son of Herakleides, of Halikarnassos.

In the tragic competition the victorious actor was Hieromnemon, son of Euanorides, of the deme Kydathenai.

In the comic competition the victorious poet was Philemon, son of Damon, of the deme Diomeia.

In the comic competition the victorious actor was Kallippos, son of Kallias, of the deme Sunium.

111. Aristotle, *Politics* 1321a31–42. Written ca. 330 B.C. Aristotle advises oligarchs on how to acquire and maintain a hold on power within the *polis*. Although Aristotle claims that the propertied class of his day (before the restriction of the franchise in 322 B.C.) did not employ it, the conversion of the *choregia* into a magistracy, sometime during the restricted democracy, is an excellent expression of this strategy.

Moreover, to the chief magistracies, which are to be held by those enjoying full citizen rights, liturgies should be attached so that the common people will gladly have no part in them and show indulgence toward those in office, who pay a great deal for the privilege. It is appropriate, upon entering into office, to offer magnificent sacrifices and undertake some public works, so that the commoners will be glad to see the (oligarchic) constitution remain in place when they participate in the feasts and to see the city adorned with monuments and buildings. As a result the leading citizens will also have monuments to their expenditures. But at present, oligarchs do not do this—just the opposite. They pursue profit no less than honor.

III A i b. Judges

A close correspondence between a playwright's success and contemporary estimation of his merits is generally assumed; much, for example, is made of the report that Euripides produced ninety-two plays but won only four victories in Athens. But in order to assess the correlation between success and contemporary reception, one needs to consider the manner in which judging took place and the factors that might influence a judge's decision. Above all, one must keep in mind that the prize was not awarded to a play but to a production: though the poet and *choregos* each won separate prizes, a single decision determined the success of both together.

What most strikes the modern observer is the degree of public participation and public scrutiny that went into the process of judging the dramatic and dithyrambic contests at Athens, making them more akin to our national elections than to the secret deliberations of Nobel Prizes

and Academy Awards. The state went to great lengths to prevent corruption, bribery, or influence peddling. Each of the ten Athenian tribes appears to have submitted a list of possible candidates to serve as judges (112, 113). The Council (*Boule*) then approved the candidates, and the names were put into jars, sealed by the *choregoi* and taken up to the state treasury on the Acropolis (113). At the beginning of the competition the jars were brought into the theater and the archon, before the assembled audience, appears to have selected one name from each (112). It is not clear whether the same judges sat for all of the contests or whether different judges sat for each (as perhaps implied by 112). The judges then came forward and publicly took an oath of impartiality (112, 114, 117, 118, 125) and were seated in a separate section of the theater, presumably close to the orchestra (116, 124). The Calendar Frieze, an Attic relief sculpture possibly of late Hellenistic date, shows the judges sitting at a table heaped with crowns and other prizes.

The choice of ten judges seems a reasonable inference from 112 and the reference to a plurality of jars (see on 113), but scholars have debated the number since late Hellenistic times (119–21). The tradition best represented names five judges, though four (119), seven, and “however many” (121) are also mentioned. The simplest way to reconcile the evidence is provided by 122: Lysias states clearly that not all the judges necessarily contributed to the final decision. He refers to a judge whose vote was not “selected by lot.” Most scholars take this as evidence of a second lottery in which only five of the ten ballots cast by the judges were selected for the final decision. This second lottery might be explained as a further precaution against corruption: if there were only one group of judges for all the contests during the four or five days of the festival, it is not out of character for the Athenian democracy to have added this further obstacle to attempts to compromise the integrity of the judges over the interval. This is true even if each contest had its own judges, since the tragic and comic contests (at least during the Peloponnesian War) each seem each to have extended over three days (III Aia). It may be added that the whole purpose of using voting tablets (122, 123) presupposes a second lottery, since 122 makes it clear that there is no question of using the tablets for a secret ballot; Lysias’ speaker assumes that had the judgment in question been read, everyone would have known whose judgment it was.

The difficulty with the theory of a five-ballot selection is the low probability that five ballots would ever produce a clear ranking even of three sets of tragedies, let alone five comedies and ten dithyrambs. This

is true even if each prize (first, second, third, etc.) were voted on independently. It has recently been suggested that the contradictions in the sources could best be reconciled by supposing that there were ten judges but that only as many votes were counted as assured placement. A given candidate would normally need five, and hence the proverb in 120. This would have the advantage of speeding up the process and avoiding the embarrassment of a tie in a case where five judges voted for Eupolis and five for Aristophanes (though admittedly adding an element of chance to the evaluation). But the five votes in favor of Eupolis might only be acquired on reading the ninth ballot (cf. 121), while any leftover ballots could be said to have missed being “selected by lot” (122). The main problem with this scheme is that it is scarcely economical since in the case of three, and especially in the case of five or ten contestants, one is not likely to leave many ballots uncounted in producing five votes for a single candidate. Indeed, chances are against any candidate getting as many as five votes.

It would make more sense to assume that a decision would be attempted on a draw of five ballots, with an option of choosing as many more as necessary to break a tie. The advantage of such a system would be less one of saving time (though this would in most cases be a welcome side effect) than to avoid indecision. We know of no procedure that would have forced a judge to alter his decision if the balloting ended in a dead heat, and one can scarcely imagine what such a procedure would be, or how the volatile Athenian audience would endure a mechanical remedy for tie breaking. A five-ballot selection would have the advantage of breaking a tie vote before the fact. Let us suppose a number of worst-case scenarios in a tragic contest where the judges’ ballots are distributed as follows: 1-1-1-1-2-2-2-2-2. In this case, selecting five ballots will force a decision that would otherwise be impossible. But what of a case, surely the most common occurrence, where the vote distribution allowed no sure placement with five votes? Consider a contest with five comedies where the vote is distributed 1-1-1-2-2-2-3-3-3-4. Chances of breaking the tie are far greater with an initial selection of five, with two or more votes to the winner, or if two candidates receive two votes each, with a clear winner emerging by the time the eighth ballot is chosen. There are still several problems unresolved by this theory. A vote distribution such as 1-1-2-2-3-3-4-4-5-5 could only be resolved if one or no pairs emerged in the selection of five ballots. Moreover, this system is only economical from the point of view of determining the winner, not ordering all the contestants from first to third, fifth or tenth,

prize as was the practice at these festivals. Total ranking adds a completely new dimension to the calculation. Two possibilities present themselves: either each rank was voted on individually, making for nine rounds of voting in the case of dithyramb, or a single vote was meant, ideally, to determine all of the places. The former procedure is implied by the wording of 122, which suggests the judge simply wrote "tribe X wins" on his tablet, and 123, which also implies a single choice. The latter procedure is envisioned by 124, but this anecdote may have no connection at all with Athenian practice.

It is most difficult to imagine how dithyrambic victors were chosen, given the fact that the dithyrambs were a tribal competition. If each tribe put forth a list of candidates, surely it did so with the expectation that its candidates would vote for the nominating tribe, and this indeed is the expectation clearly expressed by 122. The process described above would leave each competitor with only one vote; indecision could only be avoided by selecting a single vote by lot, which would make a mockery of the notion of a competition. An attempt to envision the practicalities of the business reveals how little we know. The tragic and comic competitions were no doubt less partisan. The sources seem to assume that the judges allowed themselves to be swayed by the will of the crowd; some suggest that this was the judges' obligation (123–26). The comic poets frequently include commands, admonitions, and entreaties to the judges (possibly a cue for partisans and claqueurs to shout their approval).

The extant sources leave us with a strong sense of paradox. Despite the enormous precautions taken by the state, charges of corruption, bribery, and manipulation meet us at every stage in the procedure (113–15, 118, 125, 127). On the other hand, there is no evidence at all for a failure to award a clear ranking of prizes, though the process of selecting winners hardly seems workable so far as we can reconstruct it.

Sources

112. Plutarch, *Cimon* 8.7–9. Written ca. 115 and referring to an event in 468 B.C. The passage implies that the generals were apt substitutes for the judges since they came (normally or unusually?) from each of the ten tribes. The anecdote goes on to explain that Aeschylus left for Sicily in a tiff at Sophocles' victory. The historicity of the event is extremely doubtful, but Plutarch seems to have envisioned a separate selection of judges for each genre.

When Sophocles, still a young man, entered his first production in the contest, Apsephion the archon did not choose the judges of the contest by lot, because he saw great rivalry and partisanship in the audience, but after Cimon entered the theater with the other generals and made the customary libations to the gods, he would not allow them to leave but forced them to take oaths and sit as judges, being ten, one from each tribe. Then the competition gained in ferocity because of the dignity of the judges.

113. Isocrates, *Trapeziticus* 33–34. Delivered ca. 393 B.C. The reference to a plurality of water jars seems to confirm the tribal basis of the selection: unless one candidate from each tribe was required, there is no reason to put names in separate jars.

Which of you does not know that Pythodoros, the fellow known as the "bum" who does and says anything for Pasion, opened the water jars last year and took out the names of the judges that the Council had deposited? So why would anyone be surprised if a man who for small gain would risk his life and open these jars, which were marked by the Executive Officers of the Council (*prytaneis*), sealed by the *choregoi*, guarded by the treasurers, and stored in the Acropolis . . .

114. Second Hypothesis to Demosthenes, *Against Meidias*. Cf. 106.

Meidias, a very rich and powerful citizen and an enemy of Demosthenes, for reasons Demosthenes will give shortly in his speech, frequently obstructed and hindered him, and especially, as Demosthenes says, when the judges were taking their oath to give the victory to the one who sang well, Meidias kept inciting them saying "except Demosthenes."

115. Pherecrates, *Krapataloi*, PCG F 102. Produced late 5th or early 4th c. B.C.

To the judges who are now judging I say do not perjure yourselves nor judge unjustly, or by Zeus, God of Friendship, Pherecrates will tell you another tale far more abusive than this.

116. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1224f. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. In the *exodos*, Dikaiopolis wins the drinking contest of the Anthesteria and is carried out in a victory procession (*komos*). The passage's primary reference is to the awarding of a wineskin as a prize in that contest. A humorous metatheatrical reference to the theatrical contest is obvious: the king archon presided over the Lenaea (61); a wineskin is said to be the prize of a comic *choregos* (III Aiiia).

Carry me to the judges. Where is the king archon? Give me the wineskin!

117. Aristophanes, *Birds* 445–47. Produced Dionysia, 414 B.C. After the *agon* the chorus is asked to swear to a peaceful settlement with Pisthetairos, but delivers a comic oath instead.

CHORUS: I swear on the heads of all these people (gestures to audience), that I will win by all the judges and all the spectators.

PISTHETAİROS: It will be so. CHORUS: If I transgress, may I win only by a single judge.

118. Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 1154–62. Produced 392/1 B.C.

I wish to make a little suggestion to the judges: may the ones who are wise be mindful of this play's wisdom and vote for me; may the ones who like to laugh be mindful of this play's humor and vote for me; that is to say I encourage just about everyone to vote for me. Don't let the lottery and the fact that our play was produced first be to blame for anything, but remember all of this. Don't perjure yourselves, but always judge the choruses fairly! Don't behave like bad whores who can only ever remember their last customers!

119. POxy 1611, 30–37. This fragmentary papyrus, written sometime in the late 2nd or early 3rd c., is a copy of a literary commentary, probably of Hellenistic Alexandrian scholarship, possibly by Didymus (ca. 80–10 B.C.). It seems fairly certain that the reference is to the judges of the comic contest: in a surviving fragment of the *parabasis* of Cratinus' *Plutus*, the chorus declare that they deserve to win but express some anxiety about the impatience of the judges.

"[...] now [...] you see us, being two, and the judges four": He thus shows that there were four (the papyrus actually reads "and thus it is clear there were forty judges"; this is usually emended but may be correct), but Lysippus in the *Bacchae* shows there were five, and Cratinus says the same thing in the *Plutus*.

120A. Zenobius 3.64. Date: 2nd c.

"It lies on the knees of five judges": proverbial for such things as are in the power of others. The proverb was used insofar as five judges judged the comic choruses, as Epicharmus says.

120B. Hesychius, s.v. *pente kritai*. Written 5th c.

"Five judges": So many judged the comic choruses, not only in Athens, but in Sicily.

120C. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Birds* 445.

Five judges judged the comic choruses. Those who received all five votes were happy.

121. Lucian, *Harmonides* 2. Written ca. 170. The dialogue presents a piper advising his student to play not to the crowd but to the few of discerning taste, if he wishes to be famous.

In the contests the mass of the audience know how to clap and hiss, but the judges are seven, five, or however many.

122. Lysias, *On the Wound by Premeditation* 3. Delivered late 5th to early 4th c. B.C. This passage is valuable evidence for the selection of judges' ballots. Of particular interest are the argument's presuppositions that the candidate put forward by the tribe would vote for it; that the audience would know who cast the ballot; that the audience would have been able to infer that the speaker and the judge were friends. This last presupposition may indicate that the judge did not belong to the speaker's tribe, since this would otherwise seem sufficient. Great caution is needed in pressing Athenian forensic arguments for logic.

I wish that his vote had been selected by lot when he was judge at the Dionysia, so that it would be clear to you that we were reconciled, since he judged that my tribe won. But as it is he wrote this on his tablet, but it was not selected. Philinos and Diokles know that I am telling the truth. They are not allowed to give evidence, however, since they did not make a deposition in relation to the charge against which I am now defending myself, and yet you know well that we were the ones who put his name forward in the selection and that he was sitting as judge on our behalf.

123. Aelian, *Varia Historia* 2.13. Written ca. late 2nd c. to 235. Aelian claims to describe the audiences reaction to Aristophanes' *Clouds* at the Dionysia, 423 B.C.

They applauded the poet as never before and shouted that he should win and commanded the judges from above to write no other name but Aristophanes.

124. Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 7, proem. 4 ff. Written ca. 25 B.C. The anecdote, which supposedly took place ca. 195 B.C., is absurd and anachronistic, but at least it shows us how Vitruvius' source imagined judging took place at the games consecrated by Ptolemy Philadelphus to the Muses and Apollo. There is no reason to suppose that the judging of this contest was modeled on the judging of Athenian contests, but there may be some relation, and this is the only detailed description of the process in ancient literature.

Once these arrangements were made and the games were at hand, learned judges had to be chosen to evaluate them. When the king had chosen six citizens and could not easily find a seventh suited to the task, he consulted the directors of the library and asked if they knew of anyone available for the task. They mentioned a certain Aristophanes (of Byzantium) who with great application and diligence was daily engaged in systematically reading all of the books. So when the crowds had gathered for the games and the judges had been assigned seats set apart from the rest, Aristophanes was summoned to take the place marked out for him along with the others. The first competition was for poets, and while they read their texts the entire populace by their shouts warned the judges what they should vote for. And so, when they were called upon one by one to express their judgments, the six were unanimous and gave first prize to the poet whom they noticed most pleased the multitude and gave second prize to the next most pleasing. But Aristophanes asked them to proclaim the man who least pleased the crowd. When the king and the entire audience grew indignant, he rose and obtained permission to speak. When there was silence he explained that his choice was the only poet among them—all the others had recited other poets' work—and that judges should reward what was written, not stolen. While the crowd was dumbfounded and the king was wavering, Aristophanes, relying on his memory, produced an enormous number of rolls from certain bookshelves and by comparing them with the recited poems forced the contestants to admit their plagiarism. And so the king ordered them to be arrested for theft and sent them off condemned in disgrace, but he heaped Aristophanes with honors and put him in charge of the library.

125. Pseudo-Andocides, *Against Alcibiades* 20–21. See 105.

126. Plato, *Laws* 659a–c. Written ca. 357–347 B.C. Cf. IV 172.

The true judge should not learn from the audience nor be impressed by the noise of the many or by his own ignorance . . . It was possible for him, according to the old Greek custom, just as the present custom in Sicily and Italy, to leave it to the majority of the audience and judge the winner by a show of hands.

127A. Aulus Gellius 17.4. Written ca. 180, the anecdote is set in the late 4th or early 3rd c. B.C.

Menander was repeatedly beaten by the inferior poet Philemon through his influence, friends, and supporters. When he once

chanced to meet him in the street he said, "Pardon my asking, Philemon, but tell me, are you not ashamed when you win?"

127B. Quintilian 10.1.72. Written late 1st c.

Philemon, who was often preferred to Menander in the corrupt judgments of his day, deserved to be second in the opinion of all, I believe.

III A i c. Freedom of Expression

Most literary historians from the Hellenistic period onward explained Old Comedy's freedom to abuse individuals as a "law" or "right" acquired when it was discovered that public abuse embarrassed malefactors into giving up their evil ways, but the "right" was eventually repealed, either because poets began to attack "good people" or because the "malefactors" eventually ganged up on the poets (128, 129). This theory still has its modern supporters, though modern scholars generally prefer to find the cause of comic license in the festival context of Athenian drama, mixing sacred inviolability with psycho-sociological notions of "carnival." Neither theory is really adequate. No 5th- or 4th-c. B.C. texts support either view. Moreover, comic freedom rose and declined without any significant change in its festival and religious setting. In our view, comic outspokenness was a liberty not granted but assumed at a calculated risk when the political climate seemed to offer a chance of impunity, not a creation of conscious policy or sacred tradition but a by-product of the factional struggle between the democrats and oligarchs at Athens. This is in fact the explanation offered by our 5th- and 4th-c. B.C. writers (130, 131) and repeated by one of our later sources on comedy (132), whose views may go back to the school of Aristotle (cf. 133). There are three main reasons for preferring a purely political explanation. First, there was a close synchrony between the tide of poetic freedom and rise of the Athenian democracy, its ebb, and the supremacy of the oligarchs. Second is the fact that poets were never entirely secure in expressing their views: we have evidence of two legal prosecutions of poets in the 5th c. B.C. (136, 139–41) and some possible attempts at censorship legislation (137, 138, 142, 143), both inconsistent with any stable or generally recognized privilege. Third, and perhaps most important, the freedom exercised by the comic poets in the theater did not in fact differ markedly

in kind or degree from that exercised by ordinary citizens in the democratic law courts (146–57).

Aristophanes and Eupolis are the most distinctive representatives of the political comedy that was the dominant style of Old Comedy during the period of the “radical democracy” in Athens (from about 430 to 415 B.C.). Two features typical of the style were the appearance of individual Athenians as characters in a comedy and the incidental ridicule of public personalities in the comic dialogue. Aristophanes may have been the first to devote an entire comedy to ridiculing a single individual (Cleon) with *Knights* (424 B.C.). Many other such comedies followed, but their numbers drop sharply ca. 415 B.C. and eventually give way to less direct treatments and in the 4th c. B.C. to apolitical paratragedies, myth-travesties, and social comedies. By the Middle Comic period the ad hominem plot is extremely rare and generally reserved for prominent and unpopular foreigners, who constituted safe targets. In addition to the real personalities who appear in the drama, the 430s and 420s also saw an increase in people verbally ridiculed. Aristophanes’ comedies contain a great number of such victims of abuse (*komodoumenoi*): *Acharnians* (425 B.C.), 45; *Knights* (424 B.C.), 44; *Clouds* (423 B.C.), 45; *Wasps* (422 B.C.), 81; *Peace* (421 B.C.), 40; *Birds* (414 B.C.), 61; *Lysistrata* (411 B.C.), 14; *Thesmophoriazusae* (411 B.C.), 17; *Frogs* (405 B.C.), 55; *Ecclesiazusae* (ca. 392 B.C.), 41; *Plutus* (388 B.C.), 19. One notices a decline in the statistics for the last two plays, and a very significant drop in the two plays of 411 B.C. that coincide with the unsettled period just before and just after an oligarchic coup in Athens. Peisander, a leader of the conspiracy, is the only person in *Lysistrata* to come under political attack, but Aristophanes could not at that time have anticipated his importance. Democracy was restored the next year, and its recovery is adequately reflected in the statistic for *komodoumenoi* in *Frogs*. The fragments of Middle Comedy show that the practice of ridiculing by name declined only gradually during the 4th c. B.C. By the period of New Comedy, it is rare, and the productive years of this genre coincide with a period of oligarchy at Athens from 322 to 307 B.C. (almost continually) followed by a long period in which the government remained unstable and continually changed hands. It is probably significant that the latest two *komodoumenoi* that survive are from comedies written during democratic restorations, and one of these may have had an ad hominem plot in the old style (134, 135).

The best-attested attempt to muzzle a comic poet came after the production at the Dionysia of 426 B.C. of Aristophanes’ *Babylonians*, a

satire on Athenian imperialism. Aristophanes reports that Cleon dragged him (or his *didaskalos* Callistratus) to the Council Chamber, where he was “inundated with slander and abuse” (139A). The fact that Cleon brought Aristophanes before the Council of the Athenian Assembly indicates that he used a legal procedure called *eisangelia*, normally reserved for serious crimes threatening the safety and welfare of the whole community. Two passages in the *Acharnians* mention the actual charge laid against Aristophanes: that he spoke ill against the city in the presence of foreigners (139B) and that he ridiculed the city and committed an outrage (*hybris*) on the people (*demos*) (139C). The scholiasts claim that the case went to trial: not only does Aristophanes mention nothing of this, but his words in 141, whether they refer to this affair or a subsequent event, imply that an out-of-court settlement was reached. This is a good example of the manner in which scholia fabricate facts on the basis of inferences from the text and then frequently proliferate them: the mention of charges in *Acharnians* led to the fabrication of a trial, which led to the fabrication of a multiplicity of charges, which led to the fabrication of a multiplicity of trials to accommodate all the charges. A similar scenario is not unlikely for most, if not all, of the “laws” passed against comic ridicule (cf. 143, 144).

The other 5th-c. B.C. “censorship trial” was the much earlier prosecution not of a comic poet but of the tragedian Phrynichus for the production of a tragedy on the recapture of Miletus by the Persians in 494 B.C. (136). Athens had given, but later withdrew, aid to the revolt: clearly the city was sharply divided in its policy, not least of all because the Persians continued to support the remnants of the exiled Pisistratid tyranny against the young Athenian democracy. Phrynichus’ play and its punishment (if historical) must be seen as moments in a bitter factional struggle. It is worth noting that historical tragedy flourished briefly in the first three decades of the 5th c. B.C. In addition to *The Capture of Miletus*, we know of two plays dealing with the Persian Wars (480–479 B.C.): Phrynichus’ *Phoenician Women* (probably 476 B.C.) and Aeschylus’ *Persians* (472 B.C.). Aeschylus’ play is extant and includes partisan propaganda in aggrandizing the role of the democratic leader Themistocles. Tragedy on sensitive current events then disappears in the wake of conservative ascendancy under Cimon, never to return to the Athenian theater. The case of Phrynichus would suggest that contemporary subjects in tragedy, as in serious art generally, were simply too hot to handle directly.

The late tradition has several reports of censorship legislation. The first, 137, said to have lasted from 440/39 B.C. to 437/6 B.C., cannot be confirmed by independent sources, but it is generally accepted because of the precision of the scholiast's information and the fact that it is not an obvious inference from the text. The second, 138, is almost certainly a mistaken inference drawn by a later scholar from a passage in Aristophanes. The third, 142, legislation by Cleon, was probably fabricated in an attempt to sort out the profusion of charges and prosecutions of Aristophanes, generated by uncritical ancient scholars. The fourth, 143, the decree of Syrakosios, is a little harder to dismiss: though the existence of the law is reported only by scholia and clearly based on inference, the inference in this case is drawn from a passage of a lost comedy, which the scholiast cites, but the reconstruction and interpretation of the fragment is very controversial. In any case, if the "Law of Syrakosios" was a general ban on ridiculing people by name, then its existence as legislation appears to be contradicted by the fact that Aristophanes' *Birds* and Phrynichus' *Antisocial Man*, produced at the first Dionysia after this putative legislation, both ridicule, among others, Syrakosios himself. Some take it to be a ban on ridiculing those accused of the mutilation of the herms (415 B.C.). If so, it was evidently designed to avoid exciting partisan violence in the audience. The last reported piece of legislation, 144, appears to be another fabrication of ancient scholarship, probably arising from an attempt to reconcile the legislation theory with the myth of Eupolis' death, which seems to have become a centerpiece of the rival political theory of Old Comedy in the Hellenistic period (132, 142, 144, 145).

No discussion of dramatic freedom of expression could be of any value without a consideration of the limitations on free speech outside the theater, both as they existed in law, and as they existed in practice. An examination of the law will show that comic poets did occasionally violate some legal restrictions, though here "occasionally" and "some" may be more telling than the violations. But an examination of speeches delivered in Athenian courts and subsequently published show that ordinary Athenians lavished abuse on one another in flagrant violation of the law, and did so in the expectation of getting away with it.

The slander law attributed to Solon (148) was superseded at least in part by the *dike kakegorias* (149), probably some time in the 5th c. B.C., although we cannot be sure of its existence earlier than 384/3 B.C. (149). There is some evidence that "Solon's" provisions against abusing the dead were covered by this new law (149), but our best evidence makes

it clear that it specified four insults that may not be brought against the living: "murderer," "mother beater," "father beater," and "shield thrower" (152). Perhaps separate from this law is a law that forbade ridiculing the profession of any citizen working in the marketplace (clearly a law directed at "classist" remarks, 154). The charge of *hybris* differed both in procedure and in the gravity of the charge from *kakegoria*. The latter was a *dike*, a purely private remedy, and could only be pursued by the injured party or their legal representative. The former was an indictment (*graphe*) and could be brought by any citizen (146, 147); since acts of *hybris* (mistreatment, outrage, or assault) were thought to pose a threat to the security and welfare of the community as a whole, its punishment was every citizen's business. Briefly stated, an act was considered *hybris* if it showed contempt for the rights of one's fellow citizens. There was, finally, a law against abusing civic magistrates; the penalty was loss of civic rights (147, 156, 157). Because most of our information about Athenian law comes from the 4th-c. B.C. orators, we cannot be sure that all these laws existed in the late 5th c. B.C. The exceptions are the indictment for *hybris*, which is amply attested in comedy, and presumably also the law of Solon, if it had not yet been superseded by the later slander law. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that they were all in existence during the heyday of political comedy, we find several violations in the fragments of Old Comedy, but on close inspection the violations show signs of restraint and do not show clear evidence that comic poets were exempt: rather they seem to honor them in the breach. The only apparent violations of the taboo on abusing the dead are in Aristophanes—two rather mild passages ridiculing Pericles for starting the war (150) and two more vigorous assaults on the recently dead Cleon (151), both of which, to make the issue even muddier, are rather indirect. The first attack was placed in the mouth of a fictitious foreigner in the audience; the second was couched in a figure of *praeteritio*, virtually, "now that he's dead, we musn't say anything bad about him . . . that he was a crook, a blabbermouth, an extortionist, etc." As for the *dike kakegorias*, a similar mixture of freedom and restraint is shown in the use of the taboo words: no *komodoumenos* is ever called a "murderer," "mother beater," or "father beater" in all of our extant fragments of comedy, although otherwise anonymous characters called "father beaters" do appear, and indeed fathers are even beaten on stage. But one Kleonymos is persistently ridiculed as a "shield thrower" in five Aristophanic comedies (153). Similarly, though there is frequent ridicule of "tradespeople" in the fragments of Old Comedy, the tradespeople who appear on

the stage are generally either unnamed or probably fictitious; in cases where real people's names are used we can never prove that the person actually was a tradesperson, but we can sometimes prove the opposite (155). Finally, though the scholia at *Clouds* 31 appear to think that Aristophanes made slight alterations on the name of the archon so as to mock him with impunity (157), there is some evidence to suggest that the name, not deformed, refers to a *komodoumenos* known elsewhere and someone other than the archon, but more importantly, Lysias and Demosthenes show quite clearly that the law only prohibited the abuse of magistrates in public offices and performing their official duties (147, 156).

It is difficult to say, then, whether the two or three serious violations of Athenian slander laws show that dramatists were exempted, or whether they are merely the exceptions proving that they were not. The problem is in thinking that the violation of the laws of slander would necessarily lead to prosecution. Law is one thing, but actual legal practice is quite another. An examination of forensic and political speeches shows that Attic orators took the same liberties in abusing their opponents as we find in the comic theater. One need only consider the example of 152, where the speaker, while prosecuting Theomnestos, who had gratuitously called him a "father killer" at a previous trial, not only abuses Theomnestos' dead father as a "worthless good-for-nothing," but mocks Theomnestos throughout as a "shield thrower," a charge that he also generously extends to his father; yet the context shows the charge to be unambiguously slanderous, since Theomnestos had already been acquitted of the charge by a jury. Similarly, we owe our knowledge of the law about ridiculing the occupation of tradespeople in the agora to the fact that it is violated in the prosecution of the speaker of 154. Though Theomnestos' prosecution shows that slander trials did occur, it is the only private suit for slander that survives from antiquity. Such cases seem to have been quite rare. It is of great interest to note that Theomnestos feels it necessary to apologize for bringing the suit under the *dike kakegorias*: "I think it vulgar and excessively litigious to prosecute for slander" (152). There are in fact many good reasons why someone like Kleonymos would have willingly foregone his right to sue Aristophanes, quite apart from the expense and trouble of prosecution. Whatever the prospects for success, the risks were considerable. One had only to consider such precedents as Cleon's attempted prosecution of Aristophanes, which only inflamed the poet to intensify his abuse and added motive and an air of legitimacy

to his charges. From what we know of ancient courtroom practice, a suit against a comic poet was less likely to lead to the restoration of one's good name than to provide an opportunity for more comic abuse at the trial itself (cf. 141A), let alone future comic productions. A normal trial involved a jury of five hundred random citizens, usually of the ardently democratic lower classes, and there was no reason to think that they would condemn in the courts what they approved in the theater.

Sources

Comic License

128. Cicero, *On the State* 4.11 A philosophical dialogue written 54–51 B.C. A "law" is also mentioned by Themistius, *Orations* 8.110.

SCIPIO: Except when habit of life permits it, comedy could never have won from audiences the approval of its excesses. And indeed the older Greeks preserved a certain harmony in its vicious reports; among them it was even conceded by law that comedy could say whatever it wanted about whomever it wanted by name... AFRICANUS: Whom did it not affect, or rather whom did it not molest? Whom did it spare? Granted, it injured shameless populists (i.e., "radical" democrats), men who were undermining the state, like Cleon, Cleophon, and Hyperbolus... but it was no more decent that Pericles, who had already been head of the state with supreme power for a great many years in peace and war, should be attacked in verse, and that these verses should have been paraded on stage, than if our Plautus... or Naevius abused Publius or Gnaeus Scipio.

129. Horace, *The Art of Poetry* 281–84. Written ca. 19 B.C.

Old Comedy followed these men (Thespis and Aeschylus) not without great praise, but license lapsed into excess and violence, which needed to be checked by law. The law was passed and the chorus fell shamefully silent, once it lost its right to abuse.

130. "Old Oligarch," *Constitution of the Athenians* 2.18. Written ca. 430–420 B.C. In this passage the word *demos* is left untranslated in order to preserve its ambiguous reference both to the "people," meaning lower classes as opposed to the elite, and the "people" as sovereign political authority within the democratic state.

They do not permit anyone to ridicule the *demos* in comedy, or to abuse it, so as not to suffer ill repute themselves. If, however, anyone wishes to ridicule a private citizen, they bid him do so fully

aware of the fact that those ridiculed in a comedy are generally not of the *demos* nor of the mass, but the rich, noble, and powerful. A few poor people or democrats are ridiculed in comedy, but only because they are busybodies and anxious to rise above the *demos*. Consequently, they do not mind seeing such people ridiculed in comedy.

131. Isocrates, *On the Peace* 17. Delivered 355 B.C.

I know that it is arduous to oppose your intentions, and that as there is a democracy, there is no freedom of speech, except here for those who are most thoughtless and have no regard for you, and in the theater for the comic poets.

132. Platonius, *On the Differences of the Comedies*. Written in the late Hellenistic period or later. Platonius or his source is an eclectic and has clearly added to the basic framework of a political theory of comic evolution a "terror" arising from the supposed "murder" of Eupolis by Alcibiades, a general fear of prosecution among the poets, and a particularly confused statement about the effect this had on the availability of *choregoi*. The various causes are specifically aimed at explaining the three major distinctions perceived by later theorists between Old and Middle Comedy: the disappearance of personal abuse, the disappearance of direct political satire, and the disappearance of the chorus. This distinction seems to owe something to Aristotle's distinction between the abuse (*aischrologia*) of early comedy and the innuendo of modern (i.e., Middle) comedy in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1128a.

It is good to indicate the reasons why Old Comedy has a certain form peculiar to itself, and Middle Comedy is different from it. In the times of Aristophanes, Cratinus, and Eupolis democracy ruled in Athens and the people held all the power, being itself the autocrat and master of its political affairs. Since everyone had freedom of speech, the writers of comedy had license to mock generals, judges who gave bad judgments, and also any of the citizens who were either greedy or behaved wantonly. For when the people heard the comedians vigorously insulting such persons, as I said, they exempted them from terror of reprisal. We know that the people by nature have been opposed to the rich since time immemorial and that it rejoices in their discomfiture. So in the time of the comedy of Aristophanes, Cratinus, and Eupolis some poets were pitiless against those who erred, but for the rest, when the democracy was driven back by those who wanted to set up a tyranny in Athens and an oligarchy was established and the power of the people had

gone over to a few men and the oligarchy was in charge, terror seized the poets: it was not possible to mock anyone openly when the offended parties could demand justice from the poets. And so we know that Eupolis, upon producing the *Baptai*, was drowned in the sea by the man against whom he launched the *Baptai* (Alcibiades). Because of this they grew more wary of mockery and the *choregoi* began to grow scarce, for the Athenians no longer had the will to elect the *choregoi*, who defrayed the expenses of the choreuts. At any rate Aristophanes produced the *Aiolosikon* (388 B.C.), which has no choral odes (doubtless a false inference from the noninclusion of choral *embolima* in the textual tradition). Since the *choregoi* were no longer being elected (!) and the choreuts had no sustenance, the choral odes were taken out of comedy and the character of the plots changed. The object of Old Comedy being the people's mockery of the judges and generals, Aristophanes omitted the usual mockery because of the great terror and jeered at the drama *Aiolos* written by the tragedians (i.e., Euripides, before 423 B.C.) as badly made. The character of Middle Comedy is such as the *Aiolosikon* of Aristophanes and the *Odysseuses* of Cratinus and the majority of ancient comedies that are without choral odes or *parabaseis*. . . . The poets of Middle Comedy both changed the plots and left out the choral songs since they did not have *choregoi* to defray the costs of the choreuts. These are the plots of Old Comedy: to censure some generals and judges who do not judge rightly and make money through injustice and have taken up a wicked way of life. Middle Comedy gave up that sort of plot, and proceeded to mock the stories told by the poets, because such things as mocking Homer for saying something or some tragic poet or other are not liable to prosecution. Even in Old Comedy one can find dramas of the same sort as those produced in the end when the oligarchy had consolidated its power. At any rate the *Odysseuses* of Cratinus censured no one but was a mockery of the *Odyssey* of Homer. For such are the plots in Middle Comedy. Placing in their comedies certain myths that were told by earlier authors, they mocked them as badly told and they rejected *parabaseis*, as there were no choruses because of the lack of *choregoi*. They did not even bring on stage masks made the same way as in Old Comedy: in Old Comedy the masks resembled the people ridiculed in the comedy, so that, even before the actors said anything, the identity of the ridiculed person was obvious from the likeness of the mask's

appearance; in Middle and New Comedy they deliberately constructed the masks with greater comic distortion since they were afraid of the Macedonians and the terror that was attached to them, and so that the appearance of the mask would not coincide by some chance with the features of some Macedonian ruler and the poet incur a penalty because he was thought to have acted deliberately. At any rate we see the shape of the brows on the masks of Menander's comedy and how the mouth is distorted and not of human proportion.

133. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1448a28–40. Written ca. 330 B.C. The assumption that comedy must have developed out of a democratic state is at least as old as the Megarian claim to comedy on the basis of the fact that Megara had a democracy long before Athens. Megarian tradition placed the first democracy before 600 B.C. Aristotle himself recognizes a Sicilian Dorian contribution to comedy (II 12). Analogous is Aristotle's explanation that rhetoric developed in Sicily when tyranny gave way to democracy (fr. 125 Gigon).

Wherefore some also call these <forms of mimesis> "dramas," since they imitate people in action (*drontas*). For this reason the Dorians lay claim both to tragedy and to comedy; for the Megarians, both those on the mainland <claim to be the inventors of comedy> alleging that <it arose> at the time of their democracy and also <the Megarians> of Sicily, since the poet Epicharmus, who was much earlier than Chionides and Magnes came from there; and some of the Peloponnesians claim tragedy. They adduce the names as proof. For they call their townships *komai*, but the Athenians call them "demes." They suppose that "comedy" is derived not from the word "to revel" (*komazein*), but from the fact that they were despised and wandered out of the city about the townships (*komai*). And they say *dran* (whence "drama") for "to produce poetry" (*poiein*), whereas the Athenians say *prattein*.

134A. Plutarch, *Demetrius* 12 (= PCG F 25). Written ca. 115. Referring to events in 307–302 B.C. In 307 B.C. Demetrius the Besieger put an end to the oligarchy under the regency of Demetrius of Phaleron (see IV 131–33) and restored the democratic constitution. Athenians lavished divine honors upon Demetrius and his father Antigonus, among other things renaming the Dionysia the "Demetria" and decreeing that the figures of Demetrius and his father should be woven onto the robe in which the statue of Athena was dressed at the Panathenaea (302 B.C.). The comic poet Philippides ridicules Stratokles, the principal agent of

this sycophancy. All three fragments probably come from a single comedy produced in 301 B.C. before the defeat of Demetrius and Antigonus at the Battle of Ipsus. It provides one of the last survivals of a direct attack on an Athenian politician in comedy. The last line in the first passage is taken by some as an indication that Stratokles advocated some restriction of the comic poets' freedom of speech.

The gods showed their disapproval of most of these things. When the robe <of Athena>, on which it had been decreed that the figures of Demetrius and Antigonus be woven between Zeus and Athena, was carried in procession through the Kerameikos, a sudden squall arose and ripped it in half... On the day of the celebration of the Dionysia they canceled the procession because of an unseasonable cold snap and, as a deep frost fell... the cold blighted all the vines... Because of this, Philippides, an enemy of Stratokles, wrote the following verses on him in a comedy: "because of whom the frost blighted the vines, because of whom the robe was torn in half, since he acted impiously in making human the honors due to the gods. This, not comedy, destroys the people."

134B. Plutarch, *Demetrius* 26 (= PCG F 25). Written ca. 115. The event took place in 302 B.C.

Breaking camp <Demetrius> wrote to Athens that he wished to be initiated to the Eleusinian Mysteries as soon as he got to Athens and to undergo the whole rite from the Little Mysteries to the *Epoptika* (the highest grade of initiation)... Stratokles made a motion and they voted to declare the month of Mounichion the month of Anthesterion, and they performed for Demetrius the Lesser Mysteries at Agrai, and after that Mounichion became Boedromion back from Anthesterion and Demetrius completed his initiation, even participating in the *Epoptika*. Because of this Philippides abused Stratokles in writing as "the man who compacted the year into a single month," and, for allowing <Demetrius> to set up his quarters in the Parthenon, as "the man who supposed the Acropolis was a hotel, and introduced prostitutes to the Virgin (Athena)."

134C. Plutarch, *Amatorius* 750e (= PCG F 26). Written ca. 115. This passage suggests that an actor may have represented Stratokles on stage.

Philippides the comic poet, ridiculing the politician Stratokles, wrote, "you can hardly kiss her when she turns her head away."

135. Demetrius, *The Areopagite*, PCG F 1. Performed after 294 B.C. when Demetrius the Besieger returned to Athens a second time and ousted

the tyrant Lachares after a siege that caused severe famine. This is the latest datable example of ridicule of an Athenian by name in comedy.

A BRAGGART COOK: What I have accomplished in this art of mine no actor has ever accomplished. This art is an empire of smoke! I was made *aburtake*-chef (a sauce of leeks, cress, and pomegranate) at the court of Seleucus. And at the court of Agathocles I first introduced Imperial Lentil Soup to the Sicilian. I did not tell you the most important thing. At the time of the famine, when Lachares was giving a dinner party to his friends, I provided refreshment by introducing capers.

Censorship Laws and Prosecution of Poets

136. Herodotus 6.21. See I 16.

137. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 67. The wording of the scholiast's summary of the law is *me komoidein*, which can mean either "not to write comedies" or "not to ridicule in comedy"; since we know from a fragment of the *Didaskaliai* that a comedy was produced in 437 B.C., either the former meaning is excluded or the testimony of the scholiast in its present form must be discredited. Perhaps we are meant to understand "not to ridicule by name."

"In the archonship of Euthymenes (437/6 B.C.): this is the archon in whose term was dissolved the law against ridiculing, which was passed in the archonship of Morychides (440/39 B.C.). It was in force during that year and the two years following in the archonships of Glaukinos (439/8 B.C.) and Theodoros (438/7 B.C.), after which it was dissolved in the archonship of Euthymenes.

138. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1150. The chorus of *Acharnians* complain about having been deprived of a meal by Antimachos who was their (or Aristophanes') *choregos* at the Lenaea (95). The text of Aristophanes, perhaps corrupt, refers to Antimachos as a *syngrapheus*, which can mean "composer," "drafter of legislation," or "historian." The scholiast's own words ("Antimachos appears to have") show that in this case the legislation is a simple inference from the text. Elsewhere (scholion to *Clouds* 1022) a scholiast gives us a list of Athenians named Antimachos, which include a "historian," clearly another inference from our text by another scholiast. The inference does not easily follow from the text, which is a simple complaint about a stingy *choregos*, but falls neatly in line with the late tradition that links a putative piece of legislation with the putative simultaneous disappearance of political com-

edy and choruses. It does not often happen that scholiastic inferences are obstructed by such patent counterevidence as the fact that Antimachos is abused by name in the very passage on which the theory is spun.

For they say that he drafted a law, with the result that the choruses got nothing from the *choregoi*. This Antimachos appears to have produced a law that one must not ridicule in comedy by name, and for this reason many of the poets did not come forward to get a chorus, and many of the choreuts were clearly starving. Antimachos was *choregos* at the time when he introduced the law.

139A. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 370–82. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. The hero Dikaiopolis lapses into the persona of the poet while making his defense before the hostile chorus of farmers from Akharnai.

And yet I am very much afraid because I know the ways of the farmers, who are overjoyed when some windbag praises them and the city whether justly or unjustly. And then they can't see that they're being sold out. And I know the hearts of the old men that look for nothing beyond stinging someone with a voting pebble (used for giving verdicts at jury trials). I myself know what I suffered at the hands of Cleon because of last year's comedy. He dragged me to the Council Chamber and slandered me and screamed lies into my face, and bellowed and inundated me, so that I nearly died from mucky persecution.

139B. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 496–519. The hero of the play, Dikaiopolis, addresses the spectators directly and adopts Aristophanes' own persona. The word translated "comedy," *trygoidia*, is a coinage formed on the analogy of "tragedy" (*tragoidia*). The point seems to be that comedy has its truths just as does tragedy.

Men of the audience, do not begrudge me if I, a mere beggar, intend to speak before the Athenian people on matters of state while producing a comedy. Comedy (*trygoidia*) also knows the truth. I will say things that are terrible but true. For now at least Cleon will not slander me by alleging that I spoke ill of the city in the presence of foreigners: we are alone and this contest is the Lenaea; the foreigners are not yet present; the tribute has not yet come nor the allies from the cities. . . . But since we are friends present at this discussion, why do we blame the Spartans for these things? I ask because men among us—and I do not say the city; remember this, that I do not say the city!—but rotten, bogus, worthless, ill-begotten, phony little men, kept denouncing the little cloaks of the Megarians.

139C. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 628–32. The chorus addresses the audience in the *parabasis*.

From the time that our poet took charge of comic choruses, he has not yet come forward toward the audience to say that he is clever. But since among the quick-counseled Athenians he has been slandered by his enemies, who say that he ridiculed our city and committed an outrage (*hybris*) upon the people, it is necessary for him to give an answer now to the fickle-counseled Athenians.

140. Scholion to *Acharnians* 378. The *Life of Aristophanes* (19–26) also mentions the trial for wrongful acquisition of citizen rights and adds, “and he was acquitted after being falsely accused a second and a third time.”

“I myself know what I suffered at the hands of Cleon because of last year’s comedy”: he means *Babylonians*; Aristophanes produced this play, in which he abuses many people, before the *Acharnians*. He ridiculed both the public offices assigned by lot and the elected offices and Cleon in the presence of foreigners. This is because he entered the drama *Babylonians* at the festival of the Dionysia, which is celebrated in spring at the time when the allies bring the tribute. For this reason Cleon indicted him on a charge of wronging the citizens, alleging that he had written these things to commit an act of *hybris* upon the people (*demos*) and the Council, and he indicted him for wrongful acquisition of citizen rights and he brought him to trial.

141A. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1284–91. Produced Lenaea, 422 B.C.

There are some who said that I came to terms with Cleon when he attacked me, shook me, and battered me with abuse. Then while I was being flayed, the spectators outside (“outside the building”? or possibly “those not involved”) kept laughing, caring nothing for me, but only interested in seeing whether, when pinched, I might emit a little joke. To show my contempt for all this, I’ve played a bit of a trick and so now the stake has fooled the vine.

141B. Scholion to *Wasps* 1284e.

It is unclear whether he still now refers to the bringing of charges against Callistratus (the *didaskalos* of *Babylonians*) to the Council, because Cleon brought charges against him, or to another bringing of charges against Aristophanes himself, or perhaps there was no bringing of charges but just a threat, which seems more likely.

142. Scholion to Aelius Aristides, *Oration*s 3.8 L.-B.

After Cleon prosecuted Aristophanes on a charge of *hybris*, he made a law that it no longer be permitted to ridicule people by name in comedy. Others say that they used to ridicule people by name in comedy until the time of Eupolis, but Alcibiades the general and politician did away with this. For he was ridiculed in a comedy by Eupolis (*Dippers*), and while he threw him into the sea, when he was a soldier in the expedition in Sicily, <Alcibiades> said: “you dipped me in the theater, now in the waves of the sea / I will destroy you, dipping you in most bitter waters.”

143. Scholion to Aristophanes, *Birds* 1297. In *Birds* the name “jay” is given to Syrakosios. *Birds* was produced at the Dionysia, 414 B.C., as was Phrynichus’ *Antisocial Man* (*Monotropos*), from which the scholiast cites. The apparent metrical complexity of the citation seems to indicate that it comes from a choral ode, perhaps the *parabasis*, but the text is obviously corrupt, and there is dispute about where it ends. The words “because he took,” etc., may be the words of the scholiast and not the fragment, although in this case it is difficult to see how the citation supports the scholiast’s claim that the passage is evidence for the law; similarly the words “therefore they assault him,” etc., may belong to the citation and not the scholiast.

This man (Syrakosios) is one of the politicians. Eupolis also ridicules him in *Cities* (422 B.C. = PCG F 220) He appears to have made a law against ridiculing anyone in comedy by name, as Phrynichus says in *Antisocial Man* (Dionysia, 414 B.C.): “May the mange take Syrakosios, may it be conspicuous on him and grow luxuriant (?end of citation), because he took away the right to ridicule whomever I (or they) wished” (or possibly “because he took away those whom I wished to ridicule”). Therefore they assault him even more bitterly.

144. Iohannes Tzetzes, *Prooemium* 1.87–97. Written 12th c. The word translated as “ridicule” in this passage can also mean “comedy” or “to write comedy.”

The first comedy had unveiled mockery; it was satisfied to ridicule thus in unveiled fashion until the time of Eupolis. When the latter tossed off a jest at the expense of Alcibiades the general and openly reviled his lisp—they happened to be on the warships at the time awaiting battle—he gave an order to the soldiers, and they either threw him out once into the sea and he perished, or they kept drawing him up and throwing him back into the sea tied to a rope and finally saved him when Alcibiades said to him: “You dipped me in the theater, I will immerse you in the most briny waters.”

Whether it happened this way or he perished once and for all in the waves, he put a stop to open and symbolic ridicule, or, when he was saved from such a death, he no longer pursued unveiled ridicule, but Alcibiades made a law to ridicule figuratively in comedy and not openly, and Eupolis himself, Cratinus, Pherecrates, Plato (the comic poet), Aristophanes, and others practiced symbolic mockery, and the second comedy sprang into being in Attica. When the Athenians began to break the law and did not wish to be exposed through symbols (i.e., comic allegory), they passed a law that ridicule should not take place symbolically, except that directed against slaves and foreigners alone; whence also the third comedy appeared, to which Philemon and Menander belonged.

145. Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* 6.1.18. Written 20th February, 50 B.C. Who does not say that Eupolis the poet of Old Comedy was thrown into the sea by Alcibiades while sailing to Sicily (415 B.C.)? Eratosthenes proved it false (later 3rd c. B.C.); for he adduces plays produced by him after that time. Duris of Samos (ca. 340–260 B.C.), an exceptional historian, is not laughed at because he made this mistake along with many others, is he?

Comedy and the Slander Laws

146. Isocrates, *Against Lochites* 20.2–3. Delivered ca. 400–396 B.C. For all other charges the perpetrator is only liable to prosecution by the person who was wronged, but in the matter of *hybris*, it being considered a matter of common concern, it is permitted to any citizen who wishes, after bringing an indictment before the *thesmothetai* (a board of six of the nine archons) and to appear before you <judges>. They thought it so terrible a thing that one citizen strike another that they even established a law that requires any who say something forbidden <to another citizen> to pay a fine of five hundred drachmas. And so how great must the retribution be on behalf of those who have actively suffered ill, when you appear so angry on behalf of those who have only verbally heard ill.
147. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 31–33, 47. Written 348–346 B.C. He did not only do violence to me, as Demosthenes, on that day, but also to your *choregos*; how important this distinction is you may learn from the following. You know of course that of these *thesmothetai* none is named “Thesmothetes,” but each has whatever name. Now then, if anyone commits assaults (i.e., commits *hybris*)

or abuses one of them in his capacity as private individual, he will be prosecuted on a private indictment (*graphe*) for assault (*hybris*) or a private charge of slander (*dike kakegorias*), but if <anyone assaults or abuses one of them> in his capacity as thesmothete, he will at once be deprived of his citizen rights. Why? Because anyone who does this assaults (commits *hybris* against) the very laws and your common garland (badge of office) and the name of the city, for *thesmothetes* is no individual’s name, but that of the city. And again if someone strikes or abuses the archon, the same situation: if <he strikes or abuses> while the archon is wearing his garland, he will be deprived of his citizen rights; if <he strikes him> in his private capacity, he will be liable to a private prosecution . . . (citing from the text of the law:) If anyone commits an act of *hybris* against anyone else, whether child, woman, or man, whether free or slave, or does anything illegal against any of these, let anyone who wishes, of those Athenians entitled, lay an indictment (*graphe*) before the *thesmothetes*, and let the *thesmothetes* bring him before the court of the Heliaia within thirty days of the indictment, if no public business prevents it, otherwise at the earliest opportunity.

148. Plutarch, *Solon* 21.1–2. Written ca. 115. Solon’s laws date to the early 6th c. B.C.

Also praised is Solon’s law that forbade speaking ill of the dead. Indeed piety demands that we regard the dead as sacred, justice that we abstain from assaulting those who no longer exist, and good policy that we avoid the perpetuation of feuds. It also forbade speaking ill of the living in sanctuaries, courts, the offices of magistrates, and whenever there were contests at a festival. It set a fine of three drachmas to be paid to the injured party and two more to be paid to the public treasury.

149. *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense*, in *Lex. Gr. Min.* 78.18f., s.v. *kakegorias dike* (“charge of slander”).

Charge of slander: if anyone speaks badly of any deceased person, even if he should be spoken badly of by his children, being condemned, he owes fifty drachmas to the public treasury, and thirty to the private person <who brought the prosecution>. Hyperides in the speech *Against Dorotheos* says those speaking ill of the dead are fined one thousand drachmas and those speaking ill of the living five hundred.

150. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 530–34. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. Pericles died in 429 B.C. Pericles is also ridiculed in *Peace* 606–14.

And then in anger Pericles, the Olympian, lightened, thundered, set Greece in commotion, and proposed laws written like drinking songs: “the Megarians ought not to reside on land, in the market, on the sea, or in the air.”

151. Aristophanes, *Peace* 42–48 and 642–56. Produced Dionysia, 421 B.C. Aristophanes boasts in his revised *Clouds* (549f.) that, unlike his rivals, “I punched Cleon in the stomach when he was most powerful but was not so presumptuous as to jump on him when he was laid low.” Nevertheless Cleon is here openly ridiculed, just months after he was killed in battle at Amphipolis.

HOUSE-SLAVE: So now some smart-aleck youth in the audience will ask, “What’s going on? What’s the dung-beetle for?” And an Ionian sitting beside him will say, “I suspect that it alludes to Cleon, since he eats excrement shamelessly” (or “in Hades” according to a plausible emendation). . . . HERMES (describing how corrupt politicians manipulated the events of the war): The city, pale and crouching in terror, would happily eat up whatever anyone slandered to it (a pun based on the similarity of the words “toss” and “slander”). When your allies saw the blows that were being administered to them, they stuffed with gold the mouths of the perpetrators of these acts and made them rich as a result. But meanwhile you did not notice that Greece was being turned into a desert. And the man who did this was the tanner (Cleon). TRYGAIOS: Stop, Lord Hermes, stop, don’t speak, but let that man be where he is down below. That man is no longer ours but yours (Hermes is usher of the dead). Anything you might say about him—that he was a crook, when he lived, and a blabbermouth and an extortionist and a troublemaker and a peace disturber—all this you will now say of one of your own.

152. Lysias, *Against Theomnestos* 1–12. Delivered 384/3 B.C. The speaker prosecuted Theomnestos for libeling him as a “father killer.”

I see that many of you judges were among those present when Lysitheos impeached Theomnestos for speaking in public after he had flung away his shield, this not being permitted. In that trial <Theomnestos> said that I had killed my father. Now I would have forgiven him for what he said if he had accused me of killing *his* father, because the latter was a worthless good-for-nothing. And I would not have prosecuted him if he had said any other of the forbidden things, since I think it vulgar and excessively litigious to prosecute for slander, but it seemed to me a shameful thing not to

seek vengeance from the man who said this about my father, who was such a worthy man to you and the city. . . . Now perhaps, judges, he will offer no defense concerning this, but will say to you what he dared to say even before the arbitrator, namely, that if someone says “he killed his father,” it is not one of the things that it is forbidden to say, since the law does not forbid this but rather does not permit one to say “murderer.” I think, judges, that you have to argue not about words, but about their meanings, and that you all know that all who are killers also murdered somebody. It would be a lot of work for the legislator to write down all the words that have the same significance. Rather, speaking of one, he signified all. If, Theomnestos, someone called you a father beater or mother beater, you would certainly not think he should pay you a penalty and at the same time suppose that he should go unpunished if he said that you “beat your female parent” or “your male progenitor.” I would be delighted to know, since you are an expert in the matter and have taken up both the practice and the theory, if someone were to say that you flung away your shield—the wording of the law is “if anyone says someone threw away <his shield>, let him be liable to prosecution”—would you not prosecute him, contenting yourself with having flung away your shield, and saying that the abuse is a matter of indifference to you, since “throwing” and “flinging” are not the same thing. . . . And you yourself brought a charge of slander against Lysitheos when he said you had flung away your shield. And yet nothing is said of “flinging” in the law, but rather it requires that anyone saying someone “threw away his shield” pay a penalty of five hundred drachmas.

153. Aristophanes, *Clouds* 353f. Kleonymos is the only *komo-doumenos* ridiculed for shield throwing in extant Old Comedy. Aristophanes alludes to his alleged shield throwing ten times in the extant comedies, but always with some slight comic distortion (e.g., *Wasps* 592, “Toadyonymos the shield flinger”). This passage is the only direct reference. The penalty in Athens for throwing one’s shield, i.e., running from the battlefield, is given by Andocides (1.74) as loss of citizenship rights, but Kleonymos was certainly never convicted of this crime, since he is likely to be the same Kleonymos who proposed decrees concerning the tribute in 426–5 B.C. (*IG I²* 57.34 and 65.5) and again authored a decree setting a reward for information about the mutilation of the herms in 415 B.C. (Andocides 1.27). In any case it is clear from Aristophanes that he is an active politician and not a disenfranchised nonentity (he is

said to be a perjurer at *Clouds* 400, a supporter of peace at *Peace* 673, and a sycophant at *Birds* 1479). Socrates has just explained that the clouds mimic people that they spot.

STREPSIADES: So that's why when these clouds saw Kleonymos the shield thrower yesterday, they recognized that he was the biggest coward ever and for this reason turned into deer.

154. Demosthenes, *Against Eubulides* 30. Delivered ca. 345 B.C. The speaker appeals a decision to strike him from the citizen lists on the grounds that he was a foreigner. One of the arguments used for excluding him was that his mother was not a citizen, and that this was somehow indicated by the fact that she sold ribbons in the marketplace.

I will speak concerning my mother since they slandered even her, and I will call witnesses for what I say. And yet, Athenians, not only did Eubulides slander us contrary to the legislation dealing with the marketplace, but also contrary to the laws that make anyone who disparages the occupation of any male or female citizen working in the marketplace liable to prosecution for slander.

155. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 475–79. Produced Lenaea, 425 B.C. The comic poets frequently mocked Euripides' low birth, claiming that his mother was a greengrocer. In reality she was of high birth (Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 218).

DIKAIOPOLIS: Dearest, O sweetest little Euripides, may I perish horribly if I ever ask again for anything, except one thing alone, just this one, just this alone: fetch me a piece of chervil from your mother.

156. Lysias, *On Behalf of the Soldier* 6. Delivered ca. 395–387 B.C.

All that I've just related was spoken at the table of Philios. When someone told them that I had abused them (the officials in charge of drawing up the muster rolls for conscripting citizens for a military expedition), they along with Ktesikles the archon decided to fine me contrary to the law, since the law forbids anyone to abuse a magistrate in the Council Chamber. . . . You have heard that the law clearly requires the punishment of those who speak abuse in the Council Chamber, but I provided witnesses to the effect that I did not go to the magistrate's office, but have been fined unjustly, and am not obligated to incur the fine or to pay the penalty.

157. Scholion to Aristophanes' *Clouds* 31. Ameinias was archon in 423/2 B.C. at the time of the production of the first *Clouds*. The scholion comments on a character named "Amynios" in the text, but refers the name to the archon "Ameinias." However, the Venetus, one of the two

most important of the manuscripts of Aristophanes, has "Ameinias" at *Clouds* 31 and 686. Further confusion is added by the fact that a prominent politician by the name of Amynios is mentioned in the *Wasps*, and it may well be that Ameinias and Amynios are two distinct people who both happened to be politically active at the time. It is quite likely that the legislation mentioned by the scholiast was invented as a theory to explain why "Amynios" appeared where some ancient scholar wanted the passage to refer to "Ameinias."

Amynios: . . . he mentions him also in the *Wasps*, but in the present passage he mentions him not because he is attacking that man, but rather he uses that man's name because he wishes to mock the archon. At that time Ameinias, son of Pronapes, was archon. (At this point the manuscripts give two versions to the scholion.) (A.) Not wishing to mock that man he turned the "i" to "y" and changed the spelling in a humorous way, since there was a law in Athens that no one could openly ridicule the archon in comedy. For this reason he said also Amynios, not Aminias. (B.) Since the law formerly forbade the Athenians to ridicule the archon in comedy, he took away the "i" and added the "y," and changing it a little called him Amynios instead of Aminias.

of the Odeon and other similar types of building; Izenour has a very useful treatment of the Theater of Herodes Atticus in Athens. The so-called theater-temples of Italy and Africa are dealt with authoritatively by J.A. Hanson, *Roman Theater-Temples* (Princeton 1959). C. Courtois, *Le Bâtiment de scène dans les théâtres d'Italie et de Sicilie* (Providence/Louvain le Neuve 1989), collects and illustrates with good plans what evidence remains for the scene buildings of Roman theaters, showing usefully how they developed and adapted throughout the empire. Other recent books that illustrate plans of Roman theaters are K. Mitens, *Teatri greci e teatri ispirati all' architettura greca in Sicilia e nell'Italia meridionale* (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 13, Rome 1988), and A. Neppi Modona, *Gli Edifici teatrali greci e romani* (Florence 1961). J.-C. Moretti in the new journal *Topoi* (1991-) has provided important surveys of the bibliography of theaters in Greece and in the East, which supplement earlier surveys such as that of D. di Bernardi Ferrero, *Teatri classici in Asia Minore*, 4 vols. (Rome 1966-1974), which is invaluable for its plans. But only four theaters have been properly published in the whole of Asia Minor, though we may hope for further important publications from Hierapolis and Aphrodisias. For Gaul there are good plans in the series of essays edited by C. Landes, *Le Théâtre antique et ses spectacles* (Lattes 1992).

II. Origins of Greek Drama

Much of this vast material is treated somewhat confusingly in A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, revised second edition by T.B.L. Webster (Oxford 1962), but it is now out of date. The dramatic vases are to be found in the collections of monuments illustrating ancient drama by T.B.L. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*² (*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, supplement no. 20, London 1967), and *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy*, second revised edition by J.R. Green (*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, supplement no. 39, London 1978). The Attic protocomic (?) choruses with pipers are also conveniently listed, illustrated, and discussed by J.R. Green, "A Representation of the *Birds* of Aristophanes," *J.P. Getty Museum: Greek Vases* 2 (1985) 95-118. The return of Hephaestus has been last studied by G.M. Hedreen, *Silens in Attic Black-figure Vase-painting* (Ann Arbor 1992), and "Lenaean" vases are collected by F. Frontisi-Ducroux, *Le Dieu-masque* (Paris 1991). Komasts have not yet been studied as a group, though the Corinthian vases have been

collected by A. Seeberg, *Corinthian Komast Vases* (*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, supplement 27, London 1971), and many early Attic examples can be found in H.A.G. Brijder, *Siana Cups 1 and Komast Cups* (*Allard Pierson Series* vol. 4, Amsterdam 1983). Brijder has also studied a most interesting vase in detail in "A Predramatic Performance of a Satyr Chorus by the Heidelberg Painter," in H.A.G. Brijder et al., eds., *Enthousiasmos: Essays . . . presented to J.M. Hemelrijk* (Amsterdam 1986) 68-91. The relation of drama to ritual has been often studied in detail; two good examples are R. Seaford, "On the Origins of Satyric Drama," *Maia* 28 (1976) 209-21, and W. Burkert, "Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966) 87-121. Aristotle's discussion of origins has been hotly debated with different results, and one does best to consult the latest translations and commentaries on the passage, e.g., by S. Halliwell, *The Poetics of Aristotle* (London 1987), or R. Janko, *Aristotle: Poetics* (Indianapolis/Cambridge 1987).

IIIaia. The Great Dionysia

For Attic religious festivals in general and including the dramatic festivals, see H.W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977), and E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison 1983). On the Dionysia and Lenaea, Pickard-Cambridge (see General, above) is the standard work. For a recent discussion of Peisistratus' unification of Attica through the reorganization of Attic cults, see F.J. Frost, "Peisistratos, the Cults, and the Unification of Attica," *The Ancient World* 21 (1990) 3-9. W.R. Connor, "City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 40 (1989) 7-32, reviews the evidence for the early history of the Great Dionysia and argues that the festival was founded only at the end of the 6th c. B.C. by the Athenian democracy. Ritual aspects of the Dionysia are discussed by S.G. Cole, "Procession and Celebration at the Dionysia," in R. Scodel, ed., *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor 1993) 25-38. S.D. Goldhill, "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1987) 58-76, examines the festival from the perspective of its political and ideological function. The most important discussion of the number of comic contestants at the Dionysia is W. Luppe, "Die Zahl der Konkurrenten an den komischen Agonen der Zeit des Peloponnesischen Krieges," *Philologus* 116 (1972) 53-75.

III Aib. The Lenaea, Rural Dionysia, and Anthesteria

For the other Attic dramatic festivals consult Parke, Simon, and Pickard-Cambridge (listed under The Great Dionysia, above). The organization of the Rural Dionysia is studied by D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton 1986) 212–22. Ghiron-Bistagne (see Actors in the Classical Period, below) 86–97, looks at the evidence for dramatic activity at the deme level. N.W. Slater, “The Lenaeon Theater,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 66 (1986) 255–64, argues for and attempts to locate a Lenaeon theater, separate from the Theater of Dionysus.

III Aia. The Choregic System

The most detailed discussion is in Pickard-Cambridge (see General, above) 75–78, 86–92. J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971), examines the demographics of the “liturgical class” in his introduction (xvii–xxxi) and Casson (see The Athenian Theater Audience, below) gives a detailed insight into their economic conditions. The attitudes rich Athenians held toward liturgies and the means they used to avoid them are studied by M. Christ, “Liturgy Avoidance and Antidosis in Classical Athens,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120 (1990) 147–69. Antidosis is also discussed by V. Gabrielson, “The Antidosis Procedure in Classical Athens,” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 38 (1987) 7–38. D. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 161–64, explains the laws and regulations governing liturgies. Valuable also is MacDowell (see The Choruses, below) 65–69, with further discussion of the rules governing the recruitment and exclusion of choregoi. A link between some illustrations of theatrical scenes and choregic dedications is argued by H. Froning, *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei: Beiträge zur Archäologie* 2 (Würzburg 1971).

III Aii. Judges

Far too much has been taken for granted with respect to the manner in which prizes were handed out at the dramatic festivals, yet nothing could be more crucial to such widely studied aspects of Athenian drama as its competitive context, the role of the audience, and popular reception. Apart from a four-page discussion in Pickard-Cambridge (see General, above) 95–99, English readers have only M. Pope, “Athenian Festival Judges—Seven, Five, or However Many,” *Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986)

322–26, who made the suggestion criticized in the introduction to III Aii that there were ten judges but only as many votes were counted as assured placement. This is far too simplistic a solution. Pope does not mention III 119 or G. Arrighetti, “Il papiro di Ossirinco n. 1611 e il numero dei giudici negli agoni,” *Dioniso* 45 (1971–74) 302–8, who is more critical of the ancient testimony. The problem deserves more attention.

III Aic. Freedom of Expression

More or less standard expressions of the festival license theory can be found in K. Reckford, *Aristophanes' Old and New Comedy* (Chapel Hill 1987) 461–82, and S. Halliwell, “Aristophanic Satire,” *Yearbook of English Studies* 14 (1984) 6–20. Several studies have appeared recently that apply Bakhtin’s theory of carnival to Old Comedy: J. Carrière, *Le Carnaval et la politique* (Paris 1979); W. Rösler, “Michail Bachtin und die Karnevalskultur im antiken Griechenland,” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 23 (1986) 25–44; and somewhat oversubtle and opaque in its presentation, but still of great interest, S. Goldhill, *The Poet’s Voice* (Cambridge 1991) 167–222. A.T. Edwards, “Historicizing the Popular Grotesque: Bakhtin’s *Rabelais* and Attic Old Comedy,” in R. Scodel, ed. *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor 1993) 89–117, offers a much more discriminating view of both Bakhtin and Old Comedy. J. Henderson, “The Demos and Comic Competition,” in J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* (Princeton 1990) 271–313, criticizes the carnivalists and those who regard the effect of political statements in comedy as limited only to humor. Both groups would isolate comedy from its political context by buffering it with concepts of otherworldliness, fictionality, and comic aestheticism; although the carnivalists do argue for an abstract political content in the “deep structure” of comedy, it is at the expense of its manifest political invective. Henderson argues, as we do, that comic satire and abuse are effective contributions to Athenian political discourse and do not differ essentially from their counterparts in forensic and political rhetoric. S. Halliwell, “Ancient Interpretations of *onomasti komodein* in Aristophanes,” *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984) 83–88, shows how the presuppositions and methods of Hellenistic scholars are responsible for manufacturing much of the information about *komodoumenoi* and about censorship that appears in our scholia. Halliwell argues that both the decree of Antimachos and possibly the decree of Syrakosios are inferences from the text. A.H. Sommerstein, “The Decree of Syrakosios,” *Classical Quar-*

terly 36 (1986) 101–8, argues for the historicity of this decree and revives a theory that it was a ban on mentioning those involved in the scandals of the mutilation of the herms and/or the profanation of the mysteries. This theory is effectively challenged by S. Halliwell, “Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111 (1991) 48–70. Halliwell’s study is a thorough examination of the reports of censorship legislation and of comedy’s relation to the general law of slander. Halliwell, like Henderson and like ourselves, sees comic license as ultimately derived from a combination of its political context and its festival occasion, but whereas Henderson stresses the political, as we do, Halliwell stresses the festival context. J.E. Atkinson, “Curbing the Comedians: Cleon Versus Aristophanes and Syracosius’ Decree,” *Classical Quarterly* 42 (1992) 56–64, argues a variation on Sommerstein’s theory, that Syrakosios’ decree was to protect those wrongly implicated in the scandals of 416 B.C. Many of Halliwell’s criticisms could be applied to Atkinson. The laws of slander and *hybris* are explained by MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (see The Choregic System, above) 126–32.

IIIB. The Greek World from Hellenistic to Imperial Times

There is in English no overall survey of festivals in the Greek world, nor of the hundreds of dramatic festivals in it, as is pointed out by P. Herz, “Die musische Agonistik und der Kunstbetrieb der Kaiserzeit,” in Jürgen Blänsdorf, ed., *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen 1990) 175–195 with a useful bibliography. A useful introduction to the detail of only one festival is S. Mitchell, “Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990) 183–93. An entire book was written about this inscription by M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (*Vestigia* 39, Munich 1988). Likewise a specific area is treated by A.J.S. Spawforth, “Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece,” in A. Cameron and S. Walker, eds., *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (London 1989) 193–97. Roueché (see Inscriptions, above) is a good introduction to the interesting and unique festivals of Aphrodisias and much else. G.M. Sifakis, *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (London 1968), deals with most of the Hellenistic inscriptions, and remains the basic work on the drama of that period. Also useful is B. Gentili, *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World* (Amsterdam 1979). C.P. Jones makes much use of inscriptions in his important survey of “Greek Drama in the Roman Empire,”

in R. Scodel, ed., *Theater and Society in the Ancient World* (Ann Arbor 1993) 39–52.

IIIC. The Roman World

The only survey of the area are chapters in L. Friedlaender’s *Sittengeschichte*: there is a translation of the seventh edition by L. Magnus and others, *Roman Life and Manners in the Early Empire* (New York 1965), but, being originally written in 1906, this is out of date. There is interesting general material also in P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le Cirque*, abridged as *Bread and Circuses* (London 1990), as well as D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (London 1969). H. Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (London 1981), is useful for details. E. Jory gives a good overview in “Continuity and Change in the Roman Theater,” in *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* (Bristol 1986) 143–52. A survey of recent epigraphical studies is to be found in M. Le Glay, “Épigraphie et théâtres,” in Landes (see Theater Buildings, above) 209–21. The Etruscan origins are treated by T.P. Wiseman, “Satyrs in Rome?” *Journal of Roman Studies* 78 (1988) 1–13. But for the most part one must refer to discussion of the individual passages and inscriptions, e.g., M.G. Geer, “The Greek Games at Naples,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 66 (1935) 208–21, and J.R. Arnold, “Agonistic Festivals in Italy and Sicily,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 64 (1960) 245–51. The inscriptions for the Secular Games are treated with bibliography by A.E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley 1983) 100.

IVAi. Actors in the Classical Period

There is relevant material scattered through Pickard-Cambridge (see General, above) esp. 126–56 and 279–80, but the most valuable general work is P. Ghiron-Bistagne, *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique* (Paris 1976). Ghiron-Bistagne also includes an annotated catalog of actors that supplements the list in J.B. O’Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago 1908): both are now superseded by I.E. Stephanis, *Dionysiakoi Technitai* (Heraklion 1988), written in Greek. D.F. Sutton, “The Theatrical Families of Athens,” *American Journal of Philology* 108 (1987) 9–26, shows that the early acting profession centered on professional families. G.M. Sifakis, “Boy Actors in New Comedy,” in G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and

The Context
of Ancient Drama

Eric Csapo
and
William J. Slater

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS